dinner is being planned to honor Los Angeles School Board Member, Bobbi Fiedler. We wish to take this opportunity to extend special thanks to this very dedicated woman who has done so much to improve the quality of education in the Los Angeles School District. The following outlines some of Bobbi Fiedler's many accomplishments on behalf of the people of Los Angeles and especially the young people of that community.

Mr. Speaker, we, as Representatives from the Los Angeles area, would like to take this opportunity to bring to our colleagues' attention a dynamic woman whose quiet dedication and unfailing willingness to get involved have made a positive contribution to her community and the educational system in the Los Angeles area.

Bobbi Fiedler is currently a member of the Los Angeles Board of Education, and while she has often worked in the limelight, she has also willingly accepted the responsibility for countless hours of hard work at those volunteer jobs which are often thankless and unglamorous. Bobbi Fiedler typifies that grand and unique American institution, "the volunteer." Without the Bobbi Fiedler's of this country, there would be no community spirit; no community activities; no cohesive society—there would be only people living in the same vicinity, but no "community." It is to this very issue that Bobbi has dedicated herself in the last several years.

Bobbi has managed a home and family and multiple careers. She has served as PTA Drug Abuse Chairman; PTA Parent Education Chairman and as a member of the Valley Interfaith Council—Drug Abuse Committee. She has been a leader for the Cub Scouts, Brownie Scouts and Girl Scouts, and has been active with the Mid-Valley Girls Softball League and the Encino Little League. Through all these activities, Bobbi learned and recognized the importance of the community as an extension of the home. She understands that adults working with children create a better environment for character development than children left to their own devices, and she understands that community involvement creates not only a feeling of belonging, but an acceptance of responsibility and concern for those around us.

In a society that has become more and more transient, Bobbi realizes how much more important those institutions which represent stability have become, and that the hub of a stable community is its school system. It was for these reasons that Bobbi became a driving force in establishing BUSTOP, and later became the organization's executive director. While there has been much controversy surrounding the busing issue in Los Angeles, BUSTOP has been in the forefront in trying to find acceptable alternatives to massive busing and to fighting the court order which needlessly places children on buses for over 3 hours a day.

BUSTOP has worked within the system and on an issue in which feelings run high; it has led a nonviolent opposition to the court orders. In our judgment, this is, indeed, a high tribute to those who have organized and worked on this effort. BUSTOP has, and is, waging a hard fight against Los Angeles' court ordered busing, but it has resisted the temptation to drag the issue into the muck of violence which has plagued other cities in the same quandry. For this, we all owe Bobbi Fiedler a special thanks.

Bobbi's friends and neighbors are hosting a special dinner in her honor on March 2, and we would like to join her well-wishers in paying tribute to a lifetime of giving, helping, and involvement.●

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, February 15, 1979*

The House met at 11 a.m.

The Reverend Tomas Ziuraitis, Dominican priest, Dominican Monastery, Lithuanian American Community of Metropolitan Washington, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

God bless America, this great country of human rights, and all who are commemorating the 728th anniversary of the formation of Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom and who are now commemorating the 61st anniversary of the reestablishment of the Republic of Lithuania in the year 1918.

Almighty God, eternal justice and love, Your Son came to bring freedom to all peoples, we now ask You to bestow freedom and independence upon Lithuania and all captive nations.

Graciously grant this hope and plea through Your holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REV. TOMAS ZIURAITIS

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure to welcome to our Nation's Capitol Rev. Tomas Ziuraitis, who offered the opening prayer today. He was born in Lithuania and studied in France, Germany, Belgium, and Austria, and earned his doctor of philosophy degree at the Catholic university in Salzburg. During the postwar years he was chaplain of Lithuanian refugees in Austria and Germany.

Father Ziuraitis came to the United States in 1949, where he taught at various colleges and served as chaplain at two convents in New Jersey. In 1962, Father Ziuraitis was transferred to the Dominican Monastery in Washington, D.C., where he conducts missions and retreats and pursues scholarly studies.

Dr. Ziuraitis is a member of the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Joint Baltic American Committee, and the National Advisory Board of the American Security Council.

SENATOR MUSKIE SPEAKS ON PROPOSALS TO BALANCE THE BUDGET BY CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the wisest, most experienced and highly respected persons in American life is the distinguished senior Senator from Maine, the Honorable EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

Senator MUSKIE, who is chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, delivered an address this week at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., on proposals to balance the budget through amending the Constitution of the United States.

Because I believe all Members of the House and Senate will want to read Senator MUSKIE's address on this occasion, I include the text of his address, delivered on February 13, 1979, at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE

In 1930—Franklin Delano Roosevelt confided to a friend—"It's becoming harder and harder for an honest fellow with a wife and children and nineteen servants to make a decent living."

In 1979, for families and governments alike, it is still often difficult to make ends meet. And the rush is on for a quick-fix approach to the government's fiscal dilemma.

Mathematicians have a saying—solutions can't be found until problems are stated correctly.

This afternoon, I don't expect to find the solution to the difficulties we face in balancing the budget. I do hope to state the problem correctly. I hope to raise some serious questions. I hope to start some serious people thinking—particularly about the growing demand for a new constitutional convention.

That movement has attracted much attention—but little careful thought. It is considered too casually by proponent and foe alike.

To be sure, some legislatures have reviewed this proposal with appropriate deliberation. But in many statehouses, prudence has given

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

way to panic. Resolutions to change the Constitution of the United States are introduced at noon and adopted before dinner. Sometimes without a single hearing—without a review of alternatives—without as much debate as a new state song would engender—they endorse a substantial revision of the fundamental law of the land.

They have lost their grip on the enormity of what they are doing. And they have taken the wrong way out of a troublesome dilemma.

A VERY POOR SOLUTION

I am convinced that a constitutional amendment is a very poor solution to our current fiscal difficulties. It is unworkable, counterproductive, and even harmful. But it is not the caricature some critics suggest. It is a very serious proposal indeed. It deserves very serious review.

A mandated balance is not the only issue. There are many variations on the theme. Some propose a balanced budget statute. Others invent formulas to limit federal spending. Still others hope that Congress will produce an amendment for ratification by the states. All of these proposals are dangerous and poorly thought through. But the most alarming prospect of all is a new constitutional convention.

It's an uncharted course to an unknown destination. A balanced budget amendment is only one potential result. There are other popular crusades—to outlaw guns—to outlaw gun control—to make abortion a right—to make abortion a crime—to ban forced busing—to endow forced busing with a specific constitutional sanction.

Many passionate causes are deeply rooted in our nation. Many are well supported. Many are well financed. Many are eager to readjust the underpinnings of the United States of America.

A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION?

At a constitutional convention, could the readjustments be limited? No one really knows. The Attorney General thinks so. The American Bar Association agrees. But there is only one precedent. And it is not a comforting one.

The only convention we've ever had was called to revise the Articles of Confederation. But the delegates didn't stop at the revision. They scrapped the system. They built a new one. And what would prevent a wholesale recasting of the document they devised? Not the Constitution itself—it simply says that Congress "Shall call a convention for proposing amendments." And depriving the states of Senate representation is the only amendment specifically ruled out. Hopefully, the agenda would be limited.

If a runaway convention exceeded the limits thought to be imposed by those who convene it and three-fourths of the legislatures, responding to the kinds of popular pressures now being generated, were to ratify the result, who could say no?

How many of us are willing to gamble that our national compass would not be disoriented? How many even perceive the risk?

There are too many questions here—and not enough answers.

We should not expose our Constitution to the prospect of substantial revision when there are other, less imposing alternatives. Neither should we trivialize it with money management schemes—particularly those which can do no good and a great deal of harm.

THE BUDGET AND THE ECONOMY

A mandated federal budget balance is just such an ill-considered contrivance. And it is largely the product of a basic misperception. The relationship between the deficit and the economy is a very close one indeed. But it is not a one-way affair. A bad budget can unbalance the economy. But a bad economy can also unbalance the budget. And no amendment could possibly cope with that.

When unemployment goes up only one percentage point—the deficit swells by some 20 billion dollars—20 billion dollars in lost tax revenues and increased social welfare costs—20 billion dollars drained from the federal purse without a single spending spree.

In times of severe recession, the impact on the budget can be devastating. We've had some recent experience.

In October, 1974, President Ford unwrapped his "Whip Inflation Now" Program. He pledged to hold the deficit to 9 billion dollars in fiscal 1975. But fate and recession intervened. Just 3 months later, the President revised that estimate to 35 billion dollars, and sent the Congress a fiscal 1976 recommendation for a 52 billion dollar deficit.

The men who made the WIN buttons lost their jobs—along with 2 million other Americans.

A year ago January, President Carter proposed a budget with a 60 billion dollar deficit. We worked hard to trim it—and by September, we had cut that deficit to 38 billion. But interest rates went up. Inflation pushed higher. And from September to January, the deficit increased by 5 billion dollars—when Congress wasn't even in session.

Constitutional amendments can't balance the economy. Resolutions passed in Richmond or Topeka can't dictate policy in Riyadh or Tehran. Decisions made in Washington's caucus rooms aren't always supported in the board rooms of New York.

PRUDENT FISCAL MANAGEMENT

Are we helpless then? Certainly not. Prudent fiscal management can work through the economy and lead us back to a steadier course. We are doing that job right now. But a suddenly imposed requirement for an immediate balance—or for one to be forged in the unknowable future—would have some very regrettable consequences.

Over the years, economists of nearly every persuasion have testified before our Committee. They have agreed on little more than this—you can't always catch a deficit with radical spending cuts and tax increases. That may only make it run faster.

For fiscal 1980, the President projects a 29 billion dollar deficit. But a 29 billion dollar spending cut would not bring the budget into balance. It would ripple through the economy with a tax revenue loss of many billions of dollars.

It would take a cut of at least 45 billion to put the books in balance. And that would cost more than a million American jobs. It might have an impact on inflation, but it would leave the economy far weaker than before. And where would we look for a cut of that magnitude?

Of course, a budget can be balanced by raising taxes as well as by cutting expenses. And some insist that closing loopholes would match our debits with credits.

In 1932, Herbert Hoover tried that. He rushed to balance the budget with a drastic hike in taxes. The rest is tragic history. Things got very much worse. Purchasing power had been drained from the economy exactly when it should have been injected.

1932 was not a good year for the economy. 1932 was not a good year for Herbert Hoover.

But there is a third option. When the economy is growing, taxes rise faster than spending. And unless you enact a tax cut, increased spending never catches up with revenues. So you juice up spending. You stimulate inflation. You push people into higher brackets. Your tax revenues go up. And you point with pride at a balanced budget.

That is the stuff of conservatives' nightmares. And that is yet another way to meet a balanced budget mandate.

All of these potential consequences are unattractive indeed. But perhaps the very worst result would be a failure of flexibility in times of economic downturn. Economists of every respected school agree that increased federal spending or tax cuts producing a deficit may well be the only way to boost employment, generate investment, stimulate demand, accumulate capital, and prevent a downturn from deepening into a depression.

A mandated balance would blunt our sharpest fiscal tool. And that is why thoughtful advocates are quick to point to escape clauses.

But no escape clause could be framed quite cleverly enough. How would recession be defined? Who would announce its arrival? Who would be willing to lead the escape when the signs of a trend appeared. Would two-thirds of the Senate vote to abandon a constitutionally mandated balanced budget for a deficit unless the roof was caving in? Would we have time to pop the parachute before we hit the ground?

QUESTIONS WITHOUT ANSWERS

There are too many questions with no good answers—too many holes in the theory.

And so—some map a more sophisticated route to balance. They suggest that spending should be limited to a fixed percentage of GNP, or that growth in spending should be tied to GNP growth. But have they asked the right questions?

Our Constitution does only two things. It blueprints the structures by which we govern ourselves. And it defines the human rights we respect. Do we really want to devalue that currency with algebra and bar graphs?

We wouldn't even know where to begin the equation. Which magic number would we pick? To whose projections would we tie it? The President predicts a 3.2-percent GNP growth rate for 1980. But the Congressional Budget Office says 3.9 percent. This difference of seven-tenths percent in the growth of federal spending represents three and a half billion dollars.

Perhaps we should go to a prominent private sector forecaster. But Wharton Econometrics says 1.3 percent and Chase says 4.1.

It is sometimes proposed that the number be tied to last year's growth. But like generals preparing to fight the last war, politicians preparing to deal with last year's realities are poorly prepared indeed.

Should we be writing a guessing game into the Federal Constitution? Should we bind tomorrow's needs to yesterday's performance? How can we make good practical sense out of bad theoretical blueprints?

Too many questions with no good answers—too many holes in the theory.

THE CITIES AND STATES

Perhaps the most ironic twist is the role of the states in the budget balancing controversy. 25 of them are leading us into a serious mistake. And they will pay the biggest price. If Congress must suddenly chop the deficit, it will land in the laps of the states. That is not a threat. It's a matter of arithmetic.

Where would the cuts be made? Where would we find that 45 billion dollars this year? Let me refer you to the charts we've prepared.

Our cities and states are drawing on Washington for every conceivable need—from the health and education of their children to the wages of the men who trim the statehouse lawn.

Over the last thirty years, federal grants-in-aid to state and local governments have grown five times faster than the gross national product.

In fiscal 1980, the average state expects to receive one billion, six hundred and fifty-nine million dollars from Washington. The legislatures seem to be unaware of the consequences an overnight balance would bring.

During its 1975–76 session, the Pennsylvania legislature passed its call for a balanced federal budget. That was Resolution 236. Resolution 235 demanded a renewal of revenue sharing.

When the Oregon legislature passed its amendment resolution, a "whereas" clause suggested that "a balanced budget would lessen the need for increased state and local taxes." That's an odd theory—particularly in view of the fact that Oregon got one billion, seventy-five million dollars from Washington in fiscal 1978.

We could save 31 billion—2 billion more than the President's projected deficit—merely by killing revenue sharing, education grants, EPA sewage construction, community development block grants, and the CETA program.

Is that what they want in the legislatures? Do they think the Congress would slash its own perception of national needs before it touched the states? And if we did exempt the states from surgery, what would be left to cut? Social security? National defense?

There is 82.9 billion dollars in the President's budget for grants to state and local governments. In 1978, the states ran a combined surplus of 29 billion—a figure that matches the President's deficit for fiscal 1980. An appealing solution to the balance dilemma leaps very quickly to mind.

It would be easy to ask, "Who's deficit is this?" and the states would not be pleased with the answer.

Of course, if we look to the states' example, we needn't make cuts at all. We can get into balance merely by following their long-standing and well accepted method of accounting. If we put capital investments in a separate accounting category, we'd have a much smaller deficit today. And it wouldn't make a lot of difference to our income, our outflow, or the state of the economy.

That is what the states do. That's what General Motors does. That is accepted practice.

It would also be easy to balance the budget by removing various programs from it. The federal government already spends some 12 billion dollars through agencies that are not counted in the budget totals. More programs could be moved into the dark. Or, more use could be made of federal guarantees and similar devices.

The Budget Committee is determined to bring such programs under the budget's umbrella. Only then will we have a full honest picture of real federal government activity. A balanced budget requirement would surely tempt the Congress to go the other way.

Creative accounting could provide us a meaningless paper balance, but is there any point in one? Is there any good reason for attaching a charade to the Constitution of our country?

The answers are clear. So are the holes in the theory.

THE NEW CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PROCESS

We've been perfecting a different theory since 1975—a new Congressional budget process. It was forged in reaction to 37 years of deficit spending in the 54 years between 1920 and 1974. It was established because that record was flatly unacceptable. And for the first time in its history, Congress took explicit steps to reverse that record of deficits.

For the first time in its history, Congress established a standing committee with one exclusive mission—to set a fiscal plan—to hold the Congress to it—to pull us back from those irresponsible deficits.

Contrary to the popular rhetoric, we have made tremendous progress. And ours is no simple task.

In the popular imagination, the budget resembles an hourglass, with assets and liabilities neatly stacked at opposite ends. If an imbalance develops, what could be simpler than tilting the glass until the sands even out?

But the budget is better compared to a watch. When it runs too fast or slow, a violent jolt may relieve frustration. But it will not repair a delicate mechanism. One has to determine which moving parts to lubricate—which gears to tighten—which counterweights to adjust.

We've been making those judgments. And the record is more impressive than rhetoric.

In our first year of 1975, recession prevailed—and George Meany demanded a hundred billion dollar deficit. We held it to 66 billion. And five years later, we are keeping the pressure on.

In 1975, the deficit was 3 percent of GNP. But in 1980, it is projected at 1.2 percent.

In 1980, the level of Federal spending will be 30 billion dollars lower than it would have been if Washington took the same percentage of GNP as it did in 1975.

And during the four years of the Congressional budget process, our spring budget resolutions have called for spending targets at an average of 28 billion dollars below the requests submitted by the authorizing committees.

WE CAN DO BETTER STILL

That's not good enough. We can do better still. We intend to. And we already have all the statutes, formulas and amendments we need to get the job done. We are asking the right questions. We are sealing the holes in a workable, flexible theory. Why scrap a proven system for one that defies a working diagram? Why graft an irresponsible scheme to the fundamental law of the land?

As one Supreme Court justice said, our Constitution is not a rubber ball to be tossed about and played with by each succeeding child. It embodies the essence of our system. There is no room in it for yesterday's whim or tomorrow's fancy.

In the long run, that is the centrally important concern. But in the near term, there is nothing attractive about the federal deficit. This is not a pro-deficit Congress. I am not a pro-deficit Budget Chairman. This is not a pro-deficit speech. But we don't need fiscal handcuffs to wipe the deficit out. We need fiscal discipline. We need to make informed, prudent judgments about hundreds of separate spending choices. We need the will to make those judgments stick. If we have that will, no formula is necessary. If we don't, no formula will work.

AN ANALYSIS OF PRESIDENT CARTER'S FISCAL YEAR 1980 BUDGET

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I insert an appendix to Senator MUSKIE's address, an analysis of President Carter's proposed budget for fiscal year 1980:

An analysis of President Carter's fiscal year 1980 budget

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1980 outlays
Contributory insurance and retirement programs:	
Social security	115.2
Railroad retirement	4.5
Federal employee retirement and insurance	14.0
Unemployment assistance	11.4
Medicare	32.1
	177.2
Defense and veterans programs	146.2
Net interest payments	46.1
Grants to State and local governments:	
Sewage treatment plant construction	3.6
Federal-aid highways	6.8
Urban mass transit	2.4
Community development block grants	3.3
Elementary and secondary education	3.4
Other education programs	3.7
Social services	3.0
Employment and training assistance	6.3
Temporary employment assistance	2.6
Youth, aging, and vocational rehabilitation programs	1.6
Medicaid	12.4
Other health programs	2.2
Unemployment assistance	1.8
Public assistance (primarily AFDC)	6.7
Child nutrition and special milk programs	2.6
Subsidized housing programs	3.4
General revenue sharing	6.9
All other programs	10.4
	82.9
Welfare costs in the States assumed by the Federal Government:	
Food stamps	6.5
Supplemental security income program	6.3
Earned income credits in excess of tax liability	1.7
Black lung benefits	1.5
Subsidized housing programs	1.7
All other programs	0.6
	18.3
Other Federal activities:	
Foreign affairs	8.2
Space and scientific research	5.5
Energy	7.3
Environmental cleanup and development	6.9
Farm price supports and research	3.9
Transportation	7.3
Education and training	7.9
Health care, research, and training	6.8
Administration of justice	3.9
All other programs, net	3.3
	60.9
Total fiscal year 1980 outlays	531.6

NOTE.—Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL LIMITING PROPERTY AND CASUALTY AND LIFE INSURANCE ACTIVITIES OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, it was on the night of October 5 last year that this House had the opportunity to record its will on an issue in so overwhelming a way as to leave no one in doubt as to the desire and intent of its Members on the matter of restricting the activities of bank holding companies in certain insurance related pursuits. By a 252 to 72 vote, this House said "no" to expanded bank holding company insurance activities.

Unfortunately, a quirk of legislative necessity prevented this mandate from taking the form of law. At the last moment, title XIII of FIRA was cut from the compromise package of banking reforms which ultimately passed. However, the record shows and loudly echoes today the sentiments of those in the House who strongly supported the cause of bank separation from nonbank related commerce, particularly property and casualty insurance.

At that time and on that occasion late on the Saturday evening prior to adjournment, a bond was made, a promise was given that this issue was not to go unredressed. Today, Mr. Speaker, with the enthusiastic cosponsorship of Mr. ST GERMAIN, I am starting the process by which that pledge will be redeemed. The text of a bill follows—a bill seasoned by the passage of time, aged to its prime in the coolness of objective regard. It picks up where we left off last fall, only with a more refined and sharply honed precision, to get done the job which needs doing.

This effort bridges the time gap since last October and provides a continuity on this issue which should expedite its consideration by the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulation, and Insurance and by the full Banking Committee. The forceful backing of a majority of those committees and the sense of purposeful commitment of their respective chairmen give me hope that we can have a bill such as I offer today back before the House in this session at an early date.

For many years in the courts and last year in Congress it has been argued persuasively that, because of a bank's ability to tie, directly or indirectly, the sale of insurance to an extension of credit, bank holding company insurance activities are not in the public's interest. Furthermore, the power of financial institutions which control enormous amounts of depositor's capital places special responsibilities on the banks' use of that capital, and places most competing small businesses at an immediate, usually noncompensable, disadvantage.

Congress, of course, has long recognized this problem, and the consequent need for a separation between banking and other forms of commerce. Most recently, primarily because of the insurance agents cases, Congress has also become more sensitive to the vulnerability of a variety of other businesses which face the possibility of unrestricted bank entry.

It should not go unsaid, Mr. Speaker, that some of these other enterprises have as good a case and as strong a need as do the insurance agencies for a legislated protection from the intrusive conduct of large bank holding company expansionism. I would not be at all surprised, therefore, to find that others would seek solace and find sympathy for a relief similar to the insurance prohibition contemplated by my bill.

It should come as no news that Congress already has deliberately and wisely constructed a restrictive regulatory framework within which banks must operate. That framework, enunciated in the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, and in the 1970 amendments to that act, explicitly contemplates restrictions on bank holding company nonbanking activities. Those restrictions have been steadily eroded, not by Congress' desire to see an expansion of bank holding company nonbanking activities, but because of the Federal Reserve Board's overgenerous interpretation of existing law.

If Congress intended its legislated control over banks' unique financial power to mean anything, they can begin to restore that meaning by supporting this bill. And if Congress believes, as I do, that the public interest would not be served by the elimination of large portions of a thriving and competitive insurance agency small business, they will act quickly to have this legislation signed into law.

Sensing the urgency of this cause would not be hard for any of our colleagues who have heard from the insurance companies, agents, and interested private parties already on this matter. To our other colleagues I want to communicate that same enthusiasm for deliberate but expeditious consideration and adoption of this needed legislation. A relief provided too late would be an injustice, a victory awarded posthumously would be a mockery.

In the months since the 95th Congress adjourned, circumstances have conspired to increase the danger to insurance agents of bank entry into the business. In addition to a Supreme Court decision in 1978 not to hear the insurance agents cases, and since the short-circuited effort to obtain legislative relief in the 95th Congress, the Federal Reserve Board announced in December the scheduled expiration next year of a limited grandfather clause. This will require bank holding companies to submit applications to continue in, or to divest nonbanking activities, including insurance, already engaged in when current law took effect 10 years ago. Moreover, the Federal Reserve Board rejected a House and Senate Banking Committee request in October to impose a moratorium on processing bank applications to engage in insurance activities.

These events make the swift, unhampered consideration of this bill crucial to the survival of many thousands of small business men and women who make their living as insurance agents. Furthermore, decisive action on this bill will lay the groundwork for more comprehensive, also urgently needed, bank holding company reform legislation.

I urge my colleagues to waste no time in completing legislation most supported by record vote only 4 months ago.

Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of my bill and the accompanying explanation be included in the RECORD:

H.R. 2255

A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 to limit the property and casualty and life insurance activities of bank holding companies and their subsidiaries

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that section 4(c)(8) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1843(c)(8)) is amended by striking the period at the end of the first sentence thereof and adding the following: ", but for purposes of this subsection it is not closely related to banking or managing or controlling banks for a bank holding company to provide insurance as a principal, agent or broker except (i) where the insurance is limited to assuring repayment of the outstanding balance due on a specific extension of credit by a bank holding company or its subsidiary in the event of the death or disability of the debtor; or (ii) any insurance agency activity in a place that (A) has a population not exceeding 5,000 (as shown by the last preceding decennial census), or (B) the bank holding company, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, demonstrates has inadequate insurance agency facilities; or (iii) any insurance activity engaged in by a bank holding company or any of its subsidiaries pursuant to an application which was approved prior to June 6, 1978; or (iv) any insurance agency activity engaged in by a bank holding company, or any of its subsidiaries which bank holding company has total assets of $50 million or less, provided, however, such bank holding company and its subsidiaries may not engage in the sale of life insurance or annuities except as provided in (i) or (ii) above."

EXPLANATION OF BANK HOLDING COMPANY INSURANCE PROHIBITION

During the 95th Congress, both the House of Representatives and the Senate voted overwhelmingly to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 ("BHC Act") specifically to prohibit bank holding companies from engaging in certain insurance activities. The House vote came in connection with the Financial Institutions Regulatory Act of 1978 (H.R. 13471); the Senate vote came in connection with H.R. 8389.

The accompanying bill is almost identical to that which was overwhelmingly approved just a few months ago. It contains a technical amendment in the grandfather clause which states more clearly the intent of the legislation.

The legislation would amend Section 4(c)(8) of the BHC Act to prohibit bank holding companies from engaging as principal, agent, or broker in insurance activities with certain exceptions.

Exception (i) would permit bank holding companies to continue to underwrite and sell credit life and credit accident and health insurance, lines of insurance which have historically been offered by lenders. This exception (i) is identical to that previously adopted by the 95th Congress.

Exception (ii) would permit bank holding companies and their subsidiaries to sell insurance in communities having a population not exceeding 5,000. The purpose of this exception is to confer upon bank holding companies the same authority currently available to national banking associations under the National Bank Act. *See* U.S.C.A. § 92 (1970). In addition, exception (ii) would permit bank holding companies to sell insurance in other communities upon demonstration, after notice and opportunity for a hearing on the record, that the community has no adequate insurance agency facilities. This exception (ii) also is identical to that adopted by the 95th Congress.

Exception (iii) is the bill's grandfather provision. It would permit bank holding companies to continue to engage in those insurance activities for which they received Federal Reserve Board approval prior to June 6, 1978.[1] The provision does not, however, contemplate any expansion of insurance authority received prior to June 6, 1978 after that date. Exception (iii) contains minor technical changes from the language adopted by the 95th Congress making it clear that insurance activities engaged in by bank holding companies after the 1970 Amendments pursuant to the limited grandfather provision contained in Section 4(a)(2) of the BHC Act are *not* covered by the exception. As such, such activities are subject to the general prohibition of the bill, unless Federal Reserve Board approval to retain the activities was obtained prior to the grandfather date.

[1] June 6, 1978 is the date on which the Financial Institutions Subcommittee of the House first voted favorably upon a bank holding company insurance prohibition, thereby placing bank holding companies on notice of possible prohibitive legislation.

Exception (iv) would exempt from the insurance prohibition bank holding companies with total assets of $50 million or less. This exception, however, would not permit such holding companies to sell or underwrite life insurance or annuities except as provided in exceptions (i) or (ii). Exception (iv) is identical to that adopted by the 95th Congress except for addition of the word "total" for absolute clarity.●

□ 1105

VOLUNTARY JOB PRESERVATION AND COMMUNITY STABILIZATION ACT

(Mr. KOSTMAYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, today with my colleagues STANLEY LUNDINE and MATTHEW MCHUGH of New York I am introducing the Voluntary Job Preservation and Community Stabilization Act of 1979. This bill is identical to legislation we introduced March 1, 1978, and which received the support of some 70 Members of the House.

The bill was the subject of a field hearing under the auspices of the Economic Stabilization Subcommittee in Jamestown, N.Y., last November. The subcommittee has scheduled a second hearing on employee-owned firms for February 27 in Washington.

We authored this legislation in response to the problems of plant shutdowns which in the past decade have hurt increasing numbers of Americans and threatened the economic stability of their communities. When a firm closes, employees often lose more than their jobs. The economic hardship and uncertainty can wreck families, affect mental health, and cause extended personal suffering. Idleness may last for months and many workers require substantial retraining before they are again employable. The costs to society are staggering.

We see examples of this phenomenon time and time again. In my own State of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia has lost at least 40,000 manufacturing jobs in the last 10 years, and Pittsburgh and other cities in Pennsylvania have suffered similar losses. New England's manufacturing employment has declined 9 percent in the last 10 years and that of the Midwest declined 14 percent between 1960 and 1975. New Jersey has lost 115,000 factory jobs since 1969 and heavily industrialized regions like Michigan and Ohio lost nearly 200,000 each in plant shutdowns in relatively the same period.

Plant shutdowns affect smaller towns and rural areas just as much as cities, and contrary to popular opinion, the so-called Sunbelt States are not the major beneficiaries of the new jobs by attracting runaway plants with generally lower wages and nonunionized workforces. Our research shows, for example, that between 1971 and 1976 only about 9 percent of plant relocations were to the Sunbelt. Many jobs go overseas. The South is also losing jobs overseas, and it is clear that net gains in total employment in the South are masking the effects of many plant shutdowns taking place there. Plant shutdowns are truly a national problem and job preservation should be a common concern to all regions.

Plant closings take place with painful abruptness. Generally, the law does not require a firm to give notice to its employees or the community and very often there is insufficient time to consider alternatives or plan for the consequences. The Federal and State government response is limited. The Government can spend money on unemployment compensation, welfare or expensive job training programs, but these are only short-term solutions, however, and do not combat the basic problem—preserving jobs. When a plant closes, a ripple effect goes through the business community, the tax base disappears, and an area's economy can be devastated for years.

We believe one alternative to plant closings is ownership by the employees or the residents of the affected community. Where plants would otherwise be abandoned, our bill would help interested groups of employees and community residents purchase the firms and try to run them profitably. Recognizing that such ownership arrangements will not always be feasible, we believe the approach can help blunt the impact of plant shutdowns in many areas.

The bill has four purposes:

First. To preserve jobs.

Second. To encourage employee and community participation in ownership of firms that would otherwise have closed.

Third. To support and strengthen the local economy that would be seriously damaged by the plant shutdown.

Fourth. To develop and test the value of a new strategy for the preservation of jobs.

The act builds on successful experiences with employee and employee-community ownership concepts. In a number of areas, these arrangements have saved jobs, maintained viable economic enterprises, and strengthened local economic conditions.

The legislation would facilitate this process by making loans to organizations of employees and community residents that plan to purchase plants in danger of closing down or moving elsewhere. The loans would be used to arrange the purchase, to cover start-up and initial operating costs, and to allow the employees to acquire stock in the new firm.

The act authorizes the expenditure of $100 million in the first year with appropriations rising gradually to $177 for the seventh year. Toward the end of this period, the Secretary of Commerce is directed to make a study and to report to Congress on the cost effectiveness of this program in comparison with other measures designed to deal with the problems of unemployment.

The act establishes no new bureaucracy. Implementation of the program is assigned to the Economic Development Administration, the Federal agency which has had the greatest experience in preserving jobs through assisting transfers to employee ownership, but which now lacks sufficient loan authority and legislative direction to undertake the type of program we are proposing.

This is not a giveaway program. It is just one example of an alternative legislative solution which recognizes that the big government approach is no longer feasible or realistic for handling every complex economic and social problem. The threat of long-term inflation, deficit budgets, and burdensome taxation requires that we enable and encourage the most efficient and sensible nongovernmental solutions. We must begin to phase in as much as is possible citizen, cooperative, and local solutions involving minimal Government resources. In utilizing this approach, the bill authorizes two kinds of loans; to the newly constituted firm and to individual employees for the purpose of enabling them to buy stock in their own enterprise. The company itself would be responsible to the Federal Government for collecting principal and interest payments on the loans granted employees. In order to qualify for such loans, employees are required to agree to payroll deductions under terms and conditions to be established by the Secretary of Commerce.

The Economic Development Administration is to be responsible for furnishing technical assistance to the group forming the new company on financial, legal, engineering, and organizational problems. No loans are to be authorized except when a feasibility study indicates that there is a reasonable chance that the company can become a viable economic enterprise .

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I might note that this legislation counters the major problem facing our country today—inflation. Economists seem to agree that inflation has been fueled by a disturbing nationwide downward trend in productivity. The United States now trails other Western industrial democracies and its trading partners in productivity. In the past decade, productivity—generally defined as output per hour worked—has advanced at a snail's pace: about 1.6 percent annually against 3.2 percent between 1947 and 1967. Experience shows that employee ownership can increase productivity.

This point was acknowledged by the President's former anti-inflation adviser Robert Strauss in hearings before the Senate Finance Committee last year. Mr. Strauss correctly pointed out that:

> Employee ownership can be a meaningful long-term measure to dampen inflation since "people perform better if they have a piece of the action."

VOLUNTARY JOB PRESERVATION AND COMMUNITY STABILIZATION ACT

(Mr. LUNDINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, at our subcommittee hearing in Jamestown last November, we learned about the experiences of several employee-owned firms. We heard new evidence of how this approach, by increasing worker participa-

tion and changing the structure of decisionmaking, can dramatically improve industrial performance.

One panel of witnesses described the purchase of a specialty steel plant in Dunkirk, N.Y., by a group of management employee investors in 1976. After 15 years of heavy losses, the previous owner—Allegheny Ludlum—was ready to close down the operation. Nearly 2,000 workers would have lost their jobs.

In this case, employee ownership was really the only alternative to liquidation. The group negotiated with Allegheny Ludlum for a year, eventually agreeing on a purchase price of $26 million. While the new owners obtained sufficient credit from local sources to finance initial operating expenses, they could not get a longer term loan to cover the purchase. A company witness testified:

With no past history of our own and an extremely poor past history under the prior owners, it was absolutely impossible to obtain any long-term financing.

Ultimately, the Dunkirk group was able to meet its financing requirements with the help of a $10 million loan from the Commerce Department's Economic Development Administration. The new company, Al Tech Specialty Steel Corp., significantly increased its operating capacity and hired several hundred additional workers. Productivity increased by 9 percent a year. Despite considerable pressure from imports and other difficulties, Al Tech made profits in each of its first 2 years in business.

What was different about employee ownership, that enabled Al Tech to revitalize an enterprise that Allegheny Ludlum was about to abandon? A major factor, apparently, was the ability to make decisions quickly and "call the shots" for the benefit of Al Tech alone. Extensive capital improvements undertaken by the new firm would never have occurred under Allegheny Ludlum, the Al Tech witnesses testified. Even relatively simple changes—such as installing a national Watts line for the sales office to replace a cumbersome teletype system—would never have been made.

In Al Tech's case, EDA's investment in employee ownership will have substantial payoffs. Over the life of its $10 million loan, the company is expected to pay principal and interest totaling $18 million. Al Tech employees have already paid more than $10 million in Federal income taxes in the last 2 years, and the company estimates it will pay over $1 billion in wages during the 25-year term of the loan.

Another panel discussed the case of the Mohawk Valley Community Corp., an employee-community-owned manufacturer of library furniture in Herkimer, N.Y. Recounting their efforts to purchase the company from Sperry Rand in 1976, the Herkimer witnesses stressed the need for technical as well as financial assistance.

The key hurdles in this case involved stock registration requirements. After failing to obtain a clearance from the Securities and Exchange Commission, the group turned to registration under New York State laws and was eventually able to raise the $1.8 million in equity it needed through a State approved stock offering. The State also enabled the purchasers to meet their downpayment by permitting the issuance of promissory notes to employees that could later be redeemed in stock.

Despite the difficulties of arranging the purchase, the new firm is encouraged by its prospects. In 1977, the Mohawk Valley Community Corp. made a profit of $340,000 on sales of $11.8 million. While sales slumped somewhat last year, the company is actively developing new markets and considers the setback a temporary one.

We also heard from the Jamestown Metal Products Co., which became an employee-owned firm in 1973. The former owner—a conglomerate called AVM—was about to close the plant, forcing employees to mobilize resources fast. Within a month, however, the purchase plan was drawn up, and nearly three quarters of the company's 120 employees participated in the acquisition.

Company officials recalled their initial struggles to stay in business. Right away, the new firm was faced with a steel shortage and unrealistic pricing arrangements inherited from AVM. About $3 million of its orders, for example, had been contracted before the severe inflation of 1973. But the company weathered the unprofitable years without layoffs and began developing new product lines. Gradually business revived: sales have expanded by 55 percent since 1973 and the book value of Jamestown Metal Products stock has more than tripled.

Nationally, one of the most stunning success stories involved the South Bend Lathe Co. in South Bend, Ind. After 5 years of losing money on the plant, the conglomerate owner—Amsted Industries—was prepared to shut down. Four hundred and twenty jobs were at stake.

With the help of a low interest loan from the Commerce Department and credit from private lending institutions, the shutdown was prevented and a new 100 percent employee-owned corporation took control of South Bend Lathe in 1975. Business rebounded quickly: waste was cut, absenteeism and turnover rates declined, morale was higher than ever. In its first year, the company showed pre-tax profits of 9 percent on sales of $18 to $20 million. And profits have stayed high ever since.

In each of these cases, transition to a form of employee or employee-community ownership proved a constructive way to cope with impending plant shutdowns and save jobs. But the approach need not be limited to cases of economic emergency, and can be viewed as one aspect of a broader effort to encourage worker investment and participation in decisionmaking.

Recent research on employee-owned firms offers additional evidence of their potential to improve business performance. In a major study completed last year for the Economic Development Administration, researchers at the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center concluded that employee ownership enhances profitability by strengthening workers' motivation to do a good job. With a new financial stake in their enterprise, both workers and managers are encouraged to explore ways to increase productivity and make the business run better. In many of the cases I am familiar with, cooperative labor-management efforts to restructure the workplace, develop skills, and generally improve the quality of working life contributed heavily to success.

Significant obstacles to employee ownership remain, despite the promise of the concept. Among our witnesses at the Jamestown hearing was a panel from North Tonawanda, N.Y., which described an unsuccessful attempt by employees to purchase the International Paper Company in 1976. A key factor in this case was the willingness of the seller to negotiate seriously with the prospective employee purchasers. More often, however, the buyers simply cannot make the necessary financial arrangements in time. Technical and legal requirements may pose further complications, which employee groups cannot handle without professional assistance.

The Federal Government can clearly play a more active role. Our bill would begin on a small scale, with $100 million in loan authority. But it should establish a Federal commitment to help interested groups pursue this alternative, and provide new evidence that these ownership arrangements are good practical investments for employees and their communities.

VOLUNTARY JOB PRESERVATION AND COMMUNITY STABILIZATION ACT

(Mr. McHUGH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, as Congressmen KOSTMAYER and LUNDINE have pointed out, employee and employee-community ownership of firms that would otherwise close down is becoming increasingly popular. In many cases it is a practical alternative for coping with a very real problem that many communities face in these times of economic stress, and for that reason I am pleased to join with them in reintroducing our bill.

Some may ask why this legislation is necessary. If employee and employee-community ownership has been emerging as a response to corporate divestitures in recent years, why do we need new legislation?

The answer is that employee and employee-community groups often face numerous obstacles when they seek to purchase firms that corporate managers are planning to close down or transfer. At the same time, there is no single agency within the Federal Government to which they can turn to obtain the help necessary to overcome these obstacles.

This legislation is designed to provide employees and residents of a community with the assistance they need, and to provide that assistance in a timely manner.

Mr. Speaker, transfers of ownership to

an employee or employee community group are not easily managed. As we have examined those cases where such a transfer has occurred, we have found that it took extraordinary efforts and exceptional leadership to keep the firm in operation and thus save jobs.

Moreover, for every successful case, we have found many others where employees and residents of a community have tried and failed, not because the firm could not be operated profitably but because there was no technical assistance available at the critical time or because the prospective purchasers lacked sufficient capital to purchase it.

In 1977, for example, the New York based owners of Kasanof's bakery in Boston decided to close the firm down. Although the employees were interested in purchasing the bakery and keeping it in operation, the efforts failed for a variety of reasons, including their inability to raise funds quickly enough to keep their buying option open. As a result, one of the largest employers in Boston's Roxbury section was forced to close down. Both the community and the workers were the losers.

To be sure, the Economic Development Administration has done some work in this field. However, even in those cases in which EDA loans were extended, this help was provided only as a last resort and only under special circumstances.

The fact is that EDA cannot now provide very much help to employee and employee-community groups. While it is authorized in certain cases to help the existing owners of a firm who are seeking to avoid shutting their firm down, it lacks both the mandate and the funds to help workers and community residents purchase a firm if the current owners have decided to give up. And, as my colleagues have pointed out, corporate managers often base their decisions on factors other than whether the firm could continue to operate profitably.

Our bill would offer employees and residents of a community assistance similar to that which is now provided to the existing owners in certain circumstances. As I have already suggested, that assistance is desperately needed.

For example, EDA officials have told us that they have received hundreds of inquiries regarding the possibility of its providing financial and technical support for transfers to employee and employee community groups. However, these same officials have been very frank to say that most of these inquiries have never moved beyond this initial stage because the agency lacks the mandate and the funds.

That is likely to remain the case without the enactment of this legislation. Because it has no formal mandate to do so, and lacks sufficient funds even if the mandate did exist, EDA has no plans to provide the help which employee-community groups need. This bill would enable that agency to provide basis.

By establishing a pilot program designed to provide loans and technical assistance to employee and employee-community groups, we would be helping to solve the two most serious obstacles these groups now face, namely, the need for technical assistance on how to manage such a transfer and the need for capital to purchase the plant. If not a complete answer to all of the problems these groups face, our bill provides a good starting point.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that our bill is in the best tradition of American free enterprise. It would not impose decisions from Washington upon local communities. Rather, it is designed to encourage and support voluntary local initiatives.

Our bill would not require a local community to pursue this alternative when a firm closes down. It would provide employees and residents with necessary assistance if they would like to pursue this alternative.

Our bill would not require employees and residents of a community to adopt a particular form of ownership and control. It would only aid them in making an informed choice among all of the options available to them under the laws of their State.

Finally, this bill would not require the Secretary of Commerce to provide help in cases where a transfer of ownership is not likely to be successful. It would merely give the Secretary the tools to provide such help in situations with reasonable prospects of success.

Mr. Speaker, there is increasing evidence that we cannot look to our largest corporations to provide significant numbers of new jobs for our economy. As the House Small Business Subcommittee on Antitrust, Consumers, and Employment reported last year, less than 1 percent of the new jobs created between 1969 and 1976 were generated by the 1,000 largest U.S. corporations. That is why this bill is so important. As Prof. William F. Whyte of Cornell has suggested: "It is just as important to preserve existing jobs as to create new jobs."

Given the economic impact a plant closing can have on a community and on the lives of the employees directly affected, we believe that the Federal Government has a responsibility to actively search for new approaches to preserving jobs that already exist. The achievements which my colleagues have documented suggest that this is one promising new strategy.

That is why I am so pleased that the Economic Stabilization Subcommittee of the House Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee has agreed to hold hearings on our bill. Its interest, and the support of the members who have cosponsored our bill in the past, is very encouraging.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of our bill.

The section-by-section analysis follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION 1

Short title: "Voluntary Job Preservation and Community Stabilization Act."

SECTION 2

Declaration

(1) Unemployment is a serious problem that causes grave economic loss and social suffering to individuals, their families, communities, and the nation.

(2) Federal initiatives to reduce unemployment should be multi-faceted, not limited to temporary compensation nor to expensive job training programs.

(3) Experience and research have shown that in some cases employee or employee-community purchase of industrial, manufacturing, business, and agricultural concerns that would otherwise close down can save jobs, maintain viable economic enterprises, and strengthen the local economy.

(4) However, these groups face numerous obstacles in purchasing such concerns at the present time.

SECTION 3

Purposes

(1) To save jobs and stabilize communities by facilitating employee or employee-community purchase of concerns that would otherwise close down or relocate.

(2) To support the local tax base by maintaining viable concerns through federal loans and technical assistance.

(3) To test an alternative to unemployment insurance (and other methods of dealing with unemployment).

SECTION 4

Definitions

(Self-explanatory for the most part.)

SECTION 5

Federal assistance

(a) Existing EDA regional offices, working in cooperation with appropriate state and local agencies, will identify firms in danger of closing down or relocating.

(b) In those cases where firms may be able to be kept in operation profitably, EDA will furnish information about this program to employees and the local community.

(c)(1) Loans for technical assistance, start-up and operating costs will be provided to employee or employee-community organizations that have had an application for funds approved (as provided for under Section 6).

(c)(2) An organization made up of employees and community residents who wish to apply for a loan to purchase a plant that is about to shut down must meet the following requirements:

(A) Incorporate under the laws of the State in which the plant is located.

(B) Certify that a form of ownership has been adopted by the members of the organization after full consideration of their alternatives under state law.

(C) Certify that the organization allows for the inclusion of new employees in ownership and participation, and provides a method of disposing of stock if there is no longer an association with the concern, guaranteeing the organization the right of first refusal.

(D) Agree to serve as the administrative agent of the federal government for collecting loans and interest payments from employee members of the organization through a system of wage deductions acceptable to the Secretary.

(d) EDA will make loans to the employees of the organization that has an application approved so that they can acquire stock in the concern. First, employees must make a good-faith effort to secure the loan from financial institutions in the community and must agree in writing to allow the organization to serve as administrative agent of the federal government for collecting the loans through a system of wage deductions. No loan to an employee shall be for longer than ten years or for more than $15,000, and no loan will be forgiven.

SECTION 6

Applications

(1) An employee or employee-community organization that wishes to purchase a concern that would otherwise close down may

apply to the Secretary of Commerce for loans and technical assistance provided for under this Act.

(2) The Secretary, acting through EDA, will conduct a feasibility study within 60 days after receiving an application to determine whether reasonable grounds exist to expect that the proposed transfer would be successful.

(3) If the feasibility study is positive, the Secretary may make loans for technical assistance, start-up and operating costs to the organization. The rate of interest to be charged on such loans shall be no greater than the prevailing rate within the community, and there shall be no forgiveness on such loans.

(4) Loans to employee members of employee or employee-community organizations to allow them to purchase stock in the new concern (as provided for under Section 5) shall also be made at this time.

SECTION 7

Waiver of Securities Act of 1933

This section allows the Secretary of Commerce to exempt employee or employee-community organizations from select provisions of the Securities Act of 1933 to facilitate the purchase of the plant.

SECTION 8

Coordination of Federal programs

This section provides that the Economic Development Administration, the Small Business Administration, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall give priority in making loans to organizations receiving assistance under the Act.

SECTION 9

Report

EDA will evaluate the success or failure of the program and report to Congress at the end of three years and again after seven years.

SECTION 10

Authorization for appropriations

Appropriations are authorized for seven years. For the first year the authorization level will be approximately $100 million. Each succeeding year the amount may be increased by ten percent over the previous year.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

(Mr. PEYSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, this past Tuesday I mentioned and brought out to the House the problem facing our senior citizens and our disabled people in this country under the food stamp program. This program on March 1 is going to be radically altered to a point that is going to make it nearly impossible for many of our seniors to survive in this year ahead.

I am going to give another example today of a senior citizen who happens to be a diabetic 79 years old. Her total income is $250 a month. Out of that income, she pays $156 rent, $34 for utilities and $10 for phone bills. She has been receiving $34 a month in food stamps, which is certainly not a tremendous amount. Starting on March 1 her food stamps will be reduced to $10 a month.

Mr. Speaker, we can address this problem by eliminating the $80 ceiling on rent that can be deducted and keep the deduction at the same level it is today. We are going to have well over 1 million people in this country badly affected by the change on March 1.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that, pursuant to the provisions of clause 9(a), rule I, closed circuit viewing of House floor proceedings will resume effective Monday, February 19, 1979.

The Chair would stress that under clause 9, rule I, the closed circuit system to Members' offices is for viewing purposes in Members' offices only, and is not to be utilized for commercial or political purposes. The Chair requests the cooperation of all persons concerned to assure that the dignity and integrity of the proceedings of the House are upheld.

The Chair's Informal Advisory Committee has informed the Chair that a system for complete and unedited audio and visual broadcasting and recording of House proceedings will be available beginning in early March. The Chair will announce his full implementation of that system in the near future.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF GALLAUDET COLLEGE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 420, 83d Congress, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan and Mr. BUCHANAN of Alabama.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 372, 84th Congress, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. MURPHY of New York;
Mr. HOWARD of New Jersey;
Mr. FISH of New York; and
Mr. GREEN of New York.

ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

(Mr. BOB WILSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, during our initial deliberations on the 1980 budget, one concern which has already come to the fore in the defense arena is the all-volunteer force—its costs, success to date, and prospects for the critical years ahead. Like many other Members, I am still in the process of digesting the Defense Department's massive tome on the AVF issued at the end of 1978 and of analyzing the many conflicting reports and predictions currently being generated with respect to the future of our Nation's military manpower. We are again approaching a crossroads in terms of a volunteer or conscripted military force, as well as some type of required "national" service, and I feel it is important that we air and debate a wide variety of alternatives.

Aside from the obvious question of how we will obtain a sufficient quantity and quality of young men and women to meet the requirements of our Armed Forces in the 1980's, 1990's, and the 21st century, there is an even more immediate question—how do we retain those high-caliber personnel already on board who, for a variety of reasons, are abandoning military careers.

In his January 5, 1979, report to the House Armed Services Committee, the Secretary of the Navy advised that the Navy is currently short about 17,000 skilled petty officers with 9 to 16 years of service. Aside from the critical gap in leadership this causes, these petty officers are also the backbone of the Navy's technical proficiency. Unfortunately, the Navy is by no means the only service which has been faced with a substantial downturn in reenlistments—both first-term and subsequent.

Those we are losing are often the individuals in the most highly skilled occupations in whom we have invested months and generally years of training. Obviously, the reasons are myriad. One primary factor is the competition from the civilian job market. The problem, however, transcends just the opportunity for a better-paying job.

From my conversations with young men and women in the services, I find considerable skepticism relative to the Government's ability and determination to meet its commitments to them in terms of pay, retirement, medical care, and so forth. My purpose today is not to discuss at length the "benefits erosion question," but rather to indicate the general malaise which seems to pervade much of the force, with a predictable impact on retention.

I also find that personnel leaving the service cite—with increasing frequency—the fact that they face a cutoff of their Vietnam-era GI bill educational benefits in the not too distant future. They want to assure they have at least the opportunity of using the educational entitlement provided for their battlefield colleagues who did not choose to make a career in the military service of their country.

My feedback from conversation and correspondence is apparently not an isolated observation. In her report to the Senate Armed Services Committee, incorporated in the Defense Department's AVF report, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Antonia Chayes noted:

> The 31 December 1989 termination date for the old G.I. Bill works at cross-purposes with our retention goals which will, in turn, generate increased recruiting requirements.

In expressing Department of the Navy views on AVF alternatives, Bernard Rostker, Principal Deputy to the Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, cited the need to eliminate "legislative incentives to separate," specifically the December 31, 1989, cutoff date for use of Vietnam-era educational benefits:

> This legislation [P.L. 94-502] provides a strong incentive for experienced careerists to leave the service in order to take advantage of previously earned educational benefits.

This "negative bonus" can be eliminated at minimal costs by extending eligibility for benefits for a minimum five years from the member's date of separation from active duty.

I am, therefore, today introducing legislation which would give military personnel entitled to educational benefits under the pre-1976 GI bill a period of 6 years from their release from active duty in which to use their educational benefits entitlement, even if they leave the service after the December 31, 1989, termination of the Vietnam-era program. With 6 years, the individual will have an opportunity to use his or her full 45-months of education and will have approximately a year's "grace period" in which to get relocated, attend to family problems, establish or shore up finances, and so forth. The 6-year time limitation does not extend the program for an inordinate period of time for the Government, but it does give the individual some degree of flexibility for unanticipated crises and financial obligations.

Why extend the program now—1989 is a decade away? As previously noted, rates for both first-term and subsequent reenlistments are already plummeting. As we enter the early 1980's, that trend can be expected to escalate rapidly. If Congress waits until 1988 or 1989, it will, frankly, be too late. Ironically, those individuals who will leave in order to use their educational benefits will be the most highly motivated and the best trained—in other words, the cream of our midcareer force.

I urge my congressional colleagues to look at this retention disincentive in 1979, while there is still time to correct a major part of the damage. A decade from now will be too little, too late, and we will all be the losers for it.

□ 1110

THE PRESIDENT'S FAILURE IN IRAN

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on the last day of 1977, President Carter toasted the Shah of Iran at a New Year's Eve celebration. The President praised the Shah's "great leadership," called Iran "an island of stability," and referred to the "respect and admiration and love which our people give to you."

Little more than 13 months have passed since the President spoke those words. The Shah has fled from Iran and a new, anti-American government is now in power. Everywhere I go the questions come fast and furiously. What gives—where is this administration taking us?

The administration's handling of foreign affairs is so inept, so incompetent, so totally lacking in consistency or direction that it has now become dangerous to our national security.

CRISIS IN IRAN

(Mr. SCHULZE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I feel a deep sense of outrage at the events which took place at the American Embassy in Iran yesterday. The inept handling of this situation from the first rumblings of revolution to the sacking of our Embassy is a severe, personal blow to the American people.

Congress and the American people are experiencing a combination of consternation and outrage over this latest indignity. We have every right to know why this situation has been permitted to deteriorate, and why our Government failed to prepare itself for these contingencies. I ask Mr. Speaker:

Why was our Embassy in Iran not more heavily guarded, in view of the threat which has obviously existed for several months?

Where were our Marine reinforcements?

What was happened to our expensive intelligence-gathering apparatus?

This "Valentines Day Massacre" touches me, personally, with the cold-blooded wounding of Sergeant Kraus of Lansdale, Pa., after being ordered to surrender by the Ambassador, Sergeant Kraus was disarmed, knocked to the ground, and shot at point-blank range with his own weapon.

How can we ask young Americans, like Sergeant Kraus, to serve our country without support and with indecisive leadership? How many more young men, like Sergeant Kraus, will be sacrificed on the altar of the administration's inept foreign policy?

INFLATION—THE OVERRIDING CONCERN OF ALL AMERICANS

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, today the overriding concern of all Americans is the inflation with which they have been forced to live. In recent years concern about inflation has been transformed into fear. If we, as their representatives, do not do something quickly to stop this destructive process, this fear will turn to panic.

Not one Member of this House publicly endorses inflation as a proper economic policy. We all denounce the evil that it brings, and yet the inflation continues at an unprecedented rate.

If all our colleagues are well intended, as I sincerely believe, why are we so unsuccessful in providing an economy with falling or stable prices?

I would like to suggest to you and to my colleagues that perhaps the conventional definition of inflation is incorrect. If it could be shown that our basic assumption about the cause of inflation is wrong, it would help us to understand why the concerted efforts of Republicans, Democrats, liberals, and conservatives, have failed so miserably in the past 10 years, in accomplishing anything whatsoever in restraining the destructive forces of inflation.

THE 61ST ANNIVERSARY OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

(Mr. McCLORY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) in welcoming here today as the Chaplain of the House Father Ziuraitis, and to indicate that I intend to participate in the special order which the gentleman from Illinois has taken today in commemorating the 61st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the nation of Lithuania.

We all know that the Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians, have been suppressed and oppressed—by the Soviet Union. It is heartening that these people continue to preserve their great heritage and culture, and to express their aspirations, hopes and prayers for a restoration of freedom and independence for their beloved Lithuania and for the other Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

SIXTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENT LITHUANIA

(Mrs. FENWICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, 1979, is the 61st anniversary of the establishment of an independent state of Lithuania. Lithuanians throughout the world—including a large number of Lithuanian-Americans—remember this date as a milestone in their nation's struggle for independence and self-determination. The democratic state of Lithuania, which adopted a constitution preserving freedom of the individual, was short-lived, however, for in 1940 it was invaded by the Soviet Union and declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. This was carried out despite the explicit provisions of the 1920 peace treaty signed by the Soviets recognizing Lithuania as a free and independent state, and renouncing any rights of sovereignty over it.

The past 39 years of Soviet domination have not wiped out the spirit of the freedom-loving people of Lithuania. The Helsinki accord of 1975, signed by the Soviet Union, guaranteed them certain rights, and on this 61st anniversary of the founding of their republic we must renew our faith that these rights and pledges will some day be honored.

A CONTINENTAL DOLLAR

(Mr. COLLINS of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when I was a boy, I frequently heard the expression "as sound as a dollar." If you were in good health, they would say you were "sound as a dollar."

Today we all know the dollar is sick, but America and Congress seem to lack the courage to face the facts.

I recently read an interesting speech made by Ira E. Corn, Jr., of Dallas who is a noted American historian, economist, and successful businessman. He spoke concerning the similarities between 1978 and 1778 with particular reference to the experience of the Continental dollar.

Do you remember how the Continental dollar dropped to where it was eventually redeemed for only 1 penny on a bond to take care of a dollar of paper money? The dollar dropped from 100 to 1.

Corn's conclusion is the country must face up to its responsibility of taxation to have a balanced economy. I agree completely with the balanced budget and sound economy with Government spending. However, the answer is to reduce spending, as we have too much excessive taxation already on our backs. Back in 1961 we were spending less than $100 billion. This year we will probably see Congress spend $500 billion.

The courage and perseverance of our forefathers in winning our battle for independence is an inspiration. But at that same time they learned a lesson about a loosely handled dollar. The U.S. experience with the dollar is a factual history of 1778. Now as we look at 1978 we see where we stand, and we are heading into 1979 and 1980.

With 42 cents out of every dollar going to taxes today, the way to strengthen the dollar is not to raise taxes. We need to cut down on excessive Government spending that is going beyond the 42 cents expenditure.

Let me give you some of the highlights of the Continental dollar experience that Corn discovered as he compared 1778 to 1978.

NOT THE FIRST TIME—1778 VS. 1978

In 1778, General George Washington faced an invading army to his front while behind him an impotent and fractured government staggered from crisis to crisis, refusing to face up to realities and putting off the inevitable day of fiscal and monetary reckoning. Facing his own realities as well as incredible obstacles forced George Washington to become the greatest fund-raiser in history.

And the results—rampant inflation—almost destroyed Washington's army and the new nation it represented.

We tend to think that only in the Sixties and Seventies of *this* century have Americans "lost their way," discovered self-doubt and found their government unable to cope with economic, political and military dilemmas. Events each day provide educational—and chilling—parallels to the struggles unfolding 200 years ago when our infant American Republic fought to be born and to survive. And today, our central government exercises powers that the Continental Congress of 1778 would hardly have dreamed of, nor even considered seeking.

Yet, today's government, likewise seems to stagger from crisis to crisis, unable to deal with political, economic and military dilemmas facing us at home and around the world, unwilling to face realities, and incapable of coping with its own inabilities. Let's look at some of the events of 1775–1781 and look for today's parallels.

It was in 1778 that the Continental Congress began to wake up to the disaster caused by unsupported paper money and the attempts to control price rises. Sheer knowledge by the public of the facts—in both 1778 and in 1978—explains the results.

The First Continental Congress has dissolved itself after a brief session ending October 22, 1774, without taking any practical steps to prosecute the approaching American Revolution. Congress had issued its "Declarations and Resolves" setting forth rights claimed by the Colonists and petitioning for their inherent rights as English subjects of the British Crown and also for redress of grievances listed. Most hoped for reconciliation.

Instead, hopes faded as Parliament refused even to receive Colonial emissaries. British troops increased military activities in New England, and on April 19, 1775, General Gage sent his Redcoats from Boston to seize the Colonists' munitions at Concord, leading to the "shot heard 'round the world" and the Battles of Lexington and Concord.

Some of the delegates to the Second Continental Congress already were en route to Philadelphia. Officially, that new body opened its deliberations there on May 10, 1775. Most members of the First Congress returned. Noteworthy additions included Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson.

The Second Congress also had no authority to levy taxes and even refused to debate whether Congress should seek powers to tax in support of the national defense effort. Its delegates knew that the 13 colonies' legislatures were strongly against giving taxing authority to the Continental Congress.

While the British occupation tightened in New England, the Second Continental Congress unanimously named George Washington as Commander-in-Chief on June 15, 1775. Although most of the initial military action involved the New England militia, Washington, a Virginian, was elected without opposition.

Washington proved to be the right man at the right time for the job. He retained the trust and confidence of his soldiers throughout their ordeals, which he shared with them. He effectively exhorted, cajoled, and otherwise inspired and pressured both his troops and the Congress to achieve the essentials for victory. He became almost a "beggar"—if a brilliant one—on behalf of his troops and the cause of independence.

Washington also wrote to John Hancock, then President of the Congress, seeking aid for the troops:

"Being only provided for a summer's campaign, their clothes, shoes, and blankets will soon be unfit for the change of weather which we every day feel. At present we have no tents for more than two-thirds—many of them old and worn-out; but if we had a plentiful supply, the season will not admit of continuing in them long. The case of our sick is also worthy of much consideration. Their number, in the returns, forms at least one forth of the army. Policy and humanity require they should be as comfortable as possible."

Congress knew it had to act, taking the only practical measure open—one for which it had no authority whatever: It began to issue paper currency.

Congress' initial issue of "Continentals" was to have been for $2 million, but another $1 million was authorized even before it had been accomplished.

Estimates of the sums issued by years:

1775	6,000,000
1776	19,000,000
1777	13,000,000
1778	63,500,300
1779	90,052,380

Wiser heads attempted to stop the escalation. Benjamin Franklin said, "After the first emission I proposed that we should stop, strike no more, but borrow on interest those we had issued. This was not then approved of and more bills were issued."

Pork rose from 4 cents to 8 cents per pound. By November, 1777, commodity prices were 480 percent above the pre-war average. The Pennsylvania Legislature decided to try a "period of price control, limited to domestic commodities essential for the use of the Army."

Quickly, the controlled items, the most essential, became unavailable; prices for uncontrolled goods shot sky high. Congress recommended that regional conventions be held to set prices for particular areas. New England and the middle states held such conventions, but the states south of Maryland did not.

States passed laws to counteract growing refusal to accept Continentals in payment at controlled prices. The same goods would sell when paid for in specie (hard money). Pennsylvania provided penalties—up to banishment—for refusal to accept Continentals.

In February, 1778, the Pennsylvania Assembly appointed commissioners "in every city of the state with full power to purchase or to seize, at stated prices, all provisions necessary for the army." But appeals to patriotism, accompanied by increasing threats of more force, failed to bring out the necessary provisions. The farmers would not trade the fruits of their hard labors for paper money which bought less and less.

As the market broke down under refusals to give up goods for paper of ever-declining acceptance, military forces had to intensify impressment from the surrounding populace.

The self-defeating policy of attempting price controls was abandoned. By June of 1778, the act of "regulating the several articles on the price lists" was wholly suspended. After that date the military commissary agents were instructed "to give the current price . . . let it be what it may, rather than the army should suffer . . . and the intended expedition be retarded for want of it."

Of course, the end of price regulations did not halt inflation. Neither had the regulations. And Congress continued to refuse to consider the only effective action: acquiring—and using—the power to tax.

Each year that passed with Congress refusing to seek authority to collect taxes resulted in further sharp declines in the value of its paper currency.

While the Declaration of Independence was adopted early in July, 1776, the Articles of Confederation proposed at the same time were not adopted by Congress until November 15, 1777, and not ratified by the States until later (March 1, 1781).

While confidence and morale had been rising as a result of early skirmishes, such as Lexington, Concord, Bunker Hill, and others, plus the Declaration of Independence, Congress could do nothing to sustain the euphoria. The smashing victory over Burgoyne in late 1777 had no effect on the declining value of the Continental. And the states would not permit effective action.

The troops in the field suffered most of the consequences. The poverty suffered by Washington's troops should not be attributed to any general conditions in the American colonies during this period of relative prosperity, of no droughts, and no crop failures. More than 80 percent of the economy was agrarian. Industry, though small, was booming with the population growing rapidly.

All the fighting took place along the sea coasts, affecting less than 15 percent of the inhabitants. The other 85 percent, in effect, got a free ride. They paid no national taxes and few local ones. The cost was borne by the soldiers and those citizens forced to take the paper currency, which turned out to be "not worth a Continental"—a term used for 150 years thereafter to describe a person or object considered worthless.

By January, 1777, the Continental's value in relation to specie was down 33 percent; in January 1778 it was down 75 percent, and in January 1779 it had dropped to 90 percent below face value. Then it went down

"like a collapsed balloon," as historian George Trevelyan wrote.

"In June of that year $50 were paid in Philadelphia for two pairs of shoes, and $60 for two silk handkerchiefs. Fish-hooks, in that piscatorial city, cost half a dollar apiece. In October 1780 beef sold in Boston for $10 a pound, and butter for $12. Samuel Adams, who was not a dressy man, paid $2,000 for a hat and a suit of clothes."

Despite partial redemption and retirement after 1779, and despite efforts to enforce laws on the acceptance of the currency at par value, Continental currency collapsed in May, 1781; two months later, only hard money was used in the market. Under the funding act of 1790 the old Continental issues were accepted at the rate of 100 to 1 in U.S. bonds.

Today's similarities become obvious. Congress, although possessing the power to tax to fully support the dollar, refuses to do so. Although the American people lost the right to own gold for use as money in 1933, the nominal backing of the dollar with gold owned by the government was continued, at least on a percentage basis.

In 1968 Congress eliminated the final requirement of 25 percent gold backing on March 19, 1968. On March 17, 1968, a two-tier price system was established, by which the U.S. and six western European nations agreed in Washington to stop buying and selling gold in the international markets, retaining an "official" monetary price of $35 per ounce but leaving the private market price to fluctuate according to supply and demand.

The dollar printed today by the U.S. Government has finally become the same kind of dollar that was printed by the Continental Congress, purely paper currency. As a result, we have dollars thought to be not so good chasing tremendous numbers of goods—goods with well-recognized value.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PANETTA) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

FEBRUARY 14, 1979.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the White House, received in the Clerk's Office at 1:22 p.m. on Wednesday, February 14, 1979, and said to contain a message from the President wherein he transmits the Sixth Special Message for Fiscal Year 1979 under the Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

EDMUND L. HENSHAW, Jr.,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

SIXTH SPECIAL MESSAGE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1979 UNDER THE IMPOUNDMENT CONTROL ACT OF 1974—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 96-56)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report revisions to three previously transmitted deferrals increasing the amount deferred by $33.8 million. These revisions to existing deferrals involve programs in the Departments of Transportation and the Treasury and the International Communication Agency.

The details of the deferrals are contained in the attached reports.

JIMMY CARTER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 14, 1979.*

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 19, 1979

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority whip the program for the balance of this week and next week.

Mr. BRADEMAS. If my friend the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished minority whip (Mr. MICHEL) will yield, the program for the week of February 19, 1979, is as follows:

On Monday, the House meets at noon. There is no legislative business but there will be the reading of Washington's Farewell Address.

On Tuesday, the House is not in session.

On Wednesday the House meets at 3 p.m. to consider a series of 10 House administration funding resolutions for House committees.

On Thursday, February 22, the House meets at 11 a.m. to consider House Concurrent Resolution 3, our Merchant Marine March.

On Friday, February 23, the House is not in session.

The House will adjourn by 5:30 p.m. on Thursday.

Any further program will be announced later.

□ 1120

Mr. MICHEL. Might I make this inquiry: I see no reference to the debt ceiling legislation which will have to be considered here quite soon.

Can the gentleman enlighten me on that subject?

Mr. BRADEMAS. If the gentleman will yield further, that measure will be taken up either Tuesday, February 27, or Wednesday, February 28, under the present plan of the leadership.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Speaker.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES TO BE CONDUCTED BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-12) on the resolution (H. Res. 98) to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the committee on Foreign Affairs, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES TO BE CONDUCTED BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-5) on the resolution (H. Res. 60) to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Armed Services, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES TO BE CONDUCTED BY PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-11) on the resolution (H. Res. 96) to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES TO BE CONDUCTED BY COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-3) on the resolution (H. Res. 35) to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES TO BE CONDUCTED BY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-10) on the resolution (H. Res. 92) to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Education and Labor, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES TO BE CONDUCTED BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-6) on the resolution (H. Res. 85) to provide for the expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FUTHER EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96–4) on the resolution (H. Res. 45) to provide funds for the further expenses of the investigation and studies of the Committee on Small Business, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES TO BE CONDUCTED BY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96–8) on the resolution (H. Res. 88) to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Ways and Means, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES TO BE CONDUCTED BY COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96–7) on the resolution (H. Res. 87) to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on House Administration, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES TO BE CONDUCTED BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96–9) on the resolution (H. Res. 91) to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday of next week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1979, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM MONDAY NEXT TO WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1979

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next, and that when the House adjourns on Monday next, it adjourn to meet at 3 p.m. on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

□ 1125

CONGRATULATIONS TO PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA ON THEIR 61ST ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, once again I am delighted to join today with my colleagues and with people throughout the world to commemorate tomorrow February 16 as the anniversary of the Independence Day of Lithuania.

Since 1940, this small Baltic nation has been dominated by the Soviet Union, after Hitler and Stalin struck a pact that sold into bondage the free nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, to say nothing of the people of Poland.

To move for Lithuanian independence from Russia actually began back in the 1880's. Finally, after years of struggle and with the defeat of Tsarist Russia, Lithuania declared her independence on February 16, 1918.

The next 20 years saw a great cultural revival in Lithuania. Literature, music, and dancing flourished throughout the nation. But this free and good life for Lithuania was not long to be, and cannot really come again until Soviet control over this separate country has been relinquished.

As a point of law, the Soviet Union really has no right to control Lithuania. The Soviets actually signed a treaty with Lithuania on July 12, 1920, and in that treaty renounced all claims to Lithuania. To quote from the treaty, the Soviet Union agreed without any reservation the sovereignty and independence of the state of Lithuania, were recognized and, furthermore, all territorial claims to Lithuania were "voluntarily and forever renounced." Another promise broken.

Free people everywhere should always remember the sacrifices Lithuania has made that she might secure liberty. In the years 1940 to 1952 more than 30,000 freedom fighters lost their lives on the plain of battle with Soviet warlords. All these brave people sought was that they and their children's children might be able to live in a land of freedom and not a land of serfdom.

Reminiscent of the Nazi persecution of the Jewish people, some 350,000 Lithuanians, we are told, have been sent to labor camps in Siberia, because of their desire for freedom and independence.

Yet even today the struggle for Lithuanian independence continues. It continues in large part, because Lithuania is a nation whose belief in God Almighty has never been shaken.

In 1972 more than 17,000 Lithuanians petitioned the United Nations for the restoration of religious freedom. The people of Lithuania continue to attend their churches despite all the obstacles the Russians have placed in the path of simple worship.

Despite Soviet rules forbidding religious instruction, religious publications, charity work, the ordination of new clerics to replace the old, and discouraging church attendance, Lithuania is still clearly a Christian nation.

I am proud that last August I was honored for my efforts on behalf of the cause of Lithuanian freedom, by being given the Father John C. Jutt Friend of Lithuania Award by the Knights of Lithuania. So once again I reaffirm my dedication to the cause of Lithuanian freedom, and call upon my colleagues in the House, and on all Americans, to reaffirm their own commitments to hasten the day when the land and people of Lithuania shall once again bask in the sunshine of liberty.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PANETTA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEISS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO).

□ 1130

A TRIBUTE TO ARCHBISHOP OSCAR ROMERO OF EL SALVADOR AS A NOMINEE FOR THE NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PANETTA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEISS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend and applaud my distinguished colleague, Mr. DRINAN, for the leadership he has taken in bringing the work of Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero y Galdames—or as he is simply known Archbishop Oscar Romero—of El Salvador to the attention of the Congress. Congressman DRINAN ventured into El Salvador in 1977 as part of a fact finding mission on the human rights practices of El Salvador. Through the work of Congressman DRINAN, 21 of our colleagues joined us in signing a letter to the Nobel Peace Prize Committee nominating the archbishop for the Nobel's cherished prize for peace activism. I am delighted to be given this special time on the House floor to discuss this important nomination for the 1979 prize awards.

Archbishop Oscar Romero, a telegraph operator's son, has risen from the anonymity of an obscure diocese in the

interior of El Salvador to worldwide renown. The 60-year-old Catholic leader has stood up in the face of some 40 years of repression and violence in El Salvador to rally nonviolent peasant revolt.

The year 1931 was when the last free election occurred in this tiny Latin American country. At that time a liberal reform oriented leader came to power and promised to share the land with the people. This was too much for the powerful elite—now only 1.9 percent of the population; but owning almost 60 percent of all the lands—and they enlisted the support of the military to oust the reformists and institute the repressive practices which have come to dominate El Salvador today.

In 1968 the Catholic Church began publicly to ally itself with the rural peasants and developed what is becoming known today as "liberation theology"—wedding the moral power of the church to the social goals of the populous. From 1974 to 1976 Luis Chavez was archbishop and attempted to follow liberation theological practice by issuing a number of pastoral letters protesting violations of human rights within El Salvador. But as a reaction to this progressive move the wealthy elite again summoned the repressive force of the military and Archbishop Chavez was ousted. At this point the mild-mannered Oscar Romero, who many regarded as a spiritualist rather than an activist, was appointed in hopes that the church would be seen and not heard.

But immediately Archbishop Romero sent a signal that this would not be the case. He began a campaign for the welfare of the peasants. He refused to attend the inauguration of President Humberto Romero (no relation to him) who was installed as the new dictator in July 1978.

Soon after Archbishop Romero's appointment in February 1977, two grotesque executions took place. First Father Rutilo Grande, a popular priest, along with two of his parishioners were mercilessly submachine-gunned down. He was on his way to support a protest by workers of the unfair contracts which bound them to the rich private landowners. Then in May 1977, Father Alfonso Navarro and a teenaged boy were shot while talking in a parish house in San Salvador.

Archbishop Romero's reaction was swift and decisive to these horrendous murders—he closed all Catholic schools and colleges for 3 days and held a special mass in front of the National Cathedral in the major city of San Salvador. One hundred thousand people attended this important mass. For the peasants the Catholic Church, under Archbishop Romero's leadership, was a vehicle to express their opposition to the repressive Romero regime.

In order to negate the impact of the Catholic Church the Romero regime has resorted to the most deplorable tactics. President Romero and the national press has labled members of the activist church subversives or Communists. The current government has tacitly if not openly given support to right wing paramilitary or vigilante groups—most notably ORDEN—which carry out the horrible executions like those I just described as well as abducted peasants who express discontent with Romero and his regime.

In the face of this violence and terrorism Archbishop Romero has always counseled his followers to be nonviolent. He rejects violence and refuses to endorse armed revolt. He has risked his own life in criticizing the Romero regime and protesting to the world the regime's heavy-handed tactics. He set up his own permanent human rights monitoring committee and prompted the Organization of American States (OAS) to make two onsite inspections of human rights conditions. The report of OAS is anticipated very soon.

The conditions that prevail in El Salvador are not too different than other Latin American governments where the wealthy elites are teamed up with a repressive military junta. Guatemala, Chile, Argentina are three countries that come to mind. I wrote President Carter last year protesting the conditions in Guatemala where a violent assassination squad much like ORDEN has free reign—the ruling junta refusing to take decisive action.

The struggle of the people of El Salvador and the courageous determination of Archbishop Oscar Romero has not received enough attention in our country, or for that matter the world. This inattention in itself may facilitate the kind of radical abuse of human rights which we see today. Inhumanity and terror predominate the social atmosphere as a result.

Amnesty International, the Nobel Peace Prize winning human rights monitoring group, reports that the wealthy ruling elite of El Salvador exports cash crops abroad while 73 percent of Salvadorean children under 5 years old suffer from malnutrition.

This is totally unacceptable and we must encourage and promote respect in El Salvador with all our diplomatic and economic resources for human rights.

Archbishop Romero deserves global recognition for his responsible leadership. Similar to Martin Luther King—as the Times of London stated—Archbishop Romero has stood for peace and justice through nonviolence. That is why 118 Members of the British Parliament and 23 Members of the House have nominated him for the Nobel Peace Prize in 1979.

The material follows:

[From the Washington Post Magazine, Sept. 10, 1978]

FROM HERE TO ETERNITY—HOW A PRIEST-CONGRESSMAN AND THE PRESIDENT OF GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY HAVE TRIED TO STOP MURDER, BUT NOT NECESSARILY REVOLUTION, IN TINY EL SALVADOR

(By Georgie Anne Geyer)

On Feb. 14, 1977, a scene as strange as any from the 12th century was acted out in the cathedral of San Salvador in Central America.

The cathedral, a vast and empty barn of a place with none of the gilt and marble of the Old World, was jammed with nearly 10,000 crying, singing, chanting, stricken people. The building, thrusting eight empty but vigorous stories toward heaven, had been left deliberately unfinished to symbolize the church's dedication not to its own glory but to the suffering of the people.

The seething masses seemed to sense that. Intently and passionately, they clung from balconies, from stairways and from rafters.

In the minds of many were the killings—the murders of two priests, the killing of so many peasants in the countryside. And in many minds, there were thoughts of all those who had been exiled.

As he was about to award a great honor to Salvador's unimposing Archbishop Oscar Romero, Georgetown University's President Timothy Healy that day had other thoughts.

"The wonder of it is that the archbishop survives," Father Healy remembered thinking afterwards. "Against him is arrayed every force in Salvador. There is literally nothing that prevents the blow of the fool who would strike him down."

That was why Healy, a glib, robust priest with an amiable, cultured face, had come to El Salvador's capital city to give the little, dark-skinned archbishop an honorary degree from Georgetown. He was trying to prevent the "blow of the fool." He was trying to focus the center of power in the world, Washington, D.C., and the power of one of the greatest Jesuit universities of the world, to help a simple parish priest who, to be honest about it, had attracted no attention at all before being named archbishop of the Latin nation's 4.2 million people.

The ceremony was as simple as it was imposing. In his praise of the middle-aged man who is a hero to many Salvadoreans and as likely a candidate for martyrdom as Thomas Becket in the 12th century, Father Healy began, "It is seldom easy for us to understand what God 'needs,' what he asks of those men and women on whose shoulders he lays the weight of His Church. He gives us hints, and probably the principal hints are the time and place where he puts us.

"In North America," Healy went on, "the nation precedes the church in time and in our people's consciousness. For us, the greater risk is that civil religion blocks out revelation. But in both our nations, balance is everything. Ideally, the claims of politics and faith are complementary. In the practical world of limited men, with limited vision and limited resources, faith and politics can frequently collide."

The audience was noiseless in face of the honor being bestowed upon all of them as Healy ended with a quote from Thomas More: "God made plants for their simplicity, animals for their innocence, but he made him man to serve him wittily in the tangle of his mind."

The archbishop then spoke of "the cause of Christian humanism" which had been developing in the church, and the important new emphasis of "beginning with the realities of this world" where we must implant His kingdom *now*. He spoke of how the honorary degree showed solidarity with the sufferings of Salavadorean peasants. Then he pleased everyone by taking off his cape and putting on his honorary robe.

As they walked out of the cathedral, the American and Salvadorean priests were alternately stopped by the passionate mob of humans and carried along by it. The Rev. Robert Mitchell of Georgetown University recalled later with an irony touched by awe that "the scene . . . had little resemblance to more traditional ceremonies for honorary degrees."

But Father Healy, a robust Irish Catholic whose hearty, puckish face contains the wisdom and freshness of all the vales of Ireland, had the last word. "We are 1978," he mused

later, sitting in his elegant university office, "and we're right back to 1170. And we wonder how we got there."

At precisely 5 p.m. last Jan. 10, the Rev. Robert Drinan, Democratic congressman from Massachusetts, called upon another important but unrelated Romero—one President-General Carlos Humberto-Romero. They met in Romero's office at the presidential mansion in San Salvador. The meeting was not friendly, despite the beauty of the old colonial building and its vast courtyard.

At one point the president arose in a rage and stalked across the large office to his desk. From a top drawer he withdrew a picture of the murdered Father Rutilio Grande. The peasants who loved Father Grande had, in a reproduction of the picture, put a crown around his head, as though he were already officially sanctified. But the words underneath read, "Our Government Has Done This to Us."

"How can they do this to me?" President Romero demanded, livid with anger.

And, he must have wondered, how could yet another Washington priest be "interfering"? Father Drinan, already an alumnus of an Amnesty International investigation in Argentina and a tall, dark man with the piercing eyes of a Shakespearean devil, had gone to Salvador at the request of the archbishop to investigate.

The drama between the two men takes form:

Drinan: I have talked with dozens of people in the countryside, and they tell me a grim tale of intimidation and harassment by forces responsible to the government. As a matter of fact, it is intimidation against the Catholic Church. The National Guard and the ORDEN [a right-wing group] tell people not to attend mass or go near the priests because they are Communists.

Romero: If you have gone . . . and heard these things, I think you should go to other places and other churches where the people of ORDEN themselves have suffered and where FECCAS and UTC [church-related peasant groups] commit degradations and intimidate the people. Some people have even been killed.

Drinan: I recognize that there has been violence by the other side, but I am speaking of something different. The government of El Salvador . . . is making it difficult or impossible for masses of the people to participate in religious services. This is the denial of a basic human right. The government is trying to divide the church. That is what you are trying to do right now. You are harassing the archbishop.

Romero: [with growing impatience] I have tried to seek an understanding with the clergy. I have talked to Father Jerez of the Jesuit Order and others. I provided security when they were threatened. I have gone and talked with priests . . . I have invited the archbishop. He came here, and we talked. He asked for the return of all the exiled priests. I said I could not do this because my colleagues and associates listen to the priests' broadcasts over radio stations and would put pressure on me not to allow them to return. I invited the archbishop to fill any vacancies with priests from abroad. I said to give me a list of the vacancies and of the candidates to fill them. We would investigate and decide who can come.

Drinan: [angrily] That is interference in the Church. It is not for a president to say who is a good priest and who is a bad priest.

Romero: [slowly, with impatience] Yes it is, if they interfere in the business of the government!

It is a typically busy day at the big, white, tropical-style American embassay in Salvador. Surrounded by lush gardens and a high fence, watched over by armed guards, the embassy foyer nevertheless is filled with Salvadoreans passively waiting for visas to leave their population and violence-doomed country.

Inside, an officer is upset. The ambassador, Frank Devine, must wear a bulletproof vest this day because a veiled bit of intelligence has come that "someone" might attack him that day. Who?

He shakes his head.

It could be so many people. Almost like a child's chant, he says it could be the right, it could be the left, it could be the government, it could be the guerrillas, it could be the "ins," it could be the "outs," it could be the Marxists, it could be the Catholics.

Perhaps the strangest part of the violence in this country is that it is all so frighteningly anonymous. In sprawling hot San Salvador, with its dialetic of shanty slums and elegant walled houses, nobody really knows who the murderous, rightist White Warriors or the leftist guerillas or the BPR (Popular Revolutinary Block) or the others really are. Unlike many revolutionary or prerevolutionary situations, the Salvadorean groups rarely take credit for their terrorism or attempt to explain their actions.

An American embassy officer in San Salvador finds it puzzling. "It is singularly disorganized," he said. "The country is in the process of breakdown, and it has about run its course. The mysteriousness is a function of breakdown. Nobody knows what's going on. I've never seen a country harder to know."

The problems of El Salvador in 1978 began in 1931. That year, the only free elections in the entire history of this little mestizo country were held and the liberal reformer Arturo Araujo came to power, frightening the "14 families" who had always ruled.

The military "solved" that problem by immediately taking over for the wealthy, only to be met by a massive peasant uprising in the coffee-growing region in the west. The upper-class Salvadorean "memory," therefore, is haunted by machete-wielding peasants arising like fearful shadows out of the land.

Hundreds died before the revolt was over. And that revolt was the first in the Western Hemisphere in which Communists played a significant role.

In the years following the revolt, the rest of Latin America went through change after change. Salvador stagnated and abnormal extremes of wealth and poverty became the status quo. Even today, the average per capita income is estimated at $440 a year, and 2 percent of the population owns 60 percent of the land. And there is another problem: Salvador, the smallest nation in Latin America, is also the most densely populated, with 550 persons per square mile.

The Catholic Church, not blind to such social conditions in Latin America, held an extraordinary conference in Medellin, Colombia, in 1968. Historically, one of the three pillars of the Establishment in Latin America, along with the military and the aristocracy, the church suddenly aligned itself with the poor and even with revolution. A "theology of liberation" and even a "theology of violence," hung from the church's tattered edges, catching even the most fervid radicals within its web.

With an unusually high number of foreign—especially European—priests, Salvador became a testing ground for the Medellin documents. And so, through the church, groups such as FECCAS (the peasant organization) and the umbrella group BPR and others were formed. All were illegal, because Salvadorean law prohibits such organizing.

The government, fearing all attempts at change equally, hated them quite as much and perhaps even more than the true Marxist groups—the Soviet-line ERP (Revolutionary Army of the People) and the Maoist-Castroite FPL (Farabundo Marti Brigade). By 1977, the country was in flames.

Marxist groups assassinated Foreign Minister Mauricio Borgonovo Pohl, a former president and the rector of the National University. The government's paramilitary groups—the White Warriors and ORDEN, a group numbering in the 60,000s—retaliated. Activist priests Rutilio Grande and Alfonso Navarro were murdered last year. Several score more priests were exiled.

Throughout the violence was the eerie specter of anonymity. The rector was assassinated in front of 200 eyewitnesses. When the investigation came, there were no witnesses.

Then, in July last year, the mysterious White Warriors told the Jesuits, who comprise the largest order in Salvador, that 33 Jesuits would be systematically murdered unless they left the country immediately. At that point the archbishop and the American priests, along with many American Protestant clergymen, decided to act.

The passion with which they acted suggests a spiritual and a psychological dimension that is even more fascinating than the actual situation. Why should these two Irish-American priests, settled so comfortably in the lap of world power, become so obsessed with primitive, unimportant Salvador?

For Drinan, tall and dark and gaunt, the motivations seem to be two: a concern for human rights and the camaraderie he felt for his old Jesuit colleagues. Born in Boston, he had always been concerned with human rights and his Amnesty trip to Argentina two years ago had filled him with compassion for the people of Latin America and anger at injustices there. In addition, there were his Jesuit missions in Brazil, Jamaica and Honduras where some of his former classmates are among the approximately 850 clergy and nuns who have been harassed, tortured or murdered in the last 15 years.

For Healy, who sits atop the bluff in Georgetown in one of the most beautiful offices in Washington—a French Gothic room circa 1890 with cherry wood paneling and exquisite stained glass windows—the motivations are more complicated. The son of an Australian father and a Texan mother (with a lot of Irish blood mixed all through), he went to Woodstock College before getting his doctor of philosophy degree at Oxford.

He is also a Renaissance man of sorts. He trap-shoots. He loves good jazz and is known to tipple a few. He teaches poetry to medical students to bring body and spirit together.

When you talk to him about Salvador, he talks with a passion about the "underground church," or the "original church" or the "church of the catacombs." One has the feeling Father Healy has found in Salvador and the archbishop a deeper dimension to his faith.

Then there is, as one of Healy's top aides put it, "the Jesuit in him coming out." The Jesuits have been, after all, in the forefront of action and change within the church. They founded schools, missions and churches and moved on to leave the dull, day-to-day administration of their structured flocks to others less involved in adventure.

Last spring, in response to the threats of Jesuits being murdered, Healy, along with Protestant churchmen, urgently requested a meeting with Secretary of State Cyrus Vance to ask that the U.S. make the strongest possible protest to the Salvadorean government.

Vance responded immediately. The plea was precisely in line with the new human rights policy and passion of the Carter administration.

Personal meetings between State Department officials and Salvadorean officials here and in El Salvador led to the threats being called off. The U.S. responded to apparent im-

provement by finally granting a held-back $90 million loan. But the violence in the countryside and in the city continued.

By February 1978 with spurious elections in the offing, the opposition political coalition had called a rally for their candidate, Col. Ernesto Claramount. Into the massive throng on Feb. 28 went security forces and ORDEN thugs. Five deaths were officially reported, but eyewitness observers say that more than 100 were slaughtered.

An American journalist who was there said, "I was kept out of the plaza, so I could only hear the screaming and the shooting. Then, when it was over, I got in and found it literally covered with blood, although the bodies had been removed. But perhaps the most horrible thing was when I returned again an hour after that to find they had hosed down the plaza and there was a chill as though nothing had happened at all."

The massacres continued. Villages were attacked. Individual peasants simply "disappeared," never to return. The State Department's human rights division named El Salvador one of the worst human rights violators in the hemisphere, if not the world.

The struggle in El Salvador is not simply one of violence and human rights. The conflict has overtones of some of the most complicated ideological and theological problems of our time.

A leading Jesuit in San Salvador, for instance, tried to explain the difficult path facing an activist church in the midst of Marxist politics and revolution.

"Our Christian faith has in part the concern for justice of the old prophets," he said. "It is the same as Jesus Christ in front of the social problems of his times. This goes back to the sources of the Bible. It is not only the pragmatism of the faith but justice. And the cost is very high.

"I distinguish politics in terms of parties, and that is not particularly Christian. But a Christian who works at the front of social problems is another thing. Here, we enter the area of justice, and that is really biblical."

Could a system be "sinful," as many of the Jesuits who lean toward a Marxist interpretation of history say? The priest paused. "In our work it is very important to distinguish a personal sin from a structural sin. The system is of such a type that it can form a person in sin. Sure, there is a little of Marxism in this, but we believe that this idea of sin is what Christ meant when he talked about the world as sin.

"Here, the idea of a system and the structure as sinful means . . . that the system can make one sinful, too."

Such thoughts bring up the question of whether a Christian can also be a Marxist. Or whether some of the Salvadorean priests are already Marxists.

Father Mitchell, a theologian, does not find those questions altogether relevant. The archbishop, he said, works "from clear facts and clear injustices. Although there is a liberal theology in the background, he is not working explicitly out of it. He is aware of the Marxist and the liberal analysis, but he is not using it. The injustices and discrepancies are so obvious. The theology he's in is quite faithful to [the pope], Vatican II and Medellin."

Then he added thoughtfully, "If you take the whole idea that there can be 'sinful' structures, then that opens up the possibilities of there also being 'graced' structures. Perhaps it is not sin in the same sense in which we know it, but you can see where selfishness, greed and pride can become encased in cultures and in laws and in economic systems so the thing is positively unjust. It is original sin extended to society. Therefore, the whole idea of grace and redemption is extended to it. Structures can share in grace and redemption. Structures which help people to live a just life have grace."

And Father Healy said, "Didn't the early attitudes toward the Roman Empire treat the system as evil?"

Heady stuff for a primitive country that never distinguished itself in the world for its intellectual, cultural or moral excellence. But then, the priests would add mystically that God always chose the poorest in whom to make his messages known.

Napoleon Duarte, the enormously popular former Christian Democratic mayor of San Salvador who was elected president in 1977 and immediately deposed by the military, said there are three political "fronts" that have emerged: 1.) the priests and Marxists who work together, 2.) the Christians who believe violence is the only solution but not Marxists, and 3.) those looking for a solution somewhere "between humiliation and violence."

"They all go to meetings and provoke the police," Duarte said. "People are ready to kill, and they want people to be killed. At the moment the Marxist ideology is not important to them. What is important is how to get the rich scared. The leaders, however, are the products of the Marxist mind, and the priests have much the same concerns. I would say they're all frustrated and confused but feel there is no other means to solve the people's condition."

Which might cause one to wonder if the priests and the Protestant clergy raising their voices in Washington have done any good.

They have.

With the help of the State Department and others, they have certainly stopped the killing of the priests, although there still are bitter complaints that American officials haven't put enough pressure on the Salvadorean government about the continued "disappearances" of poor peasants. The priests also believe that American Embassy officials in San Salvador haven't done enough. Embassy staff, on the other hand, think they have gone very far, such as holding up that $90 million loan until the government reigned in the rightist terrorists.

So the tension between the churchmen and the U.S. government continues, though both want the same thing. The differences are a matter of degree and tactics.

Meanwhile, however, the government and church positions have made Western democracy and Christianity respectable among the Salvadoreans.

As to outside forces, Cuban policy there seems to be, as in neighboring Nicaragua, to support guerrilla morale and to provide advice, but not to give money or military help. The Cubans seem to want guerrillas in Central America to support moderate, coalition candidates to decrease the likelihood of "Yanqui" intervention.

The Vatican, meanwhile, is another question. The priests say the apostolic nuncio in Salvador is against the archbishop. He purposely did not attend the honorary ceremony for the archbishop and has spoken out against the Jesuits in ways that many feel is historically untenable. The Vatican itself, however, has not acted—the Jesuits in Salvador feel they have fed enough of their own information back to Rome to balance the nuncio's negative reports.

American priests, in addition to sincere concern for their brethren, have found inspiration, perhaps even salvation, in the situation.

"It is in Latin America these days that it is a tremendously exciting thing to be a priest," Healy said, sitting in the so-different splendor of his Georgetown office overlooking the meandering Potomac. "It is not in North America. It is still true that those of us of intellectual words do not know the front line. Those pastors, like Romero, remind us that the church is the people of God first. Here is the reality, and it is a good reminder to me. I've been hearing these footsteps all my life."

Drinan had a similar reminder. The usually dry and outspoken churchman speaks with awe about going out one night to the countryside where Father Grande had been killed. The peasant families had chosen an isolated plot to hold the eucharist, a place where the police could not find them in a vast sugar plantation.

"Like the early Christians in the catacombs and the Catholics in the Reformation period in England, we celebrated the eucharist," he said. "Simple peasants came up to embrace me, while others watched on the lookout. They told me, 'My husband disappeared, my brother disappeared . . .' It is a torment, but it is so beautiful."

The tragedy Healy sees in El Salvador is one that should speak with particular poignancy to U.S. Catholics reared on the memories of suffering Ireland. In a speech last St. Patrick's Day, he said, "The echoes of Ireland are too numerous to deny. We are talking of an agricultural people [in El Salvador] who starve to death on rich land while they farm it. We are talking of distant and absentee landlords who suck the land dry, return nothing to it or the people, and live a safe and protected distance from their oppressed peasants. The only ally they lack is famine—since you can't blight cotton. We are talking of a government tied totally to the power structure and quite content to let the peasants starve if it keeps the rich happy.

"Finally, we see what we have seen so often in Ireland and among the Irish outside of Ireland. When the government looks the other way and the police and the army and the rich and the powerful are all against the little people, the only voice left is that of the church. It has made martyrs before. It may, God help us, make more in El Salvador. If it does, the church and her crown of thorns will be recognizable to every Irishman any place on the face of the earth."

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
London SWIA OAA, October 1978.

STORTINGETS NOBEL COMMITTEE,
Drammencveien 19,
Oslo, Norway:

We would like to strongly recommend Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero y Galdames, Archbishop of San Salvador, El Salvador for the Nobel Peace Prize.

There is growing international awareness and concern over the increasing and widespread violations of human rights in so many countries throughout the world. Those who have the courage to speak out against abuses of human rights often run very grave risks. Archbishop Romero is an inspiring example of such a person. Since his appointment as Archbishop, he has consistently and uncompromisingly denounced the numerous arbitrary arrests, detentions, tortures, disappearances and killings taking place in El Salvador today. As a committed man of peace, he has rejected violence from whatever quarter and has advocated social and economic reforms to remove the injustices of El Salvador's poverty-ridden feudal society. Almost alone he has become the champion of the poor and the defenceless. As a result he is subject to daily vilification in the press and elsewhere as insane, subversive, as a man who "sells his soul to the Devil".

On the thirtieth anniversary of the UN Declaration of Human Rights, we feel that Archbishop Romero is a particularly suitable candidate for the Nobel Peace Prize and we hope that the Committee will take his candidature into serious consideration.

Yours sincerely,

——— ———.

THE 1979 NOBEL PEACE PRIZE NOMINATION

A letter signed by 118 Members of Parliament and Peers of all parties was sent today to the Nobel Committee in Oslo nominating Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero, Arch-

bishop of San Salvador in Central America for the 1979 Nobel Peace Prize.

Archbishop Romero has been nominated because of his courageous stand in defence of human rights. Since his appointment as Archbishop he has consistently and uncompromisingly denounced the numerous arbitrary arrests, detentions, tortures, disappearances and killings taking place in El Salvador today. Almost alone he has become the champion of the poor and the defenceless. As a result he is subject to regular vilification in the press and elsewhere as insane, subversive, as a man who "sells his soul to the Devil".

He is a committed man of peace and has rejected violence from whatever quarter and has advocated social and economic reforms to remove the injustices of El Salvador's poverty-ridden feudal society. In recognition of his stand for human rights, he was awarded an honorary doctorate earlier this year by the University of Georgetown, Washington.

The 118 signatories to the nomination (77 Labour, 27 Conservative, 11 Liberal and 3 others) include from the Labour Party, Deputy Party Leader Mr. Michael Foot, Mrs. Shirley Williams, Minister for Education, Mr. Eric Varley, Minister for Industry, Mr. Tony Benn, Minister for Energy, Mr. Stan Orme, Minister of Social Security, Mr. Roy Hattersley, Minister for Prices and Consumers Affairs, Mrs. Judith Hart, Minister for Overseas Development, Mr. Peter Archer, Solicitor-General, Mr. Frank Allaun, current Chairman of the Labour Party. The Conservative signatories include Mr. Norman St. John-Stevas, Shadow Leader of the House, Mr. Mark Carlisle, Shadow spokesman on Education, Mr. John Moore, Vice-Chairman of the Conservative Party and Mr. Peter Walker and Lord Carr of Hadley, former Cabinet Ministers in the Heath administration. The Liberal signatories include the Party Leader, Mr. David Steel and Deputy Leader John Pardoe. 13 signatories are Privy Councillors.

The nomination has been supported by Trade Union Leaders Mr. Joe Gormley (NUM), Mr. Alex Kitson (TGWU), Mr. Jim Slater (NUS), Mr. Sam McCluskey (NUS), Mr. Danny Crawford (UCATT) and Mr. Ray Buckton (ASLEF).

A full list of signatories, together with a copy of the letter to the Nobel Committee is attached. Also enclosed is a background article on Archbishop Romero which appeared in Time magazine of July this year.

For further information contact: Mr. Kevin McNamara M.P., House of Commons; Mr. Gerry Wade, Tory Reform Group; and Mr. Julian Filochowski, 01-935-5260.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 26, 1979.

NOBEL PEACE PRIZE COMMITTEE,
Drammensevien 19,
Oslo, Norway.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE: We write to you to nominate Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero y Galdames, Archbishop of San Salvador, El Salvador for the Nobel Peace Prize.

In a nation notorious for its disregard of basic human rights, Archbishop Romero stands out as an eloquent and unshakable opponent of oppression and violence. In calling for social and economic reform and in condemning government sanctioned violence that has taken the form of widespread "disappearances", arbitrary arrests, murder and torture, Archbishop Romero has become the most prominent spokesman in El Salvador for peace and justice.

He has persevered in pursuit of these noble ends despite the ongoing vilification campaign that has been waged against him. An individual of unsurpassed courage and integrity, Archbishop Romero has not allowed government persecutors to frighten him into silence or submission. He has remained a forthright and compelling advocate of human rights, nonviolence, and social progress—setting a standard in defense of human liberty which can be applied not only in Latin America, but throughout the world.

Because we believe that Archbishop Romero's conduct is an inspiring example for men and women everywhere who cherish freedom, we are proud to join with many people from various nations in asking that you give serious consideration to awarding Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero y Galdames the Nobel Peace Prize.

Sincerely,

Members of Congress: Robert F. Drinan, Walter E. Fauntroy, Richard L. Ottinger, William S. Moorhead, William J. Stanton, Berkeley Bedell, Thomas J. Downey, Millicent Fenwick, Frederick W. Richmond, Stanley N. Lundine, Baltasar Corrada, William S. Green, Frank J. Guarini, Nicholas Mavroules, Don Edwards, William M. Brodhead, Robert W. Edgar, Tom Harkin, Stephen J. Solarz, Edward J. Markey, Ted Weiss, Vic Fazio, and Michael E. Lowry.

□ 1135

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEISS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DRINAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues from New York (Mr. WEISS) and I have called this special tribute to the El Salvador Archbishop, Oscar Romero, at a particularly timely moment in the history of this Central American nation. Recent events in El Salvador, and at the Conference of Latin American Bishops in Puebla, Mexico, have brought into focus the continuing polarization between the dictatorial regime in San Salvador, and the people of El Salvador.

The current crisis in El Salvador has only begun to be fully understood by the American people. Yet the continued need for a resolution to the grave human rights violations in that country goes on. El Salvador's human rights record is one of the worst in this hemisphere, with the outlook for improvement—bleak. In the "Report on Human Rights Practices in Countries Receiving U.S. Foreign Aid," recently released by the Department of State, numerous types of violations were cited. Detailed accounts of torture of prisoners by security guards, degrading treatment of prisoners, arbitrary arrests and imprisonments, frequent judicial delays, unwarranted searches of homes and religious sanctuaries, restricted freedom of speech, restricted freedom of the press, and restricted freedom of the right of assembly are cited in the report. Further, untold numbers of administrative improprieties, manipulation, and fraud have impaired the political process. In light of the fact that the El Salvador Government is a signator to the American Convention on Human Rights ratified in June 1978, clearly the human rights situation in El Salvador in nothing more than deplorable.

During the summer of 1978, the national guard detained two priests, and two church workers; one disappeared for a time and the other three were badly beaten. In July 1978, heavily armed security forces searched an urban Jesuit household for evidence of subversion and then invaded a rural parish house in an attempt to arrest a local priest. And only very recently, on January 20, a fourth priest was murdered when a band of armed militia units stormed a peaceful, nonviolent, nonpolitical meeting in a parish hall. Through a completely reliable source, and with the assistance of the Washington Office on Latin America, an eyewitness account of this deplorable event has been recorded. I have inserted the report into the RECORD on January 25, 1979, on page 1079. And in an article which appeared in the February 10, 1979, issue of America, Father James R. Brockman, S.J., explores the events in El Salvador firsthand. I am inserting this article into the RECORD at this time:

PERSECUTION IN EL SALVADOR

(By James R. Brockman)

Four parish priests have been murdered in less than two years in the San Salvador archdiocese. In March 12, 1977, Father Rutilio Grande, S.J., died in an ambush between the towns of Aguilares and El Paisnal, along with an old man and a boy. On May 11, 1977, Father Alfonso Navarro and a teen-aged boy were shot while talking in a parish house in San Salvador. Last November 17, security forces killed Father Ernesto Barreda and reported that he died in a shoot out with urban guerrillas in his parish on the outskirts of San Salvador. The archdiocese suggests, however, that he was killed elsewhere and his body taken to the scene of the battle. After the shoot out, an extremist captured with a wound in his throat appeared on television answering questions in writing for the police and journalists. The police later declared that he died of a bullet in the head during the skirmish, and so the only witness to Father Barreda's death disappeared.

Two days ago, Father Octavio Ortiz, pastor of San Francisco Parish, was with a group of teen-aged youths in a retreat house owned by the archdiocese next to the rectory of San Antonio Parish. They were making a "Christian initiation course" with the help of a nun and a laywoman. At about 6 A.M., while all were still sleeping, security forces surrounded the building and sealed off the neighborhood. With an armored car, they broke down the door of the retreat house, named El Despertar, "The Awakening," and entered in a hail of gunfire. Father Ortiz and four of the boys died, the priest of a crushed skull (perhaps the armored car ran over him), the boys of causes that I have not yet learned. Today's newspapers show two bodies on the roof of the building, where the boys may have fled from the bullets or where the police may have placed them.

For the police suggest that the boys were on the roof to shoot at the police. No guns are visible in the photos, however, and the police story is part of an amazing tale told by the security forces of a police patrol peacefully investigating a report of "something strange" going on in the retreat house and meeting gunfire from the building, of returning the fire and entering to find a terrorist training center, complete with a store of firearms and a mimeograph for turning out subversive literature.

The archdiocese immediately denied the Government version of the killings, and yesterday, in a funeral Mass concelebrated at the Cathedral of San Salvador, the Archbishop called it "a lie from beginning to end." He went on to contradict flatly President Carlos Humberto Romero, who a few days before had told Mexican journalists that there is no persecution of the church in El Salvador. "There is persecution of the church," said the Archbishop. The presence of the bodies on the cathedral steps, he said, "shows how untruthful that is." His

words could also be translated: "Shows what a liar he is," referring to the President. However, I hesitate to interpret his words so strongly. Either way, once again battle lines seem to be drawn between the two Romeros. The softspoken Archbishop seems an unlikely man for such a role. Two years ago, the Government and the ruling class fought for his appointment, and priests and others committed to a pastoral approach of identification with the poor fought against it. But a few weeks after his installation, high-powered bullets cut down Rutilio Grande on the road to El Paisnal, and for Oscar Romero the shots were like the bolt that struck on the road to Damascus. Now he is clearly the moral leader of the church in El Salvador, loved by countless thousands of the ordinary people, for whom he speaks and who listen to his words each week on the Catholic radio, YSAX, and supported by his clergy, who know that any of them could be the next victim.

In his homily at yesterday's Mass, he summed up the state of things when he said: "The conflict is not between the Government and the church. The conflict is between the Government and the people. The church is with the people, and the people are with the church, thanks be to God." The Government and the ruling class it represents persist, however, in seeing themselves as beseiged by an army of terrorists, whom "Marxist" priests abet. Several groups of extremists who presently hold four kidnapped men has frustrated efforts to find them. The Archbishop and the clergy, however, never cease to condemn such tactics and appeal for the release of the captives and against violence. But their appeals for the release of political prisoners, for an end to killing of peasants, for a more equitable social order, are "subversive" and "Communist" to the rulers and to the newspapers that support them. The newspapers, while mentioning the archdiocese's version of the killings and printing pictures of yesterday's concelebration (in two of which America's correspondent appears), nevertheless give greater prominence to the Government's version and carry such banner headlines as "Five Killed in Confrontation" (today's La Prensa Grafica), and "Four Dead in Armed Clash" (yesterday's El Diario de Hoy). Today's El Diario de Hoy places next to the photo of the concelebration an unrelated story headed: "John Paul II Attacks Marxism Again."

Among El Salvador's five other bishops, Archbishop Romero can count on support only from Bishop Arturo Rivera of Santiago de Maria. His own auxiliary, Marco Rene Revelo, opposes him and was pointedly absent from yesterday's concelebration. It is Bishop Revelo that the bishops have elected to attend the Puebla conference. But Archbishop Romero will also be there, albeit without a vote, as a member of the papal commission for Latin America. In his homily yesterday, he asked his people permission to go to Puebla. Those of us who saw their faces and heard their applause do not doubt that he takes with him their support and their hopes.

In January 1978, I accompanied Prof. Thomas Anderson, one of the foremost scholars in North America on El Salvador, and John McAward, director of the international programs of the Unitarian-Universalist Service Committee, on an investigatory mission to El Salvador. During that trip I had the honor of meeting the Archbishop Oscar Romero. I was deeply impressed with this leader by his tremendous strength and commitment to a more righteous, egalitarian society in his country. Since my visit, I remain convinced that the United States must become fully aware of the events in that nation, and of the remarkable efforts of the archbishop in cultivating human rights.

To honor this special archbishop, who has remained vigilant in the face of great odds, over 20 Members of this body have joined me in nominating the archbishop for the Nobel Peace Prize. This nomination serves as a symbol to the people of El Salvador that the world has not forgotten, nor forsaken their efforts to achieve their rights of fundamental political expression. This nomination will serve as a sign of our gratitude to Archbishop Romero for his lead role in the struggle to secure these rights. I call on my colleagues at this time to join in praise of Archbishop Romero, and to wish him every success in his future endeavors.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, again I want to commend our distinguished colleague for the tremendous leadership role he has asserted in this, as well as numerous other human rights efforts in this country and other parts of the world.

□ 1145

Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEISS. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Puerto Rico.

Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues today in bringing to the attention of all the Members of the House of Representatives the work that is being done by Archbishop Oscar Romero of El Salvador. As a cosigner of a letter nominating Archbishop Romero for the Nobel Peace Prize, I praise his commitment to the cause of human rights and a decent living for the people of El Salvador and all people throughout Latin America and the world.

The continued polarization which exists between the poor and the rich in that country has led to violence; just last January 20, another priest was killed and the violence shows no sign of abating. As the recently concluded Third Conference of Latin American Bishops held at Puebla, Mexico, continues to make clear, the job of a priest in Latin America is multidimensional, for they often have to deal not only with the spiritual well-being of their parishioners, but also with the day-to-day problems of subsisting which they face.

Archbishop Romero is an example of a priest who has been able to balance both obligations in order to lead his people toward a better life and I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing his efforts.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my distinguished colleague from Puerto Rico for the excellent comments he has made.

□ 1145

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEISS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN).

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York upon one of the finest statements, if not the finest statement I have ever heard about the deplorable situation in El Salvador. As a person who has been very familiar with the plight of this tragic country, I commend my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEISS).

I know that he is going to continue in his crusade to do all that we can, all within our power, to bring about freedom and liberty in that country.

Mr. WEISS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

I am honored to be associated with him in this endeavor.

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in endorsing the nomination of Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero of El Salvador for the Nobel Peace Prize.

El Salvador has one of the poorest human rights records in the Western Hemisphere, and Archbishop Romero has demonstrated remarkable courage in standing up to its brutal regime and defending the rights of the poor.

In the face of countless acts of violence committed against the peasants and the priests who have tried to help them, the Archbishop has responded as a true man of peace. He seeks a nonviolent solution to the enormous political and economic problems of El Salvador. His call for social and economic reforms, however, have met with charges of Communist subversion. His condemnation of tortures and unjust arrests have met with increased persecution of his church.

The Government of El Salvador has attempted in vain to discredit him. The increased international recognition of Archbishop Romero's moral courage and integrity will strengthen his efforts to achieve greater social justice for the people of El Salvador.

He is truly deserving of the prestigious Nobel Peace Prize and merits our support and admiration.●

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to add my words of support for Archbishop Oscar Romero and his nomination for the Nobel Peace Prize. As Archbishop of San Salvador, he has been an outspoken critic of government repression against the peasantry of his country—El Salvador.

El Salvador is Central America's smallest, most crowded country and is typified by a polarization of the rich and poor, the military and civilian. A resulting series of battles has caused the death or disappearance of hundreds of peasants, a number of wealthy businessmen, a government minister and at least two priests. Violations of human rights have been rampant and Archbishop Romero has surfaced as one of the few voices calling for social reform and an end to repression.

Until more just economic and social structures are created, the violence can be expected to continue. And despite the increasing threat of personal danger, Archbishop Romero has continued to speak out against injustice and to aid peasants in need. He has taken a clear stand against violence in expressing his concern for social justice.

Archbishop Romero's efforts to assist the impoverished people of El Salvador

regain "their inherent human dignity" are, indeed, worthy of recognition. He is a champion of the poor and the defenseless and is, in my opinion, an excellent candidate for the Nobel Peace Prize.●

CONGRESSMAN WHITE COSPONSORING HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION TO AMEND U.S. CONSTITUTION TO ESTABLISH BALANCED FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

● Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, today I address the House both as Congressman RICHARD C. WHITE of the 16th Congressional District of Texas and as chairman of DRO, the Democratic Research Organization. I am joined here by several of my DRO colleagues to announce that I have introduced today, on behalf of myself and 44 other cosponsoring Democratic Members of the House who are members of DRO, a House joint resolution to amend the U.S. Constitution to establish a balanced Federal budget as the norm for managing the Federal Government's fiscal affairs, while providing the flexibility to handle situations when a balanced budget is not feasible.

After long, careful and thorough review of our budgetary situation together with the remedies available, the cosponsors of this proposed amendment and I have reached the conclusion that a constitutional amendment is the only effective way to make a balanced Federal budget the norm. Let me explain how we arrived at this view.

In late 1975 and 1976 the DRO Committee To Investigate a Balanced Federal Budget conducted hearings on this matter. Approximately 40 witnesses were heard from the President's Cabinet, Congress, academia, the Federal Government, and the business world. We studied these 1,600 pages of testimony carefully. Then, in mid-1978, I, as chairman of DRO, again contacted those witnesses who had appeared before the committee to get the further benefit and updating of their views. Only at the culmination of this lengthy process did we reach the conclusion that a constitutional amendment was the only effective remedy. On August 16 and 17, 1978, the committee report on these DRO hearings was published in the RECORD.

Let us look again at the record. Since 1961 the Federal budget has been in deficit every year except one. Conventional economic wisdom holds that budget deficits are beneficial to stimulate the economy in bad economic times, and that, correspondingly, good economic times should produce surplus budgets. Yet, a continuous chain of large budget deficits both in good times and bad has become the general rule since 1971.

We all know that large budget deficits fuel the fires of inflation and that the interest costs of the debt are staggering. The relationship between the deficits and inflation is unmistakable. Since the mid-1960's the U.S. economy appears to have suffered a permanent shift toward higher rates of inflation. Price increases averaged less than 2 percent a year from 1950 through 1964, but this average yearly rate of inflation almost tripled to 5.5 percent in the next 12 years. In 1978, it was about 9 percent. During the 1950-65 period, the Federal deficit averaged only $2.6 billion a year. Large deficits occurred during recessions, but the budget moved back toward balance or even to small surplus in periods of prosperity and rapid growth.

After the mid-1960's, all that changed. Federal deficits became much larger, and the budget usually did not move back to balance or surplus during upswings in the economy. Federal deficits averaged $23 billion a year from 1965 to 1978, which is almost nine times the average deficit for the previous 15 years. During the current fiscal year, when the economy is more than 3 years into a strong recovery, a $39 billion budget deficit is contemplated. The real problem is the lack of a responsible and disciplined fiscal policy.

Speaking of the need for fiscal responsibility, former Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns made the following comment in an interview in the July/August 1978 issue of Public Opinion magazine:

> I think we need to introduce some firm discipline into the management of fiscal affairs. Simple majority government has led us into the position in which we now find ourselves—with deficits persisting year in and year out, with inflation itself accelerating in this country at a time when the rate of inflation is diminishing in most other parts of the world. The legislating of deficits by simple majority rule has led to a depreciation of the dollar in foreign exchange as well as in domestic markets. It has led to great uncertainties about the future of free enterprise in our country. It has led also to a lowering of our national prestige.
>
> Whether the rule should be a two-thirds majority in order to run a deficit, or a 60 percent majority, I don't much care. But in view of the experience that we have gone through, something more than a bare majority is needed to regain responsibility in financial and economic management.

Faced with this situation, we have no alternative but to make balanced Federal budgets the norm.●

● Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is truly an honor for me, as a new member of this body, to rise to indicate my support for and sponsorship of the House joint resolution requiring a balanced Federal budget introduced by my distinguished colleague, RICHARD C. WHITE of Texas. With the passage of this resolution, the Congress will be taking the next logical step in its effort to build a budgetary process which is manageable, effective, and most importantly, credible to the men and women paying the bills, the American taxpayer.

This amendment, supported by 45 Members of this body, would require a balanced Federal budget, except when we declare a national emergency because of war or economic disaster.

With the creation of the Congressional Budget Office, and the establishment of the Senate Budget Committee and the House Budget Committee, on which I am privileged to serve, the Congress has provided a method for obtaining the information on which budgetary decisions should be made. That process, although still in its infancy, seems to be working well. No longer must we solely rely on information supplied by the executive branch—information which in the past has so often been self-serving. We must now commit ourselves to taking the next step toward fiscal responsibility. The Federal deficit is, in my view, a major cause of the inflation which is gripping our Nation. It must be stopped in all but the most dire circumstances.

We must no longer ask ourselves only if the people of this country want a program, we must now ask if they can afford a program.

The history of this country over the past 40 years has amply demonstrated that the temptation for legislators not to say "No" to groups continually asking for more funding is simply too great to be overcome through the exercise of self-discipline and self-restraint.

We talk a lot about balancing the Federal budget, but when the time comes to cut spending, we do not respond. I have, therefore, come to the conclusion that the only way to bring spending under control and to balance the budget as soon as possible is to impose the discipline this Congress needs by way of a constitutional amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution will force the United States to live within its means. Yet it preserves the ability of the Congress to respond in times of war or economic disaster when unusual measures are necessary to assure the stability of our free market economy.

The country is demanding restraint in spending. Only with the restrictions provided in this amendment can the people be assured of that restraint.●

● Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, today's special order for the resolution proposing a constitutionally balanced Federal budget is an event worth celebrating. Only a prior, personal commitment prevents my being in Washington to share in the historic occasion—but this statement is a reminder that I am with you in spirit, if not in body.

It is said that all good things come to those who wait. Well, I and all who share my deep concern for the fiscal integrity of our beloved Nation have waited a long time indeed. After working toward this end for so long, now our time has come.

Recent events have indicated that the people have had enough of local and State government spending programs and taxes with ever-upward spiraling costs that are driving up inflation to where it is oppressive to everyone who works for a living—and even those who do not. The same would apply to the Federal Government.

Although I have never been a big spender, neither have I been an irresponsible budget cutter for publicity's sake. I believe, as a Member of the House, that I have used a discerning eye and exercised considerable prudence in reaching final judgment on every program, proposal, or appropriations measure which came before me. So as I ap-

plaud the actions of so many I also caution them in their rush to judgment. The scalpel, not the meat ax, should be employed with skill.

But the sentiment to which the people themselves are now giving expression throughout the country was very much on my own mind way back in 1965, when, on January 4—my very first day in Congress—I introduced the first of eight joint resolutions—spanning a period of 15 years—that called for the balancing of the Government's books. I could not get cosponsors, or hearings, many of my colleagues laughed, but we continued our efforts. And look where we are today.

Though then a lonely voice in the wilderness, I had determined that only an amendment to the Constitution, mandating pay-as-you-go Government—such as we have in the State of Texas—would serve to bring Federal spending under control. And so I introduced in the House a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to provide that Government appropriations should not exceed Government revenues, except in time of war or national emergency.

In the years that followed, other voices were raised, and in each succeeding Congress, they grew louder in their plea for national fiscal sanity. Now dozens of similar congressional resolutions stand beside mine—and I am pleased to add my name to this one, as well as my support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this Congress now consider a proposal whose time has clearly come. The cosponsors of this measure come from both sides of the aisle, and from all over the country. In the present climate, three-fourths of the States should have no trouble at all in transforming an income-outgo resolution into the next amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It is not so lonely any more.●

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress more than 6 years ago, among the first bills I introduced was a proposed constitutional amendment to require a balanced Federal budget except in times of national emergency. I have continued to sponsor and cosponsor such legislation until this very day, and I am pleased that many States of the Union are demanding such action.

Placing constitutional limits on the power of the Federal Government to incur debt is an extremely important goal. Immense Federal borrowing in the capital markets is an inflationary force.

However, there are difficulties in addressing this problem in terms of balancing the budget. First, there is the issue of off-budget borrowing that will run to $12 billion in 1979. Secondly, there is the question of how to prepare a balanced budget when the desired result depends on estimates of revenues and outlays affected by changing economic conditions. We also face the issue of how to define a national emergency. And I am constantly aware that a budget can be balanced by increasing the tax burden, a prospect which alarms me.

It is doubtful whether these concerns can be adequately resolved in a constitutional amendment to require a balanced Federal budget, but we can achieve our goals by other means in a constitutional mandate. I have prepared an amendment which I believe solves some of the major difficulties inherent in the balanced-budget approach, but would bring us to that same result. My amendment says:

> Congress shall not make any change in tax law that would increase the revenue of the Federal Government, or take any action that would have the effect of increasing the public debt, except by affirmative vote of not less than two-thirds of all Members elected to each House of Congress.

This amendment would cover off-budget borrowing. It controls congressional action on taxes and debt without relying on estimates based upon economic variables. The condition of national emergency is defined by the requirement for a two-thirds vote, which would be extremely difficult to obtain except under conditions of true national emergency.

I have asked for cosponsors on this constitutional amendment. I hope that many Members who have sponsored or cosponsored balanced budget amendments will join me in cosponsoring this formulation that would bring us to the same result.●

● Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the legislation which the members of DRO have introduced today is the product of 3 years of intense research on the part of myself and my colleagues in the Democratic Research Organization. In 1975, DRO established an Ad Hoc Committee To Investigate a Balanced Federal Budget at my request. As its chairman, I took testimony from 39 expert witnesses including William E. Simon, then-Secretary of the Treasury; Dr. Arthur Burns, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; Dr. Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the President's Economic Advisers; Elliot Richardson, Secretary of Commerce; Carla Hills, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; Roderick Hills, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission; James J. Needham, chairman of the board of directors of the New York Stock Exchange; Alice Rivlin of the Congressional Budget Office; Elmer Staats, Comptroller General; Dr. Leon W. Taub, vice president of Chase Econometric Associates; and numerous other representatives of government, academia, and business. Consistently and convincingly, the testimony of these witnesses advocated one step toward a health economy: a balanced Federal budget.

And then came 1978. An inflation rate of 9 percent, an unemployment rate of 6 percent, and an fiscal year 1978 budget deficit of $48.8 billion combined to burden the American public with one of the financially toughest years in recent memory. And, symbolized by proposition 13, the public mandate has also been consistent and convincing: a balanced Federal budget.

In response to urging from both the experts and the public, as well as a growing number of State legislatures (currently the number is 27), DRO established a second committee to develop language for a constitutional amendment, which I also chaired. Again with the guidance of respected economists, we devised an amendment which would require a balanced Federal budget except in times when a deficit would be necessary or desirable. We defined the areas of Federal expenditures which would be affected by the amendment, and we set forth a process through which any deficit—anticipated or unanticipated—would be swiftly reduced. It is this legislation which nearly 50 DRO members proudly introduce today.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation now has a national debt of $781.1 billion with an interest charge of $57 billion for the next fiscal year. We are currently considering a fiscal year 1980 deficit of $29 billion which, together with off-budget items, could swell to twice this size. The experts tell us that deficits lead to inflation and to unemployment and to lowered productivity and investment. And the public tells us that these figures which we juggle so casually translate into human costs as well.

It is high time that we face reality. We can no longer labor under the illusion that Government spending can solve every problem—that deficit spending will continue to gallop to the rescue and support us forever in this manner to which we have become so accustomed. Deficits are a cause, not a cure, of inflation. And if inflation is allowed to continue, the one dream which we want to sustain—that of competition for every citizen in a climate of freedom and opportunity—will be eroded slowly but surely.

Mr. Speaker, our wants exceed our resources. A budget staffed to the brim with goodies for specified constituencies may pacify some folks, but a budget trimmed down to the necessities promises to take the edge off inflation and higher taxation for us all. And until we prove that we have learned this economic lesson, we will continue to spawn hundreds of special interest groups that stamp their feet like spoiled children when they do not get a large enough piece of the Federal pie.

After 3 years of study of the problem of achieving a balanced budget, I can well understand the reluctance of certain economists to mandate fiscal constraints which in their view would tie the hands of the Congress and the Executive, making it more difficult to respond to emergencies; to prime the pump when the economy is slow; or to take the opposite steps when the economy is too hot. They are merely stating the ideal and we all know what the ideal is. The political reality is that the Congress and the President have only balanced the budget one time in the last 19 years and the politically sophisticated know that the chances of doing so in the future are almost impossible without some kind of mandatory fiscal restraint. Everyone knows that what we are doing is wrong but those who would correct our misdeeds do not want to reduce spending for their own favorite projects. The result is we continue on an economic merry-go-round year after year.

My district, like yours, is full of frustrated taxpayers who see their hard-earned and sorely needed dollars being spent for exactly what they need the least—bigger, greedier, inflationary Government. As they struggle once again

this year to balance their own personal budgets against the cruel odds of high taxes, high costs, and decreasing purchasing power, let us take steps to pass legislation which will make a balanced Federal budget and a healthier economy a norm, not a luxury. Then, and only then, will we regain our distinction as a Union made of ideals—not appetites.●

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege to reserve this special order in commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day and I want to thank all of the Members who are joining me today to help focus attention on the plight of the Lithuanian people who continue to struggle, to pray, and to work for the day when Lithuania can once again enjoy liberty.

Sixty-one years ago, on February 16, 1918, a courageous people proclaimed to the world its right to stand proudly among free countries. The very brief time—less than a quarter of a century—that the Lithuanian people enjoyed the privilege of living in independence has left an important impression on the Lithuanian people, and the years of Communist domination and Nazi occupation have made their love of freedom all the more keen.

Lithuania has been known to history for almost a 1,000 years. During the Middle Ages, education and religious toleration were encouraged, and as a result, the people of Lithuania enjoyed more freedom than their neighbors in adjoining areas. Her people have been strong in faith and spirit surviving as a cultural and political entity during long periods of foreign domination.

One of the first duties of the representatives of the Lithuanian people after they signed the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania on February 16 was the adoption of a national flag for the new state. The new national flag of three horizontal bars symbolized the natural beauty of the Lithuanian countryside as well as the courage of its people. At the top was a bar of deep yellow, symbolic of the golden rye fields and agricultural wealth of the land. In the middle came a rich green stripe, a reminder of the abundant forests and natural resources of Lithuania. The deep red bar at the bottom of the flag symbolized the blood shed by Lithuania's sons in the defense of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the national anthem of Lithuania follows as published in a booklet entitled, "Lithuania," published by the Lithuanian American Council of Chicago, Ill.:

NATIONAL ANTHEM OF LITHUANIA

Lithuania, our country,
Land of might you'll ever be;
Through the ages your fond sons
Have gathered strength from thee.
Lithuania, your children
Paths of righteousness shall tread;
For their native land they'll labor
Earth's aspiring aims they've bred.
Fount of light, may your bright sun
Pierce all that's in darkened sheen,
Show us Truth's noble way,
And we'll follow in your gleam.
In our hearts, Lithuania,
Love for you will dwell fore'er
Spirit of the world is soaring
Caught in your exalted glare.

Under the brutal domination of Soviet communism, the Lithuanian people have been under intense pressure to forsake their history and traditions, and to this day, Lithuanians have proudly resisted outside pressures and remain faithful to their language, culture, and religion.

Mr. Speaker, excerpts on the lack of religious freedom in Lithuania from a publication by the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Religious Aid entitled, "In Defense of Human Rights" follows, as well as an excerpt on cultural freedom from a publication by the Lithuanian American Community entitled, "The Violations of Human Rights in Soviet Occupied Lithuania:"

EXCERPT FROM "IN DEFENSE OF HUMAN RIGHTS"

In 1940, when the Soviet Union occupied Lithuania by force, 85.5% of the country's more than 3 million inhabitants were Roman Catholic, 4.5% Protestant, 7.3% Jewish, 2.5% Orthodox, and 0.2% of other persuasions.

In the two archdioceses and four dioceses were: 708 churches, 314 chapels, 73 monasteries, 85 convents, three archbishops, nine bishops, 1271 diocesan priests, 580 monks, of whom 168 were priests. Four seminaries had 470 students. There were 950 nuns.

Nuns cared for 35 kindergartens, 10 orphanages, 25 homes for the aged, two hospitals, a youth center, and an institute for the deaf-mute.

There were 18 Catholic primary schools, and the same number of Catholic high schools. Religion was taught in all public schools.

Catholic organizations numbered about 800,000 members. In 1935, there were 28 Catholic magazines and newspapers, with a total circulation of 7,000,000.

On June 15, 1940, the Red Army marched into Lithuania; the independent government was replaced by a puppet regime.

On July 14–15, rigged elections were staged. On July 21, with the Red Army surrounding the assembly house, the new People's Diet "unanimously" declared Lithuania a Soviet Socialist Republic.

On June 25, 1940, the Church was declared separate from the state, and the representative of the Holy See was expelled.

Parish lands were confiscated, clergy salaries and pensions were cut off, and their savings confiscated. Churches were deprived of support. Catholic printing plants were confiscated, and religious books destroyed.

On June 28, 1940, the teaching of religion and recitation of prayers in schools was forbidden. The University's Department of Theology and Philosophy was abolished, and all private schools were nationalized. The seminaries at Vilkaviskis and Telsiai were closed, and the seminary at Kaunas was permitted to operate on a very limited scale. The clergy were spied upon constantly.

On June 15, 1941, 34,260 Lithuanians were packed off in cattle-cars to undisclosed points in the Soviet Union. After World War II, the mass deportations resumed and continued until 1953.

Relaxation of pressure on religious believers soon revealed that the Lithuanian people were still deeply religious. It was decided in the mid-fifties to resume the attack. The principal means of attack would be unlimited moral pressure, since physical terror seemed only to strengthen and unify the faithful.

In 1972, the *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania*, clandestinely published in that country, began to reach the free world at irregular intervals. Primarily intended to keep Catholics in Lithuania informed of the situation of the Church there, these Lithuanian *samizdat* also serve as a constant appeal to the free world not to forget the plight of a people struggling against overwhelming odds to defend their religious beliefs and to regain their basic human rights.

EXCERPT FROM "THE VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHT IN SOVIET OCCUPIED LITHUANIA"

The situation of the Lithuanian language is difficult. Five times as many Russians are living in Lithuania today than prior to World War II, especially in Vilnius and Klaipeda. Therefore, in some offices it is impossible to make oneself understood in Lithuanian, for instance, in the Vilnius railway station in some post offices, on the street with the policemen on duty, etc. In Latvia, where on the eve of the war there were eighteen Lithuanian schools, they have all been closed. Many lands, recognized as part of Lithuania by the peace treaty between Lithuania and the Soviet Union, signed on July 12, 1920, today are under the Belorussian administration. Lithuanians are autochthonous in those lands. They have no Lithuanian schools, while in Apsas and Vydziai the churches have been closed; the church of Pelesa, built by Lithuanians after World War I, has been transformed into a warehouse, its towers have been razed, while Rector Vienazindis was imprisoned in 1950. Consequently, Lithuanians in Belorussia have no schools, no churches, and Lithuanian priests are not allowed to take up residence there.

The census data indicate that the number of Russians and of Poles in Lithuania is about equal, but various advertisements, slogans, posters, booklets, etc. in Vilnius are in two languages—Lithuanian and Russian—only. There is a Russian drama theatre in Vilnius, Russian-language classes are set up in Lithuania's higher education establishments, while the Polish language is allowed only in the Vilnius Pedagogical Institute.

The smaller national minorities are faring even worse. During the war, the Jews suffered more than any other inhabitants in Lithuania. Prior to World War II, they had 122 primary schools, three grammar schools, and 14 high schools. At present, the Jews do not have a single school, or a press of their own, although, according to the 1970 census data, there were 16,000 of them in Vilnius alone, and 4,000 in Kaunas. Twenty-four thousand declared themselves as Belorussians in Vilnius, but they do not have their own school and the Belorussian religious services were also abolished in churches in the postwar years. When private schools were forbidden after the war, the Karaites suffered a special loss, because the *Kenese* (Karaite place of worship. Ed.) of Trakai had a parochial school attached to it; the Tatars also suffered a wrong with the closing of their mosques and schools.

The Lithuanians in Latvia are given the explanation that, if they want to study in Lithuanian, they must go to Lithuania, but the Russians are not told that their children should go to Russian to learn Russian. The Ministry of Education has specified that the

curriculum of the senior class in Lithuanian high schools contain only four weekly hours of Lithuanian language and five hours of the Russian language. The same Ministry manages to demand and obtain a fluency in Russian from all Lithuanian graduates, but the same Ministry is helpless to make the same Russian graduates to learn at least a little Lithuanian. The publishing houses have even gone further: in some Lithuanian books Russian texts are now being printed without a Lithuanian translation. Various administrative officials and the press have begun talking about the bilingualism of Lithuanians—the Lithuanians are alleged to like Lenin's language. But what is to be done if in Lithuania itself it is impossible to communicate in Lithuanian?

Today, only old maps of Europe show Lithuania as a distinct entity, but the newer ones display her territory as part of the Soviet Union. However, the U.S. Government and other great Western powers have steadfastly maintained a policy of nonrecognition of the forcible annexation of Lithuania. All Americans must continue to encourage the heroic Lithuanian people in the continuing struggle for freedom and must speak out against the Soviet policies of Russification and their brutal attempts to absorb the Baltic States and destroy them as peoples.

It is for this reason that I introduced a House concurrent resolution, the text of which follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the illegal annexation by the Soviet Union of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Whereas the United States does not recognize the illegal annexation by the Soviet Union of the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania;

Whereas the United States as a member of the United Nations has pledged, in article 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter, ". . . to take joint and separate action . . ." to promote "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion";

Whereas the House of Representatives Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression of the 83rd Congress thoroughly investigated the seizure of the Baltic nations by the Soviet Union and, in its Third Interim Report, concluded, "The evidence is overwhelming and conclusive that Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania were forcibly occupied and illegally annexed by the U.S.S.R.";

Whereas the United States, as a signatory to the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, endorsed Principle VIII, relating to equal rights and self-determination of peoples, which states, ". . . all people always have the right, in full freedom, to determine, when and as they wish, their internal and external political status, without external interference, and to pursue as they wish their political, economic, social and cultural development. . ." and, "The participating States . . . also recall the importance of the elimination of any form of violation of this principle."; and

Whereas the House of Representatives in the 94th Congress, by adopting H. Res. 864 reaffirmed the United States policy with respect to the Baltic nations (and thereby urged positive actions): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the President should enter into negotiations with the Soviet Union to secure the withdrawal from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania of all military forces and political, administrative, and police personnel not under the auspices of those respective countries;

(2) another purpose of such negotiations should be to secure the release of political prisoners of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian nationality from prisons, labor camps, psychiatric institutions, and other detention centers within the Soviet Union and their return to the countries of Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania, as the case may be;

(3) the President should instruct the United States delegation to the preparatory meeting of the 1980 Madrid meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe to present as specific agenda items—

(A) the illegal seizure and annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania by the Soviet Union, and

(B) the denial by the Soviet Union of self-determination and territorial integrity to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania by the Soviet Union; and

(4) the President should make every effort to gain the support and cooperation of all nations in achieving the objectives of the negotiations set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) and in securing the agenda items set forth in paragraph (3).

Mr. Speaker, I proudly join with Americans of Lithuanian descent in my own 11th district, which I am honored to represent, in the city of Chicago, and all over this country as they share with Lithuanians everywhere the fervent prayer that their bravery and strength of character will soon be rewarded, that right will triumph over injustice, and that Lithuania will be free once more.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I would be happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what our friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) has done to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives, as he has done in such a constructive way, the desires of the people in Lithuania to be free. The gentleman from Illinois has always been a strong supporter of the concepts of freedom for those who presently find themselves behind the Iron Curtain. My colleague has been a champion of the many people who are literally in chains under oppressive dictatorships and further, he knows that the people in Lithuania look to America for the concepts of freedom and liberty and for support in the hope that some day they will again be a free people and live under true independence.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues and the Lithuanian-American community in commemorating the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. It is my wish that one day Lithuania will again be a free and autonomous nation and that her heritage of heroism, bravery, and dedication to the right of freedom will continue to be a source of inspiration for all of the oppressed peoples of the world.

It was after World War I that an independent Lithuania emerged as a free nation and declared her independence from a long history of Russian and German rule. The small country's declaration marked the beginning of a fight for freedom and resulted in an independent nation, truly capable of achieving tremendous social and economic strides.

Today, no flags of independence are flying. The country's independence was seized in 1940 by the Soviet Union and she has remained under Communist dominance for the past 39 years without any opportunity for the self-government she once enjoyed and prospered under. Miraculously, Lithuanians still remember their freedom and they have continually resisted Soviet attempts to destroy their strong unity and identiy. An ardent desire for autonomy survives in Lithuania today which is reflected in the way the people steadfastly adhere to their cultural heritage which embraced the value of freedom. It is deplorable that the Soviet Union continues to deny Lithuanian citizens the right to exercise the principle of self-determination and continues to suppress their human rights. As Lithuanians struggle to practice the freedom their declaration of independence once gave them—their culture, literature, customs, and religion, they live in constant fear of Soviet retaliation for these efforts.

As our Nation champions the cause of freedom and human rights throughout the world, let all Americans, Mr. Speaker, show compassion to Lithuanians and hope that some day they will be allowed to realize their God-given rights we enjoy and they once declared.

I thank my colleague for taking this time to bring to the attention of the House a recognition of this important day and what it means as a symbol for freedom.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the special order.

On the occasion of the 61st anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence, I wish to give assurances of my continuing support of the efforts of the citizens of Lithuania and of all Lithuanian Americans. Their ongoing struggle to help their homeland of Lithuania once again to regain her freedom and independence from Russia is an example to us all of unquestioning commitment to a worthy goal.

I am proud of the Lithuanians who reside within the 13th District of Illinois, including my friend, Ed Skalisius and my District Administrative Assistant, Dee Kweder Griesheimer. They not only persist in their efforts to keep alive the great traditions and culture of their country, but also earnestly strive to assist their fellow countrymen to regain that valued privilege of liberty which we in this country hold so dear.

I have read the resolution which the Joint Baltic American National Committee has proposed with respect to the feelings of and the efforts by the United States to assist these courageous and freedom-loving people. It is my understanding that Congressman ED DERWINSKI is planning to introduce a similar resolution soon, and I plan to support

and be an original cosponsor of that resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it seems as if the hardships the Lithuanians have undergone in the past 61 years have only strengthened their determination to be free from Russian oppression. As the Lithuanians in my district and throughout the world commemorate this great occasion, I urge them to continue their valiant and dedicated efforts in behalf of the great citizens of this small but important Baltic country.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the contributions of my good friends, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MCCLORY). I am sure that the Lithuanians throughout the entire world will be grateful for their encouraging remarks.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I am pleased to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio.

TAIWAN—A BIPARTISAN ISSUE FOR THE 1980 ELECTIONS

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, some idea of the severe and intensive opposition which followed the sellout of Taiwan by this administration can be gleaned from recent remarks of National Commander in Chief Eric Sandstrom of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Recalling President Franklin Roosevelt's observation when Benito Mussolini invaded helpless France in 1940 that the hand that held the dagger plunged it into the back of its neighbor, Commander Sandstrom stated:

> The Republic of China has been accorded the diplomatic equivalent of Mussolini's 1940 action.

Fortunately, the VFW does not intend to indulge in handwriting and commiserating over this tragic action but is looking to the 96th Congress for corrective action on a bipartisan basis. The use of the 7th Fleet "as a shield and guarantor of the Republic's safety" is one specific recommendation by the VFW national commander.

A bipartisan approach to the Taiwan question is, of course, the only way to go as the responsibility for Free China's present tragic state must also be shared on a bipartisan basis. A Democrat administration presided over the fall of Chiang Kai-shek and the mainland in 1949; Republican leaders softened up free world opposition to Red China by visits to Peking; and it remained for the present administration to effect a Jekyll-Hyde transformation of a barbarian regime into one of respectability by diplomatic recognition, while at the same time rendering our longtime friend and ally a geopolitical nonentity.

In true bipartisan fashion Congressman John F. Kennedy in 1949 criticized his own Democratic administration when the Nationalist government fell:

> This is the tragic story of China whose freedom we once fought to preserve. What our young men had saved, our diplomats and our President have frittered away.

Present-day "diplomats and our President" have again further crippled our Taiwan ally and the present home of the free Chinese by helping to remove Taiwan as a recognized state among the family of free nations.

There are almost 30 million veterans in the United States, many of whom were the "young men" cited by John Kennedy in the above-mentioned quote. Concerned veterans, and concerned voters in general, would do well by adopting Commander Sandstrom's directive for the future and getting their message through to Congress:

> We will work in a bipartisan way with members in the 96th Congress who share our sense of outrage and betrayal.

I insert at this point the VFW press release of December 18, 1978, along with the exchange of letters between Commander Sandstrom and Secretary of State Cyrus Vance.

V.F.W. LEADER: "THE HAND THAT HELD THE DAGGER . . ."

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Mr. Eric Sandstrom, decorated Marine Corps veteran who serves as National Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, today recalled, as applying to President Carter's betrayal of Free China, some words spoken in 1940 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on the occasion of Benito Mussolini's invasion of prostrate France: "The hand that held the dagger plunged it into the back of its neighbor."

"The Republic of China," Mr. Sandstrom continued, "has been accorded the diplomatic equivalent of Mussolini's 1940 action.

"The Preisdent chose a wekend during the Christmas season with Congress out of session to announce his cave-in to all three Communist Chinese pre-conditions for recognition. His almost covert message, of necessity, spared us any mention of 'human rights' on the Communist Mainland.

"As far as the V.F.W. is concerned:

"We will work in a bi-partisan way with members in the 96th Congres who share our sense of outrage and betrayal.

"We will seek to initiate prompt and practical military steps to assure the security of Free China; for but one example, using the U.S. Seventh Fleet as a shield and guarantor of the Republic's safety."

Mr. Sandstrom concluded by noting:

"I attach hereto copies of recent correspondence, initiated by me, on this matter with Secretary Vance. I note with sadness Mr. Vance's now hollow assurance that 'it is not the intention of the U.S. government to abandon Taiwan.'

"If the English language has any use as a conveyor of meaning, that is *exactly* what President Carter has done.

"Finally, the England of the 19th century earned the description of being 'Perfidious Albion' because of the mechanical way in which allies were either sought or shed. We Americans, to this point, have stood by our pledged word. Our people, unlike this Administration, are not cynical.

"I close with a question for the so-called 'realists' who abandoned Free China: how do you think Menachem Begin views American assurances today? And, can you 'realistically' blame him?"

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
October 5, 1978.

Hon. CYRUS VANCE,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: There has developed a pattern of U.S. conduct towards our friends and allies from the Republic of China that may not have been brought to your official attention.

My Washington staff, at my request, has investigated the range of U.S.-Republic of China official contacts and reported to me the following chronology:

(a) ROC Ambassador Shen, among other envoys, met with President Carter at a White House reception which was held for the Diplomatic Corps immediately after the President's inauguration. Since that formal occasion, Ambassador Shen has not had a private audience with the President.

(b) On September 10, 1977, you received Ambassador Shen at the State Department after your August visit to Mainland China. Since then, we have no evidence of any further contact between you and the ROC Ambassador.

(c) Prior to Mr. Brzezinski's visit to Mainland China (May 20–25, 1978), Ambassador Shen tried several times (through Michael Oksenburg of the NSC) to meet with Mr. Brzezinski, but our ally was told that Mr. Brzezinski had no time to spare before his trip. Instead, I understand that Mr. Oksenburg promised Mr. Brzezinski would see Ambassador Shen soon after Mr. Brzezinski returned. Nothing has happened.

(d) Incredibly, no Senior American military official has seen fit to visit the U.S. Taiwan Defense Command since Admiral McCain's period as CINCPAC, some years back.

This pattern apparently pre-dates the current Administration. For but one example, it was only following vigorous V.F.W. objections that former Vice President Rockefeller was added to the U. S. delegation that journeyed to the Republic of China to attend the funeral of President Chiang Kai-Shek.

I understand the geo-strategic imperatives that undergird our emerging relationship with Mainland China—principally the 45 Soviet Divisions along the Sino-Soviet frontier which, I suspect, caused the Mainland Chinese to approach us in the first instance.

Two things strike me as being certain:

(1) The Mainland Chinese will develop not respect, but contempt, for an America that does not meet its obligations; and,

(2) We will never make new friends by betraying old allies.

Throughout this period I have been deeply impressed by the magnificent display of correctness and good manners provided by our friends from the Republic of China. We are losing by not listening to them.

I regret that our members and posture have not been equally admirable.

I urge you to:

(a) Meet with Ambassador Shen;

(b) Arrange an appropriate meeting between the Ambassador and President Carter; and,

(c) Permit and encourage the U. S. Military—notably CINCPAC—to visit the Republice of China on Taiwan as a matter of high importance to the command.

I look forward to hearing from you on this matter of central importance.

Sincerely,

ERIC SANDSTROM,
National Commander-in-Chief.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., October 27, 1978.

Mr. ERIC SANDSTROM,
National Commander-in-Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SANDSTROM: Thank you for your letter about the United States Government's China policy and our relations with the Republic of China. Let me respond to the points you raised.

Ambassadors do not meet with the President as a matter of course. Nonetheless, Ambassador Shen has had access to a number

of senior Department of State officials. I have met with him, as have the Under Secretary for Political Affairs and the Assistant Secretary for East Asia and Pacific Affairs. Because the State Department is in close and frequent contact with the Embassy of the Republic of China, I do not believe its representatives have encountered any obstacles to the conduct of business with our Government.

Concerning your assertion that "no Senior American military official has seen fit to visit the US Taiwan Defense Command since Admiral McCain's period as CINCPAC," it is a fact that a number of flag and general rank officers have recently visited Taiwan. For example, Vice Admiral Foley (Commander, Seventh Fleet) was there in September, Major General Poston (Commander, 13th Air Force) visited in January and August of this year, and Brigadier General Schwarzkopf (CINCPAC Deputy Director for Plans) was there this month.

Finally, I want to assure you unequivocally that it is not the intention of the US Government to "abandon" Taiwan. The President and I believe that it is most important for peace in East Asia and in the world that the United States achieve a normal relationship with the People's Republic of China.

However, as we have both said many times, in pursuing improved relations with Peking, the Administration has no intention of ignoring the wide range of mutually beneficial relations we maintain with Taiwan or jeopardizing the prospect that the people on Taiwan will continue to live peacefully and prosperously.

Sincerely,

CYRUS VANCE.●

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK), the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for his very excellent statement, and I deeply appreciate his joining all of us today in paying tribute to the Lithuanian people.

● Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 61st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania as we have commemorated it for too many years—with deep sorrow.

In Lithuania today, there is no independence, except in the hearts and minds of the people who seek to be free. There is no independence from the tyranny of Moscow which seeks to eradicate the cultural heritage of a proud people. Nor is there independence from a government in Moscow which has used its might to stifle religious expression.

Daily, Lithuanian citizens seek the rights guaranteed them by the Soviet Constitution and by the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Daily these rights are blatantly violated. The people of Lithuania are denied their basic rights while in their country. At the same time, they are often prohibited from exercising their right to emigrate.

Mr. Speaker, it is my prayer that one day we can truly celebrate a Lithuanian independence day on which the people of Lithuania will be free not only in mind and in spirit but in fact.

This is a goal to which we ought to commit ourselves and our Nation.

For too long in too many nations strong and proud peoples have been subjugated—peoples whose contributions to the future of the world would be tremendously enhanced by their freedom. Lithuania is such a nation.

Perhaps one day the light which did shine 61 years ago today will truly shine again. If that is the case, the world will truly be a brighter place.●

● Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, as Americans, we live in a country where we have the right to live and express ourselves freely, without fear of government reprisal. Our freedom is so much a part of our lives that we sometimes take it for granted, forgetting that it was won as a result of our forefather's steadfast refusal to accept the rule of an unfair government.

We also sometimes forget that in other countries of the world the rights which we enjoy are denied. We are free to celebrate our Independence Day with patriotic speeches, fireworks, parades, and picnics, but tomorrow Lithuanians will not be able to celebrate the 61st anniversary of their Declaration of Independence from the Soviet Russian Empire on February 16, 1918. Their freedom is only a memory and a dream of the future.

Lithuanians enjoyed just 22 years of freedom from Soviet domination before the Soviet Army invaded and again annexed their country in 1940. Since the Soviet takeover, this once proud and free people have endured an oppressive and tyrannical government. In an effort to destroy the Lithuanians' sense of unity and identity, the Soviets have removed many Lithuanians from the country. Yet the drive and determination of the Lithuanian people to reestablish a free and independent state where they may preserve their historic, religious, cultural, and linguistic heritage lives on.

Lithuanians are a brave people who serve as a source of inspiration for all the world's oppressed peoples. I salute their valiant struggle to regain their freedom and hope that they may soon be freed from oppression. Their plight also serves as an example of what the loss of freedom represents and a warning that those of us who are fortunate enough to live in a free state must continually guard against the loss of freedom and also work to uphold the rights of all peoples who suffer from tyranny.●

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my distinguished colleagues today in observing the 61st anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence.

In this day of extensive public concern over basic human rights, we must never forget that national peoples also have basic rights. Preeminent among these is the right to self-determination and self-governance, free from foreign oppression. In the last 60 years, however, Lithuania has enjoyed but two decades of independence. Caught between Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia, Lithuania's independence, though courageously defended, was finally ground into oblivion by the Soviet Union's onslaught.

Not content with the forcible annexation of Lithuania, the Soviet Union embarked on an even more brutal policy of subjugation. In case after case, helpless people whose one desire was to live in peace under their own government, were torn from their families and shipped to the Soviet Union's bleak gulag archipelago. There, many would vanish in the trackless wastelands of Siberia, victims of numerous incidents of gross inhumanity.

Yet despite this blatant oppression, which surely would have broken less resolute people, the Lithuanians have struggled to maintain their national character and their hopes for the day when, once again, the light of freedom will shine throughout their land.

Though the circumstances prompting our observance today are tragic, the courage of the Lithuanian people should serve as a reminder that as long as freedom-loving peoples suffer the mantle of aggression, the struggle for human rights, both national and individual, must continue. Let us hope that liberty, the very essence of democracy, will one day soon prevail in Lithuania.●

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues and my friends throughout the Lithuanian-American community and commend them for their laudable efforts in commemorating the 61st anniversary of their independence.

It has been 61 years since the Lithuanian people displayed their high degree of respect for human dignity and fundamental freedoms by declaring their independence from Soviet Russia.

In the years between 1918 and 1940, Lithuania attempted to develop its economic and social sectors while keeping its basic respect for man in the forefront. Lithuania's adherence to the principles of individual freedom, however, failed to impress its neighbor. The tragic historical domination of Lithuania by Russia was reimposed by the Soviets in an action designed to forestall an attack by Nazi Germany.

Despite continued Soviet dominance in recent decades, Mr. Speaker, the commitment to individual freedom and national sovereignty continues in Lithuania today. Human rights activitists including Balys Gajauskas, Viktorus Petkus, Jonas Petkevicius, and countless others courageously express the Lithuanian yearning for democratic freedoms. The samizdat publications, including Ausra, the Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church, Varpas, and others provide an unofficial alternative to the monotonous, Soviet-controlled media, which stifles free speech and debate and alters accurate reporting of internal conditions in Lithuania.

This continued commitment to individual rights and fundamental freedom reflects the remarkable spirit of the Lithuanian people, who continue undaunted in this commitment even in the face of continued Soviet domination. I offer my personal and sincere commendation for this commitment, and hope that the yearning of all Lithuanians for a restoration of human rights will soon be fulfilled.●

● Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues today in commemorating the 61st anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania.

This tiny Baltic State enjoyed freedom in this century for only a short time.

The independent Republic of Lithuania was established on February 16, 1918 and was extinguished when 300,000

Soviet troops overran the country in 1940.

Lithuania never again enjoyed republican freedoms, or its own autonomous government.

Today, that short lived period of independence is still a bright memory for many Americans of Lithuanian descent, who will not let the world forget that their country is one of the Captive Nations of Eastern Europe.

The Captive Nations—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, were all taken over by the Soviets, who depopulated these countries of their native inhabitants in order to quell dissent.

Once a people experience the beginnings of free government, however, not even violence and terror will subdue that memory.

Hopefully, the stubborn refusal of the Lithuanian people to give up hope of freedom will serve as a beacon to others in the world, and help us appreciate here in the United States the precious freedoms we enjoy.●

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, February 16 will commemorate 61 years since Lithuanian declared her independence. Unfortunately, only for a brief period since that time has she actually been free. As we pay tribute to this courageous state, we are reminded of our own country's struggle for independence.

During the 20 years since 1918 in which Lithuania was a democratic state, the nation experienced great cultural and intellectual growth. This golden era brought advancements in the areas of agriculture, literature, and opera.

Unfortunately, since the Soviet takeover in 1940, the brave Lithuanians have experienced severe oppression. But the determination of these great people have enabled them to continuously persist in their goal of freedom. Their spirit is uncrushable. Recognizing the persistence of this attitude, we can anticipate Lithuania's ultimate victory.●

● Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I join my colleagues in extending warmest regards to the Lithuanian people on the eve of their 61st independence day.

In 1918, Lithuania proclaimed independence from Russia and Germany, and established a democratic government. Shortly thereafter, a peace treaty was signed with the Soviet Union under which the Soviets recognized "without any reservation the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania" and "voluntarily and forever renounced" any rights over the Lithuanian people and territory. This treaty, however, was disregarded following the Hitler-Stalin pact, and by 1940 Lithuania was once again under Soviet control. Since that time, the Soviet Government has consistently oppressed traditional Lithuanian customs and culture, and sought to stifle dissent from established party policies. I am happy to report, however, that the spirit of Lithuania could not be dominated, and that increasing protest has yielded some measure of relief from this oppression.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union, the United States, and many other nations signed the 1975 Helsinki accords seeking a new recognition of human and national rights. The Soviets have dishonored this agreement through the continuing suppression of these rights in Lithuania and the other Baltic States. Now it is our duty to encourage fulfillment of the ideals embodying the "spirit of Helsinki." Accordingly, I applaud the determination of the Lithuanian people to reclaim their national heritage. The strength and perseverance of their spirit should be an inspiration to our own.●

● Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have addressed this Chamber commemorating the anniversaries of Lithuanian Independence Day and expressing the sense of outrage felt worldwide concerning Soviet violations of human rights in that country. We all hoped that the 1975 signing of the Helsinki accords would finally force the Soviet Union to bestow upon its citizenry the basic and fundamental rights enumerated in its constitution. Sadly, this has not been the case.

On February 16, 1979, Americans of Lithuanian origin and descent will celebrate the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence, and once again I come before this Chamber to extend my very best wishes to the people of Lithuanian and to all Americans of Lithuanian descent. I wish that I could report some major progress of human rights in that and other Eastern European countries under the domination of the Soviet Union. While the Helsinki accords have increasingly focused world attention upon the violation of human rights made by the Soviet Union, it has only encouraged Moscow to crack down upon dissidents demanding compliance to the treaty.

Lithuanian dissidents have helped spearhead this movement and at the same time have suffered the consequences of their brave actions. Political and religious persecution continues unbated today. Dissidents have increasingly been harrassed and interrogated by the Soviet KGB. If they are arrested, their trials become a mockery of justice.

The people of Lithuanian have struggled long and hard to maintain their sense of cultural identity and independence in the face of continued Soviet pressure to do otherwise. Americans of all backgrounds support this struggle of the Lithuanians and will continue to demand that the Soviet Union comply with the Helsinki accords.●

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, Americans of every national origin today reflect on the 61st anniversary of the reestablishment of an independent Lithuania. The American-Lithuanian community can be especially proud that despite the adversities of cultural, political and economic oppression, Lithuania remains a distinct and vibrant political community. The Lithuanian people continue to resist the suffocation of Soviet assimilation despite all official efforts to suppress Lithuanian national identity and self-expression.

Today is a time for reflection, but it is even more a time for hope. Hope that Lithuanians around the world will continue to call attention to this important day in human freedom. Hope that Lithuanians will continue to resist the illegal occupation of their territory and interference in their lives by an imperial power. And, above all, hope that Lithuania will once again be free to decide its own national welfare and destiny.

The United States has never recognized Lithuania and her sisters Estonia and Latvia as Soviet entities, and America should continue this policy of self-determination in Eastern Europe. Our own Nation was born in self-determination, and we must never forget our revolutionary heritage. Let our example, both painful and glorious, stand as a monument to freedom of national choice. Let us plot own own course and, yes, make our own mistakes. We demand no less for ourselves and we should demand no less for others. May Lithuania again enjoy those freedoms which many in America have come to regard as routine, and may the Lithuanian people keep that spirit which will make those freedoms a reality.●

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to participate in this observance of Lithuanian Independence Day, which is a day of mourning for freedom lost.

We think today of the great and ancient civilizations of Eastern Europe which have been conquered by the Russian Empire and endure the tyranny imposed by the Kremlin.

Some, like Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, retain the legal status of independence while they are held by threat of overwhelming military power in the grasp of the Soviet despotism.

Others, such as Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, have literally been swallowed into the Soviet Union, which brutally attempts to stamp out any spirit of national independence.

We honor Lithuania today. We honor those Lithuanians who keep the flickering hope of independence alive in their suffering land. We honor those who have given their lives for Lithuanian independence.

But we also remember the patriots of the other captive nations and their unceasing quest for independence, and we should be thankful for the freedom we enjoy and strengthen our determination to defend it.●

● Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, today is the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence. We mark that independence best by sharing one of the goals of Ausra, one of the remaining journals of Lithuanian culture, and look to the future of this and other Captive Nations. That future depends upon the continued and expanded exercise of Lithuanians' basic human rights—the right to their language, their religious heritage, their literature, their music—rights essential to the maintenance of an independent national character.

Despite the crushing weight of Soviet domination for over 40 years, Lithuanians have struggled to maintain their national character. Ethnically distinct from their oppressors, many Lithuanians have been deported from their homeland to even the eastern parts of Soviet Asia, splitting families in the process. One of the last peoples to convert to Catholicism in Europe, Lithuanians' close affiliation

with the Catholic faith endures in the face of outright elimination of their religious institutions. Possessed of one of the oldest Indo-European languages to survive upheavals in European migrations, and foreign occupations, Lithuanians must tolerate continuing pressures to abolish the use of their native tongue.

Testimony to Lithuanians' persistence and desire to maintain their cultural identity is the high rate of listening in Lithuanian to broadcasts of overseas radio stations. Statistics indicate that especially frequent listeners are those under 30 years of age, and the better educated segments of the population. And all Lithuanians constitute a larger than normal population of those preferring broadcasts in their native language rather than Russian, the so-called official language.

Most disappointing is the complete subjugation of Lithuanian political institutions, and discouragement of learning in studies of Lithuanian history and literature. Lithuania, historically an important independent state in Eastern Europe, in modern times has known only a brief flourishing of political liberty and self-determination. Nonetheless, Lithuanians have kept alive and intact their national character even today. The restoration of the rights of national existence, and of other basic human rights, must be accorded a high place in Western policy toward Lithuania. Lithuanians have earned it because, as Father Svarinskas has said: "In Lithuania, everybody is a dissident."

The expansion of these basic human rights necessary to the identity of the Lithuanian national character must be supported by the United States. We have never recognized the bloody takeover of that nation by the Red Army in 1940. We have pursued the development of human rights in Lithuania through the vehicle of the Helsinki agreements. We must now take steps to further aid Lithuanian liberty.

This can best be accomplished by heeding the advice of expatriate Lithuanian Tomas Venclova:

> If the Soviet leaders are convinced that protests about persecutions in Lithuania are not merely a temporary expedient of the West, but will lead to a consistent and steadfast policy on the part of the West, they will have no choice but to recognize this. * * *

Americans everywhere share the sentiments of Tomas Venclova. Congress has repeatedly expressed its ongoing dedication to the struggle for Lithuanian freedoms. We in Congress will lead a "consistent and steadfast policy" of opposition to the suppression of the Lithuaian national character. We will encourage all Lithuanians and Lithuanian-Americans to keep the torch of liberty burning brightly by the courageous examples modern Lithuanians offer us.●

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in recognition of the 61 anniversary of Lithuanian independence, celebrated to commemorate the brief flicker of independence in 1918, so quickly and sadly extinguished in 1940. But we can take heart at this time with the spirit of the Lithuanians and all the Baltic peoples in their resistance to Soviet domination. These people wish only to pursue their customs without being forced to lose their distinctive character to the ways of the Soviet Union—to carve out a meaningful existence, free of Soviet constraints and restrictions.

The Lithuanian people have struggled valiantly, provoking revolts in the late 1800's and the early 1900's, and regaining their freedom. The proud spirit of these people has never succumbed, and their dream of independence continues to flourish. Their spirit and their desire for freedom will not be easily diminished. Today, we renew our support and encouragement to them in their struggle for self-determination.

It is particularly important that we understand the significance of the Baltic nations and the importance of the maintenance of their distinctive cultural and ethnic identies. The Soviet Union has forced numbers of Baltic peoples to move into central Russia, and forced emigration of Russian peoples into the Baltic States, thereby lessening their national cohesiveness and cultural uniqueness. Despite these attempts to dilute the language, religion and culture of the Baltic people, they continue to speak in their own tongues, worship in their own way, and maintain their own distinctive customs. In light of the many obstacles before them, the efforts of these people are truly remarkable.

The free exercise of human rights has always been the example set by the United States. We should reach beyond example setting, however, and see to it that the theme of human rights is felt around the world. The support of people, like ourselves, in the free countries of the West is imperative to the spirit and high hopes of the Baltic people who yearn for their freedom. We must affirm continuing support for Lithuanian independence and the independence of her sister states. As a people who cherish liberty as much as we, the gallant Lithuanians have suffered hardship and loss in their struggle to determine their own destiny. Their cause must not be abandoned. Today, we pause to remind ourselves of our good fortune to be able to live in this free land, and hope that some day, the people of Lithuania may also be able to enjoy these same freedoms.●

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, marks the 61st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania. On this day, I wish to commend the bravery and determination of the Lithuanian people. After 123 years of Russian domination, at the close of World War I, Lithuania became a sovereign and independent state.

They adopted a republican form of government based on strong democratic principles. In 1920, Russia recognized Lithuania as an independent nation, dissolving any rights of sovereignty over her. However, their independence was short lived. After only two decades of freedom, Lithuania was again taken over by the Red army during the Second World War.

The people suffered greatly under Soviet occupation. Many were deported to Siberia; others who were political prisoners were executed. Following Soviet occupation, Nazi Germany moved in and overtook Lithuania. Almost all Lithuanian Jews were executed by the Nazis. When the Nazis lost control, Lithuania was retaken by the Soviet Union and all of Lithuania was occupied.

Since then the Lithuanian people have been subjected to immense cruelties. All who practice religion are persecuted for their beliefs. Human rights are virtually nonexistent.

Through all of this, the people of Lithuania have continued in their quest for independence. They have not given up hope that they will again someday be a free nation. On this day, let us reaffirm our stand that basic human rights be the inherent right of all people. Let us remember today that the rights we so often take for granted are the same rights that other people struggle all their lives to obtain. Today we commemorate such people, those of Lithuania who have never given up and have maintained their freedom loving spirit in their battle for independence. We offer them our support and blessings.●

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to take this opportunity and join my colleagues in commemorating the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence. On this day in 1918, the Lithuanian people broke a long period of Soviet domination and declared themselves an independent nation.

Oppressed for centuries because of their geographical location, Lithuanians have suffered invasions from the East by the Russians and from the West by Teutonic knights. They have demonstrated incredible spiritual and ethnic strength by surviving these continued attacks.

Ever since this gallant Baltic country was incorporated into the Soviet Union by the Russians, the Lithuanians have struggled to throw off the chains of their conquerors. Thousands of these freedom fighters have sacrificed their lives in an attempt to secure independence for their beloved country. From 1944 to 1952 alone, approximately 50,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters gave their lives as part of an organized resistance movement. However, the cessation of armed guerrilla warfare has not resulted in the end of resistance against Soviet domination. Rather it has created the impetus for the introduction of passive protest.

Even today, Lithuanians are risking and sacrificing their lives in defiance of the Communist regime. The protests of the Lithuanian people against the denial of their right to national self-determination, and religious and political freedom continues despite Soviet oppression. With this in mind we must attempt to match the courage of Lithuania by reaffirming our dedication to the principles of self-determination and human rights.

As a nation, it is our obligation to confront the Soviet Government with the fact that despite being cosigners of the Helsinki Accords, they have blatantly ignored many of the provisions guaranteeing human rights. We must continue to speak out against the denial of human rights and not succumb to any temptations which permit us to neglect the inhumane treatment of those less fortu-

nate throughout the world. Instead, we should continue to fight vigorously for those rights to which all people are entitled.

On this day as all others, we should extend whatever support we can to the people of Lithuania and their dreams for freedom. Let us all hope for the day in the future when our Lithuanian friends can celebrate their renewed independence as a nation free from outside domination and oppression.●

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to be here today to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day. During the past two decades we have heard much talk of civil and human rights; but it is sometimes forgotten that national rights are an integral part if not the basis of all other rights.

National rights define the right of a people to retain its ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic identity. It is the very basis from which a nation can begin to address the problem of granting to its citizens the human and civil liberties they absolutely deserve.

The Lithuanian people enjoyed this national right from 1918 until 1940 when they were forcibly occupied and illegally annexed to the U.S.S.R.

During their 22 years of independence Lithuania made considerable progress in its social, cultural and economic life. A constituent assembly was elected in 1920 and a democratic constitution was adopted. Lithuania was also the first post-World War I European country to institute a radical land reform program. As a result, 717,968 hectares were redistributed to the farm population; about 89 percent of the rural population became landowners.

In 1940 the Soviet Union invaded Lithuania ending its brief modern nationhood. There followed a new colonial era for this proud people. Mass deportation of thousands of dissidents was reported by the Lithuanian Red Cross. Western books and publications were forbidden, land was nationalized and many churches were either closed down or converted for other uses.

Despite the drastic measures taken by the Soviet Union in its efforts at domination and Russification, the proud nationalism and uniqueness of Lithuania survives today.

The United States supports the Lithuanians in their drive for national self-determination by refusing to recognize the illegal Sovit invasion. Our country continues to recognize the diplomatic missions from the last independent Lithuanian Republic, along with the Latvian and Estonian missions.

For our part we are here today to offer our support for this small but vital country and to recognize its continuing struggle for nationhood. A right which is basic to all other rights.●

● Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps less difficult to be courageous and expressive in a society which encourages its people to vocalize and indicate the extent to which they cherish freedom and liberty.

Although even in a free society, its people must be always alert and watchful in safeguarding those freedoms, it takes a very special sense of courage to continue the struggle for human and religious freedom when none exists.

And, so it is with the people of Lithuania, whose independence as a nation became nonexistent in 1940, when the Soviet Union invaded and absorbed the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

February 16 marks the 726th anniversary of the coronation of Mindaugas as the first Christian King of Lithuania. It is an anniversary of considerable significance. It reminds us that, for two centuries following that coronation, Lithuania was a powerful force for freedom throughout Eastern Europe. Not only did Lithuania enjoy broad political, cultural, and commercial relations with her neighbors, but in her belief in independence through strength, she also kept in check the German drive to the east, and the assaults of the Mongols and Tartars against the west.

Through subsequent subjugation, born of the duplicity of the Czarist Russia of the 18th and early 19th centuries, the people of Lithuania never lost their Christian faith nor their burning desire to again be free. That moment came, appropriately enough, on February 16, 1918. For the next 2 years, Lithuania again made marked progress in economic, social, and scientific fields. Then, in the World War II year 1939, the great people of Lithuania again fell victim to international greed and duplicity, this time through the signing of the infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact with which Hilter-ruled Nazi Germany and the Stalin-ruled Soviet Union drew their blueprint for the division of Eastern Europe between them.

Little more than a year later the famous Lithuanian flames of faith and freedom were dimmed anew. Supported by armor and air power, a Saviet Red Army force of 300,000 rolled into, and over, that essentially agrarian land. Yet, to keep these people in check, it became necessary for the Kremlin to station 1 armed soldier there for every 10 or 12 inhabitants, as Lithuania was ruthlessly absorbed into the Soviet Union.

But, again, the incredible character of the Lithuanian people, with their tremendous faith, and their undying dedication to freedom showed itself. This was documented no better than in the 1954 report to the Select Congressional Committee on Communist Aggression, chaired with such great distinction by the late Honorable Charles J. Kersten of Wisconsin.

That chilling report contained a document which, drafted and executed by Soviet General Ivan Serov, listed more than 100 categories of people as subject to arrest, deportation, and mass human extermination. Carried to the extreme, that heinous Red plan provided for the elimination of virtually every man, woman, and child except a member of the Communist Party of unquestioned reliability.

By the time the Kersten report was issued, Soviet occupation of Lithuania was in its 14th year. Her people had been submitted to one of the most brutal occupations in modern history. One-sixth of the population had been shipped, in chains, to Russia or Siberia. Others had been killed outright. The Catholic Church, to which 85 or 90 percent of the Lithuanian people belonged, had been severely persecuted. Armed guerrilla resistance had ended. Passive resistance had taken over. It continues today, driven by devoted religious feeling, fierce national pride, and that equally fierce Lithuanian desire for freedom.

In 1975, preceding the European Security Conference in Helsinki, several of my colleagues joined with me in introducing a resolution that it be U.S. policy that the Soviet annexation of Lithuania (as well as Latvia and Estonia) should in no way be honored with U.S. recognition.

As my colleagues know, of course, this resolution was passed unanimously by this body and, in turn, by the Senate. Then, both before and after the Helsinki Conference, then-President Ford reaffirmed that policy. Consequently, the non-Communist Chargé d'Affaires of the Lithuanian Legation here in Washington, like his Latvian counterpart here, and Estonian counterpart in New York, remains recognized by our Government as the true representative of his people.

Together with his Latvian and Estonian colleagues in freedom, the Lithuanian Chargé d'Affaires continues to provide us with valuable insights with which we can compare the Soviet promise at Helsinki with the Soviet performance in Lithuania and in her Baltic sister states.

Monitoring that performance, officially, for our Government, of course, is our Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Established by the Congress, the Commission is, as my colleagues know, composed of six Members of the House, and six Members of the Senate, with one member each from the Departments of State, Defense, and Commerce.

The Commission has advised us that, in the Soviet Union, the initiatives of some citizens, in particular the brave actions of Viktoras Petkus, "in support of (Helsinki) Final Act compliance have been answered by acts of repression," and that such acts "are jeopardizing progress toward the overall goals of the Final Act."

Sadly, that information, coupled with information from the Lithuanian American Council, the Lithuanian Human Rights Commission, and the Joint Baltic Committee, leaves no doubt that much remains to be done before the Soviet promise of freedom is matched by Soviet performance.

The undaunted spirit and the determination of the people of Lithuania have somehow filtered through the iron wall of Soviet domination. By commemorating the occasion of their former independence as a nation, hopefully, the support and encouragement of the American people will permeate that iron wall and will clearly indicate to the Lithuanian people that they are being seen and heard, clearly and loudly, by a nation which remembers.

I know that on this meaningful 726th anniversary of the Mindaugas coronation, my colleagues join me in the hope and prayer of the Lithuanian people that freedom—true freedom—will, one day, be

returned to that great and noble country, as well as to her Baltic sister states.●

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1979, marks the 61st anniversary of Lithuania's establishment as a modern Republic. Established in 1918, the modern Republic of Lithuania was overrun by Nazis 22 years later when Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R.

The Lithuanian people, while under Communist domination, continue to actively work for the restoration of individual human liberties which they enjoyed between 1918 and 1940. While the dedication to human freedom symbolized by the brief existence of the Republic of Lithuania has been suppressed, it should serve to remind us just how important the intangible freedom really is.

Even those Lithuanians who have left their homeland, continue the quest for Lithuania's freedom. The pride and peace-loving nature of these people has become part of their national heritage and I want to commend Lithuanians throughout the world for their strength and determination as they continue their course toward freedom and independence.●

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, superior force may hold a people prisoner, but it cannot capture their dreams, hopes, and aspirations. This fact is reaffirmed every day as the people of Lithuania reject Soviet efforts at Russification and continue to maintain their religion, their culture, their identity, and their dream of once again being free.

This month, we in the Congress join with Lithuanian Americans across the country, and with the people of Lithuania in observing February 16 as the anniversary of their independence.

The commemoration of Lithuania's independence, however, is markedly different from our Fourth of July celebration. For unlike our country, the sovereign nation of Lithuania presently exists only in the hearts and the minds of her people, and of people, everywhere, who cherish freedom.

Sixty-one years ago, the people of Lithuania, along with their Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, fought and won their independence from Russia to reestablish themselves as sovereign nations. Under this independence, Lithuania flourished and experienced progress in all areas—land reform was instituted, industries reestablished, transportation facilities expanded, social legislation enacted, and educational institutions enlarged.

Yet this new independence was to last for only 22 years. In a swift and brutal move, Soviet forces rolled over these nations and imposed their tyrannical yoke in 1940.

Only the people of these Baltic nations know the true cost of these 39 years of subjugation. We have seen glimpses of the cost in terms of the lives lost through the Soviet's extermination practices and the exile of the people to Siberia. We were reminded of the tyranny being experienced when we saw the unsuccessful escape attempt of the Lithuanian sailor, Simas Kudirka, and the self-immolation of Romas Kalanta. Most recently, we witnessed the charade of a "fair" trial as Lithuanian dissident, Viktoras Petkus, was sentenced to a prison term of 15 years. His crime was that he was a member of a Lithuanian group which tried to oversee compliance by the Soviet Union to its human rights commitments made under the Helsinki accords.

Mr. Speaker, if the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were really part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the evidence clearly shows that the Soviet Union is not living up to its pledge, under the Helsinki accords, to guarantee human rights to her people. However, by its continued subjugation of these sovereign Baltic nations, an even greater injustice than the breaking of her pledge is being perpetrated—the Soviet Union is denying the most basic principle of self-determination to these people.

During these past 19 years ,we have never recognized these nations as part of the Soviet Union, and we must never do so. The people of Lithuania and the other Baltic States have clung to their hope of freedom. As we commemorate their brief independence, let us once again reaffirm our support of their aspirations and express our hope that they may celebrate the next independence day as free and independent nations.●

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1979, Americans of Lithuanian origin and descent throughout the United States will commemorate the 61st anniversary of the reestablishment of an independent Lithuania and the 728th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State. I wish to join my colleagues and the Lithuanian American community in commemorating this anniversary observance of Lithuanian Independence Day and salute the people of Lithuania who steadfastly cling to the richness of their cultural heritage and seek freedom of expression, religion and basic individual human rights in the country of their birth.

As we reflect on the history of the Lithuanian, we look to the country of Lithuania situated at the southern end of the eastern coast of the Baltic Sea, right at the European continent's geographic center. Historians tell us it emerged as a unified state in the early decades of the 13th century and became internationally recognized as the Kingdom of Lithuania in A.D. 1251.

After centuries of vast expansion eastward and southward, in 1569 Lithuania became a partner in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, which lasted till 1795 when it was partitioned between Austria. Prussia, and Russia. Lithuania fell under the Russian rule.

Lithuania succeeded in reestablishing its independence in 1918, at the end of World War I but was occupied again in 1940 by the armed forces of Russia, now known as the Soviet Union.

In the past the Congress was instrumental in establishing the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Public Law 94–304) to monitor international compliance with the Helsinki agreements. We also reaffirmed our Nation's policy of nonrecognition of the legality of the 1940 incorporation into the Soviet Union of the independent states of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. I was pleased to sponsor and vigorously support these congressional resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, we are all agreed that there is a continuing need for concerted action in mustering world opinion as a viable force in achieving universal understanding and agreement on basic human rights principles to eliminate government controls that dominate the personal freedoms of the individual to live and worship in the land of his or her choice and stifle the independence and sovereignty of a nation of people.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of my congressional district and the State of New Jersey, I join in the annual observance of our Lithuanian heritage and trust that through our mutual endeavors and responsibilities that we will strive to continue to achieve international understanding and agreement that will eliminate the oppression of people and restore "human rights" and the rights of self-determination by the people of Lithuania and other captive nations of the world.●

● Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me this opportunity to speak on the anniversary of the Lithuanian Independence Day.

It was February 16, 1918, that the Baltic State of Lithuania declared its autonomy from the long period of Russian hegemony and German occupation it had suffered during World War I. This tiny state was again destined to fall under Soviet domination; Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. in 1940. Having fallen into Nazi hands, Lithuania was reoccupied by the Soviet Union in 1944, and has been considered a component republic by the Soviet Union ever since. The United States never recognized the incorporation of Lithuania or any other Baltic States into the Soviet Union.

Soviet policy implementation during the Stalin years forced a dramatic change in the composition of the Lithuanian population. Some 80,000 Lithuanians fled to West Germany when the Soviets took over the Baltic region in 1944. An additional 60,000 were found in East Germany and deported during 1945 and 1946. Their passive resistance to the collectivization of agriculture brought the deportation of some 60,000 Lithuanians in 1949. The death of Stalin eased these displaced people, and about one-third of those who had been deported were permitted to return to their homeland. Yet, this cannot erase past cruelties committed by the U.S.S.R., nor the continuing effort by the Soviets to destroy the Lithuanian national spirit.

The Soviet constitution supposedly guarantees freedom of religion. Yet in the past 3 years, the Soviets have greatly increased terrorist tactics perpetrated against the faithful and all readers of religious publications. The most vitriolic attacks have been leveled against readers of chronicles of the Catholic Church. The Lithuanian population is 90 percent Catholic, and this group has lost their jobs, or worse, because of their religious tenents.

Lithuania is a travesty of international

justice. The U.S.S.R. signed the Helsinki agreement, yet Lithuania has yet to be granted any human rights that were called for in the agreement. Soviet authorities prohibit the speaking of Lithuanian in public. Reading materials are controlled and censored by the Government. The citizens of Lithuania are subject to unexplained and unwarranted searches. In late 1977, reports leaked out of the Soviet Union telling of thousands of Lithuanians rampaging the streets of Vilnius, shouting anti-Soviet and nationalist slogans. Police cars were set on fire, windows were smashed, and Soviet propaganda banners were torn down. Soviet troops patrolled the streets to restore order.

It is good to be reminded today that this noble country, which was once free, is not the subject of the violent repression of the Soviet Union. The 1 million Lithuanians living in this country have certainly not forgotten this fact. For it is only by remembering their repression that we can strive to alleviate the conditions of this satellite of Soviet hegemony that we can prevent further encroachment of this hegemony. And, perhaps, one day it will be possible for us to be commemorating another day of Lithuanian independence from the U.S.S.R.●

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in commemorating the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

The restoration of the Republic of Lithuania is a high point in Lithuanian history, and it is painful for us to realize the suffering that has occurred there under foreign domination over the past four decades. The Lithuanians are a brave people who yearn for freedom, and the massive violation of human rights that occurs simply by this denial of political freedom is an outrageous indignity.

This is a day to remember past independence and to look forward to and work for the day when the Lithuanian people will be free to form their own, independent government. Only then will this annual event be the real celebration it ought to be.●

● Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence on February 16 again reminds us of the pursuit of independence not realized in Lithuania for nearly 40 years. At a time when the cause of human rights has been raised as a guiding principle of American foreign policy, it is appropriate that we once again call to the attention of all the sad plight of the people of Lithuania, a nation occupied by the Soviet Union in 1940 and still held under the yoke of Soviet domination.

Because the Lithuanian people have been unwilling to abandon the ideal of national integrity which illuminated their national integrity which illuminated their existence for a brief 22 years, they have been systematically uprooted and dispersed from their homeland in an attempt to destroy their identity. More than one-fourth of the population has been relocated, many dying in the process. The continued dedication of Lithuanians and other Baltic peoples to the struggle for freedom must command the respect and admiration of freedom-loving people everywhere.

To further the hopes and efforts of these courageous people, I sincerely hope that we will implement the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 416 and reaffirm our commitment to Lithuanians who continue to strive toward the realization of liberty, independence and human dignity in the face of totalitarian oppression.●

● Mr. LEDERER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to ask my colleagues to rise and join with me in accordance with the special order to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. Speaker, for 22 years, Lithuania was a free and independent state which made great strides in modernization, raising the standard of living, and so forth. For 22 years, the people of Lithuania were able to live their lives as they saw fit, under their laws, their customs and in their culture. Much of this progress and heritage has either been destroyed or repressed by the Soviet Government.

Mr. Speaker, the United States does not recognize the unlawful occupation of Lithuania or any of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union. This action is in clear violation of the wartime agreements among the allies. Furthermore, the so called "plebiscite" to incorporate Lithuania into the Soviet Union was a farce, supported solely by the rifles of the Red Army.

Mr. Speaker, on this day, the 60th anniversary of the restoration of independence to the Republic of Lithuania, I feel that we, as members of an institution which epitomizes the belief in freedom, should rise and commemorate this great day, and pray for the time when a free Lithuanian nation will again be a reality.●

● Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, Friday, February 16, marks the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence. This day serves as another reminder of the need for Congress and all people of the free world to support the cause of bringing freedom back to the people of Lithuania and the entire Baltic region.

The Lithuanian people today long to recapture two very basic rights: The right to independence and self-determination as a nation, and the right to open and freely-chosen religious worship. We in the free world almost take these rights for granted. Yet they are valued as the single most important goal by those people who have had these freedoms taken away.

The people of Lithuania have not enjoyed those freedoms for 61 years. They have been subjected to forceful domination by the Soviet Union since 1940. Even the Lithuanian language, which is one of the oldest known to man, is subjected to Russification efforts by the Soviet Union.

Yet, these people have continued to demonstrate a strength of spirit and commitment to their goal of a free and independent Lithuania. Men and women like Viktors Petkus, Balys Gajauskas, and Nijole Sadunas to name only a few, continue to speak out for their national and religious rights, even though they have faced unjust persecution as a result of their bravery.

We must show our support for these brave individuals and others like them who continue to strive so valiantly for their rights. We cannot forget those who seek only to reestablish their national rights within a free and independent country where their religious practices are not subect to government control.

I will be hosting a reception on Friday, February 16, at 2 p.m. in room 2128 of the Rayburn Building to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day. All of my colleagues are invited to attend. A number of Americans of Lithuanian heritage will be present to participate with Members of Congress in a flag exchanging ceremony to signify our strong support in the struggle to bring self-determination back to the Baltic States. I urge all of my colleagues to continue with renewed efforts to lend their support for the goal of a free and independent Lithuania and Baltic region.●

● Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the 61st anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Republic of Lithuania to be observed on February 16. Lithuania was once a proud nation which now suffers under the yoke of the Soviet Union. Lithuania's sad history should serve to remind us that there are still many people in various parts of the world who cannot call themselves free.

The Lithuanian nation attained its hard won independence in 1918 only to lose this independence in 1940 when it was seized by the Soviet Union and renamed the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic. This Soviet domination may sound the death knell for the ethnic identity of an entire people. The Lithuanian culture and language is so severely restricted and repressed as to be in danger of being finally extinguished. This type of political and cultural sublimation represents an incalculable loss to people everywhere.

While we certainly must continue to seek an easing of tensions with the Soviet Union, we must not forget the many people who suffer under this type of severe repression. The recent final document of the Belgrade conference on the Helsinki accords, which made no mention whatsoever of human rights, illustrates the lack of seriousness with which the Soviets approach basic human freedoms. We must not forget that there are many in the world who do not enjoy the fruits of freedom and are not accorded basic human rights and civil liberties.

I call upon my colleagues to join me in commemorating the Lithuanian proclamation of independence. Let us not forget these proud people.●

● Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my distinguished colleagues in observing the 61st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, a time to pay tribute to the endeavors of a courageous people.

The Lithuanian quest for independence is the story of a dauntless peoples' con-

tinuous fight for freedom from the powerful Russian Empire. In 1940, a mere two decades after their declaration of independence, the Lithuanian Republic lost its precious freedom. Soviet troops overran Lithuania, and Lithuania was absorbed into the Soviet Union. Thousands of Lithuanians were forced to flee their beloved homeland to seek refuge in foreign havens while others were incarcerated in Siberian prison camps.

Nonetheless, the efforts of the Soviets to obliterate the identity of the Lithuanians were futile. The Lithuanians will never forget who they are, and will always demand that their descendants share in so proud a heritage.

Sixty years after their independence was first announced, in 1978 the Lithuanian populace throughout the world observed for the first time the anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence. This annual celebration exists as a bright symbol of hope for all Lithuanian-Americans and is especially encouraging to the oppressed native masses still seeking freedom from tyranny.

In empathy for a cause close to the core of American democratic sentiment we salute the noble efforts of the Lithuanian people toward human rights and their inalienable right to self-determination.●

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Friday, February 16 marks the anniversary of the reestablishment of an independent Lithuania and the 728th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian state. The proud history of Lithuania reveals a people who have been devoted to individual liberties and national self-determination. However, their fundamental right to national independence has been denied since 1940.

As the world's leader in the call for human rights, America cannot ignore the denial of basic personal and political freedoms which Lithuanians endure.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent in commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day and to call attention to the Lithuanian struggle.●

● Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating the 61st anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence.

On February 16, 1918, the people of Lithuania declared their land free of the tyranny of the Russian czars. Now, 61 years later, these people still labor under a harsh regime not of their own choosing. For some nations so long a period of domination by foreign rulers would ultimately cause the people to lose their own identity as a nation and take on the character of the dominating power. Lithuanians and Lithuanian-Americans are proud to say that this is not the case in their country. For despite years of hardship, years of poverty and even of forcible displacement, Lithuania is still a nation in its own right. In the hearts and minds of those within and without the borders of Lithuania, the land still lives free.

Today I would like to join with all those of Lithuanian ancestry in voicing my hope that the day will soon come when their nation will be free in word and deed as well as in spirit. I say that I hope the day is coming soon, but even if it is not, let me give warning to those people and nations who grow in strength and territory by seeking to enslave smaller nations that the people of Lithuania will not give up. They have fought for their freedom for 61 years and they will fight for another 61 or 161 years until that goal is reached. For freedom knows no time limit.●

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1979, marks the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence from foreign domination. For over a century, from 1795 to 1915, the people of Lithuania courageously withstood subjugation and political domination by the Russians. Then, during World War I, this Soviet oppression was succeeded by the devastation of German occupation.

But in 1918, the Lithuanian fervor for freedom was forever affirmed. The brave people of this struggling nation cast off their yoke of oppression, and declared their homeland to be a sovereign state. International recognition of the Republic of Lithuania was formally granted when nations around the world, including the Soviet Union, signed the Peace Treaty of 1920.

Each year, we Americans joyfully recall our nation's independence day, the Fourth of July, with fireworks and festivities; for the brave people of Lithuania, however, there will be no national celebrations. The Lithuanians mark the recognition of their anniversary of independence with silent contemplation and tears. For, in 1979, Lithuanian independence remains little more than a vivid memory for some, and a dream for others.

In 1940, after only 22 years of freedom, the promise of Lithuanian autonomy was inexorably broken by the Soviet Union. During World War II, Soviet forces again invaded Lithuania, their troops occupied Lithuanian territory, and the Lithuanian homeland was forcibly incorporated into Soviet boundaries. Soviet suppression called an abrupt halt to the great strides which Republic of Lithuania had made both economically and culturally in this short time.

The people of Lithuania cannot be denied their national identity. Despite the Russification process, the steadfast Lithuanians continue to retain their own language, their religious preferences, and their unique culture and heritage. In an effort to support the Lithuanian struggle for freedom, the United States refuses to acknowledge a permanent incorporation of the Republic of Lithuania into the U.S.S.R. While the Russians continue to maintain control over Lithuanian territory, the people of this courageous nation remain free in spirit.

On the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence, let the United States again affirm its national commitment to the inalienability of basic human rights for all. The strength of the Lithuanian dissidents may serve as a beacon to oppressed individuals throughout the world.

I urge the Soviet Union, and all of the signatory nations, to comply with the Helsinki Accords, which set forth the principles of individual liberty and basic human rights. I salute the courageous people of Lithuania, and share their hope that once again they will be granted the right to self-determination and individual freedom that we in the United States so dearly love.●

● Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the basic freedoms enjoyed by Americans, the right to worship as we see fit, to choose our governmental representatives, to speak out on public issues, and many others are denied to the courageous people of Lithuania.

Therefore, it is entirely fitting that on this day, February 15, 1979, the U.S. Congress, representing the American people, commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day. This is a symbol of hope for all Lithuanian-Americans and especially for those struggling to gain independence for Lithuania.

As freedom loving Americans, we condemn the continued oppression of the Lithuanian people, the callous disregard for their human rights. We sincerely hope that the will of the Lithuanian people is heard so that they can again enjoy the benefits of freedom and self-determination.●

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, as we pause in our great body's day-to-day business to remember the fate of a small nation on the Baltic Sea, called Lithuania, I would like to caution ourselves that, in our time of modern changes and proliferating political priorities, those unable to learn from history may, more than ever, be prone to its repetition.

When Joseph Stalin's armies invaded Lithuania during the Second World War, they were in the process of rolling back Hitler's invasion of the Soviet Union. When Hitler was finally beaten with our help Lithuania remained under the yoke of Russian Communist occupation, ending an era of distinctive culture and independence for the Lithuanian people.

For hundreds of years, the Russian Tsars had relentlessly enlarged their territory to establish predominance over the Eurasian continent and gain valued access to the oceans of the world. At the expense of China, of Poland, of Austria, of Rumania, of Turkey, of Iran, of the Tartar and Mongol peoples, and others, was this process accomplished. Lithuania remembered is evidence of those nations totally submerged by Russia until a real respect for other people, other ways of life may make itself felt in the U.S.S.R. and be translated into policy. In our time, following Lithuania's capture, Russian imperialism has been seen to involve itself in Cuba, in Africa, in Somalia, then Ethiopia, in Afghanistan, in Czechoslovakia, and in most of the other farflung troublespots of the world, most recently Indochina.

The Soviet Union's continuance of Tsarist territorial opportunism and utter lack of respect for individual desires of the world's nations and their striving for independence have kept the Baltic nations imprisoned and made them a symbol of the Russian empire's intemperance and greedy traditions. Let us hope that we may learn this lesson from the past and thus avoid panic as well as ruin in our future dealings with the Soviet

Union. May we command the wisdom and experience to help alleviate the fate of Lithuania's people and aid in the hopeful creation of a peaceful and plentiful future for all the nations willing to live together in a constructive, more tolerant world, yet in the distant future.●

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1979, Lithuanians around the world commemorate the 61st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania.

Today, in honor of this anniversary, I would like to reiterate my support of the position of the United States in regard to national sovereignty and human rights. Military occupation and broad scale ravaging may well be buried in the Lithuanian past, but so, too, are the freedoms of thought, speech, and national self-determination. It is with hope that the Lithuanian people may again enjoy those human rights that the 61st anniversary of their independence is hereby commemorated.

Lithuanians across the globe have maintained the heritage, culture, and faith of their forefathers. Lithuanian nationalism has found a variety of expressions, especially in recent years. More and more, overt assertions of identity have come to the fore in that area, proving again that ethnicity and nationalism are perhaps the most powerful forces at work in the world today.

The rulers of the Soviet Union would do well to note that truth, and accept it. In the history of the world, there has never been a country that would voluntarily renounce its own freedom and independence and submit itself to the control of a foreign ruler. But that is exactly what the Kremlin is trying to tell the world, claiming that the Baltic States joined the Soviet Union voluntarily. How ridiculous such a claim sounds when we observe scores of nations emerging from colonial rule and insisting on their right to self-determination and independence.

The ideas of individual liberty and representative government are no more distinctly illustrated than in the efforts of Lithuanians to preserve the heritage established in their once-free Baltic State. However, denationalization continues today as great numbers of non-Baltic peoples are by Soviet Government direction moved into the Baltic States—severely altering the national, cultural, and economic life of those non-Russian areas.

And so, on this 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I condemn the Soviet Union's suppression of human rights in Lithuania, as well as the denial of the principle of self-determination for Baltic peoples. I hope that Lithuanians will have freedom, self-government, and release from Soviet domination in the near future. Then, they may attain their national goal, independence—this time permanently.●

● Mr. CAVANAUGH. Mr. Speaker, we are commemorating today that date in 1918 when the people of Lithuania proclaimed the reestablishment of Lithuanian independence after 123 years of oppression under the Czars of Russia. Less than 2 years later even the Soviet Union recognized the Lithuanian Republic and voluntarily relinquished all sovereignty claims formerly possessed against this tiny nation. That noble existence ended 22 years later when on January 15, 1940, the Soviet Union under force of arms reoccupied Lithuania under the guise of the Mutual Assistance Treaty of 1939. When World War II ended, Lithuania as well as its Baltic neighbors of Latvia and Estonia—with Western acquiescence—became the Soviet spoils of war.

Even though the Lithuanian people have little in common with their Slavic neighbors, the Soviet Union since reoccupation has forced assimilation upon these Baltic people by eradicating all elements of their separate national identity as well as their independent nation state. The Soviets have killed, imprisoned, or deported tens of thousands of Lithuanians and have totally repressed all political dissent. The Lithuanian language is one of the primary targets of this eradication of identity. Lithuanian is an ancient language with its roots in the proto-Indo-European family of languages and should never be confused with the Russian language with its Slavic origins.

Finally, religion, especially Roman Catholicism, has become a special target of Soviet attack. In 1940 when the Soviet Union occupied Lithuania 85.5 percent of the country's more than 3 million inhabitants were Roman Catholic. Despite nearly 40 years of Soviet oppression of religious expression, Lithuania today still has the greatest number of Roman Catholics in the Soviet Union and the only remaining seminary for training priests in the Latin Rite, even though they have not had a bishop since 1947.

The Lithuanian people have remained faithful to their language, their religious beliefs, and their national identity. Though world attention is presently focused on other troubled areas, the Lithuanian flame of nationality still burns. We honor today not only that date in 1940 when Lithuanian independence was declared, but that continuing goal of a free and independent Lithuania. The silent struggle continues.●

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues and the Lithuanian American community in commemorating the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day which will fall on February 16. It is most fitting that the U.S. Congress pay tribute to the people of Lithuania who steadfastly cling to a cultural heritage which reflects the values of bravery, heroism, and dedication to the cause of freedom that is a source of inspiration for all the oppressed peoples of the world.

Sixty-one years ago, after World War I, the proud people of Lithuania valiantly proclaimed their right to stand among the free people of the world. Lithuania had emerged from the ruins to begin rebuilding her land, establishing her own government, and in essence determining her own destiny. This progression was halted by the Stalinist Soviets who ruthlessly seized Lithuania in 1940.

While under Soviet domination for the past 39 years, Lithuania has not been given the opportunity to govern itself. However, the people of this country have resisted persistent Soviet attempts to destroy their unity and identity and a strong desire for individual freedoms and self-determination survives in Lithuania today.

Today the Soviets believe that the Helsinki Accord of 1975 legitimizes their sovereignty over Lithuania. While tanks and missiles may give them physical control, the Russians cannot rule the minds and spirits of the Lithuanian people.

On this day, let us condemn Soviet domination of a land that reminds us of how essential and how precious freedom truly is, and what its loss can signify. And let us remember that as long as there are free Lithuanians—like the millions of Lithuanian-Americans—there will always be a free Lithuania.●

● Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, the association between Poland and Lithuania has been a long and, for the most part, a happy one. Today, the association of the two nations continues and so does the friendship between Lithuanian-Americans and Polish-Americans in this country. So, it is appropriate that Poles all over the world commemorate this 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence with their Lithuanian neighbors.

The Polish and Lithuanian nations have shared much in the past. In 1386, Poland's Queen Jadwiga married the Grand Duke of Lithuania, Jagiello, converting him and his countrymen to Roman Catholicism. In 1569, the two countries were legally united under one ruler. This harmonious union lasted until the late 18th century when Russia, Prussia, and Austria took it upon themselves to partition Poland, removing her from the map of Europe. With the last partition, in 1795, Lithuania was engulfed by Russia. Just as the two countries had shared a period of expansion and well-being, they shared captivity, Russification, and suppression of their unique cultures.

With the First World War came the end of Russian influence and, on February 16, 1918, a congress of 200 Lithuanian delegates proclaimed their country an independent, sovereign state. Under Marshal Joseph Pilsudski, the Polish army helped to maintain that status by driving out the Red Army which took over Vilnius, the capital city, in 1919. Once again, Poland's situation paralleled her neighbor's and both enjoyed a short period of freedom that lives in the memories of both peoples.

Unfortunately, the divorce of Lithuania from Poland caused disagreement over Vilnius. Lithuanians considered it their capital city even though the population was predominantly Polish. However, this was the only blot on an otherwise longstanding friendship.

The Second World War brought with it the end of that short period of freedom from domination that had been marked by a renaissance in the arts and by social reform. Because Lithuania was forcibly annexed by Russia, the United States continues to recognize only the independent Lithuanian Government. Poland's path has diverged from Lithu-

ania's in that, since World War II, Poland is no longer an independent state.

Nevertheless, Poles and Lithuanians still maintain close ties. Because the printing of religious books is forbidden in Lithuania, Polish Bibles and religious books are imported into Lithuania for use by the persecuted church there. So, just as the two nations were once joined by the marriage of Jagiello to Jadwiga and subsequent Christianization, they are connected once again today by their common religion.

The continuing friendship between these nations is reflected by the Lithuanian-American and Polish-American communities in this country. In Chicago, which has the largest Lithuanian population outside Lithuania, the Poles and Lithuanians are neighbors, carrying on the long association of the two peoples.

Therefore, it is fitting that Polish-Americans observe Lithuanian Independence Day with the neighboring Lithuanian-Americans, because the two nations have a common history. Unlike the Poles, Lithuanians both in their native country and outside it can hope for independence once again. We can only hope that one day, they will be able to celebrate Lithuanian Independence Day with true joy and thanksgiving for the realization of their dream of an independent, free homeland.●

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to express my gratitude to Representative ANNUNZIO for taking the time to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day.

It is important that we in Congress and in this Nation continue to express our strong support for the freedom of Lithuania, and of the other Eastern European nations that remain under the domination of the U.S.S.R. The United States must continue to stand by Principle VIII of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which states that—

> . . . all peoples always have the right, in full freedom, to determine, when and as they wish, their internal and external political status, without external interference, and to pursue as they wish their political, economic, social and cultural development . . .

I continue to endorse and support legislation which would call upon the President to do all that he can to see that Lithuania, and other Eastern European countries which were forcibly occupied by the Soviet Union after World War II, are again given the right to self-determination and territorial integrity.●

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to share with my colleagues a few words commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day.

The peoples of Lithuania have been in a constant struggle. They yearn to regain the independence that was granted in 1918 and taken away by the Soviet Union in 1940.

We, in the United States, may have a hard time relating to their struggle. For the basic freedoms, which are taken for granted here, are forbidden in Soviet-dominated Lithuania.

The rights to speak and gather freely are denied. The opportunity to elect their own leaders is not granted and those who exercise their right to worship are harassed.

I think it is important for us to pause and reflect upon the repression and persecution that is part of everyday life in the Soviet's Lithuania.

But we must also do more. We must speak out against these injustices and work to gather support to bring change about in Lithuania. We must work to help preserve Lithuanian identities, language, and culture.

Our Nation bust be the leader and champion the cause of oppressed peoples throughout the world. We should advocate the principles of liberty and democracy incorporated in our Constitution and the Declaration of Independence for all captive nations.

Lithuanian Independence Day serves as a perfect opportunity to express our support for the freedom-loving people of this Baltic nation. Let it be known that America stands by all those who still seek to be free.●

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House in observing the commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day.

The struggle for human rights continues in Lithuania. It is a bitter struggle recorded in a sacrifice of a courageous people.

Against crushing miseries of war and foreign domination, the Lithuanian people have remained steadfast in their commitment to those principles of national self-determination and individual freedom which were proclaimed in their homeland over a half century ago. Neither the military might of the Red Army nor the cruel Communist oppression that followed has dimmed the spirit of freedom living in the hearts of these proud people. Through endurance and unity they have preserved their national identity and perpetuated the traditions of a rich cultural heritage.

In Congress, let us today join with voices raised across the land calling for the liberty of all mankind, and let us give strength to the living hope of independence in Lithuania.●

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to commemorate a memorable date in a long struggle, a struggle that continues even as we speak.

Sixty-one years ago tomorrow, on February 16, 1918, independence was restored in Lithuania; a proud land that had been suffering under foreign occupation and oppression for the previous 120 years. That reclaimed freedom, which we are celebrating today, was not long-lasting. It could not withstand the tyrannical might of 300,000 Soviet troops that stormed the country in August of 1940.

But even this was not sufficient to crush the spirit of the brave Lithuanian people. In June 1941, Lithuanian patriots rose up and overthrew their Soviet oppressors, establishing a provisional government. This represents the last period that Lithuania was free. Six weeks later, the Nazi troops of Germany crushed out that freedom.

Today, the Soviet Union claims Lithuania as one of its "Republics." So the struggle goes on. And so long as it does, those of us who are free to speak our minds can not be quiet. Only through reminding the world of this continued oppression, can we hasten the day when there will be a new Lithuanian Independence Day for us to celebrate.●

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1979, is a date commemorated around the world by persons of Lithuanian descent as the 61st anniversary of an independent Lithuania. It is also the 728th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian state.

It is fitting that we pause for a few moments to ponder the fate of these freedom-loving people.

At one time, Lithuania was the largest

At one time, Lithuania was the largest

nation in Europe. Hundreds of years ago the Lithuanian people gave birth to, and nourished, a body of cultural excellence that mankind still can cherish.

As we all know, the people and state of Lithuania were illegally annexed by the Soviets after World War II. It is one of the tragedies of our times that more than 3 million Lithuanians live today in bondage to the Soviets. Even so, the Lithuanian people have remained independent in spirit. But the cost of their fight has been high. Repression of those who speak out for human rights and independence is the toll exacted by the Russian communists. Freedom to practice their Catholic religion is denied the Lithuanians, although more than half the population strives to attend regular mass.

Finally, we in America, who often take our freedom for granted, must strongly and loudly condemn the Soviet Union's suppression of human rights and freedom of self-determination for all under its iron rule.●

● Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, no country stands free of problems and we certainly have our share. Problems can be rated according to degree, however, and we in America sometimes become so inundated with our own worries that we forget about other countries having far more serious ones. One such country is Lithuania where, unlike our own, liberty remains only a hope and free expression a dream.

In the United States, the Statue of Liberty stands tall as a symbolic reminder of our cherished ideas of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Lithuania also has a Statue of Liberty in its capital city, but it stands for a short-lived freedom whose final flicker was extinguished 39 years ago. After having been subject to Russian oppression for more than 120 years, Lithuanians finally rid themselves on November 18, 1918, from this power-thirsty nation, only to be overcome by her again 22 years later.

It is the anniversary of this short-lived yet dearly held freedom that we, in the House of Representatives, celebrate today in honor of all Lithuanians. The United States formally declared in 1940 that it refused to recognize the forced incorporation of Lithuania and its two neighbors, Estonia and Latvia, into the Soviet Union.

Historically, the Lithuanian polity and economy have been interrupted, discouraged and ruined many times from on-

slaughts of invading armies fighting for dominance of Northeast Europe. Despite this, however, the Lithuanian people have survived, managed to retain their particular way of living, and done it with a pride and a dignity we in America understand intimately. To keep a culture alive is a most formidable exercise, one which Lithuanians keep striving to do. For their courage and fortitude they are to be praised and appreciated.

On August 1, 1975, the United States, Russia, and 33 other nations signed the Final Act of Helsinki. If I may for a moment, I would like to cite a passage from that accord:

> The participating states will respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

This passage may sound familiar to my colleagues, because of its similarity to our forefather's pledge to human rights made over 200 years ago. We must not forget the importance of that pledge and the positive affects it may have on individual expression. We must continue to condemn any nation that suppresses such free expression in countries such as Lithuania and work to encourage Lithuania's self-determination as a national entity.

I ask all of my colleagues here today to continue to support Lithuania's Declaration of Independence as we remain firm in our recognition of Lithuania, its people, and their culture.●

● Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, too often we, in America, take for granted our autonomy as a nation. In Lithuania, freedom is a memory that is being kept alive through the conviction and dedication of that country's citizens whose patriotic spirit has not diminished despite continued Soviet oppression.

Friday, February 16, marks the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence but, unlike our enduring heritage of self-determination, Lithuania's independence was cut short by a Soviet takeover in 1940.

For the past 39 years the Lithuanian people have struggled against political, religious, and cultural repression by the Soviets who have persisted in carrying out an ethnocentric policy that has as its aim the complete eradication of Lithuanian traditions and political beliefs.

Untold numbers of Lithuanian and Russian protesters have been arrested and imprisoned for voicing their opposition to Soviet domination of Lithuania and violations of human rights that are consistently committed against Lithuanians who refuse to deny their heritage.

In celebrating Lithuanian Independence Day, we would do well to recall the principles of the Helsinki agreements that were designed to insure that the elemental human rights of all people are protected.

Article VII of the Helsinki Act states that—

> They will promote and encourage the effective exercise of civil, political, economic, social, cultural, and other rights and freedoms all of which derive from the inherent dignity of a human person and are essential for his free and full development.

Twenty-four years have passed since the Helsinki articles were agreed to by the Soviet Union, and it is painfully obvious to Lithuania and other Baltic nations that their "inherent dignity" has been vilified by the Soviet Union for nearly a quarter of a century.

This month, Americans celebrate the birth of two of their Nation's most illustrious Presidents. One, George Washington, was the commander of our revolution for freedom from colonialization. The other, Abraham Lincoln, was the proponent of a national ethic of equal rights and free-thinking that has shaped our political, social, and cultural standards for scores of years.

Now, more than ever, we must not forget that liberty, justice, and equality are not just constitutional criteria that are endemic to our country. They are universal rights that the people of Lithuania adhere to and believe in as a nation.

February 16 will not be a true independence day for Lithuania until the voices of all sovereign nations join together in support of a free Lithuania and an end to the violations of human rights that are being perpetrated by the Soviets there.

We must make a concerted effort to see that the covenants of the Helsinki accord are complied with as they were originally intended, so that this will be a year of new hope for the people of Lithuania.●

● Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues and those who cherish freedom worldwide in observing the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

To serve the needs and interest of our people in these great halls is surely a uniquely American experience, but one which we all must be proud of. However, it is with great sorrow that we must remember the peoples still behind the Iron Curtain unable to enjoy the same freedoms that are so much a part of our own heritage.

Many times have I shared with my Lithuanian-American friends the rich language and customs of a great people. On this occasion we must recall the many relatives and friends of American citizens who continue to carry the torch of freedom despite continuing Soviet repression and persecution.

The litany of this valiant country is one from which we can all learn. It was on February 16, 1918, that the Lithuanian people declared themselves an independent nation after 110 years of Russian domination, and a short period of German rule. It was only 21 years later that Lithuania again fell prey to Soviet domination, and on August 3, 1940, they occupied the country and declared it a Soviet republic with a Communist government.

Lithuania was briefly occupied by Nazi troops during World War II, only to be reoccupied by the Soviets and the Red Army to this day. This little country and its great people have for so long now experienced Soviet oppression, but we should remember our own American experience. Through our forefathes declared their independence in 1776, it was not until 1783 that we were actually free from the British and our country began to take on its own form.

Lithuania has long struggled to be a free and independent nation in the world community, while enslaved by the Soviets with no self-government, religious freedoms, and no human rights. Thousands were killed in guerrilla fighting and today still countless thousands more have been sent to Siberian labor camps for their political/religious beliefs, or as punishment for resisting Soviet rule.

No longer, Mr. Speaker, can we ignore the sacrifices these people have made that embrace the very same ideals of freedom and justice that are so very dear to all Americans. So on this the eve of the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I implore all that seek peace and justice throughout the world not only to learn from the Lithuanian experience, but to work stridently toward freedom and true independence for all peoples in the Baltic region who must live their lives as prisoners of conscience for ideals they have fought for with all their energies for so long.●

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, we salute the indomitable spirit of a proud people who have struggled to preserve their cultural heritage, national language, and their historic religious faith against the attacks of Soviet totalitarianism. It is especially fitting for us to pay tribute to the brace people of Lithuania and to the many contributions made to our country by Lithuanian-Americans.

The Republic of Lithuania was established as an independent nation on February 16, 1918. These freedom-loving people enjoyed their independence from the Soviet Russian Empire for only 22 years. In June 1940, the Soviet Union invaded and occupied the Baltic States and Lithuania was forcefully annexed into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Earlier in its history, Lithuania had suffered under Czarist Russian rule.

However, no amount of repression has succeeded in stifling the Lithuanians' yearning to reestablish their nation as a free and sovereign state. Their heroic and inspiring struggle, despite massive persecution and suppression of their human rights, has proved their undaunted determination to overcome Soviet domination.

As we are painfully aware, the Soviet Union has denied religious freedom, and there is no indication that persecution of religious suppression in Lithuania is abating. It is compounded by official Kremlin interference against the Roman Catholic Church, which has played a major role in Lithuanian history and is symbolic of Lithuanian nationhood. Periodically stories of religious persecution and suppression of human rights break through the Soviet curtain, appearing in articles in the Catholic Chronicle, but we may be sure that there are many such violations which do not become known publicly.

When we as a nation consider the plight of various peoples around the world who face a deprivation of basic human rights, too often we neglect to emphasize the struggle for freedom in Lithuania and her sister Baltic States as

well as the other non-Russian nations within the U.S.S.R. Yet, the United States has consistently refused to sanction the forcible occupation of Lithuania and its Baltic neighbors. We must continue to be vocal in our objections to all Soviet violations of human rights in Lithuania and in the other captive nations. We must strive to focus world attention on these constant transgressions.

Although the oppressive Soviet occupation denies Lithuanians their political rights as well as their religious freedom and restricts their economic and cultural development, they have continued to preserve their unity and strong sense of national consciousness. It is appropriate on this occasion of the 61st anniversary of their declaration of independence, that we pay tribute to the devotion by the Lithuanian people to the reestablishment of an independent and free nation.

As we pause to mark this anniversary, we must also recognize the many contributions made to the development of the United States and the preservation of its ideals of freedom and liberty by the more than 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent.

Here in the United States, Lithuanians are a well organized and a hard working ethnic group who are deeply interested in maintaining their cultural background. When the time comes for the restoration of freedom for their homeland, they will be in a position to make a positive contribution to the progress of that nation.

The United States must continue to support the aspirations for freedom, independence, and national self-determination of all captive peoples. To this end, we remain committed and we must not waiver from our responsibility.●

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the occasion of the 61st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania.

Russia signed a peace treaty with Lithuania on July 12, 1920, recognizing it as an independent nation and pledging itself to renounce forever all rights of sovereignty. The treaty stated:

> In conformity with the right declared by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic that all peoples have the right to free self-determination, including the right of full secession from the State of which they were a part, Russia recognizes without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory. The fact that Lithuania was ever under Russian sovereignty does not place the Lithuanian people and their territory under any obligation to Russia.

Centuries of Russian imperialism and attempts at domination came briefly to an end for Lithuania with World War I. With the defeat of Germany and the turmoil of revolution in Russia a 20-member national council proclaimed her independence on February 16, 1918. It is this anniversary we celebrate today. Although a Red Army tried to enforce a Communist government, they were driven back and signed the solemn pledge I have quoted above.

Tragically, after only two decades of independence, Lithuania again fell under Russian domination during World War II, and was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. in August 1940. Following the German attack on the Soviet Union 10 months later, Lithuania was in Nazi hands until reoccupied by the Soviet Army in 1944. When the tide of the war turned against Germany, Lithuania returned not to independence, but to Soviet domination.

The United States has never and will never recognize the forcible Soviet annexation of this great nation. We must continue to protest in the strongest possible terms the oppressive measures of the Soviet Union against the Lithuanian nation.

Today I salute my constituents of Lithuanian descent, and Lithuanian-Americans throughout our country who have contributed to our American dream. We pray that their own dream and the dream of those they left behind in their motherland for a free and independent Lithuania may soon become a reality.

America, as the leader of the free world, must not and will not forget the plight of the Lithuanian people who have had their sovereignty violated and their freedom suppressed. The legitimate goals and aspiration of the Lithuanian people to win back their freedom as an independent state are shared by us all.●

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, just 2 months ago we commemorated the 30th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Tomorrow, February 16, Lithuanians throughout the world will celebrate the 61st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. Yet despite the brave and courageous struggles of these people and others of the Baltic States, Lithuania is not now free, nor are her people afforded the basic rights of human dignity that we in this country have enjoyed for over 200 years.

In 1918, Lithuania rejected the specter of Communist oppression, declared herself free, and set out to establish and follow her own culture, literature, customs, and religious beliefs. Despite Russian control and repeated Soviet attempts at armed subjugation her citizens have persisted in proclaiming their own heritage. For this strength of will they are saluted.

It is relatively easy to let the matter rest there, but I have spent some time reading the latest report on the violation of human rights in Lithuania, and know that we must do more than help Lithuanians celebrate. We must encourage their search for self-determination and condemn their oppressors for unlawful aggression against the sovereign and individual rights of a free people.

Consider the abolishment of Catholic parishes, and the suppression of religious texts. Consider the cases of the Jurgutiene family, separated since 1974, because the Soviets will not allow Marija and her daughter to emigrate to the United States to join their husband and father, the Vasilyev family that is constantly harassed by the KGB, because they belong to a Christian community, and many others who are denied visitation and reunification rights. Consider, too, the long list of dissenters who have been incarcerated for exercising freedom of thought or conscience.

I urge my colleagues to take this opportunity to renew our country's pledge to exercise responsible leadership in the human rights field. And personally, I offer my hopes and prayers to the Lithuanian people that their next Declaration Day will find them free once again.●

● Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity today to join my colleagues in commemorating the 61st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Sixty-one years ago this month, the people of Lithuania proclaimed their independence and established their own government at the close of World War I. Lithuania became a free, independent, and peaceful nation.

This freedom, however, was to be shortlived. Twenty years later, the Second World War began and the Soviet Union aggressively began its intimidation of this tiny Baltic nation by concentrating its troops along the Lithuanian-Soviet border. On June 15, 1940, all pretense was shattered when the Red Army invaded Lithuania and began an occupation which continues to this day. During the past 39 years, Lithuanian patriots have been executed, imprisoned, or deported. Mock elections have also been held with candidates whose only loyalty is to the Communist dictators in Moscow.

Despite its adoption of the Helsinki Accords and numerous other international agreements which call upon the Soviet Union to respect the civil, religious, and political rights of all peoples, the Communist government in Moscow persists in suppressing the rights of Lithuanians.

But it is a symbol of their strength as a people that they have not been broken. Their struggle to regain their freedom deserves our respect and our support, and I am especially pleased that, each year, my colleagues and I have the opportunity to register our unity with the Lithuanian people.

Mr. Speaker, the valiant and courageous struggle which continues in Lithuania should serve notice to us all that our freedoms are not to be taken lightly, and no people is more deserving of a new birth of freedom than the citizens of Lithuania.●

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as one who has for years watched successive administrations, both Democrat and Republican, ignore for the most part the plight of the peoples living today under Communist tyranny, I am glad for this opportunity to remind the citizens of our free land that there are forms of modern slavery existing today in foreign lands. The celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day is an excellent case in point.

It was in June 1941, that mass deportations of Lithuanians, along with thousands of their Baltic neighbors in Latvia and Estonia, were shipped to Siberia in one of the grossest violations of human rights by the Soviets at that time. In the

following years still more guiltless people of Lithuania were sent eastward to Northern Russia, Western and Eastern Siberia, and Kazakhstan. One can hardly imagine the suffering of these people as they labored in the slave labor camps, in the mines, and in the forests. Starvation, disease, and the brutally cold weather accounted for the deaths of many slated to die far from their native land. It has been estimated that the Communists either murdered or deported 350,000 people from Lithuania—approximately 10 percent of the population of that tragic nation.

As I have done in the past, I will introduce legislation asking that our Ambassador to the U.N. take steps to have placed on the agenda the issue of self-determination for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. These three of the captive nations are especially significant as the United States has—at least up to the present time—refused to recognize the incorporation by the Soviets of these Baltic States. It is not likely to happen since Andrew Young is a cream puff when it comes to dealing with his friends, the Communists. Lithuanians cannot agree with our Ambassador who maintains that Communists never were a threat to them. Lithuanians know better. He might brand them as "Fascists" if they resist communism too vociferously.

Like the thrilling escape of Simas Kudirka several years ago and his eventual return to the United States, all measures and activities which publicize the plight of the captive nations serve to keep hope alive in those living under tyranny. This legislation, unsuccessful in the past, helps to say to the people of Lithuania that we have not forgotten them.●

● Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today we are commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day, the day on which an independent Lithuanian Republic was established some 71 years ago. Tragically, Lithuania has been denied its freedom and independence by the Soviet Union for the last 39 years. This deprivation of human rights began with the Soviet Union's invasion and occupation of that country in June 1940. Today, even after the Helsinki and Belgrade Conferences, Soviet repression continues. Lithuanians who attempt to exercise their basic human rights are still thrown into Soviet prisons. While these prisoners of conscience number in the thousands, only a few of their names ever reach the West.

Mr. Speaker, as we observe Lithuanian Independence Day, our hearts go out to the Lithuanians who yearn for the same freedoms we in America are so privileged to enjoy. Perhaps our sympathy stems from the belief that "No one can be perfectly free till all are free," as Herbert Spencer once said.

Perhaps someday the Soviet Union will realize that what truly cements human beings to one another is not Marxism, but their common desire to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Until that day comes, we will lend our support to all Lithuanians in the hope that they can eventually live in freedom and independence.●

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 61st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. This day is remembered by myself and the entire Congress as a tribute to the millions of freedom-loving people in Lithuania and captive nations throughout the world. Hopefully, our words today will offer encouragement to the captive nations and reaffirm our commitment to human rights for all people.

On February 16, 1918, the date which we are commemorating today, the Republic of Lithuania declared its independence from Russian enslavement. Tragically, this freedom was to be short-lived. In June 1940, the Soviet army invaded and regained control of Lithuania. Since that time, the proud people of Lithuania have been forced to endure severe repression. Families have been disbanded and deported, an unknown number have been executed, and the industrial wealth of the nation has been exploited.

Yet, despite the suffering they have endured for almost four decades, the spirit of Lithuanian freedom fighters has never faltered, and I am confident that with a renewed commitment on our part, they will triumph in the end.

Despite our continued expressions of support for the peoples of Lithuania and other captive nations, very little has been done to improve the plight of these oppressed people. The message appears clear—we must go beyond mere expressions. We must take more definitive actions. The results of our human rights policy will not be measured by the number of speeches delivered, but instead by our ability to advance the cause of freedom in the captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, today we stand in honor of a courageous people who have long sought the opportunity which we have been blessed to enjoy for more than two centuries. I am hopeful that tomorrow, these words will be reinforced by effective action.

Let me add Mr. Speaker that while the world is so supportive of improved relations between the United States and its main Communist adversaries, we must be ever vigilant about expansionist tendencies by both the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. Perhaps the most important United States-Soviet issue in 1979 will be the SALT II talks. We must recognize that this issue transcends more than just discussion about weaponry and strategic balances. It should be used by the United States to force additional concessions from the Soviets about releasing their stranglehold on its captive nations. This would make this a humane agreement.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to insert a statement which appeared in a report published by the Lithuanian-American Community of 1978, entitled "The Violations of Human Rights in Soviet Occupied Lithuania." This statement details just one of the many tragic human rights violations against Lithuanian citizens:

THE CASE OF MARIJA JURGUTIENE

To all people of good will in the free world.

To the President of the United States of America, Mr. Jimmy Carter.[1]

From Marija Jurgutiene, residing in the Lithuanian Republic of the USSR, in the city of Vilnius, Zirmūnai Street, No. 75, Apt. 100.

A STATEMENT

I, Marija Jurgutiene, together with my thirteen-year old daughter Daina have consistently, since December 16, 1974, requested permission to come to the United States of America, the permanent residence of my husband and the father of my daughter, Aloyzas Jurgutis (6542 S. Fairfield Ave., Chicago, Ill. 60629, USA).

My husband, Aloyzas Jurgutis, was a senior lecturer at the State Conservatory of the Lithuanian Republic of the USSR, in the Department of Choral Conducting. On May 8, 1974, my husband went to Yugoslavia as a tourist, where he decided to change his permanent place of residence. Since 1974 he has been residing in the United States of America.

I have requested the Lithuanian SSR OVIR three times for an exit visa, by filling out all the necessary forms, but have received only the following unreasonable replies:

1. In March of 1975—treason;

2. April 21, 1976—we do not have the means;

3. December 24, 1976—rejection (of the request).

I then addressed myself to:

1. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR on February 12, 1977, on October 26, 1976, on June 2, 1976, and on May 8, 1976;

2. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR L. I. Brezhnev on December 12, 1976, on January 17, 1976, and on September 1, 1975;

3. The Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet Nikolai V. Podgorny on November 12, 1976, May 10, 1975, April 17, 1975, and September 29, 1974;

4. The First Secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party P. Griskevicius on June 15, 1976;

5. The 25th Congress of the Communist Party on February 8, 1976 (I wish to note that until now I have not received any replies to my requests);

6. OVIR (Visa) Division of the Soviet Union's Ministry of Internal Affairs on February 12, 1977, and March 9, 1977;

7. The Human-Rights Committee on Geneva on November 17, 1976, on May 10, 1976, on January 20, 1976, and on October 20, 1975.

My request to reside together with my lawful husband, and of my daughter with her true father, is considered a crime by my national government.

I am constantly threatened by word and in writing that I will be sent to prison, my apartment will be confiscated, and my daughter will be expelled from school because she has no right to be in a Soviet school. On May 30, 1974, my apartment was searched. On September 22, 1974 I was discharged from my librarian position at the

[1] Text of the statement received through private sources. In a subsequent statement to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, dated May 24, 1977, M. Jurgutiene renounced her Soviet citizenship and demanded permission to leave the Soviet Union. Text of the latter statement will be found in *Aušra*, No. 9 (1977). The intransigence of the Soviet regime appears to be due to the defection of Aloyzas Jurgutis, for which his wife and daughter are being punished.

society "Znanie". From May 30, 1974, to February 1, 1975, I was constantly called by the KBG for interrogations. In June of 1974 my 11-year old daughter, Daina, was also interrogated. All correspondence with my husband was, and still is, prohibited. On March 30, 1975, without any warning, my telephone was disconnected. I was called several times by the police to explain why I am not working. On July 29, 1976 my apartment was searched again. I have been under constant surveillance throughout this time.

What can be more natural than the union of a family? This is a vitally important question for our family. I wish to live together with the man to whom I have promised my destiny. I ask only that which is an undeniable right of every human.

Since the indicated facts are a denial of human rights and is a violation of the Helsinki Accords. I feel I have a right to inform you of these violations. Since I have exhausted all possibilities in my country, I appeal to you to help me in search of my human rights.

MARIJA JURGUTIENE.

VILNIUS, *March 10, 1977.*●

● Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, today we pause to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day. This proud people has been subjugated by the Communist leadership of the Soviet Union since 1940.

Frequently, we hear about Communist-inspired harassment, censorship, interference with religious practice, and the denial of many other basic human rights. Such inhuman treatment has been inflicted upon the Soviet people themselves and, even more so, upon those populations subjected to that totalitarian regime. The people of Lithuania have suffered greatly in this regard.

Despite such great personal suffering, Lithuanians continue to persevere courageously in the hope that self-determination and freedom will soon be theirs. Such courage should spur us to confirm our solidarity with this noble struggle. We must commit ourselves anew to the goal of a peaceful world, a world in which self-determination for all peoples becomes a delightful reality.

Further, the plight of the captive Lithuanian nation should prompt us to pause and to refresh our memories concerning the many blessings which this great Nation of ours affords. Having been so refreshed, we can then rededicate our energies and our minds to fostering a new world order, one in which human dignity is recognized and human freedom no longer shackled.

Mr. Speaker, our forefathers gave us the gift of liberty. Dare we do anything less than to share this great gift? ●

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day. Although an independent nation for a brief 22-year period, the Lithuanian people have through their efforts to regain their freedom been an inspiration to the freedom-loving peoples of the world. Since 1940, the Lithuanian people have lived under the occupation of the Soviets, Nazis, and most recently the Soviets again. Despite these hardships the Lithuanian people have never given up the hope that they will one day regain that which is rightfully theirs, a free and independent nation.

The Soviet Union's illegal annexation of Lithuania along with the other two Baltic Republics of Estonia and Latvia in 1944, was an act that has never been recognized either by our Nation or much of Western Europe. Of course, it is an act that has never been accepted by the Lithuanian people themselves. The spirit of freedom is alive in Lithuania, it lives despite all attempts by the Soviet Union to repress and extinguish it. I join my colleagues in celebrating the Lithuanian spirit, and in drawing inspiration from the determination of the people of Lithuania.●

● Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to salute the Lithuanian people on the anniversary of their declaration of independence. Their history, full of great accomplishments and great sorrows, is a paradigm of the human spirit's resilient longings to be free and nurtured in a beloved homeland.

Since ancient times, the Lithuanians have inhabited the same Baltic region; they were mentioned by the Roman historian Tacitus in the first century A.D. Their language is the oldest in its forms of the world's living languages, a fact which has made them keenly aware of their individuality. In the middle ages, they controlled land from the Baltic to the Black Sea, and played an important part in the shaping of modern Europe. Their rich cultural heritage, their strong religious faith, and their willingess to fight for national self-determination were among the characteristics which motivated them to declare an independent state in 1918, at the conclusion of the First World War.

The period of independent national life that ensued from 1918 to 1940 should never be regarded as some kind of historical accident that was tragically cut short. Rather, Lithuania's modern political independence was the culmination of centuries of strong national consciousness, a consciousness intensified still further by the Czarist domination of 125 years that immediately preceded the 1918 Declaration of Independence. During that period of Czarist oppression, the occupying Russian forces attempted to weaken the Lithuanians' sense of national identity by forbidding use of the Lithuanian language in the schools, as well as the printing of books in the Lithuanian language. But that kind of attempt to obliterate Lithuania's culture only made the Lithuanians more determined to retain their identity and achieve conditions under which it could flourish. They kept their language, culture and religious traditions alive under great duress. Despite all the Czarist attempts at conditioning in the schools, their children continued to learn to know and love the ancient and enduring ways of their motherland right in their own homes.

Just as the Lithuanians perservered in cherishing their heritage throughout the 19th century Czarist occupation, they have—predictably—been heroic since 1940 in nurturing their national identity, their language, culture, and religion, their intense national pride, and above all their determination to be free again. The Soviet forces that overran Lithuania in 1940 and have ruled there since then have never been able to subdue the people's will. This was demonstrated through long years of partisan fighting in the 1940's and early 1950's. It has been evident in demonstrations within the Soviet-managed factories, the appearance of underground newspapers and dissident journals, the brash unwillingness of Lithuanian youth to be "sovietized." And there are always special people in recent years to remind us that Lithuania is still, in the ancient phrase, a "land of heroes." Remember the student, Romas Kalanta, who immolated himself so that the world would remember Lithuania's longing to be free. Remember the sailor, Simas Kudirka, whom no prison bars could contain. Remember the prisoner, Victoras Petkus, whose spirit no Soviet court can ever convict.

Mr. Speaker, the story of Lithuania covers some two millenia of human history, and it is consistently a story of a people who have amply proven their right to be free and self-determining. The United States has never recognized the forcible incorporation of Lithuania and her sister Baltic countries, Estonia and Latvia, into the Soviet Union. Through our consistent policy in support of the Baltic countries' legitimate claim to independence and self-determination, we demonstrate that our concern for human rights is paralleled by our commitment to national rights as well.

I rejoice at the vitality, courage, and perseverance of the Lithuanian people, who continue to inspire freedom-loving people everywhere. I am confident that the essential history of Lithuania—a history of freedom—will repeat itself yet again.●

VIETNAMESE PAYMENT FOR LEGITIMATE AMERICAN CLAIMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation with Congressman BINGHAM which will allow American citizens who have had their property and businesses expropriated by the Government of Vietnam to file claims with the U.S. Government's Foreign Settlement Claims Commission. The claims will then be adjudicated by the Commission, and, when and if normal diplomatic relations are reestablished, the Vietnamese Government will be obliged to pay the claims in a formula agreed to as part of the normalization process.

As the situation now stands, Americans who have had property expropriated by the Socialist Republic of Vietnam cannot even file claims because the Foreign Settlement Claims Commission lacks authority to accept and adjudicate them. The amendments we are proposing to the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 will remedy this situation.

The Commission will then have legal authority to determine the validity of claims as it has already done in relation to Yugoslavia, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, China, East Germany, and Cuba.

Final agreements which have resulted in significant payments to the American claimants by the countries involved have been signed by the Governments of Yugoslavia, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, and Hungary. Negotiations are currently underway with Czechoslovakia and initial contacts have been made with the East German Government. Though the Commission has finished adjudicating claims against Cuba, no negotiations with the Cuban Government on this issue have taken place.

Perhaps the most striking example of the value of the Claims Settlement program will become visible later this month when Treasury Secretary Blumenthal will travel to China to continue negotiations and hopefully conclude an agreement which will be beneficial to the American claimants.

The Chinese example is illustrative because many of the claims which will soon be settled were filed a decade ago. I do not see any immediate improvement in our relations with Vietnam on the horizon, but it would be foolhardy to predict what our relationship might be in 10 or 20 years. It is important to give Americans the opportunity now to file their claims before personal memories and corporate records become further dispersed.

In closing, there are three points which I wish to stress. First, this bill specifically does not commit the U.S. Government to pay any claims which may be filed. To the contrary, the claims will ultimately be paid by the Vietnamese Government. The American taxpayers will not be presented with a bill for payment. Second, this bill is not designed to pave the way for rapid normalization of relations with Vietnam. What might happen in terms of diplomatic relations is another matter which will be determined by a variety of factors. Congress must have an important role to play in making that decision. Simply, this is a bill to aid American citizens with legitimate claims.

Third, we should understand that while many large corporations will probably file claims, American businessmen who had relatively small businesses in Vietnam will also benefit from this legislation.

In fact, my interest in this matter was stimulated by a Vermont constituent who first began a machinery sales business in Saigon in 1952 and had to abandon it as Saigon fell to the North Vietnamese in 1975.

A full survey of blocked Vietnamese assets in this country has never been conducted, but initial Treasury Department estimates put the figure at nearly $100 million. The amendment we are proposing today will open the way for a full cataloging of these blocked assets. At some point in the future, should no agreement be reached with the Vietnamese, Congress will have the opportunity to determine whether the blocked assets should be liquidated to pay the claims. This would be a drastic step and one which I am not prepared to recommend at this time. I would prefer to see the assets distributed as part of ultimate agreement negotiated with the Vietnamese authorities. However, we should prepare ourselves for the future.

I urge your support for this legislation.●

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) in introducing legislation which represents the first step toward obtaining the fullest possible restitution for Americans whose private property was taken by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam when the Government of South Vietnam fell.

The Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade, which I have the honor to chair, has legislative jurisdiction over U.S. claims against foreign governments for nationalized or expropriated property, and it is my intention to give active consideration to this proposal in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, many obstacles remain in the path toward obtaining payment from the Government of Vietnam for private American property that government now controls. We currently have no diplomatic relations with Vietnam, and indeed we unilaterally embargo all trade and financial transactions with Vietnam. Furthermore, of course, the recent invasion of Cambodia by Vietnamese military forces has complicated and severely dampened for the time being any progress that might have been made toward restoring diplomatic relations with Vietnam so that negotiations of concrete issues such as U.S. claims could get underway.

It is none too soon, however, to get our own records in order as to just what American property was lost to the Vietnamese and how much that property was worth. Such records will become the basis of the total claim which the U.S. Government will someday present to the Vietnamese Government as a basis for negotiation and settlement.

The difficult task of reviewing and validating such claims is vested by existing statutes in the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission—a Commission, appointed by the President, which has had extensive experience in establishing U.S. private property claims against foreign governments and assisting in the payment of restitution to claimants when settlements are reached. In the past 35 years, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and its predecessor agencies have adjudicated and validated such claims against virtually all of the countries of Eastern Europe, as well as against China and Cuba. Settlements have actually been reached with Yugoslavia, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, and Hungary. Our claims against the Peoples' Republic of China, which are now under negotiation, are based upon the work of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

There are widely differing views in the Congress, about when and how fast we should move toward normalization of relations with Vietnam. I personally feel that we should be prepared to lift our embargo of Vietnam as soon as the Vietnamese are willing to reestablish diplomatic relations. One reason I have felt that this should be done promptly is to avoid a long delay in gaining restitution for Americans—both corporations and individuals—who suffered losses of private property in Vietnam.

Whatever one's position on normalizing relations with Vietnam, however, I believe we can all agree that we expect restitution from Vietnam for private American property it has nationalized or expropriated. The legislation we are introducing today reaffirms our commitment to the principle of restitution for American private property, and would start the process of obtaining compensation for Americans who lost property in Vietnam by specifically authorizing the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to examine all claims by Americans against Vietnam and to determine the validity and exact amount of those claims.

This legislation is clearly in our self-interest. It makes no concession to Vietnam, nor does it place any burden on U.S. taxpayers to pay for private U.S. losses in Vietnam. On the contrary, it reaffirms our expectation that the Vietnamese Government will have to pay for American property it has taken.

I want to congratulate the diligent work of my colleague, Mr. JEFFORDS, in helping to prepare this proposed legislation, and I urge my colleagues in the House to support it after full and careful consideration has been given to it by the Committee on International Relations.●

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, Lithuanians throughout the world commemorate the 61st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania. It is important that Americans take time to memorialize the plight of the Baltic people who have been overcome by the ruthless tyranny of the Soviet Union.

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia exemplify the true meaning of human rights. In fact, no part of the world represents a more serious denial of human rights, including the right of self-determination, than the imprisoning of the Baltic people.

Soviet repression has been consistent and harsh. Human rights have been violated in numerous ways and these violations are continuing. This ongoing repression makes it incumbent upon us to uphold our heritage of a free and open society and we must champion the cause of self-determination for the Baltic people. The United States must continue to support the aspirations for freedom, independence, and national self-determi-

nation of all peoples. We cannot accept foreign domination by any nation over another nation. To this end we remain committed and we must not waiver from our responsibility.●

ARCHBISHOP OSCAR ROMERO OF EL SALVADOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. FENWICK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of El Salvador are living every day in a system which flagrantly violates their civil and human rights. The injustices they are forced to endure make a dark picture of governmental persecution, but one figure rises above all this suffering as an advocate of the poor and the defenseless. Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero y Galdames, the Roman Catholic archibishop of El Salvador, has been steadfast in his defense of the rights of his people, and in his criticism of the military government which has waged a campaign against the exercise of those rights. Arbitrary arrests, detentions, torture, and mysterious disappearances have become the order of the day—gross violations of human rights documented by such impartial international watch groups as Amnesty International, the Inter-American Human Rights Commission, the Geneva-based Commission of Jurists, and the Washington Office on Latin America.

Last month I joined 22 other Members of Congress in nominating Archbishop Romero for the Nobel Peace Prize. Despite attempts from many quarters to villify and discredit him, he has demonstrated uncomprising courage, tenacity and forthrightness in continuing to speak out for his people. He has earned the support of freedom-loving people everywhere, and deserves consideration for the Nobel Prize.●

CRIME SUBCOMMITTEE SCHEDULES HEARINGS ON LEAA AND WHITE-COLLAR CRIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Crime, which I chair, will continue its hearings, which began during the latter part of the 95th Congress, on proposals to reauthorize and reorganize the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. To this end, we will hold a hearing on this subject on February 20, 1979, at 9:30 a.m., in room 2237, Rayburn House Office Building.

The subcommittee in its attempt to comprehensively evaluate the operations of the LEAA program has also scheduled field hearings for February 22 in Detroit, Mich.; February 23 in Chicago, Ill.; and February 26 and 27 in San Francisco, Calif. While in San Francisco, the subcommittee will also take testimony from a number of witnesses on the subject of white-collar crime.

Individuals wishing to testify or submit a statement for the record should address their request to the Subcommittee on Crime, House Committee on the Judiciary, 207E Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.●

OIL IMPORT PURCHASING AUTHORITY ACT OF 1979

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) is recognized for 30 minutes.

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the victory of the Khomeini forces in Iran, the continuing cutoff of Iranian oil, and the coming 14.5-percent hike in OPEC oil prices, all serve to remind us that the "energy crisis" is still with us. Last month the subject of energy warranted no more than 12 words in the President's state of the Union message. Today administration figures speak of gasoline rationing, bans on Sunday driving, and a situation "prospectively more serious" than the 1973–74 oil embargo. We are warned that gasoline could soon be costing us $1 per gallon at the pump. Oil shortages (either real or contrived) and higher prices (always real) seem to be our destiny. It is a destiny we seem to accept with entirely too much equanimity. I propose that we begin to fight back.

I am introducing legislation which would begin to put the United States in control of its own energy fate. The Oil Import Purchasing Authority Act of 1979 would authorize the U.S. Government (through the Department of Energy) to act as the sole purchasing agent for all petroleum and petroleum products imported into the United States. In this capacity, the Department of Energy could maximize the U.S. bargaining position by soliciting sealed bids from those oil-producing nations seeking access to the U.S. market. Such competitive bidding, by OPEC and non-OPEC states, might well have a divisive impact on the OPEC cartel and could lead to a reduction in the price of imported oil.

Legislation similar to this was considered in 1975 (Public Law 94–163). At that time Congress did enact a proposal authorizing the President to submit to Congress a plan granting the Federal Government the exclusive right to purchase foreign oil. I would delete this discretionary authority and mandate establishment of an import authority.

This legislation would help break the OPEC stranglehold. The importing of oil to this country would no longer be the special province of multinational oil companies, themselves captives of the OPEC cartel. Today energy decisions vitally affecting the United States, are made, not by the U.S. Government, but by Gulf, Texaco, Mobil, Socal, and their sister companies. They decide (following OPEC) to raise prices and they decide when to restrict sales. It need hardly be said that the 70 to 90 cents we are now paying for a gallon of gasoline is not a price dictated by market conditions but rather by the oil companies which import the oil, then refine it, and finally sell it to us. The companies' price and supply decisions are not made on the basis of our national interest but out of concern for corporate profits and the companies' interests in the oil states. Despite their American sounding names and their familiar corporate logos, the major oil companies have long been under the inevitable domination of the oil states. The OPEC cartel has fixed the price of oil and the oil companies have carried out the OPEC price policy. The most flagrant example of the oil companies' servitude to the OPEC states—or, to be more polite, their identity of interests—came during the 1973 Yom Kippur war and the ensuing oil embargo. According to the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations, the oil companies enforced the Arab oil embargo of the United States and our allies. Not surprisingly, the oil companies tried to block the U.S. arms airlift to Israel. When the boycott finally was lifted, the oil companies joined in the decision to quadruple the prices of oil. Clearly the oil companies have interests which conflict with those of the United States.

The importation of oil is, simply, too important to be left to multinational companies. Oil supply and pricing decisions are crucial questions of public policy and should be made by our Government and not by corporate chieftains. OPEC is a coalition of governments and only a strong central government authority can stand up to it. Those who argue that a government importing authority would deal a blow to free enterprise are not realistic. There is no free enterprise in imported oil. What we have is a cartel of producing nations and a friendly coalition of oil companies. I would prefer having our key energy decisions made by our Government.

One more point must be made. This bill would not add to the taxpayers' burden, and it would not create any large new bureaucarcy. Funds from the U.S. Treasury would be used to pay for the oil but would be paid back by refiners who purchase the oil. The Department of Energy would not take possession of any oil. Its role would be to insure a fair bidding procedure and an equitable allocation of oil.●

COSPONSORS OF TAX EQUITY ACT OF 1979

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, I introduced H.R. 1040, the Tax Equity Act of 1979. Twenty-three Members of the House have now joined me as cosponsors. They are: Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. MAGUIRE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. WEAVER, and Mr. WON PAT.●

CONCERN FOR SAFETY OF AMERICANS STILL IN IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from New Jersey (Mr. HUGHES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, during the current unrest and upheaval in Iran, all Americans were deeply concerned for the safety and well-being of our fellow countrymen who are still in Iran on assignment for our Government or as representatives of the business community or for other purposes.

Our concern for these individuals is not based on any misplaced sense of nationalism or militarism, but rather, on a universal humanitarian concern for people whose lives or safety may be seriously endangered by turmoil within another nation.

I was deeply disturbed to learn, therefore, that our NATO ally and military partner, Turkey, refused our request to station a small force of 69 marines and 6 helicopters in Turkey in case they were needed to protect the lives and safety of Americans in Iran, or to facilitate the evacuation of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this small force could not possibly be regarded as a threat to Iran or anyone else. Such a group, by its very nature, could serve only humanitarian purposes and not represent a hostile or aggressive force. One would think that Turkey would readily open its doors in friendship to this small force. Instead, we were forced to locate these marines at other stations.

Of course, no nation has an obligation to accept our Armed Forces, regardless of the size or purpose of such forces. By the same token, however, this occurrence raises the broader question of the strength of our ties with Turkey, and the good intentions of the Turkish Government toward our Nation. I also recall the intensity of the effort made last year to win congressional approval of lifting the arms embargo to Turkey, much of which was based on the essential and irreplaceable nature of our bases in Turkey.

It is deeply disturbing to me that these bases were not even available for our use in a mission that could not conceivably be regarded in any way other than humanitarian.●

TAIWAN LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago today the President announced his decision to recognize the People's Republic of China as the Government of China, and to derecognize the Republic of China on Taiwan. He stated that the United States-People's Republic of China "normalization" would take effect January 1, 1979, that Embassies would be established March 1, 1979, and that the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of China would be terminated as of the end of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I voiced at the time of the President's announcement my dismay at the President's failure to consult meaningfully with the Congress in advance of his decision. I also stated my concern about giving in to Peking's demands on conditions for recognition and about the lack of strong assurance about the future security of Taiwan, our longtime friend and ally.

We in the Congress are now faced with a most difficult task. The President has asked for legislation which would implement the President's decision with respect to continuing relations with Taiwan, by carrying these forward on a nongovernmental basis. We have been asked to act on this legislation promptly. The Foreign Affairs Committee accordingly has been holding hearings at the full and subcommittee level over the past 2 weeks.

It is apparent that the President's action has put us in Congress under the gun, legislatively speaking. We need to act to protect America's interests in Taiwan and to assure the Taiwanese people that we are not pulling the rug out from under them in the haste to "normalize" with Peking. We have to do this in a way which will not run against the President's understanding with the People's Republic of China, we are told; and at the same time we are pushed to get the implementing legislation to the White House by March 1 if possible so there will not be a damaging hiatus in our relations with Taiwan following the closing of our Embassy there.

It has been increasingly obvious as the committee hearings proceeded that the administration's proposed legislation was deficient in many respects. We need assurances for the future security, peace, and freedom of the 18 million people of Taiwan that the legislation does not provide. We need greater provision for the uninterrupted continuation of the multibillion-dollar business and commerce between the United States and Taiwan which is so important to both sides. We need to have a stronger framework for carrying on the everyday dealings between the citizens of the United States and Taiwan.

Because of these shortcomings in the administration's proposed bill, draft legislation which is designed to meet the needs cited above is being prepared by the Foreign Affairs Committee staff and myself. This committee print will be offered to the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for consideration in markup next week. It is my hope that such a bill will meet the approval of the Members. In my opinion it will fully provide for the authorities requested by the President, and at the same time will be a constructive embodiment of the policy we must now adopt toward our friend, Taiwan.●

□ 1150

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SAN LUIS OBISPO AREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to all of the people associated with a very important institution in my district—the San Luis Obispo General Hospital. Yesterday was the 100th anniversary of the admittance of the hospital's first patient, and in those 100 years, the residents of the San Luis Obispo area have enjoyed superior medical care.

Of course, the anniversary coincides with Valentine's Day, and everyone likes to think of the hospital as the "Hospital With a Heart." All of the hospital's employees—doctors, nurses, technicians, aides—are responsible for this attitude, and it makes for a great source of comfort and care for people in my district.

At a time when we must look very hard at every Government program to eliminate waste, I think it is very important that we remember those public institutions that do serve the public interest. Quality health care is one of the most basic services Government can provide to people, and places like the San Luis Obispo General Hospital make a high level of health care for all a reachable goal.

Again, my congratulations to the hospital and all its employees. Let us all hope that the "Hospital With a Heart" continues to provide care to the residents of the San Luis Obispo area for yet another century.●

SUGAR STABILIZATION ACT OF 1979

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to be joining with the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. ULLMAN, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. DE LA GARZA, newly elected vice chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and a number of our distinguished colleagues in the House in introducing the International Sugar Stabilization Act of 1979. We do so in the very firm belief that this legislation does not recognize the needs of only one segment of our society to the detriment of others but, rather, that it will serve to the advantage of each of us in this Chamber and those not present who send us here to speak for them.

As one of the world's largest and most important sugar consuming and importing nations, the continued survival and viability of the U.S. sugar industry and the stability of the global market are clearly in our best interest. Recognizing this and the fact that efforts to date have been unsuccessful in meeting this dual objective, those of us who have been working together on this problem believe that legislation mandating a comprehensive sugar policy and program is sorely needed.

For too long, we as a nation have sat calmly by and watched our domestic production base, our safety net against future hard times and escalating world sugar prices, if you will, fall into serious jeopardy while other sugar producing countries enrich themselves at our expense.

The legislation we offer today proposes to rectify this situation by providing long-overdue authority for U.S. participation in the cooperative International Sugar Agreement as a means of fostering the stability of global sugar supplies and prices, which impact directly on U.S. consumers and producers alike; by

providing modest protection for sugar producers consistent with the International Sugar Agreement; and by insuring that those who labor in the production of sugar share equally in the benefits to be derived in terms of improved wages and working conditions.

The International Sugar Stabilization Act of 1979 builds on agreements arrived at after months of discussion in 1978 and offers some changes in the 1978 sugar bill designed to insure equitable treatment of producers and consumers of sugar as well as favorable consideration by the House. Specifically, our bill—

Provides for U.S. implementation of its rights and obligations under the International Sugar Agreement;

Establishes a complementary domestic program providing an assured return to producers of 15.75 cents per pound for 1978 crop raw sugar. This assured return is made up of two elements: A price objective of 15.25 cents per pound to be achieved by raising the price of imported sugar (and, thus, the domestic price) through import duties and, if necessary, quotas. Producers would then receive up to one-half cent per pound in supplemental payments. If for any reason a limitation were ever imposed on the direct payments program, payments would be abolished; and the market price objective would be enhanced by one-half cent to maintain the assured return.

Allows for adjustments in the price objective each year to reflect changes in the cost of production, with an absolute ceiling of 7 percent in any year, consistent with the President's anti-inflation guidelines, and a supplemental payment of up to one-half cent;

Leaves the Secretary of Agriculture discretionary authority to operate a price support loan program; and

Mandates minimum wage levels and other protections for sugar cane and sugar beet workers.

We are pleased to note that this bill has been drafted jointly by members of both the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Ways and Means in an effort to minimize any differences of approach between the two and to expedite its consideration. We sincerely believe that the situation is critical and that actions such as those we collectively recommend must be forthcoming.●

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 2155

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. MINETA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, during the past year I have become aware that the General Services Administration has interpreted the 1972 amendments to the 1959 Public Buildings Act in such a way as to allow them to exceed in certain instances the $500,000 limit in that act without seeking congressional approval. I believe the Congress must exercise its responsibility for this program to the fullest and that GSA must be directed in the most unambiguous terms possible to submit these projects to the Congress. The legislation I am introducing today would accomplish exactly that.

There are two issues here, both involving buildings leased by the GSA. The 1972 amendments provided that leases over $500,000 annually must be submitted to the Congress for approval (40 U.S.C. 606). The GSA interpretation has been that leases entered into at less than $500,000 can subsequently be added to, so that they provide more space and at more than $500,000, all without seeking prospectus approval from the Congress. We end up with a case like the one in San Francisco, where GSA is now leasing space in one building at a gross annual rent of $1.38 million (which would put the net annual rent at about $1 million) and yet has never sought congressional approval.

It is true that the GSA sought an opinion of the GAO in this matter, and in his response (B–176843) the Comptroller General stated that "we are aware of no legal basis on which to object to the proposed treatment of amendments to existing leases." This opinion was predicated on the additional space lease rather than as an amendment to the existing lease, and on GSA seeking such additional space on a good faith basis and taking "whatever precautions are necessary to prevent the splitting of a space requirement for purposes of evading the requirements (to submit a prospectus)." The distinction between lease amendments and separate supplemental lease agreements may have been lost in practice. But apart from the issues of lease amendments versus supplemental leases and good faith versus bad faith, the main point is that we should not have major commitments of Federal resources to one lease without some kind of congressional control and accountability. The bill I am introducing today would specify that a prospectus must be submitted for congressional approval under the 1959 act at whatever point the lease for all federally leased space in a building exceeds $500,000.

The second issue involves the GSA interpretation of the 1972 amendments to the effect that repair and alterations projects to leased buildings do not require congressional prospectus approval no matter how much the cost. Aside from the fact that this legal interpretation has at best a tenuous connection to the statute, it is clearly absurd that we would have greater control over Federal spending for repairs and alterations in federally owned buildings than we do in privately owned buildings. In fact, it should be just the opposite. The bill I am introducing today would, therefore, require repair and alteration projects over $250,000 in leased buildings to be submitted for congressional approval. This would be in addition to the present practice of submitting prospectuses for repair and alteration projects over $500,000 in federally owned buildings.●

TAX EQUITY FOR TENANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HARRIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the tenant's tax justice bill which allows tenants to claim their share of local and State property tax payments for Federal income tax purposes.

Tenants rent single family homes, townhouses, garden apartments, and high rises and, through their rent, they pay property taxes on their dwelling units. However, unlike homeowners who may deduct their property taxes, tenants are not afforded the same opportunity. The tax laws discriminate against the taxpayer who rents and this inequity will be corrected by the passage of this bill.

Under the bill, a tenant may claim a credit of 25 percent of the proportionate share of the property taxes paid. This share is determined by multiplying the total property taxes paid on the building by the ratio of the floor space rented by the tenant to the total rental floor space in the building, excluding common areas. For example, if someone rented for 1 year an apartment with 5,000 square feet of floor space and there was a total of 50,000 square feet of floor space in the building, the proportionate share would be 10 percent of the building's property tax. If the total property tax paid by the owner was $6,000 then the tenant's share is $600, and the credit which the tenant can claim is 25 percent of $600, or $150. A tenant is allowed to claim the credit for only the portion of the year during which he actually rents the apartment. In the example above, if the tenant had only rented the apartment for 6 months then his share of the property tax is $300 and his credit is $75.

In past Congresses, the concept of allowing tenants to claim their property tax payments received widespread attention from the national news media and several organizations. Among those who expressed favorable interest in the concept included the National Tenants Association, the American Association of Retired Persons, Apartment Life magazine, the National Apartment Association, the National Council of Senior Citizens, and the National Federation of Retired Federal Employees. At the moment, the California State Legislature is conducting hearings on a similar proposal.

The benefits of the passage of this bill are many:

Property tax relief for tenants would make the income tax system more progressive in that it would lessen the tax burden on low income taxpayers. According to a Congressional Research Service study, over 79 percent of household rental units were occupied by families with incomes under $15,000 in 1974;

A tax credit for tenants would encourage individuals to live in rental units and help reverse the suburban flight which is partially responsible for the deterioration of our center cities. Revitalization of our center cities is an important national priority, and the tax system should not be allowed to exacerbate the problem as it currently does;

A tax credit is both a more equitable and more progressive way of providing property tax relief than is an itemized deduction. Over 85 percent of income

tax returns filed by individuals with incomes under $10,000 in 1974 claimed the standard deduction, hence, most would have been ineligible for an itemized deduction. The deduction ignores the nonitemizing low-income taxpayer while a credit can be claimed by nonitemizers as well as itemizers;

A tax incentive for rental housing would spur apartment unit construction and help bring down the high unemployment rates experienced in the construction industry;

The bill discourages "instant condominiums" by removing an artificial tax stimulus to apartment conversion—simply, those who rent will no longer lose the right to claim their property tax payment;

The bill makes partners of property owners and tenants in keeping local property taxes under control. Many landlords support this concept because in addition to enhancing rental markets, the bill makes the tenants realize what portion of the rent is not "rent" at all, but a property tax payment. The landlord is currently caught in the middle—the local government raises taxes, but because the landlord collects the tax in the rent, he is "blamed" for increasing rents. Under this bill, it is clear that the landlord is merely acting as a collection agent for the local government.

The opportunities and demands of American life have made us a more mobile society. At the same time escalating costs and rising mortgage rates have priced many citizens out of the "home ownership" market. This fact is documented by the National Home Builders Association's somber prediction that new housing starts will decline by approximately 20 percent in 1979. According to the Congressional Research Service, 36 percent of all American families rent their homes and there is no doubt that that figure will continue to escalate.

Public policy has discriminated against tenants for too long; genuine tax reform requires that we treat the Nation's tenants with fairness and equity. It is for that reason that I am introducing the tenant's tax justice bill.●

CONSUMERS' ENERGY HEARINGS ACT OF 1979

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEVITAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, each day brings more frustration to Americans who are being asked to accept and pay for energy cost decisions made in Washington, many miles away from home. To begin with, it is bad enough to know that, for the most part, oil prices are being set by a foreign cartel with little concern for the American consumer. However, I think it is inexcusable when our own Government does not actively encourage the participation of citizens in making major electric and gas rate decisions over which it does have some control. I am speaking about multimillion dollar wholesale and interstate price decisions on electric power and natural gas.

The way the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) is set up and operates in the Department of Energy does not encourage or facilitate participation by the people at home who pay the bills, or by the local rural electric cooperatives, the power and light company and the local gas company that are forced to pass on these charges. It is unfair to ask citizens to be inconvenienced and to pay for the cost of traveling to Washington to have their voices heard, assuming they would be invited to attend the hearings.

For that reason, and to change this situation, I have introduced the Consumers' Energy Hearings Act of 1979 (H.R. 1977) to require that these Washington hearings be moved to the areas of the country affected by the increases. It calls for no new hearings where no hearings were required before. What it does say is that if FERC is going to hold hearings which could result in a significant rate increase, a person who is going to be affected by it can petition FERC to have the hearing moved to that area. It would then become an open proceeding with interested consumers being able to attend and participate and have their views heard directly by the people making the decisions.

This legislation attempts to facilitate consumer involvement in these Washington-based decisions which are then binding on the States and localities. Even the elected State public serivce commissions can do nothing more than accept these Federal decisions because wholesale and interstate increases are within Federal jurisdiction, and public service commissions deal only with the intrastate rates. I know of State public service commissions that simply, automatically pass on these Federal-level increases to consumers in the State. When the homeowner receives his or her utility bill, he or she will at least know what is behind the euphemisms "surcharge" or "adjustment" that appear on these bills and really mean Washington decides, you abide. This bill will give consumers a chance to be heard on these important pocketbook decisions.●

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

(Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XI, clause 2 (a), of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Rules of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation are submitted for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RULES FOR THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION, 96TH CONGRESS (1979-80)

(Adopted February 7, 1979)

RULE NO. I.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House are the rules of the committee and subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege in committees and subcommittees. Each subcommittee of the committee is a part of the committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of the committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

(b) The committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under Rule X of House Rules and (subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by Rule XI, clause 5 of House Rules) to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) The committee is authorized to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the committee. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with any meeting or hearing of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House.

(d) The committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year, a report on the activities of the committee under Rule X and XI of House Rules during the Congress ending at noon on January 3 of such year.

(e) The committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Congress convenes in each odd-numbered year.

RULE NO. II.—REGULAR AND SPECIAL MEETINGS; OPEN COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) Regular meetings of the committee shall be held on the first Tuesday of every month to transact its business unless such day is a holiday, or Congress is in recess or is adjourned, in which case the Chairman shall determine the regular meeting day of the committee for that month. The Chairman shall give each member of the committee, as far in advance of the day of the regular meeting as the circumstances make practicable, a written notice of such meeting. If the Chairman believes that the committee will not be considering any bill or resolution before the full committee and that there is no other business to be transacted at a regular meeting, the meeting may be cancelled, delayed or deferred until such times as, in the judgment of the Chairman, there may be such matters which require the committee's consideration. This paragraph shall not apply to meetings of any subcommittee.

(b) The Chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the conduct of other committee business. The committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to that call of the Chairman.

(c) If at least three members of the committee desire that a special meeting of the committee be called by the Chairman, those members may file in the offices of the committee their written request to the Chairman for that special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matter to be considered. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the clerk of the committee shall notify the Chairman of the filing of the request. If, within three calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held within 7 calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the committee may file in the offices of the committee their written notice that a special meeting of the committee will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measure or matter to be considered at that special meeting. The committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the clerk of the committee shall notify all members of the committee that such meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered; and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting.

(d) If the Chairman of the committee or subcommittee is not present at any meeting of the committee or subcommittee, the ranking member of the majority party on the committee or subcommittee who is present shall preside at that meeting.

(e) The committee may not sit, without special leave, while the House is reading a measure for amendment under the five-minute rule.

(f)(1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the committee or each subcommittee thereof shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public: *Provided, however*, that no person other than members of the committee and such congressional staff and such departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. This paragraph does not apply to open committee hearings which are provided for by clause 4(a)(1) of House Rule X or by subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, or to any meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(2) Each hearing conducted by the committee or each subcommittee thereof shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives.

Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony.

(A) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security or violate clause (g)(5) of Rule VII, or

(B) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in clause (g)(5) of Rule VII.

No member of the House of Representatives may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the committee or any subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the committee or a particular subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to members by the same procedure designated in this subparagraph for closing hearings to the public; Provided, however, that the committee or subcommittee may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

RULE NO. III.—RECORDS AND ROLL CALLS

(a) There shall be kept in writing a record of the proceedings of the committee and of each subcommittee, including a record of the votes on any question on which a roll call is demanded. The result of such roll call vote shall be made available by the committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order or proposition, and whether by proxy or in person, and the names of those members present but not voting. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present.

(b) All committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the member serving as Chairman of the committee; and such records shall be the property of the House and all members of the House shall have access thereto.

RULE NO. IV.—PROXIES

(a) A vote by any member in the committee or in any subcommittee may be cast by proxy, but such proxy must be in writing. Each proxy shall designate the member who is to execute the proxy authorization and shall be limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motion pertaining thereto; except that a member may authorize a general proxy only for motions to recess, adjourn or other procedural matters. Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the member assigning his vote and shall contain the date and time of day that the proxy is signed. Proxies may not be counted for a quorum.

(b) Proxies shall be in the following form:

Hon. _____,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear _____: Anticipating that I will be absent on official business or otherwise unable to be present, I hereby authorize you to vote in my place and stead in the consideration of _____ and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto.

_____,
Member of Congress

Executed this the _____ day of _____, 19____, at the time of _____ p.m./a.m.

RULE NO. V.—POWER TO SIT AND ACT; SUBPOENA POWER

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under House Rules X and XI the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized (subject to subparagraph (b)(1) of this paragraph)—

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within or without the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings, and

(2) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such books, witnesses and the production of such records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents

as it deems necessary. The Chairman of the committee, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b)(1) A subpoena may be issued by the committee or subcommittee under subparagraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present. Such authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman of the committee or by any member designated by the committee. If a specific request for a subpoena has not been previously rejected by either the committee or a subcommittee, the Chairman of the committee, after consultation with the ranking minority members, may authorize and issue a subpoena under subparagraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, and such subpoena shall for all purposes be deemed a subpoena issued by the committee. Whenever a subpoena is issued under this subparagraph, as soon as practicable thereafter, the Chairman shall notify all members of the committee of such action.

(2) Compliance with any subpoena issued by the committee or subcommittee under subparagraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

(c) Each witness who has been subpoenaed, upon the completion of his testimony before the committee or any subcommittee, may report to the office of counsel of the committee, may report to the office of counsel of the committee, and there sign appropriate vouchers for travel allowances and attendance fees. If hearings are held in cities other than Washington, D.C., the witness may contact the counsel of the committee, or his representative, prior to leaving the hearing room.

RULE NO. VI.—QUORUMS

(a) One-third of the members of the committee or a subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action other than the closing of a meeting pursuant to subparagraph (f) of committee Rule II, the authorizing of a subpoena pursuant to subparagraph (b) of committee Rule V, the reporting of a measure or recommendation pursuant to subparagraph (b)(1) of committee Rule VIII, and the actions described in subparagraph (b), (c) and (d) of this Rule.

(b) A majority of the members of the committee or a subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the reporting of a measure or recommendation.

(c) A majority of the members of the committee or a subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for approval of any of the following actions:

(1) Construction, alteration, purchase or acquisition of a public building involving an expenditure in excess of $500,000 and lease of space at an average annual rental in excess of $500,000 (section 2 of P.L. 92-313, 40 U.S.C. 606).

(2) Survey investigation of a proposed project for navigation, flood control, and other purposes by the Corps of Engineers (section 4 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 4, 1913, 33 U.S.C. 542).

(3) Construction of a water resources development project by the Corps of Engineers with an estimated Federal cost not exceeding $15,000,000 (section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1965, as amended).

(4) Continuation of the authorization of a water resources development project to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers where such project has been recommended for deauthorization pursuant to the provisions of section 12 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974.

(5) Deletion of water quality storage in a Federal reservoir project where the benefits attributable to water quality are 15 percent or more but not greater than 25 percent of the total project benefits (section 65 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974).

(6) Authorization of a Soil Conservation Service watershed project involving any single structure of more than 4,000 acre feet of total capacity (section 2 of P.L. 566, 83rd Congress, as amended).

(d) Two members of the committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

RULE NO. VII.—HEARING PROCEDURES

(a) The Chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the committee, and the appropriate subcommittee chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event the chairman or the subcommittee chairman whichever the case may be shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) So far as practicable, each witness who is to appear before the committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the committee, at least 2 working days before

the day of his appearance, a written statement of his proposed testimony and shall limit his oral presentation to a summary of his statement.

(c) When any hearing is conducted by the committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of those minority members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

(d) Upon announcement of a hearing, to the extent practicable the Clerk and Staff Director shall cause to be prepared a concise summary of the subject matter (including legislative reports and other material) under consideration which shall be made available immediately to all members of the committee. In addition, upon announcement of a hearing and subsequently as they are received, the Chairman shall make available to the members of the committee any official reports from departments and agencies on such matter.

(e) All other members of the committee may have the privilege of sitting with any subcommittee during its hearing or deliberations and may participate in such hearings or deliberations, but no such member who is not a member of the subcommittee shall vote on any matter before such subcommittee.

(f) Committee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the chairman for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The 5-minute period for questioning a witness by any one member can be extended only with the unanimous consent of all members present. The questioning of witness in both full and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the chairman, followed by the ranking minority party member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority nor the members of the minority. The chairman may accomplish this by recognizing two majority members for each minority member recognized.

(g) The following additional rules shall apply to investigative hearings:

(1) The Chairman at an investigative hearing shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the investigation.

(2) A copy of the committee rules and this clause shall be made available to each witness.

(3) Witnesses at investigative hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

(4) The Chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(5) Whenever it is asserted that the evidence or testimony at an investigatory hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person,

(A) such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session, notwithstanding the provisions of clause (f) (2) of Rule No. II, if by a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, the committee determines that such evidence or testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; and

(B) the committee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if a majority of the members of the committee, a majority being present, determine that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, or incriminate any person.

In either case the committee shall afford such person an opportunity to voluntarily to appear as a witness; and receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.

(6) Except as provided in subparagraph (5), Chairman shall receive and the committee shall dispose of requests to subpoena additional witnesses.

(7) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions witout the consent of the committee.

(8) In the discretion of the committee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The committee is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearing.

(9) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the committee.

(10) No major investigation by a subcommittee shall be initiated without approval of a majority of such subcommittee.

RULE NO. VIII.—PROCEDURES FOR REPORTING BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

(a) (1) It shall be the duty of the Chairman of the committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by the committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(2) In any event, the report of the committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee shall be filed within 7 calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the committee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the clerk of the committee shall transmit immediately to the Chairman of the committee notice of the filing of that request.

(b) (1) No measure or recommendation shall be reported from the committee unless a majority of the committee was actually present.

(2) With respect to each roll call vote on a motion to report any bill or resolution of a public character, the total number of votes cast for, and the total number of votes cast against, the reporting of such bill or resolution shall be included in the committee report.

(c) The report of the committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee shall include

(1) the oversight findings and recommendations required pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of Rule X of the House separately set out and clearly identified;

(2) the statement required by section 308 (a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and clearly identified, if the measure provides new budget authority or new or increased tax expenditures;

(3) the estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 403 of such Act, separately set out and clearly identified, whenever the Director (if timely submitted prior to the filing of the report) has submitted such estimate and comparison to the committee; and

(4) a summary of the oversight findings and recommendations made by the Committee on Government Operations under clause 4(c)(2) of Rule X of the House separately set out and clearly identified whenever such findings and recommendations have been submitted to the legislative committee in a timely fashion to allow an opportunity to consider such findings and recommendations during the committee's deliberations on the measure.

(d) Each report of the committee on each bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by the committee shall contain a detailed analytical statement as to whether the enactment of such bill or joint resolution into law may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy.

(e) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the committee, any member of the committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that member, with the clerk of the committee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the committee with respect to that measure or matter. The report of the committee upon that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume which—

(1) shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views which have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report, and

(2) shall bear upon its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views (and any material submitted under subdivisions (3) and (4) of subparagraph (c) are included as part of the report.

This subparagraph does not preclude—

(A) the immediate filing or printing of a committee report unless timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided by this subparagraph; or

(B) the filing by any such committee of any supplemental report upon any measure or matter which may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by that committee upon that measure or matter.

(f) (1) All committee and subcommittee prints, reports, documents, or other materials, not otherwise provided for under Rule VIII, that purport to express publicly views of the committee or any of its subcommittees or members of the committee or its subcommittees shall be approved by the committee or the subcommittee prior to printing and distribution and any member shall be given an opportunity to have views included as part of such material prior to printing, release and distribution in accordance with subparagraph (e) of this rule.

(2) No committee or subcommittee document containing views other than those of members of the committee or subcommittee shall be published without approval of the committee or subcommittee.

RULE NO. IX.—OVERSIGHT

(a) In order to assist the House in:

(1) its analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of (A) the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of the laws enacted by the Congress, or (B) conditions and circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation, and

(2) its formulation, consideration, and enactment of such modifications or changes in those laws, and of such additional legislation, as may be necessary or appropriate, there shall be in conformity with Rule XV a Subcommittee on Oversight and Review.

(b) The Subcommittee on Oversight and Review and the appropriate subcommittee with legislative authority shall cooperatively review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the

jurisdiction of the committee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof, in order to determine whether such laws and the programs thereunder are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of the Congress and whether such programs should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated. In addition, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Review and the appropriate subcommittee with legislative authority shall cooperatively review and study any conditions or circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation within the jurisdiction of the committee (whether or not any bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto), and shall on a continuing basis undertake future research and forecasting on matters within the jurisdiction of the committee. The Subcommittee on Oversight and Review shall in no way limit the responsibility of the subcommittees from carrying out their oversight responsibilities.

(c) The Subcommittee on Oversight and Review and the appropriate subcommittee with legislative authority shall cooperatively review and study on a continuing basis the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within the jurisdiction of the committee.

RULE NO. X.—REVIEW OF CONTINUING PROGRAMS; BUDGET ACT PROVISIONS

(a) The committees shall, in its consideration of all bills and joint resolutions of a public character within its jurisdiction, insure that appropriations for continuing programs and activities of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia government will be made annually to the maximum extent feasible and consistent with the nature, requirements, and objectives of the programs and activities involved. For the purposes of this paragraph a Government agency includes the organizational units of government listed in clause 7(d) of Rule XIII of House Rules.

(b) The committee shall review, from time to time, each continuing program within its jurisdiction for which appropriations are not made annually in order to ascertain whether such programs could be modified so that appropriations therefor would be made annually.

(c) The committee shall, on or before March 15 of each year, submit to the Committee on the Budget (1) its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year which are within its jurisdiction or functions, and (2) an estimate of the total amounts of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction which it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

(d) As soon as practicable after a concurrent resolution on the budget for any fiscal year is agreed to, the committee (after consulting with the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate) shall subdivide any allocations made to it in the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on such resolution, and promptly report such subdivisions to the House, in the manner provided by section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) Whenever the committee is directed in in a concurrent resolution on the budget to determine and recommend changes in laws, bills, or resolutions under the reconicliation process it shall promptly make such determination and recommendations, and report a reconciliation bill or resolution (or both) to the House or submit such recommendations to the Committee on the Budget, in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

RULE NO. XI.—BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

(a) It is the purpose of this clause to provide a means, in conformity with acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, and decorum, by which committee hearings, or committee meetings, which are open to the public may be covered, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage—

(1) for the education, enlightenment, and information of the general public, on the basis of accurate and impartial news coverage, regarding the operations, procedures, and practices of the House as a legislative and representative body and regarding the measures, public issues, and other matters before the House and its committees, the consideration thereof, and the action taken thereon; and

(2) for the development of the perspective and understanding of the general public with respect to the role and function of the House under the Constitution of the United States as an organ of the Federal Government.

(b) In addition, it is the intent of this clause that radio and television tapes and television film of any coverage under this clause shall not be used, or made available for use, as partisan political campaign material to promote or oppose the candidacy of any person for elective public office.

(c) It is, further, the intent of this clause that the general conduct of each meeting (whether of a hearing or otherwise) covered, under authority of this clause, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, and the personal behavior of the committee members and staff, other Government officials and personnel, witnesses, television, radio, and press media personnel, and the general public at the hearing or other meeting shall be in strict conformity with and observance of the acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, courtesy, and decorum traditionally observed by the House in its operations and shall not be such as to—

(1) distort the objects and purposes of the hearings or other meeting or the activities of committee members in connection with that hearing or meeting or in connection with the general work of the committee or of the House; or

(2) cast discredit or dishonor on the House, the committee, or any member or bring the House, the committee, or any member into disrepute.

(d) The coverage of committee hearings and meetings by television broadcast, radio broadcast, or still photography is a privilege made available by the House and shall be permitted and conducted only in strict conformity with the purposes, provisions, and requirements of this clause.

(e) Whenever any hearing or meeting conducted by any committee of the House is open to the public, that committee may permit, by majority vote of the committee, that hearing or meeting to be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, but only under such written rules as the committee may adopt in accordance with the purposes, provisions, and requirements of this clause.

(f)(1) If the television or radio coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) No witness served with a subpoena by the committee shall be required against his or her will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television, is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off. This subparagraph is supplementary to subparagraph (g)(5) of Rule VII, relating to the protection of the rights of witnesses.

(3) Not more than four televisfon cameras, operating from fixed positions, shall be permitted in a hearing or meeting room. The allocation among the television media of the positions of the number of television cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(4) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(5) Television cameras shall not be placed in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

(6) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the committee is in session.

(7) Floodlights, spotlights, strobelights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the hearing or meeting room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing or the meeting at the then current state of the art of television coverage.

(8) Not more than five press photographers shall be permitted to cover a hearing or meeting by still photography. In the selection of these photographers, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos and United Press International Newspictures. If request is made by more than five of the media for coverage of the hearing or meeting by still photography that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(9) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting, between the witness table and the members of the committee.

(10) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(11) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents Galleries.

(12) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be then currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(13) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

RULE NO. XI.—COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE BUDGETS

(a) The Chairman, in consultation with the chairman of each subcommittee, the majority members of the committee and the minority membership of the committee, shall, for each session of the Congress, prepare a consolidated committee budget. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, for necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the full committee and its subcommittees.

(b) Authorization for the payment of additional or unforeseen committee and subcommittees' expenses may be procured by one or more additional expense resolutions

processed in the same manner as set out herein.

(c) The Chairman or any chairman of a subcommittee may initiate necessary travel requests as provided in Rule XIV within the limits of the consolidated budget as approved by the House and the Chairman may execute necessary vouchers thereof.

(d) Once monthly, the Chairman shall submit to the Committee on House Administration, in writing, a full and detailed accounting of all expenditures made during the period since the last such accounting from the amount budgeted to the full committee. Such report shall show the amount and purpose of such expenditure and the budget to which such expenditure is attributed. A copy of such monthly report shall be available in the committee office for review by members of the committee.

RULE NO. XIII.—COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE STAFF

(a) The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be appointed and their remuneration determined in such manner as the minority members of the committee shall determine within the budget approved for such purposes; Provided, however, that no minority staff person shall be compensated at a rate which exceeds that paid his or her majority party staff counterpart.

(b) The professional and clerical employees of the committee not assigned to a subcommittee or to the minority under the above provision shall be appointed, and may by removed, and their remuneration determined by the Chairman.

(c) The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the ranking minority party member of the full committee who may delegate such authority as he determines appropriate.

(d) The professional and clerical staff of the committee not assigned to a subcommittee or to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he determines appropriate.

(e) It is intended that the skills and experience of all members of the committee staff shall be available to all members of the committee.

(f) (1) The chairman of each standing subcommittee of this committee is authorized to appoint one staff member who shall serve at the pleasure of the subcommittee chairman.

(2) The ranking minority member of each standing subcommittee on this committee is authorized to appoint one staff person who shall serve at the pleasure of the ranking minority party member.

(3) The staff members appointed pursuant to the provisions of subparagraphs (1) and (2) shall be compensated at a rate determined by the subcommittee chairman not to exceed (A) 75 per centum of the maximum established in paragraph (c) of clause 6 of House Rule XI: Provided, however, a staff person apponted by a ranking minority member shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed that paid his or her majority party staff counterpart.

(4) Subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) shall apply to six subcommittees only, and no member shall appoint more than one person pursuant to the above provisions.

(5) The staff positions made available to the subcommittee chairmen and ranking minority party members pursuant to subparagraphs (1) and (2) shall be made availalbe from the staff positions provided under clause 6 of House Rule XI unless such staff positions are made available pursuant to a primary or additional expense resolution.

(6) Except as provided by the above provisions, the professional and clerical members of the subcommittee staffs shall be appointed, and may be removed, and their remuneration determined by the subcommittee chairman in consultation with and with the approval of a majority of the majority members of the subcommittee, and with the approval of the chairman.

(7) The professional and clerical staff of a subcommittee shall be under the supervision and direction of the chairman of that subcommittee.

RULE NO. XIV.—TRAVEL OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

(a) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern travel of committee members and staff. Travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the full committee for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the chairman. Travel may be authorized by the chairman for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the committee of any subcommittee thereof and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the committee. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following:

(1) The purpose of the travel;

(2) The dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the travel is being made;

(3) The location of the event for which the travel is to be made;

(4) The names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b) In the case of travel of members and staff of a subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, and investigations involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of such subcommittee to be paid for out of funds allocated to such subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the subcommittee chairman and the Chairman. Such prior authorization shall be given by the Chairman only upon the representation by the applicable chairman of the subcommittee in writing setting forth those items enumerated in (1), (2), (3), and (4) of paragraph (a) and in addition thereto setting forth that subcommittee funds are available to cover the expenses of the person or persons being authorized by the subcommittee chairman to undertake the travel and that there has been a compliance where applicable with Rule VII of the committee.

(c) (1) In the case of travel outside the United States of members and staff of the committee or of a subcommittee for the purpose of conducting hearings, investigations, studies, or attending meetings and conferences involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of the committee or pertinent subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the Chairman, or, in the case of a subcommittee from the subcommittee chairman and the Chairman. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chairman, in writing, a request for such authorization. Each request, which shall be filed in a manner that allows for a reasonable period of time for review before such travel is scheduled to begin, shall include the following:

(A) the purpose of the travel;

(B) the dates during which the travel will occur;

(C) the names of the countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each;

(D) an agenda of anticipated activities for each country for which travel is authorized together with a description of the purpose to be served and the areas of committee jurisdiction involved; and

(E) the names of members and staff for whom authorization is sought.

(2) Requests for travel outside the United States may be initiated by the Chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee (except that individuals may submit a request to the Chairman for the purpose of attending a conference or meeting) and shall be limited to members and permanent employees of the committee.

(3) At the conclusion of any hearing, investigation, study, meeting or conference for which travel outside the United States has been authorized pursuant to this rule, each subcommitte (or members and staff attending meetings or conferences) shall submit a written report to the Chairman covering the activities and other pertinent observations or information gained as a result of such travel, when requested by the Chairman.

(d) Members and staff of the committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, or regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel.

RULE NO. XV.—NUMBER AND JURISDICTION OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) There shall be 6 standing subcommittees. All proposed legislation and other matters related to the subcommittees listed under standing subcommittees named below shall be referred to such subcommittees, respectively:

(1) Subcommittee on Aviation

(2) Subcommittee on Economic Development

(3) Subcommittee on Oversight and Review

(4) Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds

(5) Subcommittee on Surface Transportation

(6) Subcommittee on Water Resources

(b) The committee may provide for such additional subcommittees as determined to be appropriate; Provided, however, that such additional subcommittees are approved by a majority of the majority members on the committee.

RULE NO. XVI.—POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of full committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible.

(b) Whenever a subcommittee has ordered a bill, resolution, or other matter to be reported to the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee reporting the bill, resolution, or matter to the full committee, or any member authorized by the subcommittee to do so, may report such bill, resolution, or matter to the committee. It shall be the duty of the chairman of the subcommittee to report or cause to be reported promptly such bill, resolution, or matter, and to take or cause to be taken the necessary steps to bring such bill, resolution, or matter to a vote.

(c) In any event, the report of any subcommittee on a measure which has been approved by the subcommittee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the subcommittee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any request, the clerk of the committee shall transmit im-

mediately to the chairman of the subcommittee notice of the filing of that request.

(d) All committee or subcommittee reports printed pursuant to legislative study or investigation and not approved by a majority vote of the committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, shall contain the following disclaimer on the cover of such report:

"This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on (or pertinent subcommittee thereof) and may not therefore necessarily reflect the views of its members."

(e) Bills, resolutions, or other matters favorably reported by a subcommittee shall automatically be placed upon the agenda of the committee as of the time they are reported and where practicable shall be considered by the full committee in the order in which they were reported unless the committee shall by majority vote otherwise direct. No bill reported by a subcommittee shall be considered by the full committee unless it has been delivered to the offices of all members at least 48 hours prior to the meeting, unless the chairman determines that such bill is of such urgency that it should be given early consideration. Where practicable, such bills, resolutions, or other matters shall be accompanied by a comparison with present law and a section-by-section analysis of the proposed change.

RULE NO. XVII.—REFERRAL OF LEGISLATION TO SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Each bill, resolution, investigation, or other matter which relates to a subject listed under the jurisdiction of any subcommittee named in Rule XV referred to or initiated by the full committee shall be referred by the Chairman to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks, unless, by majority vote of the majority members of the full committee, consideration is to be by the full committee.

(b) Referral to a subcommittee shall not be made until three days shall have elapsed after written notification of such proposed referral to all subcommittee chairmen, at which time such proposed referral shall be made unless one or more subcommittee chairmen shall have given written notice to the Chairman of the full committee and to the chairman of each subcommittee that he intends to question such proposed referral at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the committee, or at a special meeting of the committee called for that purpose at which time referral shall be made by the majority members of the committee. All bills shall be referred under his rule to the subcommittee of proper jurisdiction without regard to whether the author is or is not a member of the subcommittee. A bill, resolution, or other matter referred to a subcommittee in accordance with this rule may be recalled therefrom at any time by a vote of the majority members of the committee for the committee's direct consideration or for reference to another subcommittee.

(c) In carrying out Rule XVII with respect to any matter, the Chairman may refer the matter simultaneously to two or more subcommittees, consistent with Rule XV, for concurrent consideration or for consideration in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations in the case of any subcommittee after the first), or divide the matter into two or more parts (reflecting different subjects and jurisdictions) and refer each such part to a different subcommittee, or refer the matter to a special ad hoc subcommittee appointed by the Chairman (from the members of the subcommittee having legislative jurisdiction) for the specific purpose of considering that matter and reporting to the full committee thereon, or make such other provisions as may be considered appropriate.

RULE NO. XVIII.—SIZES AND PARTY RATIOS ON SUBCOMMITTEES AND CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

(a) To the extent that the number of subcommittees and their party ratios permit, the size of all subcommittees shall be established so that the majority party members of the committee have an equal number of subcommittee assignments; Provided, however, that a member may waive his or her right to an equal number of subcommittee assignments on the committee; and provided further, that the majority party members may limit the number of subcommittee assignments of the Chairman and the subcommittee chairman in order to equalize committee workloads.

(b) On each subcommittee there shall be a ratio of majority party members to minority party members which shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the full committee. In calculating the ratio of majority party members to minority party members, there shall be included all *ex officio* voting members of the subcommittees.

(c) Following shall be the sizes and majority/minority ratios for subcommittees:

(1) Subcommittee on Aviation: (26 members) (17 majority; 9 minority).

(2) Subcommittee on Economic Development: (23 members) (15 majority; 8 minority).

(3) Subcommittee on Oversight and Review: (23 members) (15 majority; 8 minority).

(4) Subcommittee on Public Buildings ings and Grounds: (23 members) (15 majority; 8 minority).

(5) Subcommittee on Surface Transportation: (27 members) (18 majority; 9 minority).

(6) Subcommittee on Water Resources: (27 members) (18 majority; 9 minority).

(d) The full committee Chairman shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees the names of those members (1) selected by the majority party members of the committee in a manner determined by them, and (2) selected by the minority. Provided, however, that recommendations of conferees to the Speaker shall provide a ratio of majority party members to minority party members which shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the full committee.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a) of rule XI of the rules of the House, and at the request of the chairman, I submit the rules of the Committee on Education and Labor for printing in the RECORD:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, 96TH CONGRESS, RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

INTRODUCTION

The rules of the Education and Labor Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives have been promulgated and adopted in conformity with House Resolution 5 of the Ninety-sixth Congress, and are consistent with the rules adopted by the Democratic Caucus of the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives for the Ninety-fifth Congress and in other respects preserve those provisions of the rules and reforms governing the Committee for the previous Congress.

Paragraph (k)(2) of clause 2 of rule XI, Rules of the House of Representatives, provides that a copy of the committee rules and clause 2 of rule XI shall be made available to witnesses before the committee.

This print is furnished in accordance with that requirement.

RULE 1. REGULAR AND SPECIAL MEETINGS.—(a) Regular meetings of the committee shall be held on the second and fourth Tuesdays of each month at 9:45 a.m., while the Congress is in session. When the Chairman believes that the committee will not be considering any bill or resolution before the committee and that there is no other business to be transacted at a regular meeting, he will give each member of the committee, as far in advance of the day of the regular meeting as the circumstances make practicable, a written notice to that effect and no committee meeting shall be held on that day.

(b) The Chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the conduct of other committee business. The committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to that call of the Chairman.

(c) If at least three members of the committee desire that a special meeting of the committee be called by the Chairman, those members may file in the offices of the committee their written request to the Chairman for that special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matter to be considered. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the clerk of the committee shall notify the Chairman of the filing of the request. If, within three calendar days after the filing of the request the Chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held within seven calendar days after the filing of the request a majority of the members of the committee may file in the offices of the committee their written notice that a special meeting of the committee will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measure or matter to be considered at that special meeting. The committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the clerk of the committee shall notify all members of the committee that such meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered; and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting.

(d) All legislative meetings of the committee and its subcommittees shall be open. No business meeting of the committee, other than regularly scheduled meetings, may be held without each member being given reasonable notice. Such meeting shall be called to order and presided over by the Chairman, or in the absence of the Chairman, by the ranking majority party member of the committee present.

RULE 2. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES.—Committee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chairman for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The 5-minute period for questioning a witness by any one member can be extended only with the unanimous consent of all members present. The questioning of witnesses in both committee and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the Chairman, followed by the ranking minority party member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority party. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority party members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to place the members of the majority party in a disadvantageous position. The Chairman may accomplish this by recognizing two majority party members for each minority party member recognized.

RULE 3. RECORDS AND ROLLCALLS.—Written records shall be kept of the proceedings of

the committee and of each subcommittee, including a record of the votes on any question on which a rollcall is demanded. The result of each such rollcall vote shall be made available by the committee or subcommittee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the committee or subcommittee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and whether by proxy or in person, and the names of those members present but not voting. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member.

RULE 4. STANDING SUBCOMMITTEES, SIZE, RATIO AND JURISDICTION.—(a) There shall be eight standing subcommittees with the following jurisdictions:

(1) Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education.—Education from preschool through the high school level and vocational education.

Including, but not limited to: Elementary and secondary education generally, vocational education, school lunch and child nutrition, adult basic education, migrant and agricultural labor education, and overseas dependent schools.

The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education shall consist of 15 Members, 10 from the Majority and five from the Minority.

(2) Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations.—Relationship between employer and employee and their representatives.

Including, but not limited to: Labor-management relations generally, Bureau of Labor Statistics, pension reform (ERISA), and Service Contract Act.

The Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations shall consist of 18 Members, 12 from the Majority and six from the Minority.

(3) Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities.—Comprehensive employment and training, work incentive and equal employment opportunities.

Including, but not limited to: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, equal employment opportunities, Humphrey-Hawkins, displaced homemakers, Wagner-Peyser (employment services), Youth Conservation Corps, Young Adult Conservation Corps, import trade impact, plant relocation impact, Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act, and WIN.

The Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities shall consist of 10 Members, seven from the Majority and three from the Minority.

(4) Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education.—Education beyond the high school level.

Including, but not limited to: Higher education generally, education professions development, postsecondary student assistance, arts and humanities, museums, and library services and construction.

The Subcommittee on Potsecondary Education shall consist of 16 Members, 11 from the Majority and five from the Minority.

(5) Subcommittee on Health and Safety.—Workers' health and safety.

Including, but not limited to: Occupational safety and health, mine health and safety, youth camp safety, and migrant and agricultural labor health and safety.

The Subcommittee on Health and Safety shall consist of nine Members, six from the Majority and three from the Minority.

(6) Subcommittee on Select Education.—Special education programs.

Including, but not limited to: Alcohol and drug abuse, education of the handicapped, rehabilitation, environmental education, National Institute of Education, migrant and agricultural labor day care, child adoption, child abuse, domestic violence, domestic volunteers, ACTION (excluding volunteer older Americans programs).

The Subcommittee on Select Education shall consist of 12 Members, eight from the Majority and four from the Minority.

(7) Subcommittee on Labor Standards.—Wages and hours of labor.

Including, but not limited to: Davis-Bacon Act, Walsh-Healey Act, Fair Labor Standards Act (including child labor), workers' compensation generally, Longshoremen and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, Federal employees compensation.

The Subcommittee on Labor Standards shall consist of nine Members, six from the Majority and three from the Minority.

(8) Subcommittee on Human Resources.—All matters dealing with programs and services for the elderly, for the elimination of poverty and for the care and treatment of children, exclusive of education programs.

Including, but not limited to: Economic Opportunity and Community Services Acts (Headstart, Community Services, etc.), Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Runaway Youth Act, early childhood services, nutrition programs for the elderly, and older Americans.

The Subcommittee on Human Resources shall consist of eight Members, five from the Majority and three from the Minority.

(b) The Majority party Members of the Committee may provide for such special and select subcommittees as determined to be appropriate.

RULE 5. EX OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP.—The Chairman of the Committee and the ranking Minority party Member of the Committee shall be ex officio members of each Subcommittee established pursuant to Rule 4."

RULE 6. SPECIAL ASSIGNMENT OF MEMBERS.—To facilitate the oversight and other legislative and investigative activities of the committee, the Chairman of the committee may, at the request of a subcommittee chairman, make a temporary assignment of any member of the committee to such subcommittee for the purpose of enabling such member to participate in any public hearing, investigation, or study by such subcommittee to be held outside of Washington. Any member of the committee may attend public hearings of any subcommittee and shall be afforded an opportunity by the subcommittee chairman to question witnesses.

RULE 7. SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMANSHIP.—The majority party members of the committee shall have the right, in order of full committee seniority, to bid for subcommittee chairmanships. Any such request shall be subject to approval by a majority of those present and voting in the majority party caucus of the committee. Members so elected shall be chairman of their respective subcommittees.

RULE 8. SUBCOMMITTEE SCHEDULING.—Subcommittee chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible. Available dates for subcommittee meetings during the session shall be assigned by the Chairman to the subcommittees as nearly as practicable in rotation and in accordance with their workloads.

RULE 9. SUBCOMMITTEE RULES.—The rules of the committee shall be the rules of its subcommittees.

RULE 10. COMMITTEE STAFFS.—Except as provided in Rule XI, clause 5(d) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the staff of the House Committee on Education and Labor shall be appointed as follows:

A. The subcommittee staff shall be appointed, and may be removed, and their remuneration determined by the subcommittee chairman in consultation with and with the approval of the majority party members of the subcommittee within the budget approved for the subcommittee by the full committee;

B. The staff assigned to the minority shall be appointed and their remuneration determined in such manner as the minority party members of the committee shall determine within the budget approved for such purposes by the committee;

C. The employees of the committee not assigned to a standing subcommittee or to the minority under the above provisions shall be appointed, and may be removed, and their remuneration determined by the Chairman in consultation with and with the approval of the majority party members of the committee within the budget approved for such purposes by the committee.

RULE 11. SUPERVISION, DUTIES OF COMMITTEE STAFFS.—The staff of a subcommittee shall be under the general supervision and direction of the chairman of that subcommittee. The staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority party members of the committee who may delegate such authority as they determine appropriate. The staff of the committee not assigned to a subcommittee or to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate authority as he determines appropriate.

Staff members shall be assigned to committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

RULE 12. HEARINGS PROCEDURE.—(a) The Chairman in the case of hearings to be conducted by the committee and the appropriate subcommittee chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the committee or subcommittee determines that there is a good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event the Chairman or the subcommittee chairman whichever the case may be shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) So far as practicable, each witness who is to appear before the committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the committee, at least 24 hours in advance of his appearance, a written statement of his proposed testimony and shall limit his oral presentation to a summary of his statement.

(c) When any hearing is conducted by the committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of those minority party members before the completion of such hearing, to all witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

RULE 13. MEETINGS—HEARINGS—QUORUMS.—(a) Subcommittees are authorized to hold hearings, receive exhibits, hear witnesses, and report to the committee for final action, together with such recommendations as may be agreed upon by the subcommittee. No such meetings or hearings, however, shall be held outside of Washington or during a recess or adjournment of the House without the prior authorization of the committee Chairman or a majority of a quorum of the subcommittee: *Provided*, That where feasible and practicable, 14 days notice will be given of such meeting or hearing.

(b) One-third of the members of the com-

mittee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action other than amending committee rules, closing a meeting from the public, reporting a measure or recommendations, or in the case of the committee authorizing a subpoena. For the enumerated actions a majority of the committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum. Any two members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

(c) In the absence of the chairman of the committee or a subcommittee, the ranking majority party member present shall preside.

RULE 14. SUBPOENAS.—A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or subcommittee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activitives, only when authorized by a majority of the Members of the full Committee voting, a majority being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman of the Committee or by any Member designated by the Committee.

RULE 15. REPORTS OF SUBCOMMITTEES.—(a) Whenever a subcommittee has ordered a bill, resolution, or other matter to be reported to the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee reporting the bill, resolution, or matter to the committee, or any member authorized by the subcommittee to do so, may report such bill, resolution, or matter to the committee. It shall be the duty of the chairman of the subcommittee to report or cause to be reported promptly such bill, resolution, or matter, and to take or cause to be taken the necessary steps to bring such bill, resolution, or matter to a vote.

(b) In any event, the report, described in the proviso in paragraph (*d*) of this rule, of any subcommittee on a measure which has been approved by the subcommittee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the subcommittee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the clerk of the committee shall transmit immediately to the chairman of the subcommittee notice of the filing of that request.

(c) All committee or subcommittee reports printed pursuant to legislative study or investigation and not approved by a majority vote of the committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, shall contain the following disclaimer on the cover of such report:

"This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on Education and Labor (or pertinent subcommittee thereof) and may not therefore necessarily reflect the views of its members."

(d) Bills, resolutions, or other matters favorably reported by a subcommittee shall automatically be placed upon the agenda of the committee as of the time they are reported and shall be considered by the full committee in the order in which they were reported unless the committee shall by majority vote otherwise direct: *Provided*, That no bill reported by a subcommittee shall be considered by the full committee unless it has been in the hands of all members at least 48 hours prior to the meeting, together with a comparison with present law and a section-by-section analysis of the proposed change.

RULE 16. PROXIES.—(a) A vote by any member in the committee or in any subcommittee may be cast by proxy, but such proxy must be in writing and in the hands of the chief clerk of the committee or the clerk of the subcommittee, as the case may be, during each rollcall in which they are to be voted. Each proxy shall designate the member who is to execute the proxy authorization and shall be limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto; except that a member may authorize a general proxy only for motions to recess, adjourn or other procedural matters. Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the members assigning his vote and shall contain the date and time of day that the proxy is signed. Proxies may not be counted for a quorum.

(b) Proxies shall be in the following form:

Hon. _____.

House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR_____: Anticipating that I will be absent on official business/or otherwise unable to be present, I hereby authorize you to vote in my place and stead in the consideration of _____ and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto.

_____,
Member of Congress.

Executed this the _____ day of _____, 19__, at the time of _____ p.m./a.m.

RULE 17. AUTHORIZATION FOR TRAVEL.—(a) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern travel of committee members and staff. Travel to be paid from funds set aside for the full committee for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Travel may be authorized by the Chairman for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the committee or any subcommittee thereof and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the committee.

Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following:

(1) The purpose of the travel;

(2) The dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the travel is being made;

(3) The location of the event for which the travel is to be made;

(4) The names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b) In the case of travel of members and staff of a subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, and investigations involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of such subcommittee to be paid for out of funds allocated to such subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the subcommittee chairman and the Chairman. Such prior authorization shall be given by the Chairman only upon the representation by the appropriate chairman of the subcommittee in writing setting forth those items enumerated in (1), (2), and (4) of paragraph (*a*) and in addition thereto setting forth that subcommittee funds are available to cover the expenses of the person or persons being authorized by the subcommittee chairman to undertake the travel and that there has been a compliance where applicable with Rule 12 of the committee.

(c)(1) In the case of travel outside the United States of members and staff of the committee or of a subcommittee for the purpose of conducting hearings, investigations, studies, or attending meetings and conferences involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of the committee or pertinent subcommittees prior authorization must be obtained from the Chairman, or, in the case of a subcommittee, from the subcommittee chairman and the Chairman. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chairman, in writing, a request for such authorization. Each request, which shall be filed in a manner that allows for a reasonable period of time for review before such travel is scheduled to begin, shall include the following:

(A) the purpose of the travel;

(B) the dates during which the travel will occur;

(C) the names of the countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each;

(D) an agenda of anticipated activities for each country for which travel is authorized together with a description of the purpose to be served and the areas of committee jurisdiction involved; and

(E) the names of members and staff for whom authorization is sought.

(2) Requests for travel outside the United States may be initiated by the Chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee (except that individuals may submit a request to the Chairman for the purpose of attending a conference or meeting) and shall be limited to members and permanent employees of the committee.

(3) The Chairman shall not approve a request involving travel outside the United States while the House is in session (except in the case of attendance at meetings and conferences or where circumstances warrant an exception).

(4) At the conclusion of any hearing, investigation, study, meeting or conference for which travel outside the United States has been authorized pursuant to this rule, each subcommittee (or members and staff attending meetings or conferences) shall submit a written report to the Chairman covering the activities of the subcommittee and containing the results of these activities and other pertinent observations or information gained as a result of such travel.

(d) Members and staff of the committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, or regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel, including rules, procedures and limitations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration with respect to domestic and foreign expense allowance.

(e) Prior to the Chairman's authorization for any travel the ranking minority party member shall be given a copy of the written request therefor.

RULE 18. OVERSIGHT—(a) In order to enable the Committee to carry out its responsibilities under Rule X, clause (2) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each subcommittee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof, in order to determine whether such laws and the programs thereunder are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of the Congress and whether such programs should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated. In addition, each such subcommittee shall review and study any conditions or circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee (whether or not any bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto), and shall on a continuing basis undertake future research and forecasting on matters within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee.

(b) The Chairman of the committee, consistent with Rule 4, from time to time in order to fulfill the committee's responsibility under Rule X, clause (3)(c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, shall assign matters to subcommittees for reviewing, studying, and coordinating, on a continuing basis, all laws, programs, and Government activities dealing with or involving domestic educational programs and institutions, and programs of student assistance, which are within the jurisdiction of other committees.

(c) The Chairman of the committee, consistent with Rule X, clause (2)(d) of the

Rules of the House of Representatives, shall from time to time assign matters to subcommittees for reviewing and studying on a continuing basis the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within the jurisdiction of the committee.

RULE 19. REFERRAL OF BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND OTHER MATTERS.—(a) Each bill, resolution, or other matter which relates to a subject listed under the jurisdiction of any subcommittee named in Rule 4 referred to the Committee shall be referred to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks, unless, by majority vote of the majority party members of the committee, consideration is to be by the full committee.

(b) In carrying out paragraph (a) with respect to any matter, the Chairman may refer the matter simultaneously to two or more subcommittees, consistent with Rule 4, for concurrent consideration or for consideration in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations in the case of any subcommittee), or divide the matter into two or more parts (reflecting different subjects and jurisdictions) and refer each such part to a different subcommittee, or refer the matter, pursuant to Rule 4, to a special ad hoc subcommittee, appointed by the Chairman (from the members of the subcommittees having legislative jurisdiction) for the specific purpose of considering that matter and reporting to the committee thereon, or make such other provisions as may be considered appropriate.

(c) Referral to a subcommittee shall not be made until three days shall have elapsed after written notification of such proposed referral to all subcommittee chairmen, at which time such proposed referral shall be made unless one or more subcommittee chairmen shall have given written notice to the chairman of the full committee and to the chairman of each subcommittee that he intends to question such proposed referral at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the committee, or at a special meeting of the committee called for that purpose at which time referral shall be made by the majority members of the committee. All bills shall be referred under this rule to the subcommittee of proper jurisdiction without regard to whether the author is or is not a member of the subcommittee. A bill, resolution, or other matter referred to a subcommittee in accordance with this rule may be recalled therefrom at any time by a vote of the majority members of the committee for the committee's direct consideration or for reference to another subcommittee.

RULE 20. COMMITTEE REPORTS.—(a) All committee reports on bills or resolutions shall comply with the provisions of clause 2 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) No such report shall be filed until copies of the proposed report have been available to all members at least 36 hours prior. No material change shall be made in the report distributed to members unless agreed to by majority vote: *Provided*, That any member or members of the committee may file, as part of the printed report, individual, minority, or dissenting views, without reference to the preceding provisions of this rule.

RULE 12. BUDGET AND EXPENSES.—The Chairman, in consultation with the majority party members of the committee shall, for each session of the Congress, prepare a preliminary budget. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, for necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the committee and after consultation with the minority party membership, the Chairman shall include amounts budgeted to the minority party members for staff personnel to be under the direction and supervision of the minority party, travel expenses of minority members and staff, and minority party office expenses. All travel expenses of minority party members and staff shall be paid for out of the amounts so set aside and budgeted. The chairman of each standing subcommittee, in consultation with the majority party members thereof, shall prepare a supplemental budget to include funds for each additional staff, and for such travel, investigations, etc., as may be required for the work of such subcommittee. Thereafter, the Chairman shall combine such proposals into a consolidated committee budget, and shall present the same to the committee for its approval or other action. The Chairman shall take whatever action is necessary to have the budget as finally approved by the committee duly authorized by the House. After said budget shall have been adopted, no change shall be made in such budget unless approved by the committee. The Chairman or the chairman of any standing subcommittee may initiate necessary travel requests as provided in Rule 16 within the limits of their portion of the consolidated budget as approved by the House, and the Chairman may execute necessary vouchers therefor.

Once monthly, the Chairman shall notify the committee, in writing, that a full and detailed accounting of all expenditures made during the period since the last such accounting from the amount budgeted to the committee is available to every Member in the office of the Clerk of the Committee. Such report shall show the amount and purpose of each expenditure and the budget to which such expenditure is attributed.

RULE 22. RECOMMENDATION OF RULE FOR APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES.—Whenever in the legislative process it becomes necessary to appoint conferees, the Chairman shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees the names of those members of the subcommittee which handled the legislation in the order of their seniority upon such subcommittee and such other committee members as the Chairman may designate with the approval of the majority party members. Recommendations of the Chairman to the Speaker shall provide a ratio of majority party members to minority party members no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio of majority members to minority party members on the full committee. In making assignments of minority party members as conferees the Chairman shall consult with the ranking minority party member of the committee.

RULE 23. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS.—(a) When any hearing or meeting of the committee or a subcommittee is open to the public, that hearing or meeting may be covered in whole or in part by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by other such methods of coverage. Such coverage of hearings and meetings is a privilege made available by the House and shall be permitted and conducted only in strict conformity with the purposes, provisions and requirements of clause 3 of Rule XI of the rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) The general conduct of each hearing or meeting covered under authority of this clause and the personal behavior of committee members, staff, other government officials and personnel, witnesses, television, radio and press media personnel, and the general public at the hearing or other meeting, shall be in strict conformity with and observance of the acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, courtesy, and decorum traditionally observed by the House.

(c) Persons undertaking to cover committee hearings or meetings under authority of this rule shall be governed by the following limitations:

(1) If the television or radio coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) No witness served with a subpena by the committee shall be required against his or her will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television, is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off. This subparagraph is supplementary to clause 2(k)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, relating to the protection of the rights of witnesses.

(3) Not more than four television cameras, operating from fixed positions, shall be permitted in a hearing or meeting room. The allocation among the television media of the positions of the number of television cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(4) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(5) Television cameras shall not be placed in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

(6) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the committee is in session.

(7) Floodlights, spotlights, strobelights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the hearing or meeting room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in the hearing or meeting room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing or meeting at the then current state of the art of television coverage.

(8) Not more than five press photographers shall be permitted to cover a hearing or meeting by still photography. In the selection of these photographers, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos and United Press International Newspictures. If request is made by more than five of the media for coverage of the hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(9) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting, between the witness table and the members of the committee.

(10) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(11) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(12) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be then currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(13) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

RULE 24. CHANGES IN COMMITTEE RULES.—A proposed change in these Rules shall not be considered by the committee unless the text of such change has been in the hands of all Members at least 48 hours prior to the meeting in which the matter is considered.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the requirement of rule XI, clause 2(a) of the rules of the House of Representatives, I submit herewith the rules of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the 96th Congress and ask that they be printed in the RECORD at this point. These rules were adopted by the committee in open session on February 8, 1979:

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, RULES OF PROCEDURE, 96TH CONGRESS

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule I—General Provisions

The Rules of the House are the rules of the committee and subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege in committees and subcommittees. Each subcommittee of the committee is a part of the committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of the committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

Rule II—Meetings

(a) The regular meeting day for the full committee shall be at 10 a.m. on the second Tuesday of each month, and at such other times and in such places as the chairman may designate; however, a regular Tuesday meeting of the committee may be dispensed with by the chairman.

(b) The chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the conduct of other committee business. The committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to the call of the chairman.

(c)(1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the committee or each subcommittee thereto shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public: *Provided, however:* That no person other than members of the committee and such congressional staff and such departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. This paragraph does not apply to subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, or to any meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(2) Each hearing conducted by the commitee or each subcommittee thereof shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives: *Provided, however:* That the committee or subcommittee may be the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

Rule III—Records and Roll Calls

There shall be kept in writing a record of the proceedings of the committee and of each subcommittee including a record of the votes on any question on which a roll call is demanded. The result of each such roll call vote shall be made available by the committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members present but not voting. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member. With respect to each record vote by the committee to report any bill or resolution, the total number of votes cast for and the total number of votes cast against the reporting of such bill or such resolution shall be included in the committee report.

Rule IV—Quorums

A majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum of the committee for business and a majority of the members of any subcommittee shall constitute a quorum thereof for business: *Provided,* That any two members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

Rule V—Hearing Procedures

(a) The chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the committee, and the appropriate subcommittee chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event, the chairman or the subcommittee chairman, whichever the case may be, shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) So far as practicable, each witness who is to appear before the committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the committee, at least 48 hours in advance of his or her appearance, a written statement of his or her proposed testimony and shall limit his or her oral presentation to a summary of the statement.

(c) When any hearing is conducted by the committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the chairman of a majority of those minority members before the completion of such hearing, to call such witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

(d) All other members of the committee may have the privilege of sitting with any subcommittee during its hearings or deliberations and may participate in such hearings or deliberations, but no such member who is not a member of the subcommittee shall vote on any matter before such subcommittee.

(e) Committee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the chairman that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The 5-minute period for questioning a witness by any one member can be extended only with the unanimous consent of all members present. The questioning of witnesses in both full and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the chairman, followed by the ranking minority party member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

Rule VI—Oversight

(a) In order to assist the House in:

(1) Its analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of (A) the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of the laws enacted by the Congress, or (B) conditions and circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation, and

(2) its formulation, consideration and enactment of such modifications or changes in those laws, and of such additional legislation, as may be necessary or appropriate, the various subcommittees, consistent with their jurisdiction as set forth in Rule VIII, shall have oversight responsibilities as provided in paragraph (b).

(b) Each subcommittee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof, in order to determine whether such laws and the programs thereunder are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of the Congress and whether such programs should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated.

In addition, each such subcommittee shall review and study any conditions or circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee (whether or not any bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto), and shall on a continuing basis undertake future research and forecasting on matters within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee.

(c) Each subcommittee shall review and study on a continuing basis the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within its jurisdictions.

Rule VII—Broadcasting of Committee Hearings

Broadcasting, either by radio or TV of all open committee hearings and meetings shall be permitted when, in the judgment of the chairman, in consultation with the ranking minority member, such action is warranted. Photographs shall be permitted during hearings of the full committee and subcommittees as the chairman decides.

All coverage shall be subject to the following provisions:

(1) If the television or radio coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) No witness served with a subpoena by the committee shall be required against his or her will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television, is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off.

(3) Not more than four television cameras, operating from fixed positions, shall be permitted in a hearing or meeting room. The allocation among the television media of the positions of the number of cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(4) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(5) Television cameras shall not be placed

in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by other media.

(6) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the committee is in session.

(7) Floodlights, spotlights, strobelights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the hearing or meeting room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in the hearing or meeting room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing or meeting at the then current state of the art of television coverage.

(8) Not more than five press photographers shall be permitted to cover a hearing or meeting by still photography. In the selection of these photographers, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos and United Press International Newspictures. If request is made by more than five of the media for coverage of the hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Sttanding Committee of Press Photographers.

(9) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting, between the witness table and the members of the committee.

(10) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(11) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(12) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be then currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(13) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

Rule VIII—Number and Jurisdiction of Subcommittees

(a) There shall be five standing subcommittees as follows: Compensation, Pension, Insurance, and Memorial Affairs; Education, Training and Employment; Medical Facilities and Benefits; Housing; and Special Investigations. All proposed legislation and other matters related to the subcommittees listed under standing subcommittees named below shall be referred to such subcommittees, respectively:

Compensation, Pension, Insurance and Memorial Affairs: Compensation, pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special, and life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces; cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried, whether in the United States or abroad, except cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior, and burial benefits.

Education, Training and Employment: Education of veterans, vocational rehabilitation, and readjustment of servicemen to civilian life.

Medical Facilities and Benefits: Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

Housing: Veterans' housing programs.

Special Investigations: Investigative authority over matters that come within the jurisdiction of more than one legislative subcommittee, and that are referred to the subcommittee by the chairman for investigation and appropriate recommendations.

(b) The chairman and the ranking minority member shall serve as ex-officio members of all subcommittees and shall have the right to vote on all matters before the subcommittee.

Rule IX—Powers and Duties of Subcommittees

(a) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of full committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible.

(b) Whenever a subcommittee has ordered a bill, resolution, or other matter to be reported to the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee reporting the bill, resolution, or matter to the full committee, or any member authorized by the subcommittee to do so, may report such bill, resolution, or matter to the committee. It shall be the duty of the chairman of the subcommittee to report or cause to be reported promptly such bill, resolution, or matter, and to take or cause to be taken the necessary steps to bring such bill, resolution, or matter to a vote.

(c) In any event, the report of any subcommittee on a measure which has been approved by the subcommittee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the subcommittee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any request, the clerk of the committee shall transmit immediately to the chairman of the subcommittee notice of the filing of that request.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS

(Mr. REUSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, I submit herewith for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the rules of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, which were adopted on January 31, 1979, in accordance with clause 2(a) of House rule XI:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS, COMMITTEE RULES, 96TH CONGRESS, 1979–80

RULES FOR THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Rule No. I.—General provisions

(a) The Rules of the House are the rules of the committees and subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege in committee and subcommittees. Each subcommittee of the committee is a part of the committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of the committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

(b) The committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under rule X of House Rules and (subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by rule XI, clause 5 of the House Rules) to incure expenses (including travel expenses) in connection herewith.

(c) The committee is authorized to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the committee. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with any meeting or hearing of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House.

(d) The committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year, a report on the activities of the committee under rules X and XI of House Rules during the Congress ending at noon on January 3 of such year.

(e) The committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Congress convenes in each odd-numbered year.

Rule No. II.—Regular and special meetings: Open committee meetings

(a) Regular meetings of the committee shall be held on the first Tuesday of each month while the Congress is in session. When the chairman believes that the committee will not be considering any bill or resolution before the full committee and that there is no other business to be transacted at a regular meeting, he will give each member of the committee, as far in advance of the day of the regular meeting as the circumstances make practicable, a written notice to that effect and no committee meeting shall be held on that day.

(b) The chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the conduct of other committee business. The committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to that call of the chairman.

(c) If at least three members of the committee desire that a special meeting of the committee be called by the chairman, those members may file in the offices of the committee their written request to the chairman for that special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matter to be considered. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the clerk of the committee shall notify the chairman of the filing of the request. If, within 3 calendar days after the filing of the request, the chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held within 7 calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the committee may file in the offices of the committee their written notice that a special meeting of the committee will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measure or matter to be considered at that special meeting. The committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the clerk of the committee shall notify all members of the committee that such meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered; and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting.

(d) If the chairman of the committee or subcommittee is not present at any meeting of the committee or subcommittee the ranking member of the majority party on the committee or subcommittee who is present shall preside at that meeting.

(e) The committee may not sit, without special leave, while the House is reading a measure for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

(f)(1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the committee or each subcommittee thereof shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day be closed to the public: *Provided, however,* That no person other than members of the committee and such congressional staff and such departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed

to the public. This paragraph does not apply to open committee hearings which are provided for by clause 4(a)(3) of House Rule X or by subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, or to any meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(2) Each hearing conducted by the committee or each subcommittee thereof shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives: *Provided, however,* That the committee or subcommittee may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

(g) No person other than a Member of Congress, committee staff, or a person from a Member's staff when that Member has an amendment under consideration, may walk in or be seated at the rostrum area of the committee unless the chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee, or a majority of the committee determines otherwise.

Rule No. III.—Records and rollcalls

(a) There shall be kept in writing a record of the proceedings of the committee and of each subcommittee, including a record of the votes on any question on which a rollcall is demanded. The result of each such rollcall vote shall be made available by the committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and whether by proxy or in person, and the names of those members present but not voting. A record vote may be demanded by any three of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member. With respect to each record vote by the committee to report any bill or resolution, the name of each member voting for and voting against the motion to report, and whether by proxy or in person, and the names of those members present but not voting, and the names of those members absent, shall be included in the committee report.

(b) All committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the member serving as chairman of the committee; and such records shall be the property of the House and all Members of the House shall have access thereto.

Rule No. IV.—Proxies

(a) No vote by any member of the committee or any of its subcommittees with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy unless a proxy authorization is given in writing by the member desiring to cast a proxy, which authorization shall assert that the member is absent on official business or is absent due to personal illness and is thus unable to be present at the meeting of the committee or subcommittee and shall be limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto. Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the member assigning his/her vote and shall contain the date and time of the day that the proxy is signed. No proxy shall be voted on a motion to adjourn or shall be counted to make a quorum or be voted unless a quorum is present.

(b) Proxies shall be in the following form:

Hon._____,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear_____: I will be absent on official business/due to personal illness and thus unable to be present at the meeting of the committee or subcommittee. I hereby authorize you to vote in my place and stead in the consideration of _____ _____ and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto. The official business that necessitates my absence is_____.

_____
Member of Congress.

Executed this the _____ day of _____ _____, 19__, at the time of _____ p.m./a.m.

Rule No. V.—Power to sit and act; subpena power

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under House Rules X and XI the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized (subject to subparagraph (b)(1) of this paragraph)—

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings.

(2) In the case of such hearings which are to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary, such hearings must be authorized by a vote of a majority of the members of the full committee, a majority being present. The chairman of the committee, or any member designated by the chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b)(1) A subpena may be authorized and issued by the committee under subparagraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present. The power to authorize and issue subpenas under subparagraph (a)(2) may be delegated to the chairman of the committee pursuant to such limitations as the committee may prescribe. Authorized subpenas shall be signed by the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by the committee.

(2) Compliance with any subpena issued by the committee under subparagraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

(c) Each witness who has been subpenaed, upon the completion of his testimony before the committee or any subcommittee, may report to the office of counsel of the committee, and there sign appropriate vouchers for travel allowances and attendance fees. If hearings are held in cities other than Washington, D.C., the witness may contact the counsel of the committee, or his representatives prior to leaving the hearing room.

Rule No. VI.—Quorums

A majority of the members of the full committee or subcommittees shall constitute a quorum of the full committee or subcommittees for the reporting of a measure or recommendation: Provided, that the number of members constituting a quorum for the taking of any action other than the reporting of a measure or recommendation shall be one-third of the members of the committee or subcommittee, and any two members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

Rule No. VII.—Hearing procedures

(a) The chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the committee, and the appropriate subcommittee chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event the chairman or the subcommittee chairman whichever the case may be shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the committee shall promptly notify all members of the committee and the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) So far as practicable, each witness who is to appear before the committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the committee, at least 24 hours in advance of his appearance, 100 copies of his proposed testimony and may be required to limit his oral presentation to a summary of his statement.

(c) When any hearing is conducted by the committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the chairman by a majority of those minority members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

(d) Upon announcement of a hearing, the Clerk and Staff Director shall cause to be prepared a concise summary of the subject matter (including legislative reports and other material) under consideration which shall be made available immediately to all members of the committee. In addition, upon announcement of a hearing and subsequently as they are received, the chairman shall make available to the members of the committee any official reports from departments and agencies on such matter.

(e) All other members of the committee may have the privilege of sitting with any subcommittee during its hearings or deliberations and may participate in such hearings or deliberations after members of the subcommittee have been given an opportunity to participate, but no such member who is not a member of the subcommittee shall vote on any matter before such subcommittee.

(f) Committee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the chairman for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The 5-minute period for questioning a witness by any one member can be extended only with the unanimous consent of all members present. The questioning of witnesses in both full and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the chairman, followed by the ranking minority party member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

(g) The following additional rules shall apply to investigative hearings:

(1) The chairman at any investigative hearing shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the investigation.

(2) A copy of the committee rules and this clause shall be made available to each witness.

(3) Witnesses at investigative hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

(4) The chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(5) If the committee determines that evidence or testimony at an investigative hear-

ing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person it shall—

(A) receive such evidence or testimony in executive session;

(B) afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and

(C) receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpena additional witnesses.

(6) Except as provided in subparagraph (5), the chairman shall receive and the committee shall dispose of requests to subpena additional witnesses.

(7) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the committee.

(8) In the discretion of the committee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The committee is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearing.

(9) A witness may review and photostat a copy of his or her testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the committee.

Rule No. VIII.—Procedures for reporting bills and resolutions

(a)(1) It shall be the duty of the chairman of the committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by the committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(2) In any event, the report of the committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee shall be filed within 7 calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the committee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the clerk of the committee shall transmit immediately to the chairman of the committee notice of the filing of that request.

(b)(1) No measure or recommendation shall be reported from the committee unless a majority of the committee was actually present.

(2) With respect to each record vote by the committee to report any bill or resolution, the name of each member voting for and voting against the motion to report, and whether by proxy or in person, and the names of those members present but not voting, and the names of those members absent, shall be included in the committee report.

(c) The report of the committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee shall include—

(1) the oversight findings and recommendations required pursuant to the last sentence of clause 2(b)(1) of rule X of the House separately set out and clearly identified;

(2) the statement required by section 308 (a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and clearly identified, if the measure provides new budget authority or new or increased tax expenditures;

(3) the estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 403 of such act, separately set out and clearly identified, whenever the Director (if timely submitted prior to the filing of the report) has submitted such estimate and comparison to the committee;

(4) a summary of the oversight findings and recommendations made by the Committee on Government Operations under clause 2(b)(2) of rule X of the House separately set out and clearly identified whenever such findings and recommendations have been submitted to the legislative committee in a timely fashion to allow an opportunity to consider such findings and recommendations during the committee's deliberations on the measure.

(d) Each report of the committee on each bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by the committee shall contain a detailed analytical statement as to whether the enactment of such bill or joint resolution into law may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy.

(e) If, at the time of approval of any measure, matter or any report or submission to be made to the House or to the Committee on the Budget under subclauses (g), (h), and (i) of clause 4 of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives by the committee, any member of the committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than 3 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that member, with the clerk of the committee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the committee with respect to that measure or matter. No report shall be filed until the chairman has consulted with the ranking minority member of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee from which the legislation emanated or would have emanated. The report of the committee upon that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume which—

(1) shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views which have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report, and

(2) shall bear upon its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views (and any material submitted under subdivisions (3) and (4) of subparagraph (c)) are included as part of the report. This subparagraph does not preclude—

(A) the immediate filing or printing of a committee report unless timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided by this subparagraph; or

(B) the filing by any such committee of any supplemental report upon any measure or matter which may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by that committee upon that measure or matter.

(f) If hearings have been held on any such measure or matter so reported, the committee shall make every reasonable effort to have such hearings printed and available for distribution to the Members of the House prior to the consideration of such measure or matter in the House. This subparagraph shall not apply to—

(1) any measure for the declaration of war, or the declaration of a national emergency, by the Congress; or

(2) any executive decision, determination, or action which would become, or continue to be, effective unless disapproved or otherwise invalidated by one or both Houses of Congress.

Rule No. IX.—Oversight Subcommittee

(a) In order to assist the House in:

(1) its analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of (A) the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of the laws enacted by the Congress, or (B) conditions and circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation, and

(2) its formulation, consideration, and enactment of such modification or changes in those laws, and of such additional legislation, as may be necessary or appropriate, there shall be established in conformity with rule XV an Oversight Subcommittee.

(b) The Oversight Subcommittee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the committee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities which have responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof, in order to determine whether such laws and the programs thereunder are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of the Congress and whether such programs should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated. In addition, the Oversight Subcommittee shall review and study any conditions or circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation within the jurisdiction of the committee (whether or not any bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto), and shall on a continuing basis undertake future research and forecasting on matters within the jurisdiction of the committee. The Oversight Subcommittee shall in no way limit the responsibility of the subcommittees from carrying out their oversight responsibilities.

(c) The Oversight Subcommittee shall review and study on a continuing basis the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within the jurisdiction of the committee.

Rule No. X.—Review of continuing programs; Budget Act provisions

(a) The committee shall, in its consideration of all bills and joint resolutions of a public character within its jurisdiction, insure that appropriations for continuing programs and activities of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia government will be made annually to the maximum extent feasible and consistent with the nature, requirements, and objectives of the programs and activities involved. For the purposes of this paragraph a Government agency includes the organizational units of government listed in clause 7(d) of Rule XIII of the House Rules.

(b) The committee shall review, from time to time, each continuing program within its jurisdiction for which appropriations are not made annually in order to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations therefor would be made annually.

(c) The committee shall, on or before March 15 of each year, submit to the Committee on the Budget (1) its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year which are within its jurisdiction or functions, and (2) an estimate of the total amount of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction which it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

(d) As soon as practicable after a concurrent resolution on the budget for any fiscal year is agreed to, the committee (after consulting with the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate) shall subdivide any allocations made to it in the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on such resolution, and promptly report such subdivisions to the House, in the manner provided by section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) Whenever the committee is directed in a concurrent resolution on the budget to determine and recommend changes in laws, bills, or resolutions under the reconciliation process it shall promptly make such determination and recommendations, and report a reconciliation bill or resolution (or both) to the House or submit such recommendations to the Committee on the Budget in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Rule No. XI.—Broadcasting of committee hearings

Any meeting or hearing that is open to the public may be covered in whole or in part

by radio or television or still photography, subject to the requirements of Rule XI, clause 3 of the Rules of the House of Representatives. At all such meetings or proceedings, coverage by radio, television or still photography will be allowed unless specifically forbidden by a record vote of the committee or subcommittee. The coverage of any hearing or other proceeding of the committee or any subcommittee thereof by television, radio, or still photography shall be under the direct supervision of the chairman of the committee presiding at such hearing or other proceeding and, for good cause, may be terminated by him/her.

Rule No. XII.—Committee and subcommittee budgets

(a) The chairman, in consultation with the majority members of the committee shall, for each session of the Congress, prepare a preliminary budget. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, for necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the full committee, and after consultation with the minority membership, the chairman shall include amounts budgeted to the minority members for staff personnel to be under the direction and supervision of the minority, travel expenses of minority members and staff, and minority office expenses. All travel expenses of minority members and staff shall be paid for out of the amounts so set aside and budgeted.

(b)(1) The chairman of each subcommittee, in consultation with the majority members thereof, shall prepare a budget to include funds for staff, travel, investigations, and miscellaneous expenses as may be required for the work of the subcommittee.

(2) The chairman of each subcommittee shall control the funds provided for in the subcommittee budget.

(c) The chairman shall combine the proposals of each subcommittee with the preliminary budget of the full committee into a consolidated committee budget, and shall present the same to the committee for its approval. The chairman shall then take all action necessary to bring about its approval by the Committee on House Administration and by the House.

(d) Authorization for the payment of additional or unforeseen committee and subcommittees' expenses may be procured by one or more additional expense resolutions processed in the same manner as set out herein.

(e) The chairman, the ranking minority member of the full committee, or any chairman of a subcommittee may initiate necessary travel requests as provided in Rule XIV within the limits of their portion of the consolidated budget as approved by the House, and the chairman may execute necessary vouchers thereof.

Rule No. XIII.—Committee and subcommittee staff

(a) The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be appointed and their remuneration determined in such manner as the minority members of the committee shall determine within the budget approved for such purposes by the committee; provided, however, that no minority staff person shall be compensated at a rate which exceeds that paid his or her majority party staff counterpart.

(b) The professional and clerical employees of the committee not assigned to a subcommittee or to the minority under the above provision shall be appointed, and may be removed, and their remuneration determined by the chairman in consultation with and with the approval of the majority members of the committee within the budget approved for such purposes by the committee.

(c) The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority members of the committee who may delegate such authority as they determine appropriate.

(d) The professional and clerical staff of the committee not assigned to a subcommittee or to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he determines appropriate.

(e) It is intended that the skills and experience of all members of the committee staff be available to all members of the committee.

(f)(1) The chairman of each standing subcommittee of this committee is authorized to appoint one staff member who shall serve at the pleasure of the subcommittee chairman.

(2) The ranking minority member of each standing subcommittee on this committee is authorized to appoint one staff person who shall serve at the pleasure of the ranking minority party member.

(3) The staff members appointed pursuant to the provisions of subparagraphs (1) and (2) shall be compensated at a rate determined by the subcommittee chairman not to exceed (A) 75 per centum of the maximum established in paragraph (c) of clause G of the House Rule XI; provided, however, a staff person appointed by a ranking minority member shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed that paid his or her majority party staff counterpart.

(4) Subparagraphs (7) and (2) and (3) shall apply to six subcommittees only, and no member shall appoint more than one person pursuant to the above provisions.

(5) The staff positions made available to the subcommittee chairmen and ranking minority party members pursuant to subparagraphs (1) and (2) shall be made available from the staff positions provided under clause 6 of House Rule XI unless such staff positions are made available pursuant to a primary or additional expense resolution.

(6) Except as provided by the above provisions, the professional and clerical members of the subcommittee staffs shall be appointed, and may be removed, and their remuneration determined by the subcommittee chairman in consultation with and with the approval of a majority of the majority members of the subcommittee, and with the approval of a majority of the majority members of the full committee, wihin the budget approved for the subcommittee.

(7) The professional and clerical staff of a subcommittee shall be under the supervision and direction of the chairman of that subcommittee.

Rule No. XIV.—Travel of members and staff

(a) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolution as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern travel of committee members and staff. Travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the full committee for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the chairman. Travel may be authorized by the chairman for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the committee of any subcommittee thereof and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the committee. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the chairman in writing the following:

(1) The purpose of the travel:

(2) The dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of the events for which the travel is being made;

(3) The location of the event for which the travel is to be made;

(4) The names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b) In the case of travel of members and staff of a subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, and investigations involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of such subcommittee to be paid for out of funds allocated to such subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the subcommittee chairman, the ranking minority member of the full committee whenever minority staff is involved, and the chairman of the full committee. Such prior authorization shall be given by the chairman only upon the representation by the applicable chairman of the subcommittee in writing setting forth those items enumerated in (1), (2), (3), and (4) of paragraph (a) and in addition thereto setting forth that subcommittee funds are available to cover the expenses of the person or persons being authorized by the subcommittee chairman to undertake the travel and that there has been a compliance where applicable with Rule VII of the committee.

(c)(1) In the case of travel outside the United States of members and staff of the committee or of a subcommittee for the purpose of conducting hearings, investigations, studies, or attending meetings and conferences involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of the committee or pertinent subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the chairman or, in the case of a subcommittee from the subcommittee chairman and the chairman. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the chairman, in writing, a request for such authorization. Each request, which shall be filed in a manner that allows for a reasonable period of time for review before such travel is scheduled to begin, shall include the following:

(A) the purpose of the travel;

(B) the dates during which the travel will occur;

(C) the names of the countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each;

(D) an agenda of anticipated activities for each country for which travel is authorized together with a description of the purpose to be served and the areas of committee jurisdiction involved; and

(E) the names of members and staff for whom authorization is sought.

(2) Requests for travel outside the United States may be initiated by the chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee may be initiated by the chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee (except that individuals may submit a request to the chairman for the purpose of attending a conference or meeting).

(3) At the conclusion of any hearing, investigation, study, meeting or conference for which travel outside the United States has been authorized pursuant to this rule, each subcommittee (members and staff attending meetings or conferences) shall submit a written report to the chairman covering the activities and other pertinent observations or information gained as a result of such travel.

(d) Members and staff of the committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, or regulations of the House and the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel.

Rule No. XV.—Number and jurisdiction of subcommittees

(a) There shall be nine standing subcommittees as follows: Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy; Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development; Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization; Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs; Subcommittee on International Development Institutions and Finance; Subcommittee on Financial In-

stitutions Supervision, Regulation and Insurance; Subcommittee on International Trade, Investment and Monetary Policy; Subcommittee on General Oversight and Renegotiation; and Subcommittee on the City. All proposed legislation and other matters related to the subcommittees listed under standing subcommittees named below shall be referred to such subcommittees respectively.

Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy extends to all matters relating to monetary policy and agencies which directly or indirectly affect monetary policy, including the effect of such policy and other financial actions on interest rates, allocation of credit, and the structure and functioning of domestic and foreign financial institutions.

Further, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy extends to all private foundations and charitable trusts.

Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development extends to all matters relating to housing and mortgage credit (except programs administered by the Veterans' Administration), including mortgage and loan insurance pursuant to the National Housing Act; FHA mortgage interest rates; rural housing; housing assistance programs, secondary mortgage market programs and all other activities of FNMA, GNMA, and FHLMC; private mortgage insurance; housing construction and design standards; housing-related energy conservation; housing research and demonstration programs; financial and technical assistance for nonprofit housing sponsors; counseling and technical assistance; regulation of the housing industry (including landlord-tenant relations); real estate lending powers of financial institutions (including regulation of settlement costs); and interest charges for members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System.

The jurisdiction of the subcommittee further extends to matters relating to community development and community planning, training and research, including community development block grants; urban renewal; model cities; rehabilitation loans and grants; neighborhood facilities grants; open space land and urban beautification grants; water and sewer facilities grants; public facilities loans; national, urban or community development banks; advance acquisition of land programs; new communities assistance programs; national urban growth policies; comprehensive planning (including land use and areawide programs); community development training and fellowships; and urban research and technologies.

Further, jurisdiction of the subcommittee extends to flood insurance and related land use controls, urban property protection and reinsurance, crime insurance, and regulation of interstate land sales.

Also, the jurisdiction of the subcommittee includes FHA property improvement loans under title I of the National Housing Act which can be used to finance the preservation of historic structures; community development block grant funds authorized under title I of the 1974 Housing Act which can be used to finance the acquisition and preservation of historic properties; and section 701 comprehensive planning grants to public bodies which can be used to finance surveys of historic sites and structures.

Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization shall extend to all matters relating to financial aid to all sectors and elements within the economy, all matters relating to economic stabilization, and all defense production matters as contained in the Defense Production Act of 1959, as amended, and all related matters thereto.

Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs shall include all matters relating to consumer credit, including those matters in the Consumer Credit Protection Act dealing with truth-in-lending, extortionate credit transactions, restrictions on garnishments, reports of the National Commission on Consumer Finance, and fair credit reporting. The jurisdiction shall further include collection practices, discrimination in the extension of consumer credit, creditor remedies and debtor defenses, Federal aspects of the Uniform Consumer Credit Code, and credit cards.

The jurisdiction of the subcommittee shall further extend to matters relating to the price of consumer goods, services, and commodities; the rationing of consumer products; and hoarding.

Further, the subcommittee's jurisdiction extends to all matters relating to coins, coinage, currency and medals, including commemorative coins, commemorative medals, proof and mint sets and other special coins, Coinage Act of 1965, gold and silver, including coinage thereof (but not the par value of gold), gold medals, counterfeiting, and currency denominations and designs.

Subcommittee on International Development Institutions and Finance

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on International Development Institutions and Finance extends to all matters relating to all multilateral development lending institutions, including activities of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies as related thereto; and monetary and financial developments as they relate to the activities and objectives of such institutions.

Subcommittee on Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulation and Insurance

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulation and Insurance extends to all agencies which directly or indirectly exercise supervisory or regulatory authority in connection with, or provide deposit or other insurance for financial or other institutions, the establishment of interest rate ceilings on deposits, and all auxiliary matters affecting or arising in connection with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Reserve Board and System, the National Credit Union Administration, and the Comptroller of the Currency, together with those activities and operations of any other agency or department which relate to both domestic or foreign financial institutions.

Further, jurisdiction extends to and includes, with respect to financial institutions and the department and agencies which regulate or supervise them, all activities relating to and arising in connection with the matters of chartering, branching, mergers and acquisitions, consolidations, and conversions.

Subcommittee on International Trade, Investment and Montary Policy

The Subcommittee on International Trade, Investment and Monetary Policy shall have jurisdiction over all matters within the jurisdiction of the committee relating to international trade, including but not limited to the activities of the Export-Import Bank.

Further, the jurisdiction of the subcommittee shall extend to international investment policies, both as they relate to U.S. investments for trade purposes by citizens of the United States and investments made by all foreign entities in the United States.

Further, the subcommittee shall have jurisdiction over the International Monetary Fund, its permanent and temporary agencies, and all matters related thereto.

Subcommittee on General Oversight and Renegotiation

The Subcommittee on General Oversight and Renegotiation shall assist the House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs in appraising the administration of the laws and regulations under the jurisdiction of the committee and present such recommendations as deemed necessary to the appropriate subcommittee(s) of the committee.

Further, the subcommittee shall exercise continuing oversight of the execution by the administrative agencies concerning any of the laws the subject matter of which reside within the jurisdiction of the committee and shall study all pertinent reports, documents and data pertinent to the jurisdiction of the committee and make the necessary recommendations or reports thereon to the appropriate subcommittee(s) of the committee.

Further, the subcommittee shall have full jurisdiction over the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended.

Subcommittee on the City

The Subcommittee on the City shall be a non-legislative subcommittee to study, investigate, report on and make recommendations concerning the problems of the cities.

(b) The committee may provide for such additional subcommittees as determined to be appropriate; Provided, however, that such additional subcommittees are approved by a majority of the majority members on the committee.

(c) A member serving as chairman of any subcommittee on this committee shall not also serve as the chairman of a subcommittee on any other standing committee; Provided, however, that this provision shall not apply to members serving as subcommittee chairman on the Budget Committee; House Administration Committee; Joint Committees; or on the Small Business Commmittee who served as a subcommittee chairman on the Select Committee on Small Business as of October 8, 1974.

Rule No. XVI—Powers and duties of subcommittees

(a) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the chairman and other subcommittee chairmen and with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of full committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

(b) Whenever a subcommittee has ordered a bill, resolution, or other matter to be reported to the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee reporting the bill, resolution, or matter to the full committee, or any member authorized by the subcommittee to do so, may report such bill, resolution, or matter to the committee. It shall be the duty of the chairman of the subcommittee to report or cause to be reported promptly such bill, resolution, or matter, and to take or cause to be taken the necessary steps to bring such bill, resolution, or matter to a vote.

(c) No bill or joint resolution approved by a subcommittee shall be considered by the committee unless such measure, as approved, has been made available to all members at least two calendar days prior to the meeting, accompanied by a section-by-section analysis of such measure. The provisions of this

paragraph may be suspended by the committee by a two-thirds vote or by the chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member of the full committee.

(d) All committee or subcommittee reports printed pursuant to legislative study or investigation and not approved by a majority vote of the committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, shall contain the following disclaimer on the cover of such report.

"This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs (or pertinent subcommittee thereof) and may not therefore necessarily reflect the views of its members."

(e) Bills, resolutions, or other matters favorably reported by a subcommittee shall automatically be placed on the agenda of the committee as of the time they are reported and shall be considered by the full committee in the order in which they were reported unless the chairman, after consultation with the ranking minority member and appropriate subcommittee chairman, otherwise directs: Provided, that no bill reported by a subcommittee shall be considered by the full committee unless each member has been provided with reasonable time prior to the meeting to analyze such bill, together with a comparison with present law and section-by-section analysis of the proposed change, and a section-by-section justification.

Rule No. XVII.—Referral of legislation to subcommittees

(a) Each bill, resolution, investigation, or other matter which relates to a subject listed under the jurisdiction of any subcommittee named in Rule XV referred to or initiated by the full committee shall be referred to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within 2 weeks unless, by majority vote of the majority members of the full committee, consideration is to be by the full committee.

(b) Referral to a subcommittee shall not be made until 3 days shall have elapsed after written notification of such proposed referral to all subcommittee chairmen, at which time such proposed referral shall be made unless one or more subcommittee chairmen shall have given written notice to the chairman of the full committee and to the chairman of each subcommittee that he intends to question such proposed referral at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the committee, or at a special meeting of the committee called for that purpose at which time referral shall be made by the majority members of the committee. All bills shall be referred under this rule to the subcommittee of proper jurisdiction without regard to whether the author is or is not a member of the subcommittee. A bill, resolution, or other matter referred to a subcommittee in accordance with this rule may be recalled therefrom at any time by a vote of the majority members of the committee for the committee's direct consideration or for reference to another subcommittee.

(c) Committee reports shall be filed at such time as the committee shall determine with reasonable time allowed for members to file supplemental, individual, dissenting or other views.

(d) In carrying out Rule XVII with respect to any matter, the chairman may refer the matter simultaneously to two or more subcommittees, consistent with Rule XV, for concurrent consideration or for consideration in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations in the case of any subcommittee after the first), or divide the matter into two or more parts (reflecting different subjects and jurisdictions) and refer each such part to a different subcommittee, or refer the matter pursuant to Rule X to a special ad hoc committee appointed by the chairman (from the members of the subcommittee having legislative jurisdiction) for the specific purpose of considering that matter and reporting to the full committee thereon, or make such other provisions as may be considered appropriate.

Rule No. XVIII.—Sizes and party ratios on subcommittees and conference committees

(a) To the extent that the number of subcommittees and their party ratios permit, the size of all subcommittees shall be established so that the majority party members of the committee have an equal number of subcommittee assignments: Provided, however, that a member may waive his or her right to an equal number of subcommittee assignments on the committee: and provided further, that the majority party members may limit the number of subcommittee assignments of the chairman and the subcommittee chairmen and the minority party members may limit the number of subcommittee assignments of ranking minority party members in order to equalize committee workloads.

(b) On each subcommittee there shall be a ratio of at least two majority party members for each minority party member. In calculating the ratio of majority party members to minority party members, there shall be included all ex officio voting members of the subcommittees.

(c) Following shall be the sizes and majority/minority ratios for subcommittees:

(1) Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy: total—9. Majority—6. Minority—3.

(2) Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development: total—27. Majority—18. Minority—9.

(3) Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization: total—18. Majority—12. Minority—6.

(4) Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs: total—9. Majority—6. Minority—3.

(5) Subcommittee on International Development Institutions and Finance: total—15. Majority—10. Minority—5.

(6) Subcommittee on Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulation and Insurance: total—18. Majority—12. Minority—6.

(7) Subcommittee on International Trade, Investment and Monetary Policy: total—18. Majority—12. Minority—6.

(8) Subcommittee on General Oversight and Renegotiation: Total—12. Majority—8. Minority—4.

(9) Subcommittee on the City; Total—9. Majority—6. Minority—3.

(d) The full committee chairman, or a member designated by a majority of the majority members on the committee, shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees the names of those members (1) selected by the majority party members of the committee in a manner determined by them, and (2) selected by the minority party members of the committee in a manner determined by them. Provided, however, that recommendations of conferees to the Speaker shall provide a ratio of at least two majority party members for each minority party member.

SALES REPRESENTATIVES PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. MIKVA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Sales Representatives Protection Act together with Congressman CHARLES ROSE and Congressman BILL BRODHEAD. The bill is designed to protect sales representatives from unjustifiable termination by the business firms they represent. Sales representatives are an independent businessmen and women who do not have the benefits of workman's compensation, unemployment compensation, company sponsored retirement or pension plans, and are not eligible to bargain collectively.

The vast majority of salesmen and women work long, hard hours attracting and maintaining customers for the business firms they represent. However, they are not protected from wrongful termination from their accounts by their principals, nor are they protected from a reduction in their sales territories, which cuts their income. Finally, they are not protected from such other inequities as the conversion of their accounts to accounts serviced directly by the principal.

The bill establishes certain minimum standards to protect sales representatives from unfair conduct by their principals. The bill does not establish any regulations of any kind, nor does it interfere with the right of principal and sales representative to enter into a mutually agreeable contract. Rather, the bill permits sales representatives to bring an action in court to obtain an indemnity when they are terminated unfairly, or when they have their territories or commission rates cut without good cause.

The commissioned sales representatives serve as important assets to the American economy. They fulfill the American competitive spirit, bringing lower prices for the consumer, and adding strength and substance to our economy. It is clear that many businesses derive their profits from the hard work, and sacrifices of their commissioned representatives. We think fair and equitable public policy requires that these men and women be protected from arbitrary and unfair termination of their accounts, reductions in their sales territories without compensation, or reductions in their commission rates.●

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE TRADE FAIR ACT

(Mr. MIKVA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend the Trade Fair Act. This act allows the Secretary of Commerce to request the Secretary of the Treasury to waive duties and import taxes on goods coming into this country, if those goods are for display at fairs that the Secretary of Commerce deems to be "in the public interest." Trade fairs are excellent forums for merchants from this country and other countries to show off their expertise, display their technical prowess and foster an increase in trade. The Trade Fair Act was enacted to encourage such activities and I support that purpose.

I am troubled, however, that this act embraces a kind of trade fair that I do not support and that I do not believe, in any way, serves "the public interest." That is a trade fair to promote the sale of arms. We ought not allow this act to provide an incentive for the arms trade. We ought to rewrite the act to demonstrate our commitment to arms reduction. Therefore, the amendment I offer today would disallow the Secretary of

Commerce to request a waiver for any military goods or other related hardware.

I am troubled also, that such an arms fair is planned for Rosemont, Ill., on February 18–22. Its name, "Defense Technology '79," disguises its purpose. Its sole purpose is to promote and encourage the sale of military goods and other related hardware. This is totally antithetical to the stated goal of the administration for arms reduction. It is totally contrary to the views of a majority of Americans. And it is totally contrary to the moral imperative that arms reduction, not arms sales, is the philosophy that the Congress should encourage.

Let me emphasize that this legislation is not parochial in its nature. Certainly part of my intention is to discourage the fair in Rosemont, Ill., but this legislation would discourage such a fair anywhere else in this country. We can ill afford to provide incentive for arms proliferation. We must, instead, provide incentives for arms reduction. We must make it clear that trade fairs that seek to promote arms sales do not have the blessing of this or any other Congress.●

THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION PROTECTION ACT OF 1979 H.R. 1068

(Mr. McCLORY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the United States is today suffering from a problem which seriously affects our Nation's security. The disclosure of sensitive, classified information—be it through espionage or the so-called leak—is undermining the vitally important mission of the departments and agencies of our government engaged in foreign intelligence and counterintelligence activities.

The state of the law allows those who steal or leak classified information to believe that their crime cannot be prosecuted—that they will go unpunished. Unfortunately, in many cases this is the all too real, sad truth. In most cases the law requires that sensitive intelligence information—in addition to that which the defendant is charged with disclosing—be disclosed in open court. As more and more culprits get away with their underhandedness, others feel safe to pursue the same course. The law is actually engendering abuse of our national security classification system.

Mr. Speaker, in order to help solve this problem, I have introduced the Foreign Intelligence Information Protection Act of 1979, H.R. 1068.

My bill would simplify the prosecution of those who commit espionage—that is, clandestine communication of classified information to a foreign power. No longer would sensitive national security information have to be publicly disclosed in order to bring a foreign spy to justice.

Mr. Speaker, the bill would also establish a new system for handling classified information dealing with our most sensitive secrets involving so-called intelligence "sources and methods". Any unauthorized disclosure of this information by a person with lawful access would likewise be punishable without necessitating further public disclosure of classified information.

Finally, the bill would establish special protection for those brave men and women who work for the United States covertly in foreign countries, often at great risk to their personal safety. Any disclosure of information which could lead to the identity of such a person—when the disclosure could prejudice that person's life or physical safety—would be subject to criminal penalties.

Mr. Speaker, this is essential legislation which I hope will be favorably acted upon during the 96th Congress. The Subcommittee on Legislation of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, of which I am a member, has already held seven hearings to generally inquire into the problems in prosecuting espionage and "leaks". After listening to the testimony of those both within and without the government, I strongly believe that we must act to provide statutory solutions. Therefore, I am hopeful that the Intelligence Committee will schedule early hearings on H.R. 1068 and that it may be promptly enacted into law for the protection of our Nation and for the strengthening of our intelligence capabilities.

A section-by-section analysis of this bill follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE "FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION PROTECTION ACT OF 1979"

INTRODUCTION

This bill is designed to simplify existing law regarding disclosure of classified information, and, in specific, highly sensitive areas, expand existing law. The bill covers classic espionage (i.e. covert transmission of classified information to a foreign power), unauthorized disclosure of so-called "sources and methods" information by a person with authorized access to the information, and disclosure of information which could lead to the identity of an individual who has a secret relationship with one of our intelligence agencies where such disclosure could put the individual's life in danger.

Section 1

This section sets out the short title of the bill—the "Foreign Intelligence Information Protection Act of 1979".

Section 2

Statement of findings.—This section sets out the need for the legislation. While recognizing the public's interest in access to government information, new laws must be enacted to better protect from disclosure to foreign powers extremely sensitive information which directly relates to our national security.

Section 3

Title V—Protection of foreign intelligence information.—This section amends the National Security Act of 1947 by adding to it an additional title. The title contains eight sections.

Definitions.—Section 508 includes eight definitions: "Authority" means at the direction of the President or pursuant to a statute or an Executive order, or pursuant to a lawful demand of a congressional committee.

"Classified information" means information that is designated and clearly marked or represented pursuant to statute or Executive order as requiring a specific degree of protection against unauthorized disclosure for reasons of national security, or information derived therefrom.

"Communicate" means to impart, transfer, convey or otherwise make available to another.

"Disclose" means to communicate (as defined above) or to release by publication.

"Foreign power" includes foreign governments, factions of foreign nations, international terrorist groups, foreign based political organizations, entities directed and controlled by foreign governments, and anyone acting on behalf of the above.

"Knowingly acts" means to act with knowledge or reason to know of all of the elements of the criminal offense involved.

"Lawful access" means to have access to classified information as a result of a contractual arrangement with the government (e.g. as an employee) or otherwise pursuant to a statute or an Executive order.

"Sensitive intelligence information" means classified information which is designated and clearly marked or represented as sensitive intelligence information because it relates to: particularly sensitive or sophisticated methods of collecting foreign intelligence; a source of foreign intelligence; a particularly sensitive or sophisticated method of analysis of foreign intelligence; a method of defense against the intelligence activities of foreign powers; or the identity of an individual or entity which has a secret relationship with a government intelligence agency.

Designation of sensitive intelligence information.—Section 501 empowers the Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) to designate certain information as "sensitive intelligence information" (see definition above) and, as appropriate, remove such designation. Further, the DCI shall delegate this authority to other appropriate officials, and, in consultation with interested government agencies, develop and issue regulations for the implementation of the authority. This section also provides that the designation of "sensitive intelligence information" may only be removed by the DCI, by those to whom the DCI has delegated such authority, or by action taken pursuant to the Rules of the Senate or the House.

Espionage.—Section 502 establishes as an offense: (1) communication of classified information to a foreign power; and (2) collection of classified information on behalf of a foreign power. The government is not required to prove that the classification was proper, but section 506 requires that the Attorney General and the Director of Central Intelligence certify that the information was properly classified. This offense is punishable by a fine up to $20,000 or imprisonment for up to the defendant's life, or both.

Unauthorized disclosure of sensitive intelligence information.—Section 503 establishes as an offense the unauthorized disclosure of "sensitive intelligence information" by a person having or having had lawful access to the information. The government must prove that the defendant had lawful access to the information, that the information was designated as "sensitive intelligence information"—without going behind the designation—and that the defendant knowingly disclosed the information without authority. Section 506 requires that before prosecution, the Attorney General and the Director of Central Intelligence must certify to the correctness of the designation. Punishment for the offense ranges up to $10,000 or imprisonment for 20 years, or both.

Unauthorized disclosure of classified information.—Section 504 establishes as an offense disclosure of information which has been properly designated as classified information by a person having or having had lawful access to it. The government must prove that the individual had lawful access, that the information was, in fact, subject to classification and was properly designated

as classified information, and that the defendant knowingly disclosed such information without authority. The penalty for this offense ranges up to $10,000 or imprisonment for 10 years, or both.

Unauthorized disclosure of the identities of certain individuals.—Section 505 establishes as an offense the unauthorized disclosure of the identity of any individual or entity as being or having been secretly associated with a U.S. intelligence agency where such disclosure could prejudice the life or physical safety of the individual or entity identified. The penalty for such an offense ranges up to $5,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both.

Prosecution.—Section 506 requires in a prosecution brought under section 502 that both the Attorney General and the Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) certify in writing to the court that at the time of the commission of the offense the information the defendant is charged with disclosing was properly designated as "classified information". Likewise, in a prosecution brought under section 503, the Attorney General and the DCI must both certify in writing to the court that at the time of the commission of the offense the information the defendant is charged with disclosing was properly designated as "sensitive intelligence information".

Jurisdiction.—Section 507 establishes federal jurisdiction over an offense established by this title if the offense is committed in the United States or if the person who committed the offense is a citizen or a permanent resident alien.●

FEDERAL SENTENCING LAWS REQUIRE MODERNIZATION

(Mr. McCLORY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, much has been written on the subject of sentencing. We have been told over the years that judges are often too lenient, that they give probation or short-term confinement too easily. We have been told that Federal and State correctional facilities are too often inadequate to cope with the problems of today's criminal community, that rehabilitation has become a joke. We have also been told that wealth and influence play too great a role in creating a different brand of justice for those who have ready access to it. In the end, we are told that, whatever we do, the crime rate continues to escalate with no end in sight.

I do not presume to be an expert on sentencing, but I have read a good deal about it. One problem constantly surfaces: there rarely seems to be any consistency to sentencing. For example, in 1974 an interesting experiment was conducted in New York's Second Judicial Circuit, one of the most respected in the country. Fifty different judges were given specific facts from actual cases and asked to recommend sentences applying the discretionary ranges available under current Federal law. As a result, the recommendations of these 50 Federal judges varied widely for the same crime. In fact, they ranged from 20 years imprisonment and a $65,000 fine to 3 years imprisonment with no fine. I find this situation intolerable, but unavoidable if current discretionary ranges continue to exist.

As many of you know, "judge-shopping" has become a fine art in the Federal and State courthouses around the country. Lawyers hope against hope that they will get Judge A, the reasonable or lenient judge, rather than Judge B, the "hangin' judge." Some judges have a bias against drug offenders and, therefore, apply harsh sentences while, in the case of white collar offenders, their anger turns to forgiveness if only partial restitution is made. Please understand that my comments are not meant as criticism of the judiciary. On the contrary, judges are simply human beings operating within the wide range of discretion we in the Congress have seen fit to give them. In the final analysis, we have made it inevitable that society has once again became the victim of our inclination to farm out our decisions to others. I cannot understand how society can be expected to maintain its faith in the criminal justice system when the punishment it metes out often defies logic and reason. It is our responsibility to remedy that disparity.

The bill I will introduce today takes a giant step in that direction. Its principal purpose would be to set up a U.S. Commission on Sentencing within the judicial branch. Its membership would include not only judges but practicing attorneys and other criminal justice personnel. Its purpose would be to promulgate and distribute very specific sentencing guidelines for use by the sentencing court in determining its sentence, including probation. My bill requires that, in setting these guidelines, the Commission consider a defendant's age, mental and emotional condition, physical condition, role in the offense, prior criminal history and the degree of his dependence upon criminal activity for a livelihood. My bill also contains a sunset provision which would result in the abolition of the Commission within 6 years of its creation.

Once the Commission's recommendations are generated, the other portions of my legislation would apply. A Federal court, in deciding to impose a term of imprisonment within the range determined as fair by the Commission, must consider not only the Commission's guidelines but also such factors as the community's need to be protected from any future criminal offenses committed by the accused and his need for educational or recreational training. In any case in which the court imposes a penalty, whether it is a term of imprisonment or a fine, it must state, in open court and on the record, the reasons and rationale underlying its decision. Under current law no reasons need be stated; a defendant can be sentenced to prison for a month or the rest of his life and never know precisely why.

My bill, for the first time, also provides for appellate review of sentences issues by the trial court. Under current law sentences are virtually nonreviewable because of the level of discretion practiced by the trial court. My bill would provide for potential review by the Court of Appeals with harsher standards applied for sentences issued outside the Commission's guidelines. In time, case law will develop which will assist judges in giving similar sentences for similar crimes.

My hope is that we in the Congress make the sentencing procedures utilized by the Federal courts more uniform and therefore more fair. I believe it is imperative that those who must face punishment under our criminal justice system be treated fairly and predictably. They should know what penalties they will face for what offense. Their future freedom and, conversely, society's safety, should not depend upon the luck of the draw.●

BILL TO REVERSE THE ILLINOIS BRICK SUPREME COURT DECISION

(Mr. McCLORY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill to reverse the Supreme Court decision in Illinois Brick Co. against Illinois, a decision which greatly impaired the ability of consumers, businesses and governments to collect damages resulting from antitrust violations.

I am offering this measure so that it will be before the Judiciary Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law for consideration by members and witnesses at the hearing expected later this month. Representative PETER RODINO, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee on which I serve as ranking member, has already introduced an Illinois Brick bill, H.R. 2060, which differs in significant respects from the bill which I am introducing today. H.R. 2060 is identical with S. 300, introduced in the other body by the chairman of its Judiciary Committee, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY.

With one exception my bill is precisely the same as H.R. 11942, the Illinois Brick bill which was ordered reported by a 21 to 12 vote of the Judiciary Committee on June 20, 1978, but which was not considered by the House before the end of the 95th Congress. I have deleted the so-called Pfizer amendment, because it deals with a subject significantly different from the issues raised by the Illinois Brick decision.

A most important difference between last year's committee bill and this year's Rodino-Kennedy bill is in the provison on assessment of aggregate damages, and I believe that the former deals with this critical mater with much greater precision and in a more responsible manner.

In the committee bill it is stated that, except as provided for parens patriae actions, "damages shall not be assessed in the aggregate against the defendant but shall be assessed only on behalf of any person who makes a valid damage claim." This is squarely in accord with the rationale and justification for the the rationale and justification for the reversal of the Illinois Brick decision—the need to compensate victims of antitrust violations for their injuries. The intent and clear meaning of the committee bill is to provide that damages may be assessed only to satisfy real claims of real victims (and then only to the extent that

the purchases are satisfactorily proven to the court or a master). While this language expressly repudiates the concept of aggregate assessment, the language in the Rodino-Kennedy bill is much more obscure and deficient on this subject. The Rodino-Kennedy bill states that, except as provided in parens patriae cases, "a defendant shall not be required to pay damages except to persons on whose behalf a valid claim is presented to the court." Not only does this provision lack the express repudiation of aggregate damage assessment, but it conceivably could be read to authorize precisely such action. In the committee bill, it is clear that the individual valid damage claim precipitates the assessment; in the Rodino-Kennedy bill the assessment is precipitated by the presentation of valid claims which arguably could be aggregated.

Two other significant provisions which were in the committe bill but which were deleted in the Rodino-Kennedy bills are sections providing for the discretionary award of a reasonable attorney's fee to a prevailing defendant upon a finding by the court that the plaintiff purchaser or seller or his attorney acted in bad faith, vexatiously, wantonly, or for oppressive reasons and providing that the court, before approving a settlement in a Clayton section 4 class action, shall determine attorneys fees acting as a fiduciary for those persons on whose behalf action was brought.

Both of these provisions are important to deter suits brought by irresponsible plaintiffs or attorneys attracted by the "deep pocket" of the defendant.

Another deletion in the Rodino-Kennedy bill is of the "cap" provision which specified that an indirect purchaser may recover damages only with respect to the amount of initial overcharge proved to be passed on to him. Changing this admits the unwelcome possibility that an indirect purchaser could recover from the defendant for the additions to the initial overcharge which were added by intermediate purchasers after the price-fixed product was sold by the defendant and passed from its control. Little can be said for being ambiguous on this point to the possible detriment of the defendant.

In addition to the above deletions of important provisions in the committee bill, the Rodino-Kennedy bill advances some mischief on its own. Whereas the committee bill conferred on defendants the right to prove that the plaintiff did not himself absorb the injury but instead passed it on to others in the chain of manufacture, production, or distribution, the Rodino-Kennedy bill limits this right significantly yet incomprehensibly. Under this new provision, defendants are allowed to speak the truth about plaintiff's injury only "in the discretion of the court, in order to avoid duplicative liability."

This is such a sharp departure from the committee's approach last year that I must confess some puzzlement. I am troubled by the necessary implied result that plaintiffs can recover for injuries they did not suffer. Was it not to overturn that principle that the committee reported its bill last year? I am also troubled by the idea that the decision to allow the defense—which in some cases may dictate where millions of dollars will flow—is expressly laid to the "discretion" of a judge. One might ask what it would mean to limit the defense to cases where it is needed to avoid duplicative liability without injecting judicial discretion and then ask what change is effectuated by the grant of such discretion. According to canons of construction, the addition of "discretion" must give some new meaning to the provision. While many possibilities abound, none appear salutary to me.

Last year, the committee position was quite clear. It opposed aggregation of damages both horizontally and vertically. Horizontal aggregation occurs when a plaintiff collects the damages that ought to be paid to another at the same level in the chain. Vertical aggregation occurs when a plaintiff collects the damages that ought to be paid to another below the plaintiff in the chain. Vertical aggregation was mandated by the Supreme Court in Illinois Brick as a simplifying device. Horizontal aggregation has been espoused by consumer groups for similar reasons. The business community has generally denounced horizontal aggregation while vigorously defending vertical aggregation.

The committee bill rejected aggregation in either mode. Conceivably, the Rodino-Kennedy bill accepts aggregation both horizontally and vertically.

I look forward to the comments of scholars and antitrust practitioners when the Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law begins its hearings at the end of this month.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the subject of the special order today by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLINGER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JEFFORDS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROUSSELOT, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. FENWICK, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STACK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VOLKMER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BINGHAM, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. CORMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUGHES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ZABLOCKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CAVANAUGH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WEAVER, on February 21, 22, 26, and 27 for 10 minutes each.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STACK), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FOLEY, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. MINETA, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVITAS, today, for 5 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLINGER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FORSYTHE.

Mr. SAWYER.

Mr. CLAUSEN.

Mr. LEWIS.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. RINALDO.

Mr. WYDLER in two instances.

Mr. ROUSSELOT in two instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. PAUL in two instances.

Mr. RUDD.

Mr. MICHEL in three instances.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

Mr. CARTER in four instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. FRENZEL in three instances.

Mr. SYMMS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STACK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. IRELAND.

Mr. BEDELL.

Mr. PEASE.

Mr. PEYSER.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. VOLKMER.

Mr. BAILEY.

Mr. FARY.

Mr. ROE in three instances.

Mr. NOWAK in five instances.

Mr. ERTEL.

Mr. DRINAN in 10 instances.

Mr. KOSTMAYER.

Mr. AUCOIN.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. CONYERS in two instances.

Mr. SIMON.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.

Mr. GRAY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STACK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HARRIS.
Mr. GEPHARDT.
Mr. LEVITAS.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 37. An act to repeal a section of Public Law 95-630; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 19, 1979, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

632. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting selected acquisition reports and SAR summary tables for the quarter ended December 31, 1978, pursuant to section 811(a) of Public Law 94-106; to the Committee on Armed Services.

633. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs and Logistics), transmitting a final environmental impact statement for the disposal of surplus Federal military properties at the Quonset Point Naval Air Station, Davisville Construction Battalion Center and Newport Naval Base, Rhode Island, pursuant to section 610 of Public Law 94-431; to the Committee on Armed Services.

634. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), transmitting the Base Structure Annex to the Defense manpower requirements report for fiscal year 1980, pursuant to section 302 of Public Law 94-361; to the Committee on Armed Services.

635. A letter from the Associate Director of Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the semiannual report covering the period July 1 through December 31, 1978, on Air Force experimental, developmental and research contracts of $50,000 or more, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

636. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the report of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/International Monetary Fund Joint Committee on Staff Compensation Issues, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 95-435; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

637. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the first annual report on the review of export control country policy, pursuant to section 4(b)(2)(A) of the Export Administration Act of 1969, as amended (91 Stat. 235); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

638. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; transmitting the 20th annual report of the Commission, pursuant to section 5(3) of Public Law 86-380; to the Committee on Government Operations.

639. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on appropriate Federal actions to mitigate the economic impacts of expansion of the Redwood National Park, and the annual report on the management of additions to the park, pursuant to sections 102(a) and 104(a), respectively, of Public Law 95-250; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

640. A letter from the Chairman and members, U.S. Commision on Civil Rights, transmitting a report on the status of school desegregation across the Nation, pursuant to section 104(c) of Public Law 85-315, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

641. A letter from the Secretary-Treasurer, Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the U.S.A., transmitting the annual audit report of the Society for calendar year 1978, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 88-504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

642. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report for calendar year 1978 on the Coast Guard's use of authority to designate and rent inadequate quarters, lease housing and hire quarters, pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 475(e); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

643. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a Corps of Engineers report on Potomac River streams draining the Alexandria area, Virginia, in response to a resolution of the House Committee on Public Works adopted October 5, 1966; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

644. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting an amendment to the approved prospectus for the Post Office and Courthouse, New Haven, Conn., pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

645. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus proposing alterations at the Interstate Commerce Commission, Customs, and Connecting Wing, Washington, D.C., pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

646. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus proposing alterations at the Everett McKinley Dirksen Federal Building, Chicago, Ill., pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

647. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus proposing alterations at the U.S. Post Office and Courthouse, Scranton, Pa., pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

648. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus proposing alterations at the Post Office and Courthouse, 5th Avenue and 9th Street, Huntington, W. Va., pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

649. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's annual 5-year plan for research, development, and demonstration, pursuant to section 5 of Public Law 94-475; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

650. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to continue the work of the President's Commission on Pension Policy to develop a national retirement income policy in the United States, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Education and Labor, Post Office and Civil Service, and Ways and Means.

651. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the sale of unfit and misbranded food to the public by the food salvage industry (HRD-79-32, February 14, 1979); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, Agriculture, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

652. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the Navy's Surveillance Towed Array Sensor program (PSAD-79-35, February 14, 1979); jointly, to the Committee on Government Operations, and Armed Services.

653. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the Army's Roland Missile program (PSAD-79-28, February 14, 1979); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, and Armed Services.

654. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the Office of Education's program for strengthening developing institutions of higher education (HRD-78-170, February 13, 1979); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, and Education and Labor.

655. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report on domestic safeguards for fiscal year 1978, pursuant to section 209(d) of Public Law 93-438, as amended (92 Stat. 2949); jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

656. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and section 305 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Foreign Affairs.

657. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the fourth annual report on activities under the Deepwater Port Act of 1974, pursuant to section 20 of the act; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Public Works and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 35. To provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-3). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 45. To provide for the further expenses of the investigations and studies of the Committee on Small Business with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-4). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 60. To provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-5). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 85. To provide for the expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-6). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 87. To provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on

House Administration with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-7). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 88. To provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Ways and Means with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-8). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 91. To provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-9). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 92. To provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Education and Labor with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-10). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 96. To provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-11). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 98. To provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-12). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AuCOIN:

H.R. 2152. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a charitable deduction for certain crops furnished by farmers to certain tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEDELL:

H.R. 2153. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to guarantee loans for the construction and operation of fuel alcohol plants, to provide for a secure supply of feedstocks for the operation of such plants, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the set-aside program for feed grains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. SPENCE, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. EMERY, Mr. TRIBLE, and Mr. DOUGHERTY):

H.R. 2154. A bill to revise the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, to require that appropriations for the acquisition of strategic and critical materials be authorized by law, to establish a national defense stockpile transaction fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MINETA:

H.R. 2155. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 relating to leased space; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 2156. A bill to provide that all petroleum imported into the United States after September 1, 1979, shall not be available for purchase other than by the Government of the United States; jointly, to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRINKLEY (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GINN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. LOTT, Mr. NICHOLS, and Mr. SKELTON):

H.R. 2157. A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to allow Federal civil defense funds to be used by local civil defense agencies for natural disaster relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2158. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to allow supplies under the control of departments and agencies within the Department of Defense to be transferred to the Federal Emergency Management Agency as if it were within the Department of Defense and to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to authorize the Federal Emergency Management Agency to loan to State and local governments property transferred to such agency from other Federal agencies as excess property; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Armed Services.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 2159. A bill to strengthen and improve the early and periodic screening, diagnosis, and treatment program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mr. CONTE, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. YATRON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. SIMON, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. THOMPSON):

H.R. 2160. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a clearinghouse for information respecting digestive diseases, to authorize grants to strengthen educational programs in digestive diseases in medical schools, and to establish the National Digestive Diseases Advisory Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 2161. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that payments of aid to families with dependent children which are made to an individual during any period while he is awaiting a determination of disability for social security purposes shall be recovered from the amount of any disability benefits subsequently awarded to the extent that such benefits are paid on a retroactive basis for months in that period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONABLE (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 2162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of certain employees' trusts organized to invest in real estate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COTTER:

H.R. 2163. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish a grant program designed to develop methods of prevention and treatment relating to domestic violence, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Education and Labor, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR.:

H.R. 2164. A bill to terminate the authorization for a portion of the Norfolk Harbor and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia, improvement project; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 2165. A bill to repeal the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 and to amend the declaration of purposes of the Metric Education Act of 1978; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 2166. A bill to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DRINAN:

H.R. 2167. A bill to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to extend relocation assistance to persons displaced as the result of real property acquisitions by private persons for federally assisted programs or projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. ERDAHL:

H.R. 2168. A bill to modify the project for flood protection at Winona, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 2169. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, to subject imported tomatoes to restrictions comparable to those applicable to domestic tomatoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 2170. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of legal expenses incurred by the city of Fairfax with respect to a 1971 entry and search by employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITHIAN:

H.R. 2171. A bill to deauthorize the Lafayette Dam and Reservoir, Wabash River, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BAFALIS, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. COELHO, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HEFTEL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. JENRETTE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LEACH of Louisiana, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MOORE, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. TREEN):

H.R. 2172. A bill to implement the International Sugar Agreement, 1977, between the United States and foreign countries, to protect the welfare of consumers of sugar and of those engaged in the domestic sugar industry, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 2173. A bill to extend for an additional period the existing tax treatment of certain activities of certain private foundations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 2174. A bill to establish a program of drug benefits for the aged; to establish a Drug Benefits Council and other appropriate management controls to provide for the efficient administration of such program; and to require the conducting of certain studies and experiments, to enhance the capability of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to administer such program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2175. A bill to provide property tax relief to low-income elderly homeowners through direct reimbursements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic $5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2177. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include dental care, eye care, and hearing aids among the items and services for which payment may be made under the supplementary medical insurance program; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2178. A bill to provide medicare coverage for orthopedic shoes or other supportive devices prescribed by a physician for correction or treatment of abnormalities of the feet or legs which cause serious detrimental medical effects; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GEPHARDT:

H.R. 2179. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat as public charities certain organizations which operate libraries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 2180. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Docket 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2181. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Document 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2182. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Document 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2183. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Document 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2184. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Document 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2185. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Document 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2186. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Document 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2187. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Document 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2188. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Document 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2189. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Document 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 2190. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the reclassification of positions of U.S. Border Patrol agents; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. CARR, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FASCELL, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GUDGER, Mr. GUYER, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGUIRE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOTTL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WINN, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. PATTERSON, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 2191. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow individuals a refundable tax credit for a portion of the rent which they pay on their principal residences and which is attributable to real property taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HECKLER:

H.R. 2192. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to authorize grants for the purchase, construction, and modification of certain drinking water treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H.R. 2193. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the changes made by the Tax Reform Act of 1976 in the sick pay exclusion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 2194. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a clearinghouse for information respecting digestive diseases, to authorize grants to strengthen educational programs in digestive diseases in medical schools, and to establish the National Digestive Diseases Advisory Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. JENKINS):

H.R. 2195. A bill to provide for the reform of the administrative and reimbursement procedures currently employed under the medicare and medicaid programs, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. GUYER, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. ROE, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. PRICE, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. GINN, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. COELHO, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. PREYER, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. ADDABBO):

H.R. 2196. A bill to establish a congressional award program for the purpose of recognizing excellence and leadership among young people; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself and Mr. BINGHAM):

H.R. 2197. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to authorize assistance to States for purposes of reducing asbestos levels in the interior of school buildings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 2198. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the adjusted gross income limitation on the credit for the elderly, to increase the amount of such credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUCKABY:

H.R. 2199. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of Alaska as units of the National Park, National Wildlife Refuge, Wild and Scenic Rivers and National Wilderness Preservation Systems and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself and Mr. BINGHAM):

H.R. 2200. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to allow recovery by U.S. nationals for losses incurred in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 2201. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to make clear that State or Federal prisoners who are otherwise eligible for Federal habeas corpus relief may not be denied such relief on the ground that such State or Federal Government provided an opportunity for a full and fair litigation of a constitutional claim, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself, Mr. RODINO, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. GUDGER, Mr. SANTINI, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. SAWYER):

H.R. 2202. A bill to abolish diversity of citizenship as a basis of jurisdiction of Federal district courts, to abolish the amount in controversy requirement in Federal question cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOSTMAYER (for himself, Mr. LUNDINE, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 2203. A bill to preserve jobs and stabilize communities by facilitating employee, or employee-community, ownership of concerns that would otherwise close down or move out of the community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MCCLORY:

H.R. 2204. A bill to restore effective enforcement of the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2205. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to establish certain guidelines for sentencing, establish a U.S. Commission on Sentencing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCLOSKEY (for himself, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BEARD of Tennessee, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. SIMON, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. ADDABBO, and Mr. COELHO):

H.R. 2206. A bill to establish a National Service System under which the young people of the United States shall have the choice of either entering voluntary military or civilian service or being subject to induction into military service by random selection; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Education and Labor, and Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (by request):

H.R. 2207. A bill to improve the protections afforded the public against risks associated with the transportation of hazardous commodities by pipeline; jointly, to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 2208. A bill to exempt certain defense-related articles from the preferential tariff treatment accorded to articles imported for exhibition at trade fairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. BRODHEAD):

H.R. 2209. A bill to correct inequities in certain sales representatives practices, to provide protection for certain sales representatives terminated from their accounts without justification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 2210. A bill to revise the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 2211. A bill to establish an Interagency Committee on Arson Control to coordinate Federal antiarson programs, to amend various provisions of the law relating to programs for arson investigation, prevention, and detection, and for other purposes;

jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 2212. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend title XII of that act relating to emergency medical services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of California:

H.R. 2213. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to prevent the illegal entry and employment of aliens in the United States, to facilitate the admission of aliens for temporary employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2214. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent tax deductions for the salary of aliens illegally employed in the United States and to amend the Social Security Act to limit benefits under the aid to families with dependent children program and under the medicaid program to citizens and lawfully admitted aliens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTTL:

H.R. 2215. A bill to eliminate the reduction in social security benefits for spouses and surviving spouses receiving certain Government pensions, as recently added to title II of the Social Security Act by section 334 of the Social Security Amendments of 1977; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 2216. A bill to amend section 1625 of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants under that section to be made to nonprofit private hospitals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina):

H.R. 2217. A bill to revise and reform the Federal law applicable to drugs for human use and to establish a National Center for Clinical Pharmacology within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. EMERY, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. PRITCHARD, and Mr. DORNAN):

H.R. 2218. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Endangered Species Act of 1973 during fiscal year 1980, 1981, and 1982; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. EMERY):

H.R. 2219. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of Alaska as units of the National Park, National Wildlife Refuge, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, and National Wilderness Preservation Systems, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PEASE:

H.R. 2220. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for political contributions to candidates for Congress which is more limited than the existing tax credit for such contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2221. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for financing of general election campaigns for the House of Representatives, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for political contributions to candidates for Congress which is more limited than the existing tax credit for such contributions; jointly to the Committees on House Administration and Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON (for himself and Mr. ASHBROOK):

H.R. 2222. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to clarify the scope of its coverage; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 2223. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 with respect to annuities for widows and widows of certain railroad employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE (for himself and Mr. BOB WILSON) (by request):

H.R. 2224. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act to provide greater flexibility for the Armed Forces in training Reserve officers ordered to active duty for training for not more than 6 months by removing requirement that they be ordered to active duty for not less than 3 months; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS (by request):

H.R. 2225. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to make benefits under chapter 41 of such title (relating to job counseling, training, and placement services) available, in the case of veterans, only to those who served during a period of war, the Korean conflict or the Vietnam era; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2226. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT):

H.R. 2227. A bill to establish the Veterans' Administration as an executive department to be known as the "Department of Veterans' Affairs"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 2228. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to waive the limitation on the amount of the excess shelter expense deduction for households which are composed entirely of persons who are age 65 or older or who receive benefits under title XVI of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2229. A bill to amend the National Bank Act, to refund to the Comptroller of the Currency funds held as successor to closed national bank receiverships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD (by request):

H.R. 2230. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend eligibility for medical care benefits under the Veterans' Administration CHAMPVA program to dependents and survivors of any veteran having a permanent service-connected disability rated at 80 per centum or 90 per centum; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2231. A bill to amend section 612(b) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize outpatient dental treatment for those veterans otherwise eligible for medical services; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT):

H.R. 2232. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to contract for the furnishing of private health care to veterans when such health care is authorized by a Veterans' Administration physician as necessary for the treatment of medical emergency; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2233. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide outpatient medical services for any disability of a veteran of World War I as if such disability were service-connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2234. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authorization for certain expiring health care program of the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD (for himself and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) (by request):

H.R. 2235. A bill to amend section 612(e) of title 38, United States Code, so as to provide that any disability of a veteran of World War I shall be, for the purposes of medical treatment, considered a service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2236. A bill to amend title 38, U.S. Code, so as to provide that the term "veteran" as used in section 613 shall include a person who died in the active military, naval, or air service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2237. A bill to amend title 38, U.S. Code, to eliminate a disincentive to certain disabled veterans to continue their educations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2238. A bill to amend title 38, U.S. Code, to provide medical services and hospital care abroad for certain catastrophically disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2239. A bill to amend title 38, U.S. Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide medical services to any veteran with a service-connected disability who is 80 years old or older; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2240. A bill to amend title 38, U.S. Code, to provide medical care for parents of a deceased veteran who are in receipt of dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2241. A bill to amend title 38, U.S. Code, to extend eligibility for medical care benefits for survivors and dependents of veterans under the Veterans' Administration CHAMPVA program to survivors and dependents who are eligible for hospital insurance benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2242. A bill to amend title 38, U.S. Code, to provide outpatient dental treatment for veterans with permanent and total service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2243. A bill to amend title 38, U.S. Code, to provide for an increase in the benefits payable for certain home improvements and structural alterations which are necessary or appropriate for the home health care of certain veterans with service-connected disabilities, and for an addition to the types of improvements and alterations for which those benefits are payable; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2244. A bill to amend title 38, U.S. Code, to provide dental services in Veterans' Administration facilities to any veterans who was a prisoner of war for more than 180 days; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAWYER:

H.R. 2245. A bill to require the Federal Bureau of Investigation to classify the offense of arson as a part I offense for purposes of the uniform crime reporting program and the uniform crime reports for the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2246. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, relating to local governments mailing matters of public interest at reduced rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMON:

H.R. 2247. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, for the purpose of reorganizing the U.S. Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMON (for himself, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DER-

RICK, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. PREYER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. JENRETTE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. CARTER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. FLOOD, Mrs. SPELLMAN, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 2248. A bill to authorize funds for the Robert A. Taft Institute of Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. SNOWE:

H.R. 2249. A bill to terminate the authorization of the Dickey-Lincoln School project, Saint John River, Maine; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. TRAXLER (for himself, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. CARR):

H.R. 2250. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make permanent certain rules relating to travel expenses of State legislators; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 2251. A bill establishing a National Domestic Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 2252. A bill to amend title 38 of the U.S. Code to allow eligible veterans to receive certain educational assistance during the 6-year period following their last discharge or release from active duty even if such period extends beyond December 31, 1989; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRICE, Mr. SIMON, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. WINN, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 2253. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act and the Social Security Act to require that specific alien and citizenship information be provided prior to the issuance of a social security card, to require that social security cards which cannot be duplicated be issued, to require that these cards be presented to employers by prospective employees before obtaining employment, to provide penalties against employers for violating the provisions of the act and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 2254. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY (for himself and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H.R. 2255. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 to limit the property and casualty and life insurance activities of bank holding companies and their subsidiaries; to the Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.J. Res. 206. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to title I of the Agriculture Act of 1949, as amended, to raise the price support levels for milk, wheat, corn, soybeans, and cotton to 90 percent of the respective parity prices therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.J. Res. 207. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITHIAN:

H.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORSYTHE:

H.J. Res. 209. Joint resolution designating the week of May 14 through May 20, 1979, as "National Diabetes Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. FISH, Mr. HOWARD, and Mr. GREEN):

H.J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission to proceed with the construction of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RUSSO:

H.J. Res. 211. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the protection of unborn children and other persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEISS (for himself and Mr. OTTINGER):

H.J. Res. 212. Joint resolution to renounce the first use of all nuclear weapons and to conclude treaties with all nations renouncing the first use of all nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE (for himself, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BEVILL, Mrs. BOUQUARD, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BYRON, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GINN, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. HALL of TEXAS, Mr. HANCE, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JENRETTE, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LEACH of Louisiana, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. MCDONALD, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOTTL, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WHITLEY, and Mr. WYATT):

H.J. Res 213. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the level of total outlays of the United States for any fiscal year shall not exceed the level of total receipts of the United States for such fiscal year and for the disposition of unanticipated deficits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.J. Res. 214. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to insure that due process and equal protection are afforded to an individual with respect to the right to life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the illegal annexation by the Soviet Union of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COUGHLIN:

H. Con Res. 50. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to the Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution to seek the resurrection of the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churces in Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself and Mr. WAMPLER):

H. Res. 117. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself and Mr. MIKVA):

H. Res. 118. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H. Res. 119. Resolution disapproving the deferral of budget authority relating to uranium enrichment services (deferral numbered D79-48) which was proposed by the President in his special message of January 31, 1979, transmitted to the Congress under section 1013 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. Res. 120. Resolution disapproving the deferral of budget authority relating to summer youth employment assistance (deferral numbered D79-50) which was proposed by the President in his special message of January 31, 1979, transmitted to the Congress under section 1013 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. Res. 121. Resolution disapproving the deferral of budget authority relating to interstate transfer grants (deferral numbered D79-51) which was proposed by the President in his special message of January 31, 1979, transmitted to the Congress under section 1013 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H. Res. 122. Resolution to amend the rules of the House to establish the Committee on Internal Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H. Res. 123. Resolution to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MINISH:

H. Res. 124. Resolution requesting the President not to propose to the Congress the exemption of motor gasoline from petroleum price control regulations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H. Res. 125. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation of the nationalization of the oil industry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H. Res. 126. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the major television networks should take such steps as may be necessary to use line 21 of the television vertical blanking interval to provide captioning of programs for hearing impaired individuals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

30. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to full funding of all programs under the Older Americans Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

31. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, relative to the public service of the Hon. Jamie L. Whitten; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEPHARDT:

H.R. 2256. A bill for the relief of the Jewish Employment Vocational Service, St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2257. A bill for the relief of Ebinger Electronics, Inc., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H.R. 2258. A bill for the relief of Gaudiosa M. Etulle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOSTMAYER:

H.R. 2259. A bill for the relief of Jean Pierre Baer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 2260. A bill for the relief of Eleftherios Pistentis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 29: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. STARK, Mr. ROE, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 42: Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. ANDERSON of California, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 43: Mr. BARNES, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. CARR, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOTTL, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STARK, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ANDERSON of California, and Mr. LONG of Maryland.

H.R. 44: Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. CARR, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOTTL, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STARK, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ANDERSON of California, and Mr. LONG of Maryland.

H.R. 45: Mr. BARNES, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. (PHILLIP) BURTON, Mr. CARR, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOTTL, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SABO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STARK, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LONG of Maryland, and Mr. ANDERSON of California.

H.R. 46: Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOTTL, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STARK, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. LONG of Maryland, and Mr. ANDERSON of California.

H.R. 54: Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. ASHBROOK, and Mr. RUDD.

H.R. 81: Mr. NELSON.

H.R. 85: Mr. STACK, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. HOWARD, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. MINETA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. DOWNEY.

H.R. 120: Mr. UDALL.

H.R. 596: Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 622: Mr. BENJAMIN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SABO, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. DORNAN.

H.R. 628: Mr. ARCHER, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FISHER, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 656: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MAGUIRE, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. RODINO, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. MINETA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ROE, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STARK, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 953: Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. WINN.

H.R. 1008: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 1040: Mr. CONTE, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DIXON, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. SPELLMAN, and Mr. WEAVER.

H.R. 1071: Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. STARK, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HANCE, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. D'AMOURS.

H.R. 1104: Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 1114: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BALDUS, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GINN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. MATTOX, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. PREYER, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. STARK, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. WINN, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, and Mr. ZEFERETTI.

H.R. 1297: Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. JOHN L. BURTON, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. YATES Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. WEISS, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. ROE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. STARK, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WINN, and Mr. FLORIO.

H.R. 1460: Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. WEISS, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. GUDGER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCKINNEY, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 1481: Mr. SEIBERLING and Mr. LONG of Maryland.

H.R. 1516: Mr. DRINAN; Mr. BUCHANAN; Mr. AUCOIN; Mr. COLLINS of Texas; Mr. LAFALCE; Mr. FASCELL; Mr. MCCLOSKEY; Mr. WHITEHURST; Mr. FORSYTHE; Mr. ERTEL; Mr. GUYER; Mr. WEAVER; Mr. HOLLENBECK; Mr. KOGOVSEK; Mr. MICA; Mr. SEIBERLING; Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. GRISHAM.

H.R. 1522: Mr. AKAKA; Mr. BRODHEAD; Mr. DOWNEY; Mr. HUGHES; Mr. ICHORD; Mr. JEFFORDS; Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland; Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania; Mr. RANGEL; Mr. SOLARZ; Mr. STARK, and Mr. WHITEHURST.

H.R. 1523: Mr. AKAKA; Mr. BEDELL; Mr. BRODHEAD; Mr. BURGENER; Mr. JOHN L. BURTON; Mr. CARR; Mr. CORRADA; Mr. DIXON; Mr. DOWNEY; Mr. DRINAN; Mr. EDWARDS of California; Mr. FORSYTHE; Mr. GORE; Mr. GUARINI; Ms. HOLTZMAN; Mr. HUGHES; Mr. HYDE; Mr. JACOBS; Mr. MCHUGH; Ms. MIKULSKI; Mr. MIKVA; Mr. MINETA; Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland; Mr. MOAKLEY; Mr. MOFFETT; Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania; Mr. OTTINGER; Mr. RANGEL; Mr. RICHMOND; Mr. SEIBERLING; Mr. SOLARZ; Mr. STARK; Mr. STUDDS; Mr. VENTO; Mr. WEISS, and Mr. ZEFERETTI.

H.R. 1524: Mr. BARNES; Mr. BONIOR of Michigan; Mr. DORNAN; Mr. DOWNEY; Mr. EDWARDS of California; Mr. FORD of Michigan; Mr. GEPHARDT; Mr. GUYER; Mr. HOLLENBECK; Ms. HOLTZMAN; Mr. HOWARD; Mr. HUGHES; Mr. MARKEY; Mr. MINETA; Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland; Mr. OTTINGER; Mr. RANGEL; Mr. RODINO; Mr. SCHEUER; Mr. SEIBERLING; Mr. STARK; Mr. STUDDS; Mr. VENTO; Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. ZEFERETTI.

H.R. 1597: Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. MCDONALD, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. TRIBLE, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. GRASSLEY.

H.R. 1598: Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. MCDONALD, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. TRIBLE, and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 1605: Mr. PATTEN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GUYER, Mr. PEASE, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WEISS, and Ms. FERRARO.

H.R. 1612: Mr. AMBRO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. PEASE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 1613: Mr. AMBRO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. PEASE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 1643: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. DAVIS of Michigan.

H.R. 1644: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. MCKINNEY, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana.

H.R. 1711: Mr. BARNES, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SABO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WALGREN, and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 1741: Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. JOHN L. BURTON, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. RODINO, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. SCHEUER, Ms. FERRARO, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 1852: Mr. MATHIS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. STRATTON, and Mr. BURGENER.

H.J. Res. 100: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SIMON, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. WEISS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. EVANS of Delaware, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. JENRETTE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. STARK, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.J. Res. 122: Mr. WEISS.

H.J. Res. 145: Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BEARD of Tennessee, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FROST, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. LEE, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STARK, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WEISS.

H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. BAILEY, Mr. LOTT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. HEFTEL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. LEE, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. ROE, Ms. MIKULSKI,

Mr. STOKES, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. SYMMS, and Mr. RUDD.

H. Res. 84: Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CARR, Mr. CAVANAUGH, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GUYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATHIS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WAXMAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

54. The SPEAKER presented a Petition of the City Council, New Bedford, Mass., relative to the ban on catching yellowtail flounder west of 69 degrees west; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NORTHERN TIER PIPELINE MAY HARM WILDLIFE REFUGE

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, the Dungeness National Wildlife Refuge in Washington State is the latest entry on a long list of key natural resource areas that may be adversely affected by the proposed Northern Tier crude oil pipeline.

"May" be affected could seem scant cause for alarm. However, the Northern Tier consortium has not been noted for firmness of plans or precision of detail since it first made public plans to construct a supertanker oil port at Port Angeles, Wash., to serve a major new pipeline to Clearbrook, Minn.

Members of the House may recall, for example, the sense of urgency that Northern Tier proclaimed in 1977 and 1978 to justify expedited Federal review of its plans. Members may not know that shortly thereafter the pipeline sponsors revised 60 percent of the project's 1,557-mile route, thereby throwing the ongoing review process into shambles. Those who have closely followed the development of the Northern Tier proposal have come to expect the unexpected and to suspect each aspect of the project that is not defined and assessed in firm and specific terms.

The Dungeness National Wildlife Refuge protects a fragile, narrow sandspit that supports 246 bird species and provides outstanding recreation opportunities for many people. The Northern Tier project includes a tank farm that would require stabilization of the base of a nearby shoreline bluff. Recent studies suggest that the erosion of the bluff may be a major source of sand and gravel that replenishes and sustains the spit as wave and tidal action continually remove material from it.

Nearby Port Angeles demonstrates the folly of idle tampering with the dynamics of such a sandspit. The excellent deepwater harbor that attracted Northern Tier to Port Angeles is protected by Ediz Hook, a natural spit created and formerly maintained by adjacent river and shoreline erosion. River dams and a shoreline bulkhead disrupted this process, forcing the Corps of Engineers to assume nature's role and stabilize the Hook at a recent cost of $6 million.

Eric Pryne, a staff reporter for the Seattle Times, discussed the threat to Dunegess Spit in a series of articles, which follow:

A SPAT OVER DUNGENESS SPIT

(By Eric Pryne)

SEQUIM, CLALLAM COUNTY.—When Polly Ball and her husband, Claude, retired in 1965, they chose this area because it reminded her of the Northern California Coast where she grew up.

Mrs. Ball soon discovered a feature on the Olympic Peninsula that the California Coast doesn't offer—Dungeness Spit.

"What a bonus," she said. "I fell in love with the place."

Dungeness Spit has become important to others who have retired in Clallam County. Homer Frazier lives on the bluff overlooking it.

"At night when it's quiet, I can hear the waves hitting the shore," he said. "It's probably as loud as a freeway, but I tell people it's not the same at all."

Every month Karl Greubel walks the spit, keeping track of the kinds of ducks, gulls, geese, songbirds, loons, herons, eagles, falcons—246 species in all—that frequent Dungeness.

Others fish, or dig clams, or just sit on a log and watch the surf thunder ashore. And, when they aren't on the spit, they fight what they perceive to be threats to its geological and biological balance.

First a housing development, then a resort, then a marina. Now they're fighting the Northern Tier Pipeline Co.

Northern Tier wants to build a 1,500-mile oil pipeline from Washington to Minnesota, using crude oil which would be unloaded and stored at Port Angeles, 15 miles west of Sequim.

Local environmentalists have been asking questions about oil spills and air pollution since the proposal first surfaced three years ago. Lately they've started to ask questions about Dungeness Spit, too.

Some government officials share their concern. The issue is a complicated one, which focuses on the geological process that shaped the spit, and how Northern Tier's plans might affect that process.

Dungeness Spit owes its existence to erosion of the high, steep cliffs along the Strait of Juan de Fuca to the west. Waves slap into the cliffs, tear away tiny particles of dirt and eventually wash them ashore at Dungeness.

The Spit took thousands of years to form. Vern Wray, resident supervisor of the wildlife refuge at Dungeness, said it's still growing. And the continuous flow of sediment from the west helps the spit "heal" itself when it is breached by a storm.

The bluffs that provide that sediment haven't been disturbed much by man. The Northern Tier project would be the first major alteration.

The company plans to unload incoming oil tankers at Ediz Hook in Port Angeles, then pump the crude oil through two parallel pipelines, under the floor of the strait, six miles east to a tank farm on a promontory called Green Point.

To get from the beach to the tanks at Green Point, the pipelines must climb a 120-foot cliff.

To accomplish that, Northern Tier's plans call for excavating 120,000 cubic yards of dirt from the cliff face. This would form a sloping "notch"—40 feet wide at the bottom, 325 feet wide on top—for the pipes. The cut would be filled later.

(A Northern Tier engineer, Ken Berryman, said a consultant is examining whether a narrower notch is feasible.)

The notch is what most concerns environmentalists and some federal officials.

"We're concerned that it could destroy Dungeness Spit." said Rex van Wormer of the Fish and Wildlife Service. "They're going to have to stabilize that bluff to keep it from eroding. And if they keep material from the cliff from getting into the water, it's going to alter the natural patterns."

Van Wormer, the federal Geological Survey and environmentalists like Polly Ball contend there simply isn't enough data to predict exactly what's likely to happen to Dungeness Spit if Northern Tier's project goes ahead.

"We've been studying this a long time," Berryman said. "We can't foresee any adverse impacts."

In its application to the State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council last year, Northern Tier conceded its project could have some effect. But the company, using consultant studies, made these points:

A comparison of maps drawn in 1863 and 1961 indicates the cliff the notch would cut through is regressing only about 3 inches a year.

Because the erosion rate is so slow, a 400-foot barrier of boulders at the base of the cliff will be the only erosion protection needed.

The Green Point bluff doesn't contribute much material to Dungeness Spit anyway. Aerial photographs show the spit gets most of its sediment from cliffs farther east.

But Ralph Keuler, shorelines specialist for the Geological Survey, said bluffs as far west as Morse Creek, west of Green Point, contribute material to Dungeness. No one is certain exactly which segments of cliff contribute how much sediment to Dungeness, he said.

Keuler also said he would be "very surprised" if the Green Point cliff erodes only 3 inches a year. The average for bluffs in the area is 20 to 40 inches, he said.

The Bureau of Land Management's draft environmental-impact statement on the Northern Tier proposal, published last month, doesn't say much about Dungeness Spit.

But it does note that Northern Tier's statement that the bluff is "relatively stable" conflicts with State Department of Ecology reports that geologic deposits in the bluff are "unstable and susceptible to slumping or sliding."

More studies are needed, the impact statement adds. That theme is echoed by others.

"They (Northern Tier) damn well better know what's going to happen before they do something that drastic," said Bruce Fox-

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

worthy of the Geological Survey. "And we don't think they do."

"There's no solid data," Van Wormer agreed. "We understand the principles, but not the specifics."

Both agencies are preparing responses to the draft environment-impact statement. Van Wormer said his office may suggest that Northern Tier build its tank farm at another site.

If Dungeness Spit does begin to erode, he said, one of the first impacts will be destruction of eelgrass beds in the protected inner bay. Waterfowl depend on eelgrass for food. Clam and oyster beds also could be affected.

"There are too many natural values (at Dungeness) to take a chance," Van Wormer said.

DUNGENESS SPIT: PIPELINE FIRM'S PLAN UPSETS RESIDENTS

SEQUIM, CLALLAM COUNTY.—Local residents fighting the Northern Tier Pipeline Co.'s plans for an oil port and tank farm at nearby Port Angeles now have another battle cry: "Save the Spit!"

They aren't sure Dungeness Spit is in danger. But they aren't taking any chances.

The spit, a few miles northwest of Sequim, is the longest natural sandspit in the world. It curves into the Strait of Juan de Fuca like a barbed fishhook, stretching five miles to a Coast Guard lighthouse at its tip.

It's been a national wildlife refuge since the time of President Wilson, and it's also a popular recreation area. Last year 80,000 people visited the spit to hike, picnic and watch the birds through their binoculars.

Northern Tier's oil port at Port Angeles would be more than 10 miles west of the spit. The company's proposed tank farm, while closer, still is five miles from Dungeness. So what's the threat?

Not oil spills or air pollution or any of the concerns usually associated with petroleum, opponents say.

Their biggest worry is that the Northern Tier project could reduce the flow of waterborne sediment that constantly replenishes Dungeness. The "nourishment" keeps the strait from eroding the spit and, eventually, washing it under.

The opponents admit they don't have much solid information. But at the same time, they contend, Northen Tier doesn't have much evidence to reassure them, either.

"They're changing something that man has never messed with before—and no one knows what's really going to happen," said Polly Ball, a director of the Washington Environmental Council and Olympic Peninsula Audubon Society. She lives in Sequim.

Northern Tier disagrees. Ken Berryman, an engineer, is convinced the project's impact on Dungeness Spit will be negligible.

"We've had consultants study the situation, and we think sufficient information is available," he said.

But two government agencies also are concerned about Northern Tier's impact on the spit, and are preparing responses to the federal environmental-impact statement on the project which probably will express those concerns.

"The delicate balance the spit depends on has been there for hundreds of years, as far back as you want to go," said Rex Van Wormer, a wildlife biologist with the federal Fish and Wildlife Service.

"A change in that balance could have an impact on the spit—no one is really sure. And, with us, Dungeness Spit is not negotiable."

A LESSON LEARNED FROM EDIZ HOOK

When opponents of the Northern Tier Pipeline Co. worry about the effects the proposed oil port could have on Dungeness Spit, they point to nearby Ediz Hook as an example of how man can inadvertently destroy a sandpit.

Ediz Hook, like Dungeness, is a natural spit. It protects Port Angeles' deepwater harbor.

For millenia the hook was fed by sediment from the west—some carried down the Elwha River, most from seaside cliffs eroding under constant pressure from the Strait of Juan de Fuca.

Then two dams were built on the Elwha and a bulkhead was built to protect a water-supply pipeline along the shore between the river and Port Angeles.

The result? The natural flow of materials to Ediz Hook was cut off, and the hook started to erode. In 1937, Port Angeles began a continuing battle to keep it from washing away.

Five winters ago a storm breached Ediz Hook, destroying part of the road and temporarily isolating the Coast Guard Station at the tip.

Last year, the Army Corps of Engineers completed a $6 million project to stabilize Ediz Hook and protect the harbor which the Corps said is "essential to commerce and industry in Clallam and Jefferson Counties."

"So you can see why we're a little gunshy about Dungeness," said former Clallam County Commissioner Rosemary Cockrill. "Ediz Hook will never be the same." ●

TRAGEDY ON THE CHESAPEAKE BAY

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, last weekend the residents of Tilghman Island, on the Chesapeake Bay, experienced a profoundly tragic loss. Five watermen, all members of one family, were lost in the icy bay waters. They were all aboard one of the most modern fishing boats on the bay, captained by Garland Phillips. Mr. Phillips was one of the best known, and most beloved, of the bay's hardy watermen.

The watermen of the Chesapeake Bay are a rapidly disappearing breed, literally risking their lives almost every day to harvest our seafood and reveling in the freedom of being as one with nature. This particularly sad loss serves to underscore the perils and hardships of the watermen's lives. But it also demonstrates their great love of life on the water, a devotion to their way of life that overcomes the dangers of unforgiving seas.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to insert in the RECORD an article that appeared in the Washington Post dealing with this tragedy.

ICY DEATH FOR BAY STALWARTS

Maryland Marine Police Coast Guardsmen and private searchers gathered in three boats off Tilghman Island in the Chesapeake Bay yesterday. Shortly after noon they sent divers through the ice and into the frigid water.

Sixty feet down the divers found the sunken wreckage of the Hay Russ IV, Garland Phillips' 50-foot workboat. They didn't have time to look for bodies. According to Larry Simns, head of the Maryland Watermen's Association, the boat was ringed with fishing nets that had broken loose when it went down. The divers dared not penetrate it with ice reforming on the surface.

There still is no confirmation of death, but mourners on Tilghman Island have about given up hope that they will see Garland Phillips, 46, and his crew of four again.

The boat went down Friday evening in high winds. The five men are lost and presumed drowned. On Tilghman, where all five lived all their lives, the mood is somber.

"We lost a good bunch of people," said Russell Dize. "It's the most tragic thing that's ever happened here."

Phillips had been a waterman all his life, as had the four family relatives that were with him Friday—George Cummings, 65, his uncle; Muir Cummings, 30; Rusty Cummings, 26, and T. R. Cummings, 19, all Phillips' first cousins.

The loss of Phillips will be felt beyond the waterman's haven of Tilghman, which is on the Eastern Shore about 20 miles south of the Bay Bridge.

Phillips was among the last and best of a declining breed. He was a Chesapeake drift fisherman. For about six months each year, starting at the end of November, he was a waterborne nomad, following the fish as far north as Chesapeake City at the head of the bay and as far south as Crisfield at the bottom end of Maryland waters.

Drift fishermen fight a ceaseless battle with the weather. "It's probably the hardest and most dangerous job on the bay," said Simns, who has done it. "You have to travel so far and carry so much net, and you catch the most fish when the conditions are worst."

Drift fishermen call whatever port is nearest the fish home. They sometimes sleep aboard their boats for days and even weeks at a stretch. Each cold morning they wake before dawn and watch to see if ice will lock them in port.

If they can get out, they go.

Once there were many more drift netters. As many as 50 boats cruised the winter bay in pursuit of rockfish 10 or 15 years ago. But declining stocks of the prized table fish have turned drifting into work for only the most dedicated. Only 15 or 20 drift boats are working now.

Phillips ran the queen of the fleet. His 50-foot fiberglass Hay Russ IV was the sturdiest, most powerful, best equipped of the winter fishing boats, according to colleagues.

The boat was well known and so was Phillips. "There isn't a place in the bay that he hasn't fished," said Rock Hall waterman Ronnie Fithian. "He was the type of fellow, he'd never get up in the morning with the idea he had to hide anything from anybody. Some people think they've got to keep it a secret when they find the fish, or they won't get their share. Garland wasn't like that. He would tell you what he was catching.

"He's helped me a half-dozen times. If you were in trouble, you called Garland. If he was on the way he'd give you help."

Said waterman Wayne Brady, "He was a gung ho fisherman. He'd spend $1,000 to make a dollar. Here he had a $90,000 boat running up and down the bay, but he was always willing to help anybody. Garland was the kind of guy who was willing to jeopardize his own life to help somebody else."

Phillips was within a few miles of home port in Knapps Narrows when the accident occurred Friday. Other fishermen say he was in an area that he had set net, and apparently he was taking those nets up. He reportedly called his wife by radio before sunset to tell her he'd be back within an hour.

There were unconfirmed reports that he stayed later to help another fisherman pull in some troublesome nets.

There were hard northwest winds that eveing and ice was forming near all the boats, according to Dize.

"There was a lot of activity on the radio. There was ice making all over. Everybody was having trouble. We had one boat taking water right here in the channel. Some of the boys remembered hearing someone saying

over the radio they ware taking water and bailing with buckets.

"But they figured it was the boat that was in trouble in the channel. They asked those boys later and they said they never said anything like that on the radio."

"Now we think it could have been Garland."

The Coast Guard and Marine Police intended to resume diving operations today.●

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this resolution authorizes the construction of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial. The F.D.R. Memorial Commission, which I am honored to serve as Secretary, was established by the Congress on August 11, 1955, and charged with the responsibility of overseeing the creation of a memorial to one of this country's greatest Presidents, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

In the 24 years since the Commission received this charge, a great many designs, over 700, have been considered by its members. Of this number only three have been adopted by the Commission for serious development and presentation.

The first design resulted from a competition sponsored by the Commission in 1960. The winning design was a rather large structure which was quickly dubbed "Stonehenge." The design was subsequently dropped after opposition from city groups and the Federal Commission on Fine Arts which felt that its size would distract from the landscape and compete with the existing Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials and the Washington Monument.

In 1955 the Commission contacted 55 noted architects to determine their interest in participating in the project. Mr. Marcel Breuer was selected and presented a design composed of seven granite "darts" soaring to a height of 60 feet from a granite base. The Commission on Fine Arts rejected this design the following year.

The design we have now, created by Mr. Lawrence Halprin, an internationally acclaimed landscape architect, has received the approval of the F.D.R. Commission as well as the support of the Federal Commission on Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission. The proposed memorial is unlike any other in this city. It will be essentially an open, landscaped, walk-through garden which will feature bronze sculptures and carved quotations inspired by President Roosevelt's life. The sculptures and inscriptions will be placed in several locations along a granite wall which will run the length of the memorial. The sculptures will be the work of four prominent American artists: George Segal, Neil Estern, Leonard Baskin, and Robert Graham. These four gentlemen were selected from recommendations sought from respected authorities in the art world and after an extensive review process undertaken by Mr. Halprin and the F.D.R. Memorial Commission.

Throughout the public discussion of this project, both in and out of Congress, I have never heard one person express the belief that we should not have a memorial to President Roosevelt. The concerns most often voiced are over the cost of the memorial, approximately $46 million, and the fact that President Roosevelt himself preferred a simple remembrance.

Forty-six million dollars is a large sum of money. However, the National Park Service has estimated that if the three existing Presidential memorials were constructed today, costs would run to $59,860,000 for the Lincoln Memorial, $37,960,000 for the Jefferson Memorial, and $45,260,000 for the Washington Monument. It has been suggested that short cuts could be taken in the construction of the memorial to decrease its cost. Very careful calculations have been made as to the type of materials needed for the project and the cost of each. To require the use of inferior materials, to encourage short cuts in the construction of the memorial, or to delete parts would do serious damage to the integrity of its appearance and its carefully integrated components. After 23 years this design has not been hastily arrived at. Serious thought and consideration has been given to each and every element that contribute to the total memorial. To arbitrarily cut the project would undermine its very base.

The second concern I have heard is that President Roosevelt preferred a memorial of lesser proportions; a simple plaque that is already in place across from the National Archives. I know I do not have to remind any Member of this body that when you enter public life and become a public official, your personal wishes are many times subordinate to the wishes of those you serve.

President Roosevelt was not simply an outstanding leader in this country, but was internationally respected. He became a source of personal inspiration to those who witnessed the sheer force of will that helped him overcome the obstacles he faced when stricken with polio. While his achievements in and out of public office are documented in history books and remembered by those of us who had the opportunity to share his life, a memorial of this type will evoke a more complete understanding of the man and his times. This memorial will allow his contributions to this country and to the world to live on for all who visit the site.

I urge the swift approval of this resolution so that work can begin on the memorial in the near future. It would be most fitting to dedicate this memorial to our 32d President on the centennial of his birthday in 1982. This will be possible only if we act quickly.●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE LOUIS (BUD) HESSELBROCK OF NEW JERSEY—1979 "PAUL HARRIS FELLOW," ROTARY CLUB OF WAYNE

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, may I request that you and our colleagues here in the Congress join with me in heartiest congratulations and best wishes to my good friend, outstanding community leader, and distinguished citizen, the Honorable Louis (Bud) Hesselbrock of New Jersey, whose standards of excellence throughout his lifetime have earned him the most highly coveted honor of being chosen the 1979 Paul Harris Fellow of the Rotary Club of Wayne—the highest award that Rotary can bestow upon any of its members.

The Rotary Club of Wayne is one of our Nation's most prestigious affiliates of Rotary International whose motto: "We make a living by what we get . . . we make a life by what we give"—"Service above Self"—and their good deeds in helping others, young and adults alike have served to inspire all of us. Bud Hesselbrock has by his example and lifetime of dedication to these same true American ideals personified exemplary leadership in his outstanding responsible service to our people. The Paul Harris Fellow Award will be presented to him at the Rotary meeting to be held in Wayne on Wednesday, February 21.

Mr. Speaker, Bud's personal commitment to the economic, social, and cultural enhancement of our communtiy has been a way of life for him. He was born in 1910 in Evanston, Ill., the home of Rotary International, and for the past 60 years has been a highly respected citizen of the State of New Jersey. He attended the University of Pennsylvania and graduated from the Wharton School of Business and Finance in 1934. Following graduation and during the depression years he immediately commenced his career pursuits in the business world. In 1939 he became associated with the Mack Molding Co., which at the time was among the largest and most prominent business firms in town and was encouraged by the company's management to become involved in community affairs. Between 1945 and 1950 Mack Molding Co. supported the organizing of the first little league and the establishment of the Wayne first aid squad.

Mr. Hesselbrock has been a leading and active participant in the business community throughout Wayne and the State of New Jersey. In 1951 he was among the founders of the chamber of commerce of Wayne, was named the first vice president and within the first few months of its organization was elected to the presidency of this most esteemed chamber of commerce.

He has been a member of the board of directors of the Rotary Club of Wayne since 1966 and during his tenure has

served as director of club services (1966–1967), secretary (1968–1969) and president (1969–1970).

Mr. Speaker, Bud has attained the greatest respect and deepest appreciation from a grateful community for his compassion, dedication, and untiring efforts in service to his fellow man. Among his many achievements we particularly commend him for his outstanding public service as a longstanding member of the board of trustees of the Foundation for the Handicapped.

All of us who have the good fortune to know Bud are especially proud of his accomplishments. He was in the vanguard in helping to bring new industry into our region and we particularly applaud his teamwork efforts in the U.S. Rubber Co.'s decision to locate their research laboratory in Wayne in 1954 and the establishment of a modern and efficient postal system for Wayne. Bud Hesselbrock's expertise in his professional career and civic endeavors has truly enriched our community, State and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as we reflect upon the history of our great country and the good deeds of our people who have made our representative democracy second to none among all nations throughout the world, I appreciate the opportunity to call your attention to this distinguished gentleman and seek this national recognition of all of his good deeds. I know you will want to join with the Rotary Club of Wayne, N.J., in honoring our good friend Bud as an outstanding citizen and great American. We do indeed salute the Wayne Rotary Club's "Paul Harris Fellow"—the Honorable Louis Hesselbrock.●

ROBERT STACK

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, actor Robert Stack will be the recipient of the "May Mann Award," to be presented at the Golden Anniversary Ball of the Ida Mayer Cummings Auxiliary of the Jewish Home for the Aged of Los Angeles on Sunday, February 25, 1979. Mr. Stack is known around the world for his acting talents, but the May Mann Award is given to honor those individuals in show business who serve humanitarian causes. Bob Stack deserves our honor and respect for his unfailing responses to the auxiliary's requests for help. With his wife Rosemarie, he has given unstintingly of his time and effort to many community causes.

Suspending his acting career to join the Navy in 1942, Bob was commissioned and assigned to the naval base at Pensacola for basic training, graduating top man in his class. He became an aerial gunnery instructor and served for 4 years, including a year of overseas duty. Returning to acting after the war, Bob Stack very quickly attained the eminent place in the movie and television industry which he continues to hold.

It is a pleasure to bring Robert Stack to your attention as a fine and generous citizen, and I know the Members will wish to join me in honoring him.●

WE DO NOT NEED A DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, rarely does one come across an issue on which the Washington Post and the Wall Street Journal agree. But both of these prestigious newspapers recently published editorials condemning the proposed Department of Education.

The Post states that such a department would be a "gigantic single-minded lobbying outfit." The Wall Street Journal says that if the department remains small "it will be a colossal waste of money" and that if it grows it "will present serious dangers" to our educational system.

I want to take this opportunity once more to state my opposition to the creation of such a department. There is overwhelming documentation about the sorry role the Federal Government has played in education in recent years. There is also the obvious fact that powerful lobbying groups would actually control such a department. In the face of such facts what possible argument can be given to support the creation of a new Department of Education?

At this time I wish to insert in the RECORD, "Education Shell Game," from the Wall Street Journal, February 12, 1979. and "The Education Department—Again" from the Washington Post, February 11, 1979.

The articles follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 12, 1979]

EDUCATION SHELL GAME

Officials in the Carter administration say they're making a good faith effort to run the federal government more efficiently. We think this is so, and we're happy to praise them for it. But it's going to be hard to believe they really care much about making government work if they keep up their current campaign for a Department of Education.

As we and many of our fellow journalists have said by now, the proposal to create a Department of Education is one of the most inane policy ideas to come down the pike in a long time. It would take the education part out of the present HEW, add some of the educational enterprises now run by other government departments from Defense to Interior, and put them together in a new organization with a $14 billion budget and some 16,000 employees.

The National Education Association, the country's biggest teacher's union and the chief supporter of the new department, says the consolidation would give a "clear expression, from the national viewpoint, about what we should do for education in this country." Perhaps it would; if so, it's hard to imagine a less cheering prospect than a unified national education policy set by the NEA. The thought seems to be upsetting lots of other people as well. Most of the bureaucracies and constituencies that the NEA wants to fold into the new department have been energetically lobbying to keep themselves out. And, needless to say, it would cost a bundle to carry out the changes necessary to neaten up the organization charts.

The NEA has members everywhere in the country. During the 1976 election campaign Jimmy Carter promised he would support their new department. The NEA responded by endorsing Mr. Carter for the presidency. President Carter introduced a bill to create the department and now, with the re-election fight coming, has reintroduced it into this Congress. Moreover, his effort hasn't been pro forma: We hear that high administration officials have been, to put it indelicately, calling in the markers. They've been meeting with educational groups that have expressed reservations about the bill, reminding them of Mr. Carter's generosity to educators, and trying to persuade them to keep quiet.

The bill as it now stands would include in the new department mainly the organizations now in HEW and overseas schools run by the Department of Defense. But once a new department is created, a President could reorganize other agencies into it without congressional approval. If the new department stays small, it will be mostly a colossal waste of money. If it grows, it will not only waste even more money but begin to present the more serious dangers inherent in educational centralization. We hope more people will begin to speak out and say so.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 11, 1979]

THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—AGAIN

Never underestimate the power of a bad idea to generate bad arguments. Vice President Mondale's remarks the other day in favor of the creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Education were an example. The vice president, in a briefing, made the point that the United States "is the only major industrial democracy in the world that does not have a department or a ministry of education," although, to our certain knowledge, this is neither a symptom nor a source of what is wrong with American education. Mr. Mondale, according to the news story, also suggested that education "suffers because its highest official 'is not at that Cabinet table speaking directly to the president.' "

You would hardly judge from any of this that the United States is also the only major industrial democracy (or any sort of country) in the world in which three-quarters of the children graduate from high school, and half of those graduates go on to college. And we also question whether, despite the proponents' assurances, a new federal department would not subtly and unwisely enlarge the federal jurisdiction in the schools. In theory anyway, education remains a primary function of the states and localities, which is surely one reason this country has not had a national ministry of education as part of its political tradition. We think it is a tradition worth holding on to.

It is, of course, true that much of the money for our public schools now comes from general revenues and that there has been a vast increase of federal involvement in public education over the past couple of decades. But both the money and the involvement can be managed by government instrumentalities now available to do so. It is argued by those who favor the new department that it would work pretty much as a harmless conduit of federal funds and coordinator of federal programs, all the while respecting the primacy of the states and localities in school affairs, and that it would do all this much more efficiently than is done under the present slovenly dispensation. Consulting ancient and modern bureaucratic precedent and looking around us at the evidence of our senses, we discover no reason at all to believe this is how things will turn out. They never do. Look at the Labor Department. Look at Commerce. A Department of Education, if such unfortunately is enacted into law, will

become a gigantic single-minded lobbying outfit. It will be the NEA writ large.

Anyone who observed last year's congressional proceedings on this subject—the hearings, committee debates and so forth—should understand that what we really have here is a fight over turf: who gets which hunk of jurisdiction over whom and what and how much money. Evidently the administration, in coming back with its Education Department legislation in this Congress, has carved up the turf in a new and politically more persuasive way, so that the proposal is likely to have a smoother time this year. We hope it does not. The purpose of the federal government—as we keep harping when this proposal comes up—should be to fit federal education programs into a system of priorities and values *larger* than the education industry's perspective permits it to see, not to break off those programs into a client- and constituent-run principality of its own.

The best thing that could happen to President Carter's proposal for a department of education, from his point of view and everyone else's, would be for Congress to bury it.●

FRANK J. CIGNETTI—OVER 32 YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE

HON. DONALD A. BAILEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to recognize an outstanding citizen who has devoted his life to the welfare of others. Mr. Frank J. Cignetti, of Jeannette, is a humanitarian, civic leader, and former police officer whose reputation for good works has long been appreciated by his community.

Frank J. Cignetti, the only child of Madaline Monstrola Cignetti and Domenico Cignetti, was born on May 15, 1920 in Hermanie, Pa.

As a lifelong resident of the city of Jeannette since the age of 2, Frank has made a lasting impression on the city and its people that is well-known throughout the community.

Upon graduation from Jeannette High School in 1938, Frank entered the private sector for employment for a brief period which was followed by his stint in the U.S. Army Air Force in 1940.

Receiving his honorable discharge in 1946, Frank joined the Jeannette Police Force as a patrolman later in the same year. It was the beginning of over 32 years of dedicated service that saw Frank rise from the rank of patrolman to the Acting Chief of Police in 1972.

His accomplishments and projects were many and varied, from establishing the Jeannette Auxiliary Police Department, initiating the Jeannette police photographic section, becoming president of the Jeannette Police Benefit Association, to designing the sleeve emblem for uniforms of Jeannette's policemen.

The common element through all of these achievements was Frank's dedication and commitment to helping the residents of Jeannette live in a better and safer community.

Frank's wife, Anna, and his two children can be as proud of him as the city of Jeannette is thankful to him for the 32 years of dedicated service of Frank J. Cignetti.

I believe that we in this U.S. House of Representatives should recognize the accomplishments and unselfish devotion of this talented human being. Therefore it gives me a great deal of personal satisfaction to pay tribute to Mr. Cignetti for all that he has done for the betterment of his community.●

CROSS COUNTRY KINETIC SCULPTURE RACE

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the Nation every Memorial Day is focused on the running of the Indianapolis 500. However, in these days of increased energy awareness and with a strong national movement toward energy conservation, it is fitting to become aware of other races which practice the conservation goals toward which we strive.

The westernmost incorporated city in the United States, Ferndale, Calif., is the scene of an annual kinetic sculpture race. Based on the in-depth and historical research effort of William A. Beers, official scribe of the Ferndale Kinetic Sculpture Race, I, in my position as official starter, delivered the principal address for the occasion.

So that my colleagues and people across the Nation may become aware of this event, I am placing into the RECORD the remarks I made at the fifth annual running of this exciting and fun-filled race.

The remarks follow:

Gentlemen, dignitaries, members of the working press, intrepid racers . . . ladies. It is an honor indeed for me to address such an august body of sportsmen and racing enthusiasts on this momentous occasion—the fifth annual running of the great Arcada to Ferndale cross country kinetic sculpture race!

We are all gathered here amid the pomp and circumstance of this great day to witness the second chapter of an incredible odyssey, a new chapter in man's eternal struggle against the elements played out as these brave contestants try their mettle against that cold and unforgiving enemy—the sea!

But this is not the first test for these great racers, this new challenge comes on the very heels of yesterday's harrowing competition that saw these courageous crews pitted against the trackless wastes that lie so omiously betwen Arcada and Eureka. Surely, these valiant competitors have given their all, braving the ferocious onslaught of wild beasts in the sand dunes, the spying eyes of legions of photographers, alas—even the prying eyes of a million tourists!

And now—after a long cold night of barbaric deprivation in Eureka, these fearless crews stand ready once again to make the supreme sacrifice as they brave a terrifying bay crossing.

It is a crossing fraught with blood curdling dangers! Now they face ferociously fanged sharks, man eating clams, indeed, all manner of monsters from the ocean's depths wait in hideous array below the sinister surface of this seemingly peaceful body of water.

And what faces the survivors of this perilous voyage? What new danger lies on the far shore, that far flung and mysterious strip of land, the south spit? It stretches like some threatening phantom's arm, northward, from the dark and frightening walls of Table Bluff to meet these brave men and women who would best the incredible forces of nature.

When these intrepid sportsmen land on the farshore they first do battle with a sea of mud before crossing to the ocean side of the spit where crashing waves and shifting sands threaten their very lives as they press southward past doomful crags to finish the day, exhausted, on yet another sandy waste opposite Crab Park.

Here, our brave competitors enjoy an all too brief overnight respite with food, drink, merriment, and the happy blaze of a communal campfire. But when morning comes, they again face the deadly serious business of the Great Arcata to Ferndale Cross Country Kinetic Sculpture Race!

This, the third morning of the Great Race brings our heroic crews and their ingenious machines yet another supreme test—the terrifying journey across the treacherous waters of crab slough!

Then, those who have not foundered at Neptune's hands make their way in comparative safety along colorful country lanes to Cock Robin Island where they face yet another trial—the storm swollen torrents of the raging Eel River!

Once our fearless competitors have negotiated this last and most frightening hazard they proceed through peaceful dairy country to the victorian village, Ferndale. There, dogged by the everpresent spectre of sheer physical exhaustion these marvellous men and women marshal their remaining strength for a grand dash down main street to the finish at Fireman's Park. Then, in a gala award ceremony the intrepid racers receive a kaleidoscope of prizes and pay tribute to those who have perished along the way.

So now, as thousand watch, these brave crews stand ready to fling themselves headlong across the inky depths of Humboldt Bay at the boom of the starting cannon! They stand ready to risk life and limb for the spirit of this—The Great Arcata to Ferndale Cross Country Kinetic Sculpture Race! These valiant racers indeed deserve the very best—let us cheer them on I say! Let us give them three rousing cheers!

Hip, hip, hooray!
Hip, hip, hooray!
Hip, hip, hooray!

Thank you ladies and gentlemen. Thank you.●

ALFRED S. GAINSLEY

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, Alfred S. Gainsley will receive its Man of the Year Award from the Ida Mayer Cummings Auxiliary of the Jewish Home for the Aged of Los Angeles at a golden anniversary ball on Sunday, February 25, 1979. Departing from tradition to honor a president of the home while he is still in office, the auxiliary follows its theme "Golden Years/Golden Deeds" to commemorate Mr. Gainsley's long-time affiliation with the home. His father and mother set an example of devotion during their lifetimes. His father, Nat Gainsley, was a founder, 40 years ago, of the Guardians, the men's group of the home, which was started in 1938. His mother, Rahle Gainsley Hornwood, was

president in 1939 of the junior auxiliary, now the Cummings auxiliary, and then served as the auxiliary's chaplain until her passing. Alfred's wife Jean is a member of the auxiliary's advisory board, and their daughters Carol Glover and Barbara Scheineman, are life members. Thus, from the time of his birth in 1912 in the shadow of the original home in the Boyle Heights section of Los Angeles, Alfred Gainsley inherited this tradition of care for the aged, and has not only contributed his time and concern for his own generation, but has preserved his parents' heritage and passed it on to his children.

My fellow Members will, I know, wish to join me in this well-deserved tribute to Alfred Gainsley, whose commitment to his community has been lifelong.●

USE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL FRANK

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards has revised and updated its publication entitled "Use of the Congressional Frank by Members of the House of Representatives and Rules of Practice in Proceedings Before the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards." Two copies of the publication will be distributed to every office within the next 3 days. Additional copies will be available upon request through the Commission for your district offices.

The purpose of the publication is to set forth the laws, Rules of the House, and regulations established thereunder, governing the proper use of the congressional frank.

Additionally the Commission will conduct a seminar for staff members on use of the congressional frank on Wednesday, February 21, 1979, at 9:30 a.m. until noon in the Caucus Room, 345 Cannon.

My friend and colleague ED DERWINSKI, ranking minority member of the Commission, as well as all other members of the Commission, join me in urging that each Member and committee be represented by staff at the seminar.

Often the actual determination of whether or not to send a particular piece of mail under the frank probably will be made by staff who prepare mail for delivery. An improper use of the frank by a staff member, whether an inadvertent mistake or a willful abuse on a single letter or a mass mailing, will be imputed to the Member, under most circumstances. To help avoid these violations of the franking law, with all of their resultant possible penalties, a Member should reasonably assure that his staff knows what kinds of mail are frankable by providing for their familiarization with these regulations.●

HARDBALL I

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a message from the administration. I was told that the administration was going to hold firm on its budget proposals. I want to thank them for giving me "the word." Now, just for a moment I want to make clear where I am coming from in this Congress and on this budget.

The President wants to balance the budget. The chairman of the full committee is looking for balance in 1981. Most of the colleagues I receive these days seem to deal with balancing the budget. A much quoted Gallup poll says that a majority of the American people want a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget. Let me say that I too want to balance the budget.

However, before somebody calls Sacramento, I should explain that I mean more than balancing dollars received and dollars expended. I mean that every American born in this third decade—our "receipts"—should have a job, an education, complete medical and dental protection, a chance to realize his and her potential as an individual, and a guarantee that they will not be abandoned in their later years, I mean that in a country as rich as ours in both natural and human resources our expenditures should indeed, equal our receipts.

Let me talk about dollars and sense. The administration has come up here ready to cut spending. I am ready to play ball. I do not believe that we should waste a single tax dollar. If there are programs that do not benefit anyone—"I will cut them." If there is waste and inefficiency in existing programs—"I will support, strongly, all efforts to shake things out right." However, if the administration comes up here and wants to cut programs that do, in fact, benefit the poor and the disadvantaged—then I want my innings. And I will fight you on that as hard as I can. Still I do not really believe that a Democratic administration and a Democratic Congress should really have much to fight about here.

This country can afford to maintain and where necessary increase its level of public assistance. It cannot afford not to. The cost, the real cost and even the dollar cost of not doing so would give us a deficit that might indeed destroy us.

The budget is an ordering of priorities. The administration is telling us that we cannot afford not to increase defense spending by three percent. Is it telling us with the budget that it has sent this subcommittee that we can afford not to increase our human resource programs? If we loose the battle in the streets, no new mobile missile system, no new warplane, no new tank is going to be any protection at all.

I do not believe that it is simply a question of guns or butter. I believe that there are lower priority programs, like a chunk of the approximately $150 billion in tax expenditures now set for fiscal year 1980. The administration has come forth with no proposals to cut there. Does that mean that they are all priority programs—all programs that we cannot afford not to continue?

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed by the sense of ennui that seems to pervade the halls of the 96th Congress before we have even fairly sat down to business. There is a feeling that we are not going to get much done in the next 2 years—that this is not the time for new ideas, new programs to deal with the problems that few will deny exist any more than they deny the Gallup poll results on the question of a balanced budget. There is a feeling that we should just try and hold the line.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if we just try and hold the line we are going to lose the whole ball game.●

AMERICAN SOKOL ANNIVERSARY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the first American Sokol unit was founded on February 15, 1865, by a group of Czech immigrants in St. Louis, Mo. In my own city of Chicago on October 30, 1892, the first Slovak Sokol Society was formed, and its heritage is similar to that of the American Sokol organization. Sokol USA shares the goal of physical and moral strength, as do the Catholic Sokols.

Sokol, which is a Czechoslovak word meaning falcon, symbolizes well the ideals of the Sokol organizations, because the falcon is a bird that has a love of freedom as well as strength, courage, and agility. The Sokol organization was founded in Czechoslovakia in 1862 by Dr. Miroslav Tyrs (1832–84), a professor of history and esthetics at Charles University in Prague, and by Jindrich Fuegner (1822–65), who was a businessman and a lover of the arts and music. These two men perfected a system of physical fitness through a series of calisthenics and other activities, based on the idea that each individual is important and could and should progress to the ultimate peak of physical fitness. Their motto was "A sound mind in a healthy body."

The Sokol movement, which includes men, women, and children of all ages, increases physical fitness while teaching the virtues of individual responsibility, emphasizing high moral principles, and developing the ability to work successfully with others. The physical education program stresses individual initiative, creativity, as well as self-discipline, which is a basic requirement for personal achievement enabling the gymnast to become a cohesive and cooperative member of American society. In uniting Czechoslovak culture, the American heritage, and Sokol ideals, the organization contributes greatly to the welfare, safety, and freedom of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with

Sokol members in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois I am honored to represent, in the city of Chicago, and all over our country as they celebrate this anniversary.●

A PROPHECY THAT (UNFORTUNATELY) CAME TRUE

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Assassinations Committee has, I am sad to report, fulfilled my every expectation. After spending $5 million of the taxpayers' money, and perpetuating the sensationalism that has dogged the two tragic murders it investigated, it has failed to answer a single question about either assassination. It has, in fact, only raised more theories, doubts, and qualified each of its findings. The committee's sad record was succinctly appraised by columnist James J. Kilpatrick, and at this time I insert his column on the subject in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HOUSE ASSASSINATION REPORT WAS A DUD

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

It might have seemed impossible for any body of men to convert one of the most dramatic events of the 20th Century into an exercise in boredom, but the House Select Committee on Assassinations brought it off. The committee's preliminary report is a dud.

The committee was created in September 1976 with a mission to make a definitive investigation and report on the assassinations of John F. Kennedy in 1963 and Martin Luther King in 1968. Some of us asked at the time: Why? What was to be gained by hashing and rehashing the findings of the original Warren Commission? Some of us prophesied, on the record, that no report ever would satisfy the assassination buffs who get their ghoulish jollies from the spattered brains of a slain President.

So it has turned out. A very considerable body of money has been spent; thousands of pages of notes and testimony have been filed; by the end of March, we are to have a multi-volume final report that no one but the buffs will ever read. The taxpayers who financed this investment in futility have wound up with a very poor return.

None of the questions that were left dangling 15 years ago has been settled. It was clear then, and it is just as clear now, that Lee Harvey Oswald killed the President. It was not clear then, and it is no clearer now, whether Oswald acted in conspiracy with others. The committee says it was "probably" a conspiracy. But the committee has not the foggiest idea who the conspirators, if any, might have been.

Two years of labor have produced but one positive conclusion on this point: "The Secret Service, Federal Bureau of Investigation and Central Intelligence Agency were not involved in the assassination of President Kennedy." And bully for them!

Everything else is qualified. The committee believes, "on the basis of the evidence available to it," that the Soviet government was not involved. Neither was the Cuban government involved. Neither were anti-Castro groups as such, though individual members may have been involved. Similarly, no evidence points to organized crime, as such, but it might possibly have been some maverick mobster, acting on his own, who fired a shot from the famous grassy knoll.

The tentative conclusion that a conspiracy "probably" was afoot derives from expert acoustical evidence. If this evidence ever were offered as testimony in a court of law and subjected to cross-examination by a skilled defense attorney, the evidence would be reduced to unconvincing conjecture.

The evidence in question is a taped recording drawn from an open microphone on the motorcycle of a Dallas police officer, but the officer, testifying the other morning on NBC's "Today" show, said it couldn't have been his microphone. Speaking merely as one of 50 million jurors in the court of public opinion, I found the cop more believable than the experts.

The committee's summary as to the assassination of Dr. King is almost as unsatisfactory. This, too, was "probably" a conspiracy, but the "probably" results largely from a stale charge made by a fellow from Missouri a long time ago. Ten years after the fact, perhaps a federal case might be made against two other fellows from Missouri who reportedly boasted they would pay $50,000 to anyone who would kill Dr. King. The prospect seems remote.

Otherwise, such are the benefits of hindsight, we are informed that the Secret Service and the FBI performed "with varying degrees of competency" in the Kennedy assassination. Secret Service agents "were inadequately prepared to protect the President from a sniper." In its final report, perhaps the committee will advise us how a President may be protected from a sniper when the President insists upon traveling in an open limousine through the streets of a major city.

The final report, due in March, will include a string of recommendations for laws, guidelines, regulations, procedures and, alas, "implementing mechanisms that would permit inter-agency tasking of particular functions." By this the committee apparently means that law enforcement agencies should get together on their intelligence-gathering efforts. It is sound advice, but we might have had it for less than five million bucks.●

JACK BORMAN

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 25, 1979, the Ida Mayer Cummings Auxiliary of the Jewish Home for the Aged of Los Angeles will hold a golden anniversary ball. In accordance with its theme "Golden Years/Golden Deeds," the auxiliary has created a special "Golden Years" Award for presentation to Mr. Jack Borman. The longtime support of the home by this insurance executive has been a special interest of his, but not his only community commitment. He is currently commissioner of the fire and police pension system in Los Angeles, and is involved with many civic, cultural, religious, and Jewish causes. Among them are Founders of the Music Center, Sinai Temple, B'nai B'rith, the county museum, UCLA Alumni Association, and the Jewish War Veterans. He is also a founder of Haifa University in Israel and a member of the Prime Ministers' Club, State of Israel Bonds.

It is because of the generosity of Jack Borman and those who, like him, care about the elderly in our community that the Cummings Auxiliary can approach its golden anniversary with the surety of being able to maintain this fine Jewish home for the aged. I ask the Members to join with me in honoring this man who has a keen awareness of the needs of others and who has contributed so generously toward them.●

WORK INCENTIVES FOR WELFARE RECIPIENTS

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, I have long supported the idea of work incentives for our welfare system. The fact that welfare recipients cannot easily get themselves off the public dole is contrary to the Americans ethic of paying one's own way when one is able to do so.

Recently, some newspapers have printed articles about people who tried to "save" their way off the welfare rolls and the subsequent court actions which they faced. I would like to share another recent article from UPI which tells the story of a woman who elected to work as a trash hauler rather than accept public assistance. Perhaps it can serve as an example for others and as motivation for Congress to improve work incentives provisions in existing welfare regulations.

The article follows:

SHE'D RATHER HAUL GARBAGE CANS THAN LIVE ON WELFARE

MIAMI.—Alma Sumpter would rather lug garbage cans than live on welfare.

When Mrs. Sumpter, 40, had trouble finding work seven weeks ago, she persuaded the State Employment Service to contact the city of Miami on her behalf about collecting garbage.

"We told her about the rats and the roaches and the worms," said Bill Smith, a garbage department superintendent. "But she wanted to get off welfare. She wanted to earn her own living. She talked like she could do the work."

It wouldn't be half as hard as picking tomatoes or nursing mental patients, as she had done in the past, Mrs. Sumpter said. "Just put me on the truck and tell the men to keep up."

The worst part of the job is rising at 4:30 a.m. to be at work before 6 a.m., she says. Snarling dogs used to be a problem. Now she warns, "Get away or I'll put my boot in your mouth," and the animals retreat.

Mrs. Sumpter's supervisor says the 115-pound woman can handle most loads alone. "I get a lot of help from the guys on the crew," she said. She may be the only woman collecting garbage in Florida, according to Clarence Patterson, who heads Miami's sanitation department. Patterson said he would hire more women "if they're as good as this one."

And her son is supportive.

"At first my son was proud of me," Mrs. Sumpter said. "He hasn't said anything lately, except that he thinks I should make more money."

The best part of the job, she says, is the $5.49 an hour that she earns.

"I wouldn't be married to anything except those cans," she said. "And it beats being on welfare. I hope a lot of other women get the hint . . . and get off welfare."●

LACK OF U.S. INNOVATION CONTINUES TO BOOST COSTS TO CONSUMERS

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that one of the primary causes of the rising cost of consumer goods is excessive Government regulation. Manufacturers from the west coast to the East roundly decry the heavy Federal burden of regulation and attendant paperwork, and have placed the burden of guilt of rising costs where it belongs, at the feet of the Federal Government.

Excessive regulation of the health care industry cannot only be costly, but downright dangerous to the health and welfare of American citizens. One of the worst Federal offenders, in my opinion, is the Food and Drug Administration. The drug lag and the lack of innovative new drug research in the United States reflect this bureaucratic regulatory disease, Mr. Speaker.

The New York Times published an opinion piece entitled "Whatever Happened to U.S. Innovation?" on February 4, 1979. Written by Leo-Arthur Kelmenson, chief executive officer of Kenyon & Eckhardt, Inc., this article accurately describes the unhealthy state of U.S. innovation. I find it to be an insightful point of view and recommend it to my colleagues.

The article follows:

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO U.S. INNOVATION?

(By Leo-Arthur Kelmenson)

The Carter Administration has launched a major study to find out why innovation by private industry is in the doldrums. Set at the Cabinet level, this Government project will feature a committee drawn from 15 Federal departments, agencies and offices, and headed by Secretary of Commerce Juanita M. Kreps. Input will also be sought from private industry, advisory panels in labor, "public interest groups" and academe.

Secretary Kreps has already formulated a "work plan" and Mr. Carter has set this June as the deadline for learning the results of his "search for clues on what changes should be recommended to the President in order to reverse the declining trend in new-product innovation."

Any number of corporate executives could quickly supply those "clues." Asking for them from a committee heavily loaded with people who represent Government regulatory bodies is like asking a mosquito to discover the cause of malaria.

The President's concern is, of course, justified. Innovations do more than keep us ahead of foreign competition in terms of prestige and our marketing position. Our inability to compete on an international scale in high-technology advances and product superiority contributes substantially to the country's unfavorable balance of payments, to the dollar's devaluation and to inflation and unemployment here at home.

There was a time in the 1940's and 1950's when it would have been laughable to suggest that this country would soon suffer a technology gap with Germany and Japan, our two vanquished enemies. No more. While Japan and West Germany enjoy huge, multimillion dollar surpluses in their trade balances, the United States deficit soars.

The pioneering characteristic that once made America the most highly advanced industrial nation in the world has shown alarming signs of evaporating. When appropriate rewards for innovation all but disappear, when regulatory burdens and the Federal paperwork accompanying them threaten to drown the corporation, when "total disclosure" edicts turn a successful research and development company into a patsy for competitors, it is small wonder that some businesses find the simplest solution to be the cop-out.

Perhaps the biggest deterrent to researching, developing and marketing new products—even beyond the high cost, high risk, and long-term payout involved in such innovative activities—is the accelerating effect of regulatory requirements. There are more than 80 Federal agencies that regulate private activity, and the bible of these agencies, the Code of Federal Regulation, now runs to some 70,000 pages. In the steel industry, companies must comply with more than 5,000 regulations issued by 27 different Federal agencies.

Not only is the price tag on such Government involvement in the market-place staggering (more than $100 billion this fiscal year), but the new bureaucracy made up of the regulatory agencies—which has become a powerful fourth branch of Government not provided for in the Constitution—generates a nightmare of Federal paperwork.

In some industries, heads of research and development report they spend more man hours filling out Government requests and reports than in doing the research itself, and that these requirements are smothering the very initiative and innovation whose decline the President laments.

While reasonable Government "watchdogs" have their place, too many of these agencies are taking on functions they were never meant to have. Bureaucracy lays its heavy hands on almost every aspect of research and development, as well as on the marketing process. In some industries even the nature of the proposed research must be Government-approved. From there the agencies go on to regulate, specify and assess manufacturing techniques and procedures, factory construction, environmental impact, employment practices, promotional tools, package size and material content, advertising copy, media use, the language of warranties and pricing—all that before the Government even gets around to tax policies.

But it is the hard-line attitude toward business that the regulatory agencies employ that has such a devastating effect on innovation. As any creative person knows, true innovation calls for unfettered freedom; its success depends upon the ability to move away from the norm, into uncharted waters; upon the ability to deviate from routine procedures and thinking, with a minimum of restraints. Since it is in the very nature of regulatory bodies to be non-creative themselves (one could even go so far as to say they are parasitic, thriving only as long as there is an industrial body on which to feed), the distance between the regulator and the regulated is enormous, and the two appear to each other as hostile forces on opposite sides of an unbridgeable chasm.

Not only the regulatory agencies, but the Government itself seems to take joy in putting down big companies. While Washington cries "divestiture" in the name of freer competition, Japan offers inducements to business to grow large, recognizing what we do not: The splintered corporation is in danger of being unable to compete on an international scale.

Not without reason, one of the few products this country seems to be exporting with great success is research itself. Growth of research and development abroad, by American companies, continues to outpace growth of domestic research and development. In addition to Japan, other countries, including Canada, offer extraordinary incentives, including outright subsidies, cash grants and long-term, low-interest loans to companies willing to do their innovating away from home. In England, the Queen has introduced corporate awards for innovation.

Given the hostile climate here and our overly restrictive regulatory philosophies, can United States companies find happiness by establishing research facilities abroad? Obviously so.

In the last few years, there has also been a dearth of risk capital. When the maximum tax on capital gains was raised from 25 percent to 49 percent, that ended the era of ready venture-money. The potential gain became too small for investors to chance their money on such an uncertain thing as new-gains tax has been cut back, there is bound product development. Although the capital to be a long gap before venture-capital flows freely once again. Meanwhile, many small companies with high-technology capabilities have dried up. With their demise went the jobs and corporate taxes they delivered—and, as Mr. Carter's committee will find out, their innovativeness as well.●

THOMAS ALVA EDISON

HON. JOHN G. FARY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, this year marks the 100th anniversary of the invention of the incandescent light. February 11 is the birthdate of Thomas Alva Edison, its inventor.

Born in Ohio in 1847, Thomas Edison spent only 3 months in school before his education was undertaken by his mother. As a youth, he sold fruit, candy and papers on the "Grand Trunk Railroad." Eventually, with the aid of a small handpress, he printed the Grand Trunk Herald and distributed it among the railroad's 400 employees. At age 15, he became a tramp telegrapher, and at 17, he developed an automatic telegraph repeater, his first invention.

Though he is most famous for inventing the incandescent lamp and a dynamo to light it, Edison also held hundreds of

other patents. Many of his inventions are still being used today, only slightly improved from his original patents. Other of his inventions provided the groundwork on which several modern American industries are built. Western Union bought his telegraph transmitter. Remington bought his typing machine. A. B. Dick bought his "electric pen" for making stencils. The Victor Co. used his phonograph patents. Firestone used his latex patents. The list can be continued.

By organizing the research efforts of his 80 scientists and technicians, Edison fostered a technological revolution. His inventions changed the course of history. The legacy of ingenuity and perseverance he left has been imprinted on the minds of the thousands of young scientists who have labored in research labs throughout America.

Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, this year, in these times of trouble to our economy and to the industry which keeps it moving, we need to rededicate ourselves to the American spirit Thomas Alva Edison embodies. It is time to rekindle the spirit of the American pioneers in those whose job it will be to lead the country along the road to technological achievement.●

ARSON AND THE UNIFORM CRIME REPORTS

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, being deeply concerned about the need for public awareness of the tragic effects and widespread crime of arson, I am introducing legislation that will permanently make arson a part I offense for purposes of the uniform crime reporting system, as compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. As you may remember, Congressman JOHN SEIBERLING and I introduced an amendment to the 1979 Justice Department authorization bill which required the FBI to begin collecting arson data as a part I offense in the 1979 fiscal year beginning October 1, 1978, for a period of 1 year. The FBI has, in accordance with this mandate, prepared a procedure to collect arson statistics nationwide for the first time. An information packet will be sent to the 45 State agencies that collect crime statistics and report them for contribution to the Uniform Crime Reports. The goal of this program is, obviously, the collection of accurate arson statistics. Such data has never been collected and it is high time this situation was corrected, as arson is believed to be the Nation's costliest property crime and one which accounts for 10,000 injuries and 1,000 deaths annually. Until last year, arson was classified as a part II offense for purposes of the Uniform Crime Reports sharing that category with public drunkenness, disorderly conduct, and forgery.

The public has not had the advantage of complete reporting and news and media coverage of this crime, public apathy and indifference has resulted. It is hoped that the collection of accurate arson data and the full reporting of them through the Uniform Crime Reports will bring about more involvement in arson detection and prevention and that the public will become more aware of the costly nature of arson. I believe that this legislation will go far in correcting this long neglected offense and I urge your support of this measure to achieve that result.●

CONGRESSMAN PAUL SIMON COMMENDED FOR LEADERSHIP

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. BEDELL, Mr. Speaker, it has been my profound pleasure to serve with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SIMON) since we first came to Congress in 1975. I have had the opportunity to develop a sincere respect for his leadership abilities which time after time have resulted in legislative victories for the public good.

PAUL's contribution has not gone unnoticed. Recently, two respected national columnists, Robert Walters and Martha Angle of the Newspaper Enterprise Association, wrote a piece concerning the responsibilities each Member has to concern himself above all with the interests of the Nation as a whole as opposed to the more parochial concerns of our individual districts and States.

It is fitting that they focused on PAUL SIMON. No better example could be found of a Member dedicated to the common good of our country at a time when we as a people seem as fragmented as ever by geographic, partisan and economic divisions. I believe that the people of Illinois' 24th District also deserve a measure of appreciation for sending us a Representative with his clear vision and outstanding capabilities.

The column has an important message for all of us, and I commend it to every Member of the House:

[From the Alton Evening Telegraph, Feb. 2, 1979]

PAUL SIMON PICKED AS ONE OF BEST IN DISTRICT SERVICE

(By Robert Walters and Martha Angle)

WASHINGTON (NEA).—Members of Congress, like retail sales personnel, are expected to pretend the constituent-customer is always right. But it ain't necessarily so.

All too often, John Q. Public is likely to be passionate in his opinions but parochial in his outlook. His interests and his perspective are shaped by his own experience.

He may acknowledge the possibility people elsewhere in the country—not to mention the world—have problems different from his own, but he doesn't much care.

His one question for his congressman is "What have you done for me?" Most spend the bulk of their time trying to answer the question to the satisfaction of enough constituents to insure a return ticket to Washington at the next election.

They use most if not all their official allowance to hire "caseworkers" to track down constituent Social Security checks, or staff aides to birddog sewer grants, water projects and other "pork" for the folks back home.

Every time a controversial issue looms, they whip off a questionnaire soliciting constituent opinions on how they should vote. They scour the mail, race home every weekend and "vote the district."

They become, in other words, "Mr. Fix-its" for the people in the districts, not national legislators balancing the interests of all Americans, as the Founding Fathers originally intended.

"I'm afraid we're getting too many people in Congress whose sole aim is to get re-elected," conceded Rep. Paul Simon, D-Carbondale, one of the most effective and conscientious members of the House.

Simon, now serving his third term from the 24th District in Southern Illinois, has felt the pressures so many of his colleagues succumb to. But he has quietly resisted them.

Last fall, for instance, one newspaper in his district endorsed Simon for re-election but grumped about his "straying towards world politics," suggesting his average constituent "believes there are more than enough problems in Southern Illinois to keep a legislator busy."

Instead of apologizing for his service as a U.S. delegate to the United Nations, or for his work on problems of world hunger, Simon carefully and patiently wrote a column for all the newspapers in his district explaining why the rest of the world matters to Southern Illinois.

He reminded his constituents, many of whom live in rural areas, one out of two acres under cultivation in Illinois produces food for export to other countries; in the southern third of the state, some 15,600 jobs are directly related to manufacturing export goods; inflation is affected by the unfavorable U.S. balance of trade with other countries; world hunger contributes to international tensions.

It wasn't the first such column that Simon, a former newspaper publisher, has written for his constituents. And it won't be the last. He is one congressman who takes his leadership responsibilities seriously, including the responsibility to educate his constituents.

Nor is Simon alone. There are other members of the House and Senate equally disturbed by the tide of parochialism, single-interest politics and "me-first" rhetoric now washing over Capitol Hill.

They are by no means indifferent to the needs and wishes of their own constituents. On the contrary, most are assiduous in performing casework and pursuing federal largesse for their districts. But they do not stop there.

The best members of Congress acknowledge their responsibility to look beyond the borders of their own districts, their own states, to the problems and needs of the nation as a whole.●

SADIE AND LEW ZUCKERMAN

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, married on February 28, 1909, Sadie and Lew Zuckerman will be celebrating their 70th wedding anniversary coincidentally with the Golden Anniversary Ball which will be held on February 25, 1979 by the Ida

Mayer Cummings Auxiliary of the Jewish Home for the Aged in Los Angeles. Sadie is honorary life president of the auxiliary, and Lew is honorary life president of the home. The Zuckermans, a young and spry 93 each, were married at Congregation Beth Israel at Olive and Temple Streets in Los Angeles. Sadie's father, Louis Goldberg, was the president of this prominent Orthodox synagogue. Their wedding was an important social event of the Jewish community, and they entertained over 700 guests.

Soon after their marriage, Sadie and Lew helped found the home in 1912, and in the decades since then they both have served it unstintingly and with complete devotion.

It gives me special pleasure to ask the Members to join with me in extending warm congratulations and good wishes to Mr. and Mrs. Zuckerman, who have used their years so very well.●

AMTRAK

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like my fellow colleagues to have the opportunity to see a side of Amtrak which is very seldom heard nor put into print. I commend Mr. Whitaker for bringing forth facts which shed a different light on the Amtrack dilemma.

AMTRAK, THE CABOOSE

(By Rogers E. M. Whitaker)

Amtrak, which has—surprisingly—attained the age of eight, is an institution unique among the multitudinous enterprises established by our Federal Government: It was deliberately designed by its proponents to be non self-perpetuating but self-destructing.

The day the Amtrak bill became law, one of my eldest friends in the railway fraternity—a lawyer cerebrated for his skills at persuading the Interstate Commerce Commission to permit the discontinuance of one passenger train after another—burst into my office to announce, tritely (and, I fear, truthfully), that "President Nixon has signed the death warrant of the long-distance American passenger train." His point was well taken: Only a tiny fraction of that service had survived into 1971, and 70 percent of that remnant was now to be expunged.

Amtrak was to contract and pay for this service, all of which was unprofitable (in large part because of Government subsidies to competing modes of transport), and make it, by magic, profitable. Yet the traveler by train from New York to Detroit must now travel 600 additional miles, at twice the cost and twice the time; for a long time, cities as important as Cleveland, Toledo, Salt Lake City and Dallas (population over a million) were to have no service at all.

The railways had hastily sold several hundred of their best passenger cars to railways in Mexico and Canada; some railways would not permit Amtrak to run trains on the most useful routes; wage negotiations with unions were conducted without Amtrak participation, and the cost was levied upon Amtrak.

The perfect model for Amtrak would have been the original United States Post Office. It had the power to order railways to carry mail on whatever trains it wanted, to set the price it would pay, and to levy fines for dilatory performance. Amtrak was given no such regulatory powers. In return for relieving the railways of the cost of running passenger service, it was rewarded with slower trains, delays because of poor track and freight-train wrecks, arbitrary changes (on no notice at all) of route. The costs of all this were assessed against Amtrak. None of the Amtrak services were of Amtrak's choosing; for some years the law specified that the Department of Transportation would design the network of routes, and some of its choices served vastly underpopulated territory.

Among the early members of Amtrak's board of directors were Louis Menk, the head of the Burlington Northern Railroad, who in print and on the television program "60 Minutes" denounced Amtrak as a concept as archaic as the stagecoach; Thomas Gilhooley, the head of Transportation of New Jersey, a large bus company in direct competition with Amtrak; and William Moore, the head of Penn Central, whose downgrading of passenger service had been assailed by several public-service commissions.

The law stated that there were to be public-interest members of the board, but they were not appointed for more than two years after Amtrak was set up. The board voted, against the opposition of these members, to permit the railways serving Chicago to stop holding connecting trains for passengers going through, and thousands of customers had to be sent by bus and by plane on the rest of their journeys, or housed and fed overnight, all at Amtrak's expense.

James MacDonald, the leading public-interest member, said he would disclose this secret deal, and Congress mandated a new head for Amtrak. Paul Reistrup, a well-known and experienced passenger man was chosen, but the board refused to seat him until Congress ordered that he be seated. This man had to face up to an increasingly poor performance by the railways under contract, a vast overstaffing of a headquarters that was well-laced with officers transferred from the discredited Penn Central; the aforesaid hostile board; and a group of employees openly defiant of him and yet—because of long-term contracts and/or political influence—impossible to dislodge. The new man resigned last spring.

His successor, Alan Boyd, much more knowledgeable about Capitol Hill politics, has had some of the rebels removed, and is getting to work on reducing the overpopulated staff.

All of this constitutes what Brock Adams, the Secretary of the Department of Transportation, terms giving Amtrak a "fair chance" to succeed, and he has now proposed an enormous reduction in the service it provides. Unless Congress objects to his proposal before the end of April, it becomes irrevocable.

Mr. Boyd counters with the proposal that Congress, mindful of the wishes of its constituents, tells Amtrak precisely what service should be provided.

The Secretary replies that he does not want Congress to meddle. That leaves the issue squarely up to us constituents who believe that Congress still possesses the constitutional right to legislate.●

BROTHER, CAN YOU SPARE A TREE?

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, while Japan is keeping busy its 26,000 mills cutting up our logs, our own mills are closing down everywhere in the Northwest. The latest victim is the Pope and Talbot Plywood Mill in Kalama. The 340 lost jobs represent a severe social and economic impact in that area.

While we continue to ship large volumes of our prime old growth timber to the Orient (3 billion board feet in 1978), the U.S. manufacturers are importing dimension lumber from Canada. Increasingly we are buying more finished products from our northern neighbor which now supplies 25 percent of our lumber and paper market.

Traditionally the Northwest has been heavily dependent on timber and commodity production as its economic base, but that is seriously threatened because of a projected timber-supply shortage in the early 1980's. In a number of recent studies, the U.S. Forest Service has consistently warned of the dwindling supplies in the Pacific Northwest industrial lands and the concomitant loss of employment in timber-related businesses.

This decline could be corrected by a combination of intensified forest management, particularly on public lands, and revised harvest levels set by the Federal Government.

There is also a considerable effort underway to open up more public land for harvesting as Congress debates RARE II legislation this year.

While I support such initiatives we can ill-afford to ignore the most formidable threat to the timber supply problem—the export of unprocessed logs. It is not a good resource policy to send our valuable logs to Japan at a time when our timber supply is dwindling; it is also poor economic policy to deny ourselves the mill capacity and tens of thousands of related jobs when most countries are taking steps to maximize the full economic benefit of their resources.

A respected columnist for the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, Mr. Shelby Scates, ably describes what is confronting the wood products industry in the Northwest. It is a regional problem but with national implications. Because Congress may be faced with acting on the log export issue this session, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article which appeared in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer:

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, Feb. 11, 1979]

BROTHER, CAN YOU SPARE A TREE?

(By Shelby Scates)

KALAMA, WASH.—A plywood mill closed here last week, another victim of log exports, leaving 340 persons without jobs in this small Columbia River community. Poignant, but only a hint of the trouble in the nation's timber supply.

The shame of the Northwest economy, this shipping of unprocessed logs from our forests to the insatiable Far East markets, is a factor in what is about to become a knotty problem in the national economy.

It's spelled out in startling detail inside a study of the nation's timber situation ordered last April by President Carter, prepared by the Department of Agriculture, but as yet unpublicized.

"These figures confirm what we have strongly suspected for five years—the country is running out of timber," said U.S. Rep. Don Bonker, D-Wash. He was shown a portion of the report.

"The U.S. Forest Service knows this. So does the industry. But we keep on exporting logs. Like junkies, we can't kick the export habit."

From sources with access to the study, these are the most telling forecasts:

U.S. consumption of softwood timber will increase from 210 billion board feet (bbf) in 1978 to 240 bbf in 1985. This includes our exports.

To meet this demand, timber sales from private and state lands must increase from 155 bbf to 165 bbf. Sales from federal lands must go up from 45 bbf to 55 bbf.

Net imports, mostly from Canada, must double from 10 bbf to 20 bbf if the 1985 demand is to be met.

Sources who've seen the study say these figures translate into fast rising lumber prices and the equivalent jump in pressure for an increased harvest off federal land.

Lumber prices, a major cost in construction from Port Angeles to Key West, have doubled in the last four years. Everett Towle, director of policy analysis for the Forest Service, admits that they will probably double again by 1985.

"This will be equaled by pressure for cutting timber on federal lands," said Towle, who favors a public release of the timber study by the administration.

Other sources question Canada's ability to double its exports by 1985. The study itself says it will be "very difficult" to achieve the increase in timber harvest from state and private lands needed to meet the demand.

"We've got another OPEC situation," said one source familiar with the study. "Instead of oil, it's timber. The result is the same. We're going to wind up depending on a foreign country for critical supply. And this will dictate the price."

The administration's Towle disagrees. He says other factors mitigate the supply crisis, especially technological developments in wood substitute materials.

This is little consolation in Kalama where the Pope and Talbot mill provided basic employment. Log exports weren't the only factor in the closure. It was an old mill, not highly efficient.

But exports take the blame. The feeling here is that an absence of competition from exporters for purchase of raw logs off federal, state and private lands would have saved the mill.

"It just doesn't make sense," said Bonker, whose district includes Kalama, the forests of the Cascade and Olympic mountains and the log ports of Olympia and Grays Harbor.

He continued:

"In the face of this timber shortfall, we're exporting 3 billion board feet of raw logs a year. You couldn't offset that timber loss if we opened up all of the wilderness areas in the State of Washington to loggers—and don't think some timber guys wouldn't like to do it.

"The economics are crazy. Take 1,000 board feet of timber. To ship that amount overseas requires four man hours of labor. But to process it into a two-by-four gives 12.5 man hours of labor. Turn it into plywood and you've created 18 man hours of labor."

Attempts to curb log exports, a la British Columbia, have met the irresistible opposition of the big timber companies who own private forests, particularly the Weyerhaeuser Co.

Weyerhaeuser's good friend in Olympia, Bert Cole, the state land commissioner, has consistently battled export bans.

Cole's reason is the same as big timber's to maximize the immediate return on investment. Hard to argue with a private company's profit mission. But as trustee of lands owned by the state, Cole's unabashed attitude favoring log exports seems narrow indeed.

The people of the state might be better served by getting less money for their logs, but saving their local mills and jobs.

Weyerhaeuser argues the question would be moot with an adequate reforestation program, such as their own model. Re-forestation would leave the nation with timber to spare.

Unfortunately, Weyerhaeuser's practices have never been implemented on federal or state lands. Never enough, money in public budgets.

Small mills dependent on public lands for their timber supply can't meet the anything goes export competition when they bid on the stump. So they fade away, like Pope and Talbot here.

The situation is so acute for small mills they have raised a war fund in Washington state, hired a top lobbyist, Thomas Owens, and are set to start a legislative fight to halt exports of logs from state lands.

Their strategy is step by step. In 1968 they tried and failed to get a total export restriction. This year in Olympia, they'll attempt to ban the export of red cedar, a species which is likely to disappear from the market within 20 years unless this effort succeeds.

Next step would be a ban on all exports from state lands. It will follow, next session, if the cedar ban succeeds.

Bonker has bills in Congress to ban cedar exports and to prevent a timber company from bidding on federal timber if it engages in any exporting of raw logs. None of this legislation is likely to restore those 340 jobs in Kalama. But it might save the next mill down the river. And it will help hold down the price of lumber in Peoria.●

THE PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES: THE STATE OF THE UNION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report for February 14, 1979, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES: THE STATE OF THE UNION

President Carter's 1979 State of the Union address will rank as one of the more important documents of his presidency.

As has been the practice of Presidents in recent years, Mr. Carter used the State of the Union message as more than a description and forecast of the nation's progress. He certainly gave us his analysis of where he thinks we are, what direction he thinks we ought to be going, and how he thinks we should get there, but he also set forth the underlying theme of his administration. His attempt to define his presidency in terms of a theme came in response to those who have criticized him for not having a clear vision of his role. This criticism is one that I have made, and my impression is that virtually all Mr. Carter's closest advisors agreed that a theme had been lacking. I do not know whether the President succeeded in giving the people a better idea of his vision for America, but I have the feeling that his address is as good a place as any to begin to understand his presidency.

The President talked about the nature of the problems we face today. They are "more subtle, more complex, and more interrelated" than the problems of earlier times. Solving them, he claimed, will require changes in attitudes on the part of the public. Mr. Carter said that the nation confronts not only military dangers abroad, but also domestic dangers such as cynicism, apathy, and selfishness. Warning against simplistic and extreme solutions to our difficulties, he appealed for a "New Foundation" on which to base a sound economy, a more effective government, and a stable peace. In speaking of this "New Foundation," the theme of his administration, Mr. Carter evoked the "New Freedoms" of Woodrow Wilson, the "New Deal" of Franklin Roosevelt, and the "New Frontier" of John Kennedy. By that phrase the President hopes to symbolize his efforts to realign the nation's economic priorities and foreign policy. He is trying to re-establish the feeling that the nation has the capacity to meet problems at home and abroad.

The scope of the speech was an indication that the President has deliberately thinned out his "wish list" of legislation and narrowed his goals of previous years. In the spare, sharply focussed message he placed greatest emphasis on two issues: inflation and national defense. Mr. Carter's concern for these issues is not really new, but the central place he has given them in his overall program is new. The plea for fiscal responsibility and less government interference in the private sector came through loud and clear.

The President urged everyone to recognize the limits of government action on the domestic front. He said, for example, that we cannot live beyond our means or create new programs that we can neither finance nor manage. The plea for approval of the strategic arms limitation treaty (SALT) was also very prominent. The President did not dwell on the negative consequences of rejecting SALT, but concentrated instead on the advantages that ratification would have for the United States and the Soviet Union, both of whom have an overriding interest in reducing the threat of nuclear war. To quiet the fears of those who are already uneasy about the terms of SALT, he said that any treaty would be verifiable and would not undercut America's nuclear deterrent.

In addition to expressing his views on these matters, the President went on record in favor of the first steps toward a national health insurance plan. He also called for a new Department of Education, a restructuring of economic development and natural resources programs, limited public financing of congressional campaigns, deregulation of bus, truck, and rail transportation, an initiative to contain hospital costs, approval of the multinational trade agreements, implementation of the Panama Canal treaties, and formation of a new framework for relations with Taiwan.

The speech had few surprises and little rhetorical flourish, and it was criticized by some for its many omissions. One Senator remarked that the President failed to mention many of the things, such as energy policy, which worry members of Congress. Mr. Carter's words were applauded frequently, but they were not received with enthusiasm. They neither inspired nor excited the Congress. The concern on Capitol Hill, at least as I read it, has not so much to do with the President's priorities. Rather, members of Congress want to know whether Mr. Carter will remain firm in his commitment to fight inflation, and whether he will continue to pursue other goals he has set.

Mr. Carter's address was interesting from a political point of view. In the speech he was preparing himself for the 1980 presidential race by seeking a position in the center of the political spectrum, with Governor Jerry Brown of California to his right and Senator Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts to his left in the Democratic Party. The President avoided provocative statements throughout as he steered a middle course between inflation and recession at home, and between confrontation and capitulation

abroad. Sounding a theme he is sure to use in the presidential campaign, Mr. Carter noted that "no American has died in combat anywhere in the world" during his term in office. He added that America's ambition was not to become the world's policeman, but the world's peacemaker.●

NEW UNITED STATES-PEKING RELATIONS DIPLOMATIC COUP FOR CHINA

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, Gen. John K. Singlaub, USA, retired, in addition to being a very outspoken person on behalf of America and a much decorated combat veteran, is a very astute observer of world events. Last June, after he voluntarily retired, the Atlanta Journal ran a series of excellent articles by him about our withdrawal from Korea. These appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of June 8, (p. 16907), June 6, (p. 16436), June 5, (p. 16344 and 16331), and June 2 (p. 16107). On this topic, I believe he is proving to be correct, for the withdrawal has been slowed down and many persons are having second thoughts on the issue. The article I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today, which appeared in the Atlanta Sunday Journal and Constitution, is particularly good for its highlighting of the economic aspects of our recognition of Red China. General Singlaub points out the harsh realities of the situation which the Carter administration and the press have tended to gloss over. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

NEW UNITED STATES-PEKING RELATIONS DIPLOMATIC COUP FOR CHINA

(By John K. Singlaub)

The United States' recognition of the People's Republic of China, our de-recognition of Taiwan and the abrogation of our defense treaty with that island republic represent the crown of the Chinese diplomatic victories over the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. in 1978.

The issues involved have become very confused and I feel some clarification is necessary.

There are numerous assumptions that are being accepted at face value, and several complex issues that should be examined more closely concerning our relations with the People's Republic of China. Completely separate from this, one must investigate the manner in which this diplomatic "game" was conducted. Finally, the implications of the U.S. nullification of the treaty with Taiwan must be analyzed.

There would be little to say about the recognition of China as *an isolated event*, except that it seems to break with an American tradiiton of using recognition as an instrument to show approval of a government.

However, there are several questionable premises—as well as some complex problems—that seem to have been swept under the rug. These complicated issues are deemed either exclusively beneficial to our side or they have been written off as representing no real problem whatsoever.

The first of these assumptions is the idea of potential large-scale economic benefits arising from our recognition of China. The real question here is whose benefit and whose cost? This cost aspect seemingly has been ignored.

The Chinese have strongly emphasized their desire to modernize, to encourage foreign investments, and to enter into joint ventures with U.S. firms. This appears to promise a continuous flow of goods to China, which, of course, would greatly improve U.S. exports and thereby our balance of payments situation, as well as reduce the unemployment problem. Nothing less than a wonder cure! However, there is a lot more to this than meets the eye.

If the Chinese desire to modernize is as strong as they claim it to be, it is expected that they will import primarily machinery and modern technology on a large scale and only a few consumer items beyond Coca-Cola and agricultural products. This kind of shopping list raises several interrelated problems. How are they going to pay for such imports? Where are they going to sell their products?

The apparent answer is that China would export its oil to pay for its imports and use its increased manufacturing capacity only for domestic purposes. Again, nothing less than a miracle: We obtain the oil we need and do not have to take any cheap imports we do not want. This solution is based on an oversimplified assumption that China has enough oil.

First of all, we have no idea how much oil China really has. (I will comment on this later.) Secondly, the development of Chinese oil fields will take a long time and will require huge investments. The third point is that a country that wishes fast modernization will rapidly require more oil to cover its own needs, comparable to OPEC countries' exponential growth of domestic oil consumption.

The more oil China needs domestically, the less there will remain for export. So when we view the Chinese oil aspect, we will have to be happy and content if they do not appear as a competitor for oil internationally and thereby help force up oil prices. After all, to modernize a quarter of the world's population will necessitate no small amount of oil and investments.

Therefore, China will, no doubt, be forced to borrow extensively from the U.S. It has even been mentioned that if Congress permits, China could receive tariff cuts as well as U.S. government loans and economic aid. Before this is possible, however, it is assumed that China will be required to improve its position on human rights in the same way that other countries have been required to improve theirs in recent past.

It is well known that several friendly countries do not receive U.S. economic benefits because of their disregard for human rights. Congress has a record that clearly shows that they have a strong stand on human rights—above and beyond the rhetoric of President Carter. But before the human rights issue can be settled, China will have to borrow on the open market. (There are further complications, and I will touch upon them later.)

Money that is borrowed must be paid back, we assume. The only way China can do this is by export of goods. What kind of goods? Probably consumer items involving low and middle range technology that is labor intensive. It is here we have to face the other side of the problem of a quarter of the world's consumers, which is a quarter of the world's labor force—the lowest paid at that. How will American industry, especially in the areas of low and middle technology such as the textile industry, be able to meet this challenge?

What does the administration think about this problem which they have so carefully avoided? Will the government use the funds repaid by the Chinese to subsidize U.S. industry or to pay for unemployment created by cheap imports? After all, not everyone can produce computers. The alternative is to raise tariffs to keep out imports and thus make the Chinese unable to repay their loans.

When assessing the large-scale economic benefits we might receive from selling to one quarter of the world's potential consumers, we must remember they have the same share of the labor force. The big question I would pose to the advocates of large-scale economic benefits is: How do we plan to compete with this cheap labor? And how will the third world countries who have borrowed extensively on the international market for their modernization be able to compete?

By today's standards, Third World labor is cheap; it cannot, however, be compared to wages paid in China which are estimated to be between 7 cents and 14 cents per hour. How will this affect the Third World's struggle to develop or their ability to repay their debts to the international banking system—not to mention their prospects for future loans?

The second major assumption is implicit in the idea of the "China Card." That is, we can use China to bring a new leverage against the U.S.S.R. This could be true for a certain length of time, but for just how long? No one can possibly know. The only safe assumption we can make is that the Chinese will remain our "China Card" only as long as it suits their interests.

Teng Hsiao-ping appears to be the strongest of the leaders in China. He also is presumed to be the major force behind the idea of modernization. How strong is this commitment without his support? We really cannot know, since China is still very much a closed society. Only vague estimates based on uncertain indicators can be made. Teng has already been purged twice.

When one considers the apparent lack of stability in China's policies and the potential disruptive effects a modernization campaign may have on a society, as it has on Iran, we must not discard the possibility of Teng being purged a third time. Additionally, he is already 74 years old—so, even if he is not purged a third time, how long can he remain the dominant actor in China's foreign policy? If his ideas do not have strong support, a reversal in the drive for pragmatism and modernization could occur.

Further, we have to be aware that there are irreconcilable differences between the U.S. and China in terms of social systems, the structure of society and accepted values. How can we know whether, after the initial wave of U.S. investments and the guaranteeing of enormous credits to China, that the Chinese will not turn against us in alliance with their fellow socialists in the U.S.S.R.? After all, the split between the Soviets and China widened and grew to the surprise of most; so, too, it may close to everyone's surprise. This is a process that may be accelerated by dissolution of the traditional society that may be brought about by increased industrialization.

I am well aware that neither politicians nor anyone else, including generals, have perfect foresight, and therefore they must act with a certain amount of uncertainty at times. But this should serve to increase the need to examine alternative courses of action. To ignore totally the possible negative aspects of a problem seems to reveal either a dangerous naivete or an equally dangerous amount of deception on the part of our leadership.

One complex issue with some possible negative aspects is the settlement of the confiscated funds—that is, American-owned funds confiscated in and by China at the time of the communist takeover and Chinese funds confiscated in the U.S. at the same time. This has been mentioned by some newspapers, but only marginally alluded to by the administration. There are several interesting aspects

concerning the settlement itself, but primarily it will serve as an indicator of how this administration will handle future settlements in the event the president decides to recognize another "simple reality," namely Cuba.

The funds confiscated in Cuba are significantly larger, Cuba's ability to pay presumably lower, and the economic benefits of a recognition there are surely estimated very low, even by our professionally optimistic experts in selling "new realities." I am confident that the settlement of the Chinese confiscated funds issue will be watched very closely as it will create a precedent for settlements that may follow.

It will be of particular interest to see who receives the funds the U.S. confiscated. It seems to me that it would be difficult to build a case that these funds belong to China. I suspect that they belonged to individuals already executed as capitalist enemies of the state or to firms that no longer exist. Who will receive these funds—China, as a premium for efficient execution of the bourgeoisie?

Monday in the Journal: Broken Promises and Broken Treaties.●

DENVER SCHOOL EXEMPLIFIES SPIRIT OF YEAR OF THE CHILD

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, a beautiful letter which eloquently conveys much of the hope of what the Year of the Child is all about recently appeared in the Denver Post. I would like to share the letter with my colleagues:

PARENTS "TEST" SCHOOL BUSING

To the Denver Post:

Last summer my company purchased approximately 500 acres of land for a new home community in Southwest Denver at Wadsworth and Belleview. A major concern of ours was that the junior high school students would be bused downtown to Morey Junior High School. To learn for ourselves the quality of this school, three of us spent the day of Jan. 25 at Morey.

We were excited to find a superbly managed, highly disciplined school in a "landmark" building across the street from St. John's Cathedral.

Some highlights of our day: We picked up the bus at 7 a.m., joining 17 attractive, nicely dressed suburban Denver students. The drive only took us 30 minutes, and that in rush hour with a light snow coming down. It was fun to drive along Hamden, Sheridan, 6th Avenue, and among the older tree lined streets of downtown. The interior of the school is immaculate, the hallways scrubbed, the walls painted white with blue and gold graphics. Much of the beautiful original woodwork and high ceilings remain.

We found classrooms with usually fewer than 20 students, which meant that each teacher knew those kids. Lots of reading, writing and arithmetic. Yet we were impressed with electives such as a fine jazz band, graphic arts and woodworking. There is a beautiful tiled indoor swimming pool, two gymnasiums a running track and an auditorium which can seat the 900 students at one time.

The principal, Mr. Tilford Cole, is a man of principle and sound philosophy who points with understandable pride to a strict and fair discipline program. The students are orderly in the halls, they call their teachers "Mr., Miss, or Mrs.," there is no hanging around.

The students don't leave school until the very end of the day, and most of them take a bus home; which I, as a parent, feel is much safer than my 14-year-old daughter walking a mile with her young friends in the suburbs.

These young people at Morey are getting a very superior education in an atmosphere of structure versus the more unstructured concept of the suburbs. Mr. Cole told me of 20 students who this year switched from private schools into Morey Junior High School.

Are there some success stories about busing? Can it be fun to attend an older, well maintained "landmark" school? Can our children make some new friends with students of other races and backgrounds without a single major racial incident in six years? Does the Denver Public School System have something to be proud of in Morey? I am pleased to tell you that the answer to all this is a definite YES!

NICHOLAS M. SCHMIDT,

Vice President—Marketing, Sanford Homes.●

TRIBUTE TO DELOS WRIGHT

HON. GERALD B. H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1909, a richly deserved tribute will be paid to an outstanding citizen and public servant, Mr. Delos Wright, as he retires from his position as highway superintendent for the town of Schodack.

I wish to congratulate and commend Mr. Wright for his many contributions to the Schodack area and the Nation's business community.

Born on August 8, 1979, in Rutland, Pa., he grew up and worked on his family's dairy farm. After graduating from Elmira High School in 1927, he started to work for the Montgomery Ward Co. His enthusiasm, dedication, and plain hard work earned him a place in the management of that company, and at the conclusion of his service 25 years later, he was responsible for all of the Ward's farm and garden stores on the east coast. Mr. Wright then joined the W. R. Grace Co., where he served for 13 years as executive assistant to the vice president. Again his industry and ability were rewarded by being placed in charge of South American imports and distribution operations for W. R. Grace in Lima, Peru.

Del returned to the United States in 1963 and after concluding his outstanding service for W. R. Grace Co., in the true entrepreneurial spirit, opened his own highly successful business known as "Dell's" located in the Delmar shopping plaza which he ran for 10 years. In 1973 he became highway superintendent for Schodack and the people of the town have been fortunate indeed to have had the services of this enterprising and gifted man.

It is entirely fitting that Del Wright be recognized not only for his services to his community, but for his unrelenting efforts and accomplishments within our American economic system. I join with Del's many friends and neighbors in the wish that his retirement years will be graced with good health, the richness of many friendships, the warmth of memories, and the deep satisfaction that comes from many jobs well done.●

NATIONAL DIABETES WEEK

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducting a resolution providing for the establishment of a commemorative week in May as National Diabetes Week.

Diabetes is a chronic, metabolic disorder which adversely affects the body's ability to manufacture and/or utilize insulin, a chemical needed for the conversion of carbohydrates into energy.

The information that has been compiled in the past several years about diabetes presents a frightening picture. Ten million Americans suffer from this disease for which there is no known cure. Diabetes is the third leading cause of death by disease in the United States today, right after cancer and cardiovascular disease. We do not know what causes diabetes, but we do know that its prevalence is increasing by 6 percent a year and that diabetes reduces life expectancy by approximately 30 percent. Women are 50 percent more likely to have diabetes than men, nonwhites are 20 percent more likely to have it than white and low-income persons (with incomes under $5,000 a year) are three times more likely to have it than middle- and upper-income persons. Diabetics also often suffer such incapacitating side effects as blindness, kidney failure, heart attack, stroke, gangrene in the extremities, and nervous system problems.

There are two clinical types of diabetes: Juvenile-onset and maturity-onset diabetes. Juvenile diabetes is the most severe form of the disease and can occur at any age, though it commonly appears from infancy to the late thirties. Those who suffer from juvenile-onset diabetes must take daily injections of insulin to stay alive. Maturity-onset diabetes usually begins in the middle or later years and usually progresses more slowly. This form of diabetes is generally treated by controlling diet and body weight and sometimes with oral medication. Insulin is not usually required, at least during the early years. Children can be stricken quickly and suffer a rapid advance of the disease. Presently, 50 percent of the children who contract diabetes die from kidney disease within an average of 25 years after the disease is diagnosed. The only known treatment for juvenile-onset diabetes is insulin therapy in combination with a controlled diet and exercise.

The costs of this disease in terms of human suffering are obvious. However, the economic impact is equally great. We spend approximately $5.3 billion each

year for health care, disability payments and lost wages.

Because insulin treats the overt symptoms of diabetes, its discovery in 1921 was heralded as a cure. Today we know better. We know that it is only a treatment. Unfortunately, for 50 years after the discovery of insulin, little progress was made in research efforts to find a cause or cure. We are now funding diabetes research and there are promising fields for research in immunology, virology and epidemiologic aspects of the disease.

Still, the public is often unaware of how pervasive a disease diabetes is, its impact on its victims and their families and how much work remains to be done. I believe that it is vitally important that we establish a commemorative week to help focus attention on this disease. It is my hope that by increasing public awareness an additional impetus will be provided to encourage further research so that eventually a cure will be found.●

DEMOCRATIC RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today with other members of the Democratic Research Organization in introducing legislation to amend the Constitution to provide for a balanced Federal budget.

In this Congress, I have already sponsored similar legislation of my own, House Joint Resolution 143, introduced on January 23. I think we desperately need to do something on this subject.

I want to pay particular tribute to my colleagues, DRO Chairman DICK WHITE, and DICK ICHORD, Chairman of the DRO Committee To Investigate A Balanced Federal Budget, as well as others on the DRO Committee, for the hard work and effort put into our balanced budget hearings and report.

Thus far this year, we have heard a great deal about this being the so-called "austerity Congress"—concerned more with expanded oversight of existing Federal programs and tightening outlays where possible, than with mandating new or enlarged programs. Along with those who are cosponsoring this bill, and I am sure many others, I welcome this development and this new mood.

The proposition 13 message is strong throughout the country. Taxpayers in every State—our constitutents—are frankly and rightfully saying enough deficit spending, enough waste and fraud, enough extravagance and mismanagement. Truth is, of course, that many of us have shared those same sentiments all along and have worked unceasingly toward those ends. I for one am pleased and encouraged that more of our colleagues in this House are apparently joining in the demand for reduced spending and for a balanced budget.

Hopefully, this Congress will be responsive to the calls of the American people for greater fiscal responsibility and sounder fiscal management.●

THE BEST WAY TO HELP THE POOR

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times recently told of the successful efforts of many businesses to help alleviate poverty and build jobs for those in need.

It seems to me that this is the best way to fight poverty. Too often government anti-poverty programs become tools for ideological zealots, intent upon spreading their own twisted notion of progress instead of really helping the poor.

I think the best way to help the poor is to have private enterprise—which, after all, is the only institution we have with experience in creating jobs—help the needy.

At this time I want to insert in the RECORD, "Businesses Are Stepping Up Their Roles in Social Problems of Cities", from the New York Times, February 4, 1979:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 4, 1979]

BUSINESSES ARE STEPPING UP THEIR ROLES IN SOCIAL PROBLEMS OF CITIES

(By Maryann Bird)

If the business of America is business, as Calvin Coolidge said, the business of business is, increasingly, America's social problems.

A spot check of cities around the country, including New York, Dallas, Baltimore, Detroit and Boston, shows that the private sector, spurred largely by the social upheaval of the 1960's, is taking greater interest in such public areas as job training, health, education and housing.

But many business spokesmen are quick to note that their commitments of money and manpower are motivated by what Dallas businessmen see as "enlightened self-interest."

"The days of the bleeding hearts have passed," said Hilda Heglund, vice president of special projects for the Milwaukee Association of Commerce. "Getting involved is not just social responsibility. It is economic and good business."

SPURRED BY RIOTING

Business involvement in social problems began in earnest after urban rioting in the summer of 1967. The National Urban Coalition was formed, stirring hope that for the first time the labor movement, the business community and civil rights groups could work together to reduce poverty, improve education and fight racial discrimination.

Corporate leaders, at the behest of President Johnson, created the National Alliance of Businessmen to administer a nationwide project in which Federal subsidies were provided to companies willing to hire and train the disadvantaged.

Many programs eventually faded away, often succumbing to inflation, but in other places, projects prospered and corporate involvement grew.

In Baltimore, the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company has "adopted" an elementary school and initiated programs to improve student reading levels.

BETTER COMMUNITY RESPONSE

"When the company has a human face in the community, the community responds better to the company's presence," said Champe McCulloh, the company's public information supervisor.

For the last three years, the Commercial Credit Company has had a full-time manager of public affairs working in such areas as public education, housing and illiteracy among adults.

In Boston, business involvement increased after riots in the 60's and school desegregation problems that began in September 1974.

William F. Chouinard, executive vice president of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, said, "The civil rights movement required business to reach out and deal with community groups."

In the 60's, he said, "there were a lot of companies that had to be kind of coaxed along in terms of their civil rights involvements. Today," he continued, "they have community responsibility. Many firms have gone through what I'd call a social audit."

Emory N. Jackson, executive director of the Urban League of Eastern Massachusetts, cited the expanded role of business in such areas as fair housing. "The relationship of the social problems and the business community has been far better recently than ever before in history, but we have not reached the millennium yet," he said.

Throughout New York City, industry is involved in strengthening neighborhoods, providing job training, sponsoring health fairs and stepping up efforts against crime.

Citibank's programs include a pilot project for community improvement in the Flatbush section of Brooklyn. A civilian radio motor patrol program, begun by the bank to alert the police to crimes and other emergencies, includes taxi and bus drivers, home-heating oil deliveries and Macy's truck drivers.

CON ED HEALTH CARE

The Consolidated Edison Company has provided a van and driver to health-care agencies to test city residents for hearing deficiencies, sickle-cell anemia and hypertension.

The New York Telephone Company helps inmates at Rikers Island to prepare for the job market by providing counseling, grooming tips and practice in filling out job application forms.

In Atlanta, greater corporate involvement in the city has been laid to a new generation of business leadership and the election in December 1977 of Jesse Hill as president of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce.

"I say to the leaders of the black community that they should not take the chamber's goal of economic development lightly, because that's where we're creating jobs," said Mr. Hill, president of Atlanta Life Insurance Company, one of the largest black-owned companies in the country.

LIMIT TO SOCIAL PROGRAMS

"You back us into a corner and we have to admit that only 10 percent of our budget goes for social programs," Mr. Hill continued, "but that figure cannot begin to reflect the number of man-hours we have contributed, the planning and contributions the chamber has made."

John W. Mack, president of the National Urban League's chapter in Los Angeles, noted that his group had contracts with General Dynamics, the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation and other corporations that provide for recruitment, training and job referrals. In partnership with the Bank of America and I.T.T., the league has trained about 1,500 people for jobs in the computer industry.

The Dallas Chamber of Commerce has played a key role in the city's so-called magnet schools, seven centrally located, career-oriented facilities that draw students across

neighborhood lines. Growing out of an experiment begun after 1971 and 1976 Federal desegregation orders, the program provides specialized education in a wide range of subjects.

Dallas' largest banks, Republic National and First National, were among the businesses that "loaned" executives to establish magnet programs in predominantly black and Mexican-American high schools.

New Detroit Inc., an affiliate of the National Urban Coalition, has given $4.5 million in grants to help stabilize Detroit neighborhoods. Last year, the organization, with a $2.2 million budget contributed by 90 corporations and foundations, including the big three auto makers, donated $30,000 toward a campaign for passage of a school-tax increase and another $30,000 for a school-tax renewal measure.

And an alliance of big business and city government has produced, with no small amount of arm-twisting by Henry Ford 2d, a $327 million Renaissance Center in an effort to revive the city.

SAVINGS PUT AT $5 MILLION

Project Business Aid in Philadelphia has surveyed costs in hospitals and recommended ways to reduce them. The program, headed by William L. Rafsky, director of the Center for Philadelphia Area Development, part of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia, is similar to a cost-cutting project three years ago in the city school system.

In the school program, businessmen came up with suggestions that saved the school system $5 million, Mr. Rafsky said, and identified a potential savings of $50 million.

The Milwaukee Association of Commerce's vice president for urban affairs, Paul Juhnke, said that business involvement stepped up in Milwaukee in 1967, after urban riots and 200 consecutive days of marching for open housing.

One of the association's projects is the Commandos, a group that began as part of the youth organization of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The Commandos, now autonomous, receive accounting services, management advice and about $30,000 a year from the Association of Commerce.

The group operates an alternative high school with a work-study program; a work program for parolees; a job placement service for former offenders; two half-way houses; a youth employment program; a children's health clinic, and a summer camp.

According to Jules Modlinski, special assistant to the Commando's director, "If it weren't for the business community I'm not sure we would have survived 10 years."

TRIBUTE TO NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1979

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my words of tribute to the memory of Nelson A. Rockefeller, one of our Nation's outstanding statesmen. In addition to serving as our 41st Vice President and as four-term Governor of New York State, Nelson Rockefeller distinguished himself in capacities of considerable importance under both Democratic and Republican Presidents.

Blessed with both wealth and intelligence, he gave generously of both to the American people. Throughout his almost 40 years of public service he contributed greatly as a dedicated and dynamic public servant. Much of his personal fortune was channeled into education, health, the arts and the humanities, thereby enriching the lives of all Americans.

He was clearly a major force in the political arena of this Nation, maintaining his indomitable spirit and zest for new experience throughout both victory and defeat. And his capacity to view as challenges what others saw as problems was one of his major strengths.

A legend in his own time, Nelson Rockefeller has earned a prominent place in American history. My deepest sympathy is now extended to his widow, Happy, and to his entire family.●

JOSE MARTI: MAN OF FREEDOM

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the birthday of George Washington, who won freedom and a future for this beloved Nation, our homeland, let the House and our distinguished colleagues consider, for a moment, one of the great men of freedom of a later era in history, the period of emancipation of the Spanish empire.

Jose Marti, kindled by the fire of liberal ideas, toughened in exile, educated by political oppression and refusals, made kind and considerate by his own sorrows, ennobled by their worthy and unselfish cause and finally, destined for martyrdom by the course of history, was instrumental in winning independence for his country, our near neighbor, Cuba.

Exiled in the United States from his youth until he returned to Cuba, soon to die in an early battle for the republic, Jose Marti became a thinker and writer, an example and a teacher of men who value moral rectitude and integrity of mind. He made himself into an outstanding historical figure in the struggle between colonialism and liberty, which marked our hemisphere's emergence from the shadow of the European mother countries.

Because of Jose Marti's contribution to American culture and his close affiliation as a sojourner in our land, a just fugitive and then an herioc martyr, I recommend to you the following speech by one of Miami's proud exiled Cuban community and urge your support for House Joint Resolution 121 to honor Jose Marti in a day of national respect:

THE LEGACY OF JOSE MARTI

(Speech delivered at the steps of the Court House, in Miami, Florida, on January 26, 1979, by Uva A. Clavijo)

It seems proper and poignant that we should gather here today in the anniversary of the birthdate of Jose Marti, at the steps of this court house, for Marti, who was a lawyer, even though he never had an opportunity to practice, was a man who loved and admired law, justice and the principles of democracy which this very building symbolizes. And it is also appropriate that we should honor Marti here, in the state of Florida, for he often travelled to this State; more specifically to Key West and Tampa, to talk to the Cuban exiles of that century, about the need of a Revolution to free the Fatherland, and also about tomorrow's Cuba, a nation he envisioned "por todos y para el bien de todos", "for all and for the good of all."

One cannot keep from wondering what is the source of Marti's love for freedom? Where did this frail man of humble origin learn that man's most precious prerogative is his power to choose his spiritual freedom? It is true that as a youngster Marti attended a school run by a man of great distinction, Rafal Maria Mendive, who had a decisive influence in the child's mind and character and instilled in him those courageous elements which marked in the boy the man he was to become.

When the Ten Year War of Emancipation broke out in 1868, Marti, only 15 years old, was too young to join the "mambises" in the battlefields. He and his classmates contributed as best they could to the cause of Cuban independence by publishing clandestine periodicals. He soon was arrested and jailed. After months of forced labor under inhuman conditions, Marti was deported to Spain. From then on until his death he was to visit his beloved Cuba on only two brief occasions. His long exile had begun. He was only seventeen.

During his long years in the United States Marti matured intellectually, spiritually and politically. Startled and stimulated by his contact with the great city of New York, he studied every aspect of the young democracy he saw blossoming forth all around him, but not without pitfalls and growing pains.

Marti arrived in the United States in 1880, at the end of Hayes' presidential term. He witnessed the inaugurals of Chester Arthur, Cleveland, Benjamin Harrison, and, again, Cleveland. The electoral process and the ritual of inauguration itself fascinated him and inspired many of his chronicles.

But he observed more than the political climate of the United States. Under his watchful eye, every day events became serious studies of the different aspects of American life. New York City under the merciless snow storm of March 1888; the boldness of Jesse James; the frontier spirit of the "Oklahoma Land Rush" or a Sunday walk through then-fashionable Coney Island, were some of the North American scenes he introduced to Latin American readers. Many American men awakened his admiration and moved his pen. Of General Grant, Emerson and Walt Whitman he wrote with reverence.

Much has been said about Marti's anti-imperialism. It is true he suffered a constant, throbbing preoccupation that the nations from Mexico to Brasil, underdeveloped, parochial and still asleep might, someday, be devoured by the colossal neighbor from the North. In one of his first articles written in the United States, Marti says: "I have arrived, at last, to a nation where every man is his own master. One can breathe freely here, for freedom is the basis, the safeguard, the essence of life." He wanted that same spirit for "los pueblos del sur" he so deeply loved, and he feared and attacked the United States only when its foreign policy did not allow smaller countries to achieve for themselves the same independence Americans had wrested from England.

I believe Marti would have been pleased with this commemorative ceremony, I think he would be pleased that a woman—a Cuban woman—is here at this microphone talking to you, for Marti loved women. It is true he expressed many tender, beautiful, romantic thoughts about woman, but it is also true he valued a woman's contribution to society. If his vision of women might at times appear idealistic, this is tempered by the

many occasions in which it is a woman's character and not her physical attributes, which awakened his admiration.

Marti also loved children. He was a very busy man, who took upon himself many responsibilities. A man who had the mission of bringing freedom to his country; a man who was a teacher, a writer, a poet. He had a family. He had to work to earn money for his wife and child. And yet, this genial, occupied man found the time to write and edit a magazine for the children of America, which spawned that beautiful book, I hope you all know, "La Edad de Oro". It is through this book first and through other writings of Marti later on, that I hope you will learn to know and love him, for you will find in him a friend and a teacher. His stories, his poems are ever-flowing with tenderness, imagination and wisdom. One will learn from him in a very painless way. He had a great faith in the children of America. I hope you allow him to enter your world, for you will find he will enrich yours.

The story of Marti's groundwork activity in preparation for the Cuban revolution was characterized by the ups and downs of exile politics: free lance actions in Cuba, meetings among the leaders, exhaustive travelling and speech making. It is often said that Marti was a dreamer, a visionary, a poet; but if one studies his work carefully, he emerges as a level-headed realist who, not without pains, became the mouthpiece of the Cuban people. He defended the cause of Cuban independence in every forum, and often even encountered persecution from American authorities.

And yet, he was more than a great Cuban patriot; he was a man of the Americas, who wanted to see all the nations of the continent working together as friends and helping each other.

A man like Marti, who loved all men, even his adversaries, who made the humble, the poor, the ignorant, the Negro, the Indian, feel they were his equal, this angelic man who played tenderly with his "little king", who wrote stories for the children of America, had to spend half his life calling men to war.

Marti knew that war, no matter how hateful, is sometimes made unavoidable. He never held a weapon in the small, delicate hands which had held a smaller, but more powerful arm—a pen, (for many hours.) But he had one more call to answer.

Against the better judgment of those who knew the value of his work as coordinator in New York, in May, 1895, he landed in Cuba in a frail rowboat. Like a child he rejoiced when he saw again the countryside, the Royal Palm trees that to him symbolized the Fatherland. Of military tactics he knew nothing. But he had not come to command armies. Others much better fitted than him were to take on that responsibility. He had only come to die. A few days later he charged against a small detachment of Spanish troops at Dos Rios and died of a single bullet in his chest, "de cara al sol", "facing the sun", as he had hoped in his poetry. On the eve of his death he had written "Para mi ya es hora", "My hour has struck". He was 42.

More than a century has elasped since Jose Marti was born—in 1853—in the humble two-story house of Paula Street in Havana. With his birth began a life dedicated to the pursuit of freedom and the accomplishment of one dream: the independence of Cuba and the unity of Latin America.

One cannot help wondering, whether Marti's preachings, his writings, his example have been of any influence in the development of Cuba and of Americas? One cannot help but ask if Jose Marti lived—and died—in vain. Stark reality seems to indicate so. Today, more than a million of his countrymen live in exile. Today, the island he so defended is dominated by a foreign power. Autocratic regimes—whether they are rightist or leftist dictatorships—sprout from the Caribbean through the Andes. Freedom, in any real sense, often seems an illusion.

And yet, concurrent with this apparent victory of totalitarianism, there is a rebirth of man's conscience in his own destiny. Marti once wrote "tyranny is one and the same in its various forms, even when it adorns itself with great deeds and beautiful phrases."

The jails of Cuba are still full of political prisoners. The jails of the Americas still hold men who believe in dignity, in democracy, in human rights. As long as there is one man on our continent who understands, believes and defends those principles which make freedom "the essence of life", Jose Marti will not not have lived—and died—in vain.

Thank you.●

THE LEGACY OF NELSON ROCKEFELLER

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1979

● Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, Nelson Rockefeller will be remembered as an outstanding public servant, patriot, diplomat, philanthropist, patron of the arts, Governor of New York, and Vice President of the United States.

As the grandson of the Nation's first billionaire, Nelson acquired all the advantages accompanying enormous wealth. But in the tradition of his family he rejected a life of leisure and luxury, and regarded his fortune as a public trust. He became a formidable contender for public office in an effort to solve people's problems. In more ways than one, Nelson Rockefeller started at the top and remained there all his life. He sought the highest office in our land, but enthusiastically performed whatever duties were demanded by his country.

Throughout the State of Arkansas, the Rockefeller name has long evoked great respect and is synonomous with philanthropy. Nelson's father, John D. Rockefeller, before he died in 1960, gave uncounted millions of dollars for medical research and other charitable humanitarian endeavors.

I became acquainted with Nelson during his brother, Winthrop's, tenure as two-term Governor of the State of Arkansas. Winthrop Rockefeller's contributions to our State stretch back for many years and he is remembered as a beloved figure who was instrumental in bringing about monumental improvements in the quality of life for citizens throughout the State. Thus, the people of Arkansas are still proud that Winthrop Paul Rockefeller still makes Arkansas his home and continues the philanthropies of his father.

Raised in a staunch Baptist atmosphere, Nelson was instilled with the notions of service to God, home and country very early in his life. His commitment to people no doubt stems from these early years and the traditions of his philanthropic father. The Rockefeller family nurtured the unique aspects of Nelson's character that prepared him for his major role in our Government.

Nelson made many trips to Arkansas during his brother's service as Governor, and it was during this time frame that I came to recognize his magnetic grin, and to appreciate the full force of his personality. At official and social gatherings at Win Rock Farms, I was able to witness the special flair and vitality that brought this man to the forefront of the American political scene. I became enchanted with Nelson Rockefeller's hearty, good-natured ease, his great ability, his unfailing good humor and selfless dedication to public service. It was then that I learned how high his expectations were for the American people and for our Nation as a world leader. I doubt that we will see his unique brand of leadership again in the near future.

Rockefeller began his Government career in 1940, when he became coordinator of inter-American Affairs under President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He helped develop the good neighbor policy and later served as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America. Under Truman, Rockefeller helped formulate the point four program of aid to underdeveloped countries. Furthermore, he chaired a commission that recommended the formation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Eisenhower administration and was Under Secretary of that Department.

His early years as Governor of New York were marked by massive programs for education. He expanded the State university system from 28 campuses with 38,000 students to 71 campuses with 346,000 students. He began innovative drug rehabilitation programs, reorganized the New York transportation system, and started many public works projects.

His immense fortune did not make him myopic to the disadvantaged segments of our society, for he was a man of great compassion. He understood the everyday problems and perspectives of the average citizen and in every office he held his actions reflected that posture, for he vigorously tried to improve the working man's lot.

By the time he departed from Albany, an entire generation of citizens had reached voting age and could not recall a time in their lives when Nelson Rockefeller was not the chief executive of the State. It was well known that Rockefeller had made substantive improvements in the economic, political and cultural life of New Yorkers.

His contributions to New York architecture alone were noted in a very special way by Alan Sagner, chairman of the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, "his vision, enthusiasm, and his love for his city and State remain etched not only in our memories but also in the great constructive landmarks which stand in his tribute, including the New York World Trade Center."

Although he was once quoted as stating that he did not wish to be vice president of anything, he graciously accepted President Ford's nomination because he believed that the newly appointed President and his country needed unity, and

that it was his duty to fill that need and serve as asked. Vice President Rockefeller helped ease our Nation's wounds from the tragedy of Watergate.

Among the long list of Nelson's impressive activities was his personal involvement in the National Commission on Critical Choices. This was his attempt to gather the best minds in the country to study our most baffling problems before our Nation would make decisions on how to solve these difficulties.

He lived his life to the fullest whether he was pushing a particular bill through the State legislature or launching his latest business of merchandising reproductions of his art treasures.

I was most fortunate to have been in attendance at the memorial tribute to Mr. Rockefeller with family members, associates, close personal friends, and national and international dignitaries which was held last Friday at 11 a.m. in the Riverside Church in Manhattan. It was most fitting that this service was held at the Riverside Church since it was founded and built with Rockefeller support. In its entirety, the service was an intensely moving experience. The eloquent eulogies of his two children, Ann and Rodman, his brother, David, and Dr. Kissinger, most appropriately expressed the feelings of a nation in mourning for one of its greatest statesmen.

The musical selections played a special part in setting the tone of the memorial and included the outstanding choir of the Riverside Church, a brilliant solo by Roberta Peters of the Metropolitan Opera, and Lionel Hampton, who expressed through their musical notes the very essence of Nelson Rockefeller. Personally, I departed the church with a renewed sense of spirit invigorated to move on with the tasks at hand.

Nelson Rockefeller will be memorialized through the annals of history for his firm commitment to a better life for all Americans and for buttressing our Nation's standing in the world.

My wife and I join in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Happy Rockefeller and the entire Rockefeller family. We realize just how deeply he will be missed.●

INDEPENDENCE DAY IN SRI LANKA

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 4, Sri Lanka observed its National Day and the 31st anniversary of its independence from Great Britain. Sri Lanka has made remarkable strides, in economic, and political development, in recent years that are worthy of attention by the Members of this body. Particularly for those here who despair over the worldwide prospects for governmental policies that protect civil liberties and promote human rights and public welfare, Sri Lanka stands as a model for emulation.

The human rights report just transmitted to Congress by the Department of State offers testimony on many of the achievements for which Sri Lankans can be proud. It highlights the government commitment and the national accomplishments in increasing literacy and educational levels, improving health and nutrition, and providing for income benefits to the poorest of the population. Constitutional guarantees protect freedom of thought, speech, publication, religion, and assembly.

As many here join in condemning questionable human rights practices in many countries in the world, it is my hope there will also be many who will join in praising practices and accomplishments in countries such as Sri Lanka that deserve proper acknowledgement.

As in our own society, all the problems of Sri Lanka have not been solved. As an ethnically mixed country and as a developing country Sri Lanka faces many challenges that will require patience and hard work. As the Sri Lankans work together to carry on the impressive record of the past we congratulate them.●

A FINE MODEL FOR AN INTELLIGENCE CHARTER

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant tasks facing the 96th Congress will be the drafting of a legislative charter for our Nation's intelligence agencies. Such a charter must protect U.S. citizens from unwarranted invasions of their privacy without hampering the ability of our intelligence agencies to safeguard the national security.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the wiretap control bill passed by Congress last year can serve as a fine model for future reforms of intelligence gathering practices. For that reason, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to an article I have written on this subject, which was published by the Chicago Sun-Times on February 2.

The article follows:

WIRETAP BILL A FINE MODEL

(By Rep. MORGAN F. MURPHY)

As Congress convenes this month, it will be grappling with major proposals to reform U.S. intelligence agencies. The push for such legislation is an outgrowth of disclosures in recent years that the FBI and CIA have violated the privacy of American citizens with wiretaps, mail openings and surreptitious entries.

The bills deal with a number of issues that have surfaced since certain intelligence "horror stories" first came to light in 1974. Those issues include:

What activities, if any, should be prohibited in the conduct of covert operations abroad? An executive order issued in January 1978 by President Carter places no restrictions on those operations. (Carter's order currently governs the activities of our intelligence agencies.) A bill sponsored by Sen. Walter Huddleston (D-Ky.) would prohibit assassinations of foreign officials, the torturing of individuals and the use of chemical or biological weapons that violate U.S. treaties. A House proposal, first introduced by former Rep. Herman Badillo (D-N.Y.), would forbid all covert operations except in time of war.

Should intelligence agencies, as revealed in testimony before the Church and Pike Committees in 1975, be allowed to use clergy, journalists or academics in espionage and covert activities? Carter's executive order leaves this matter to the intelligence community. The Senate bill would permit such individuals to volunteer their cooperation; last year's House proposal, by forbidding covert operations in peacetime, would prohibit these arrangements altogether.

Should surreptitious entries (those for which no warrant is obtained) be authorized for intelligence purposes? President Carter's order allows such entries within and outside the U.S., and Huddleston's bill would also authorize them. The House bill would permit physical searches only under a criminal warrant procedure.

These are the kinds of questions, then, that the Senate and House intelligence committees will be looking into as they examine various proposals and draft legislation overseeing the activities of our intelligence agencies.

Shortly before adjourning last October, Congress took a major step forward in curbing intelligence abuses when it passed a bill requiring search warrants for most national security wiretaps. Until this legislation was signed into law, Presidents were able to order electronic surveillance without a warrant in "national security" cases. The new law requires the government to get a search warrant so that Americans are protected from unreasonable searches and seizures, as guaranteed under the Fourth Amendment.

The bill had the support of the Carter Administration, the American Bar Association, the American Civil Liberties Union and the intelligence agencies themselves, which argued that a new law would protect their agents from civil suits and other repercussions. (Recently, Director William H. Webster announced that he plans to fire two FBI supervisors, demote another and suspend a fourth for carrying out illegal surveillance during a search for radical fugitives in the early 1970s.)

As passed by Congress, the bill requires the government to obtain a search warrant before wiretapping American citizens suspected of spying in the U.S. for foreign governments. In those situations, the government must get a warrant based on standards similar to those in ordinary criminal cases. When wiretaps are aimed at employees or agents of foreign countries, the standards would be less strict. No warrant would be required for monitoring communications exclusively between foreign powers, such as an embassy and its home country. (The attorney general, however, would have to certify that there is little or no likelihood that the conversations of Americans would be picked up.)

To ensure that the intelligence agencies are not prevented from acting effectively when the need arises, the bill allows "emergency surveillances" for a 24-hour period, after which a warrant would have to be obtained.

In my view, the wiretap control bill will protect U.S. citizens from unwarranted invasions of their privacy without hampering the ability of our intelligence agencies to safeguard the national security. Moreover, it will protect FBI and CIA agents from being sued for conducting surveillance that might later be judged illegal. The upshot of this is that intelligence gathering will actually improve, as agents can now carry out monitoring activities without fear of legal or administrative consequences.

Passage of the wiretap bill suggests that

Congress can strike a prudent balance between gathering and protecting citizens' civil liberties. In that spirit, Congress should proceed to develop legislative charters for the CIA and FBI, to ensure that abuses of these agencies never occur again.●

LEGISLATION TO EQUALIZE THE ASSISTANCE OFFERED TO PUBLIC AND NONPROFIT HOSPITALS

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the legislation I am introducing today will extend to nonprofit hospitals the same financial assistance available to public medical institutions for the necessary modernization of their facilities.

Currently, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare administers a grant program for public hospitals authorized under section 1625 of the Public Health Service Act. This is an extremely important program providing funds for the modernization of existing hospitals when these facilities are faced with safety hazards or noncompliance with licensing or accreditation standards. My bill very simply enlarges the eligibility limits for this program to include nonprofit facilities.

A similar, companion program to section 1625, section 1610, providing assistance to nonprofits existed up until last year. At that time the authority for this program was deleted because regulations to implement its provisions were never promulgated by HEW. The 1610 program was established as a system of formula grants to the States, while the program for public facilities is run centrally out of the national office of the Health Facility Planning Bureau of the Health Resources Administration. The latter approach has proven successful and is why I propose to add nonprofits to this program rather than resurrect the old formula grant program. For the very reasons that we provide assistance to public facilities we must offer it to nonprofits; both types of hospitals have the same problems.

It is important to note that this grant program is not designed to construct new hospitals but rather to provide financial aid to existing hospitals to aid in the renovation and modernization required to make the facility safe. The Public Health Service Act states, and I quote:

> The Secretary may make grants for construction or modernization projects designed to (A) eliminate or prevent imminent safety hazards as defined by Federal, State, or local fire, building, or life safety codes or regulations, or (B) avoid noncompliance with State or voluntary licensure or accreditation standards.

This type of program is even more vital in light of the nationwide surplus of hospital beds and our efforts to limit new hospital construction. While we must cut back on new construction, we must also recognize that the hospitals already in existence will require renovation and modernization to continue as safe and efficient facilities. The Federal Government can and must help in this assuring the adequacy of our health care institutions, be they public or nonprofit.

This legislation creates neither a new bureaucracy nor a new program. It merely reconfirms the congressional intent behind a previously authorized program and puts it in a setting which will allow funds to be dispersed from a central coordinating office. This will facilitate the determination of where the requirements of an individual institution fit into the national priorities thereby extending aid to those facilities with the greatest need.

The enactment of this legislation will end the inequities of the current program by making these vital project grants available to both public and nonprofit entities. As there is no valid reason to discriminate against nonprofits, I urge my colleagues to support this proposal.●

TRIBUTE TO NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it seems sometimes that praise is the rarest of commodities. Yet in a recent editorial in a newspaper in my district, the Madison County Newsweek, both Congress and National Public Radio drew plaudits for handling of the Select Committee on Assassinations' public hearings.

I believe that this editorial fairly sums up the contributions of that committee and of National Public Radio and its affiliates like WBKY, and I include it for the RECORD so that others might know of this useful comment:

UK EDUCATIONAL RADIO COMMENDED

WBKY, the educational radio station at the University of Kentucky, should be commended for airing the U.S. House of Representatives Assassinations Committee hearings.

These hearings, like the earlier Watergate hearings, permitted each listener to arrive at their own conclusions about the nature of the crimes, the individuals involved, the likelihood of a conspiracy, and the quality of the investigation and law enforcement.

One cannot listen to these deliberations without coming away strongly appreciating our Congress at work. The avid listener also recognized the value of strong legal representation, and the many protections afforded the witnesses.

Ultimately, the listener became cognizant of the fine balance between the rights of the state and the rights of the individual; a balance provided by our democratic system.

Phrases like "first amendment rights," "Fifth amendment rights," "Immunity," and "contempt of congress," were phrases repeatedly used during the hearings that gave breath to this delicate balance. They also provided the listener with a refresher course in Civics.

In short, one could not listen at length to these hearings without considering how many other political systems would provide its citizens with as much protection.

Thanks WBKY and National Public Radio for making it possible for us to develop a new respect for our political system.●

SENATOR HATFIELD ON SALT II

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, since the House of Representatives does not ratify treaties there has been a little debate in this body on SALT II. But as the Senate takes up this controversial subject it would be advisable for all Members of Congress to seriously contemplate the full implications of strategic arms limitations proposals.

Those who are anxious to end the arms race are generally supportive of SALT II because it allegedly places a ceiling on arms development and production, but Senator MARK HATFIELD warns us that this may not be the case. According to Senator HATFIELD, the administration has made enough concessions among hostile Senators that the agreement may result in an escalation, not a reduction, of weapons systems in both the U.S.S.R. and the United States.

The interview also reveals Senator HATFIELD's grave concern about the moral implications of the arms race. His experience in observing the devastation at Hiroshima and clear perspective as a Christian leader often have led him to question our national commitment to a program of self-destruction.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senator HATFIELD's comments on SALT II which appeared in the February 1979 issue of Sojourners.

THE ILLUSION

SOJOURNERS. You were at Hiroshima after the atomic bomb was dropped. What did you see, and what was your reaction?

HATFIELD. I had seen a great deal of destruction in the war. But the magnitude of devastation at Hiroshima was the most shocking. One could see, even at a distance from the point of explosion, how the searing heat had imprinted itself on concrete and steel. We were far on the periphery. Yet there were unburied bodies in the rubble, blackened from the heat.

I had some ambivalent feelings, for I realized that I was probably alive because of the bomb. I was in the Navy, and we were preparing for what would have been the invasion of Japan.

But in retrospect, even if my life had been involved, I question now whether the atomic bomb had to be dropped on people. First, it could have been dropped at sea. Second, it unleashed nuclear power for military purposes. This triggered the spiraling nuclear arms race, leading us to where we are today.

SOJOURNERS. What are the chief concerns you have now about the nuclear arms race?

HATFIELD. We have today the equivalent of more than 638,000 bombs in our arsenal that are the size of the one dropped on Hiroshima. As this enormous storehouse of nuclear arms has increased, there has been a direct ratio of decrease in the sense of security, both in this nation and in the world.

Second, there is an enormous increase in the technological sophistication of weapons systems today.

Everything seems to be an escalation of madness, an insanity of self-destruction. The ability to create these things has become the master of our circumstances. We are now, it seems, victimized by our own knowledge and technology. Jacques Ellul has pointed out that simple technological ability does not necessarily justify creating whatever we can. But we seem to have a compulsion to produce the fruits of our experimentation with the technology of nuclear arms.

So we are caught in a sequence. It is not as though we can create a weapon which has no relation to any other weapon or to the next stage of destruction. There is an increasing, ever-accelerating ability to destroy more and more, and in ever more spohisticated ways.

SOJOURNERS. In your thinking, does the proposed SALT II treaty offer the opportunity to reverse this trend?

HATFIELD. I see SALT II as part of this long series of events that has neither stabilized nor leveled off our nuclear arsenals, but has acted to stimulate production in order to reach those new agreed-upon levels and ceilings.

When we hear all the talk about limitation of armaments, I don't think people are really being honest. I think it's deceptive.

I view SALT II with a great deal of suspicion. I suspect it is another one of those escalating steps in the nuclear arms race, rather than a truly constricting effort.

SOJOURNERS. Would you specify how this is so?

HATFIELD. There are two categories of things I would point to that prompt my concern about SALT II. First are those weapons systems now in place or being developed which, according to press reports, will be exempt from the proposed treaty. In large part this is because of trade-offs and compromises made by President Carter to various individuals in attempts to win support for SALT II.

For instance, certain members of Congress raised concerns about the size of Soviet missiles. So the administration is pushing for both land and sea deployment of the massive Trident II missile. Then there were those who have raised concerns about the Soviet civil defense program. So the president announced that we are going to increase the U.S. civil defense budget by 48 percent, to a total cost of between $1 and $2 billion, even though we know that ultimately civil defense against a nuclear holocaust is impossible.

Another area of escalation specifically allowed under SALT II is development of the M-X mobile missile, eventually costing between $20 and $40 billion. The M-X would be about four times as powerful as our existing missiles, possess three times as many warheads, and would be mobile, able to move continually from one point to another.

The M-X missile is particularly worrisome because its increased accuracy would give the U.S. the potential, by the 1980s, to destroy Soviet land-based missiles. You see, this increases Soviet anxiety about what is called a U.S. first strike capability—meaning that the U.S. could launch its missiles first, attempting to destroy the Soviets' missile force. Naturally this threat would prompt the Soviets to take countermeasures, escalating the arms race to still more dangerous levels.

A related recent proposal is the Multiple Aim Point System (MAPS) which would allow the M-X missile to be rotated randomly, and secretly, from one silo to another, or even to be placed on launching pads that could be carried by moving trucks or planes. This would pose serious future problems for verifying the true size of the U.S. missile force, making the mutual trust necessary for arms control more difficult.

One final example of a current weapons system under development, and effectively allowed by SALT II, is the cruise missile. Because it is small, easily hidden, and can be launched from airplanes, torpedo tubes, or even jeeps, it poses unique problems for arms control and limitation in the future.

Now the administration points out that deployment of mobile missiles and cruise missiles—based either on sea or land—is banned by mutual agreement until 1982. But what the administration does not say is that there has never been a plan to deploy those weapons prior to 1982.

These are all contemporary programs which, largely because of political pressures, will be exempt from the SALT II treaty. Their development, which will entail an enormous expansion of our nuclear arsenals is virtually assured by SALT II.

SOJOURNERS. And you have another category of concerns as well?

HATFIELD. Yes. The second category is those prospective, future weapons systems of even greater sophistication which are not at all addressed by SALT II. These include the terminal guidance warhead, which if developed would give U.S. missiles absolute accuracy—and this is needed only for a first strike capability.

Another example is the hunter-killer satellites being developed by both the U.S. and the Soviets. These are intended to destroy those satellites used by the opponent to verify the number of enemy missiles, and to guide its own missiles to their targets.

There has been speculation about both sides' development of what are called particle beam weapons. These would throw a "field" of particles into space which would disable or explode incoming missiles while they were still in the upper atmosphere.

Finally, there have been recent and dramatic advances reported in the U.S. anti-submarine warfare system. This may eventually make it possible for the U.S. to destroy the entire Soviet missile-firing submarine fleet. Again, this sort of development heightens Soviet anxiety over U.S. intentions, and makes the possibility of future arms control far more complex.

We have to understand the total effect of many of these programs, and how they are seen by the Soviets. These proposed nuclear weapons will trigger Soviet responses, which then alarm us into taking countermeasures, and the arms race escalates further.

The combination of these existing and projected new weapons systems will give the U.S. a first strike capability, according to most experts. Supposedly, until this point our strategic nuclear posture has been built on deterrence. But moving more and more toward weapons which give us a first strike capability destroys the very image we have tried to create of possessing nuclear weapons only as a means of deterring nuclear war.

SOJOURNERS. What then do you feel that SALT II ultimately does?

HATFIELD. First, I think it confuses matters. It confuses a public which believes we are getting some kind of real constriction or stabilization of our nuclear arsenals. And that's misleading. Because of this confusion, some real and valid arms control program—one that could be built on a clear determination that we're going to limit and reduce military expenditures and nuclear weapons systems—is made impossible.

What we have to do is to be honest. If we don't address the emerging developments in the nuclear arms race, and actually constrain the growth of nuclear weapons systems, then we aren't really getting much of anything except the political, ceremonial event of signing a document.

That's why I feel very strongly that at this point we ought to be about the business of SALT III—making a commitment to achieve a real limit and reduction of these ongoing programs, and addressing ourselves to the forthcoming weapons. Getting public understanding and support for such an approach to arms control now would be a far more significant development than misleading the public into thinking that we have achieved something which is actually illusory.

SOJOURNERS. And you believe that SALT II would actually prevent such an agreement rather than be a step towards it?

HATFIELD. Yes. Rather than blindly fall into a SALT II treaty—based upon what has been disclosed about it in the press at this time—it seems to me we had better let SALT II fade out. And then commit ourselves to an approach that truly would be a move in reversing the arms race.

SOJOURNERS. Have you decided then to definitely oppose SALT II when it is voted on by the Senate?

HATFIELD. Well, I don't want to be presumptuous about a treaty which has not yet been formally completed. I cannot be honest with myself and assure you that I know exactly how I will vote until we have actually seen all the documents of the treaty. But I am certainly leaning more negatively than positively on the whole issue.

I'm raising now, publicly, these questions and reservations to signal that here is one liberal who cannot be taken for granted in terms of my vote on SALT II. The administration is counting up the votes now and making compromises, thinking that it can pick up those vote or that vote by making concessions to conservative forces. I think that the administration ought to know about some of the reservations that I have.

Further, there is such a thing as going back to the drafting board. I don't accept the proposition that if SALT II cannot be passed, everyone is going to throw in the towel and say that it is impossible to achieve real arms reductions, even though a whole new approach leading to a SALT III treaty. I think that, frankly, rejecting SALT II might give us a better treaty in the end, one more in line with the objectives that I am seeking. Passing SALT II, and guaranteeing development of a whole new generation of nuclear weapons, would seriously jeopardize the possibility of any meaningful SALT III agreement in the future.

There is a kind of arrogance which assumes that SALT II must be passed now as the only hope for arms control. But there are others besides myself on the so-called liberal wing of the political spectrum who are increasingly concerned about some of these same questions. I don't think that they can be taken for granted either.

SOJOURNERS. It is being argued by the liberal church lobby that even a poor SALT II treaty is better than none at all—that we have to settle for "half a loaf" to be politically realistic rather than holding out for unattainable goals. Much of the liberal arms control community, including many who have been allies with you in the past, agrees. How do you respond to the criticism which will come your way from these circles as you raise these strong reservations?

HATFIELD. Well, number one, the unfortunate thing is that our society is living more and more by code words, labels, and symbols. If this sort of treaty had been proposed under a Nixon administration, there would have been immediate suspicion of it. It happens under a Democratic president, who has the support of some of the liberal Democratic establishment, and it immediately gains acceptance. It must be good.

But all of this comes without careful review and study of the proposal on its own. This is just part of our fast culture, of getting flashes and images of things to which we react positively or negatively.

The second factor is the idea that some-

how, as long as we call something a "strategic arms limitation treaty" enough times, it must be that. You know, say it enough times and you convince yourself that it really is so. No matter what it is, as long as the label is there, being constantly conveyed and communicated to the public, it must be acceptable.

Also, as you say, there is the idea that something is better than nothing, that half a loaf is better than none. Well, I don't accept that as being the case in the situation.

I remember that during the Vietnam war some people thought that we shouldn't bring a particular proposal up for a vote because we might not win. In other words, don't fight for a position unless you know that you can succeed.

I am not one of those who believes that you have to have a guarantee of achieving a truly effective measure to reduce nuclear arms before launching an effort. In fact, I think that when you fail to try, you create an environment in which these phony programs can come along and gain acceptance. Until people have something to rally around, and have a clearly understood and meaningful focus in the cause of arms control and arms reduction, they are vulnerable to buying anything which comes under an attractive label. So I think that some of our liberal church friends are buying a false package, a false hope.

All we're talking about now are ceilings on the numbers of missiles and warheads to be produced. I would much rather have us say, "Look, our effort initially is to limit nuclear arms, but our objective is to actually reduce them." But there is nothing in the picture that I have seen which would even give the impression that reducing the number of our nuclear arms is in anyone's thoughts.

SOJOURNERS. Do you see a relationship between the arms race and the development of nuclear energy?

HATFIELD. We really can't separate the discussion of nuclear weapons from the use of nuclear power for other objectives. In the military budget presented to the Senate Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, there is not a separate figure for funds going to the actual research and development of nuclear warheads. That figure is found, instead, in the appropriation for the Department of Energy. The federal budget for energy is going in large part for the development of nuclear energy by fission as the answer to our energy problems. But the development of nuclear weapons, also funded by the Department of Energy, becomes the propelling power behind our nuclear energy program. And it is becoming increasingly difficult to forestall the options of the fast breeder and reprocessing.

Ultimately, the Christian community, as well as the whole of society, has to face this question: How far are we going to commit this nation to a plutonium economy as a means of meeting energy needs while refusing to recognize the relationship of such an economy to nuclear weapons development and potential nuclear proliferation? These are interlocking forces, dovetailing with one another.

These questions are profoundly connected to assumptions of our culture and the depths of our corporate life in this country today.

SOJOURNERS. How does your own Christian commitment relate to your convictions about the nucelar arms race?

HATFIELD. As a Christian to begin with, I believe in the biblical view of creation. There is a Creator, and there is a creation. I do not believe that we have the right to destroy a part of the creation, because we have not created it. It is still in the hands and control of the Creator.

We must realize that we do not own anything We are only stewards. In that stewardship role we must recognize that all of the world was created for the inhabitants thereof. That's not for just any one segment of humanity, but for all inhabitants. Anything which threatens to destroy any part of that creation—its natural resources or its human resources—is wrong, just basically wrong. And I cannot be a part of that. I must stand and speak against the kind of program or power that leads to such destruction.

Second, the Christian gospel is very clear about calling us to the specific mission of reconciliation. Christ was reconciling the fallen world unto God. And if we are to follow as imitators of Christ, we ought to be reconciling rather than polarizing. The more armaments you build which separate people, threaten people, and cause fear both at home and throughout the world, the more you deny the Christian commission of reconciliation.

Third, there is a Christian doctrine of sharing, of giving. Christ gave his life, literally. I feel that we have a responsibility, as stewards of great resources and power in this nation, to use them not just for the selfish internal use of our own people, but to share them with all people.

There is a massive imbalance caused by those systems and programs designed to destroy life and consume the resources which otherwise could be used to sustain life. This is totally contrary to my understanding of Christian convictions.

SOJOURNERS.—How do you regard the churches' response to the nuclear question, and what would you hope for?

HATFIELD.—The discouraging thing is that much of the church and its leadership has reflected the cultural values and the political priorities of society rather than heeding the call to become a subculture. I think that the Christian community in this secular, materialistic age is increasingly going to have to be seen and understood as a subculture, or a counterculture.

As we look at the arms race, and all these things that are totally contrary to the Christian doctrine, the question is, where is the Christian resistance? Where is the Christian counteraction? It is very spotty. And that is because the Christian community has been caught up in the thought patterns, values, and ways or living dominant in the secular culture.

I don't really have much confidence in the church councils which pass resolutions supporting arms control, and then have nothing to say about the lifestyle of the church in this society. Christ and his way must be made real to the parishioners of those churches. We've had too many resolutions passed, by church boards and councils who don't speak, I'm afraid, for many more than themselves. They often don't even speak for their constituents. And they feel that passing a resolution has discharged their responsibility. I'm weary of resolutions.

I would much rather see the life of the church demonstrate the strong evidence of their values as Christians, and their confidence in God as the object of their trust and the source of their security. That would do far more to influence the political institutions than passing a resolution.

We must exemplify in our lives the Christian gospel, and see ourselves as the light, the salt, and the leaven of society. We must act as lambs being sent into a world of wolves. On the surface, that seems like idiocy. But there is in this approach the power of God, and that grants credibility.

So the question becomes, can the church simply be the church? Can we be those people who place their security in God? Can our lives be motivated by reconciliation rather than hatred and fear? Where will we place our trust? In our nation's armaments, or in our Lord?

Until the church is willing to assume a truly countercultural role in proclaiming an alternative basis of security and trust in its own life—a life marked by love and reconciliation—I don't think it will have much of an effective role in the question of disarmament.●

LIBRARIES SEEK TAX GUIDELINES

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to provide that any tax-exempt organization that operates a bona fide library as a permanent and principal part of its tax-exempt activities, that was organized by a public act of the United States, of any State, of the District of Columbia, or of any possession of the United States, or was in existence prior to 1789, be treated for tax purposes as a public charity in the same manner as other educational organizations such as schools and universities. The bill is limited to only those libraries described above to insure that only such libraries that are clearly organized to serve the public will benefit from this legislation.

Because of the investment income from their endowments, some tax-exempt organizations that operate a library as described above, run the annual risk that they will fail to meet the Internal Revenue Service guidelines to qualify as a "publicly supported" organization and that, therefore, they will be classified as a private foundation. Under existing law, unless a library meets the "publicly supported" financial tests, it will not qualify as a public charity even though such library clearly serves a public purpose. Such libraries spend significant amounts in legal and accounting fees on an annual basis, funds that would otherwise go to the exempt purpose, for example, to purchase books, et cetera, to determine and insure that they meet the Internal Revenue Service guidelines. A library that does not meet these tests is usually classified as a private operating foundation and is required to pay a 2-percent excise tax on their net investment income. The purpose of the excise tax, as set out in the legislative history, is not to raise revenue for the Government, but to cover the Internal Revenue Service expense in monitoring private foundations, principally to insure that such organizations are promptly and properly using their funds for charitable purposes. The purpose behind the excise tax does not appear to be applicable to the class of libraries described in the bill.

A library that is classified as a private foundation also has a more difficult task than an organization classified as a public charity in soliciting funds from potential contributors. For example, a private foundation that is not an operating foundation may make contributions to public charities and private operating foundations, but generally may not make qualifying contributions to other private foundations that are not operating foundations. Because of the uncertainty as to whether a private operating founda-

tion continues to qualify as an operating foundation (there are complex tests that must be satisfied annually) many individual contributors and other private foundations that are not operating foundations are hesitant to contribute funds to such an organization even though it clearly serves a public purpose. As a result, funds that would otherwise go to a library described in the bill are diverted to other charitable organizations.

Although most libraries within the class of libraries described in the bill are able to satisfy the "publicly supported" test and qualify as a public charity, there is one library within that class that I am aware of, the St. Louis Mercantile Library located in St. Louis, Mo., which, because of its endowment fund, is unable to satisfy these tests, and therefore is classified as a private operating foundation. Because this library is classified as a private operating foundation, it must pay an excise tax on its net investment income. For taxable years after 1977, this will amount to $2,000 to $4,000 per year. In addition, this library must incur annual legal and accounting expenses to make sure that it falls within the private operating foundation guidelines.

I am not aware of any other similar library in the particular situation being faced by the St. Louis Mercantile Library. It is anticipated that the annual loss in revenue if this bill is enacted would be less than $5,000 per year. The bill indirectly affects many other libraries because the passage of the bill will also relieve them of the necessity of continually insuring that they meet the "publicly supported" tests, and this is why the bill is supported by, among others, The Independent Research Libraries Association, whose members include the New York Public Library, the Henry E. Huntington Library, American Antiquarian Society, and the Library Company of Philadelphia.

The St. Louis Mercantile Library Association was established in 1846 to form a well-rounded collection of books for the information and convenience of St. Louis. The formation of the library was authorized and approved by a public act of the General Assembly of the State of Missouri. The library is maintained in its own building in downtown St. Louis.

Over the past 132 years, the library has assembled a notable collection of books, now over 213,000 volumes, comprising a general collection in the liberal arts area, with emphasis on history, biography, travel, philosophy, religion, and the arts. The library maintains one of the country's distinguished and most comprehensive collections of regional history pertaining to St. Louis and Western Americana.

The Western Americana Collection, with approximately 55,000 rare books, is probably the most comprehensive collection in that field in existence. The collection is frequently consulted and referred to by many students and historians in this field.

In addition, the Library has one of the most complete files available in the St. Louis area for six local papers, including some 500 bound volumes of St. Louis newspapers beginning with 1812 (a few of these cannot be obtained in any other library).

The Library has also been the recipient of many valuable gifts during its existence. These gifts include the fragmentary journal of Pierre Laclede's stepson, Auguste Chouteau, describing the founding of St. Louis, and the original manuscript "Journal of the Proceedings of the First Legislative Council of the Territory of Louisiana, from June 3, 1806 to October 9, 1811." For individuals researching the organization of the territorial government of the Louisiana Purchase or about Missouri's first steps toward statehood, these documents are of extreme importance. Another notable possession is the four-volume elephant folio of Audubon's "Birds of America."

The library is open to the public and currently maintains a broad based membership of over 2,000. While membership is necessary to check out materials (membership dues are currently a nominal $10 per year), anyone can use the books and collection on the premises of the library. The library is also made available to students from Washington University to observe the library's unique cataloging systems, reference department and rare book room.

The St. Louis Mercantile Library should not be penalized by the private foundation rules and applicable excise taxes. These provisions were not intended to penalize organizations that clearly provide a public benefit such as this library does. Further, other libraries of a similar nature likewise should not be burdened with the additional legal and accounting expenses to insure that they continue to satisfy the "publicly supported" financial tests.●

PROTECTING OLDER AMERICANS AGAINST OVERPAYMENT OF INCOME TAXES

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Special Committee on Aging has published a checklist of itemized deductions to protect older Americans against overpayment of Federal income tax. According to the committee, this summary is not intended to be an all-inclusive checklist for every conceivable circumstance. Instead it is designed for more typical situations to help assist the majority of taxpayers claim every legitimate deduction, exemption, and credit to which they are entitled.

If you have already filed your tax return but overlooked allowable deductions, you may still claim items initially omitted by filing an amended return—form 1040X. But, it must be filed within 3 years after the original return was due or filed, or within 2 years from the time the tax was paid, whichever is later.

Several important tax relief measures became law in 1978, including a 15 percent credit on up to $2,000 in qualified expenditures for energy conservation devices and a one-time, up to $100,000, exclusion from capital gains tax for persons 55 or older who sell their homes. This checklist is a valuable source of information for senior citizens and I would like to share this with my constituents:

CHECKLIST OF ITEMIZED DEDUCTOINS FOR SCHEDULE A (FORM 1040)

MEDICAL AND DENTAL EXPENSES

Medical and dental expenses (unreimbursed by insurance or otherwise) are deductible to the extent that they exceed 3% of your adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040).

INSURANCE PREMIUMS

One-half of medical, hospital or health insurance premiums are deductible (up to $150) without regard to the 3% limitation for other medical expenses. The remainder of these premiums can be deducted, but is subject to the 3% rule.

DRUGS AND MEDICINES

Included in medical expenses (subject to 3% rule) but only to extent exceeding 1% of adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040).

OTHER MEDICAL EXPENSES

Other allowable medical and dental expenses (subject to 3% limitation):

Abdominal supports (prescribed by a doctor).
Acupuncture services.
Ambulance hire.
Anesthetist.
Arch supports (prescribed by a doctor).
Artificial limbs and teeth.
Back supports (prescribed by a doctor).
Braces.
Capital expenditures for medical purposes (e.g., elevator for persons with a heart ailment)—deductible to the extent that the cost of the capital expenditure exceeds the increase in value to your home because of the capital expenditure. You should have an independent appraisal made to reflect clearly the increase in value.
Cardiographs.
Chiropodist.
Chiropractor.
Christian Science pracitioner, authorized.
Convalescent home (for medical treatment only).
Crutches.
Dental services (e.g., cleaning, X-ray, filling teeth).
Dentures.
Dermatologist.
Eyeglasses.
Food or beverages specially prescribed by a physician (for treatment of illness, and in addition to, not as substitute for, regular diet; physician's statement needed).
Gynecologist.
Hearing aids and batteries.
Home health services.
Hospital expenses.
Insulin treatment.
Invalid chair.
Lab tests.
Lipreading lessons (designed to overcome a handicap).
Neurologist.
Nursing services (for medical care, including nurse's board paid by you).
Occupational therapist.
Ophthalmologist.
Optician.
Optometrist.
Oral survery.
Osteopath, licensed.
Pediatrician.
Physical examinations.
Physical therapist.
Physician.
Podiatrist.
Psychiatrist.
Psychoanalyst.

Psychologist.
Psychotherapy.
Radium therapy.
Sacroiliac belt (prescribed by a doctor).
Seeing-eye dog and maintenance.
Speech therapist.
Splints.
Supplementary medical insurance (Part B) under Medicare.
Surgeon.
Telephone/teletype special communications equipment for the deaf.
Transportation expenses for medical purposes (7¢ per mile plus parking and tolls or actual fares for taxi, buses, etc.).
Vaccines.
Vitamins prescribed by a doctor (but not taken as a food supplement or to preserve general health).
Wheelchairs.
Whirlpool baths for medical purposes.
X-rays.

Expenses may be deducted only in the year you paid them. If you charge medical expenses on your bank credit card, the expenses are deducted in the year the charge is made regardless of when the bank is repaid.

TAXES

Real estate.
State and local gasoline.
General sales.
State and local income.
Personal property.

If sales tax tables are used in arriving at your deduction, ordinarily you may add to the amount shown in the tax tables the sales tax paid on the purchase of the following items: automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, airplanes, boats, mobile homes, and materials used to build a new home when you are your own contractor.

When using the sales tax tables, add to your adjusted gross income any nontaxable income (e.g., Social Security, Veterans' pensions or compensation payments, Railroad Retirement annuties, workmen's compensation, untaxed portion of long-term capital gains, dividends untaxed under the dividend exclusion, interest on municipal bonds, unemployment compensation and public assistance payments).

CONTRIBUTIONS

In general, contributions may be deducted up to 50 percent of your adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040). However, contributions to certain private nonprofit foundations, veterans organizations, or fraternal societies are limited to 20 percent of adjusted gross income.

Cash contributions to qualified organizations for (1) religious, charitable, scientific, literary or educational purposes, (2) prevention of cruelty to children or animals, or (3) Federal, State or local governmental, units (tuition for children attending parochial schools is not deductible).

Fair market value of property (e.g., clothing, books, equipment, furniture) for charitable purposes. (For gifts of appreciated property, special rules apply. Contact local IRS office.)

Travel expenses (actual or 7 cents per mile plus parking and tolls) for charitable purposes (may not deduct insurance or depreciation in either case).

Cost and upkeep of uniforms used in charitable activities (e.g., scoutmaster).

Purchase of goods or tickets from charitable organizations (excess of amount paid over the fair market value of the goods or services).

Out-of-pocket expenses (e.g., postage, stationery, phone calls) while rendering services for charitable organizations.

Care of unrelated student in your home under a written agreement with a qualifying organization (deduction is limited to $50 per month).

INTEREST

Home mortgage.
Auto loan.
Installment purchases (television, washer, dryer, etc.)

Bank credit card—can deduct the finance charge as interest if no part is for service charges, loan fees, credit investigation fees, or similar charges.

Other credit cards—you may deduct as interest the finance charges added to your monthly statement, expressed as an annual percentage rate, that are based on the unpaid monthly balance.

Points—deductible as interest by buyer where financing agreement provides that they are to be paid for use of lender's money and only if the charging of points is an established business practice in your area. Not deductible if points represent charges for services rendered by the lending institution (e.g., VA loan points are service charges and are not deductible as interest). Not deductible if paid by seller (are treated as selling expenses and represent a reduction of amount realized).

Penalty for prepayment of a mortgage—deductible as interest.

Revolving charge accounts—may deduct the separately stated "finance charge" expressed as an annual percentage rate.

CASUALTY OR THEFT LOSSES

Casualty (e.g., tornado, flood, storm, fire, or auto accident provided not caused by a willful act or willful negligence) or theft losses—the amount of your casualty loss deduction is generally the lesser of (1) the decrease in fair market value of the property as a result of the casualty, or (2) your adjusted basis in the property. This amount must be further reduced by any insurance or other recovery, and, in the case of property held for personal use, by the $100 limitation. Report your casualty or theft loss on Schedule A. If more than one item was involved in a single casualty or theft, or if you had more than one casualty or theft during the year, you may use Form 4684 for computing your personal casualty loss.

MISCELLANEOUS

Appraisal fees to determine the amount of a casualty loss or to determine the fair market value of charitable contributions.
Union dues.
Cost of preparation of income tax return.
Cost of tools for employee (depreciated over the useful life of the tools).
Dues for Chamber of Commerce (if as a business expense).
Rental cost of a safe-deposit box used to store income-producing property.
Fees paid to investment counselors.
Subscriptions to business publications.
Telephone and postage in connection with investments.
Uniforms required for employment and not generally wearable off the job.
Maintenance of uniforms required for employment.
Special safety apparel (e.g., steel toe safety shoes or helmets worn by construction workers; special masks worn by welders).
Business entertainment expenses.
Business gift expenses not exceeding $25 per recipient.
Employment agency fees under certain circumstances.
Cost of a periodic physical examination if required by employer.
Cost of installation and maintenance of a telephone required by your employment (deduction based on business use).
Cost of bond if required for employment.
Expenses of an office in your home if used regularly and exclusively for certain business purposes.
Educational expenses that are: (1) required by your employer to maintain your position; or (2) for maintaining or sharpening your skills for your employment.

Political Campaign Contributions.—You may claim either a deduction (line 31, Schedule A, Form 1040) or a credit (line 38, Form 1040), for campaign contributions to an individual who is a candidate for nomination or election to any Federal, State, or local office in any primary, general, or special election. The deduction or credit is also applicable for any (1) committee supporting a candidate for Federal, State, or local elective public office, (2) national committee of a national political party, (3) State committee of a national political party, or (4) local committee of a national political party. The maximum deduction is $100 ($200 for couples filing jointly). The amount of the tax credit is one-half of the political contribution, with a $25 ceiling ($50 for couples filing jointly).

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND

Additionally, you may voluntarily earmark $1 of your taxes ($2 on joint returns) for the Presidential Election Campaign Fund.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

For any questions concerning any of these items contact your local IRS office. You may also obtain helpful publications and additional forms by contacting your local IRS office.

OTHER TAX RELIEF MEASURES

Filing status	*Required to file a tax return if gross income is at least—*
Single (under age 65)	$2,950
Single (age 65 or older)	3,700
Qualifying widow(er) under 65 with dependent child	3,950
Qualifying widow(er) 65 or older with dependent child	4,700
Married couple (both spouses under 65) filing jointtly	4,700
Married couple (1 spouse 65 or older) filing jointly	5,450
Married couple (both spouses 65 or older) filing jointly	6,200
Married filing separately	750

Additional Exemption for Age.—Besides the regular $750 exemption, you are allowed an additional exemption of $750 if you are age 65 or older on the last day of the taxable year, each is entitled to an additional exemption of $750 because of age. You are considered 65 on the day before your 65th birthday. Thus, if your 65th birthday is on January 1, 1979, you will be entitled to the additional $750 exemption because of age for your 1978 Federal income tax return.

"Zero Bracket Amount."—The "zero bracket amount" is a flat amount that depends on your filing status. It is not a separate deduction; instead, the equivalent amount is built into the tax tables and tax rate schedules. Since this amount is built into the tax tables and tax rate schedules, you will need to make an adjustment if you itemize deductions. However, itemizers will not experience any change in their tax liability and the tax computation will be simplified for many itemizers.

Tax Tables.—Tax tables have been developed to make it easier for you to find your tax if your income is under certain levels. Even if you itemize deductions, you may be able to use the tax tables to find your tax easier. In addition, you do not have to deduct $750 for each exemption or figure your general tax credit, because these amounts are also built into the tax table for you.

Multiple Support Agreements.—In general, a person may be claimed as a dependent of another taxpayer, provided five tests are met: (1) Support, (2) gross income, (3) member of household or relationship, (4) citizenship, and (5) separate return. But in some cases, two or more individuals

provide support for an individual, and no one has contributed more than half the person's support. However, it still may be possible for one of the individuals to be entitled to a $750 dependency deduction if the following requirements are met for multiple support:

1. Two or more persons—any one of whom could claim the person as a dependent if it were not for the support test—together contribute more than half of the dependent's support.

2. Any one of those who individually contribute more than 10% of the mutual dependent's support, *but only one of them,* may claim the dependency deduction.

3. Each of the others must file a written statement that he will not claim the dependency deduction for that year. The statement must be filed with the income tax return of the person who claims the dependency deduction. Form 2120 (Multiple Support Declaration) may be used for this purpose.

Sale of Personal Residence.—You may exclude from your gross income some or all of your gain from the sale of your principal residence, if you meet certain age, ownership, and occupancy requirements at the time of the sale. These requirements, and the amount of gain that may be excluded, differ depending on whether you sold your home before July 27, 1978, or on or after that date. The exclusion is elective, and you may elect to exclude gain only once for sales before July 27, 1978, and only once for sales on or after that date.

If you sold your home before July 27, 1978, and you were age 65 or older before the date of sale, you may elect to exclude the gain attributable to $35,000 of the adjusted sales price if you owned and occupied the residence for 5 of the 8 years ending on the date of sale. If you sold the home after July 26, 1978, and you were age 55 or older before the date of sale, you may elect to exclude $100,000 of gain on the sale if you owned and occupied the residence for 3 of the 5 years ending on the date of sale (or 5 of 8 years under certain circumstances). Form 2119 (Sale or Exchange of Personal Residence) is helpful in determining what gain, if any, may be excluded.

Additionally, you may elect to defer reporting the gain on the sale of your personal residence if within 18 months before or 18 months after the sale you buy and occupy another residence, the cost of which equals or exceeds the adjusted sales price of the old residence. Additional time is allowed if (1) you construct the new residence; (2) you were on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces; or (3) your tax home was abroad. Publication 523 (Tax Information on Selling or Purchasing Your Home) may also be helpful.

Credit for the Elderly.—You may be able to claim this credit and reduce taxes by as much as $375 (if single), or $562.50 (if married filing jointly), if you are:

(1) Age 65 or older, or

(2) Under age 65 and retired under a public retirement system.

For more information, see instructions for Schedules R and RP.

Credit for Child and Dependent Care Expenses.—Certain payments made for child and dependent care may be claimed as a credit against tax.

If you maintained a household that included your dependent child under age 15 or a dependent or spouse incapable of self-care, you may be allowed a 20% credit for employment related expenses. These expenses must have been paid during the taxable year in order to enable you to work either full or part time.

For detailed information, see the instructions on Form 2441.

Earned Income Credit.—If you maintain a household for a child who is under age 19, or is a student, or is a disabled dependent, you may be entitled to a special payment or credit of up to $400. This is called the earned income credit. It may come as a refund check or be applied against any taxes owed. Generally, if you reported earned income and had adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040) of less than $8,000, you may be able to claim the credit.

Earned income means wages, salaries, tips, other employee compensation, and net earnings from self-employment (generally amount shown on Schedule SE (Form 1040) line 13). A married couple must file a joint return to be eligible for the credit. Certain married persons living apart with a dependent child may also be eligible to claim the credit.

For more information, see instructions for Form 1040 or 1040A.

ENERGY TAX ACT

The Energy Tax Act of 1978 is directed at providing tax incentives for energy conservation measures and for conversion to renewable energy sources.

A credit of up to $300 may be claimed for expenditures for energy conservation property installed in or on your principal residence, whether you own or rent it. The residence must have been substantially completed by April 20, 1977. Items eligible for the credit are limited to the following: insulation (fiberglass, cellulose, etc.) for ceilings, walls, floors, roofs, water heaters, etc.; exterior storm (or thermal) windows or doors; caulking or weatherstripping for exterior windows or doors; furnace replacement burner which reduces the amount of fuel used; a device to make flue openings (for a heating system) more efficient; an electrical or mechanical furnace ignition sytem which replaces a gas pilot light; an automatic energy-saving setback thermostat; and a meter which displays the cost of energy usage.

A maximum credit for renewable energy source property is $2,200. Equipment used in the production or distribution of heat or electricity from solar, geothermal, or wind energy sources for residential heating, cooling, or other purposes may qualify for this credit.

Energy credits may be claimed by completing Form 5695 and attaching it to your Form 1040. Credit for expenditures made after April 19, 1977, and before January 1, 1979, must be claimed on your 1978 tax return. Do not file an amended 1977 return to claim a credit for expenditure in 1977.

Examples of items which do not qualify for energy credit are the following: carpeting, drapes, wood paneling, exterior siding, heat pump, wood or peat fueled residential equipment, fluorescent replacement lighting system, hydrogen fueled residential equipment, equipment using wind energy for transportation, expenditures for a swimming pool used as an energy storage medium, and greenhouses.

For further information, consult the instructions for Form 5695 and IRS Publication 903, Energy Credits for Individuals.●

DEALING WITH MEXICO

HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, congressional support for forging a new partnership with Mexico is growing. Last month, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 34 which calls upon President Carter during his state visit to Mexico to reach agreement with Mexican President Portillo on a framework for United States-Mexican cooperation on a variety of common concerns, including terms for mutually-beneficial development of Mexico's oil and gas reserves. Sixty-five of my colleagues have joined me in communicating this message to the White House.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that one of the keys to increased Mexican oil production is profitable gas use. If Mexico does not export gas, cannot use all of it domestically, and refuses to waste it, then projected oil production will have to be cut back—reduced by as much as 400,000 barrels of oil per day by 1988. The following editorials from the New York Times and the Washington Post underscore the growing public demand for new approaches in our bilateral relations with Mexico.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 5, 1979]

MAKING A DEAL WITH MEXICO

As everyone knows by now, Mexico sits on a pool of oil and gas second only to the reserves of Saudi Arabia. Its leaders intend to raise oil production at a measured pace, selling enough crude in world markets (at world prices) to finance a long period of industrialization. What will happen to the natural gas has yet to be determined. Its sole potential foreign buyer is the United States. Last year, after months of haggling over price, the two countries broke off negotiations and the Mexican Government vowed to develop the gas for domestic use. But we doubt that will be the Mexicans' last word.

Both Governments understand the powerful arguments for exports to the United States. And if an agreement could be worked out that did not appear to compromise the Mexican Government's strong public commitment to a price of $2.60 per thousand cubic feet, Mexico would be satisfied. That is why the issue ranks high on the agenda of President Carter's talks with President López Portillo later this month.

Mexico chose $2.60 because it was equivalent at the time to the price of home heating oil. Natural gas is a clean, versatile energy resource easily substitutable for the distilled oil used for home heat. Moreover, the Mexican Government proposed to cover most of the investment for a pipeline to bring the gas from wellhead to consumers. The deal was acceptable to private American pipeline companies.

But the Carter Administration objected to both the economics and the politics of the offer. The President's energy plan, then stalled in Congress, called for a maximum price on domestic gas well below $2.60. And no one wanted to explain to an already balky Congress why a premium should be paid to Mexico. Then, too, there was the problem of Canadian gas, which was selling in the United States for only $2.18. Had Mexico gotten $2.60, the Canadians would have demanded parity.

In the year since President Carter refused to initial the Mexican agreement, Congress has finally passed legislation that will eventually let domestic producers sell gas for more than $2.60. But the Canadian problem remains, and the Carter Administration is divided over how much to offer the Mexicans.

Energy Secretary James Schlesinger opposes paying much more than the value of the gas to Mexico's domestic industry—about four-fifth's the asking price. Mr. Schlesinger is plainly worried that the Mexican connection would further delay gas production in Alaska. Owing to the enormous costs of pipeline construction, Alaskan gas will never be a bargain. But it would

reduce American dependence on foreign energy. A subtler view, focusing on other aspects of the Mexican energy connection, seems more farsighted. Even if Mexican gas is, strictly speaking, slightly overpriced, the gas issue should not be allowed to sour future United States negotiations with Mexico over energy.

If President Carter managed to persuade the Mexican Government to accept a lower price, the savings would not necessarily serve the national interest. The loss of face for President López Portillo would undoubtedly strengthen chauvinist political forces, making it more difficult for any Mexican leader to accomodate the United States on oil development or on increased flows of gas when circumstances demand.

The Carter Administration should aim for a compromise that Mexicans can reasonably view as a victory. We might, for example, yield to the $2.60 demand in return for an option to buy more gas in the future at the same price, or for a price formula that would become more favorable as energy prices rise in the mid-1980's. However the agreement is reached, the future of Mexican-American energy relations is too important to be left to the price hawks at the Department of Energy.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 8, 1979]

BUYING GAS FROM MEXICO

The Mexican gas negotiations are, at the moment, hanging in midair. That's a bad place for them. President Carter is going to Mexico City next month, and agreement on the gas is now urgently in the interest of both countries. It's not only that the amounts of gas for sale are enormous. Mexico's future policy on oil production will be influenced by its ability to dispose of the gas. The turmoil in Iran, and the abrupt cessation of its oil exports, suggests once again the peril in the United States' present over-dependence on Middle Eastern supplies. Anything that encourages new oil and gas production anywhere else in the world is good for the United States. That's why the Carter administration needs to get the gas talks going again—rapidly.

These gas negotiations have an unfortunate history. The pipeline to carry the gas from the wells up to the U.S. border is already under construction. Last year Pemex, the Mexican oil and gas monopoly, had arrived at an agreement with a consortium of six American gas transmission companies. But then the U.S. government suddenly intervened and suspended the whole sale. The reasons are still not entirely clear, but the American buyers were offering a price significantly higher than the regulated ceiling price for domestic gas. Perhaps the administration feared that approval of that higher price might upset the fragile compromise in Congress on the gas-pricing bill that was then inching its way, excruciatingly slowly, toward enactment.

This abrupt and unexplained veto by the Carter administration has deeply irritated the Mexicans. It suggests a lack of concern for the Mexican position when it might conflict with the political exigencies of the moment here. To the Mexicans, the whole affair seemed to cast doubt on the reliability and constancy of American purposes.

The issue is essentially the price. The Mexicans wanted to sell the gas for the price that Americans would pay for the equivalent energy in imported heating oil. The Carter administration had two objections to that. First, it is understandably reluctant to let the price of other fuels get tied automatically to a standard—the price of imported oil—that OPEC can raise at will. Second, it argues that this gas will not compete with heating oil but rather with the grades of heavy industrial fuel oil that are considerably cheaper. Both of these objections are reasonable. But the first one, involving the link to world oil prices, has already been eroded a bit. Both belong to the category of issues that reasonable people ought to be able to work out amicably. It would probably serve this country best to give a little on the initial price, in order to get more assurance of predictability for the future.

But there are compelling reasons on both sides of the border to get an agreement. The Mexican gas is produced in association with the oil—which is to say that they come up the pipe mixed together. At present the gas is being flared off in the Mexican fields merely to get rid of it. Those flares are a dismaying symbol of waste. If the Mexican government cannot sell its gas in the American market, it may well feel a responsibility to hold down the development of both oil and gas production until its own economy can absorb the gas. Mexico can sell her oil anywhere. But for the gas there is, as a practical matter, only one possible market of any great significance.

The Mexican gas negotiations constitute a test of the Carter administration's attitudes toward Mexico's resources generally, and the relationship that this country would like to strike with the owners. Mexico is a peaceful and stable country. Peace, stability and proximity of the producing country ought to be worth quite a lot to the customer. That, unhappily, is the lesson of Iran.●

AARON HENRY AND NELSON CRUIKSHANK OPPOSE PROPOSED CUTS IN SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, President Carter urged Congress in his 1980 budget request to cut certain unnecessary social security benefits. If this is approved, roughly $600 million in such benefits would be eliminated during the budget year. These proposed social security cuts would be one of several casualties in the fight against inflation. Others are the steep cuts in public service employment, subsidized housing, summer jobs for youth, and child nutrition programs. Unfortunately, as has happened in a great many other previous Presidential battles against a variety of public enemies, this battle against inflation could well result in a great number of unnecessary casualties. The fact of the matter is, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the President's budget by the fourth quarter of 1980 will only lessen inflation by a mere one-tenth of 1 percent. Controlling inflation is an important goal; but surely there must be more effective methods, and methods that also spare the most vulnerable individuals, such as disabled and retired persons.

If the President's proposed cuts in social security disability benefits take place, nearly 5 million disabled persons and their dependents will be affected. Other cuts will affect equally large numbers of individuals who are recipients of social security, of whom there are nearly 34.5 million. Out of curiosity, I obtained statistics on the numbers of older Americans who are living in or at the edge of poverty. If the measure of poverty is the official poverty line of $2.895 for a single individual, there are at least 4.1 million, 60 years and older, who are poor by official standards (as of 1977). If the poverty line were raised to $5,000 for individuals, certainly a realistic level, there are at least 16.7 million Americans, 60 years and older, who are poor, having incomes of only $5,000 a year. The point is that older Americans are a highly vulnerable group, whose incomes generally just allow them to get by. If we have to cut Federal spending, why does it always have to be taken out on the weakest?

I know that both Houses of Congress will examine very closely the President's social security proposals before any action is taken. For this reason, I recommend to my colleagues two recent articles that offer a good background on the issues involved. The first is a statement by Dr. Aaron Henry, chairman of the National Caucus on Black Aged, which he delivered on January 25, 1979 to the Coalition to Save the Social Security Program. The second is an article that appeared in the Washington Post, February 8, 1979, which examines the position of Nelson H. Cruikshank, the President's own counselor on aging, who opposes the social security cuts.

STATEMENT OF AARON HENRY

We are witnessing a sad time in our society. A time when, for the purpose of balancing the federal budget, those members of the American population who can least afford it are having taken from them the few dollars in Social Security benefits that they, themselves, contributed toward, and, which mean so much to them. I speak of the elderly and the poor. The minority elderly—the Blacks, the Pacific Islanders, the Asian American, the Hispanics—who always suffer the most in the name of budget reductions.

Elimination of the $225 lump sum death benefit, as proposed by the Administration, though sorely inadequate to meet today's extraordinary expenses at the time of death, could leave a spouse without any money at a time of great grief and stress. That sum, though small, will permit a poor widow one last bit of dignity—to make funeral arrangements for her departed husband. Are we really so callous as to deny her this?

Elimination of the minimum of $122, though a pittance, would deal a crushing blow to the minority elderly and disabled. As a result of forced lay-offs, irregular work and non-covered jobs, they have been unable to earn substantial earnings benefits. By cutting these persons off from their Social Security benefits, the government would, supposedly save $65 million in 1980, $140 million in 1981 and $230 million in 1984. Unbelievably, the Administration says, "Let them go on welfare." That's incredible! We are trying to reduce the welfare rolls, not add to them. All of the cuts proposed by the administration come to about $600 million in fiscal 1979, and $1 billion in 1980. However, if the cuts are implemented, it will amount to a loss of $6.5 billion in benefit protection by 1984. That purported saving is infinitesimal compared to the $531 billion budget for fiscal year 1979, $123 billion of which has been allocated for the military.

If the Administration is serious about reducing the Federal deficit, there are far more lucrative areas. Minimizing the numerous income tax breaks allowed to corporations would be one such area. Cutting human programs should be a last resort! We are already seeing the effects of the reduction or "hold the line" syndrome where human service programs are concerned. Since no funding has been provided for many of the programs under the 1978 amendments to the older Americans act many services are being cut back. Rather than gearing up for urgently needed increases in services this year, state and city aging offices and area agencies on aging throughout the country are preparing

for reductions in services—some as much as 25 percent.

Unless governmental neglect of the urgent needs in this area, as well as reductions in other social programs, is halted the crucial needs of the minority elderly, widowed and disabled, will never be met.

The irony is that if benefits under Social Security are reduced, the need for services which are provided under the older Americans act and other federally funded programs, such as Title XX of the Social Security Act, will dramatically increase.

As I mentioned, 25 percent of the budget goes for defense spending. The administration's bid for a conservative fiscal policy, in this manner, makes the poor, the minorities, the elderly, the widowed and the disabled, give up, once again, more than they can afford. They will bear the brunt of this oppressive action while the economic system designed to protect the existing contracts between the government and big business remains intact. The cut will come neither from that part of the budget nor from military spending.

The $600 million taken from social programs will affect the rate of inflation less than .3 percent of 1 percent. But, it will catastrophically affect the lives of the poor and minority recipients. I stand before you as a true long time friend of President Carter, Joe Califano of HEW and of Social Security Administrator, Stanford Ross, I remain so today. And we believe that President Carter will hear our voices and can be convinced by us that the Social Security cutbacks recommended in the budget to Congress will be cancelled by the Administration and that the national leaders of Social Security and HEW, and of the United States Congress including Congressman Al Ullman, who really are our friends, will come around to supporting our position in opposing these cuts. We are hoping that we can depend upon them and you. We will work with them, and you, if possible but we will work around them, and you if necessary.

The following organizations have joined us in this determination to prevent these Social Security cutbacks: The NAACP, National Urban League, National Urban Coalition, National Dental Association, National Association of Black Women Attorneys, National Task Force on Senior Citizens, Black Child Development Institute, Inc., Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Delta Housing Corporation, National Pharmaceutical Association, D.C. Coalition for the Appointment of Women, National Black Veterans Organization, Rural America, D. C. Mental Health Association, National Association of Social Workers and the Congressional Black Caucus. (This is a partial list.)

CARTER AIDE HITS PROPOSED SLASH IN SOCIAL SECURITY

(By Spencer Rich)

Nelson H. Cruikshank, President Carter's counselor on aging, assailed the administration yesterday for its proposed cuts in Social Security benefits.

While Cruikshank was blasting the cuts, the House Ways and Means Social Security subcommittee, headed by Rep. J. J. Pickle (D-Tex.), concluded that even if it eventually approved some of the cuts, the action almost certainly will not come in time to take effect during fiscal 1980 as Carter has proposed.

In a virtually unprecedented performance for a sitting adviser to a president, Cruikshank told the House Committee on Aging that the proposed cuts are "ill-advised," "at the very least disingenuous," and "trumped up" to grab credit for a quick budget reduction.

He said they reflect "lack of understanding" of "the very nature" of Social Security and of benefit promises made to persons who have paid in all their lives. Cruikshank's views were in tune with those of a huge coalition of organizations, headed by former Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Wilbur J. Cohen, who also testified and said he will battle the cuts to the end.

Cruikshank said he was speaking for himself, not the administration, and he had been informed by the White House "that I am free to express (my) disagreement as long as I make clear the distinction between what are my own views and what are the administration's positions."

As proposed by the administration, the cuts—which include phasing out the student benefit for orphans aged 18 to 21, eliminating the $122-a-month floor on benefits, reducing disability benefit levels and eliminating the $255 burial benefit—would have saved $609 billion in fiscal 1980.

Stanford Ross, the current Social Security Commissioner, defended the proposed cuts in later testimony. "None of our proposals affects the central elements of the Social Security program" or hurts current beneficiaries, he said, adding that the proposals seek only to keep program costs within reasonable limits by cutting elements of "relatively low social priority" or "random largess."

Pickle, at an organizational meeting of the Ways and Means subcommittee, said some of the cuts are so controversial that it is "neither realistic or practical" to expect passage in time for any savings in the fiscal 1980 budget, if ever.

He and the subcommittee made an exception for disability insurance provisions, which the subcommittee acted on last year. Pickle said disability cuts—among a host of Social Security issues like coverage for federal employees and a hope-for postponement of the Social Security tax rate increase scheduled for 1981—are the only element likely to pass Congress in time to have any impact on the fiscal 1980 budget. Fiscal 1980 begins Oct. 1.

Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to inform the full Ways and Means and Budget committees that, of the $609 million proposed savings, the most that can actually be expected in 1980 would be $50 million to $75 million, by reduction of disability benefit levels.

Pickle said that in view of the coalition headed by Cohen and other factors, it simply is not practical to think of making any other major cuts soon.

But he said the subcommittee will study all major Social Security financing and benefit issues and perhaps might come up with a comprehensive bill of some type around the end of this year or early in 1980.

He said that as the scheduled tax increase—from the present 6.13 percent rate to 6.65 percent in 1981—approaches, members may be more willing to consider changes in the system to reduce the tax increase.

Cohen, former Social Security Commissioner Robert Ball, former Social Security Chief Actuary Robert J. Myers (1947–70) and other witnesses all joined Cruikshank in attacking the proposed cuts.●

SOVIET JEWS URGE CONGRESS NOT TO MODIFY JACKSON-VANIK AMENDMENT

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, it was recently reported in the New York Times that a group of 68 Soviet Jews from eight cities had appealed to the U.S. Congress not to change legislation that bars favorable trade terms for Moscow, because of its restrictions on emigration. In clear reference to moves in the House and the Senate to modify and weaken the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974, these prominent Soviet "refusniks" urge the U.S. Congress to remain firm in its commitment to Soviet Jewish emigration. This goal cannot be achieved, they believe, through a change in existing U.S. laws.

This appeal was received by telephone from Moscow and translated into English by the London correspondent to the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews, Mr. Michael Sherbourne. The text of the appeal follows:

To Members of the United States Congress:

We are addressing ourselves to you inasmuch as the situation in the field of emigration from the USSR remains far from satisfactory, although the Soviet Union is a signatory to and has ratified five international agreements that stipulate freedom of emigration; and although this freedom is granted to citizens of the USSR by its laws, nevertheless today, as previously in this sphere, tyranny continues to prevail.

The Soviet authorities decide as they see fit and without reference to any laws. They grant permission to emigrate to some and refuse it to others. Some of those deciding to emigrate are forcibly kept back in this country under various pretexts, and some without any sort of reason being put forward. While many are deprived of all means of existence and suffer repression and harassment, a number of activists of the Jewish emigration movement have been brought to trial by courts on fabricated charges, which have demonstrated to the whole world their contempt for the elementary norms of legal justice, a process which culminated in the notorious trial of Anatoly Sharansky.

Under these circumstances, the only legislative enactment which to some extent at least acts as an obstacle to the unbridled tyranny of the Soviet authorities in their emigration policies, is the Jackson-Vanik Amendment to the Foreign Trade Bill accepted by the Congress (1972–74). On the general human level, the Jackson-Vanik Amendment is an act of historic significance in the spirit of the finest democratic humanitarian traditions of the American people. This aspect of the Amendment is reviewed by Academician Andrei Sakharov in his work, "My Country and the World."

During the discussions of the Amendment and after its acceptance, there was both an increase and a reduction in the number of exit permits granted as well as a lessening and a reduction in the number of exit permits granted as well as a lessening and a hardening of the repressive acts. But we who have been living in this country all our lives, and who for many years have been feeling on our backs every change in the political wind of the leaders of this country, are deeply convinced that the Jackson-Vanik Amendment has played, is playing and we hope will continue to play, a great significant and positive role in restraining the Soviet authorities from committing the severest of repressive acts.

The Jackson-Vanik Amendment compelled the Soviet government to refrain from demanding the tax on education and is the only real stimulus to them to bring about a liberalization of their emigration policies. We believe that in the long run, this amendment will eventually lead to the liberalization of Soviet emigration policies when the leaders of the USSR come to the realization that the U.S. Congress will stand firm in its position of defending freedom of emigration as one of the fundamental rights of man.

During our recent meetings with delegates of the United States Congress, representatives of all trends in the Jewish emigration movement unanimously expressed their support for the retention of the basic concept

of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. We are convinced that the United States Congress has done much to preserve legality in its support for freedom of emigration by offering the USSR trade preferential treatment in return for that freedom. This now appears to be the only means of bringing about a real limitation of tyranny and abuse of authority in this sphere, which is of such importance for all humanity.

Moscow: Alexander Lerner, Judith Perlman, Boris Chernobilsky, Yelena Chernobilskaya, Yakov Rakhlenko, Vinya Belkina, Victor Yelistratov, Batsheva Yelistratova, Yevgenny Tsirlin, Galina Tsirlina, Arkady Mai, Helen Seidel, Ida Milgram, Mikhail Kremen, Galina Kremen, Leonid Shabashov, Olga Shabashova, Alla Drugova, Yakov Shmayevich, Igor Gudz, Lev Blitshtein, Vladimir Chepkassy, Ludmilla Cherkasskaya, Yakov Alber, Aba Stolyar, Gita Rosovskaya.

Leningrad: Y. Kogan, Alexander Genusov, Lev Furman, Vladimir Knokh, Yuri Speisman, Nelly Speisman, Lev Israelev.

Minsk: Lev Ovsischer.

Kharkov: Alexander Paritsky.

Tibilisi: Isai Goldstein, Elizabeta Bykova.

Vilnius: Eitan Finkelshtein.

Odessa: Lev Roitburd.

Lvov: David Shvartz.

Kiev: Sergei Rotshtein, Elna Oleni, Dimitri Raizman, Yefim Frimmerman.

The above list of 44 signatures is a partial list as of February 11. Since then, the list has totalled 68, according to the New York Times of February 13, 1979.●

CECIL MOORE, A GREAT LEADER

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, this week the city of Philadelphia mourns the death of a man who was a great leader in every sense of the word—City Councilman Cecil B. Moore.

It would be impossible to exaggerate the importance of Cecil Moore's role in the civil rights movement in Philadelphia, Mr. Speaker. Throughout the 1950's and 1960's, he was the driving force responsible for bringing equality and dignity to the people of our city.

At the time of his death, he represented the people of the Fifth Councilmatic District. He brought to the chamber of City Council the same outrage at inequality; anger at substandard living conditions; and intolerance for government inaction which marked his entire career.

He was a brilliant lawyer. Time after time, he represented the cases of those who were poor and disadvantaged. He developed what was reported to be one of the largest criminal practices in the Nation, and was generally acknowledged to have few peers in the legal profession in our city.

But, Mr. Speaker, it was in the field of civil rights that Mr. Moore scored his greatest accomplishments.

As President of the Philadelphia Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, he was responsible, more than any other person in the city, for the integration of blacks into Government and industry jobs.

He took over the presidency of the NAACP in 1962, and increased its membership from 7,000 persons to more than 30,000. During his terms in office, the Philadelphia NAACP was considered to be the strongest and largest branch in the United States. Mr. Moore led a volunteer army of thousands of people who would picket businesses which discriminated against blacks.

Perhaps his most noted accomplishment was the campaign against Girard College.

According to the will of Stephen Girard, Mr. Speaker, this school for fatherless boys was prohibited from accepting black students. But for 7 months in 1965, Mr. Moore led picket lines around the walls of the school in North Philadelphia, mounting a publicity and legal campaign which resulted in the 1968 decision of the U.S. Supreme Court to rule that the school could not exclude blacks.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Philadelphia will miss this giant of a man who made his contributions to our city and country in so many ways—as a 9-year veteran of the U.S. Marine Corps, as a lawyer, as a civil rights leader, as a City Councilman, and as a consistent and effective voice against inequality.

I know that my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, join me in expressing sincerest sympathies to his wife, Helen Golden Boyer, and his daughters, Mrs. Ceciley Banks, Mrs. Alexis Love, and Melba Moore.●

ASBESTOS HEALTH HAZARD IN SCHOOLS

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education will hold hearings on February 21 on legislation which I have introduced, together with over 30 of my colleagues, which would reduce the asbestos health hazards in potentially thousands of schools across the United States. H.R. 1524 is an effort to involve the United States in a limited fashion in the identification and mitigation of severe asbestos hazards where they exist. That effort, according to my bill, would be shared with parties which are actually far more responsible for the current situation than the Federal Government, namely State and local government and manufacturers of asbestos materials.

Last month, this subcommittee held 2 days of hearings in which nationally recognized experts testified that there is no established threshold of asbestos exposure which is "safe." We also heard that we should restrict our removal or containment activities to those situations which pose an imminent danger to the health of schoolchildren or employees. Through this kind of reasoned and limited approach, which is reflected in H.R. 1524, we will avert any public panic while responsibly addressing a potentially serious problem.

A recent article in the Journal of the National School Boards Association (November 1978) discussed the extent of the present problem and the need for a coordinated effort to identify and remove the danger. I would like to submit this brief article to the RECORD.

The article follows:

ASBESTOS IN SCHOOLS: WALLS AND HALLS OF TROUBLE

(By Dan Levin)

D. That's right. The answer to the multiple-choice question on the front cover of this month's Journal is that asbestos in schools may cause a rare, incurable cancer, can be extremely dangerous and expensive to remove and is a problem that can be solved by astute school boards.

If exposure to asbestos can cause cancer and if the walls and ceilings of your schools are covered with asbestos, does this mean that your students and employes face a health danger just from being inside your school buildings? That question can't be answered with a simple Yes or No; it requires replies containing "maybe" and "possibly" and "it all depends." Your responsibility in this matter, however, is clear-cut: to begin asking some key questions. Do your schools contain asbestos? To what extent is that asbestos a health hazard to students and employes? How can the health danger be eliminated? What's it all going to cost? This article is a starting point from which you can collect answers to the foregoing questions. One more thing to keep in mind:. Some of the latest and best research information about asbestos in the schools (that information prompted this article and will be referred to later) may negate advice you've had in the past about asbestos in your schools. So now you have to look at the problem again; start looking here:

In schools built between 1946 and 1973, the use of asbestos, especially sprayed asbestos, was not uncommon. Builders considered it effective for fireproofing, insulation, acoustical and even decorative purposes. Because it is durable, strong, flexible and resistant to wear, asbestos has been used for an estimated 3,000 purposes in commercial, public and industrial applications. But in 1973, after research concluded that some shipyard workers who had handled asbestos during World War II were dying of cancer as a result of asbestos exposure, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (E.P.A.) banned its use in most sprayed applications.

Asbestos workers, according to a study published last March, were dying of cancer at rates higher than those in the general population. Lung, stomach, esophageal, intestinal and rectal cancers all occurred more often among asbestos workers than normally would be expected. These findings strongly influenced recent National Cancer Institute estimates that in the next 30 years, 17 percent of all cancers will be asbestos related. But one truly significant finding of the asbestos workers study showed that seven percent of the 17,800 workers studied had died from mesothelioma—an extremely rare form of cancer in the general population that, until 1976, had not even been listed in the cancer registry. Mesothelioma affects the pleura, a membrane lining in the chest cavity, or the peritoneum, a similar lining in the abdominal cavity.

What does all this mean for students in school buildings with walls and halls of asbestos? No one is able to answer that question—not yet. Virtually all of the 4.5 million World War II shipyard workers received much higher exposures to asbestos than do students whose schools contain asbestos on the ceilings, for example. But what complicates the picture is that no air samplings

were taken in World War II shipyards, so we don't know the contamination level of the air those workers were breathing. Further clouding the issue are reports that people with no history of direct exposure to asbestos—those who lived near an asbestos-producing plant or families with an asbestos worker in the household—also have contracted asbestos-associated cancers. (Predictably, smokers run an exhorbitantly higher risk of contracting asbestos-associated lung cancer than do nonsmokers who have had the same exposure to asbestos; mesothelioma, however, is not associated with cigarette smoking.) Wide disagreement exists on the matter of what constitutes a "safe" level of exposure to asbestos. And, a lack of decisive research findings has led one prominent scientist to conclude that linking low-level, nonoccupational exposure to asbestos (such as that present in school buildings containing asbestos) to cancer is "uncertain and difficult."

However: After exposure to asbestos—for as short a period as one month or two—asbestos-related cancers can take from 15 to 35 years to appear. Current studies of asbestos-related cancer reflect exposures of decades gone by. Who can say what scientists will find 20 or 50 years from now as a result of research on people exposed even to "low" levels of asbestos from 1946 until today?

No wonder there's been so much misunderstanding about schools and asbestos—misunderstanding such as that in Howell Township, New Jersey, where six elementary schools were closed in the middle of the 1976–1977 school year to remove asbestos ceilings. A parent who worked as a supervisor in the state Department of Environmental Protection, and who obviously knew something about asbestos, had a sample tested, then came to a school board meeting and declared the stuff was dangerous.

Fueling the fear in cancer-conscious New Jersey, which has the highest cancer mortality rate in the nation, was a report that at least one Howell Township child had had severely swollen glands since the start of the 1976 school year. (The malady later turned out to be mononucleosis.) Other parents were complaining that their kids were suffering from a variety of respiratory ailments; everyone was blaming asbestos. Threatened with a boycott of classes, the board of education, after an emergency meeting, ordered the schools temporarily closed in January 1977.

The president of the board agreed with the alarmed parents and said that he, too, would keep his kids out of school until the staff was removed. He said the older kids in one school had loosened the asbestos material with yardsticks and were throwing it in other kids' faces. Superintendent Sidney Zaslavsky tried in vain to salve the situation, futilely urging the board to wait until the summer to remove the asbestos. But the state Department of Education applied pressure, according to Zaslavsky, and the job of removal began. In the end, it cost the Howell Township schools about $180,000 to remove the asbestos from the schools: elementary school students lost four weeks of classes.

Because some school officials panicked and because the testing for and removal of the asbestos may have been sloppy, several observers say the Howell Township case was mishandled from an educational as well as from a scientific standpoint. But it did spur action. In February 1977, the Massachusetts Public Interest Research Group, a Ralph Nader-inspired consumer organization, surveyed the 50 states to find out what was being done about asbestos in schools. Although the findings now may be a bit outdated, seven of the 24 states that replied were found to be only minimally aware of the potential hazards of asbestos in school buildings. Thirteen of the states reported taking some action to determine the extent of the problem, but in several cases the "action" was testing the air for asbestos—an extraordinarily unreliable method for determining danger from asbestos exposure. Unfortunately, too many administrators have been duped into believing that low readings in air samples let them off the hook.

Massachusetts, it turns out, now appears to be in the vanguard among the states that are attacking the problem. Late in 1975, two years after one city, Newton, spent a whopping $275,000 to solve the asbestos problem in a newly completed high school, the state established a legislative commission to determine the extent of the problem in the commonwealth. The state's Division of Occupational Hygiene, armed with a staff of three and funded with $50,000, sent letters to the 1,418 schools in the state that were built between 1946 and 1972 to find out if they had *any* sprayed material; 849 did. Then, borrowing 40 inspectors from the Division of Industrial Safety, occupational hygiene director Harold Bavely sent these people out to take samples from the schools. By last August, lab tests were completed in 60 percent of the 849 schools; 91 contained asbestos.

The Massachusetts State Asbestos Commission also has information that asbestos in one school may be implicated in the death of one man. William Wigmore, head maintenance man at the Hull schools from 1957 to 1966, died of mesothelioma on August 8, 1977. Wigmore had covered pipes with asbestos insulation and had used asbestos fibers to clean liquid spills.

So far, no public school in Massachusetts has removed asbestos ceilings. Newton North didn't remove its asbestos ceilings because of the extreme danger involved. Instead, according to the Newton system's Director of Support Services Roy Cornelius, some ceilings were coated (the trade term is "encapsulated"), while drop ceilings were placed beneath other areas. The school still conducts bimonthly air sampling tests with help from Harvard University scientists; the school's custodial crew has been apprised of the situation and regularly inspects ceilings for damage.

Does encapsulating asbestos or installing drop ceilings put a school in the clear? Several experts would say no.

First of all, the asbestos is still in the school. If the school has to be remodeled or demolished, or if there is an accident of some sort, authorities will have to deal with the problem of potential exposure. Furthermore, the sealant used to encapsulate the asbestos may be of questionable value, depending on several factors. Certain kinds of sealants applied to certain kinds of asbestos can crack when struck and this can release fibers into the air. Currently, no list of effective sealants exist. Battelle Laboratories of Columbus, Ohio, is working on an E.P.A. contract to determine the effectiveness of 70 sealants and the results should be published shortly.

Second, air sampling is an expensive complicated process that may yield deceiving results. One reason for this is changing standards. Occupational Safety and Health Administration standards for asbestos levels in the air have changed over the last few years—"safe" levels of asbestos exposure in 1972 may, in 1978, be considered "dangerous" occupational levels.

Thus, says Dr. Robert N. Sawyer of Yale University, "Application of the OSHA standard is inappropriate and irrelevant in school buildings." Sawyer is perhaps the country's leading expert on the asbestos problem. He is coauthor, along with Charles M. Spooner of the GCA Corp. of Bedford, Mass., of an E.P.A. guidance document, published just last March, entitled "Hazard Abatement from Sprayed Asbestos-Containing Materials in Buildings." E.P.A., as well as other scientists, consider it the definitive work in the field. (It is available for $4.50 from the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Rd., Springfield, Va. 22151. Cite document No. EPA-450/2-78-014.)

You should not be led into thinking that you're getting a clean bill of health when air samples of your schools show low levels of asbestos fibers in the air. Monitoring air samples to determine risk of exposure is misleading and unreliable for reasons aside from the dubious OSHA standard.

The E.P.A. guidance document describes two air sampling techniques: phase contrast microscopy and electron microscopy. The first is an optical technique not used necessarily or exclusively for asbestos; it costs $30 to $50 to perform. It simply counts the *number of fibers of a certain size and shape.* Therefore, many hazardous asbestos fibers may not even be counted using this method because they may be too small.

"Electron microscopy," says the guidance document, "is presently the definitive method for fiber counting and exposure estimation." But electron microscopy has its drawbacks, too, according to Sawyer. "There is presently no standard electron microscopy technique," the guidance document observes. "A provisional optimum procedure is under development by E.P.A. and is intended to increase uniformity and enhance interlaboratory agreement."

For air sampling to be truly effective, Sawyer says, a competent lab must perform several tests with several samples while normal school activity takes place—that is, while the kids walk through the halls or while the janitor sweeps up.

Electron microscopy costs $300–$500 *per sample.*

Sawyer stresses that air sampling should be used as a monitoring device before, during and after an asbestos removal or encapsulation operation. But the only effective way to determine the risk of asbestos in a school, he argues, is to take and test bulk samples of the suspected material wherever it exists. (See accompanying story on page 30.)

This, unfortunately, is easier said than done. Competent commercial laboratories are difficult to find and Sawyer hastens to add that state laboratories often are deficient, too. A horror story from an E.P.A. source, and corroborated by Sawyer, recounts how a Connecticut state lab told one school system near Hartford that it had asbestos in one school and that the ceilings should be removed. To the dismay of the schools, the "asbestos" turned out to be cellulose. But the discovery wasn't made until *after* the ceilings were removed.

The situation in New Haven was worse. Officials there were told by a state lab that certain samples contained no asbestos. But city engineer Len Smith was doubtful about the results. The city sent samples to the Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York, which reported some samples contained as much as 35 percent to 75 percent asbestos. Smith reports two New Haven schools spent about $10,000 for small removal operations, while a larger job in Lee High School, in which the auditorium and gym required attention, cost about $20,000.

Sawyer and associates currently are at work developing an accurate technique for labs to use in analyzing asbestos samples. He's also putting the finishing touches on a condensed version of the guidance document so school board members will be able to recognize the problem and know how to deal with it rationally. According to E.P.A. Deputy Assistant Administrator for Chemical Control John De Kany, Sawyer's condensed guidance document will receive wide distribution not only among school board members but in various state and municipal offices as well.

Only two months ago, De Kany's office was in the planning stages of a project that aims to take samples from schools across the country. Personnel in the ten E.P.A. re-

gional offices will be trained in the technical aspects of asbestos detection and will educate certain key contact people in states, municipalities and schools. De Kany hopes the voluntary survey will be completed by early next year and says that the degree to which schools cooperate will determine whether E.P.A. recommends mandatory federal regulations. De Kany says he hopes he doesn't have to recommend the regulatory approach.

While Sawyer works on the condensed guidance document for school board members and on a reliable bulk testing system, De Kany's right-hand man, Larry Dorsey, is devising a system by which commercial laboratories can become informally "accredited" in asbestos detection. It'll work like this: A central reference lab, probably Mount Sinai, will be charged with testing the samples commercial labs receive. Any lab that wants to be listed as "competent" by E.P.A. will have to split every sample it receives and send half to the reference lab, according to Dorsey.

Dorsey also has been responding to phone calls spurred by a mid-August press release by H.E.W. Secretary Joseph Califano. The release actually was a letter (to the 50 state governors) expressing concern over the asbestos problem. It also contained a report conducted by Mount Sinai's William Nicholson—"Control of Sprayed Asbestos in School Buildings: A Feasibility Study." The report, commissioned by New Jersey Rep. Andrew Maguire as a result of the Howell Township fiasco, largely reflects information in the more complete E.P.A. guidance document.

School boards will be faced with some tough "asbestos decisions" in the near future. Budgets are tight enough without the added burden of allocating funds for asbestos removal. Federal dollars are not forthcoming and it's doubtful that Congress will authorize financial assistance. A bill to grant schools 90 percent of the money needed to remove asbestos was introduced by New Jersey Rep. John Howard, who represents Howell Township, but it languished last term in the overburdened House Commerce Committee and eventually died. So: The financial consequences of removing asbestos, if your schools contain it, will be considerable. The consequences of not removing it, however, may be devastating. No one knows for sure.

One can only sympathize with plaintiff Howell Township Superintendent Sidney Zaslavsky, who says, "I feel sorry for anybody who has to go through this."●

THE HICKOX SCHOOL CELEBRATES ITS CENTENNIAL

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the fact that the Hickox School of Boston, Mass., is celebrating the 100th anniversary of its founding. Over the past century, the Hickox School has prepared students from all over the world to enter the business community. Indeed, as the oldest secretarial school in the Nation, it has always been a leader in this field of education. Its founder, William Hickox, was one of the first business educators to introduce touch typing in the United States.

Long before individualized instruction became fashionable, Hickox was teaching by the individual advancement method. For generations, Hickox students have known the powerful effects of encouragement, reinforcement, and achievement. At the Hickox School, individual capability is motivated by trained instructors, and students are challenged by their teachers to improve their performance every day. In addition, special programs for the handicapped have been developed that will open up unique opportunities for these students.

In a era largely influenced by automation and characterized by impersonalism, the Hickox School continues to pioneer methods developing individual worth and individual ability. The ultimate objective of this institution is to prepare students not only to meet the performance standards required by the business community, but also to become responsible and contributing members of our society.

Located in downtown Boston, the Hickox School occupies modern facilities at the corner of Boylston and Tremont Streets, on the site of the former home of John Quincy Adams. Easily accessible by public transportation, the Hickox School draws many students from the greater metropolitan area. Its student body, however, is as varied as the community it serves. Recent high school and college graduates, people returning to the work force, and those already employed seeking to improve their skills, study and work together in a congenial atmosphere.

Actual on-the-job experience is available to students in all Hickox diploma programs. Student secretaries learn to deal with everyday problems while working in the administrative offices of the school, thereby increasing their self-confidence.

Although the uniqueness of its students and instructors has been the key element which has made the Hickox School successful, the foresight and leadership of its administrators has also been essential. The president, Alan C. Fagan, and the dean-director, Mary L. Beaudry, have—along with their colleagues in administration—contributed immeasurably to the high standard of excellence for which the Hickox School is so well known.

On their 100th anniversary, I am pleased to congratulate the Hickox School, and its alumni, for their proud record of dedicated service to the business community.●

ISRAEL'S STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE MUST BE RECOGNIZED

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, while events in the Middle East have received considerable press coverage lately, one item not selected for public viewing was President Carter's statement concerning the strategic importance of Israel to the United States. The President made this statement when the new Israeli Ambassador Efriam Evron was greeted at the White House.

Israel's strategic importance to our country must be recognized not only in light of the revolution in Iran but as a strategic asset based on Israel's internal stability. As a democracy, Israel's policies are not totally dependent on one leader's rise or fall from power. The nation has a life of its own, outliving the transiency of one or another ruling party or leader.

At this very moment our experience with Iran is teaching us that we cannot afford to ignore the factor of internal instability of the Arab nations in the Middle East. To treat Israel as if it is a liability rather than a strategic asset will destine our efforts in the Middle East to mirror our failure in Iran. Secretary of Defense Harold Brown's visit to the Middle East must not result in an alliance between our country and Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Egypt unless Israel is fully included in this equation. Any such agreement should require a quid pro quo from Saudi Arabia and Jordan to join in the peace efforts of Egypt and Israel.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting in the RECORD a January 28, 1979, Jerusalem Post article reporting on the President's statement of Israel's strategic importance to the United States.

AFTER THE IRAN UPHEAVAL: WHAT ROLE FOR ISRAEL NOW?

WASHINGTON.—With the collapse of the Shah of Iran, the U.S. has been taking another look at its fundamental strategic interests in the Middle East.

Accompanying this major reappraisal is a hotly contested debate among key officials at the White House, the State Department, the Pentagon and the Central Intelligence Agency.

Simply put, the question is this: Does Israel represent a strategic asset or liability to the U.S.? The foreign policy bureaucrats here are in a behind-the-scenes, barely visible debate, and President Jimmy Carter has been thrown right into the middle of it.

Those arguing that Israel is indeed a strategic ally appeared to have won the battle on January 11 when Carter, during a routine ceremonial presentation of Israeli Ambassador Ephraim Evron's diplomatic credentials, stated: "This is Ambassador Evron, the newly-arrived representative of the great nation of Israel. I think all of you know the importance of this country to us. Strategically, they mean a great deal to the security of our nation and to stability in the Middle East. They are friends and allies in the best sense of the word."

But Carter's first-ever public reference to Israel as a strategic asset raised some ripples at the State Department, the National Security Council and certain other circles in the U.S. government. It seems that some of the President's advisers disagreed with him, and were upset.

This may partly explain why Carter's description of Israel as strategically important "to the security of our nation and to stability in the Middle East" was almost totally ignored in the American news media. "The White House simply didn't push the story as newsworthy or important," one key insider said.

At a meeting with American Jewish leaders at the White House on January 19, however, several top U.S. officials denied that there

was anything sinister about the lack of coverage of the President's remarks.

Assistant Secretary of State Harold Saunders acknowledged the scanty exposure given to the statement but maintained that this was inadvertent. He told the group, according to participants, that what the President had said was "self-evident."

But others, including some of the Jewish leaders who attended the session, remained skeptical. They wanted to hear Carter repeat the statement, and to see it win wide publicity.

Basically, there are two schools of thought. Some officials, especially at the National Security Council and the State Department, see U.S. support for Israel as resulting from purely political, historic or moral considerations. They dismiss the strategic argument. They see America's strategic interests in the Middle East lying with Saudi Arabia and even Egypt more than with Israel. In fact, some of these officials would argue privately that Israel is a "burden" to the U.S., a concept articulated two years ago by the late Gen. George Brown when he was Chief of Staff.

Other officials, including several influential generals at the Pentagon, value Israel as a reliable, democratic militarily-powerful friend in a basically unstable part of the world. This view was advanced last month when a group of retired generals and admirals wrote to Carter urging him to recognize that Israel plays a critical role in the Middle East. Among those signing the letter were Adm. Elmo Zumwalt, Jr., former Chief of Naval Operations; Gen. Paul Freeman, Jr., former U.S. Army Commander in Europe; Gen. T. W. Parker, former Chief of Staff in Europe; Maj. Gen. John Singlaub, former Chief of Staff of U.S. Forces in Korea, and Maj. Gen. George Keegan, Jr., former Chief of Air Force Intelligence.

With the collapse of the Shah and with the nearly-concluded Israel-Egyptian peace treaty, the Middle East is at a potential crossroads. Washington consequently is taking a closer look at both positions. New position papers are being drafted. These papers will colour U.S. policy toward the Middle East in the months and years ahead. Because the two camps are arguing the merits of the respective cases, Carter's January 11 remarks were significant.

The stakes involved are very real. Will Israel, for example, be called upon by the U.S. to fill some of the role played by Iran in protecting U.S. national interests if, as now seems likely, the new regime in Teheran moves away from the American camp? Or will Washington begin to rely more on Saudi Arabia and Egypt to meet these responsibilities out of fear that a much closer alliance with Israel would antagonize the Arab world?

Those policy-makers who regard Israel as a strategic asset begun using Carter's remarks as ammunition in fighting for a closer relationship—on the strategic level—with Israel. It's not easy for any U.S. official to take issue with what the President has stated publicly.

But their opponents nevertheless resisted the argument. What they were trying to do, in effect, was to erase Carter's remarks from the public record. They met with some success. The statement was not included in the official weekly report of the President's public utterances.

The explanation given by the White House was that Carter was speaking only "informally" at a "photo opportunity" and an official stenographer was not present.

Indeed, except for the fact that this reporter and a handful of other Israeli and American Jewish journalists who were in the Oval Office at the time wrote stories about the statement, there would have been practically no public awareness whatsoever about it.

Why the President had decided to make the statement in the first place remains unclear. Everyone recognizes that he was not speaking casually. Someone had briefed him before Evron arrived to refer to Israel's strategic importance. Maybe the President wanted to defuse his brother Billy's remarks about Libya. Perhaps he wanted to "soften" Israel to make some more concessions in the treaty negotiations with Egypt, knowing that his remarks would receive front-page coverage in the Israeli press (it did). Then again. Carter may really have believed what he said.

With this as background, the President's brief passage to the Middle East in his annual State of the Union address before Congress on Tuesday evening was revealing. There were only four sentences devoted to the Middle East—three of them general statements concerning the American hope for a peaceful settlement.

But the President also said: Our firm commitment to Israel's survival and security is rooted in our deepest convictions and in our knowledge of the strategic importance to our nation of a stable Middle East.

Clearly, it was not the unequivocal reference to Israel's strategic importance he had made earlier. Here, in this latest statement, he referred to the strategic importance of "a stable Middle East," not simply Israel. Yet at the same time, Carter's words could be interpreted by some as meaning that Israel was strategically important.

My own assessment is that those officials supporting the doctrine of Israel's strategic importance managed to insert another reference to it in an early draft of the speech, but others resisting this approach later diluted it. What emerged was a compromise.

Thus, the battle continues, with the final outcome still in doubt.●

"NO" TO CHINA-UNITED STATES AXIS?

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Marvin Stone, editor of the U.S. News & World Report always provides readers with informative and balanced views of complicated situations. His editorial, " 'No' to a China-U.S. Axis," discusses the attempts of the mainland Chinese to have us, in Mr. Stone's words, "draw a common dagger with China against Russia."

At this time I wish to insert in the RECORD " 'No' to a China-U.S. Axis," U.S. News & World Report, February 12, 1979:

"NO" TO A CHINA-U.S. AXIS

(By Marvin Stone)

Once again this country is being asked to draw a common dagger with China against Russia. The Chinese make no secret of their fear of their predatory neighbor—the "polar bear." It is a fear that approaches paranoia.

The latest appeal for united action came from Vice Premier Teng Hsiao-ping during his Washington visit. It is nothing new. I heard the same appeal from the same man in December of 1975 when I accompanied President Ford on his fruitless trip to Peking.

At that time, I reported that "China would like nothing less than for the U.S. to . . . revive the cold war in its most virulent form." I left Peking with the impression that China would, in effect, like to be brought under the same nuclear umbrella that now provides Japan with assurance of support in the event of an attack by Russia.

Now, as in 1975, the United States must respond to Peking's appeal with extreme caution and with a firm grasp of its own interests in dealing with Russia. These interests sometimes parallel those of China, but by no means do the interests of the two countries coincide on all counts.

We agree with those in the administration, Security Adviser Brzezinski among them, who believe it is useful to add a little to Soviet anxieties. In this way, we give the Kremlin a greater incentive to avoid actions that might encourage us to move closer to China in its anti-Soviet vendetta.

But this is a potentially dangerous game—extremely dangerous—if it is not played with skill and, yes, even selfishness. It would be a disastrous blunder for the United States to allow itself to be drawn into confrontation—perhaps even conflict—with the Soviet Union to serve the interests of China. That is what Teng Hsiao-ping and his colleagues in Peking have in mind when they speak of "unity" against Russia.

Teng spelled out China's basic long-range strategy in 1977 in these words: "Nixon, Ford, Carter and future American imperialistic leaders all fall into this category [enemies]. They want to use the split between us and the U.S.S.R. to destroy the world socialist system in order to manipulate and lessen the Soviet threat toward themselves.

"Why can't we take advantage of the contradiction and grudge that exists between them and initiate actions that would be favorable to our national policy? We must control others and cannot allow others to control us."

While cooperation with Peking on specific issues may serve American interests, there is no reason for this country to attempt to "control" China. By the same token, the U.S. must beware that it does not allow itself to fall under Peking's influence.

Inevitably, the U.S. in the future, as in the past, will be called upon to take risks to counter the continuing challenge of Moscow's policy of opportunism around the world. But those risks must be weighed strictly in terms of our interests, not China's.

Teng, during his visit, implied that the U.S. is too timid to face up to the Soviet threat. On this score, the U.S. needs no lectures from the Chinese. After all, these are the same men who reviled the United States as a dangerous, imperialistic power during the years we were spending blood and treasure to curb the Kremlin's expansionism in Europe and Asia. They are the same men who sent their troops against ours in Korea, and sent their arms to be used against us in Vietnam.

Normalization of relations with China may change many things, but it has not changed the basic realities of world power. Those realities dictate a policy of balanced relations with the two Communist giants—recognizing the hazards of embracing Peking blindly in an anti-Soviet alliance as much as the dangers of ignoring Moscow's unremitting drive to expand. We would be wise to look out for ourselves.●

RESTORE EXCESSIVE SHELTER COST DEDUCTIONS FOR ELDERLY AND DISABLED FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to restore the unlimited shelter cost deduction under food stamps for elderly and disabled individuals.

The 1977 farm bill in an effort to tighten income requirements for food stamp eligibility eliminated most of the previously allowed deductions and substituted a $65 standard deduction per household with allowances for dependent care and earned income costs. The bill placed an $80 cap on shelter deductions which becomes effective March 1, 1979. Previously, all shelter costs (rent and mortgage) were allowed as deductions.

Two years ago, 81 percent of the food stamp population's income was under poverty level guidelines. The Agriculture Committee concerned that some of those remaining 19 percent had incomes far above that intended by the food program eliminated a number of deductions for medical costs, child care fees, alimony payments, taxes, and mandatory payroll withholding, work related expenses to $30 a month and other similar costs.

The purpose of those deductions was to determine as accurately as possible the amount of income a food stamp recipient had available to spend on food.

One of the most far-reaching changes effected by the new revisions was to eliminate automatic food stamp eligibility for those receiving aid to families with dependent children allotments.

Last week, notices of reductions and terminations effective March 1 were mailed to food stamp recipients in my district. Roughly speaking, some 14,000 persons in my district alone are expected to be affected not counting the Bronx portion for which figures are not yet available.

Ninety-five percent of those who called my office concerning these cuts were disabled elderly people.

A preliminary analysis by the Congressional Research Service of my constituent case studies shows that the cap on shelter deductions is the single most contributing factor in the reduction of food stamp allotments.

For instance, one of my constituents, a 77 year old woman with a severe cardiac condition receives $280 in supplemental security income and social security and pays rent of $200 a month. Under the old law before the 1977 farm bill revisions, this woman received $37 a month in food stamp benefits. Under the new law effective March 1, her benefit will be cut to $18. Under my proposal, the cap on shelter deductions would be removed and her benefit would be brought back to the $37 level.

Thus elderly and disabled food stamp recipients under my proposal would receive 30 cents in food stamps for every $1 worth of shelter deductions over the $80.

It is important to note that my proposal does not restore all of the original cuts in food stamp deductions made by the 1977 farm bill.

My bill affects only the 10 percent of food stamp recipients who are elderly and disabled. It is limited in scope to those who need it the most and therefore fiscally responsive to the expected rise in Federal food stamp appropriations that will be necessary to compensate for food price increases.

Certainly, consideration of excessive shelter costs for the elderly and disabled is in keeping with the 1977 food stamp changes designed to see that the neediest in our society have enough money to eat.●

WHY DEFICIT FINANCING CAN BE A MAJOR CAUSE OF INFLATION

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there is a never ending debate here in Congress over the causes on inflation, and what we in Congress can do to end the wage-price spiral that has engulfed the Nation. During the past several Congresses, I have introduced, and reintroduced, a balanced-budget resolution because I have maintained that the Federal Government's intentional policy of deficit spending can be a major cause of inflation.

Now, as the call-of-necessity for a balanced Federal budget is gaining momentum across the Nation, it is gratifying to see that even leaders of the Democratic Party are being awakened by the Nation's protest against rising taxes, rising deficits, and rising prices. Notably, Governor Brown, of my own State of California is calling for a Constitutional Convention to draft an amendment requiring a balanced budget in reponse to this protest. The fact is, however, that the U.S. Congress now has the power to restrain increases in Federal spending, to reduce deficits, and to balance the budget. But the majority in Congress apparently needs a mandate from the people in order to perform in a more fiscally repsonsible manner.

I am not opposed to the convening of a Constitutional Convention to draft a balanced-budget amendment, but I sincerely hope that if such a convention were convened, that the amendment adopted would include a provision to restrict the Federal Government's ability to balance the budget by raising taxes. It is not, and it has not been our intention to balance the budget by raising taxes, but it has been our intention to stem the growth in the size of the Federal Government, because, as we have seen, a burgeoning Federal Government inevitably leads to burgeoning Federal deficits.

There are two main reasons for opposing Federal deficits. First, deficit financing can be a major contributor to inflation if the deficit is financed by the Federal Reserve Bank's printing presses. When this occurs the money supply increases, but the supply of goods and services in the economy does not. As a consequence, the price level rises because there is too much money circulating in the system compared to the number of goods and services available for sale.

Said in another way, consumers, with more freshly printed paper money in their pockets, are willing to pay more for the products they desire in the marketplace, and producers, knowing of this willingness, charge more. Producers charge more, but do not produce more, because as each and every consumer tries to buy extra products with their extra cash, prices will rise as producers try to get as high a price as possible for each individual item that is already available for sale. This is the way supply and demand works in the marketplace. Therefore, it should be evident that deficit financing does not increase economic activity, although Keynesian economists believe this to be true. Rather, the creation of extra paper dollars, in excess of the amount needed to conduct the normal transactions required in the economic marketplace, merely drives up prices.

The second reason for opposing deficit financing is that if the Federal Reserve Bank did not finance the Government's borrowing, then the deficit would have to be financed with funds borrowed from the private sector. These are funds that would otherwise be used to promote economic expansion in the private economy. Such funds are vital to the creation of new capital and new jobs on our society, but unfortunately, very often these funds are used to finance Government programs of dubious repute. Our economy has been suffering from a capital shortage as a result. The decline in our Nation's productivity is testimony to this fact.

The effect deficit financing has specifically on inflation was discussed in an excellent article which appeared in the January 1979 edition of Reader's Digest entitled "What Really Causes Inflation." The article, authored by Ralph Kinney Bennett points out that controlling the money supply and the size of the Federal deficit is a necessity if we are to be successful in controlling inflation in our economy.

It is a myth, Mr. Bennett points out in his article, to believe that rising wages cause inflation, or that OPEC causes inflation, or that we can control wages and prices, while we continue to want only print money. We must recognize, as Mr. Bennett has recognized, that—

> Prices and wages are primarily signals of the changing balance of supply and demand that takes place daily in billions of transactions in the American marketplace.

In other words, when the price of one item rises faster than other items this is a natural reflection of changing supply and demand conditions in the marketplace.

For example, if the OPEC oil cartel were to increase the price of oil, then the price of oil would rise relative to the prices of all other goods and services in the economy. We would all be poorer to the extent that we could no longer purchase as much oil and all the other items we were accustomed to purchasing before the oil price increase. But the price increase, by itself, should not be considered inflationary. Inflation means that all prices are rising, not due to changing conditions in the marketplace, but rather because the exchange rate between the common denominator, paper money, and "all" the other goods and services

available in the economy has changed for the worse. There is more money in circulation, but not more goods and services. All prices must rise when this happens, but oil prices will rise even faster because of OPEC's price raising actions.

Unfortunately we have been suffering from the worst of both worlds in recent years. The oil cartel has been increasing prices; this has meant a decrease in the purchasing power of American salaries and wages. Simultaneously the Federal Government has run huge deficits which has resulted in excess money creation. So we have become poorer in two ways. We are poorer because of the oil price increase, and we are poorer because of the depreciation of the dollar. The depreciation of the dollar has meant that all prices in the economy have risen, and as prices have risen, wages and salaries have risen, and as wages and salaries have risen, taxes have risen because of our steeply progressive tax code. Now we are on a treadmill of rising deficits, rising prices, and rising taxes, a treadmill that can only be halted by cutting the growth in Federal spending. If we fail to curtail Federal spending, then surely we will deficit-finance and tax ourselves into economic oblivion.

There is, however, an alternative course of action that we can follow. If we index the tax code and restrict the Congress' ability to spend more than the amount it collects after indexing, by requiring say a three-fifths majority vote of both House of Congress in favor of such an action, then we can balance the budget and actually reduce many of the spending programs which are now heavily influenced by competing special interest groups. I would add to this rule that proposed tax increases also be subject to the three-fifths majority requirement, but that tax cuts, only require, as they do at present, a simple majority of both Houses of Congress.

In this way we will be telling the people that it is the sense of Congress that tax cuts do far more to promote economic growth, than spending increases and tax increases. For this reason we have made it easier for ourselves to enact tax cuts than spending increases, and tax increases. Spurring economic growth, and in the process, expanding the tax base, is a far better way to increase tax revenues, than by raising taxes from a shrinking tax base.

This course of action which I am proposing is a novel one, but I am sure that many will agree that it is a wise one. It will enable us to increase spending, but it will make it more difficult to do so. It enables us to decrease taxes, but still requires that the economic justifications for such tax cuts be readily apparent to a majority of both Houses of Congress.

By limiting spending, this plan enables all Members of Congress to feel more comfortable in voting in favor of cutting the heavy burden of taxes that is destroying economic incentive and productivity in our society. It also gets to the heart of the fears many of my colleagues and my constituents are expressing over rising deficits. These fears are justified. Congress has been known in the past to legislate spending programs that are wasteful, tax increases which are economically counter-productive, and tax rebates that do not improve work incentives in the marketplace. It is for this reason that we need a plan to guard against any such proposals, which although well-intentioned, can lead to the kinds of deficits that are ultimately financed by the Federal Reserve Bank's freshly printed dollars, instead of from an expanding tax base.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to review with my colleagues in Congress Mr. Bennett's article in Reader's Digest, because it lucidly describes how Federal deficits can lead to inflation, by inserting it in the RECORD. I call it to the attention of my colleagues as being pertinent to their decisions as Members of that legislative body which is charged with the power to control our Nation's purse strings.

The article follows:

WHAT REALLY CAUSES INFLATION?

(By Ralph Kinney Bennett)

How did the three-bedroom house that sold for $33,000 back in 1969 become a $96,000 house today? How could a family sedan that cost $3110 a decade ago now come in a smaller size costing $6474? How is it that the man who retired in 1969 with a $9000 annual pension and maximum Social Security benefits (benefits up 118 percent over the past ten years) now has 36 percent *less* buying power than he had then?

Inflation is the answer, of course, but what exactly is inflation? What causes the phenomenon that silently robs us of our living, that in the past 40 years has shrunk the value of the dollar to 20 cents?

To understand inflation, one must first understand what is being "inflated." It isn't prices (although they certainly are rising) and it isn't wages (also rising). It is the *supply of money*—currency and bank credit. The real wealth of the nation is the goods and services produced by its people. Money—coined or printed by the government—is merely a convenient symbol of that wealth. We give part of our wealth to the government in taxes. But the government has been spending vastly more wealth than we give it—to date, over $766 billion more. In addition, it has run up future financial commitments (Social Security, pensions, loan guarantees) in excess of *$7 trillion*—more than $71,000 per taxpayer.

How can government spend more than we give it? Usually by "monetizing" its debts, by printing more symbols than there is real wealth. That basic law of economics—the more there is of something, the cheaper it becomes—applies to dollars, too. As former Secretary of the Treasury William E. Simon puts it, "The American dollar is being debased by its own government. The real problem with the dollar is that we're printing too many of them."

This is the root cause of inflation—more money poured into the economy than the economy is worth.

Only when we accept this basic truth can we deal intelligently as citizens with the myths about inflation put abroad daily in press, classroom and government. Here are three of the most pernicious:

MYTH 1. RISING WAGES AND PRICES "CAUSE" INFLATION

Secretary of the Treasury W. Michael Blumenthal perpetuated this myth when he listed among the factors causing inflation "wage settlements that substantially exceed the productivity and real growth of the economy, [and] price increases that bring unjustified excess profits."

In our competitive system, prices and wages are primarily signals of the ever-changing balance of supply and demand that takes place daily in billions of transactions in the American marketplace. If there is only so much money (and credit) in the system, a business cannot ignore supply and demand by arbitrarily raising its prices or by giving in to excessive wage demands. If its prices are too high, people will buy elsewhere. If wage demands are too high, business must refuse to pay them or hire fewer workers at the new rate. Competition itself, then, is supposed to keep a rein on prices.

But this real discipline of the marketplace has been circumvented by government. To pay its bills and finance a broad list of social goals, including "full employment," government generally inflates the money supply. It thereby abets higher wages and prices by fostering the notion that it will always create enough money to pay for them.

And once the money supply has been increasing rapidly for some time, prices seem to have an upward life of their own. Instead of saving, people "buy now," hoping to beat future price raises. Unions seek contracts with cost-of-living clauses. Banks lending money to be paid back in steadily cheapening dollars insist on higher interest rates.

If rising wages, in and of themselves, were inflationary, then West Germany should have one of the most inflationary economies. German workers' wages increased 236 percent in the decade 1967–77, but the inflation rate averaged about four percent annually because the government kept the money supply in balance with the real productive wealth of the economy. U.S. workers during the same period saw their wages increase 101 percent, a rise nearly outpaced by inflation averaging over six percent a year. The fact is, wages for the most part are *reacting* (in some cases over-reacting) to government-caused inflation.

What about rising prices? It is still popular to characterize the cataclysmic rise in oil prices since the oil embargo of 1973 as a major cause of inflation. But this is simply not true. The high oil prices added to our financial burdens. But they were clearly not the author of inflation.

Consider the experience of Japan and West Germany during the embargo. Unlike the United States, both countries were almost entirely dependent on foreign oil. But during the embargo, both pursued prudent fiscal policies, holding down budget deficits and keeping a tight rein on the money supply. Result: inflation in both nations *declined*, while soaring to 12.2 percent in the United States as politicians cranked out printing-press money to finance continued deficits ($130.9 billion from 1973 through 1976). This, not an Arab hand on the oil spigot, was the reason for the rising American inflation.

MYTH 2. WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS WILL "CURE" INFLATION

This popular delusion feeds on the first myth. "Price controls have been imposed repeatedly for more than 2000 years," notes Nobel Prize-winning economist Milton Friedman. "They have always failed." Roman emperor Diocletian used capital punishment in a futile effort to enforce controls in A.D. 301. Thousands died, and the economy was nearly wrecked.

In 1775, the Continental Congress sought to finance our infant government's debt by authorizing the issue of an almost worthless paper money. A disastrous inflation followed. The Pennsylvania legislature sought to stem it with price controls. Many farmers and businessmen refused to sell at the controlled prices. Shortages developed. The army wintering at Valley Forge in 1777–78 could not get badly needed supplies. The

army's misery, wrote John Adams, was due largely to "that improvident Act for limiting prices . . . [which] if not repealed will ruin the state and introduce a civil war."

Historical experiences like these underscore the well-known deficiencies of wage and price controls. Such controls . . .

Create shortages

Many businesses cannot or will not produce at the artificially set prices.

Result in a lowering of quality

Former "standard" features on a product becomes costly extras.

Are consistently circumvented. Black markets spring up.

Require a large and expensive bureaucracy to administer them

During World War II—our longest flirtation with controls—the Office of Price Administration (OPA) employed 65,000 bureaucrats who directed an additional 325,000 "price-control volunteers."

But, worst of all, while controls may create an illusion of being effective, they only temporarily hold down wages and prices, while the tremendous pressure of inflation continues to build up. Once the controls are lifted, the market spurts to find its natural level, and a more pronounced and damaging inflation is usually the result.

This country's most recent attempt at controls—the Nixon Administration's "Phase I, II, III and IV" program begun in August 1971—built up pressure for one of the worst inflationary explosions in U.S. history. The rate of growth of consumer prices had been in decline at the time the controls were instituted. This was the result of a cutback in money supply in the waning days of the Johnson Administration. But during the period of controls the Consumer Price Index began a steep climb, reaching almost 13 percent by mid-1974. The disaster was compounded by a harrowing confluence of events—a worldwide crop failure and the Arab oil embargo. Some people still entertain the idea that these factors caused the inflation of 1973–74. The fact is that the Nixon controls were a facade behind which government spending increased sharply.

Why then do governments return to wage and price controls, frequently with popular support? (A recent Gallup poll showed about half the respondents in favor of some form of controls.) The outcry for controls, contends Friedman, "is based on neither experience nor analysis but simply on the 'for God's sake let's do something' syndrome." However, controls are not the answer when they are imposed by a government that at the same time goes deeper into debt while printing more money to pay the bills.

MYTH 3. INFLATION IS "EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS"

According to President Carter, "It's a myth that government itself can stop inflation. Success or failure in this overall effort will largely be determined by the actions of the private sector."

While the President's assertion coincides with some theories of inflation, it contravenes the clear evidence of economic history and practical experience. As Friedman points out, "Government has an effective printing press on which it can turn out green pieces of paper, and as a result government and government alone is the source of inflation." The steady downward trend of the dollar since 1940, notes economic writer Henry Hazlitt, has been accompanied by an awesome growth of American money supply. At the beginning of 1940, U.S. currency and bank deposits totaled $52.7 billion. By January 1978, currency and bank deposits totaled $815.9 billion, an increase of 1448 percent.

Inflation in Western European countries has been routinely running high with two dramatic exceptions—West Germany and Switzerland. West Germany has kept its inflation rate around four percent; Switzerland below two percent in recent years. Both countries have displayed the political courage and citizen discipline to keep a tight rein on their budgets and on the growth of their money supply.

In the postwar era there have been three major instances of inflation being brought under control. West Germany did it in 1948—refusing to "spend" its way to prosperity by running up huge deficits. The United States did it in 1953, under President Dwight D. Eisenhower, whose prudent fiscal policies led to an inflation rate during his Administration of 1.4 percent a year. France accomplished the feat in 1958, when Charles de Gaulle halved the government's budget deficit. In each case, control was achieved by dramatic cuts in government spending and a concomitant dialing down of the money machine.

Unfortunately, neither France nor the United States stuck to its guns. That old predilection of politicians—to give (social benefits) without taking (taxing)—asserted itself. Americans now face a $500-billion-plus budget (more than $60 billion of which the government can pay for only by turning out more phony money) and surging inflation that reached an annual rate of almost ten percent last summer.

The anti-inflation plan unveiled by President Carter last October imposes wage and price guidelines on business and labor as if they were the cause of the problem. "The President did recognize the role of the budget deficit," comments Hazlitt. "But he did not promise to eliminate it—he promised only to reduce it over a period of years. This was practically an assurance that our inflation will be continued."

Clear away the myths and one discovers that the way to stop inflation is to literally *stop inflation*—stop inflation of the money supply beyond the real ability of this country to produce; stop pretending that we have more money than we really do; stop running huge deficits that can be financed only with fiat dollars.

The United States cannot expect a painless extrication from the inflation in which it has found itself for almost 40 years. A broad range of programs will have to be cut back; unemployment is likely to increase temporarily. But, as economic historian and monetary expert Donald Kemmerer warns, "a nation that does not stop an inflation simply because it is politically painful to do so is essentially declaring bankruptcy." ●

OKUN POINTS TO POLARIZATION DANGER

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, an unusually fine observation about where we are and the dangers of polarization appeared in the Washington Post recently. It is an article by Arthur M. Okun, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and an economic adviser to several Presidents.

The article was taken from a lecture he gave at Columbia University on business and society.

I am inserting his article in the RECORD at this point because I know that many of my colleagues were not in Washington shortly after the election when the article appeared in the Washington Post.

The article follows:

"THE POLARIZERS ARE HARD AT WORK"

(By Arthur M. Okun)

In establishing a capitalistic democracy, the United States has built a society on two differing foundations. The capitalistic foundation attaches top priority to efficiency—operating through market incentives for getting the economic job done in the way that obtains the most useful output from our labor, capital and natural resources. The democratic foundation, in contrast, emphasizes egalitarian and humanitarian values of cooperation, compassion and fraternity.

Because our society rests on both of those foundations, we encounter creative tensions and uneasy compromises. As individuals, we attach different weights to the two sets of values, and we reach different conclusions on particular policy issues that define the scope of the marketplace and the scope of the political process. So inevitably we disagree and we debate. And the debates are often constructive. In the broad light of history, our nation has displayed remarkable ability to hammer out the needed compromises to balance the two value systems. We have generally avoided big polarizing ideological debates that might have rocked our institutional structure off its democratic and capitalistic foundations. Yet the threat of polarization has always lurked in the background, and at times has become a clear and present danger.

The polarizers seem particularly hard at work today. By grasping at either the market or democratic value system and ignoring the other, one can readily indict our society for grave defects and grievious crimes.

Those who march under the banner of democracy point to the ugly features of capitalism. Our economic contests are motivated by greed and allow the winners to ride roughshod over the losers. There is less nutrition on the tables of many of our poor than in the garbage pails of our rich. Our egalitarian political rights are sometimes contaminated by the power bought by money.

Those who wave the banner of market efficiency see a different set of specters: high tax rates that choke off initiatives, expensive government programs that fail to accomplish their goals, a maze of regulations that impose large economic costs and that constrain individual liberty.

There is some truth in both of these diagnoses, but both are distorted and partial views that lead to fundamentally wrong and dangerous perscriptions. One would set laudable humanitarian targets and cripple the productive capability essential to hit those targets. The other would probably strengthen our productive capability, but in a manner that could destroy our social cohesion. Despite the appeals of the polarizers, the vital center in American political and social attitudes typically prevails on Election Day. These centripetal forces stem from the appreciation of the favorable features of both our capitalistic and egalitarian foundations, and from the recognition of their mutual limitations.

At bottom, most Americans know that our government and our private economy depend on each other. Many of the government's functions in promoting and regulating activity in the marketplace are not controversial; indeed, some are conducted so routinely that they tend to be taken for granted. And the same general, implicit acceptance applies to many of the contributions that our private economy makes to the vitality of our democracy. The best antidote to polarization is the joint recognition that the pursuit of our human values depends on harnessing materialism and "greed," and that the conduct of our market activity relies on the restrictive legal powers of the state and its "bureaucracy."

In my judgment, polarization is a threat to our system. And the character of that threat has changed. A decade ago, it came mainly from the left—typified by the middle-class youths who emerged from their sports cars to condemn our society for its materialism and greed, for oppressing the masses and for plundering the planet. Today, in my view, the main threat comes from the extreme right—from those who issue a blanket indictment against all government regulation and intervention, who redefine poverty as the "freedom to fail," and who basically ignore the values of democracy. The worst enemies of U.S. capitalism are a handful of its ardent proponents, who precribe fiscal-monetary policies that would produce mass unemployment, regulatory policies that would flagrantly violate the legitimate interests of third parties, and "reforms" of government programs that would put vivid pictures of economic misery back on the front pages.

The consequences of their program would swing the pendulum of public opinion far to the left. Because I do not believe that we will adopt their program, I expect capitalism to survive and thrive in the United States. And I expect us to continue to pursue the goals of democratic capitalism, striving to make the verdict of the market more humane and the operation of our government more efficient.●

A HEALTHY DIET FOR THE NEEDY

HON. LES AuCOIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which will make a significant contribution to providing a healthy diet for low income, elderly, and disabled individuals in this country. Since I first introduced this bill last year, I have received support from a wide variety of hunger and nutrition groups throughout the country.

The United States boasts a high standard of living but ironically, most of us do not have to look much beyond our own back yards to see the signs of malnutrition and hunger.

This bill is not a spending bill. My proposal amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a charitable deduction for the farmer who donates gleaned crops to non-profit organizations.

Legislation similar to this has already been adopted by Oregon and several other States. Its aim, and its result, has been the creation of gleaning and food bank redistribution programs throughout the country. Gleaning programs exist or will soon exist in the following States: California, Colorado, Illinois, Connecticut, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Texas, Utah, and Washington.

Gleaning is the process of hand harvesting crops left behind after mechanized harvest or which remains unharvested because of adverse marketing conditions. A large quantity of this food now rots in fields and orchards when it could be taken and distributed to needy individuals. The granting of this tax exemption will give farmers an added incentive to cooperate with gleaning organizations and foster the development of greater numbers of cooperative food distribution organizations in this country.

Gleaning programs are run on a self-help basis. Needy individuals are organized to go into the fields and orchards of donating farmers and hand harvest what remains. In many cases, they are then asked to share a portion of the crop with those who are physically unable to glean. Crops which can be readily gleaned include all fruits, vegetables, berries, and nuts.

How successful are these redistribution programs? Has this excess crop reached the needy?

Oregon pioneered this approach to feeding the poor, elderly, and disabled 6 years ago. Last year, 338,727 pounds of produce were gleaned in Oregon alone. The wholesale or farm produce value would have been $38,350. In Oregon, 276 farmers participated in the donor program last year and food reached 1,834 households representing 5,439 individual clients.

Gleaning is going on all over the country. Although no national figures are available for last year's harvest, I believe the Oregon gleaning statistics accurately reflect the enormous food contributions which resulted from well-organized gleaning efforts last year—contributions which would not otherwise be made.

And finally, this bill provides some welcome news to our Nation's farmers who are caught in a debilitating cost-price squeeze and have come to Washington again this year to dramatize their problems—an opportunity to help themselves a bit while helping the hungry a lot.

The spirit of self-help, cooperation, and generosity evident in gleaning programs in Oregon attest to the eagerness of people to participate in this kind of effort if given the opportunity. My bill offers them this opportunity. I urge my colleagues in the House to support this legislation.●

A RENEWAL OF FAITH ON FLIGHT 37

HON. ANDY IRELAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, at a time, when we hear so many complaints about doctors, particularly that they do not get involved in emergency situations because of their fear of malpractice suits, I would like to bring the following newspaper article from the St. Petersburg Times to your attention.

This article is, in part, about my good friend and constituent Dr. Robert Windom, of Sarasota, Fla. Dr. Windom's efforts to help a fellow passenger, who had collapsed in an airplane, demonstrate quite clearly that the vast majority of physicians take the hippocratic oath seriously, and do come to the aid of those who need them, when they need them, whatever the circumstances.

The article follows:

A RENEWAL OF FAITH ON FLIGHT 37

(By Eugene Patterson)

Roughly nine-tenths of letters to the editor are devoted to bellyaching about something or other (one of the unhappiest denunciations is: You idiot, why don't you print some happy news?).

The fact is, most editors prefer a hero story to just another report of villainy. They feel as warm inside as any reader when they can present a tale of brave astronauts landing on the moon, or of Joe Montana coming off his sickbed to quarterback Notre Dame to victory in the Cotton Bowl, or of John and Greta Rideout reconciling.

Unfortunately the bad seems to predominate in the news of this imperfect world, as well as in the mail from readers commenting on it. Surely, then, we can pause this Sunday to consider the letter Clifford E. Burt of Belleair mailed off last week to newspapers in the Tampa Bay area.

Why the wholesale mailing? "I really enjoyed writing it," he said.

"Before retirement 18 years ago," his letter began, "I enjoyed ... a decades-old cartoon, with a little old guy crouched, glowering out at the world, from the confines of a small box, over the caption, 'people are no damn good.'

"It was ... good for lots of laughs. Little did I realize, then, that the transition from somebody to nobody, during the retirement process, would cause me to react somewhat like the little old guy in the cartoon.

"But ..." — and here Mr. Burt underlined his finding for emphasis — *"the caption is not true."*

He explained:

"Returning from a Christmas visit with daughters and grandchildren in Dallas, I collapsed on the Jan. 3 Braniff Flight 37 from Dallas to Tampa.

"In minutes, the flight's crew decided that oxygen alone would not be enough, so they asked (with my wife's permission) 'Is there a doctor on board?'

"There was—a darned good one, Dr. Robert Windom of Sarasota, who must have instantly decided 'Damn the malpractice-suit dangers! Full speed ahead!' He and the crew got me on the floor, and with lots of oxygen, some chest thumping (I assume) and lots of encouragement from nearby fellow passengers, I made it to a normal landing in Tampa.

"Now to the real point of this letter to the editor," Mr. Burt wrote: "Most people, I'm convinced, are truly interested and concerned about their fellow beings.

"Witness the reaction of my seat neighbors on that completely full Flight 37 loaded with weather-delayed, tired and frustrated holiday travelers.

"Friendly faces, asking how I felt, assuring me that my color was coming back, even treks down the aisle for reassuring pats on the shoulder.

"In such an atmosphere of kindness and concern, I didn't even think about how ridiculous I must have appeared stretched out on the floor in the aisle of the airplane.

"I wish I could reach all those good people with this letter, but of course I can't, even if you decide to print it. Maybe they have already felt some inner satisfaction from helping a fellow man with a rather severe problem.

"As for Dr. Windom, if there is a St. Peter (and I'm a firm believer in the judgment principle), he has a very bright star awaiting him.

"The Braniff flight crew were, I suppose, just doing their jobs, (but) bless their hearts. They were great.

"As for me," Mr. Burt concluded, "I'll be around."

And, he added, "If I can just avoid hearing or reading about that bunch of political yahoos in Washington, D.C., I may be able to stay out of that damn little box."

Now there, friends, is a letter that sorts out some priorities.

The asperity of that last paragraph makes it plain that Clifford E. Burt of Belleair is no Pollyanna, searching for ways to be nice and charitable to the burdened bureaucrats spending his tax money in our nation's capital.

On the contrary, one gathers he would readily take his cane, if he has a cane, to the skulls of those yahoos, the lot of them, whose misfeasances, idiocies and waste we report to him daily in the unsettling columns of this newspaper.

No, there's nothing tame about Mr. Burt, as that flare of impatience makes plain. He clearly has not been successful in making that retirement "transition from somebody to nobody," and his fellow passengers on Flight 37 didn't buy that, either.

Yet for all his efforts to crawl in the little box and regard people—not just politicians—as being "no damn good," our crusty correspondent has failed, utterly.

So he's made a public confession, out of first-hand experience, that "Most people, I'm convinced, are truly interested and concerned about their fellow beings."

And that, as far as this editor is concerned, is the news of the day.●

NEED FOR A NEW APPROACH TO THE PROBLEMS OF REGULATIONS

HON. ALLEN E. ERTEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. ERTEL. Mr. Speaker, the growth in the number of Federal regulations and their increasing impact on the private sector of our economy is increasingly becoming a source of major concern in this country.

We are all aware that many of these regulations have had major beneficial impacts on the quality of life in this country. Other regulations, however, pursue dubious goals, often at exorbitant costs. We have encountered more and more regulations which are excessive, duplicative, anticompetitive, and inflationary. A reappraisal of the entire Federal regulatory process is urgently needed to insure that regulations are appropriate and serve a real need.

Mr. Speaker, under the current committee structure of the House, every standing committee has some oversight responsibilities. While this is both appropriate and essential to the conduct of committee business, it also leads to a piecemeal approach to the problems of regulations. This growth phenomenon in the Federal regulatory process has been experienced across-the-board, and many of the issues and problems associated with this growth cut across committee jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason I have introduced legislation to create a Select Committee on Regulatory Affairs and Oversight. This select committee would address the broad range of questions pertaining to the regulatory process as a whole, its impact, possible means of reorganization, and congressional oversight procedures in general.

Mr. Speaker, this select committee will not have legislative authority. It is designed to study the regulatory process and its implications in order to make legislative recommendations to the appropriate standing committees. I do not believe that we can effectively deal with the problems created by Federal regulations in a piecemeal fashion. An assessment of the overall situation is a necessary precondition for effective solutions to the questions that cut across standing committee jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this initiative in addressing these serious problems and hope that early consideration of this resolution will be forthcoming.●

MEXICAN ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION QUESTION: A BALANCED APPROACH

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most vexing problems this Nation has is the problem of illegal immigration.

Those who have simple solutions have not studied the problem in any depth.

Obviously the long range answer is to lift the standard of living of the people in Mexico. Then the incentive to come to the United States would diminish. To a great extent that is what has happened with residents of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Their standard of living has improved and now there is a net outmigration back to Puerto Rico rather than to the mainland of the United States.

The New York Times recently reprinted a column by Jackie Dewey of the Star News of Chula Vista, Calif., a biweekly newspaper there.

Its sentiment and sensitivity I applaud.

The column follows:

COLD EYES—MEXICANS—WET EYES

(By Jackie Dewey)

IMPERIAL BEACH, CALIF.—It's a persistent, ratcheting, clatter—a noise that bores in and bothers and won't stop. Like the fly you can't flap away at a picnic.

You pull the warm covers over your ears, but they won't muffle the mind-picture. Because you know: Outside, a helicopter hovers, its searchlight spearing through the 4 A.M. cold and damp. Because you live on the edge of the Pacific and close to the Mexican border you know that somewhere out there are hunted human beings.

You no longer get up, put on your bathrobe, go outside and watch. You know too well how they'll look. Like bundles of limp laundry. They'll huddle and crouch till they are flushed from hiding and herded into pale green vans. They won't cry or scream or struggle. Some may run, but not far. Their faces will be blank, with no trace of dangers past, of terror now, or despair for tomorrow.

And you wonder how you came to be part of a system where it seems proper to roll over and go back to sleep, safe, warm, well-fed, in a world where there's no room for people willing to face so much danger and hardship only for a chance to work for a living.

We can't let them in, you are told; they'll lower our standard of living. What a strange thing for a country whose last Christmas spending spree was the greatest in its history. Among the more popular items bought: expensive gadgets to turn television sets into games of skill, power-driven shoeshiners, electric can openers.

And you wonder, how standard should these things be when next door it's not necessarily standard to seat three meals a day?

You make no judgments about the men who fly helicopters and drive the pale green vans and cars. Their job is hard and sad and often dangerous.

They must feel that they are standing at the bottom of an avalanche. That now and then they throw a handful of pebbles back toward the top.

Is it all an exercise in cynicism? Does anybody really think there is money or manpower enough, or walls so high, or ditches so deep as to stop a human from somehow struggling his way to a place where he will find food and warmth and hope?

As these hunted people move along the beach in their never-ending parade, you can't help but hope they'll get a break somewhere along the line.

They try so hard to blend in, but they stand out so pathetically. Sometimes they come by, evenly spaced, about 50 feet apart. How can they rush, without warning, to be at a pickup spot on time? How can they look like casual, carefree gringo sunbathers, when their suntan stops at their shirt collar and at the cuffs of their sleeves? When their haircuts are all wrong?

How can they saunter casually, when they're really running for their lives? How to hide their desperation as they try not to glance back too often to see if someone they love is keeping pace?

And then the man with the green van gathers them up, one by one. And another man with cold eyes who watches from a street end by the beach shrugs his shoulders, starts up his engine, and drives away. His camper is empty—this time.

No. When you hear the helicopter, you don't go back to sleep. And as you lie there and hurt for them, you ask yourself, isn't there, somewhere, a more human answer?●

NO TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a bill which will disallow tax deductions for alcoholic beverage advertising.

The fact that the alcohol industry spends $500 million a year to advertise its products, and the total cost to the United States of alcoholism in terms of job time lost, decreased productivity, health care costs, et cetera, is $44 billion, suggests to me a pressing need to reduce the ranks of the more than 10 million Americans who are problem drinkers.

But problem drinkers are made, not born. An individual's attitudes are generally shaped by an influential adult, peers, and increasingly the mass media. We must become much more concerned about how alcohol media advertising is perceived by young people.

Psychology Today magazine, in an effort to boost its alcohol industry advertising revenue, placed its own advertisement aimed at liquor marketers in the 1978 Wine Marketing Handbook. The ad stressed the magazine's youthful audience, and said:

They're 18 to 34 years old. And they've got the new power. You can see it in the way they live. Young and successful, they're the kind of people who are first to make new drinks popular. And start new trends.

If we could be certain that alcohol manufacturers would exercise conscientious discretion, there would be little need for my bill. The liquor industry should be capable of making intelligent decisions about what aspects of their advertising campaigns affect the consumer in a negative fashion. However, the possibility of oversight is ever-present.

For example, several years ago, Hublein Inc. had to scrap its advertising campaign for "Kickers," a 30 proof pop-flavored product being marketed in 6.8 ounce milk bottle-shaped containers. The campaign depicted teenagers in the advertisements as well as used knee patches, pop art posters, and T-shirts as promotional gimmicks.

The product itself was advertised as:

The new drink that's putting cocktails out to pasture.

Drink variations included the Strawberry Sparkler, the Banana Blitz, and the Mocha Kicker.

Members of a special committee of the board of the Alcohol and Drug Problems Association registered a formal complaint to the Distilled Spirits Council of the United States and Hublein voluntarily agreed to withdraw the entire "Kickers" campaign.

The ADPA committee report said:

The campaign in our view appealed to an illegal underage market.

The committee's concern was justified by the fact that over the past 10 years the average age at which young people have their first drink has decreased from 13.6 years to 12.9 years of age.

It is a common belief that the moderate use of alcohol by very young people will help them to develop a responsible attitude toward liquor. However, there is an immediate danger if this belief is extended to include pre-teens.

"Alcohol is a special danger to children because it tends to cause hypoglycemia, which is a drop in blood sugar," said Dr. William Altemeier, director of pediatrics services at General Hospital in Nashville, Tenn. If the brain does not get enough blood sugar, brain damage or retardation could result, he said.

"We're seeing a growing number of kids who are alienated and using alcohol to escape from other problems," said Loran Archer, acting director of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.

What is particularly frightening is the fact that even the unborn can be seriously affected by alcohol consumption. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms recently made public a report on "The Fetal Alcohol Syndrome."

This relates to alcohol's potential to cause birth defects when it is consumed by an expectant mother. A summary by Dr. Sergio Fabro, one of the project's researchers follows:

Dr. Fabro concludes in this report that the fetal alcohol syndrome does exist. He states that some alternation in brain function, growth, and facial appearance are essential for the diagnosis of the full blown syndrome. He believes that evidence so far indicates that, to produce the full blown syndrome, the level of alcohol consumption must be sufficiently high to cause easily recognizable chronic alcoholism in the mother. He also states that, while evidence indicates that with lower levels of alcohol the full blown syndrome is unlikely, "some other poor pregnancy outcome (e.g. low birthweight, stillbirth) appears possible."

As the fatal accident rate for cars, boats, and drownings involving teenagers increases, we must become more alert to which situations are inappropriate for the presentation of alcohol use in the media. The link between youth alcoholism and advertising has not been firmly established, but the Federal Trade Commission is suspicious enough of the possible connection to cosponsor research being conducted at Michigan State University.

A survey conducted at the University of Wisconsin showed that students drink more each year they go to college in order to have fun, and avoid stress. In addition, many show the symptoms of alcoholism without admitting the disease.

As the Psychology Today advertisement said, the under-35's are the trendsetters. I think it would be a terrible mistake to permit this group to become the primary practitioners of a habit which leads inevitably to a decline in physical, mental, and emotional health.●

CRUELTY OF THE STEEL-JAW TRAP

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I recently reintroduced legislation which would outlaw interstate commerce of pelts which originate in States that allow the steel-jaw trap. Today I am submitting 54 cosponsors to this bill.

Mr. John B. Oakes, former senior editor of the New York Times, in a recent article brought to public attention the "abominable cruelty of the leg-hold trap and the needless suffering it entails." I would like to share this article with my colleagues:

The men and women who carelessly toss the furry skin of a wild animal across their shoulder—just as their ancestors did in the forests of Northern Europe and Asia several thousand years ago—may not know it, and if they do, surely prefer not to think about it, but with few exceptions what they're really doing is flaunting evidence of many hours or even days of torture suffered by each wild animal whose pelt they wear.

There is no escape from this ugly fact, nor can it be hidden either by ridicule of the "do-gooders" who are trying to put a stop to this anachronistic form of cruelty or by the false claim that abolition of the steel leg-hold trap will destroy the fur industry.

For those who prefer facts to emotion on this touchy subject, a look at the facts will show that:

The steel leg-hold trap, as normally used on land throughout the United States and Canada, is a monstrously brutal method of capturing wild animals.

The overwhelming preponderance of wild (as distinct from ranch-raised) animals whose pelts are used in the American fur industry are caught by the steel leg-hold trap although more humane, if more expensive, alternatives are available.

Use of this trap has already been outlawed or restricted in a number of fur-producing countries and in a few American states.

The recent shift in fashion toward "fun" furs has raised the demand (and prices) for pelts of relatively common wild animals, usually taken by this barbaric device.

When the steel trap is sprung on an animal's leg, the traumatic effect has been compared to that of a car door smashing a human finger caught between the hinges. But (unless the trap has been set underwater in which case the animal fairly quickly drowns) the agony does not end there; it only begins.

The trapped animal will almost certainly thrash wildly about in terror, rage, pain and panic, breaking its teeth on the steel trap or the chain that holds it in place. Occasionally the victim will succeed in gaining freedom, after hours of struggle, by wrenching or biting off its own foot at the point where the steel jaws have already dug into the bone. This is known in the trade as "wring-off" and the animals that thus leave one paw behind them are the lucky ones.

The others—the vast majority of the millions trapped on land each year—are eventually worn out by the struggle and lie inert and exhausted, without food or water, until the trap line is visited, which may easily be two, three, or more days later. At that point, the victim at last is put out of its misery, usually by clubbing or strangulation—provided it has not already starved or frozen to death. It has been estimated by Government trappers (and the United States Government is the biggest single trapper of all with its indefensibly wasteful predator-control program) that about 75 percent of the unwanted animals caught in traps set for other species are so badly injured that they have to be destroyed.

More than six and one-half million muskrats and three million raccoons were trapped and killed in the United States in 1976–77; nearly 175,000 coyotes; 21,000 badger, (sic.) etc. etc.—to a total of more than 16 million wild animals in that year alone, taken by an estimated two million trappers, licensed and unlicensed.

Various substitutes for, or modification of, the leg-hold trap have been tried but are not in general use in this country, except perhaps for an "instant kill" trap that has its own dangers and defects.

Nearly a dozen countries, including Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and the United Kingdom, forbid use of the steel leg-hold trap. So, to a limited degree, do a few American states, including New Jersey, where a battle is going on right now to extend the prohibition to all countries in the state. Senators Harrison A. Williams of New Jersey and Birch Bayh of Indiana have introduced comparable legislation at the Federal level.

The fur industry itself has been enjoying an economic revival in the last few years, sparked in part by the new emphasis on "fun" furs trapped in the wild. The rise and use of wild-animal furs (80 percent of which

in the United States are caught in the steel leg-hold trap) accounts for a significant part of what today has become a $700 million business.

That's why it's becoming more urgent than ever that the abominable cruelty of the leg-hold trap and the needless suffering it entails be brought to the attention of otherwise sensitive men and women who through ignorance or indifference don't hesitate to wrap themselves in the skin of an animal that probably died under frightful torture.●

PAUL DOUGLAS INCIDENT CONTAINS LESSONS

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, recently the Chicago Tribune had an excellent editorial commenting on the fact that the Federal Bureau of Investigation kept a file on the most distinguished, late Senator from Illinois Paul H. Douglas. In fact at one period the FBI had selected Senator Douglas as one of the persons to be jailed in time of crisis.

That becomes even more unbelievable when you view the evidence that was compiled by the FBI.

For example, one piece of evidence was the fact that a man who subscribed to a Communist paper had, as the FBI report says, "white and colored guests to his home", and he listed Paul Douglas as a reference on an employment form.

In any event the Chicago Tribune has a reasoned, sound editorial response to what took place and I hope my colleagues will take the time to read this editorial.

THE DOUGLAS FILES

For several years there has been a continuous flow of information from Federal Bureau of Investigation files about that agency's investigations of political and other public figures. During the congressional investigations of the FBI, the revelations came in a torrent. The FBI and the public relived decades of history in a short period of time, and it was not a pleasant experience. Now the flood has diminished to a trickle.

The latest former FBI target revealed from the files is the late Sen. Paul Douglas, who came to the attention of the Bureau in 1941 and remained a subject of scrutiny until 1964. In fact, at one point the FBI included Sen. Douglas' name on a list of people targeted for jailing in time of crisis.

In hindsight, the information that piqued the Bureau's interest seems innocuous. His exploratory interest in Communist activities before World War II—and that is about as serious a charge as the information warrants, even assuming its accuracy—was hardly out of line in that day's academic world. Though we at The Tribune often differed with him on economic matters, his reuptation for integrity in public service remains unblemished.

The questions these revelations raise do not concern Sen. Douglas at all. And they are not new. They concern the proper standards for government investigation of political figures, for the retention of material which has outlived its usefulness, and for the public release of material that is retained. The FBI and Department of Justice have learned from the excesses of the past. Because of the important civil liberties issues raised whenever police investigate political groups or their members, Department of Justice guidelines now set strict standards for opening and continuing such cases. Because of the danger of error inherent in lists of persons targeted for detention in times of crisis, such lists have been abolished.

These and other reforms, coupled by the emergence of a new generation of leadership in the FBI, make the revelation about the Bureau's investigation of Sen. Douglas a matter more of historical interest than current significance. It may be that a lesson from history can never be relearned too often, but it is unfortunate that the process dredges up old and salacious gossip about decent citizens like Sen. Douglas. For a person whose reputation was less well established, the excavation and publication of such material might be far more damaging.●

THE RIGHT TO LIFE

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a resolution which calls for a constitutional amendment to preserve and safeguard man's basic right to life, including the life of the unborn. It is with a sense of responsibility and concern that I offer this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am in no way pretending to be in a position to dictate to any family the number of children they should have. I do raise the question, however, of whether any human being has the right to decide upon the death of another. The right to life is the most basic of all human rights, and it must be preserved.

Unfortunately, since the January 22, 1973 Supreme Court decision which made restrictive State abortion laws unconstitutional, legal abortions have risen at a rate of 10 percent annually. The most recent figures indicate that over 1.4 million abortions were performed last year, and abortion is rapidly becoming one of the most frequently performed surgical procedures.

Mr. Speaker, a fundamental tenet of our society and form of Government is that the State protect each of our lives until natural death occurs. Our very own Declaration of Independence, written and approved nearly 200 years ago, affirmed every individual's basic right to life:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life . . .

Yet, Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1973, the Supreme Court made a mockery of the right to life in the Declaration of Independence. It failed to offer the protection of the laws to this God-given and most basic human right. Subsequently, we find ourselves in a society where abortion is becoming a common, everyday experience and where physicians and intellectuals freely discuss taking the lives of those whom they judge to be of no use to society.

Mr. Speaker, I, along with millions of our fellow Americans, am greatly distressed with this downward thrust of this interpretation of American laws protecting the sanctity of life. It is already clear that the Supreme Court decision of January 22 has led to excesses and abuses never intended or envisioned by proponents and supporters of the decision.

Supreme Court Justice White astutely foresaw this development in his disagreement with the Supreme Court arbitrary decision on the value of life which makes the worth of a potential human being dependent upon being wanted by his or her mother. In his dissenting opinion, Justice White argued:

At the heart of this controversy are those recurring pregnancies that pose no danger whatsoever to the life or health of the mother but are nevertheless unwanted for any one or more of a variety of reasons—convenience, family planning, economic, dislike of children, the embarrassment of illegitimacy, etc. . . .

The fact is, human life irrespective of age, health, function or condition of dependency, guaranteed under our Constitution, must be preserved and protected. The unborn have long been held to have legal rights under the law. They have property rights. They may inherit property, family names, and in some societies, family titles. The rights to property have long been affirmed by the courts of this country. As such, they deserve to be safeguarded just as an adult is protected under existing laws governing homicide.

There is, of course, the difficult moral question which arises when the mother's life is seriously endangered by the continuation of pregnancy. In this case, it is clear that abortion may be permissible. This adheres to self-defense principles long established within our body of laws. We must remember, however, that abortion statutes are written to protect the unborn child—not to serve the whims of one or both parents, social planners, or popular faddists. Furthermore, the responsibility of saving the child should be equal to the responsibility of saving the mother in those cases where abortion is necessary.

The right to life, especially for the unborn, must be reaffirmed and protected. In that spirit, Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution to restore this most basic human right and to insure that this right is recognized and safeguarded under the Constitution of the United States:

JOINT RESOLUTION

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to insure that due process and equal protection are afforded to an individual with respect to the right to life.

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 within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. With respect to the right of life, the word 'person' as used in this article and in the fifth and fourteenth articles of amendment to the Constitution of the United

States, applies to all human beings, including their unborn offspring, at every stage of their biological development, irrespective of age, health, function, or condition of dependency.

"SEC. 2. No unborn person shall be deprived of life by any person: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this article shall prohibit a law permitting those medical procedures required to save the life of the mother when a reasonable medical certainty exists that continuation of pregnancy will cause the death of the mother, and requiring that person to make every reasonable effort, in keeping with good medical practice, to preserve the life of her unborn offspring.

"SEC. 3. Congress and the several States shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation within their respective jurisdictions." ●

CHILD HEALTH ASSURANCE ACT

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation to increase the availability of quality health care for children in low-income families and for low-income pregnant women.

This legislation, the Child Health Assurance Act of 1979, is essentially the bill which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported to the full House last fall. As you will recall, that bill failed to be brought up before adjournment.

This Child Health Assurance Act was the product of many hearings and much consideration by Members of the 95th Congress. I believe it remains a good and a sensible approach and that it deserves the consideration of the 96th Congress. I believe that it would be very helpful in remedying the difficulties persons in need have encountered in obtaining preventive medical care.

The need for this Child Health Assurance Act is clear.

According to Health, Education, and Welfare Department estimates, 35 percent or more of all children under 15 are not fully vaccinated. That includes 19 million children who are unprotected against polio, 15 million unprotected against diphtheria, and 12 million unprotected against measles and rubella.

In addition, 10 million children in the United States never see a doctor and 5 million receive no dental care. Among low-income children, what medical treatment is received often is sporadic and occurs only after complications have set in from an illness.

In contrast to this poor record of preventive care for youngsters is the knowledge that we have the means to prevent most, if not all, of the worst effects of infant and childhood diseases and disabilities. In addition to immunizations, we have the means to treat vision problems and hearing loss, dental problems and emotional disturbances so that these major handicaps to a productive life can be overcome.

The Child Health Assurance Act, as it is formulated in the bill I am introducing, has two purposes, basically.

The first is to expand medicaid eligibility to children under 18 years of age from families whose incomes fall below the $4,200 per year per family of four standard. These youngsters would be eligible for medicaid services included in the State plan, including assessment under the existing early and periodic screening, diagnosis and treatment program (EPSDT). The CHAP legislation also allows States the option of providing medicaid coverage to children who are hard to place for adoption because of a handicapping or medical condition.

As its second aim, this CHAP bill seeks to improve the services now being offered by EPSDT.

The legislation provides for increasing the Federal share of matching rates for health assessment by 25 percentage points, to a maximum of 90 percent for the Federal share. An increase in the Federal matching rate for costs of outreach and followup administrative efforts also is proposed as an incentive for reaching as many eligible children and mothers as possible. As a third part of improving EPSDT efforts, a variety of qualified health-care providers, including private physicians, public health departments, community health centers, Head Start agencies and school systems, would be encouraged to contract with the States to perform health assessments and such followup care as their facilities permit.

To those in this Congress who are concerned about expanding services at Federal expense, let me point out that the preventive care which is being furthered through this legislation ultimately is the most cost-effective health care we can provide. I urge the Members of this body to take a long-range view of the health of our Nation's children. Routine preventive care now helps reduce serious and costly medical problems later. But more important, dollars spent now contribute to the healthy development of our Nation's youngsters. Our children are truly our future, and I urge my colleagues to carefully weigh this investment in that future.●

CARTER FOREIGN POLICY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, frustration, more than any other sentiment, expresses my opinion on the Carter administration's foreign policy, which at this point is in a state of near chaos. An example of this is the situation in Rhodesia which is the subject of an editorial in the February 1, Chicago Tribune. I insert it for the Member's attention:

RHODESIA'S VOTE, CARTER'S PROBLEM

As expected, the white voters of Rhodesia have overwhelmingly approved a constitutional change providing for the election of a black-led government in a one-man, one-vote election on April 20.

There could hardly have been any other outcome. To have rejected the biracial government's plan would have been to assure civil war and the destruction of the country. Besides, the approved plan includes some safeguards designed to protect whites at least until a new government has had a chance to prove that a biracial society can work in Rhodesia as well as it has worked in Kenya and the Ivory Coast.

This isn't to say that peace is now assured; far from it. What the vote does do, though, is to force the United States and Britain to reexamine the remains of their Rhodesia policy.

They can persist in their vindictive attitude that the Ian Smith government is "illegal" and continue to refuse to do anything to help it—a policy which has already brought the country to the brink of civil war.

Or they can acknowledge that the Smith government has gone a long way toward meeting the conditions once laid down for Anglo-American support. These include a willingness to meet with the guerrilla leaders (it is the guerrillas who refuse) and the scheduling of a free election in which all blacks can take part (the guerrillas refuse to take part in an election).

To acknowledge this would mean to give up the Carter administration's insistence that the guerrillas be included in an all-party conference and in any new government, and to reconsider the United Nations' economic sanctions against Rhodesia which the United States (and very few other western countries) observes.

Last summer the Senate agreed to continue the sanctions only after a compromise provision was added (the Case-Javits amendment) authorizing President Carter to end the sanctions unilaterally if the Smith government held free elections and committed itself to negotiate with the guerrilla leaders, Joshua Nkomo and Robert Mugabe.

These conditions are being met, however reluctantly, by Mr. Smith and his black partners. To persist in the Carter administration's policy is in effect to give the guerrillas veto power over any change in this policy, simply by refusing to talk to the Smith government. And, in the process, it will assure a civil war which the guerrillas, with arms from the Soviet Union and troops from Cuba, expect to win. Without a change in Anglo-American policy, time is clearly on their side.

Matters have deteriorated so far already that even an abrupt change in our policy may come too late. Former Sen. Dick Clark of Iowa, a formulator and champion of our present nonpolicy [along with U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young], undertakes to defend it on the Op-Ed page of Tuesday's New York Times by saying that even if the sanctions are lifted, "it will have little or no impact on the outcome. . . . It would come at the 11th hour, when the prospects of peace in Rhodesia and the influence of the U.S. government will be at their lowest point ever."

Better, in Mr. Clark's view, to stick aboard the ship as it plunges toward the rocks than to admit that maybe we've been on the wrong course and a change is in order. Even Britain's Prime Minister Callaghan has sadly accepted the report of his latest mission to Rhodesia that Anglo-American policy is at a dead end.

Having thus bungled the defense, Mr. Clark proceeds to bungle the offense. "Few members of Congress," he says, "are familiar with the complexities of the Rhodesian war." How true. And they include people like Mr. Clark who persist in viewing African politics purely as a black vs. white issue in terms of the U.S. experience. They are suspicious of any blacks who try to work with whites toward a biracial solution that might save their country from destruction.

The truth is that African blacks are them-

selves badly divided by tribal rivalries. This is clear even in countries such as Nigeria and Zaire, that have been independent for nearly 20 years. And if Rhodesia plunges into a full-scale civil war, the fighting will not be between blacks and whites so much as between members of the aggressive but minority Matabele tribe, which generally represents the guerrillas, and the more passive, majority Shona tribe, represented by the black partners in Ian Smith's government.

Is this the goal of American foreign policy?●

KEY ISSUE OF VERIFICATION STUDIED CAREFULLY

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, by far the finest article I have seen on the key question of verification on the SALT II agreement appeared in the Scientific American of February 19, 1979, offered by our colleague from Wisconsin, LES ASPIN.

It is a lengthy article and there may be those who are discouraged from reading it by its length. I hope that barrier will be overcome by many of my colleagues and their staffs. Obviously the SALT II agreement is a major decision for this Nation and while the Members of the House will not be voting on it, we will frequently be asked our opinion and we will help shape public opinion.

This thorough analysis by LES ASPIN is a great public service and I commend him and the magazine for its publication:

THE VERIFICATION OF THE SALT II AGREEMENT

(By LES ASPIN)

[Graphs and map not printed in RECORD.]

The keystone of any international arms-control agreement is the ability of each side to make sure the other side abides by it. Without adequate verification of compliance agreements such as the bilateral strategic-arms pacts between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. are bound to collapse. As the Senate prepares to debate the ratification of the new treaty emerging from the second round of strategic-arms-limitation talks (SALT II) between the two superpowers, charges that the Russians will seek to evade its provisions are beginning to be heard. The charges raise several fundamental questions of verification: How could the U.S.S.R. go about cheating? How could the U.S. discover such violations? What would the U.S.S.R. stand to gain and what would the U.S. stand to lose if the Russians were to violate the SALT II treaty? Let us examine each of these questions in turn to ascertain just what the real problems of verification are.

The SALT II agreement will apparently consist of two basic parts: a treaty lasting through 1985 and a protocol lasting through 1982. A summary of the various provisions included under these two headings is given in the illustration on the opposite page.

The new SALT treaty will provide in the first instance for a gradual reduction in the total number of strategic offensive-weapons launchers allowed on each side, from 2,400 at the time of ratification to 2,250 by 1982. For the purpose of the treaty strategic launchers are defined in such a way as to include land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's), submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBM's) and long-range heavy bombers.

The U.S.S.R. could try to evade the ceiling on the total number of strategic launchers in three ways: by deploying new types of strategic weapons, by deploying more weapons of the existing types or by converting nonstrategic, tactical weapons into strategic ones (for example by increasing their range).

The first of these cheating methods—deploying new types of strategic weapons—is perhaps the least feasible and most easily detectable way in which the U.S.S.R. could violate the SALT II total-launcher ceiling. The introduction of a new strategic weapon involves at least five stages: research, development, testing, production and deployment. At any one of these stages the present ability of the U.S. to detect clandestine activity on the part of the U.S.S.R. ranges from fair to excellent. The key point, however, is that the Russians would have to disguise all five stages and the odds against their successfully doing so are extremely high.

Consider the ways in which the U.S. is currently able to monitor just one of these stages: the testing of strategic launchers. U.S. line-of-sight radars can identify the distinctive "signature of reflected microwaves associated with each major type of Russian missile. In addition over-the-horizon radars can penetrate deep into the interior of the U.S.S.R. and recognize the characteristic pattern each type of missile makes when it disturbs the earth's ionosphere. Early-warning satellites, originally designed to detect a Russian ICBM attack, can also serve to monitor missile tests; the infrared sensors on these satellites can identify the rocket-exhaust plume of a missile as it is being test-fired. Finally, the U.S. has a complex array of sensors, including assorted photographic gear, on ships and planes that routinely monitor missile-test impact areas on the periphery of the U.S.S.R. and in the Pacific. The information gathered from these sources can be used to distinguish new types of missiles from old ones.

In short, the "national technical means" of surveillance available to this country for observing Russian missile tests are multiple, redundant and complementary. They enable the U.S. to detect all long-range missiles fired from test sites in the U.S.S.R. They are, in fact, far more reliable than most human intelligence gathering (that is, spying), which may yield second-hand, dated information or even false, planted information.

To repeat, testing is only one of the five steps that must be taken before a new weapon is ready to be introduced to the strategic arena. Other means of detection could uncover a Russian attempt to evade this particular treaty provision either before testing (during the research and development stages) or after testing (during the production and deployment stages).

The second method potentially available to the U.S.S.R. for cheating on the overall strategic-launcher ceiling—deploying additional weapons of existing types—is more difficult to monitor than the first cheating method, but here the detection capabilities of the U.S. are still very good indeed. The national technical means of surveillance adopted by this country are particularly effective in detecting the production and deployment of additional missile-carrying submarines and heavy bombers.

Strategic submarines are large ships, displacing between 8,000 and 9,000 tons and measuring more than the length of a football field. They are hard to hide. Moreover, there are only two shipyards in the U.S.S.R. that currently build submarines of this type. Both these two sites and other potential sites for constructing submarines are constantly watched. Even if a new missile-carrying submarine were to be built under impenetrable cover (assuming the simultaneous successful disguising of all support activities), the new submarine must eventually leave its shipbuilding ways. From that point on there would be innumerable opportunities for observing it. The deployment of additional missiles on Russian submarines also cannot go undetected.

Similarly, the detection of any increase in the number of heavy bombers in the Russian air force is a fairly straightforward task. The production lines for the two existing types of heavy bomber, referred to by U.S. military analysts as the Bear and the Bison, have long been closed. Renewed production of these two aircraft could be detected by the U.S. with a high degree of confidence, as is evident from the demonstrated ability of this country to monitor the production of much smaller pieces of Russian military equipment, such as tanks. The additional deployment of heavy bombers would also be hard to hide. There are no more than 10 heavy-bomber airfields in the U.S.S.R., and all of them are closely watched by U.S. surveillance satellites. If the Russians were to decide to build new airfields equipped to handle such planes, their detection would be easy; runways cannot be hidden underground. If, as some strategic planners expect, the U.S.S.R. were to deploy a new type of heavy bomber by the early 1980's, it too would be readily detectable.

Detecting the deployment of additional land-based strategic missiles would be only a little more difficult. Given the current Russian practice in such matters, the U.S. can reliably identify by means of satellite photography such telltale activities in the U.S.S.R. as the construction of new ICBM silos and the transport of missiles to new deployment sites. The emplacement of command-and-control systems and associated support equipment can also be detected.

If the Russians were to attempt to hide these activities, they would probably have somewhat more luck than they would with strategic submarines. After all, land-based ICBM launchers are smaller than submarines, and there are vast interior areas of the U.S.S.R. in which they could be built or based. Even in the case of additional ICBM's, however, the likelihood of successful large-scale deception is very small. The Russians might try to build more ICBM launchers in the open, on the assumption that the vastness of their country would hide the violation, but that would be a mistake. U.S. surveillance satellites currently provide complete photographic coverage of the U.S.S.R. at frequent intervals. If suspicions are aroused by the regular large-area survey photographs, "close look" cameras can be ordered to rephotograph the area in question, providing more detailed information. The present generation of high-resolution cameras on U.S. surveillance satellites are theoretically capable of making a clear photograph of an object one foot across from an altitude of 100 miles. Photographs at this resolution would leave little doubt about the nature of the activities in question.

Alternatively the Russians could attempt to deploy additional ICBM's under camouflage or at night. U.S. satellites, however, are now equipped with multispectral sensors that can penetrate camouflage and can also observe nighttime activity. Infrared sensors are particularly good at detecting underground missile silos and silos that have been camouflaged. As long as the ground in the immediate vicinity of the suspicious object is at a different temperature from that of the surrounding terrain (or has different infrared-emission characteristics) an underground or camouflaged missile silo will stand out in the infrared image.

Primarily because of the time it takes for U.S. photoanalysts to process the data contained in such satellite pictures, small-scale violations might be hard to identify. Any sizable effort to cheat (say a clandestine addition of 100 ICBM's), however, would surely be detected.

The third method of cheating on the overall strategic-launcher ceiling—converting nonstrategic weapons into strategic ones—presents a more challenging problem of verification. Two notable examples of Russian intermediate-range weapons that could be made long-range (and therefore strategic) weapons are the Backfire bomber and the SS-20 intermediate-range ballistic missile (IRBM).

There is little disagreement within the U.S. intelligence community that the primary purpose of the Backfire is to carry out missions in areas peripheral to the U.S.S.R. (such as Europe and China). Roughly half of the Backfires deployed so far have been assigned to naval-aviation missions, and the rest are part of the U.S.S.R.'s medium-bomber force. There is also little question, however, that the Backfire has some intercontinental capability, specifically for one-way missions with recovery in a third country, for round-trip attacks against the western U.S. and, provided the bombers are refueled in flight, for even longer round-trip missions.

Although the SALT II treaty will exclude Backfires from the overall count of strategic launchers, the treaty will be accompanied by a variety of assurances (some in the form of unilateral statements) that will limit the strategic value of the aircraft. These assurances could include limits on the production and deployment of the Backfire, restrictions on the employment of the bomber in conjunction with tanker aircraft capable of inflight refueling and limits on the bomber's range and payload. Of these assurances the easiest to verify would be the limits on production and deployment (even assuming deception), simply because of the size and complexity of these activities. These constraints are as applicable to the Backfire as they are to the strategic Bear and Bison bombers discussed above.

Verifying tanker restrictions would be a little harder, U.S. Air Force pilots testify to the difficulty of midair refueling. It is extremely doubtful that the Russians would actually try to refuel Backfires during a war without having attempted some practice runs, and practice runs can be monitored by a variety of means, including listening in on aircraft communications. If the Russians wanted to take their chances and attempt wartime refuelings without rehearsals, however, there is no guaranteed means of verifying any such restrictions on tanker employment.

The most difficult of the SALT II Backfire assurances to verify involve the plane's characteristics, specifically its range and payload. Even with unhindered surveillance there has already been some dispute among U.S. analysts over the range of the Backfire. Assuming skillful and determined cheating on the part of the U.S.S.R., both the range and the payload of the Backfire could probably be disguised.

The other intermediate-range weapon that could be converted into a strategic weapon is the SS-20 IRBM. The SS-20 is not covered by the SALT II treaty, since its present range (3,000 kilometers) is less than the 5,500-kilometer lower limit used to define ICBM's. The potential problem stems from the fact that the SS-20 comprises the first two stages of the advanced three-stage SS-16 ICBM; moreover, the mobile launcher for the SS-20 is identical with that for the SS-16. By surreptitiously stockpiling SS-16 third stages and payloads the Russians could at some point in the future be in a position to upgrade SS-20's into SS-16's on short notice. This course of action could provide them with a significant numerical increase in their ICBM force with very little warning.

The SALT II agreement, however, will specifically ban the further production, testing and deployment of the SS-16 ICBM and will further require that existing SS-16's be dismantled. Thus if the Russians were to try to augment their ICBM force by adding a third stage and a different payload to the SS-20's, in effect making them SS-16's, they would be doing so without any opportunity for testing the new system. The existing prototype models of the SS-16 have not been tested in almost two years, and the last test was apparently a failure.

In short, the issue of upgraded SS-20's turns out to be another testing issue. To have any confidence in upgraded SS-20's, particularly enough confidence to satisfy traditionally conservative Russian military planners, the U.S.S.R. would have to test some of them, and as was pointed out above surreptitious testing of new strategic missiles by the U.S.S.R. is a practical impossibility.

The problem of preventing the Russians from converting nonstrategic weapons into strategic ones is complicated by one other factor: the existence of between 90 and 100 "reconfigured" heavy bombers in their arsenal. These aircraft have been modified to serve in reconnaissance and antisubmarine-warfare roles, but they still retain their bomb bays. Any further permanent change in the configuration of most of these aircraft could be detected in time. Nevertheless, about a dozen of these planes were originally built in such a way that they could be rapidly converted into heavy bombers at their airfields, making prompt verification of their nonstrategic roles extremely difficult.

Besides limits on the number of launchers, the SALT II treaty will contain numerical limits on missiles equipped with multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles (MIRV's) and on bombers equipped with strategic air-launched cruise missiles (ALCM's). According to the treaty, the sum of these two types of systems will not be allowed to exceed 1,320. Furthermore, no more than 1,200 MIRVed missiles will be allowed on each side, and MIRVed ICBM's will be limited to 820.

Strategic weapons launchers	Launchers deployed	Warheads per launcher	Total warheads
MIRVed:			
Minuteman III ICBM	550	3	1,650
Poseidon C-3 SLBM	496	10	4,960
Subtotal	1,046		6,610
Not MIRVed:			
Titan II ICBM	54	1	54
Minuteman II ICBM	450	1	450
Polaris A-3 SLBM	160	[1] 1	160
B-52D Bomber	79	4	316
B-52G, B-52H bombers	269	4	[2] 1,076
Subtotal	1,012		3,556
Total	2,058		10,166

[1] 3 MRV's.
[2] Plus 1,500 SRAM's.

Note.—U.S. strategic arsenal is broken down in this table into 2 broad categories: weapons launchers that carry multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles and those that do not. The number of nuclear warheads indicated for the Poseidon C-3 SLBM is believed to be an average figure. The number of B-52's available for strategic missions is an estimate. The number of warheads per strategic B-52 listed represents the standard loading; the B-52H and B-52G aircraft carry an additional complement of nuclear-armed short-range attack missiles (SRAM's). The 3 reentry vehicles on the Polaris A-3 SLBM are not independently targetable and hence are not counted as MIRV's. Cruise missiles and FB-111 bombers are omitted.

Strategic-weapons launchers	Launchers deployed	Warheads per launcher	Total warheads
MIRVed:			
SS-17 ICBM	100	1 or 4	
SS-18 ICBM	170	1 or 8	~2,500
SS-19 ICBM	320	1 or 6	
Subtotal	590		~2,500
Not MIRVed:			
SS-9 ICBM	130	1	130
SS-11 ICBM	620	[1] 1	620
SS-13 ICBM	40	1	40
SS-16 ICBM	20	1	20
SS-N-6 SLBM	528	[2] 1	528
SS-N-8 SLBM	286	1	286
SS-N-17 SLBM	16	1	16
SS-N-18 SLBM	96	1	96
Bear bomber	100	2	200
Bison bomber	40	2	80
Subtotal	1,876		2,016
Total	2,466		~4,500

[1] 3 MRV's.
[2] 2 MRV's.

Note.—Russian strategic arsenal is estimated in this table on a similar basis. In accordance with the new SALT II "counting rules" the MIRV subtotals shown here include some 135 ICBM's that have not yet been MIRVed and hence still carry single warheads. In addition the intermediate-range bomber referred to by U.S. military analysts as the Backfire is omitted. In general numerical tallies of this kind fail to reflect substantial U.S. advantages over the U.S.S.R. in terms of missile accuracy and reliability. Moveover, such tables do not include the fact that the U.S. has thousands of tactical nuclear weapons capable of reaching targets in the U.S.S.R., where the U.S.S.R. has none in a comparable position to reach targets in the United States.

There are four ways the Russians might try to increase their combined MIRV/ALCM total beyond the treaty limits: by constructing new ICBM silos and SLBM submarines for the additional MIRVed missiles; by substituting MIRVed missiles for unMIRVed ones in existing missile silos or submarines; by deploying MIRVed payloads on unMIRVed missiles in existing silos or submarines, and by placing strategic ALCM's on additional bombers.

The first way the U.S.S.R. might try to evade the MIRV/ALCM ceiling—constructing new silos and submarines for MIRVed missiles—would clearly be unfeasible, since (as was pointed out above) any cheating on the total number of such strategic launchers can be detected by the U.S. with a very high degree of confidence.

The second way the Russians could exceed the MIRV/ALCM ceiling would be by substituting MIRVed missiles for unMIRVed ones in existing silos or submarines. The U.S.S.R. currently has a number of silos and submarines containing unMIRVed missiles. Detecting their surreptitious replacement with MIRVed missiles requires that the U.S. know which Russian missiles are MIRVed and which silos and submarines contain which missiles.

In the SALT II negotiations both sides have agreed that all missiles of a type that has been tested in a MIRVed mode or has

been fired from a launcher with a MIRVed warhead would be counted against the MIRV ceiling. The U.S. proposed this counting rule precisely because it facilitates verification. U.S. analysts already know from extensive observation which of today's Russian missiles are "MIRV-capable," and future MIRV-capable ICBM's and SLBM's can be detected at the test stage.

Although the U.S. knows which Russian missiles are MIRVed, another question remains: Is it possible to tell which silos and which submarines contain which missiles? The answer is again provided by the known differences among missile systems. First, Russian silos that contain MIRV-capable missiles are significantly different in appearance from those that contain unMIRVed missiles. Second, MIRVed launchers require different command-and-control systems, support equipment and other facilities, all of which are observable with existing U.S. satellites.

The various types of missile-launching tubes on strategic submarines can also be identified by U.S. surveillance satellites. Any attempt by the Russians to install existing MIRVed SLBM's on submarines with unMIRVed missiles would require the alteration of the launching tubes, the replacement of fire-control systems and other extensive modifications. These would take time; even a routine overhaul of a nuclear submarine takes from 30 to 36 months. Under the circumstances the changes would certainly be detectable.

Another method of evading the MIRVed-missile limits would be to take an unMIRVed missile and replace just its warhead. If the Russians were to deploy MIRVed payloads onto unMIRVed missiles in existing silos or submarines, that would be very hard to detect. Fortunately no such transferable payloads exist now, and the current generation of Russian missiles have design characteristics that make it virtually impossible to transfer MIRV payloads from the new MIRVed missiles onto the old unMIRVed ones.

A final method of evading the MIRV ceiling would involve placing strategic cruise missiles on additional bombers. The treaty places a ceiling of 1,320 on the total number of MIRVed missiles plus bombers equipped with ALCM's. Could the Russians exceed that ceiling by producing more than the allowed number of ALCMed bombers?

For the foreseeable future the U.S. will be able to tell which Russian bombers are equipped with cruise missiles, since Russian cruise missiles are externally mounted and therefore visible. Internal mountings would present a problem, but so far the Russians have none. Internally mounted cruise missiles would be detected most readily at the time of their introduction, because the aircraft involved would presumably have to be sent to some central facility to be modified, and the U.S. follows the activities at such facilities quite closely.

The verification of the limit on internally mounted cruise missiles will be eased considerably by the adoption in the SALT II accord of a "type" rule, which states simply that if one bomber of a given type carries ALCM's, all bombers of that design would be counted as ALCMed bombers. Counting which bombers have cruise missiles, however, is not the same as verifying which bombers are strategic. Bombers might be fitted with cruise missiles that had short ranges, which would not qualify them as bombers armed with strategic cruise missiles. Bombers might also be fitted with long-range cruise missiles carrying non-nuclear payloads. Hence a separate and far more complicated problem is determining whether cruise missiles on bombers have strategic ranges (in this case more than 600 kilometers) and strategic payloads.

Under normal conditions the U.S. can obtain adequate if rough estimates of these characteristics, but there is no systematic way of verifying the range of deployed cruise missiles. Significant differences would be revealed neither by the missile's exterior nor by its flight test. Unlike ballistic missiles, cruise missiles do not have to be tested at full range or even near it for the military to have confidence in their performance. Like aircraft, they can be flown for a limited time under cruise conditions, and their range can be estimated on the basis of the amount of fuel consumed. As it happens, the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff do have good estimates of the range of existing Russian cruise missiles, and the U.S.S.R. does not yet have air-to-surface cruise missiles capable of strategic ranges. Moreover, the Russians are not expected to have many long-range ALCM's for a number of years, and so it is unlikely that they could exceed the numerical restrictions in the SALT II treaty before it expires in 1985.

As for the payloads of cruise missiles, there is no way at present to distinguish a nuclear-armed cruise missile from a non-nuclear one by external observation. Once again, however, the Russians are not expected to have long-range ALCM's with either nuclear or conventional warheads for a number of years, so that violations of this provision before the treaty expires are unlikely.

Assuming that the Russians do perfect strategic ALCM's, the U.S. would still not be at a loss. If the Russians were to begin refitting existing aircraft with new ALCM's, suspicions would be aroused and the U.S. would be aware of the potential for cheating. Even if a new Russian bomber were equipped with ALCM's but the U.S.S.R. falsely asserted it was not strategic and the U.S. was not able to contradict the assertion, it is doubtful that more than about 120 bombers would be available before the expiration date of the treaty.

The SALT II treaty will also contain a sublimit on the number of modern large ballistic missiles (MLBM's) allowed on each side. Any missile larger than the Russians' SS-19 (which has a "throw weight" of about 8,000 pounds) will count as an MLBM; any missile larger than the largest ICBM currently in the Russian inventory (the SS-18, with a throw weight of roughly 16,000 pounds) will be prohibited. The debate over the substitution of SS-19's for SS-11's after the signing of SALT I provides ample evidence of the sophistication of U.S. monitoring techniques. The dispute turned on the question of whether the installation of SS-19's in SS-11 silos violated the SALT I provisions covering the substitution of "heavy" missiles for "light" ones. The consensus following the debate was that the substitution by the Russians did not violate the letter of the SALT I treaty but that it was inconsistent with one of the unilateral statements made at the time by the U.S. The main point here, however, is what the discussion revealed, namely that the U.S. knew precisely how much larger the SS-19 was than the SS-11.

The SALT II treaty will also prohibit "rapid reload" systems. The purpose of this provision is to protect against the possibility that the U.S.S.R. would stockpile extra ICBM's and fit them into existing launchers once a first salvo had been fired. Loading a 50-ton missile into a silo is considerably more complicated than putting a cartridge into a rifle. The elaborate equipment around existing silos necessary for such a system to work, to say nothing of the storage sites for extra missiles, would certainly be detectable with existing satellites. The Russians could scatter the equipment and extra missiles far from the silos and probably avoid detection in that way as long as they did not test the resulting system; they would then, however, not have a rapid-reload capability, and so there would be no violation of this particular provision.

In addition to the treaty lasting until 1985 the SALT II agreement will contain a protocol lasting until 1982, and there will be verification issues in the protocol too. One part of the protocol will ban the deployment and testing of mobile ICBM launchers. The potential for violation of this section lies in the possible deployment of the existing SS-16 ICBM in a mobile mode; no other mobile ICBM is expected before the protocol expires. There is no question of the ability of the U.S. to ascertain that the Russians have deployed a mobile land-based system. Nevertheless, under certain deceptive basing schemes such as the multiple-aim point, or "shell game," options discussed recently (which involve the construction of hundreds or even thousands of shelters, only a fraction of which contain missiles), verifying the actual number of missiles deployed would be very difficult.

The SALT II protocol will also ban the flight testing and deployment of ground- and sea-launched cruise missiles capable of ranges in excess of 600 kilometers. Since the ranges of cruise missiles cannot be determined accurately in the event of conscious deception, such a ban will not be verifiable.

The flight testing of U.S. cruise missiles has only recently begun, however, and these weapons are not scheduled to be deployed in militarily significant numbers until after the SALT II protocol expires. Current Russian cruise missiles are primitive technologically. The U.S. is far more advanced in the development of compact warheads, computer-guidance systems and small turbofan engines, the technologies that are the key to small but long-range cruise missiles. The U.S. Department of Defense has stated that in cruise-missile technology the U.S. is "10 years ahead of the Russians" and that U.S. cruise missiles now under development are "two or three generations" ahead of current Russian weapons.

There are nevertheless some existing Russian sea-launched cruise missiles that exceed the 600-kilometer limit by as much as 250 kilometers. Because of their primitive design, however, they are very large. Since any attempt to begin new deployments is observable, and since the Russians have no capability for deploying new, long-range ground- and sea-launched cruise missiles until after 1982, there is virtually no potential here for violations by the U.S.S.R.

The SALT II protocol will include certain limitations on the flight testing and deployment of new types of ballistic missile. Although a full assessment of the associated verification problems depends on a detailed analysis of these limitations, there is reason for optimism. New ballistic missiles can be detected at the test stage, and added deployments of new missiles would be one of the easiest violations to detect.

The ability of the U.S. to detect potential violations of the SALT II agreement by the U.S.S.R. can be summarized in terms of three broad levels of confidence. First, there are the numerous cheating methods for which the verification capabilities of the U.S. are excellent, and the possibility of successful evasion on the part of the U.S.S.R. is remote. These contingencies include all the areas in which major violations by the U.S.S.R. could upset the present strategic "balance of terror": the deployment of new strategic weapons, the addition of even small numbers of bombers and SLBM's, the deployment of additional ICBM's on either a large scale or a moderate scale, the upgrading of the SS-20 missile to the status of a strategic weapon (unless it is upgraded without ever being tested), the deployment of additional MIRVed missiles or ALCMed bombers (in the absence of radically different systems), the upgrading of smaller missiles into modern large missiles and the introduction of rapid-reload systems.

Second, there are several areas in which the verification capabilities of the U.S. are at present quite weak. In all these cases,

however, the possible cheating is not militarily significant. The problems of verification include detecting the small-scale deployment of additional ICBM's, monitoring the operational characteristics of the Backfire bomber, verifying that an untested SS-20 upgrade system does not exist and verifying the status of a limited number of heavy-bomber variants.

Third, there are a few areas, mainly those involving cruise missiles and transferable MIRV payloads, in which the U.S. may face serious verification problems at the next stage of the SALT negotiations. Although the Russian cruise missiles of today are primitive, at some point in the future it will be virtually impossible to determine whether the range of a given Russian cruise missile is long enough to be considered strategic. The U.S. will also not be able to determine whether the payload of a given Russian cruise missile consists of conventional explosives or nuclear explosives. Furthermore, counting cruise missiles accurately will never be easy.

At present the payloads of the MIRVed Russian missiles are so different from their single-warhead payloads that the MIRV's cannot be installed on the old missiles. If the Russians eventually develop a transferable warhead, the U.S. could then face a serious verification problem.

The issues of strategic cruise missiles and transferable payloads are not problems of any great magnitude for the duration of the SALT II agreement. Looking forward to a SALT III pact in the mid-1980's, however, the verification problems are certain to be much more difficult.

In general the surveillance capabilities of the U.S. cited in this article are almost certainly underestimated. The reason is that the assessment considers only those methods of intelligence gathering that can be firmly relied on, such as satellite photography. Actually there is a great deal of other information the U.S. intelligence community receives that cannot be guaranteed in advance. For example, U.S. monitoring of internal communications and signals within the U.S.S.R. might pick up evidence of some activity that is not detectable by satellite photography. An undetected violation might even be revealed by a defector, whose defection could never be assumed in advance. Data obtained under such fortuitous circumstances would undoubtedly reduce even further the chances for successful violations.

The potential for violations is also overstated here because inordinately skillful cheating by the U.S.S.R. has been assumed throughout, a routine assumption in assessing one's own verification capabilities. It may not necessarily be a realistic assumption, however, because even the best-laid plans of a nation attempting to cheat can go awry.

Take, for example, the one known case in which the U.S.S.R. attempted a significant covert strategic-arms buildup: in Cuba before the missile crisis of October, 1962. Although the Russians clearly wanted to hide the emplacement of offensive missiles in Cuba, they were quite inept at doing so. On several occasions standard operational procedures and routines, which are necessary for the functioning of any large organization and are notoriously inflexible, betrayed their plans. For cheating to be successful everything must work perfectly. In the real world, however, unforeseen events upset plans. To be sure, one cannot count on any particular scheme's going awry, but any nation would be foolish to count on its not happening.

There has already been a heated debate in the U.S. concerning possible Russian violations of the SALT I agreement. That experience has raised a number of questions about the intentions of the Russians regarding their compliance with existing treaties, but it has not raised any questions about the ability of the U.S. to monitor what the Russians are doing. Indeed, the very basis for the allegations that violations have taken place is the detailed information the U.S. intelligence services have gathered on Russian actions since the SALT I pact was signed. The debate has centered not on what the Russians' actions have been but rather on what their actions mean. If the U.S.S.R. had engaged in illegal behavior that had gone unnoticed, this would obviously raise doubts about the detection capabilities of the U.S., but no one has even hinted that this might be the case.

So far only the potential for undetected violations has been considered here. An equally important issue is whether the Russians would attempt to cheat if they felt they could get away with it. The potential for violations is small; the likelihood of violations seems even smaller.

First, the SALT II framework provides enormous leeway for both sides to pursue strategic programs without cheating. Although the Russians would be able to build substantially larger forces without SALT II, they can still do much under the terms of the treaty. They can scrap existing missiles and replace them with more reliable and more accurate models. They can greatly increase their inventories of multiple-warhead missiles. They can direct a greater effort into areas not prohibited by SALT II, such as antisubmarine warfare, that could be perceived in the U.S. as threatening.

Second, even if the Russians became dissatisfied with the SALT II agreement after signing and ratifying it, they still would not necessarily cheat. Several alternatives might seem at least as attractive, if not more so: seeking the renegotiation of certain provisions, seeking to modify the terms of the SALT II pact in the SALT III negotiations, reneging on a part of the treaty (or even withdrawing from the treaty altogether), partly modifying their programs to comply with the treaty and so on.

Third, there is the question of what benefits would accrue to the U.S.S.R. from cheating. There could be no political gain unless the Russians made their transgressions public. No one is intimidated by weapons that are not known to exist. Yet if the Russians did make public the fact of their creating, there would be enormous political repercussions. The U.S. Government, for example, might find itself pursuing an unprecedented arms buildup in response to the expressed demands of an aroused American public.

The real dangers stemming from Russian violations of SALT II would arise only if there were a significant military advantage to be gained by cheating, for example, if the Russians, after cheating for a few years, could then unveil a devastating superiority that would force the immediate surrender of the U.S. That, however, is impossible. Under the term of the SALT II agreement the U.S. will still have a formidable strategic arsenal: almost 2,000 launchers and roughly 10,000 independently targetable warheads. To upset the strategic "balance of terror" the Russians would require much larger numbers of weapons than they are now allowed, and it would be impossible for them to acquire enough additional weapons without cheating on such a massive and pervasive scale that it would be detectable with certainty.

It helps to consider a number of plausible "worst cases" in which the U.S.S.R. could actually cheat on certain SALT II provisions and evade detection. The Russians might, for example, add as many as 100 ICBM launchers to their strategic arsenal clandestinely, but that would amount to an increase of less than 5 percent in their launcher force and would yield no discernible advantage. The Russians now have almost 2,500 missiles and bombers. Under the terms of the SALT II pact this total would drop to at most 2,250, a cut of about 250. Hence cheating would be more than outweighed by the reduction in forces required by the treaty.

The Russians might also be able to divert some Backfires to strategic missions in case of war. This substitution would add marginally to their second-strike forces but would correspondingly diminish their antiship capability and undercut their capability against enemies on their borders, which would hardly be a fair trade from their point of view.

The Russians might already have an untested SS-20 upgrade potential. Even if this potential were realized, the resulting SS-16 missiles would be the least accurate and least powerful ICBM's of the current generation. The diversion of SS-20's to intercontinental attack missions would also substantially reduce the threat to Western Europe and to China.

The Russians might convert some of their naval aircraft into long-range bombers. Again, this would marginally increase their strategic retaliatory strength while substantially diminishing the threat to the U.S. Navy.

The Russians might also develop an untested, nonrapid-reload capability. The benefit from having a launcher reloaded (at the optimum) 12 hours after a first firing is questionable; the silo could be destroyed in the interim and by that time the reload missile is likely to be no more than a potential "rubble-bouncer" anyway.

In other words, even if the Russians were to cheat in every way that might evade detection, they would add little to their strategic power, and they might actually reduce their military strength in other areas.

To sum up, the ability of the U.S. to verify Russian compliance with the SALT II accord is clearly essential to a successful outcome of the agreement. On close consideration, however, it becomes evident that the much-touted problems of verification are more imagined than real. The multiple and duplicative methods of detection at the disposal of the U.S. are sufficient to reveal any cheating on a scale adequate to threaten this country militarily. Certain small violations of the treaty could be achieved by the Russians without detection, but a handful of additional missiles or bombers would add too little to their arsenal to be militarily significant. In the political realm the Russians would stand to lose more than they would gain by violating the single most important treaty they would have with a foreign power.

It is in the future that verification problems might become critical. Technological advances, particularly those involving cruise missiles and transferable MIRV payloads, will stretch the monitoring capabilities of both sides once the SALT II protocol and treaty expire. Dealing with these systems under a SALT II agreement may well require a substantial lowering of the present standards of confidence for detecting violations. At that point a renewed examination of the entire verification issue will be in order.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. NICHOLAS P. KRIKES

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 11, 1979, Doctor Nicholas P. Krikes will be stepping down as president of the California Medical Association.

Doctor Krikes' contributions to the medical profession and to the community have been many and far reaching.

Since graduating from the University of Southern California, Doctor Krikes has had a family practice in San Bernardino for over two decades. As a member of the San Bernardino County Medical Society and the American and California Medical Associations, he has given of himself in a way that few have.

Doctor Krikes' service to the California Medical Association has been most extraordinary. He has served on the Board of Directors of the California Medical Education and Research Foundation, as well as the Audio-Digest Foundation, on which he also served on the Executive Committee. He has chaired the committees on Medi-Cal and Finance. On March 11, his service will not end, but merely culminate as he steps down from the association's highest office.

Doctor Krikes has served with distinction on many community organizational boards. He has brought honor to the San Bernardino County Medical Society through his leadership as a dedicated physician who gives his time without question, and he is held in the highest esteem by his peers.

Therefore, on behalf of the entire California delegation I would like to commend and thank my good friend Doctor Nicholas P. Krikes for his many years of faithful service to the people of San Bernardino and the State of California.●

BORDER PATROL AGENTS

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, illegal entry into the United States has received much attention in recent years and we all recognize that it is not a simple matter to deal with. However, little consideration has been given to the needs of the Federal personnel who patrol the Nation's borders and have the difficult and often controversial job of enforcing the immigration laws. I am speaking of the border patrol agents of the Immigration and Naturalization Service within the Department of Justice who, under hazardous and trying conditions, are charged with the responsibility for stemming the tide of undocumented workers.

Today I am introducing legislation which provides for the upgrading of the positions of certain Border Patrol agents. This legislation provides that such personnel who spend no less than 25 percent but not more than 50 percent of their time in investigative duties, as opposed to routine border patrol activities, shall be immediately upgraded to grade GS–11 within the general schedule. In addition, such personnel who meet this requirement, and in addition have program or supervisory responsibilities in a single geographic area, would be entitled the grade GS–12. Furthermore, Border Patrol agents that spend less than 25 percent of their time in investigative duties, but who have program responsibilities in more than one geographic area, would also be entitled to the grade of GS–12.

This legislation would correct the inequitable and outmoded single agency standard now utilized by the Department of Justice for these personnel, and, if enacted into law, would adequately reward them in amounts commensurate with the degree of danger and stress incident to their responsibilities.

I realize that Congress has been reluctant to consider the issue of upgrading civil service positions, but I hope that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee would look into the particular problem surrounding the Border Patrol agents.

I also plan to write to Mr. Alan Campbell, Chairman of the Office of Personnel Management, in hopes that enough attention will be focused on the Border Patrol situation to receive some action this year.●

HOLE IN AMERICA'S POLITICAL SPECTRUM

HON. JAMES G. MARTIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1979

● Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, Nelson Rockefeller was a controversial man. He was born to it and could not possibly have escaped it, not even if he had opted for the life of a hermit. His death leaves a gaping hole in America's political spectrum as well as a hurt in the hearts of a family which has lost two brothers in rather rapid succession and without warning.

In remembering Nelson Rockefeller, we must remember the controversy that accompanied his life in politics and government. "Born to great wealth" is a phrase much repeated today as if it were important in and of itself. Well, it is not irrelevant. But, in what way is it relevant? In the case of Nelson Rockefeller, it provided an opportunity for and a reason for public service. First, it enabled a man to be able to throw his entire life and every effort into endeavors which were not financially rewarding. There was no way he could expect to gain financially from political and philanthropic activities. Coming from a family tradition holding that great wealth meant great responsibility, he saw the effort to build a more humane society whose citizens could lead a more fulfilling life as a reason for being.

Nelson Rockefeller's vision—in reality, a family's vision—was a cause of trouble and controversy. His early championship of racial equality—the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God—did not sit well with some in an earlier day and was, I believe, the cause for the undying characterization of the man as a political liberal, even by those in a later day who shared his view on such matters; a label can outlive the reason for labeling.

It is difficult to separate the contribution of Nelson Rockefeller from the contribution of his family. While he concentrated in the hurly-burly of elective politics, he—like others of the clan—played a dynamic role in improving health care, advancing education, and fostering the development of the arts.

In fact, it is hard to imagine what the state of the arts and medicine would be today had it not been for the philanthropy of the Rockefeller family in general and Nelson Rockefeller in particular. A man with a great zest for life made a more zestful life for all.

Our late Vice President, four times the Governor of New York, active public servant under six presidencies has left the political and cultural arenas much richer for his having been in them. A class act has ended. But the Republic has been improved by a lifetime of service to an ideal in the fulfillment of one's responsibility.●

U.S. POLICY SEEN WOOING DISASTER

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an article in the San Diego Union of February 5, 1979 concerning the security of the United States. The article follows:

U.S. POLICY SEEN WOOING DISASTER

(By Paul Cour)

The security of the United States today is "seriously at hazard," says retired Navy Adm. U.S. Grant Sharp, a former commander in chief of American forces in the Pacific.

"The American people are not being informed, indeed they have been misled," said Sharp at Saturday's defense seminar of the San Diego Council of the Navy League at San Diego City College theater.

"When Americans do understand and when they become aroused, I believe they will force a change in the disastrous policy that we are pursuing."

Retired Adm. Horacio Rivero said that under the first Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty "the Soviets gained numerical superiority of 40 percent in land- and sea-based ballistic missiles" and that the signing of another arms treaty with the Russians would engender a "false sense of security" in America.

Rivero said that nuclear superiority which the United States used "to force the Soviets out of Iran in 1948 and out of Cuba in 1962" has vanished, "and the shoe is now, or about to be, on the other foot."

Retired Marine Lt. Gen. Victor H. Krulak questioned the new U.S. policy toward the People's Republic of China.

"Would we industrialize the PRC and make them a competitor in world markets of the United States?" he asked. "That doesn't seem to be the royal road to success with respect to the Soviet Union."

Krulak suggested that the United States should sell arms to China, a policy which, he said, "would give the Soviet Union pause in its activities in Western Europe and tie down the Soviets more effectively on its border with China. . . .

"Wouldn't it be better, for hard cash, to sell them those things—surface-to-air missiles and short-range surface-to-surface rockets—that will give the Soviet Union pause? It would seem to me that this is a strategic decision confronting the United States today."●

THE HOLY LAND CHRISTIAN MISSION AND MOUNT OF DAVID CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S AND ORTHOPEDIC HOSPITAL

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, when an organization has long been engaged in improving the quality of life for the poor, the homeless, and the afflicted, it is fitting that we pay tribute to this organization, its unselfish and humanitarian efforts, and its thousands of generous supporters. Such is the case for the Holy Land Christian Mission and Mount of David Crippled Children's and Orthopedic Hospital, which has American headquarters in Kansas City, Mo. The mission established in 1936, is located in Bethelehem on the west bank of the Jordan, now under military control of Israel, and is in the midst of camps containing over 300,000 Arab refugees.

Since so many Pennsylvania residents contribute to the mission, I am particularly honored to bring to the attention of my House colleagues the outstanding work and achievements of this nonprofit, nondenominational organization.

Like a miniature city, the mission maintains its hospitals, orphanage, school, and support facilities to meet the total needs of its large family of orphans and crippled children—and reaches out "beyond its walls" to provide care and monthly assistance to hundreds of widows and refugees and other people of the Holy Land. One outreach service provided to these destitute people is a program of child care centers which the mission operates in refugee camps for preschool-age children.

The 18-building complex includes trade workshops for teaching manual skills to the orphans. The mission is self-sufficient, making its own clothing, shoes, linens, and other materials. Its trade shops manufacture all of the special shoes and braces for the crippled children. The mission school, staffed with a highly qualified faculty, offers grades one through nine.

More than just a clinic or welfare station, the mission offers a good education and counseling—and lots of "tender loving care." The large staff employed by the mission includes a number of former orphans who are now dedicated to providing the children with the same important care they once received.

Following a serious outbreak of polio in 1952, the mission opened a new rehabilitation center to care for the crippled children in Bethlehem and surrounding areas. In 1971, the current hospital, the only free children's orthopedic facility in the Middle East, was opened in newly remodeled facilities under the direction of Dr. A. F. Zuaiter, who brought together an expanded staff of fine physicians, physiotherapists, nurses, and medical technicians.

Today, the hospital ranks as one of the largest and certainly the most progressive orthopedic hospital in the entire Middle East. Equipped with two modern operating theaters, a topnotch physiotherapy department, and an outpatient department, its expert staff ministers to thousands of patients a month—including those with cases of congenital hip dislocation and club foot problems, birth defects, polio, and other crippling diseases.

At the present time, over 2,300 severely crippled children are waiting to be admitted to the hospital. The demand for its services is so great that an expansion is now underway, with completion of the new facilities scheduled to the availability of funds.

Furthermore, the hospital continues to conduct specialized orthopedic research and plans are now underway, with the support of the Agency for International Development, to make its highly successful and advanced surgical techniques available to American medical personnel.

I am indeed proud to commend the Holy Land Christian Mission to the attention of my colleagues and I know that they join me in conveying our appreciation and commendation for the outstanding efforts of this unique organization.●

SAN LUIS DRAIN PROPOSAL IS UNACCEPTABLE

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, for several years both State and Federal agencies have been studying the possibility of constructing a large canal to dispose of waste water accumulated from irrigated agriculture in the Central Valley of California. Residents of much of the northern portion of the State have long watched as billions of gallons of their fresh water have been drained to irrigated lands of questionable benefit, to the severe detriment of the areas in which the water had originated.

The plan for this drainage canal is to exacerbate these northern California problems by dumping heavily polluted waste water into that area of origin. A draft report outlining how this would be done has recently been released by the interagency drainage program, and has been the subject of intensive criticism at public hearings. I testified on this plan in Concord, Calif., last Thursday, and would like to share that testimony with my colleagues. I should point out that it would behoove Members to read this testimony, because the San Luis drain is one of those projects of questionable wisdom which I have no doubt we will be asked to appropriate several hundred million dollars to construct by special interests in the not-too-distant future.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT ON THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY INTERAGENCY DRAINAGE PROGRAM INTERIM REPORT

The concept of a master drain discharging Valley waste water into the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta is perhaps the most serious threat confronting the water quality of northern California in the near future. It is an apologia for past excesses, illegalities and indifference masquerading as a "future solution." At its very outset, the Report suggests that there are high environmental, economic and political costs associated with any of the potential solutions. As usual, northern California, and particularly the millions of residents of the Bay-Delta region, will be forced to bear the greatest burdens.

Many of my basic reservations about this report are due to some inherent assumptions upon which it is predicated. The Report assumes that we must construct a Drain to serve the entire Valley. The Report appears to assume the construction and operation of the Peripheral Canal. The Report minimizes the efficacy of water conservation, and appears to take a view of newly developed water in the Central Valley. Once again, we are confronted with high cost, high impact construction plans as the "solution" to severe environmental problems which have been created by past blunders. The policy recommended by this Report would, in my opinion, compound those past errors.

Let me also suggest that these recommendations do not reflect the mood of the federal government. After years of effort, we have secured a pledge from the Department of Interior to operate its Central Valley Project in conformity with state water quality standards for the Delta in about the same manner as the state has operated the State Water Project. In return, this Report and recent legislative proposals of the Brown Administration would, in my view, subject the Delta region to new dangers through the construction and operation of unwise projects such as the Master Drain and the Peripheral Canal.

I do not believe that there will be significant support for these proposals in Washington, and for good reasons. Less than one week ago, I had the opportunity to discuss the entire Delta and Valley issue with Secretary of the Interior Andrus, Reclamation Commissioner Higginson, Assistant Secretary Guy Martin and other departmental officials. We discussed not only this Report, but the recently negotiated repayment contract of the Westlands Water District (for which the present San Luis Drain is under partial construction) and last year's study by the San Luis Unit Task Force. On the basis of that conversation, I can state emphatically that there is at present no intention by the federal government to participate in the construction of the kind of Drain envisioned in this Report. Participation would be dependent upon the project's economic and environmental feasibility; your own report strongly suggests that it meets neither test. The Department's lack of enthusiasm, I must tell you frankly, is likely dwarfed by the degree of support in Congress for so costly a project.

I also should point out that the federal government's qualms about the drainage program are not only speculative. The recently negotiated repayment contract between the Westlands Water District and the United States provides for a termination of construction on the San Luis Drain at Kesterson Reservoir after the expenditure of $48,000,000. The amount of drainage which can be handled by this degree of construction is just 45,000 acres. Several additional conditions, including environmental safety, fiscal reasonableness, and repayment ability constrain further construction. The contract further states that compliance with these provisions—

Shall not be construed as a commitment on the part of the United States to seek such authorization or appropriation of funds unless the secretary has made an affirmative finding that in consideration of all factors, including federal budget limitations and national priorities, provision by the United

States of drainage service to the additional lands is in the national interest.

This contract, recently agreed to by the Westlands Water District and the Department of Interior, is the most recent statement of federal policy on the question of drainage programs in the Central Valley. It should also be noted that President Carter has not included new funds for construction in his FY 1980 budget.

Let me discuss briefly some of the major flaws and questions left unanswered in this Report. Foremost is the assumption that this Drain should be designed and operated to drain the entire Valley. Failure to do so, we are told, will jeopardize productivity on thousands of acres of land. But it is critical to note that not all this land is currently under irrigation. Nor have there been built drainage facilities on all of this land, or even on much of it. Your own report notes that subsurface drains have been built on just 1,500 of 300,000 acres targeted as requiring drainage, or one-half of one per cent! Within the service area, the collector drains are less than five per cent complete.

At this point, I think it is very important to note the findings of the San Luis Task Force on the matter of lands scheduled for irrigation in the Valley. Within the San Luis Unit, the Task Force found that nearly 125,000 acres which, in the words of the Definite Plan Report for the project, "Are marginal in their suitability for irrigated agriculture . . . because of highly saline, permeable soils with anticipated or present drainage problems." (See page 32 of the DPR) The Task Force concluded—

Not only does this expansion into the area requiring drainage create additional burdens on the system to remove the drainage water, but the poor quality of the soils have financial implications for farm operations in the area as well . . . although detailed data are not available, the task force suggests that these poor quality soils may also yield a poorer quality of drainage water. (Page 163).

These conclusions concerning San Luis are highly relevant, for that single project is estimated to ultimately provide one-quarter of the flow and one-half of the "pollutant loadings" of the Drain. Moreover, much of the land in the Valley which ultimately would be put into production may not be of any better quality than the marginal lands illegally added onto the San Luis Unit, which are now causing drainage problems. Lastly, these poorer quality lands which would use the Drain have limited productivity, and thus have a lower capacity to repay a portion of the Drain itself, a financial burden which will instead be passed along to utility rate customers and taxpayers.

This discussion touches on the central premise of your Report, that being the continued expansion of agricultural water service in the Central Valley, which is used as the basic justification for the construction of this Drain. You foresee doubling the amount of water currently used in the Valley, while increasing the amount of polluted water drained off that land by over 11 times between 1980 and 2080. Your figure of 667,813 acre feet of drainage annually compares with 150,000 acre feet estimated for the Drain if used by the San Luis Unit. The acreage to be drained would increase from 56,000 acres in 1980 to nearly one million acres, as compared to the 230,000 acres estimated by the Task Force for San Luis. The original feasibility study for the San Luis Unit, which was to be the primary user of the Drain, estimated 96,000 acres of drainage area.

Plans have continually changed in recent years. The State was first willing, then unwilling, and is now willing again to help construct a Drain. A facility which was to cost about $7 million now has a price tag of $185 million, and perhaps twice that amount. A small amount of drainage water has escalated into hundreds of thousands of acre feet, and a drain intended to serve one district has grown to a Valley wide channel.

Nor will the growth in problems end here. Your own report indicates that the availability of additional surface water will compound the groundwater use problem, and will encourage the irrigating of marginal, high salt, lower productivity lands "with drainage problems." (18.1) Your proposal flies in the face of fiscal and water planning reforms which stress more efficient use and conservation, since you admit that such techniques are not well suited to lands which need to be leached to purge out contaminants. Lastly, you acknowledge that by maintaining agricultural productivity on marginal lands and compounding the overdraft problem, "adverse impacts" could be suffered by the Delta and in Northern California." (16.1)

It is evident that your Report contains some provisions designed to appease Delta interests who rightly view this proposal with alarm. One of the proposed uses for the drainage water is to repel salt water intrusion from San Francisco Bay on the theory that this could be effectively achieved with drainage rather than with salt water. As an added attraction, you have noted that time releases from the yet-to-be-authorized Peripheral Canal could be used to flush out any reverse flows which brought the drainage effluent too close to the Federal pumps.

There are numerous fallacies in this concept, not the least of which is its reliance on the Peripheral Canal as a corrective device. The purpose of the Canal, in the first place, is to significantly increase diversions from the Delta, thereby contributing to the drainage and waste disposal problem. Operation of the Canal for water quality purposes, when irrigation is heavy and normal outflow is light, is a dubious promise, given the fact that Valley farmers would also seek any water in the canal for irrigation purposes.

Your recommendation further minimizes the complexities associated with this proposal. You do not seem to have followed the recommendation of the report from the Environmental Impact Planning Corporation which assessed for you various issues relating to Valley agriculture:

The IDP should acknowledge that the discharge of drain water to the Delta does not provide a good rationale for subtracting an equivalent volume of fresh water from delta outflow requirements. (San Luis Report, 172).

It should be noted that even at the highest projected level of drainage discharges, current plans would remove from the Delta far more via the Peripheral Canal than would be substituted in the form of polluted drainage waters.

In your own Report, you note that salinity repulsion would be "significant" only under highly selected criteria such as those which occurred in 1976 and 1977. These "favorable conditions," as you refer to them, were the worst drought years since the projects have been in operation, and it is not difficult to imagine why dumping just about anything into the Delta during those years might have improved the situation. Such conditions occur perhaps once every 40 years, and it is therefore unrealistic to base planning on this standard. Moreover, you note that under "less favorable (i.e., less catastrophic) conditions," the salinity decreases due to the drain would "probably be more than outweighed by salinity increases." (8.5) The benefits to the Delta of this Drain proposal are therefore non-existent, and attempts to portray it otherwise are merely rationalizations for policies which have nothing whatever to do with Delta protection or the needs of northern California.

Given these serious concerns, I must conclude that you have not made a sufficient case for the Drain to justify the expenditure of funds and the endangering of future water quality for northern California. The net result would be to place the Delta and Bay areas again at the mercy of interests which have long shown little if any serious concern for the industrial, municipal, agricultural, recreational and environmental needs of millions of Californians. I believe that the solution must better reflect the interests and needs of all Californians than does the course of action which you have recommended.●

MEDICARE REIMBURSEMENT OF TEACHING PHYSICIANS

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, during the 95th Congress I introduced legislation to repeal section 22 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972 (Public Law 92–63), on behalf of myself and 40 cosponsors. We took this step at that time, because of our grave concern that the implementation of section 227 through regulations proposed by HEW's Health Care Financing Administration would have meant dedicated physicians who are responsible for training the next generation of doctors would receive less than fair compensation for their services. Although final action was not taken by the 95th Congress on this issue, the desire to seek an equitable solution to the problems surrounding reimbursement of teaching physicians remains.

Section 227 was included in Public Law 92–603 as a result of a GAO study conducted in the late 1960's which reviewed medicare payments to physicians in six major teaching hospitals. The study found that in certain cases medicare was being billed for physician services on behalf of doctors who had not themselves provided services to patients; instead the physicians had only supervised the work of interns and residents. It should be kept in mind that billing medicare on behalf of these "public patients" (patients whose care is provided by the house staff) constitutes double billing for the same service, since medicare already provides reimbursement for the costs of house staff salaries. While the hospitals GAO studied represented all geographic sections of the Nation, five of the six were large, urban municipal hospitals and as such were not a proper sample of the more than 1,200 non-Federal teaching hospitals in this country. Nevertheless, the findings from that limited study were used in drafting section 227 to apply to all 1,200 teaching hospitals.

Section 227, when added to the law in 1972 was intended to deal with the problem of double billing. The section was supposed to insure that all payment for physican services for public patients in a teaching hospital would be determined based upon the reasonable cost of providing those services by house staff under the supervision of the teaching physicians. In the legislative committee reports associated with section 227, Con-

gress made clear, however, that fee-for-service payment was to remain available for private patients.

The problem which arose first in implementing these directives was how to determine which patients were public patients, being cared for by the house staff, and which were private patients, receiving the bulk of their care from their personal physicians (in this case, a teaching physician).

It should be kept in mind that house staff may assist in the care of private patients while under the direct personal supervision of a private physician. In other words, the distinction between private patients and public patients is a matter of degree, and distinguishing between the two categories is frequently difficult.

Medicare officials have expended a great deal of effort and time in attempting to prepare regulations for carrying out section 227. The delay has been caused largely by the inherent difficulty in distinguishing between public and private patients. In 1973 Congress deferred implementation for 6 years and a similar deferral bill was passed in 1977. Last year, 6 years after enactment, HEW proposed regulations that failed to accomplish what Congress mandated and instead presented difficulties which ultimately would have crippled these institutions.

Because of the outpouring of criticism of those proposed regulations, HEW Secretary Califano announced late in 1978 that HEW would accept an additional delay in the implementation of section 227 so that the Department and the medical education community could study the implementation of the law and, if necessary, recommend changes in the law to the Congress. Since that time representatives of teaching hospitals have met with officials of the Health Care Financing Administration, and have reported to me that it is their strong belief that the Department is sincere in its desire to seek an equitable solution to the problems surrounding reimbursement of teaching physicians.

Because of the willingness of HEW and the medical education community to seek a negotiated solution to the problems surrounding reimbursement of teaching physicians, I am today introducing legislation to provide for the necessary delay in the implementation of section 227. I am hopeful that this extra time will be used productively to insure that an equitable resolution of this problem is found, and that the critical interests of medical education are met fully by this process. I would ask that my colleagues join me in seeking speedy enactment of this legislation.

A draft of the bill I am introducing follows:

H.R. —

A bill to extend through October 1, 1979, provisions which expired on October 1, 1978, relating to payment under the Social Security Act for services of physicians rendered in a teaching hospital

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 15(d) of Public Law 93-233 (as amended by section 7(c) of Public Law 93-368, the first section of Public Law 94-368, and section 7 of Public Law 95-292) is amended by striking out "October 1, 1978" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1979".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall be effective from October 1, 1978, except that nothing in this Act shall be deemed to render improper any determination of payment under title XVIII of the Social Security Act made prior to the date of the enactment of this Act for any service provided during a cost accounting period which began on or after October 1, 1978.

NATIONAL YOUTH SERVICE ACT

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, increasingly over the past several years we have seen evidence that the All-Volunteer Force concept is not working. Reserve force levels in particular are deteriorating rapidly, and it is clear that in the event of a major war, the Selective Service System could not be reactivated quickly enough to deliver the additional 650,000 personnel required.

In December, for the first time, the Air Force was unable to meet its enlistment quotas with reasonably qualified applicants, a problem which has plagued the Army and Marine Corps for some time. For the last quarter of 1978, the percentage of qualified recruits for all of the four armed services dropped below established goals. The Air Force met only 95 percent of their quota, the Army 93 percent, the Marines 86 percent, and the Navy 85 percent.

The Army has just asked for standby reinstitution of the Selective Service System, and a recent GAO report recommends this action as well.

These problems threaten our constitutional responsibility for the national defense. We are sorely in need of a system of military recruitment that can provide essential manpower. At the same time, we are failing to utilize a vast reservoir of the Nation's youth to meet social, economic, and environmental needs.

Today a number of us are introducing the National Youth Service Act, a bill designed to join the abilities and idealism of our young people with our need for combat-ready Armed Forces and the fulfillment of a number of other goals of the Federal, State, and local governments. This bill does not require universal conscription or military service, and hopefully it might serve to remove the need for any conscription.

The national service concept is not new. Mentioned by Prof. William James at Stanford University in 1906 as "the moral equivalent of war," the legislation was originally conceived by Don Eberly in 1966, shaped by the nonprofit national service secretariat and first introduced in the House by our colleague JONATHAN BINGHAM in 1970.

Both Senator SAM NUNN and Representative RICHARD WHITE, chairmen of the Senate and House Armed Services Manpower Subcommittee have agreed to hold hearings on the bill early this spring.

It is our feeling that today's youth are not opposed to national service; they may well oppose the use of conscription to support undeclared wars such as Vietnam, but the young idealists who opposed Vietnam in 1969 were the same type of individuals who volunteered to serve in the Canadian Armed Forces in 1939, before the United States entered the war against Germany.

Duty, honor, country, and a sense of obligation to serve the Nation and mankind are very much a part of the ethic of today's youth.

That sense of obligation can hopefully be implemented under the basic provisions of our proposed bills. The basic elements of the plan are as follows:

1. The Selective Service System will be replaced by the National Service System and all persons, men *and* women, will be required to register within 10 days after their 17th birthday.

2. Information on service opportunities will be made available to all persons between their 17th and 18th birthdays.

3. All registrants will have the option of serving in a civilian capacity for one year or in the military service for two years or more, and will be allowed to defer such service until the age of 23.

4. At the age of 18, persons will have the right to elect:

(a) Two years of military service, which will entitle them to four years of educational and training benefits paid at the base monthly rate provided to Viet Nam-era veterans (those enlisting prior to January 1, 1977: 38 U.S.C. 1651), but adjusted to account for cost-of-living increases since that time;

(b) Six months of active duty, followed by five and one-half years of Reserve obligation;

(c) One year of service in a civilian capacity; or

(d) None of the above, in which case they will be placed in a military lottery pool for six years of draft liability. If military manpower requirements are not filled during this period, these individuals might be required to serve two years of active duty and would also incur a four-year Reserve obligation. They would be entitled to two years of educational and training benefits.

5. If voluntary enlistments are not adequate, then and then only would one be subject to possible conscription.

6. The Civilian Services Corps will be operated by a National Youth Service Foundation as outlined below:

(a) A National Youth Service Foundation will be established by law. This will be a quasi-public organization and will receive appropriations from Congress.

(b) The Foundation will be operated by a 19-member Board of Trustees with 12 of its members to be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the following persons to serve as ex-officio members: the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the Administrator of the Office of Youth Development, the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment and Training, the Director of ACTION, the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, the Director of the National Youth Service Foundation, who will also be appointed by the President.

(c) An Advisory Council will be created to advise the Board of Trustees on broad policy matters. It will have 24 members with at least eight under 27 years of age at the time of appointment.

(d) Present federal programs providing opportunities for youth service will remain in effect. These include the Peace Corps, VISTA,

Teacher Corps, College Work Study Program, Job Corps, and the various youth programs funded by CETA.

(e) The Foundation will invite units of state, regional, and local governments to submit applications, outlining plans for the employment of individuals in National Youth Service activities within specified guidelines. The Foundation will support such applications on the basis of merit.

(f) The Civilian Service Corps will have two major options: community service and environmental service. Community service applicants will interview for a wide range of local community service projects sponsored by public agencies or private non-profit organizations. Those who wish to travel in search of community service projects will do so at their own expense and will register with the local National Service System agency, and no special provisions will be made for them.

(g) Most sponsors of the environmental service option will be federal, state or local agencies. Most environmental projects will require travel costs as well as expenditures for supplies and equipment. Such costs will be the responsibility of the sponsor, not of the Foundation. When lodging and food are provided by the sponsor, it will be entitled to reimbursement by the grantee from whose jurisdiction the participant was recruited.

(h) Military pay for junior enlisted personnel (those with less than two years of service) will be reduced to a subsistence level.

(i) The Civilian Service Program will ideally be phased in gradually over a three-year period.

Present cosponsors of the bill are DAVE BONIOR, Democrat of Michigan; PAUL SIMON, Democrat of Illinois; TRENT LOTT, Republican of Mississippi; JONATHAN BINGHAM, Democrat of New York; MILLICENT FENWICK, Republican of New Jersey; PAT SCHROEDER, Democrat of Colorado; CHARLES WILSON, Democrat of Texas; JOSEPH ADDABBO, Democrat of New York; TONY COELHO, Democrat of California; and ROBIN BEARD, Republican of Tennessee. We are hopeful that we will be joined by a majority of our colleagues when they have had the opportunity to study this concept.●

IF TENG LEVELS WITH SCHLESINGER

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that Vice Premier Teng Hsiao-ping has returned home, the news headlines are devoted to the developments in Iran and the impending energy shortages. I wish to insert an editorial which appeared in the January 31 Chicago Tribune which I believe is still very pertinent. I hope that it will receive the attention of Secretary Schlesinger and company:

IF TENG LEVELS WITH SCHLESINGER

On learning that Energy Secretary James Schlesinger is helping to show Vice Premier Teng around, we imagined the following exchange:

Mr. Teng: Call me a capitalist roader, but I think your free-market economy does one bang-up job.

Mr. Schlesinger: Yes, we're quite proud of it—except for energy. Can't seem to produce enough. Everywhere it makes problems. Take the Mexicans. They got angry when I told Congress we shouldn't buy their natural gas. They want $3 for a thousand cubic feet, which is highway robbery. Canada charges us only $2. If we let the Mexicans in our market at $3, won't the Canadians want $3, too?

Mr. Teng: What do I know about markets? But if you ask me, letting Mexican as well as Canadian gas in will drive up the supply. So won't Canada and Mexico end up bidding their own prices down toward your domestic level?

Mr. Schlesinger: Can't happen. Already Canada charges more than we let our own domestic natural gas producers make. We won't let them get the world market price until 1985—and then only maybe.

Mr. Teng: You mean you don't permit free markets for your own natural gas producers? And you also tell your own private-sector suppliers how much they can pay for imported natural gas?

Mr. Schlesinger: Sure. Otherwise American consumers would have to pay more. And American gas producers would make bigger profits—obscene profits, as my President says.

Mr. Teng: Yes, I've heard the phrase before, from my late Chairman. But if your consumers pay more, they would use less—and you wouldn't have to import so much gas. And if your producers could get the world—you'll excuse the expression—market price, they'd have more profits to invest in finding and producing more gas. And if you didn't have periodic shortages, your prices wouldn't rise so fast.

Mr. Schlesinger: Really?

Mr. Teng: For sure. And meantime if you stop telling your—again, you'll pardon the expression—private sector how much it can pay foreigners for natural gas, you won't make your neighbors like Mexico and Canada angry. They'll compete to sell at what your market demand brings—and if Mexico prices itself out of your market, it won't be able to blame your government.

Mr. Schlesinger: Very interesting—but we can't do it. At least not right away.

Mr. Teng: Why not?

Mr. Schlesinger: Because for years we've been telling the American people that government control is good and necessary and that they should hate and fear free markets in energy. How would we look if suddenly we said we were all wrong? Besides, if you're so crazy over free markets, how come you don't have any?

Mr. Teng: Because for years we've been telling the Chinese people that government control of everything is good and necessary and that they should hate and fear free markets in anything.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, a month ago the 50th anniversary of the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., took place. The passing of time ordinarily has a way of tarnishing the memory of even the greatest of leaders. Such has not been the case with Dr. King. In the history of the American Nation he is one of the few leaders for whom affection, respect, and admiration have grown with the passage of time.

DR. KING'S LEGACY

Martin Luther King's stature rests upon many qualities: a steadiness of character and self-discipline; single-minded commitment to assisting the disadvantaged and the oppressed; his dream of a future when human beings would work together for the common justice of all; his unforgettable and inspiring speech; and his unshakable faith in the basic goodness of human beings. He was a deeply religious man, the son and grandson of two prominent ministers at whose church he too became a minister. A precocious student in Atlanta's public schools and lifelong student of theology at Morehouse College, the University of Pennsylvania, and Harvard University, he completed his formal education as a Doctor of Philosophy at Boston University. He was also, needless to say, an exceptional political leader, whose moral force was harnessed to a practical politics, in the Birmingham movement of 1963 to end legal segregation, which culminated in the 1964 Civil Rights Act; the Selma movement, which resulted in the 1965 Voting Rights Act; and in numerous crusades of conscience in Montgomery and elsewhere to end segregation in public places, overcome housing discrimination, and win a better life for the poor. In 1964 he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, only the third black person, 12th American, and the youngest person ever to achieve it.

The combination of a few of these qualities would entitle an individual to a large measure of respect. Yet his greatness exceeded their sum-total. The quality that above the rest touched the hearts of an entire world was his sense of hope, and his courage to act on that hope, whatever the obstacles. In this he reached out to hundreds of millions of people, whose lives were filled, instead, with apathy and despair. "This is our hope," he spoke on the steps of Lincoln Memorial in 1963,

This is the faith that I go back to the South with. With this faith we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope (and) transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood.

VIETNAM AND GOING BEYOND BEING A BLACK SPOKESMAN

In the last years of his life, Martin Luther King, Jr., spoke out increasingly against the Vietnam war. Many, including some close supporters, questioned his judgment in addressing the most controversial issue of the day, which seemed so far removed from the struggles for civil rights and justice at home. They thought he should leave international issues to the so-called "best and the brightest" in Washington. "Over the past 2 years, as I have moved to break the betrayal of my own silences, as I have called for radical departures from the destruction in Vietnam," Dr. King said:

Many persons have questioned me about the wisdom of my path . . . Peace and Civil Rights don't mix, they say . . . I am greatly saddened, for such questions mean that the inquirers have not really known me, my commitment or my calling.

Martin Luther King was an opponent of the Vietnam war because of its terrible

cost in human lives, because it threatened to destroy the world through great-power nuclear war, and because it also destroyed the promise of the great society and "war against poverty" which had been held out to the poor and the disadvantaged. Is it foolish to suggest that as Dr. King moved toward a fundamental analysis of the relationship between injustice at home and militarism overseas, he became an even more potent threat to the establishment than he was earlier? Through this analysis he not only challenged the basic assumptions of the highest leadership in the Nation, but he also succeeded in breaking through race divisions and reaching the hearts of all Americans.

A few months before his assassination, Dr. King stated:

> I am still convinced that the struggle for peace and the struggle for civil rights as we call it in America happened to be tied together . . . These two issues are tied inextricably together and I feel that the people who are working for civil rights are working for peace; I feel that the people working for peace are working for civil rights and justice.

CIVIL RIGHTS, JUSTICE, AND PEACE

Martin Luther King's view of the connection between justice and peace is as relevant today as it was in the 1960's. Civil rights and legal justice embraces full employment and economic justice; and peace means, of course, an end to the arms race, the frantic military buildup, and the spiraling military budget.

"National security" has been the most expensive and least examined concept in American history. More than $2 trillion has been spent on weaponry and defense since 1946. In the name of "national security" all manner of official illegality and deception has taken place. "I am very sad to say it: we live in a Nation that is the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today," Dr. King said in February 1968.

> Any nation that spends almost $80 billion of its annual budget for defense and hands out a pittance here and there for social uplift is moving toward its own spiritual doom. . . It is no longer a choice between violence and non-violence. It is either non-violence or non-existence, and the alternative to disarmament . . . will be a civilization plunged into the abyss of annihilation.

The military buildup continues unabated today; for fiscal year 1980 the administration has requested $125.8 billion for defense, up 10 percent over last year, the second consecutive year in a row of increases at that level. Why such increases when we are not at war abroad and already have enough killing power in our missiles to destroy the world many times over? Why such increases at a time when the Department of Defense will have by September 1980 a surplus of $99 billion, DOD funds that have either been contracted for, but not spent, or else not even yet contracted for? What is the weaponry for, anyway? It clearly is of no use to people since you cannot eat, or obtain health care, or find shelter through weapons. It is not even of use in fighting wars or controlling events in the Third World, as the examples of Vietnam and more recently Iran dramatically demonstrate. Certainly, the strategic nuclear weapons, especially, are not to be used for great-power confrontations, which would spell the end of the world. Then what are they to be used for, except to feed on some madcap notion of security, or illusory notion of national insurance against adversaries, or, of course, to protect the status and livelihood of defense contractors and generals.

Three statistics illustrate that the same misguided priorities exist today as existed in Martin Luther King's day. While the administration has called for a 10-percent increase in defense spending, its fiscal year 1980 budget also requests a 14-percent decrease in budget authority for CETA public service jobs (a cut of $1.5 billion for a request of $9.2 billion). Incidentally, this year roughly $4.5 billion will be spent on new prison construction, one half of what is spent on the only major Federal employment and training program in the country. Why are these public job reductions taking place at a time when joblessness in minority communities remains at an all-time high and when the overall official unemployment rate hovers at 6 percent, nearly twice the rate in Dr. King's day?

The third statistic casts an even more dramatic light on our lopsided national priorities. America's prison population is increasing each year by roughly 10 percent, and already we have the largest prison population per capita in the industrialized world, with the possible exception of South Africa. Is it merely a matter of chance that criminal behavior rises as economic opportunity measured by jobs and income drops? Is it a matter of coincidence that our prisons are filled with a vastly disproportionate number of black and brown Americans, whose opportunities for employment are the most restricted in society? Is the close parallel in the rise in defense spending and in the rise in the prison population (and expenditures for crime control activities in general) without any meaning? "We would think about the fact today," Dr. King said in February 1968—

> That our government spends about $500,000 to kill every Vietcong soldier while we spend at the same time about $53 a year per person for everybody that is characterized as poverty stricken in the so-called war against poverty . . . I would like to say that there is a restlessness in the land because the land doesn't seem to have a sense of purpose, a proper sense of policy, and a proper sense of priority.

Dr. King was well aware that, historically, spending on "national security" meant a turning away from addressing human and social concerns at home. In his recent budget message to Congress, the President stated that his first commitment was to the Nation's defense and that as a result of his meeting with NATO leaders in May 1977, he committed the Nation to a 10 percent increase in the defense budget in 1980. Why should a pledge to European leaders take precedence over the oath in taking office to "promote the general welfare" and "establish justice"?

DR. KING, CIVIL RIGHTS, AND ECONOMIC JUSTICE

Martin Luther King, Jr. refused to allow others to define the issues and the struggles that he engaged in. He refused to be typecast as a civil rights leader who had no business to question the government on foreign policy. Similarly, he refused to permit others to define the nature of the civil rights struggle as only involving legal issues, and the legal life of black Americans only. As he pointed out increasingly toward the end of his life, the struggle for civil rights was inevitably being transformed into a struggle for full employment and economic justice, and an end to militarism as well, without which justice could not arise. Just as the civil rights revolution that he led was not only a black struggle, but a struggle for human dignity and freedom for all people, today the struggle for economic justice (and to fully implement the goals of the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment Act as its major vehicle) is not for a single group, but for all Americans.

The social and economic reality today is not very different from what it was during Dr. King's time. The incomes and economic opportunities of the working and middle classes are no better, and in many cases are worse, than they were in the late 1960's. Real income has not changed in the past decade. On the other hand, the extent of middle-class debt poverty has increased considerably. For low-income Americans the economic picture today is absolutely bleak. If the official poverty line currently pegged at the grossly unrealistic level of under $6,500 for an urban family of 4 is brought up to the more realistic level of $12,000 annually, there exist in the country an estimated 70 million individuals (nearly one-third of the population) who are living in or on the edge of poverty.

Among black Americans, as one example, a comparison between 1968 and 1978 shows that:

> The average jobless rate for blacks has nearly doubled from 6.7% to 12.3%;
>
> The jobless rate for black teenagers is at least 12% higher than 10 years ago (37%), and as bad as it was 4 years ago at the height of the '75 recession;
>
> The average black income today is 57% of white income, roughly at the same level as a decade ago and 5% less than the average black income during the 1975 recession; and
>
> The proportion of black families living in poverty has grown to 28% (1.637 million families), whereas in 1968 it was 29.4%.

What has been the Government's response to the frozen economic situation of the American people during the past decade and, for some groups, a worsened condition? Its response, unfortunately, has been indifference or else one of calling on the most vulnerable groups to assume the largest share of the economic burden. At a time when real income is eroding, unemployment levels remain critically high, and a growing number of families have become impoverished, the administration has called for substantial cuts in Federal programs, which, historically, have been the major instrument since the New Deal of improving the lives of the disadvantaged. In the past 2 years alone, there has been a reduction of roughly $25 billion in Federal spending as a proportion of the gross national product. The 1980 budget calls for:

A cut of more than 300,000 jobs in public service employment from the 1978 level;

A cut of over 300,000 summer youth jobs next year from this year's level;

A 12.5% drop in housing assistance for low-income persons which it is estimated translates into a cut in about 60,000 subsidized housing units;

Cuts of $500 million from child nutrition programs;

Cuts in disability insurance and other benefits under Social Security, amounting to about $600 million; and

A rise in Social Security payroll taxes, which in the absence of genuine tax reform, leaves working and middle class families with less disposable income.

"We have developed an underclass in this nation," Dr. King said in 1968, "and unless this underclass is made a working class, we are going to continue to have problems. The bitterness is very deep as a result of these problems."

His warning of 10 years ago that we are on the path toward "spiritual doom" so long as we attach higher priority to military security than to human needs rings as true today as in his day. America's military build-up and growing preoccupation with military security once again is destroying the few hopeful efforts at social and economic improvement today, as the Vietnam war made a mockery of the "great society" in Dr. King's day. His fundamental insight of the link between peace, jobs, and justice challenges Government and citizens today as much, if not more, as it did a decade ago.

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.'S VISION OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

The administration's economic policies, especially the effort against inflation, reflect the same flawed assumptions that operated during the Nixon and Ford era: Namely, economic growth, full employment, and an equitable distribution of income are seen as the major causes of inflation, and any movement toward these goals as aggravating economic distress. The President's remedy is cutbacks and contraction. If these policies continue to operate, surely we as a Nation will reap an increasing harvest of public bitterness, despair, and antagonism. The gains that have been made in affirmative action and equal opportunity will erode (Bakke and Weber are only the initial signs), as competition for the remaining pieces of a shrinking economic pie intensifies.

This Nation has the resources with which to create full employment; it is lacking the determination and the leadership to accomplish it. The Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act is the law of the land, the vehicle for bringing us closer to a just society. Toward the end of his life, Martin Luther King, Jr. posed the central question, if peace and justice can only come with a willingness to change, will that change be nonviolent? He tried to answer that question:

We must forever conduct our struggle on the high place of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protests to degenerate into physical violence . . . many of our white brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny. They have come to realize that their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom. We cannot walk alone. We cannot turn back . . . No, no, we are not satisfied, and we will not be satisfied until justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream. (*At the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, August 28, 1963.*) ●

A CLOSE WATCH ON FEDERAL ACTIVITY

HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have been elected chairman of the newly created Subcommittee on Human Resources of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The subcommittee's jurisdiction will include the oversight of personnel staffing policies, ethics, and the practice of the Federal Government contracting out to private industry.

I believe that by closely monitoring the activities of Federal agencies, we can succeed not only in reducing the massive growth of Government, but in decreasing the deficit in the Federal budget as well.

I would like to share with my colleagues the Federal Diary column by Mike Causey, which was published in the Washington Post on February 5; and an article by Bun Bray, Executive Director of the National Association of Supervisors of the Federal Government, which was published in the Federal Times on January 9. These articles clearly illustrate the urgent attention that these issues deserve by the Subcommittee on Human Resources:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 5, 1979]

THE OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS

(By Mike Causey)

Is a small, growing army of well-connected consultants taking control of some government goliath agencies? Is it possible that thousands of outside experts and think-tank inhabitants have more power and influence than 2.8 million professional bureaucrats?

Does an outfit like the federal government, which pays salaries of $4.3 billion a month and hires 153,000 people each year need any outside help? If it does, is government getting the right sort of help and advice, or is it hearing what the people and firms it tries to regulate want to hear? Some people wonder.

Suppose the Department of Energy hired an outside consulting firm for $500 thousand (peanuts at the DOE) to advise it on holding down rates charged the public by gas and electric utilities?

And suppose you heard that the head of the firm DOE hired was also the largest stockholder in a major utility, a utility that just asked for a 25 percent rate increase?

And suppose nearly 50 of the consulting firm's top brass were ex-officials (and current stockholders) in various utilities?

And suppose the firm DOE was paying half a million dollars too, for advice, gets 20 times that much money each year from various utilities, for similar consulting work?

At some point, you might wonder just what sort of "impartial" expert advice on utility rate regulation DOE would be purchasing with its—rather, with your—half a million bucks. If true, it does make for some head-scratching.

Rep. Herbert Harris (D-Va.) has heard that horror story. In the months ahead he will be hearing a lot more. Harris is the new chairman of the Human Resources Subcommittee. Despite that rather vague, unsexy title, the unit of the Post Office-Civil Service Committee has a mandate, money and time to look into contracting out by government agencies, and the use of outside consultants. Harris plans to make that sort of oversight one of the main thrusts of his new assignment.

Representing, as he does, about one-eighth of the total federal work force, Harris is concerned about outside contractors replacing legitimate government workers. As agencies cut personnel (but not dollar) ceilings, more and more are contracting out to get work done.

More federal agencies are hiring outsiders to do cleanup, security and "thinking" chores all the time. Despite denials from the White House, the Carter administration appears on the verge of expanding rules and allowing agencies to contract out more work while the federal work force is cut.

Harris doesn't know how many consultants and outside experts the government has. But that doesn't make him either a dummy, or unfit to chair the contracting-out oversight committee. Jimmy Carter doesn't know, either. Nor does Tip O'Neill, nor Barry Goldwater, nor Ralph Nader.

Nobody knows for sure how many people the government hires for daily, weekly or monthly chores because it cannot find somebody in its 2.8 million member work force that can do the job.

Harris may not know this time next year, either. But he hopes to get a handle on the numbers, and reasons for consultants. And their price tag.

He also is especially interested in the Department of Energy, a mammoth bureaucracy that is getting more mammoth all the time. Harris says he will look into DOE's consulting operations to find out if it is using the same people who consult for the oil companies who keep coming up with reams of material to show why the price of gas keeps going up.

Movie Review: Federal executives, supervisors and other ranks are being shown special movies—along with briefings—about the new civil service reform law. This is what the AFGE union reviewer wrote after viewing the presentation at the Labor Department:

"The session for nonsupervisory workers consisted of a 30-minute videotape featuring Carter's teeth and a dog and pony show with Civil Service Commission Chairman Alan Campbell and several complaint agency personnel heads . . ." Maybe the book was better.

[From the Federal Times, Jan. 8, 1979]

INCONSISTENCIES IN MANPOWER MANAGEMENT

(By Bun B. Bray, Jr.)

We all realize that tens of thousands of federal employees, certainly including supervisors and managers, are frustrated, disturbed, and dismayed by several current manpower policies and actions as well as proposed changes in the federal government's manpower programs. There are many reasons for this feeling and not the least are the many obvious inconsistencies currently noted in the administration of the manpower function, including civil service matters, in the federal government.

What are some of these inconsistencies?

Personnel hiring freezes.

Personnel ceilings.

Model employer versus cheapest contractor.

Inadequate control of supply and demand—civilian personnel.

Military personnel in civilian-type jobs.

Quota versus merit system.

Management decisions and high pay.

Numbers game.

Moves to improve employee productivity.

Let's review each of these and thereby note reasons for the frustration.

Personnel hiring freezes—With much fanfare, President Carter recently announced a personnel freeze in the federal government. This freeze had to be politically motivated since the same approach has been tried dozens of times in the past—by both Democratic and Republican presidents—and without any long range advantage to the efficiency or economy of the government.

One high-level manpower expert made the following comment when this latest personnel freeze was announced:

"A personnel freeze by management is an admission that they have failed to manage by a system which management itself had established."

Specific cases of increased managerial costs and of decreased services to the American people are legion from the recent Carter freeze. They have come from many different departments and agencies.

Thus we predict the politically motivated manpower freeze will melt by mid January 1979.

Personnel ceilings—At any given time any agency, the Civil Service Commission (or its replacement, the Office of Personnel Management) and the Office of Management and Budget can give the exact number of people directly employed, repeat directly employed, by the federal government.

But there is no one in the government, from the White House down, who has specific data on man days bought by the government from contractors. For years the Defense Department has attempted to get man days purchased from contractors.

We have within the government varying degrees of personnel ceilings. Congress sets ceilings for the Defense Department, based on elaborate committee hearings. But we have other large departments with little or no ceilings restraints.

On top of that, OMB takes the congressional ceiling and sets its own figures. We call this bureaucratic versus democratic government. Through the legislative process, Congress decides the manpower needs, and in turn a group in OMB, far removed from the electorate, makes its own pontifical decisions as to personnel requirements.

For many years now, many of us who follow the ceiling control process have felt the OMB restraints were cleverly devised to throw more work to government contractors. There is just no doubt that the biggest reason contractors are used is due to personnel ceilings.

The personnel ceilings used by the federal government merely fool the U.S. taxpayer. He thinks his government is using less manpower when actually his government is paying much more for the total labor requirements, direct hire and contractor personnel.

Model employer versus contractor—The personnel ceiling requires government management to go out on contract for labor. Thus we find the government in the paradoxical situation of giving up the role of model employer—with appropriate training, compensation, hours of work, upward mobility, retirement, insurance, etc.—for the lowest contractor bid to furnish labor. Of course, many contractors can and do equal the federal government's model employer role. But to get the job of furnishing labor the majority of the profit-motive companies bid as low as possible, they pay the minimum wages, hold fringe benefits to a minimum, and leave training up to the government.

There are many places in your government today where civil service people, well trained and qualified, are being rifed to be replaced at the same work benches with lower paid, less qualified people furnished by flesh merchants.

Then we wonder about Civil Service employee morale!

Inadequate control of supply and demand—It is almost impossible to believe that in this computer age the free world's largest and most sophisticated employer has no central control point on supply and demand of personnel.

We have seen over the years many instances where one agency will have recruiting teams spread across the country looking for people with certain specific skills and another agency in the same geographic area laying off civil service employees with many of those same skills.

For years the Defense Department has operated a central clearing point on supply and demand within its department. But do you think the civilian agencies joined and/or worked with the DOD program You are jolly well right: They did not.

Now with the Civil Service Reform Act and more power delegated to the agencies, you can assuredly expect even less coordination of supply and demand of our government employees.

Military in civilian-type jobs—We have often visited an Army or Navy military base and noted no more than three or four military personnel in a major functional organization such as transportation, supply, fire department, base maintenance. A visit to an Air Force base would be most revealing in contrast.

The Air Force will have from 40 percent to 60 percent military, including both officers and enlisted men, working side-by-side with civil service personnel. And very often, the first-level supervisor of a work group, which could be an all-civilian group, will be an enlisted man.

The question has been asked of top managers in the Pentagon many times for this difference in staffing between the military departments. And we have received many different answers. None are fully responsive.

The typical federal civilian employee has nothing against his military friend. It is just the fact that military manpower, all costs considered, is more expensive than civilian personnel. And many taxpayers wonder why we must recruit military personnel to lay brick or to package goods.

Quota vs. Merit System—Recently a civilian personnel officer in a federal agency said "the Federal government is actually not a fair employment agency. It is a discriminating agency hiring certain types of people to look good."

In fact this civil service employee of over 30 years in the government went on to add the federal government was more interested in meeting quotas than in hiring the best qualified people. From this, one begins to wonder how many high-level management officials in the U.S. government truly believe in many of the personnel actions that are being popularized and forced to carry out.

Frequently we hear of a "goal to have a designated percent of employees of a specific race or ethnic origin or sex in a specific category of jobs."

So, what is a goal and what is a quota?

A goal, says a CSC official, is when an agency indicates that by the end of a certain date a specific number of jobs hopefully will be filled by specified types of people.

A quota, says the same CSC official, is when an agency determines that at the end of a certain time period there will be a designated number of employees of a particular race, religion or sex in a specific category of jobs.

A long standing and irritating problem arises from the confusion of the two terms "quota" and "goal." Ambitious and eager personnel types often confuse the terms. They are thinking of their top managers and the publicity.

There are today many popular programs tailored to emphasize certain segments of our work force. They are called affirmative action, upward mobility, and NOW.

No one questions equal consideration for qualified applicants for civil service jobs regardless of race, religion, color, sex, age or national origin. But when selections are made of only those qualified applicants who are of a particular sex or skin pigment then one begins to wonder if there are any differences between such selective processes and the selection of only those qualified applicants of a particular political membership or religious faith.

In light of the Carter administration promises to various minority groups, civil service commissioners, led by vice chairman Jule Sugarman, in November, 1977 proposed a plan to expedite the placing of more specific groups of employees in the federal government. This plan became well known as the "Sugarman Plan."

Under the Sugarman Plan CSC would allow departments and agencies to use different and lower entry standards to hire minorities, women and handicapped people.

Public hearings on the proposal brought a flood of cabinet-level sponsors of the plan and a few brave souls who disapproved.

Maybe for several reasons, the Sugarman Plan, also known officially as the Special Emphasis Program, has been on the "back burner." The reason could be the zeal of getting the Civil Service Reform Act passed and/or the fear that the Sugarman Plan might alienate too many members of Congress.

Then, too, there was the impact of Rep. George Mahon, House Appropriations Committee chairman, who in early 1978, spoke out in reference to a quota system of hiring:

"I believe that civil service jobs should be awarded on the basis of merit. Without merit then no targets in any form have a proper place in hiring of governmental personnel."

The House Appropriations Committee in its report for the Department of Defense Appropriations Bill, 1979, i.e. Report No. 95-1398, made the categorical statement that "the Special Emphasis Program or any other new program of a similar nature without adequate non-discrimination and merit safeguards not be implemented or tested within the Department of Defense."

We continue to need qualified people in the government. We need improved employee morale. The hiring of more people, regardless of merit, to meet quotas tends not only to lower quality but also most certainly destroys the morale of employees who were hired and/or promoted through the merit system.

Responsible government managers know that you can not have both the merit system and the quota system. But too many of these same managers are quite willing to continue to play the cute cat and mouse game of politics in the use of our human resources.

Management decisions and high pay grades—Numerous studies have been and/or are being made to suggest that large numbers of federal employees are overgraded, overpaid. In fact, in 1958 the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee issued a report showing terrific inflation in the grade structure of white collar employees in the federal government. The House report recommended an aggressive control of pay grades by the Civil Service Commission.

Twenty years later things are worse than they were then in 1958. Why?

Many reasons have been advocated, some not nearly so controllable as one, namely "management decisions." By that term we mean the approval of top managers to raise the grades of air controllers, or firefighters, or hard-to-find scientists. And too many bosses placate and please for their own personal advancement.

Numbers game—Several years ago, Rep.

Jim Davis of Georgia, chairman of the House Manpower Subcommittee, made the succinct observation that thousands of wage board supervisors had no incentive to improve production. If they did, then they cut their own pay.

The reason for this situation arises from the fact that the pay of a wage board supervisor is based on the number of employees working for the supervisor. Thus a WS-11 supervisor with 80 employees institutes a new operating procedure and eliminates 10 employees and also increases the amount of work accomplished. But by cutting his work force from 80 to 70 employees, the supervisor also reduced his own pay grade to WS-10.

Hard to believe, but this CSC policy is still with us.

Increasing productivity—The big thrust of 1979, so we hear in Washington, will be to increase productivity. This will be a major gain for the American people and undoubtedly a way to put brakes on spiraling inflation.

We consider employee desire, willingness, to be a major factor in the improvement of productivity in the government. And due to this factor, the administration faces the uphill task of reselling our 2.8 million federal employees on the idea that they are appreciated, that they have ability, and that they are effective and efficient.

We say "re-sell" simply because a large segment of our federal work force has resented the negative picture painted during 1978 by many top managers in the Executive Branch and echoed by members of Congress.

You can hardly expect a "gung-ho approach" in 1979 by federal employees when they have been described as overpaid, underworked and too numerous in 1978.

The sad note in government is the lack of recognition by top management of the importance of these lower level managers. All too often these supervisors are made an integral part of the management team only when it is politic. The remainder of the time they are in never-never land—between union leaders and top management.

The recent Civil Service Reform Act is supposed to delegate more responsibility and more authority. If this happens, with adequate managerial training, we can expect major improvements, both as to improved personnel management and increased employee productivity.

Conclusion—Any program that relates to more than 2.8 million employees, watched over by our millions of citizens, with a 535-member board of directors, Congress, is bound to be complicated, ever-changing and with inconsistencies. But, the inconsistencies, as detailed above, can be corrected, improved or eliminated. It is the task of federal employees, individually and/or in united action, to show top management in the Executive Branch and congressmen the inconsistencies in our federal personnel system.

However, in conclusion, these inconsistencies will continue until we have in the federal government several hard-nosed, practical manpower managers with both a comprehensive knowledge of the problems and the authority to make corrections.●

GOLD SCORES A RECOVERY

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, gold is exciting more interest not only in the United States but all over the world, despite the best efforts of politicians.

That is why I would like to bring the following article, by the eloquent editor of Barron's, to my colleagues' attention:

SOME BARBAROUS RELIC—IN THE GLOBAL MONETARY SYSTEM, GOLD SCORES A RECOVERY

Over on page 11, Peter George, remarkably outspoken member of the South African brokerage firm of Saunder & Taylor, offers his unhedged predictions on the price of gold. From current levels, he looks for bullion to reach $300 per ounce by August, plunge to $190 sometime thereafter and then surge to $640 by 1981. (He may be right or wrong, but he's never in doubt; no wonder his partners in Johannesburg are willing to let George do it.) Forty-eight hours after we taped his observations in New York City, Walter Frey, a general manager of Swiss Bank Corp. and an "acknowledged expert" in the field, told AP-DJ that gold has risen to "unreasonably high levels" and faces a sharp decline. The right price, he added, should range somewhere between $200 and $220 an ounce.

By the same token, according to the January issue of Gold Newsletter, a number of other authorities on the precious metal lately have issued unusually precise forecasts, both bullish and bearish. The bulls include James Dines (*Barron's*, Sept. 18, 1978, and Jan. 1, 1979), Lawrence Heim, Eliot Janeway and Paul Sarnoff of ContiCommodity Services, all of whom look for $300 or so by the end of the year. Among the bears: R. E. McMaster, editor of *The Reaper*, who "believes gold has peaked and will break $200, perhaps going as low as $150 in 1979," and John McFalls, who, "if gold breaks $193, looks for $150–60 this year. . . ." One money manager, who shall be nameless, not long ago literally turned on a dime, covered his shorts and went along.

That's what makes markets, and we freely concede that bull and bear alike have a persuasive case. As to the latter, Mr. Frey, whose employer happens to be a major element in the global trade in gold, puts it well (if a bit shrilly). Gold traditionally mirrors weakness in the dollar; yet at present, as the Swiss Bank spokesman observed, the greenback has been firm and, at least so long as the recently negotiated international lines of credit and swap agreements hold out, promises to remain so. "Benign neglect," he added, is over. "Let us say I am an optimist at this time. . . . I have been convinced." Frey also had harsh words for the bullion trading centers of London, New York City and Zurich, where, in effect, he charged dealers with buying and selling merely "to make commissions on the business." And he warned that the Russians, who for months had been inactive, are coming. "Who," he cried, "is going to buy all this gold?"

On the constructive side, bulls point to persistent heavy demand from industry and the jewelry trade, which, they indicate, in the absence of official gold sales, far exceeds new production of the precious metal. They go on to suggest that the International Monetary Fund, which during the past few years has been a major source of supply, sooner or later may opt for merely distributing what's left of its holdings to its members. As to the U.S., which has also done its share of liquidating, they cite the legislation enacted last fall under which the Treasury, effective next fiscal year, will be striking half-ounce and one-ounce medallions for sale to the American people. Confronted by heavy demand from this quarter, claim the bulls, the powers-that-be may back away from taking double dips out of the dwindling (though admittedly still huge) official U.S. gold reserves. Their clincher, of course, is the perennial decline in the value of paper money, which this year, notably in Europe, they view as more widespread and virulent than ever.

You pays your money and you takes your choice. Ups and downs aside, however, the big development in this realm strikes us as not economic but political (or perhaps the right word is geopolitical). Despite the best (or worst) efforts of the chrysophobes in Washington and elsewhere to phase out the precious metal from the international monetary system—to transform bullion, by a perverse alchemy, into just another commodity like pork bellies—gold is in the process of making a comeback. In the past few years, a number of countries have revalued their holdings to a market-related price, thereby acquiring a valuable—in the case of Italy and Portugal—a literally priceless asset. Since early 1978, when IMF-inspired constraints expired, central banks have been free to buy and sell bullion, a mint-quality prerogative which one after another quietly and discreetly (by and large through private agents) has begun to exploit. Now comes the impending European Monetary System, which, as the centerpiece of its activities, aims to draw upon its members' holdings and to issue currency backed in part by gold. Extravagances and absurdities like floating exchange rates and Special Drawing Rights come and go. Gold endures.

And what a lot it has had to put up with. After insisting for decades—over-optimistically, in the event—that the dollar was as good as gold the U.S. monetary authorities, by fiat, so to speak, desperately sought to prove that in global financial affairs it was better. First they closed the gold window reneging on a generation of solemn pledges to the contrary. They threw their weight behind the Special Drawing Right, a bastard form of what John Exter has aptly termed the "I-Owe-You Nothing." Several years ago, as hundreds cheered, gold was officially drummed out of the international monetary system and the IMF launched on a series of sales aimed at disposing of the barbarous relic forever. In turn, the Treasury, beset by a plunging dollar, has stepped up its own liquidation from 300,000 ounces per month to the current rate of 1.5 million. The National Committee for Monetary Reform, in company with Jim Dines and his readers, have valiantly marched on Washington in vain.

Gold may have lost a battle or two, but while few apparently have noticed, it has been winning the war. Early signs of its inevitable triumph surfaced a few years ago even as the flat money forces seemed to be moving from strength to strength. In mid-1974, Italy, hard pressed to meet the huge deficits in its balance of payments, revalued to the market price its holdings of the precious metal, which it proceeded to use as collateral against a loan from West Germany. France, which didn't really need the money, promptly followed suit. Since then, Australia, The Netherlands and, in recent weeks, Austria, have embraced some form of market-related price (the last-named, ironically, to compensate for the loss of reserves caused by the drop in the worth of its dollar holdings).

Preference for gold has shown up in other ways. In the past half decade or so, the number of countries minting legal tender gold coins has surged from a handful to nearly 50. Early last year, as noted, the temporary ban on central bank dealings in the precious metal expired. Since then, according to the Gold Newsletter, 11 countries, including Colombia, Cyprus, India, Kenya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, the Philippines and South Korea, have opted to receive their share of the IMF auctions in gold rather than currency, while another 28 have reserved the right to bid noncompetitively at future sales. At the IMF auction on Jan. 3, the central bank of Paraguay acquired 16,400 ounces.

The newsletter suggests that Japan, the vast reserves of which consist very largely of dollars, in coming months may shift to gold. "The conventional wisdom has long been that the Japanese are not really interested in

gold and prefer platinum. This may be true of jewelry, but as *Wolfe/Wire* pointed out in their Jan. 10 report, total Japanese gold demand in 1978 was close to 150 tons and is expected to be higher in 1979. Gold ownership had long been controlled by the government with strict importation restrictions. Now Japan has an almost completely free gold market and 10 major Japanese world-trading companies have set up a joint study committee to review prospects for a major gold market in Japan to rival Hong Kong, Europe and the United States. All this is at the encouragement of the Japanese government. . . . With the defeat of Prime Minister Takeo Fukuda and his replacement, Mr. Masayoshi Ohira, the tendency of Japan to follow U.S. Treasury's wishes on gold will probably come to an end."

Far and away the most dramatic change will occur when the leading Western powers launch the European Monetary System, under which the high contracting parties agree to pledge 20 percent of their dollar holdings, plus 20 percent of their gold, in return for a new currency known as the ecu. As *The London Economist* recently observed: "The ecu, which many hope would become new reserve asset for the world, will therefore be backed by gold. Only in part, to be sure, and the gold will not be valued at full market prices (75 percent of the past three months' average price is almost certain to be the formula adopted). But the key point is that the EMS will help convert hitherto 'unusable' gold reserves into very usable liquidity." And, as Thomas W. Wolfe, one of the leading U.S. authorities in the field, recently observed: "This new and flexible 'official price' for the EMS members will gradually be accepted by governments throughout the world in valuing gold in their reserves and as a standard for transactions between governments." Some barbarous relic.

ROBERT M. BLEIBERG.●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE CHESTER J. KRULAN OF NEW JERSEY, DISTINGUISHED AGRICULTURIST, COMMUNITY LEADER AND GREAT AMERICAN

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 3, the people of my congressional district, State of New Jersey joined together at the 52d annual dinner of the Passaic County Board of Agriculture in testimony to the lifetime of good works of an esteemed agriculturist, community leader, and good friend, the Honorable Chester J. Krulan of Clifton, N.J., whose standards of excellence in conserving, preserving, and enhancing our natural resources have truly enriched our community, State and Nation. I know you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our warmest greetings and felicitations to Chester Krulan, his good wife Greta and their three daughters and two sons as they celebrate his outstanding achievements as an active participant in New Jersey's agricultural endeavors including 43 years of distinguished service with the Passaic County Board of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of time here in America our country's soil has been nurtured and nourished by people like Chet Krulan whose contribution to the wealth and richness of our Nation's land resources has achieved a quality of excellence second to none among all nations throughout the world. The Passaic County Board of Agriculture is a sponsoring agency for cooperative extension service in the State of New Jersey, formulating agricultural policy and programs for our young people and adults alike in many vitally important areas including 4-H Youth Club work and home economics.

During his term as president of the Passaic County Board of Agriculture, Chet's progressive attitude and far-reaching vision was in the vanguard of efforts which were instrumental in realizing the interdependence of farmers and industrialists and expanding membership on the board to include nonfarm branches of the total economy. He served as board secretary for 16 years and his tenure of 43 years of active service on the board is one of the longest and best in the entire State.

Mr. Speaker, Chet will long be remembered for his ability and success on the Passaic County Board of Agriculture in providing an industrial landscape beautification program, organizing a "Farm Labor Brigade" to harvest crops during the manpower shortage of World War II and the spearheading of the campaign in Passaic County to gain voter support for the Farmland Tax Assessment Act referendum.

Among his leadership endeavors Chet is well known as an articulate spokesman of agriculture in seeking the enactment of laws through legislative representatives for the benefit of our farmers and horticulturists and has served time and again as a delegate to the State agricultural convention on their behalf. He was appointed and served for 7 years as a member of the board of managers of Rutgers the State University's College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences—now Cook College—and was at the helm of this distinguished board as president in 1969.

Mr. Speaker all of us in Passaic County and throughout our State are proud of Chester Krulan's achievements in guiding the Agricultural Cooperative Extension Service's programs in Passaic County and applaud the richness of his wisdom and expertise in New Jersey agriculture. His indepth knowledge and know-how in the agricultural field began at the early age of 12 years when he was first employed by a plant grower and retailer in Paterson, N.J., and has spent 53 years of continuing dedication and hard work ever seeking to make Passaic County and the State of New Jersey a better place to live through the production of plantlife. For the past three decades, he has been associated with Pilken's Inc. of Clifton, N.J., a large wholesale florist firm, where he served as a vice president and general manager. Today, in retirement, he continues to make a major contribution to the beauty and wonders of ornamental plants as a consultant to this corporation.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to seek this national recognition of Chet Krulan and his lifetime of dedication, devotion and personal commitment to our Nation's natural resources—all contributing substantively to the quality of our environment and way of life here in America. We do indeed salute a good friend, respected community leader, distinguished agriculturist and great American, the Honorable Chester J. Krulan.●

UNION STRIFE: LEARNING FROM EXPERIENCE

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding American once gave advice which we in the Congress would do well to remember in 1979. Patrick Henry observed:

I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that our Nation should learn a lesson in economics from our friends across the sea in Great Britain. That nation has suffered many difficulties in recent years, but none more serious than those caused directly or indirectly by powerful labor union officials.

One problem which our own Nation has thus far managed to avoid is the secondary boycott. Nevertheless, union officials have been lobbying the Congress diligently in recent years urging us to legalize the secondary boycott by permitting common situs picketing at construction sites. The Congress wisely rejected this concept last year, and I would sincerely hope that the issue will remain deservedly dead. Should it be resurrected, however, I would urge my colleagues to reject it once again. Common situs picketing is a concept which has been tried in Britain and proven to cause serious economic problems which we would be well advised not to transplant to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "Lesson From Britain" from the Arizona Republic be printed at this point in the RECORD.

LESSON FROM BRITAIN

Britain is plunging down the road to chaos.

Strikes have completely disrupted the economy, paralyzing the nation's transportation system, shutting down factories, leaving stores without goods to sell, schools without teachers, hospitals without ambulance drivers, farmers without feed for livestock, drying up supplies of gasoline and heating oil in the midst of the bitterest British winter in many years.

And the end is not yet in sight.

The strikes are for higher wages.

Prime Minister James Callaghan's Labor government set a 5 percent guideline for wage increases, but the unions are not content with that. Railroadmen are demanding raises of 20 percent, ambulance drivers 69 percent. Some civil service workers are holding out for nearly 100 percent and a cut in their work-week from 40 hours to 35.

Britain is a frightening example of what can happen when labor unions become too powerful.

In Britain, about 50 percent of the workers are unionized, compared to roughly 20 percent in the United States. But equally important, Britain has no laws against strikes by government employees and no laws against secondary boycotts.

The railroads are owned by the government. Railroadmen are civil service workers, yet they can strike with impunity.

It's also perfectly legal for a union to declare a secondary boycott and to picket companies with which it has no grievance.

This, it will be remembered, is a right for which the building trades unions have been fighting in this country. Fortunately, the 95th Congress rejected a bill that would have permitted a construction workers' union with a grievance against one contractor on a project to picket every other contractor, and shut the entire project down.

Callaghan has the power to declare a national emergency, and call out the army to move raw materials.

Until now, the prime minister has desisted from doing so for political reasons.

Britain is holding a general election this year. One of the Labor Party's big campaign points has always been that it can get along with the unions. Callaghan doesn't want to admit the obvious—that it can't.

It's conceivable that Callaghan will finally call out the army because chaos will leave no alternative. It's equally conceivable that he will abandon the 5 percent guideline.

In the latter event, if Callaghan continues to keep a tight rein on the money supply, the result will be a recession. On the other hand, if Callaghan loosens the money supply, Britain will return to 30 percent inflation.

Either outcome would be a disaster, for which the unions would have to shoulder the blame.

The United States could well take a lesson from Britain.●

NUCLEAR AND ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, recently my colleague on the Committee on Science and Technology, BARRY GOLDWATER, JR., addressed the American Nuclear Society on nuclear and alternative energy sources. His speech gives an excellent perspective on our various energy options and what directions the 96th Congress must take on energy. I include the speech here for the benefit of my colleagues:

NUCLEAR POLICY AND ISSUES IN THE 96TH CONGRESS

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for that very kind introduction and good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Its a pleasure for me to appear before this dinner meeting of the Washington section of the American Nuclear Society, and especially to follow in the footsteps of your most recent speaker, Miss Kitty Schirmer of the Domestic Policy Council. I hope you will give me as warm a reception as you gave her last month.

Although the topic of my talk is to be nuclear policy and issues in the 96th Congress, I think I can best set the stage for discussing nuclear matters by putting them in context with other energy sources. As some of you know, in the last Congress I was the Ranking Minority Member on the House Science Committee's Subcommittee that dealt with solar energy and geothermal energy. I would like to say a few words about those energy sources, as they are often presented as alternatives to the continued development of nuclear power. Let's take geothermal energy first.

Geothermal energy is very important in my home state of California, as we have some of the Nation's major geothermal resource areas in our backyard. The Geysers field in Northern California provides about one-half the electricity needs of the city of San Francisco, and does so at a cost cheaper than that from any other available energy resource. In the Southern part of our state, we have the Imperial Valley, with a resource potential of several thousand megawatts. We've made some important strides in geothermal energy development in the last few years, with the cost of well drilling having come down by a moderate amount thanks, in part, to the research and development program we have established within the Department of Energy. We've also seen increased private interest in the construction of geothermal plants, with a 10MW totally privately financed plant about to come on line in the next few months, and a 50MW demonstration plant project now in the formative stages as a cooperative venture between the Department of Energy and a New Mexico utility.

However, despite this promise, geothermal energy, like all other energy technologies, is not without its problems. We have been bringing geothermal energy plants on stream Nation-wide at the rate of only about 25–50 megawats per year. That's a fairly significant rate when you consider that geothermal is a relatively new technology, but it is small, of course, when compared to the size of a large nuclear or coal-fired power plant at 1,000 megawatts each. Also, several problems stand in the way of accelerating geothermal development, such as objections to the gases released, uncertainty over reservoir life-time, leasing delays, and possible need for additional government development incentives. All these factors combine to leave some question as to what the ultimate contribution of geothermal energy will be. The resource base does seem to be there, but it is now clear that we are not going to have the 3 or 4 thousand megawatts on line by 1985 that had been predicted only a year or two ago. The statement by Governor Brown that nuclear power is not needed in California as geothermal energy can meet most of the state's future energy requirements is, in my opinion, not supported by fact, and totally irresponsible. Nor is it agreed to by almost all knowledgeable observers. Nevertheless, geothermal energy is a real resource, is providing some electricity now, and also is being used for direct heat applications. We need to continue the resource development and demonstration programs currently underway, but must not forget that any new energy technology takes a long time to break into a market place. Hopefully, the tax incentives provided under the National Energy Act, such as investment tax credits, and deductions for intangible drilling expenses and depletion allowances, all of which I supported, will help accelerate geothermal energy's entry into the market.

Solar energy receives much more attention than geothermal energy and is currently the energy source in vogue. The solar R&D budget is up to about $600 million in fiscal 1980, and when you count tax incentives and activities in departments other than the Department of Energy, you find that the Federal solar effort is up around the $800 million level, and still growing. Earlier in this decade solar funding was almost non-existent.

Solar energy, as you all know, is actually a number of different technologies—photovoltaics, wind power, ocean thermal energy conversion, power towers, heating and cooling, and biomass, each with their own prospects and problems. The real questions are what contribution will solar energy as a whole make to our future energy requirements, when will this be obtained, and at what cost. Projections of solar's contribution by the year 2000 range from 5 percent to 25 percent. While I naturally hope that the result is towards the higher end of this range, we have to be realistic. Solar has a long way to go. One must not forget, for example, that if we were to convert 20 percent of all the residences in the United States to solar heating and cooling, this would be equivalent to saving about 1 million barrels of oil per day, or 6 percent of the daily oil requirements. This 20 percent conversion would involve about $15 million residences, which at about $10,000 per residence would cost $150 billion. Are we ready for that?

Also, it would take about 500 of the largest sized windmills being developed today to provide the same energy capacity as one large coal or nuclear fired power plant. These windmills would require a land area of over 100 square miles.

Another solar technology, photovoltaics, is very promising, but it would take 25,000 times our present photovoltaic production capacity of about 750 peak kilowatts per year to produce electricity equivalent to that from 200,000 barrels of oil per day. That would be only about 1 percent of our current oil requirements. The present cost of photovoltaic devices, also, is so high as to presently rule this technology out for all but the most limited applications.

I could say similar things about the other solar options such as power towers, OTEC, or biomass. I don't want to be overly negative, as I feel we should be developing these solar options, but the point is that we have a very long way to go, and experience tells us that developing a new technology is not an easy or rapid task. The public must not be misled into believing that the sun is an energy cure-all.

Nevertheless, we do see signs of that happening, in a manner reminiscent of the "too cheap to meter" earlier promises about nuclear energy. Just this past weekend, it was reported that 115 Members of the Solar Caucus in Congress wrote the President requesting additional funding for solar energy, and new initiatives in line with the "technically achievable" proposal of the Domestic Policy Review of the solar energy. I suspect that new funding will be held down due to the Congress' and the Administration's current mood of fiscal restraint, but some "grandstanding" or White House announcement of new solar goals cannot be ruled out.

Now that I've reviewed where we stand on solar energy and geothermal energy, and some of their problems, let me say a few words about what we have accomplished in the last Congress in the overall alternative energy field. I can point with some pride to the following:

a. passage of the Automotive Propulsion Research and Development Act of 1977, expanding and accelerating research and development on more efficient automotive propulsion engines;

b. modification of the Geothermal Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Act of 1974, facilitating use of the geothermal loan guarantee program;

c. establishment of a financial support program for converting municipal wastes into energy;

d. authorization of loan guarantees for biomass demonstration facilities;

e. establishment of a program for greater utilization of our low-head hydroelectric resources;

f. modification of the Electric and Hybrid Research, Development and Demonstration Act of 1976, so as to better phase the electric vehicle demonstration program in with technology development;

g. House passage of the Solar Power Satel-

lite Research, Development and Demonstration Act, which would accelerate a determination of feasibility for this potential energy source; and

h. passage into law of the Solar Photovoltaic Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Act of 1978, which established a more centralized goal oriented program for this very promising technology.

This last bill was the only major piece of energy R&D legislation that was passed by the 95th Congress.

In addition to these activities, Congress in its last session successfully shaped the course of ongoing research, development and demonstration programs in other aspects of solar energy, geothermal energy, and energy conservation through selective changes to the funding levels proposed by the Administration, and has partly corrected the lack of emphasis we found on a broad front of energy production activities.

So much for the previous Congress. Let's take a look at what's ahead for the new one. First of all, on my own Committee, Science and Technology, we've had a major change, both in the jurisdiction of our energy subcommittees and in their Chairmen. As many of you probably know by now, Don Fuqua of Florida has assumed the Chairmanship of the Full Committee, taking over for Tiger Teague of Texas, who retired. Jack Wydler of New York remains as Ranking Minority Member. Mike McCormick of Washington has become the Chairman of our new Energy Research and Production Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over all fission and fusion programs, that is, all nuclear activities under the auspices of the Science and Technology Committee. I don't think I need to tell you where Mike stands on nuclear issues. In addition to the Chairman, however, there is quite a variety of Democrats on this Subcommittee, ranging from those who look favorably upon the nuclear option and those who do not. Other Democrats in addition to Mike McCormack are Bob Roe of New Jersey, Marilyn Lloyd Bouquard of Tennessee, and Dick Ottinger of New York. We have a total of 12 Democrats on that Subcommittee. On the Minority side John W. Wydler has been selected as Ranking Minority Member. This, of course, is the Subcommittee that will consider the Clinch River Breeder Reactor issue in the 96th Congress, and I know its going to be a busy year.

As to our Senate counterpart, namely the Energy Research and Development Subcommittee of the Senate Energy Committee, Frank Church of Idaho remains the Chairman, and Senator James McClure, also of Idaho, now becomes Ranking Minority Member, replacing Senator Hatfield. While I think you are all familiar with the favorable position of both Senators Church and McClure on the breeder situation, you should recognize that the Committee as a whole is less conservative than last year. Among the new Democrats appointed to this Subcommittee are Senators Tsongas and Bradley.

As far as jurisdiction over the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is concerned, in the House that still resides with the Interior Committee, which is chaired by Congressman Udall. In the Senate, NRC jurisdiction remains with the Nuclear Regulatory Subcommittee of the Committee on Environment and Public Works. This Subcommittee is under Gary Hart of Colorado and has a new Ranking Minority Member, Senator Simpson of Wyoming. Along with Senator Simpson on the Minority side of that Subcommittee are Senators Domenici and Baker. Senator Simpson replaces Senator McClure, who, while remaining on the Energy Committee in the Senate, also moves to the Appropriations Committee.

By now you are all aware that nuclear jurisdiction has shifted substantially from what it was several years ago, when it resided with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. In the House, the Science and Technology Committee now has jurisdiction over civilian nuclear power research and development, but several other Committees have part or feel they have part of that turf. Both the Interior and Commerce Committees, for example, are quite interested in the subject of radioactive waste disposal, and Interior has already held hearings on that subject this year. The Armed Services Committee is concerned about the disposal of those radioactive wastes generated in military programs. The International Relations Committee monitors nuclear exports and nonproliferation matters, and the Appropriations Committee is concerned with funding for all of the Federal Government's nuclear activities. The Government Operations Committee is concerned about how the various Federal agencies organize their nuclear responsibilities. I hope I didn't leave anybody out.

In the Senate, again several Committees are involved in nuclear matters, primarily Environment and Public Works, the Energy Committee and Government Affairs. What we have in both Houses of Congress is a classic situation where an issue has generated broad public interest and controversy, but the Congress has not adequately defined the jurisdictional boundaries are to how this subject should be handled. I wish I could say that the matter will soon be resolved, but in the House, unless the Speaker, the Rules Committee, or a Committee on Committees steps in, I do not anticipate a quick or easy resolution of this matter.

One factor that has made the whole situation somewhat difficult and confused has been the late passage, indeed this year the lack of passage, of an authorization bill for the Department of Energy. The House passed one, but the Senate did not. As a result, it has been the Appropriations Committees that have provided the funds and the direction for the nuclear programs.

As many of you know, the usual role of the Appropriations Committees is to decide the actual funding levels for energy programs, after following the policy directions set by the authorizing committees. However, because the appropriations committees have moved ahead of authorizations in energy legislation in recent years, they sometimes take an independent course in areas where their members have strong views. The recent situation with fiscal year 1979 funding for the Clinch River Breeder, for example, while probably one that this audience would not oppose, is a case in point.

It is probably too soon to say whether this year will prove different. I know the authorizing committees are aware of the weakening of their roles, and will do what they can to arrest this shift in authority. However, at this time it is questionable that we will see a fiscal year 1979 authorization bill become law, as the Senate Energy Committee appears inclined to skip that over and wage the Clinch River battle on the 1980 bill. As a first step, however, a fiscal year 1979 bill has been introduced jointly in the House by the Science, Commerce and Interior Committees. Just what priority and action this bill will receive remains to be seen.

As to the nuclear issues that will come up this session, the list is a long one, and I suspect very familiar to most of you. Another one laying over from the previous year is the licensing bill. We don't know yet whether the Administration will resubmit this bill, the purpose of which is to cut the present 12 year lead time for building a new nuclear plant in half. At the moment, bills are being prepared by both the Administration and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the latter at the request of the House Interior Committee. The situation is uncertain as the Administration has not decided whether it wants to send its own bill up or not. Experience shows that when a situation gets this murkey, little gets done. I have serious doubts that we will see a licensing bill enacted into law.

One area where, unfortunately, I think we will see some interest if not legislative action is in the Price Anderson Act. As you know, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's repudiation of some of the conclusions of the Rassmusen Report have opened the door, in the minds of some people, to reexamination of the link between the Rassmusen Report and the Price Anderson Act. If consideration of this insurance program is reopened, as it might be, the most likely result would be a retention of the Price Anderson system itself, but removal of the limits on liability. When one considers that some of the other provisions of the Act are meritorious only when connected to a limit on liability, the prospect of reopening the Price Anderson matter is not encouraging.

It is somewhat encouraging, however, to see that the Administration has finally recognized the seriousness of the spent fuel problem and that a bill will soon be sent up to provide away-from-reactor storage capacity. On the other hand, I am concerned by the reported statement of a DOE official that the fees for storing spent fuel will be structured so as to give utilities an "overwhelming" financial incentive to store their spent fuel at reactor sites. I hope this bill helps more than it hinders. I also hope that those opposed to the nuclear option will act responsibly towards this legislation, as the forced shutdown of any nuclear plants, should it come to that, due to lack of fuel storage space would not be in anybody's best interests.

This whole problem could be solved, of course, by recognition of the need for reprocessing. I believe we will see that recognition in the final results of the International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation, to be completed next year, but whether the current Administration will accept these results is anybody's guess.

The major nuclear issue this year, as last year and the year before, will be the Clinch River Breeder Reactor. I don't think any of us have been convinced by the Administration's arguments concerning the lack of need for this plant, despite the fact that they talk about obsolescence, high cost, reduced energy demand, possible availability of alternative fuel cycles, and other smoke screen issues. Their concern is and always has been that of proliferation. Those of you who were at the last meeting of this section and heard Kitty Schirner speak can draw your own conclusions about the validity of the Administration's concern over proliferation. I, for one, think it is a misplaced concern and that the Nation will suffer if we deny ourselves breeder technology. We already see other countries moving ahead of us in breeder development, and we will soon be relegated to second class status among the nuclear power nations.

The Clinch River debate has been at somewhat of a standstill over the last few months with Capitol Hill attention focused partly on the McClure compromise. The President's budget for fiscal year 1980 contains no funds for Clinch River, and it is still his intention that the project be terminated. There is some confusion over the meaning of the word discontinue as used in the compromise, but I understand that Secretary Schlesinger has recently said that the Administration will still go along with a discontinuation of the project, as opposed to its absolute termination. For the moment, we see a breeder base program at around the $500 million level, which is sufficient to maintain at least part of our technical capability, but far short of the effort needed if we're really serious about developing the breeder.

I believe we have to be serious about breeder development. Nothing has changed

in the last year or two that provides any further support for the Administration's arguments. This Nation needs the breeder program and it needs a plant, a real plant, as the focal point of that program. As is the situation with nuclear waste management, we must not go back and restudy our options. The time to build a plant is now. We already have fabricated a number of Clinch River components, and it would be an irresponsible waste of taxpayer's money not to get the maximum benefit from the work that has been put into that plant. The ball is now in Congress's court, and despite the fact that we have an inflation-minded Congress that fully intends to maintain a tight budget, we need to do something to keep the Clinch River project going. Authorization hearings start this week with markup sessions likely to be held toward the end of this month or in early March. As an industry, you need to maintain the same presence and vigorous support of this project that you have displayed over the last two years.

Saving the best for last, I would now like to talk about the subject of nuclear waste management. We had hoped to see the final Interagency Review Group report completed by the President's deadline of February 1st, but it looks as if it will now be delayed for at least a month. In the absence of Administration action on this subject, I introduced yesterday the Nuclear Waste Management Research, Development and Demonstration Act of 1979. This bill provides for the construction of a permanent Federal repository for nuclear wastes and spent nuclear fuel assemblies generated in the operation of civilian nuclear power plants. It requires the Secretaries of Energy to construct a repository to be in operation no later than September 30, 1988.

The bill will help us avoid the frightening prospect of an energy shortage, which a nuclear slowdown would surely entail. While the problems surrounding the construction and operation of nuclear waste facilities are substantial, recent evidence leads me to conclude that the technology has reached the stage where we should proceed with a demonstration facility. This bill directs the Secretary of Energy to construct and operate a permanent repository for the disposal of nuclear wastes and the storage of spent fuel assemblies, and its key element is that it sets a strict timetable for the completion of this job, recognizing the urgency of the problem. Site selection is to be based on the many studies conducted *to date* on nuclear waste disposal, as well as on specific site evaluations yet to be completed. The demonstration facility must become operational, as I have indicated, by September 30, 1988.

The issue of nuclear wastes is of considerable importance to the Nation and is a problem which has been neglected for too long a period of time. We have already been forced to limit construction of the new nuclear plants in some areas of the country due to the public's perception of the nuclear waste problem. We must act now to insure that this situation gets better, not worse.

My motivation for introducing this bill was in part the realization that we have studied the subject of nuclear wastes and studied it again. As I have stated in a letter to the Secretary of Energy on this matter last year, I cannot help but note that we have seen a seemingly unending series of studies, reviews and evaluation of this subject within the last several years, each ending with several laudible recommendations or goals that somehow get sidetracked before they are achieved. Endless paper studies do not seem to me to be the solution to the nuclear waste disposal problem. What we need instead is to establish a research, development and demonstration program that will get this job done, and to my mind that includes construction and operation of a repository in a timely manner. The bill does exactly that, and for this reason, it is imperative that we act on this legislation during this session of Congress.

When I was out at Hanford this past summer, it was impressed upon me that during World War II, we built our first plutonium production reactors in a period of about 13 months, but now I find that we cannot dig a hole in the ground to handle the waste from those reactors for 13 years. That is an intolerable situation, and my bill proposes to correct it. In addition to mandating the construction of a repository, the bill requires this facility to go through a licensing process and designates both the Department of Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission as joint lead agencies for preparing the necessary environmental impact statements. The bill also provides for a meaningful State role in commenting on the construction and operation of the repository and encourages public participation in the project. Finally, the bill establishes a nuclear waste advisory committee and extends the licensing authority of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to cover spent fuel assemblies and transuranic elements.

One thing the bill does not do is establish a new Federal agency to regulate nuclear wastes. We don't need a new agency, as some of my colleagues in the Congress have suggested. We have the necessary mechanisms in place. What we really need is the initiative to get on with the job and get it done.

The bill also does not provide a legislative veto for the States. I don't believe this is necessary, as there are ample mechanisms under the bill for the many industrial, scientific and environmental organizations interested in this project and the public at large to provide their views for consideration during the siting, design, and construction of the repository. States and other parties must play a significant role in the formulation of any effective nuclear waste disposal program. My legislation formally recognizes the role of the states and gives them an opportunity to comment on and influence any action taken by the Secretary under this bill. It specifically provides for state input at early stages of the decision-making process for the facility, thereby protecting the rights of the states involved while providing for the construction and operation of a facility that is in the Nation's best interests.

Strong congressional action must be taken in the 96th Congress to focus on the need for a permanent, operational nuclear waste facility. The Congress must recognize that the principal national issue of concern with nuclear energy is waste disposal. I believe that this legislation provides the tools to allow us to adequately address this concern, and I therefore will be pressing for its enactment.

I could go on further but I think that by now you've got the message. Nuclear power faces problems, but other energy technologies do as well. In fact, if there is one thing we have learned from nuclear power it is the difficulty of bringing any new energy source from the laboratory, through several development and demonstration stages, and into the marketplace. There is no reason to believe that the road will be easier for solar or geothermal energy, or for any other energy source.

The government's role must be one of encouragement, moral support, and funding of needed research, development and demonstration activities that the private sector alone will not accomplish. We see this approach being employed for the politically popular energy sources, but only the third item applies to nuclear power these days. It would be extremely beneficial, and cost very little, if the Administration would come out with a statement of support for the nuclear option. If they were to do so, a number of the current uncertainties facing the industry would disappear, and it may not be beyond the bounds of reason, someday, to see the solar lobby and a "nuclear caucus" working in Congress for a common goal—a narrowing of the energy supply-demand gap, and a reduction in oil imports.

Thank you.●

"OTHER" KENTUCKY CONGRESSMEN

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, a column in the Cincinnati Enquirer recently described one of the "other" Kentucky Congressmen for readers in the greater Cincinnati area.

I believe this column by Jack Hicks rather aptly summed up some of the highlights in the career of my good friend from the Fifth District, Dr. TIM LEE CARTER. I thought others might enjoy it also, so I am including this article for the RECORD:

"OTHER" KENTUCKY CONGRESSMEN

(By Jack Hicks)

WASHINGTON.—Tim Lee Carter isn't the only medical doctor in the U.S. Congress, but when someone recently shouted, "Is there a doctor in the house," the Fifth District representative was there to respond.

That incident occurred in a Washington restaurant rather than inside the Capitol Building, but Carter sometimes can't divorce himself from practicing medicine there either. Once an Ohio colleague complained of a stomach pain, and Carter's immediate diagnosis was a "hot" appendix about to rupture.

The Buckeye Congressman went to a hospital where Carter's finding was sloughed off, but before many more hours passed the hospital called back to correct itself and an appendectomy followed.

In the restaurant incident, a woman was choking on a piece of beef and was fortunate that Carter was at the scene. He utilized the "Heimlich hug," a maneuver developed by a Cincinnati doctor, and the woman gained immediate relief, Carter explained.

It was the second time within a few weeks that the congressman from Tompkinsville was called on for emergency medical treatment. At an airport ticket window a man suffered an attack, and "fell like a tree," Carter related. The doctor recognized symptoms of a stroke and performed cardiac massage until the victim began breathing. The man turned out to be an Army colonel who is now recovering.

When going about his business on the floor of the House, the subject of medicine often comes up. Carter said, both as chit-chat and in connection with the many medical-oriented bills in which he has an interest. Among those the Congressman intends to be involved in this session are medical-facilities construction, health planning, nurses' training, emergency medical services, safe drinking water and cost containment of medical services.

Carter has a particular interest in health planning. Proper co-ordination can allow the sharing of equipment and save money, he pointed out, and the lack of planning has resulted in 100,000 more hospital beds than we need, at a cost of $20,000 per bed per year.

He believes in containing the cost of medical care, he said, "but we just can't concen-

trate on this and let other segments of the economy fly high."

Carter isn't a man who weighs his words when expressing an opinion. Although he has only the testimony of others as proof, he calls the state administration of Gov. Julian Carroll one of the most corrupt in history. He'll be backing former Gov. Louie Nunn in this year's gubernatorial race because, he said, Nunn is the best qualified to put an end to corruption.

In national politics, Carter supported fellow Republican Gerald Ford for President in 1976, but is presently leaning toward Sen. Howard Baker of Tennessee as the GOP's presidential nominee in 1980.

Baker, whose home in Tennessee is only a few miles from Carter's in Kentucky, is a good middle-of-the-road choice who could rally elements on both the left and right, Carter said. "I want to see a winner," he declared.

Carter is also a close friend of former President Nixon, and was instrumental in arranging Nixon's appearance last summer in Hyden, Ky. Nixon and he talk regularly on the phone, the congressman said.

Carter has also been a faithful friend of America's military establishment. "I'm very much in favor of a strong defense, so strong no one dare attack us," said the World War II combat medic.

Until last year Carter had a penchant for handing out little red roses to be attached to suit lapels. Wearing a rose to express belief in defense of the country goes back to the Revolutionary War—"for those who love their country enough to stand up and defend it," Carter explained.

Beset with personal grief two years ago when his 22-year-old son died of leukemia, Carter has stopped giving out the roses. He still loves his country and is as solid for strong defense as before, he said, and chose not to elaborate further.

Dr. Tim Lee Carter doesn't get to Northern Kentucky often, and like other congressmen from far-away parts of the commonwealth, isn't so familiar to people here. But like Reps. M. Gene Snyder, Larry Hopkins and Carl Perkins, who do have parts of Northern Kentucky in their districts, Carter does represent some 450,000 Kentuckyians in Washington. He's part of that group of nine men (seven representatives and two senators) who are the state's congressional delegation, who to one degree or another are our voice in the nation's capital.

Others whose names aren't exactly household words hereabouts are Reps. Carroll Hubbard, William Natcher and Romano Mazzoli, of the First, Second and Third Districts respectively.

Hubbard is a Democratic candidate for governor and will become better known here, at least until the May primary. He hails from Mayfield and his district is in the westernmost part of the state.

Natcher of Bowling Green is a veteran congressman who boasts a nearly perfect record of answering House roll calls. Mazzoli is, like Natcher, a Democrat and represents Kentucky's only real urban area, Louisville.

The term "Kentucky congressman," then can mean a Tompkinsville physician or a Mayfield attorney, and not just Gene Snyder, Larry Hopkins and Sens. Walter (Dee) Huddleston and Wendell Ford.●

INVESTMENT PRIORITIES AND OBJECTIVES

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, on November 29, 1978, I was invited to give testimony before the California Senate Select Committee on Investment Priorities and Objectives in Los Angeles.

My testimony concerned the need for the United States to pursue an active program of economic conversion and economic diversification of communities which are heavily dependent on military spending for their economic well-being. Both my own State of Connecticut and the State of California are heavily dependent on defense contracts for employing their citizens. While the United States obviously needs to maintain a strong defense, the "feast or famine" nature of defense spending can often have disastrous economic effects on communities which are especially vulnerable to shifts in military procurement. If nothing else, the example of the economic trauma many Californian communities went through after the cancellation of the B–1 bomber program illustrates the need for defense-dependent communities to broaden their economic bases.

In the near future I will be introducing legislation designed to assist defense-dependent communities diversify their economies away from their present dependence on military procurement.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter my remarks before the California Senate Select Committee on Investment Priorities and Objectives into the RECORD in order to allow my colleagues the opportunity to discover the reasons I feel economic diversification legislation is so necessary.

The remarks follow:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I would first of all like to thank you for giving me this opportunity to testify before you today on a subject of particularly great importance to both the people of Connecticut and to you here in California. The dependence both of our states have on defense contracts for employing our citizens, while bringing many benefits, also brings substantial problems and economic risks.

While the defense industry in California employs more people and attracts larger contracts than in Connecticut, for its size, Connecticut is the most defense dependent state in the country. In a recent study by the Council of Economic Priorities, it was found that 27.7% of the workforce in Connecticut is employed in deefnse-oriented industries. Connecticut also has more defense contracts per capita than any other state. In my own congressional district, in the Groton-New London-Norwich area, a study conducted several years ago by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency concluded that over 71% of the workforce was engaged in defense-related production.

Connecticut's great dependence on defense spending stems in large part from the influence of just two major corporations: United Technologies and General Dynamics. United Technologies employs over 48,000 people in Connecticut. Two of its subsidiaries, Sikorsky and Pratt & Whitney, perform defense work for the most part. However, both Sikorsky and Pratt & Whitney, and United Technologies overall, also have large civilian contracts. That is not the case of the second major defense firm in Connecticut: The Electric Boat Company, which is a division of General Dynamics. Its name notwithstanding, Electric Boat, builds nuclear-powered submarines.

Presently, both the new Trident nuclear missile-firing submarine and the new Los Angeles class fast attack sub are constructed in EB's yard in my district. While United Technologies's 48,000 workers are divided between eight different divisions in the state, almost all of EB's 24,000 employees work at the shipyard in Groton, and all of them do defense work, as EB has no other customer but the U.S. Navy. It is this concentration of defense workers in one small area of the state that leaves the community so vulnerable to defense-related economic disruption.

Of course, in the event of a contract termination or cutback at the shipyard, far more than the 24,000 EB workers would suffer. In my district alone, there are over 250 businesses with whom EB subcontracts. Most of these businesses and the people who work there would suffer if there was a major cutback at EB. The ripple effect from United Technologies would be even greater.

Obviously, then, the potential economic effects of major defense cutbacks in Connecticut concern me greatly. During the four years I have served in Congress, Electric Boat has experienced a five month strike, and the layoff of 3000 workers at one time. More recently, 8000 EB workers were handed pink slips which were later withdrawn.

Yet, despite these clear warnings, one of the greatest challenges I have faced is trying to convince the people in my district that our economic dependence on defense is potentially disasterous. My constituents see the 24,000 jobs at EB as an economic resource, and they wonder why I spend time attempting to point out the economic pitfalls of our defense dependence.

This past August, I sponsored a conference in Hartford titled "Defense Dependency and New England." I was pleased to have Connecticut's governor, Ella Grasso, and Senator Charles Mathias of Maryland participate in the conference and address themselves to this important issue. We were also fortunate to have representatives from the Pentagon's Office of Economic Adjustment, the Economic Development Administration, State and local government, and, most importantly, business and labor groups. We of course were not able to solve all of New England's defense-related economic problems at that conference, but I believe that it was a great success in bringing together many of the people in government, business and labor who have a direct stake in the problem. We were also successful in bringing the issue to the public's attention for what may have been the first time in Connecticut. If nothing else was accomplished, I believe that informing the public that there are serious economic problems associated with defense dependency, was well worth the effort.

I applaud this committee's work in providing the same service to the people of California who should be just as vitally concerned as the people of Connecticut.

However, I think we must recognize that many people looking at the number of workers the defense industry employs in California and Connecticut would ask us why we see our good fortune as a potential problem. There is a widespread belief that defense spending and the resulting employment is automatically a boon to any community.

One of the primary reasons the general public perceives defense spending as unambiguously beneficial to an area's economy is the vigor with which public officials fight to insure that military bases or defense plants are not shut down in their communities. A situation can thus develop where basic decisions affecting our national defense can be made for parochial economic reasons rather than for a true assessment of what is needed for our national defense. But defense spending is not necessarily beneficial to a local economy or even to our national economy.

In fact, a number of thoughtful economists have long been telling us that defense spending does more economic harm than good. Defense industries, after all, pro-

duce goods which consumers cannot buy. No new civilian jobs are created once a tank rolls off the production line. Its economic usefulness ends once it has been produced. Military spending also fuels the inflationary cycle because bringing down the cost of military hardware has never been one of the Pentagon's greatest concerns. Defense industries are able to bid up the price of materials and skills, thus making them more expensive to the civilian economy. The best technological talent in this country also seems to end up in the service of the military. Military technology has become the cutting edge of much of our most sophisticated technology. Some of our best scientists and technicians work for the defense industry, denying their skills to the civilian sector. Some economists contend that our present inability to successfully compete on the international market in stereos, televisions, automobiles, and other areas is a result of our best engineers and scientists leaving civilian work or never joining it in the first place.

So far from being a boon to the national economy, defense spending can actually seriously weaken our whole economic system. Communities which are heavily dependent on only one source of employment are naturally vulnerable to economic dislocations. This vulnerability is exacerbated if that one industry is defense oriented. The defense industry knows no market force but that exerted by the Federal Government. As we are all aware, decisions on defense spending can vary substantially from administration to administration, from Congress to Congress, and because of international conditions over which we may have no control.

When layoffs occur, defense workers are often laid off enmasse. California's experience with the B-1 is ample proof of that. The point is, however, that the layoffs which hit the workers at Rockwell International could just as easily have struck thousands of workers in Connecticut, New York, Washington, or any other defense dependent state. It unfortunately takes the cancellation of a contract as large as the B-1 before the dangers of overreliance on defense spending hits home. When I saw the TV reports of hundreds of B-1 workers walk out the factory gates for the last time, I could not help but think that the same thing could happen in my district.

At the present time, the Electric Boat Company in my district has plenty of contracts and will for years to come. When a community like mine is in the feast stage of the feast or famine cycle of defense spending, there are few complaints, and unfortunately few thoughts of what might happen if the nearby military base closes or the local defense plant has its contracts cut back. However, it is precisely during the times of plenty that the temptation of sitting back and congratulating ourselves for our good fortune must be avoided. It is then that a community should start seriously planning for the contingency of reduced defense spending in the future.

I realize that these hearings have been convened to address the issue of "Defense Dependency and Economic Conversion". However, I would like to bring to the committee's attention an alternative to economic conversion as a method for reducing a community's defense dependence. That alternative is the economic diversification of an area. This is not a substitute of Economic Conversion but rather a supplement to that approach, and practically a more achievable goal than some of the Economic Conversion proposals.

Let me briefly discuss economic conversion and the economic diversification proposals. First of all, as public officials we must take into account public perceptions of what reducing our economic dependence on the defense industry is supposed to accomplish. To me, reducing defense dependence simply makes good economic sense because it reduces a community's economic vulnerability to severe economic disruption. I do not approach the issue from a disarmament viewpoint although I do not disagree with this approach.

Unfortunately I do not believe the conversion of defense industries to civilian production will be necessitated by our current negotiations with the Soviet Union to limit Strategic Arms. For example, in 1972, SALT I placed upper limits on the number of strategic delivery vehicles each side maintains, but required no actual reduction. The Vladivostok agreement of 1974 limited both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to 2400 strategic delivery vehicles, again necessitating no actual cutbacks. As much as I would hope that the SALT II treaty currently being negotiated will result in substantial reductions in both sides strategic stockpiles, I think that there is now no question that it will not. In fact, it appears that President Carter may well give his approval to new strategic systems in order to appease potential SALT critics in the Senate.

The economic conversion of a military base or most of the larger defense plants can only occur if the facility is completely shut down. Alternative use planning may be the key to economic conversion. If every military base and defense plant were required to maintain a plan for the conversion to civilian use in the event of a shutdown, the pressure to keep the facility operating at any cost would not be so severe. And of course, the resulting economic dislocation would pass more quickly as workers would be retrained to operate the converted facility.

Planning for the possible shutdown of defense facilities through alternative use planning is obviously a prudent measure which must be encouraged. However, it has been my own experience that incremental cutbacks in defense production are more common than outright shutdowns. Your experience here in California, especially after the B-1 cancellation, may be substantially different.

It is a result of Connecticut's experience that I have stressed economic diversification, rather than conversion, as the primary vehicle to reduce overreliance on defense spending. Diversification is an old concept. The desirability of economic diversification has long been recognized by the business community. I would be hard pressed to name one major corporation which has not sought to reduce its vulnerability to market fluctuations by diversifying its operations. Simply stated, diversification makes good economic sense. While a corporation may be relatively well protected against the loss of a major defense contract, the same will probably not hold true of the local community. It is in the local community that diversification is most important.

Legislation I will be introducing in the next session of Congress will seek to aid defense dependent communities diversify their economies. I will propose the establishment of an office of economic diversification within the economic development administration. The office will assist local diversification committees draw up long-term diversification plans, and strategies for implementing them. Naturally, if a community is happy with its heavy dependence on defense contracts, then it would certainly not be required to participate in a diversification program. The basic decision-making should be left in the hands of the local government, and not mandated by the state or federal governments. The lack of local input over many government programs, by the way, is one of the causes, I believe, of Proposition 13 fever. For economic diversification strategies and economic conversion plans to work, we need to build a political base with grass roots support.

The diversification assistance I envision will be targeted on a priority basis to the communities with the highest levels of economic dependence on defense spending. The decision of what kind of diversification strategy a community should pursue will be left largely in the hands of the local committee. An office of economic diversification will be able to provide the technical assistance necessary to form an appropriate strategy and it will be able to provide a community with a broad range of options. Once a diversification committee has identified the resources available in the area and the types of industries best suited to take advantage of these resources, they can then seek assistance from existing federal agencies for those projects they feel are most necessary to expand their economic base and the commercial desirability of their area in order to attract new industry.

If a diversification committee is unable to obtain the federal funding it seeks, it could appeal to the office of economic diversification. If the office, on the basis of a community's level of defense dependency and the strength of its diversification plan, determines that the requested funds are necessary to implement the community's diversification plan, the office would then make the funds available to the appropriate federal agency. In this way, defense dependent communities would have a "second chance" at obtaining economic diversification asssistance. This concept of "second chance funding", I believe, will provide many defense dependent areas with the long-term economic aid they need to successfully diversify.

Long-range diversification strategies, drawn up at the local level with the aid of an office of economic diversification, are the surest way to avoid the potentially catastrophic consequences which can befall any community too dependent on defense spending.

We must face the fact that high level of reliance on defense spending is economically unhealthy in any state or local community. Drawing up alternative use plans to deal with the possibility of base and plant shutdowns, coupled with a program of economic diversification, is the way to move towards a more stable and less vulnerable economy.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, thank you for your indulgence. If you have any questions, I would be pleased to try to answer them.●

NELSON ROCKEFELLER EULOGIES

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1979

● Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD additional newspaper articles eulogizing the late Nelson A. Rockefeller. As these articles show, tributes to this great American echoed throughout the world.

The articles follow:

[From the Tulsa World, Jan. 29, 1979]

NELSON ROCKEFELLER

Nelson Rockefeller, the scion of the Rockefeller dynasty who channeled his immense wealth and abilities into politics, is dead at 70.

While he was unsuccessful in three tries at the Presidency, he nevertheless was a power in Republican politics, serving three terms as Governor of New York, and a hitch as an appointed Vice President under Gerald Ford.

Rockefeller's death leaves only Laurance and David alive of the five grandsons of John D. Rockefeller, who founded the Rockefeller financial empire.

John D. Rockefeller III died in an automobile accident last July. Winthrop, who had served as Governor of Arkansas, died in 1973. A sister, Abby, died in 1967.

Nelson Rockefeller was the leader of the liberal faction of the GOP which lost out to the forces of Richard Nixon in 1960 and 1968 and Conservative Barry Goldwater in 1964.

All of the Rockefeller brothers, backed by the virtually unlimited resources of the family fortune, have proven to be good stewards of that legacy. The family's philantropic efforts have been considerable and each brother has contributed to society in his own way.

For Nelson, the attraction was service in public life. His record as Governor of New York was good and most observers think he would have made a strong and capable President.

He was a loser in Presidential politics but the judgment here is that the American public was perhaps the greater loser for his having failed to attain the job.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 29, 1979]

NELSON ROCKEFELLER'S LEGACY

Years after the sudden death of Nelson A. Rockefeller, history may set him down alongside Henry Clay and William Jennings Bryan and other men who diligently sought the presidency, never won it, yet left an imprint on the American political system.

Nelson Rockefeller did not come very close to being chief executive, despite a background of family prestige a brilliant record as governor of New York and personal charm. Indeed it is ironical that despite making overtures for the Republican presidential nomination in 1960 and openly seeking it in 1964 and 1968 the closest he did come was as an appointed vice president for a nonelected president Gerald Ford.

Yet Mr. Rockefeller served his state and his nation well officially and otherwise. He was employed by two administrations to seek better relations with Latin America a particular field of his expertise and served as coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. His unofficial influence on public issues was extended through sponsorship of the Council on Foreign Relations and chairmanship of the Commission on Critical Choices for Americans.

From all this the public got the impression, not just of an Eastern Establishment spokesman, but of a liberal, at least in the British sense of the word. He believed in free enterprise and government that was freely representative of all elements in the nation, and as to foreign policy, the world was far too small, and his interests far too broad, for him to concede anything to isolationism. But a liberal Republican? That was the trouble.

He could easily have been a Democrat, it has been said, but he was a Republican, and the right wing of his party denied him the presidential nomination. The struggle of the Old Guard to maintain party control at all costs, even at the cost of losing elections, is an old one. It was seen when Taft supporters tried to deny the nomination to President Eisenhower, and again when the right championed Goldwater candidacy to disaster. But Nelson Rockefeller's challenge to the GOP was to keep closer to the middle ground of America, the only basis either for victory or effective government.

Mr. Rockefeller himself said it well at the 1976 Republican National Convention in Kansas City: "The nation needs a strong and vigorous two-party system. Frankly, this Republican party of ours has been shrinking . . . We know we can have a broad appeal. We've won four out of the last seven presidential elections. But we did it with candidates and campaigns that appealed to the broad spectrum of the American populace—not a narrow few."

The party to which Nelson Rockefeller devoted his political career and best instincts, and which rejected him, is still caught in a struggle between factions and still seeks its direction. But if he had not been on the political scene, constantly urging that broader appeal to America, the two-party system might now be weaker. That is part of his legacy to the nation.

[From the Kansas City Times, Jan. 29, 1979]

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER

Playing the game of what-might-have-been can go on and on. In the case of Nelson A. Rockefeller, the possibilities are infinite. What if Rockefeller had succeeded in derailing Richard M. Nixon somewhere along the line? What if he had succeeded in securing one of the Republican nominations he sought? Win or lose, the effect on the United States and the GOP would have been immense.

Rockefeller rates much more than a footnote in the books, and we would guess that in the years ahead historians will uncover the Rockefeller factor in political and economic equations not now known. The uses of the Rockefeller fortune permeate American life. His role as governor of New York and his influence since the days of World War II in the federal government went far beyond that state or any particular job he held in Washington. Sometimes it seemed as if he were conducting his own state department or shadow government that often complemented, and sometimes conflicted with, official policy.

Great sections of the Republican Party never accepted Rockefeller, yet he had a profound impact on the Grand Old Party. The ravening delegates at the 1964 Goldwater convention focusing their hatred on Rockefeller showed an element of the party naked and at its worst. It seared a lot of people, including other Republicans.

Rockefeller's name and wealth were forces that worked against a clear run at the White House on his own. Gerald Ford made him Vice President at a time when the fragility of the executive branch had been painfully demonstrated. The country sighed with relief. Whatever happened Nelson Rockefeller was a man who knew what to do. People wondered how such a man ever could put himself in the place of a commoner with unpaid bills. But in New York, and in the party, he was a voice of compassion for the poor. Sometimes it seemed that Republican fat cats, men who had made it on their own and who couldn't understand why everyone else couldn't overcome poverty, were the ones who disliked him most.

Attica, intraparty throat-cutting, the frustrations of the vice presidency and a boredom that came with being a Rockefeller ("after that what else is left except the White House?" he once said) were other parts of the story. It was a drama that somehow had an unsatisfactory ending.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 29, 1979]

ART PATRON ROCKEFELLER ACQUISITIVE, CONTROVERSIAL

(By Robert W. Duffy)

Nelson Rockefeller pursued art collecting with the same vigorous intensity with which he pursued the presidency of the United States.

By the time he died Friday night in his study at 13 West 54th Street—a stone's throw from the Museum of Modern Art in New York, an institution he and his family have served and supported since its birth—Rockefeller had gathered a Medicean collection of works of art—everything from the work of the greatest of the modern masters and classics of primitive art to exquisite china, rugs and furniture. In all, it has been reported that Nelson Rockefeller owned in his lifetime as many as 16,000 pieces of art.

He bought his first object when he was on a round-the-world honeymoon with his first wife, the former Mary Todhunter Clark of Philadelphia, in 1929. The object was a knife handle in the shape of a shrunken head, purchased in Sumatra. That purchase was to be prophetic: As the years went by, Rockefeller was to amass a splendid collection of Oceanic, African and pre-Columbian objects.

The first in a series of books on Rockefeller's collection was devoted to his collection of primitive art. Called "Masterpieces of Primitive Art," the book, with an introduction written by Rockefeller, was published by Alfred Knopf in October 1978.

In 1957, Rockefeller founded the Museum of Primitive Art in New York to house his collection. The work is now in the Metropolitan Museum in New York, housed in the Michael C. Rockefeller Memorial Wing. The wing was named for Rockefeller's son, an anthropologist, who was killed in New Guinea in 1961.

Nelson Rockefeller was at work on the second volume of books on his collection, which was concerned with modern art, at the time of his death.

In 1932, when he was only 24, he took a seat on the board of the Museum of Modern Art. In 1935 he became treasurer; by 1939 he was its president.

(His taste for the moderns would, at times, cause him problems. For example, when Rockefeller Center was being completed, he commissioned Mexican artist Diego Rivera to paint the central murals for the massive complex. What Rivera painted—a picture quite critical of capitalism, complete with a portrait of Lenin—was unacceptable. Rockefeller tried to bargain with the artist, who refused to compromise. The mural was effaced.)

Rockefeller filled his residences in New York City, in Pocantico Hills, N.Y., and in Maine, with works he bought and works he commissioned. In the 1930s, for his lavish New York apartment, Henri Matisse and Fernand Leger were commissioned to paint murals; Alberto and Diego Giacometti supplied lamps and fireplace andirons.

When Rockefeller was named vice president by former President Gerald R. Ford, the Rockefellers took to the vice presidential mansion in Washington a number of the modern works they owned and gave to the nation a bed made by the surrealist artist Max Ernst.

Rockefeller probably would have been revered forever as a patron, connoisseur and benefactor of the arts had he not embarked on a curious enterprise last year.

Rockefeller went into the art business. And the area of art commerce he went into is one that is increasingly the subject of much criticism, that is, art reproduction.

Doing business as the "Nelson Rockefeller Collection," Rockefeller arranged to have reproduced works of art and decorative objects that he owned.

Offered for sale in a glossy catalog massmailed from Labor Day on and in a showroom at 48 East 57th Street in Manhattan were reproductions of the Giacometti andirons and lamps; a repro-Rodin bronze for $7,500; works by Degas, Nadelman, Bonnard, Cezanne and Toulouse-Lautrec; as well as primitive pieces, furniture and china.

The list goes on and on—a list of copies of precious things collected by Rockefeller over the years, now offered to the public like highly-priced gimcracks.

Friends and acquaintances of the Rockefellers were heard to say, "Can you imagine Nelson opening a store!" A recent New Yorker magazine cartoon portrayed a couple showing off their living room to visitors. The gag line reads something like, "We've re-

done the room completely in Nelson Rockefeller."

There is a more serious side, however. Some critics have called the Rockefeller venture artistic profanity. The works are not represented as mere copies, but as reproductions of enduring merit. Critics like Hilton Kramer of the New York Times have judged them, however, "glossy but shoddy."

The reproduction business, as practiced by Rockefeller as well as former Metropolitan Museum director Thomas P.F. Hoving (who set up shop last year), has been condemned by the American Art Dealers Association. The position of the association is that the high-priced reproductions business dilutes and diminishes the market for original works of art.

The association's condemnation, in the opinion of many critics, curators and practicing artists, is not self-serving. For the price one pays for a Rockefeller reproduction of a Picasso, say, one can buy an original produced by an artist of merit.

Viewing a reproduction, as Hilton Kramer correctly observed, "bears little relation to the experience of the original object . . . it demeans the artist's work—all in the name of bringing it closer to us."

Nelson Rockefeller, a grand acquisitor, a man of great taste, was, however, following in the footsteps of his progenitors, men who were never hesitant to make a buck. And apparently, the Nelson Rockefeller Collection is successful.

One can be sure, however—and this is to his credit—that Nelson Rockefeller never, ever would have considered buying one of the objects that, late in life, he offered for sale.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 30, 1979]

ROCKEFELLER EULOGIZED BY SON AT GRAVESIDE SERVICES

TARRYTOWN, N.Y.—The ashes of Nelson A. Rockefeller were buried Monday in a family cemetery here after a eulogy by his 15-year-old son.

None of the public clamor that punctuated Rockefeller's life was evident at the graveside rites.

"Dad, we know how much you love us and we want you to know how much we love you and how much we will miss you," Nelson Jr., one of two sons by Rockefeller's second marriage, said.

"Your spirit will live on with us forever. We'll try to live up to the example you've set as a father, as a husband, as a brother, as a statesman and as a friend.

"Dad, we're not saying goodby, but until we meet again."

After the eulogy, Laurance Rockefeller, one of two surviving brothers, told his nephew: "Nelson, you've spoken for all of us."

The former Vice President and four-time New York governor, who died of a heart attack Friday night, was cremated Sunday at the Ferncliff Crematory near the family's 250-acre Pocantico Hills estate.

President and Mrs. Carter will attend nondenominational memorial services for Rockefeller on Friday morning at New York's Riverside Church, the White House announced Monday.

Only family members were present Monday for the 70-year-old Rockefeller's 30-minute graveside rites.

Attending the ceremonies were his widow, Margaretta (Happy) Rockefeller, by whom he had two children, and Mary Todhunter Clark, who had borne him five children before their 1963 divorce.

The grave was just to the right of the plot where John D. Rockefeller Jr., Nelson's father, and his mother, Abby Aldrich Rockefeller, are buried. The patriarch and founder of the family fortune, John D. Rockefeller Sr., is buried in Cleveland.

Estimates of Nelson Rockefeller's personal fortune ran as high as $200 million to $250 million. Included, however, was a $37.4 million art collection, which he reportedly willed to Manhattan's Museum of Modern Art.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 30, 1979]

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER

Strong political leaders—indeed, leaders in any field—have a quality in common: They tend to be so uniquely themselves, so all-of-a-piece, that even their deaths bear the same individual stamp and character as their lives. Perhaps that is what's meant by "integrity." It is certainly a quality that Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller had in full measure.

Mr. Rockefeller's death at 70 Friday was in itself almost a monument to his life. He was stricken at 10:15 p.m. while working in his midtown Manhattan office, after having spent a typically long working day; it had included a speech introducing former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, a long-time friend and associate, in an appearance at a private school attended by two of Mr. Rockefeller's sons. When he collapsed of a heart attack, he was working on a forthcoming volume about modern art, one of many projects associated with his own vast art collection.

The great themes of Nelson Rockefeller's life—business, statecraft, art, zest for hard work, and a tireless drive to share his advantages with others—came together at his death.

Mr. Rockefeller was one of the richest men in the world, member of a financial dynasty and heir to the incalculable oil and real estate fortune founded by his grandfather, John D. Rockefeller Sr. He could have lived a life of uninterrupted luxury and ease. Instead, he plunged into the management of an industrial empire, broadened its philanthropic scope, and became a powerful force in the nation's political life—adviser and administrator to every President since Franklin Roosevelt, four times governor of New York state, founder and head of a panel designed to solve the nation's economic and social problems, Vice President under President Gerald Ford. The one goal he never reached was the Presidency itself; he repeatedly sought but never won the Republican nomination.

Nelson Rockefeller summed up his own life in the brief speech he gave on taking office as Vice President. "I feel a great sense of gratitude," he said, "for the privilege of serving the country I love." The services can never be returned; the gratitude can be, and is.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 29, 1979]

NATION'S LEADERS EXPRESS SORROW

Former President Gerald R. Ford, the man who appointed Nelson A. Rockefeller Vice President, said Saturday that Rockefeller's death was a tragic loss personally and politically.

"One cannot adequately express one's sadness when a tragic death occurs," Ford said in a statement from King Hussein's guest palace in Amman, Jordan. "I have lost one of my closest friends, both personally and politically."

Ford appointed Rockefeller his Vice President upon succeeding Richard Nixon in the White House. He learned of Rockefeller's death shortly after breakfast on the next-to-last day of his two-week Middle East tour.

"The nation loses a truly great leader who unselfishly devoted his lifetime to helping his country and its people.

"The world has lost a statesman with vision, understanding, and wisdom. Betty [Mrs. Ford] and I extend our deepest condolences to Mrs. Rockefeller, their children, and the Rockefeller family," Ford said.

Nixon, in a statement issued at his San Clemente, Cal., office, said:

"Nelson Rockefeller inherited great wealth. But to his eternal credit, instead of sitting on the sidelines, living it up, he plunged into the political arena, where he enjoyed great victories and suffered disappointing defeats.

"His great ability, enormous energy, unfailing good humor, and selfless dedication to public service left an indelible mark for good on the American political scene.

"Mrs. Nixon joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Rockefeller and his family."

NEW YORK Gov. Hugh Carey ordered the flags at all state office buildings lowered to half-staff and praised the four-time Republican governor as "a man of wisdom and courage, energy, and vision."

"With the passing of Nelson Rockefeller, we have lost our great governor and our beloved Vice President," he said.

Ronald Reagan, former California governor and presidential candidate, awakened at his home in a Los Angeles suburb, said: "I've known him for years, and we had many dealings as governors. He was a longtime public servant. We had our political differences, but we had a cordial relationship. I'm deeply shocked, as I'm sure everyone is, and I have the deepest sympathy for his family."

Sen. Percy [R., Ill.], whose liberal political philosophy was considered akin to Rockefeller's, said: "Nelson Rockefeller's influence on American politics was considerable, just as his influence on many lives was great.

"Throughout his lifetime, he was in the forefront of human rights, but he always stood for a strong national defense and a dynamic foreign policy.

"It was characteristic of Nelson Rockefeller that, as he closed the political chapter of his life, he immersed himself in the next phase, his modern art collection, with the same enthusiasm and energy that he had shown in all other aspects of his life."

Gov. Thompson Saturday directed that all Illinois state officers fly the American flag at half-staff next week through sundown Friday.

Thompson said of Rockefeller: "He was a personal friend, but more than that, he was one of the best friends this nation ever had.

"He was always a part of our country's courage and integrity, and we will all miss him. I feel deep sympathy for his family."

Former Illinois Gov. Richard Ogilvie characterized Rockefeller as "a fine, decent guy."

"He was my choice for Vice President when Ford was running for President, and I believe if Ford had picked Rockefeller rather than Bob Dole, he would have continued to be President."

Ogilvie recalled that when he was elected governor in 1968, "I sent members of my transition team to visit then-Gov. Rockefeller in New York, and he gave them excellent advice on how to organize our administration. We got to be close friends as fellow governors."

When Rockefeller made his belated entry into the 1968 presidential campaign, his third unsuccessful attempt for his party's nomination for the office, Elroy Sandquist was his Illinois campaign chairman.

Sandquist, now a Republican state representative from Chicago, said:

"I am deeply shocked by his death. I got to know him very well, and I found him to be a warm and understanding human being. I was very disappointed that we didn't get him nominated in 1968."

In Charleston, West Virginia Gov. Jay Rockefeller, Nelson Rockefeller's nephew, said he was saddened to learn of his uncle's death.

"Sharon and I grieve over the loss of Uncle Nelson, not only from our family's standpoint but also that of the state and nation," the governor said. "His energy, zest, and determination for a stronger, wiser America came from a total devotion to this country and its way of life."

Mrs. Rockefeller is the former Sharon Percy, daughter of Sen. Percy.

Sen. Jacob Javits [R., N.Y.] said Rockefeller had "a big vision and a big concept of what the American people were capable of achieving in peace and prosperity for themselves and the world. His extraordinary public service to New York State, to our nation, and to his political party are the material of history and will mark him as one of America's most distinguished sons.

"We will do well to remember his ideas, his teachings, and his personal warmth and dynamism. It will help us as individuals and as a people. We have all lost a good friend."

Former Sen. Hiram Fong of Hawaii said Rockefeller "always appeared in good health. It was surprising. He was a fine man. I knew him quite well and liked him very much."

Fong said Rockefeller was twice "within reach of the presidency," when he was asked by Nixon to run against John Kennedy and when he was Ford's Vice President.

"Had he run with Nixon against Kennedy, both would have won, and the history of the world would have changed," Fong said.

James Farmer, founder of the Congress of Racial Equality [CORE], said: "It is with great sadness and grief that I learned of the passing of an old friend, Nelson Rockefeller. Nelson was a friend whose wealth did not blind him to human misery, suffering, and poverty. He was a man of passion for all people—rich and poor."

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 28, 1979]

STUNNED FAMILY PREPARES ROCKEFELLER'S LAST RITES

NEW YORK.—The stunned family of Nelson A. Rockefeller gathered Saturday morning to make funeral arrangements for the former Vice President who died late Friday night of an apparent heart attack at the age of 70.

Laurance Rockefeller, Nelson's brother, emerged into Fifth Avenue with his wife, Mary French Rockefeller, both in tears after a morning telephone conference with family members far and wide.

Laurance Rockefeller spoke in a weak voice as he and his wife came out into the wind.

He said he wanted to try to "say a few words about my brother.

"I have always loved and admired Nelson as a brother and friend for as long as I can remember."

Rockefeller clutched a small plaque of the well-known prayer of St. Francis of Assisi. He said he is finding "great solace" in it and asked Hugh Morrow, a Rockefeller spokesman to read it. Morrow read the last paragraph:

"O Divine Master, grant that we may not so much seek to be consoled as to console, to be understood as to understand, to be loved as to love. For it is in giving that we receive, it is in pardoning that we are pardoned, and it in dying that we are born to eternal life."

Morrow, also weeping as he stood in an icy wind on the sidewalk, said the family would be reunited in a few hours and funeral services would be worked out.

Former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger was with Rockefeller's youngest son, Mark, at the Pocantico Hills estate in Westchester County. It was Mark's 12th birthday Friday and no one knew if Kissinger had informed him yet.

The late governor's wife, Margaretta—known as "Happy"—accompanied by a doctor, gave the news to their other son Nelson Jr., after returning from Lenox Hill Hospital in early morning. Morrow said she was grief-stricken, but composed.

"We will miss him very much," the boy is reported to have said.

Spokesman Morrow said Rockefeller died while working at his desk in Rockefeller Center, the midtown Manhattan business and entertainment complex that bears the family name.

Morrow said Rockefeller collapsed at about 9:15 p.m., Chicago time, as he worked on a book featuring his extensive modern art collection.

Security personnel tried in vain to revive him. He was taken to Lenox Hill Hospital, where he was pronounced dead.

Dr. Anthony Mustalish, chief of emergency services at the hospital, said Rockefeller arrived at about 10 p.m. Chicago time, and was not breathing. Mustalish said a team of doctors tried for an hour without success to revive him.

The body was taken to a funeral parlor in Tarrytown, N.Y., where the family's estate is located.

Rockefeller, a Republican who served as New York's governor for 15 years, spent a "normal day at his office" before the incident, Morrow said.

"Rockefeller was enjoying life since leaving politics and had not suffered any illnesses," Morrow said.

He said the former Vice President always had been considered in excellent health and apparently died of "instantaneous heart seizure."

Morrow said that at about 5 p.m., Rockefeller had accompanied his wife and their two sons to young Nelson's private school for a speech by Kissinger, Kissinger, a long-time friend, had been an adviser to Rockefeller during his years as New York's governor.

The family then returned to their Fifth Avenue apartment for dinner, after which Rockefeller went back to his office to work on his art book.

Since leaving the vice presidency and politics in 1976, Rockefeller had energetically devoted his time to retail sale of reproductions of works in his art collection. He printed a catalog before Christmas offering the high-priced and high-quality works.

He had been scheduled to speak Saturday to the Fifth World Antiques Market Conference here, where he was to announce plans to make his retail store on 57th Street a permanent operation.

Nelson was the oldest surviving brother of the sons of John D. Rockefeller Jr. His brother John D. III, eldest of the third generation of the financial dynasty started by John D. Rockefeller, died last July in an automobile accident on the family estate. He was 72.

Another brother, Winthrop, died in 1973 after serving as governor of Arkansas for two terms.

Two other brothers, Laurance and David, and a sister, Abby, survive. Laurance, 68, has made his career in philanthropies, especially conservation efforts. David is a giant in American financial circles; he is president and chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank.

Rockefeller had been elected to four terms as governor of New York State, served in an array of appointive posts in government during World War II and after, and managed the family's many business enterprises.

Rockefeller was born July 8, 1908, in Bar Harbor, Me. His grandfather, John D. Rockefeller, was the country's first billionaire and the founder of the Standard Oil Co.

In 1930, Rockefeller graduated from Dartmouth College, received a $2,500 bonus from his father for not smoking or drinking, married Mary Todhunter Clark, the daughter of a socially prominent Philadelphia family, and immediately began supervising the family businesses.

Recalling his youth, Rockefeller said his Baptist religion played a major role in his family. "We had family prayers every morning before breakfast and on Sunday attended Sunday school and church," he said.

"We were raised strictly, as was my father and his father before him. The surroundings were obviously different but the principles and the discipline were the same."

During World War II, Rockefeller served under Franklin Delano Roosevelt as coordinator of inter-American affairs, and also as assistant Secretary of State. He was undersecretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1953–54; special assistant to the President in 1954–55; and chairman of the President's committee on government organization in 1953–58.

In 1958, in his first try for elective office, he scored a political upset by defeating Democrat Averell Harriman for New York governor by 573,000 votes.

His original and somewhat stiff "Call Me Nelson" approach soon gave way to the familiar "Hiya, fella!" wink-and-grin "Rocky" that proved a delight to political cartoonists and headline writers. He was elected governor four times.

Two years later, he made a belated try for the Republican presidential nomination but was defeated by Richard Nixon, who became a bitter personal political enemy and long-time foe of Rockefeller's liberal tradition.

In 1964, he let the GOP nomination slip away again, this time to Sen. Barry M. Goldwater of Arizona. In 1968 he lost to Nixon a second time.

Rockefeller's years as New York governor are best remembered for his stand during the Attica prison rebellion in 1971, during which 43 people died. His refusal to go to the prison in western New York and negotiate with the inmates stirred liberals to charge the governor with a lack of compassion.

In 1963 he shocked the political world by marrying Margaretta Fitler Murphy, a Bryn Mawr graduate and debutante whose family had made a fortune in the rope business.

Rockefeller and his first wife had separated Nov. 17, 1961, after a 31-year marriage. They were divorced in Reno, Nev., on March 17, 1962.

Some politicians believe his divorce, and remarriage to Happy, cost him the 1964 presidential nomination. As Rockefeller campaigned throughout the country, he often was greeted by criticism of his divorce and remarriage.

An authority on modern and primitive art, Rockefeller served as a trustee of the Museum of Modern Art in New York City. He also was a founder of the Museum of Primitive Art.

Rockefeller faced personal tragedy often during his life.

In 1961, one of his sons by his first marriage, Michael, was swept out to sea while on an exploration near New Guinea in 1961. His body was never found.

In 1974, while he was undergoing congressional confirmation hearings on his appointment as Vice President, Rockefeller called a surprise news conference in his Manhattan office. Many of the reporters present expected him to withdraw his name from contention.

Instead, he announced that his wife, Happy, had just undergone a radical mastectomy for breast cancer.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 29, 1979]

CARTER'S TRIBUTE

WASHINGTON.—President Carter's statement on the death of Nelson Rockefeller:

"Today the nation mourns one of its most distinguished public men, Nelson Rockefeller. Rosalynn and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Rockefeller and his family.

Nelson Rockefeller was born to privilege and accepted his privilege as an obligation to serve his state and nation. He sought the highest service, but willingly and ably performed whatever tasks were asked of him by his country. He was a strong and popular governor. He served unstintingly under many Presidents of both parties whenever there was a special task to be done.

"At a time when our people's trust in their government had been deeply shaken he ac-

cepted appointment to the vice presidency, helping to reassure the nation with his own integrity and vigorous optimism.

"But Nelson Rockefeller did not limit himself to tasks others assigned him. He had special concern for the less fortunate, for the arts, for the processes of government itself, and, most of all, for the vision that guided this nation. When he saw a need, he marshalled the necessary resources and talent to set about meeting it.

"A warm and generous friend, he knew how to lose with grace and win with enthusiasm. He drank deeply of life from a full cup.

"We knew him by his good works."

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 7, 1979]

ROCKEFELLER CREMATED; ASHES TO BE BURIED TODAY

TARRYTOWN, N.Y.—The body of former Vice President Nelson A. Rockefeller was cremated Sunday, a family spokesman said, a day before a private memorial service scheduled at the Rockefeller estate overlooking the Hudson River.

Rockefeller's ashes will be buried today at the family cemetery at Pocantico Hills. He and his brothers and sister spent much of their childhood at the family estate there.

Rockefeller, who died Friday night at the age of 70, was cremated in Westchester County, the spokesman, who asked not to be identified, said.

Hugh Morrow, another family spokesman, said most of the family, including Rockefeller's brother David, had joined his widow, Happy, and his children at Pocantico Hills by Sunday.

David Rockefeller, chairman of Chase Manhattan Bank, had been in Oman in the Middle East when he received word of Nelson's death, and immediately headed for home.

A separate memorial service for family, friends and national and international leaders was scheduled for 11 a.m. Friday at Riverside Church on Manhattan's Upper West Side. The church was financed with the help of donations by Rockefeller's father, John D. Rockefeller Jr.

New York Gov. Hugh L. Carey said he intended to hold a tribute to Rockefeller in Albany at a future date.

Rockefeller served 15 years as governor of New York and two years as Vice President under Gerald R. Ford.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 29, 1979]

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER

He should have been President. To say that of Nelson A. Rockefeller is not to say definitively that he would have been a great President, certainly not that he would not have made mistakes of judgment. It is rather to say that more than most public men of his time he was equipped by experience, character and outlook to hold the office he so energetically went after, but which his own party firmly and at times vindictively denied him the chance for.

He was out of phase with the Republican Party of his day, as indeed by the time of his death his approach to public policy seemed out of tune with the currently fashionable political mood. "Era of limits," "lowered expectations" were phrases without meaning for Nelson Rockefeller; he seemed to have been born with a temperament of boundless optimism (and why shouldn't a Rockefeller be optismistic?); for him there were no problems without solutions, no obstacles that could not be overcome by hard work and good will. His evident belief in the inevitability and rightness of progress was in a way more of his grandfather's century than of his own.

After so many years of public life his record was, as they say, mixed; his death will not go unmarked by controversy about this judgment, that decision—but his views were consistent. From the beginning of his service in Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration, he was an internationalist; he knew that the United States was, like it or not, the main actor on the world stage, and he thought that the role should be played with both firmness and generosity. The beneficiary of democratic capitalism himself, he saw both its uses and its limitations, and he believed in employing government both to promote enterprise and assertively to provide for the common good.

From his public posts and his private philanthropies he encouraged improvements in education, medicine and science with the same gusto he applied to government, but it was art that enthralled him. "In a mechanistic world," he once said, "it is the great refresher, the source of inspiration, the renewer." It is hard to overestimate his influence on modern taste. He was one of those collectors who do not follow public taste but lead it; he did more than any person in America to bring primitive art into the public eye.

No stranger to private trouble and great grief, he was cheerful, even jaunty, in the face of public disappointment, and when you heard that gravelly New York voice you knew he thought that things—however they looked at the moment—were going to get better.

Vastly ambitious for himself, denied the prize he wanted most, Nelson Rockefeller nevertheless was what the phrase public servant is all about.

[From the New York Post, Feb. 1, 1979]

ROCKEFELLER REMEMBERED: THE ELUSIVE NOMINATION

(By William F. Buckley)

Some years ago—it was during the period of indecision in 1967–68 over whether to contest Richard Nixon for the Republican nomination for the presidency—Henry Kissinger called to advise me that Gov. Rockefeller would like to meet me. Meeting me is terribly easy to arrange, so not long after, HK and I rode up the elevator to the Fifth Avenue apartment, and Happy opened the door. What would I like to eat, drink, smoke, etc., and in a few minutes—powerful men, it is my experience, generally let a visitor cool for a moment or two to heighten the suspense: but it was easy to pause there, because within eyesight lay several million dollars of nicely distracting art treasures—he strode in. We exchanged pleasantries while I wondered what was the purpose of the meeting.

In due course I found myself listening to an hour-long recitation of his early career on the Latin American desk, at the Chapultepec Conference, and at San Francisco, where he had labored continually to counter Soviet machinations. All this was done quietly in the tones, I gradually perceived, of a postulant. Nelson Rockefeller wished to convince me that he was profoundly anti-Communist.

I always believed this true of him, but notwithstanding his consistency on the question—marred by an ambiguity on Vietnam when, briefly, Adviser Emmet Hughes prevailed over Adviser Henry Kissinger, respectively the dove and the hawk in the inner circle—Nelson Rockefeller permanently alienated the right wing in America. He did this in 1963 when he was induced to denounce in extravagant terms the whole of the conservative movement as though it were a branch of the John Birch Society. His reward was the distasteful episode in San Francisco when delegates who went there grimly determined to nominate Barry Goldwater gave Rockefeller the Bronx cheer—as if to say: "If that is what you think of US, this is what we think of YOU."

But Nelson Rockefeller never gave up. And so now, in 1968, he made a gesture to representatives of the right wing. During the convention itself, against the forlorn possibility that he might actually be nominated over Nixon and Reagan, a special representative of Rockefeller kept me regular company, his mission to guard against the preemptive denunciation of Rockefeller by certain quarters, which denunciation would have had on Rockefeller's candidacy the same effect that the virtual denunciation of him by the labor leaders had on George McGovern in '72.

Then, too, there was the image of Rockefeller the Big Spender. He was unquestionably the central figure in the progressive decline of the economy of New York and New York City. But he came gradually to recognize that there were limits to all of this. And so he quarreled with John Lindsay, who finally joined the Democratic Party, where he had always belonged. And on one occasion, with several dozen persons present, Nelson Rockefeller rose to toast Gov. Ronald Reagan at the other end of the room:

"I feel the urge to confess," said Gov. Rockefeller, "that I tried a different approach to state welfare than Gov. Reagan. And his has proved more successful than mine."

In 1970 we met to discuss the senatorial race in which my brother James competed, and won. The incumbent, Sen. Charles Goodell, having been appointed by Gov. Rockefeller upon the death of Robert Kennedy, had switched radically to the left, proving an embarrassment to Rockefeller. On that occasion he told me he would give only formalistic support to Goodell, to whom as a fellow Republican he was organizationally committed. "I really am a conservative, you know." And then, winking, "I've got a lot to conserve."

Classically, Nelson Rockefeller is another example of the man who, having nothing left to animate him, dies; like Napoleon at Elba, or Robert Taft after Eisenhower's nomination. He was a very strong man, persuasive in conversation, dogged in his pursuit of his goals, unsentimental, yet generous.

Henry Kissinger believes he would have been a great President. I think it altogether possible that this is true. He had the strength of character to profit from his own mistakes. If he had been kinder to Nixon during the years of exile, Nixon might have appointed him to replace Agnew. If that had happened, Rockefeller would almost surely have been President last week—in which event, almost surely, he would still be alive.●

BUDGET BALANCING

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, balancing the Federal budget has been a goal of some politicians—or at least a plank in their platforms—for decades. To listen to some, one might be persuaded to believe that balancing the Federal budget will end inflation, reduce taxes and the size of Government, and usher in an age of national prosperity. Unfortunately, a balanced budget, in itself, will do none of these things.

Inflation, for example, is caused by the Federal Reserve System and the fractional reserve banking system it oversees. Inflation is not caused by unbalanced budgets, and balancing the Federal budget will have little or no effect on inflation as long as our present banking system remains unaltered. The year the stock market crashed, 1929, the Federal

Government had a stupendous surplus in its budget, $1.2 billion. A surplus of comparable size today would be $80 billion. Despite this large surplus (and surpluses in other years during the decade of the twenties), the Fed was still able to inflate the money supply sufficiently to cause the crash and subsequent depression.

Neither will a balanced budget reduce taxes or the size of Government. Budgets might be balanced by raising taxes as well as by reducing expenditures. Agencies, prohibited from spending more money, might promulgate regulations that shift costs from the Federal budget to the budgets of consumers and businesses. Balancing the budget, in short, will not result in any of the consequences desired by the proponents of a balanced budget. Inflation will end only when honest money—which is gold—becomes our national currency. Taxes will be reduced only when this body cuts taxes. The unconstitutional powers of the bureaucracy will be curbed only when this body summons the courage to curb them.

I ask that an article by Bruce Bartlett, an economist on the staff of Senator ROGER JEPSEN of Iowa, entitled "Budget Balancing" appear in the RECORD at this point. The article originally was published in the January 24, 1979 edition of the New York Times:

BUDGET BALANCING

(By Bruce Bartlett)

ARLINGTON, VA.—President Carter's proposed fiscal 1980 budget, which would contain a $29 billion deficit—down from the 1979 deficit of $37 billion—shows his concern for reducing the Federal deficit and moving toward a balanced budget for 1981. Gov. Edmund G. Brown Jr. of California also seeks a balanced Federal budget, but wants to mandate it by a constitutional amendment.

Although conservatives are widely applauding these actions, the economic rationale for a balanced budget is extremely weak and there may be unforseen consequences, both political and economic.

If one looks at the economic problem, there are really only two good arguments for a balanced budget: to hold down the growth of Government spending and to control inflation. Unfortunately, a balanced budget guarantees neither.

On the surface it would appear that an amendment requiring a balanced budget would reduce Government spending to the level of budget receipts.

But the Congress could just as easily decide to maintain the same high level of spending and raise taxes instead.

If you don't think the Congress will raise taxes if necessary to keep from cutting spending, remember that the last Congress raised Social Security taxes by $227 billion despite a so-called tax revolt.

Furthermore, every state in the Union has a provision in its constitution requiring a balanced state budget, yet this has had no effect on the states' ability to increase spending.

Indeed, for many years the fastest growth of government has been in the state and local sectors, not the Federal. Consequently, it is just wishful thinking to believe that Federal spending will be reduced by a balanced-budget requirement.

Nor can we expect a balanced-budget amendment to reduce inflation, because inflation is primarily caused by an expansionary monetary policy.

A budget deficit in and of itself has no inflationary impact. The only thing that matters is how that deficit is financed.

If it is monetized—that is, financed by creating more money—then there will be an inflationary impact, just as there would be from any increase in the quantity of money with or without a deficit.

But if the deficit is financed by borrowing from real savings, then there is no inflationary impact. Capital merely becomes diverted from market-directed purposes to Government-directed purposes. This may or may not be desirable on other grounds, but there won't be any inflation as a result.

Considering these facts, one wonders why conservatives are so adamant in their devotion to a balanced budget, especially when it has brought them so much political harm.

Because conservatives hate budget deficits so much, they became the liberals' tax collectors.

The liberals would win election by promising the people something for nothing via the miracle of deficit spending, and then they would let the conservatives oppose such spending or raise taxes to pay for it.

Consequently, conservatives have become associated negatively in the public's mind with those who take away their benefits without offering anything in return except the virtues of a balanced budget.

It is ironic that just when conservations have finally begun to shake off their hopeless quest for a balanced budget and adopt the more fruitful tax-reduction approach of Proposition 13, a liberal Democrat like Governor Brown should pick up the idea and breathe new life into it.

Eventually, conservatives must understand that "deficit" is only a code word without economic significance. They must be prepared to say that it is better to have a $400 billion Federal budget with a $100 billion deficit than a $500 billion budget that is balanced. Reducing taxes and reducing spending are the proper goals.

Pursuit of a balanced budget is not the way to achieve them.●

TRIBUTE TO TOM MACK, SKILLED ATHLETE AND GREAT COMPETITOR

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, Americans have always paid great tribute to our Nation's outstanding athletes primarily, I believe, because these individuals express competitive strength and give their best for the performance of their skills to bring honor to their sport. It is, therefore, with justifiable pride that I tell my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives that one of our country's better-known professional football players is a constituent of the congressional district which I represent, California's 26th. Tom Mack, offensive guard for the Los Angeles Rams, is a resident of San Marino, my hometown. To be more accurate, Mr. Speaker, I must say that Tom Mack is a former offensive guard for the Los Angeles Rams, because Tom recently announced that he has retired from his career in professional football. While Tom's friends know that hanging up his jersey will mean the beginning of another outstanding career, they are, nonetheless, sad to lose him to the sport in which he has performed with excellence and through which he has afforded so much pleasure for those of us who have watched him play his sport to our ultimate expectations. Tom Mack has represented everything that is sportsmanlike—skill, agility, stamina, fairplay, and team spirit. On Monday night, January 29, in the Los Angeles Coliseum, Tom Mack played his last professional football game. Although his team lost out on the big one—Super Bowl—Tom Mack gave his all for an NFC win and went out in style with cheers and standing ovations from his fans and Ram's teammates.

None question that Tom Mack will have a highly successful career in his new profession as an engineering salesman for Bechtel Corp., but he will certainly be missed in the sport of football where he provided great entertainment, recreation, and diversion for those of us who are spectators. So, the San Marino Tribune called this "The End of an Era" in their Thursday, February 1 edition where Jeff Weir wrote an article about the night Tom Mack "hung up his cleats and shoulder pads for the last time." Without seeking public attention, Tom Mack played as he always had—giving his greatest effort to the team he had played with for 13 seasons, the Los Angeles Rams. I would now like to share Jeff Weir's article with my colleagues, because he was there on the night of Tom Mack's "retirement" and because Tom's friends expect to see even greater things emerge from Tom's new business career:

THE END OF AN ERA: TOM MACK

(By Jeff Weir)

Tom Mack hung up his cleats and shoulder pads for the last time Monday night after shivering through a lackluster Pro Bowl game in the cavernous Coliseum. The scene had all the touches of a storybook finish—and a little drama, and nostalgia, to boot, for it represented the end of an era.

Like his neighbor and friend, Merlin Olsen, Mack probably played more years for the Rams than he wanted to in hopes of getting to the Super Bowl. Sadly, neither Mack nor Merlin saw their Super Bowl wishes come true.

Still, Mack went out in style Monday, with standing ovations, hugs from his teammates and a Coliseum full of admirers, not to mention a national television audience.

The game had Mack written all over it.

Fittingly, he was the last man introduced to the sparse crowd. And, despite the fact that he was surrounded by the household names of pro football—the best in the world—Mack, just an offensive guard (not a glory position), drew the most attention.

It had to be a humbling experience, even for a man who'd become used to cheers.

The game itself was incidental. Even so, whenever Mack went into the game, things happened.

He made his first appearance midway through the first quarter to block for Frank Corral's field goal. Corral missed and Mack trotted back to the bench.

He started the second quarter, alongside several Ram teammates, and the NFC All Stars, behind Archie Manning, promptly moved downfield to the first touchdown of the game. After the kick, Mack trotted back to that familiar seat on the bench where he'd spent 13 seasons with the Rams. Now and then he'd reminisce with Coach Bob Holloway, the NFL defensive coordinator who just happened to be Mack's coach at Michigan 14 blurred years ago.

Mack returned to the field in the third quarter and, yup, the NFC again marched to a touchdown, the team's second and the game's final one.

The rest of the game was anticlimax. Nothing stirred the crowd until late in the game when, with the NFC running out the clock, coach Bud Grant sent Mack back into the huddle.

For the last time. The crowd knew it, the players knew it. Everything stopped while the players congratulated Mack with head slaps and bear hugs and the crowd rose to its feet. It was the stuff that shivers are made of, going right up the spine.

Then it was over.

Afterwards, standing naked before a battery of reporters, Mack tugged for the last time at the tape encasing his knuckles and ankles. He'd done countless interviews before, so this avalanche of newspapermen was nothing new. And he knew they were all looking for him to utter that one word or phrase that could turn a basic "retirement" story into a fasting piece of human drama.

As always, Mack accommodated every "How do you feel?" question with a sincere answer. He shook hands, joked, got serious, then joked again. And laughed—a great open faced laugh that is eminently believable.

His laughter, no doubt, was laced with sadness. "The hardest thing is walking away. It's overpowering. This whole week has been unreal for me, with people asking me not to retire. But there's no chance. I knew this was coming as far back as October.

"Football's been wonderful to me. But now I have to go out and start over. But it's hard to say goodbye."

Bending down, Mack tore the last bit of tape off his ankle and stuffed it into the bag holding his helmet, pads and shoes. Then, with a grunt, he lifted the bag and threw it toward the equipment man. With finality.

Asked again about retirement, for the umpteenth time, Mack replies with a grin, "People were so nice to me when I retired that I may retire again." Then, serious, he says, "I really don't know what to say, after all the years and interviews. . .

"The neatest part was Sunday afternoon, when you play. I know I'll miss it when everybody starts going to training camp next summer."

The reporters started drifting away, save for one who kiddingly asked Mack why the team scored every time he went into the game.

"Don't tell, but I was the secret weapon."

He was more than that. But he was gone, off to the shower where, very probably, he would have to endure a round of ribbing from his teammates. In the shower, football players act just like kids.

Later, dressed and ready for the next step in his life, Mack walked outside to another throng of young and old admirers, well wishers, autograph seekers, people who wanted to see what a football player looks like—up close.

And then he was really gone, off to the night, and later to San Marino, where he'll tackle his next career on the front lines of the Bechtel Corporation as an engineering salesman.

Mack, the personable, likable giant, will be missed. Football not only lost an aging offensive guard Monday but a veteran sportsman. Tom Mack was an ambassador of good will. Seeing him walk away from it all was, well, the kind of experience that shivers are made of, going right up the spine.●