

H.R. 154: Mr. FLORIO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. CORRA-DA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. STANGELAND, and Mr. WHITLEY.

H.R. 165: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. CLAY, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. COELHO, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. DOWNEY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. LUENEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. EDGAR, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SOLARZ, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. RODINO, Mr. PRICE, Mr. ROE, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. GEPHARDT, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 201: Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. McDONALD, and Mr. SYMMS.
H.R. 202: Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. McDONALD, and Mr. SYMMS.

H.R. 277: Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HOWARD, and Mr. PRICE.

H.R. 571: Mr. TREEN, and Mr. HILLIS.
H.R. 662: Mr. COLLINS of Texas, and Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL.

H.R. 677: Mr. COLLINS of Texas.

H.R. 1140: Mr. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1290: Mr. GLICKMAN, and Mr. HAMILTON.

H.R. 1297: Mr. BEDELL.

H.R. 1597: Mrs. SNOWE, Mr. HINSON, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and Mr. KRAMER.

H.R. 1598: Mrs. SNOWE, Mr. HINSON, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and Mr. KRAMER.

H.R. 1600: Mr. GRADISON, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. GRISHAM, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. EVANS of the Virgin Islands, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. KEMP, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SYMMS, and Mr. MARRIOTT.

H.R. 1658: Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. FLIPPO.

H.R. 1906: Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. TRIBLE.

H.R. 1964: Mr. HAGEDORN.

H.R. 2152: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. CORCORAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KEMP, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, and Mr. DORNAN.

H.R. 2212: Mrs. BOUQUARD, Mr. CAVANAUGH, Mr. EVANS of the Virgin Islands, Mr. STARK, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 2254: Mr. LOTT, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. COLLINS of Texas.

H.R. 2291: Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. MOTTI, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. McDADDE, Mrs. SNOWE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 2447: Mr. FOWLER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 3100: Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. ERTEL, Mr. BLANCHARD, and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 3159: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. LEE, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. KEMP, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LOTT, Mr. KELLY, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. MOORE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. WALKER, Mr. TREEN, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LENT, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. SEBELLIUS, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HANCE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. CHENEY, and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 3335: Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 3370: Mr. NEDZI, and Mr. BLANCHARD.

H.J. Res. 196: Mr. GRASSLEY.

H.J. Res. 265: Mr. MINETA, Mr. LEVITAS, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. SIMON, and Mr. ZEPFERETTI.

H. Con. Res. 7: Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. McDONALD, Mr. SYMMS, and Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE.

H. Con. Res. 54: Mr. BARNES.

H. Con. Res. 85: Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. FISH, Mr. YATES, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. STARK, and Mr. FAZIO.

H. Res. 57: Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. DANNE- MEYER, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. McDONALD, and Mr. SYMMS.

H. Res. 105: Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska.

H. Res. 181: Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. STUMP, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. MAGUIRE, Mr. ZEPFERETTI, Mr. CHENEY, and Mr. CLEVELAND.

H. Res. 190: Mr. CAVANAUGH, Mr. HINSON, Mr. PEASE, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. BARNES, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. LOTT, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. YATRON, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. RAHALH, Mr. BONKER, Mrs. BOUQUARD, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. COELHO, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr.

GOODLING, Mr. BEARD of Tennessee, and Mr. FROST.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

96. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council, Salem, Mass., relative to approval of the final environmental impact statement on the proposed highway connection from route 128 at Lowell Street to Interstate 95 in Peabody, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3324

By Mr. BONER of Tennessee:
—Page 46, after line 9, insert the following:

REDUCTION IN AUTHORIZATIONS

Sec. 602. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount appropriated under any provision of this Act—

(1) for the fiscal year 1980 may not exceed the amount specifically authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1980 by such provision less eight percent of that amount; and

(2) for the fiscal year 1981 may not exceed the amount specifically authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1980 by such provision less ten percent of that amount;

except that, in applying this section with respect to appropriations to carry out chapter 4 (economic support fund) of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the amounts specified in section 532(b)(1) of that Act for Israel and Egypt shall be excluded in determining the aggregate amounts which may be appropriated.

(b) Not to exceed \$96,600,000 for fiscal year 1980 and \$117,000,000 for the fiscal year 1981 may be appropriated under section 121(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

By Mr. RITTER:

—On page 24, immediately after line 25, insert the following new section:

MIDDLE EAST PEACE DEVELOPMENT FUND

Sec. 306. It is the sense of the Congress that the President take all appropriate steps to negotiate with other industrial nations an agreement for the creation of a Peace Development Fund whose purpose would be to underwrite the costs of implementing a Middle East peace.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NONPROFIT STATUS FOR U.S. OLYMPICS

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would entitle the U.S. Olympic Committee, its national governing bodies, its affiliated multisport organizations, and the Lake Placid Olympic Committee in

the category of nonprofit organization to the special postal rate. This inclusion consists of less than 50 organizations, some of which operate under the special rate. The cost of this special rate to the Postal Service would be no more than \$500,000 per year. I recognize that a few of the organizations entitled to the special rate under this bill have interests in areas unrelated to Olympic sports. In these cases, such organizations may use the special rate where their mail pertains to amateur sports.

I would like to add that educational organizations already enjoy a special

postal rate. I believe that extending this privilege to organizations which perform a different type of educational function, training, and assisting amateur athletics, is in order.

We demonstrated our support of athletics in the United States by the enactment of the Amateur Sports Act in the 95th Congress. To further demonstrate our support for national and international sports organizations, this measure would enhance our olympic team by freeing funds which could be used to assist the training of such athletes.

Specifically, the special rate would charge 2.7 cents per piece of mail sent third class as compared to 8.4 cents per piece of mail sent regular third class. In addition, books and catalogs would be charged 14 cents per pound under the special rate as compared to 36 cents per pound under the regular rate. Finally, bulk third class would be charged 17 cents per pound as compared to the regular rate of 41 cents. It is obvious from comparing the different rates that the savings would significantly benefit our sports organizations.

As you know, the Internal Revenue Service recently considered amateur sport organizations as tax exempt organizations. While I realize that the U.S. Postal Service is not obligated to abide by the IRS rulings, generally, the special postage rate is given to nonprofit, tax exempt organizations. It is paradoxical to allow tax deductions for donations to Olympic organizations if we immediately negate the advantage by requiring that the respective organizations pay full postage costs which are not required by similar organizations.

Mr. Speaker, recognizing the needs of our Olympic teams, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. ●

THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO INCUR DEBT

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, with good reason the American people are telling us that they are not satisfied with the way the Federal Government is handling their money. Clearly, when a majority of the States have passed resolutions calling for a constitutional amendment restricting the discretion of the Federal Government to borrow money, the time has come for Congress to respond.

Many Members have responded with drafts of constitutional amendments calling for balanced budgets, repayment of the national debt, and restrictions on spending as well as statutory proposals with the same goal. I have joined with my colleagues on various proposals both constitutional and statutory. Hearings and debates have brought into focus what I believe is the crux of the issue: The power of Congress to incur debt.

The discussion to date has also highlighted the extreme difficulty in drafting an amendment that is well-defined, that preserves the spirit of the Constitution, and that cannot be circumvented. With these goals in mind I have introduced the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

Article —

SECTION 1. The Government of the United States shall not incur direct or indirect debt without an affirmative vote of two-thirds of both Houses of Congress.

CXXV—459—Part 6

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Some have argued that requiring a two-thirds vote would provide excessive power to the minority in Congress. Yet the Founding Fathers recognized certain decisions were of such consequence that they merited a broader consensus than a simple majority. The Constitution requires a two-thirds vote to override a Presidential veto, propose a constitutional amendment to the States for ratification, ratify a treaty in the Senate, or expel a Member. To require a two-thirds vote on the incurrence of debt similarly acknowledges that borrowing is a serious matter, an action not to be taken lightly, and every bit as important as other matters which require more than a majority vote. In my judgment the proposed amendment provides needed flexibility, recognizing that debt increases may be needed under some circumstances—but requires that broad support exist before the borrowing option is exercised.

I welcome comments on this amendment and cosponsorship by those who support it. ●

SEAFORD HIGH SCHOOL BAND TO REPRESENT THE UNITED STATES AT INTERNATIONAL YOUTH MUSIC FESTIVAL

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a signal honor that has been bestowed upon the Seaford High School Band, from Seaford, N.Y., in my Fourth Congressional District.

The Government of Belgium has invited the band to represent the United States at the 27th annual International Youth Festival of Music to be held the last week in April in Neer Pelt, Belgium.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in the 27 year history of this international event that an American high school band has been invited to participate in this music festival. All of us in the Fourth Congressional District are very proud that the Seaford band has been selected for this high honor. We salute the some 80 members of the band, and the Band Director Joseph Manos for this significant achievement.

The selection of the Seaford High School Band as the first to represent the United States at this noted music festival is a well-deserved tribute to the outstanding musical ability and the dedicated work of the band members and their director. I know their performances at the music festival will bring international recognition of the fine musical talent to be found among our Nation's young people.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we all are

aware that in recent years we have seen an unfortunate tendency to overemphasize the negative aspects involving the youth of our Nation. We hear a great deal of the problems of the younger generation, but very little about the many accomplishments of that generation. We tend to overlook the fact—and it is a fact—that the overwhelming majority of our young people contribute in a very positive way to their communities and to their country.

In the hope of providing some counterbalance to the negative impressions about our young people, I am taking this opportunity to inform my colleagues of the achievement of the Seaford High School Band. I know that all of you will join me in wishing them the greatest possible success as the representative of the United States at the 27th International Youth Music Festival in Belgium. ●

THE NORTH-SOUTH DIALOG: A FALSE DIVISION

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of introducing Senator CHURCH at conference in Seattle on the New International Economic Order: I found his comments thoughtful and enlightening, and thought they should be shared with my colleagues:

THE NORTH-SOUTH DIALOG: A FALSE DIVISION
(By Senator FRANK CHURCH)

It is a pleasure to be here in Seattle to discuss with you the state of our relations with developing countries and their importance to a strong and stable American economy. Indeed, it is fitting for this conference to be held in the State of Washington, which has for so many years been ably represented by Senator Magnuson and Senator Jackson. In my 23 years in the Senate, no other two Senators have had more to do with the enactment of major legislation.

In May of 1974, at the Sixth Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly, developing countries of the so-called Third World, as a result of their dissatisfaction with the current economic system, demanded the establishment of a new International Economic Order. Their demand was undoubtedly connected with their observance of how the OPEC oil cartel had gained the upper hand over the great industrialized nations of the West.

The New International Economic Order was to be fashioned through a North-South Dialog, during which the underdeveloped Third World countries demanded sweeping changes in trade, aid, and investment policies, with particular focus on Western Europe, North America and Japan.

In some ways, this North-South Dialog has a tone of a false dichotomy. It presents the image of a Southern Hemisphere made up of impoverished lands, victimized by the rich, advanced nations of the North. Once before, a few short years ago, we took an equally simplistic view of a world split between the East and the West. In the depths of the Cold War, our political maps were often drawn in two colors—one portion solid

red, denoting the communist world, and the other solid blue, denoting the free world.

In retrospect, no such world—perceived as consisting of two monolithic blocks—ever really existed. Yet, we were blind to the fractures behind the Iron Curtain, until the cracks opened into fissures, and communist governments turned upon one another with smoldering acrimony, seething hostility, and, finally, open war—the conflagration we have recently witnessed in South-East Asia.

By the same token, our touted "free world" was never composed, in the main, of free countries, but of despotisms and dictatorships of many different kinds, among which were sprinkled a smattering of truly free lands, few and far between.

We are in danger of making a similar mistake with the North-South concept. All of the richest countries are not located in the North. Indeed, the richest of all, as measured by per capita income, are today located in the Middle East. Nor are all countries in the North developed and prosperous. Several of our European allies—Spain, Portugal, Turkey, and Greece, for example, are plagued with widespread poverty and insufficient development.

It is equally true that all of the South is not poor—some southern countries are rich and well developed—the Union of South Africa comes readily to mind. Others, like Brazil, Mexico, Taiwan, and South Korea, to name but a few, are, in some circles, no longer considered developing countries at all, but rather as "newly industrialized."

With such variety, the interests of the Third World countries are anything but monolithic. For some, the decisions that we make with regard to tariffs and other trade issues are far more important than our foreign aid. This is not to say that rich nations should not continue to provide financial assistance to the poorest of the developing countries. Aid to improve health care and nutrition for the most impoverished should continue.

But of more enduring importance to many of the developing countries is trade. In 1977, for example, these countries earned more foreign exchange from just one month's exports, than they received from official development assistance from all major donors for the entire year.

In addition to being an important market for our agricultural products, developing countries also purchase sizeable quantities of U.S. manufactures—actually more than Western Europe, Japan, and all the Communist countries combined.

Nor is this trading relationship a one-way street. The U.S. imported \$67 billion worth of products from developing countries in 1977, constituting 45 percent of all U.S. imports, although 22 percent of these imports we were forced to buy at prohibitive prices, as the result of our growing dependence on OPEC oil.

Unlike OPEC, there are hopeful spots of cooperation developing between North and South. For instance, Southern nations who are major exporters of tin, have joined together with Northern consuming nations and attempted to fashion an agreement intended to cushion extreme fluctuation in the world market price for tin.

The United States is the world's largest consumer of tin, importing almost all we consume. We joined the Fifth International Tin Agreement in 1976 in the belief that it would benefit us by providing a measure of price and supply stabilization in an otherwise volatile market. Unfortunately, the International Tin Agreement (ITA) has not performed well. It has failed to moderate skyrocketing prices.

Last year, I attempted to bolster the flagging International Tin Agreement. I introduced an amendment which would have authorized the President to contribute 5000

tons of surplus tin from our national defense stockpile to the tin buffer stock of the ITA. An additional 30,000 tons of surplus tin would also have been disposed of by the General Services Administrator. The U.S. contribution owing the ITA would have been sold by the International Tin Council. This sale, together with the sale of 30,000 additional tons by our own government, would have brought the price of tin below the target ceiling set in the ITA, and substantially reduced the inflationary impact of high tin prices. Here was a case where the U.S. Government—often accused of being a major source of inflation—could have acted to moderate prices.

Unfortunately, the amendment failed to clear both houses of Congress before adjournment last year. But, I remain dissatisfied with the performance of the International Tin Agreement. I will urge that it be restructured when the current agreement expires in 1981, so that it can better cope with market extremes.

The farmers and businessmen of the Northwest share in common with the developing countries the hardship imposed by wild gyrations in the prices of basic commodities. Take sugar, for example. The extreme fluctuation in sugar prices is as harmful to sugar beet farmers in my state of Idaho as to growers in Jamaica. Prices which whipsaw from 7 cents to 70 cents a pound are as injurious to the health of our national economy as they are disastrous to the sugar beet farmer attempting to make a living. To remedy this, the U.S. Government joined with many others from both North and South—developed and developing countries, consumers and producers—in which over 70 nations participated. The goal of this Agreement is to stabilize the price of sugar on international markets via a series of quotas and national buffer stocks within a free trade range of 15 to 19 cents per pound.

Unfortunately, to date, the success rate of international commodity agreements has not been reassuring. Because of this poor track record, I held the International Sugar Agreement captive last year in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I felt we must first enact an adequate domestic "insurance" program for our own farmers. Now, I am reasonably confident that the Congress will pass, and the President sign, legislation to insure the survival of our domestic sugar industry. As soon as this occurs, I will move forward expeditiously to secure Senate ratification of the International Sugar Agreement.

Only the test of time will demonstrate whether the I.S.A. is a well crafted commodity agreement to which all signatory nations will adhere. Only the test of time will show whether this agreement can successfully withhold stocks in reserve during times of surplus, in order to guarantee a fair return to producers, and supply additional sugar in a time of shortage to moderate excessive price increases to consumers.

Some form of international commodity agreement is now called for to raise the price of wheat above today's distress levels. The wheat growers of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, along with the wheat growers of Canada, Australia, and Argentina share a common problem—they face wheat prices approaching record lows in terms of their real purchasing power.

The Administration has recently sent to the Senate Protocols for the Fourth Extension of the 1971 International Wheat Agreement—a purely consultative arrangement. These protocols are now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I intend to use this opportunity to review various proposals for cooperative arrangements among major wheat producers—proposals which would seek to raise the price of wheat to at least \$4 a bushel at the farm gate.

On April 13, I will lead a delegation of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and

leaders of American business and agriculture to the People's Republic of China. The Pacific Northwest will be ably represented on the trade delegation by: Messrs. William H. McMurren, President of Morrison-Knutsen Co.; Robert K. Pedersen, Chairman of the Board, Ore-Ida Foods; Juan del Valle, Executive Vice President of Boise Cascade Corporation; Arthur A. Oppenheimer, Chairman of the Board of Oppenheimer Cos.; De Von R. Woodland, President of the National Farmers Organization; and George F. Brocke, President of G. F. Brocke and Sons. The purpose of the trip will be to explore new and expanding trade positions with China.

Future commerce with China will be of particular importance to the Pacific Northwest. Seattle will undoubtedly be a major transshipment point for American goods destined from this new Far Eastern market. However, we must remember that aside from all the technical trade difficulties which are yet to be resolved—the extension of U.S. Export-Import Bank trade credits to the PRC, and whether to grant Most Favored Nation Status—the PRC remains a developing country with all the limitations that entails. For American business, this market will be a totally new venture with all the uncertainty which usually surrounds entry into uncharted waters. Similarly, for the PRC, after almost 30 years of isolation from western markets and business practices, initial commercial transactions are likely to be undertaken cautiously.

Last year the U.S.-PRC trade flow totaled slightly more than \$1 billion. Estimates suggest that U.S. exports to China may grow to \$13 billion by 1985. With over 1 billion people to feed, agricultural exports should be high on China's shopping list. The United States, and in particular, the Pacific Northwest, with its high quality grain, will I am sure, become an important supplier of these needs. Last year, in order to facilitate agricultural exports to China, Congress passed legislation which would permit the extension of three year agricultural credits from the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Peking Government, the credit worthiness of which, incidentally, is excellent.

In addition to providing agricultural exports to the PRC, the United States can perform a vital service to both countries by sharing its technical expertise and capital equipment to further oil and gas discovery and production. Current estimates place PRC oil reserves at approximately three times those of current U.S. reserves. Successful exploration of these oil reserves can provide the Chinese economy with energy supplies necessary for industrialization, as well as mixed foreign exchange through sales on the international energy market. Either way, additional energy supplies will help to moderate the ever tightening world oil supply.

Nowhere is it more apparent than in the case of oil that the division of the world into North and South does not apply. Impoverished oil importing countries of the Third World share with us the urgent necessity to curtail oil imports. For these costly imports undermine a poor country's development potential by diverting sorely needed resources to pay for foreign fuel.

The potential for oil and gas production exists in the developing world. A recent study by the World Bank indicated that some 50-60 developing countries—currently oil importers—could produce oil and/or gas domestically. Currently, only 14 developing countries are doing so. One of our closest neighbors, Mexico, is estimated to have proven and probable oil and gas reserves of almost 50 billion barrels.

We in the North must encourage and assist developing country efforts to bring as yet untapped domestic oil and gas supplies "on stream."

But it isn't enough that the U.S. assist

developing countries in adding additional oil and gas supplies to the world market. The North—the developed world, must reduce its escalating dependence on imported oil from the Middle East. In addition, the United States must take action domestically to lessen its increasing dependence on imported oil—currently estimated at 47 percent of our total oil demand. This can be most rapidly accomplished by cutting through the knot which has created a glut of oil on our West Coast, while serious shortages threaten soon to develop elsewhere in the country. Presently, 800,000 barrels of oil are “shut in” in Alaska and 300,000 in Elk Hills, California, simply because pipelines have not been constructed to market these supplies.

We must also seek to convert, where feasible, to alternate fuels. Recent estimates by the Department of Energy indicate that the conversion of energy supplies of public utilities from oil to natural gas would reduce our oil demand by 400,000 barrels a day.

Likewise, by using a mixture of gas and alcohol to fuel American automobiles, U.S. oil imports could be reduced by fully one-fifth. I introduced legislation during the last Congress to require that all service stations sell gasohol—a 90%/10% gasoline/alcohol blend. The use of gasohol would require no alterations in current automobiles. The technology to produce it is well known. Alcohol is readily produced from woodwastes or surplus agricultural products—all renewable resources. Over 500 stations in the Midwest are now selling gasohol. I have once again introduced this legislation and will work actively for its passage.

United States officials must break through the morass which, until now, has impeded the full use of Alaskan oil, and has seen progress on conversion of generating plants from oil to alternate energy sources proceed at a snail's pace. Failure to do so will mean that U.S. prestige and influence in the world economy will continue to decline as larger trade deficits further weaken our domestic economy and drive down still further the already diminished value of the dollar. Our ability to bridge the gap between North and South—to exert strength and positive influence in the world—depends on a prosperous and healthy American economy.

There truly can be a New International Economic Order—but it should be an order which is not imposed by one group upon another—instead, it should be an order which encourages the growth of world commerce to the benefit of all. Only this kind of New Economic Order, of benefits to both developing and developed nations, constitutes a worthy goal. ●

DEV O'NEILL WAS A GOOD FRIEND

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly grieved today to hear of the recent death of an old friend and the former photographer of the U.S. Congress, Dev O'Neill.

I am proud to number myself among those who called Dev a friend. And in the great tradition of friendship, Dev never let his friends down. On too many occasions to remember, Dev was always present to take that all important photograph. His keen sense of humor and deep-seated knowledge of Congress and the unique needs of Dev's own constituents—the Members of the House and Senate, assured us that he would do a perfect job every time.

During his years in charge of photography in the House, Dev O'Neill shot thousands of memorable pictures that will forever record the important times he lived and worked in. My own wall, as does the wall of many of our colleagues, are adorned with examples of Dev's fine handiwork.

Dev's passing is truly a loss to his many friends. When he retired a few years ago, we all hoped he would enjoy a long rest which he so richly deserved. He has left many friends here on Capitol Hill and he has left a rich legacy of photographs that future generations will value for their professionalism and for their historical value.

It was typical of Dev to make certain that we would not be left without the best of talent to replace his skills and we can forever be grateful that one of Dev's most able assistants, Keith Jewell, today runs the operations of the House Democratic Photographers with the highest level of skills that Dev himself would appreciate.

To Dev's family and friends, I extend my deepest regrets at his untimely passing. May he rest in peace in the knowledge that he will long live in the memory of those he left behind. Thank you. ●

GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I am today adding the names of 19 additional Members of Congress to H.R. 2291, to extend for 4 fiscal years the authorization of appropriations for the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972, generally referred to as general revenue sharing. This brings the total number of cosponsors to 41.

More and more Members of the House are realizing the importance of continuing the program as it is a vital part of their district's revenue. There is no formula change; no gimmicks; and no increase in spending. Rather, the bill simply makes a 4-year extension of the existing program.

No one can deny the importance of the program to the States. The discontinuance of it would be disastrous—a fact which we must all consider in evaluating the program's worth.

The cosponsors of this bill are:

COSPONSORS OF H.R. 2291—GENERAL REVENUE SHARING, APRIL 4, 1979

- Hon. Joseph Addabbo of New York.
- Hon. Dan Akaka of Hawaii.
- Hon. Mario Biaggi of New York.
- Hon. Clarence Brown of Ohio.
- Hon. John Buchanan of Alabama.
- Hon. James Cleveland of New Hampshire.
- Hon. William Clinger of Pennsylvania.
- Hon. Barber Conable of New York.
- Hon. Tom Corcoran of Illinois.
- Hon. Charles Dougherty of Pennsylvania.
- Hon. Arlen Erdahl of Minnesota.
- Hon. Edwin Forsythe of New Jersey.
- Hon. William Green of New York.
- Hon. Frank Horton of New York.
- Hon. John LaFalce of New York.
- Hon. Robert Lagomarsino of California.
- Hon. Raymond Lederer of Pennsylvania.
- Hon. Gary Lee of New York.
- Hon. Norman Lent of New York.

- Hon. Dan Lungren of California.
- Hon. Joseph McDade of Pennsylvania.
- Hon. Robert McEwen of New York.
- Hon. Parren Mitchell of Maryland.
- Hon. Ron Mottl of Ohio.
- Hon. Austin Murphy of Pennsylvania.
- Hon. Charles Pashayan of California.
- Hon. Ed Patten of New Jersey.
- Hon. Carl Perkins of Kentucky.
- Hon. Joel Pritchard of Washington.
- Hon. Nick Joe Rahall of West Virginia.
- Hon. Charles Rangel of New York.
- Hon. Fred Richmond of New York.
- Hon. Robert Roe of New Jersey.
- Hon. James Scheuer of New York.
- Hon. Olympia Snowe of Maine.
- Hon. Sam Stratton of New York.
- Hon. William Thomas of California.
- Hon. Ted Weiss of New York.
- Hon. G. Wm. Whitehurst of Virginia.
- Hon. Larry Winn of Kansas.
- Hon. Leo Zeferetti of New York.

LACK OF MINORITY MANAGERIAL OPPORTUNITIES IN PROFESSIONAL SPORTS

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, since 1947, when the late Jackie Robinson broke the color barrier in professional baseball, blacks have made an incalculable contribution to professional athletics in the United States. One need only review the box scores of the morning's sports page to be reminded of the thrills, achievements, and excitement generated by numerous gifted black athletes.

I find it disturbing, however, that professional sports opportunities for minorities seem to end with the athlete's retirement from active competition. The dearth of blacks in front office, managerial, and coaching positions is highly disproportionate to their numbers, and their talents, on the playing field. It is astounding, for example, that baseball owners, who are known for changing managers as often as they change their shirts, have hired only two blacks to serve as their field generals. Professional football has yet to hire its first black head coach. Even in professional basketball, where a majority of its players, and virtually all of its “stars” are black, only 3 out of its 22 coaches are black. This “double standard” casts serious doubts upon the popular conception of professional sports as an avenue of advancement and upward mobility for minority youth.

Recently, the Los Angeles Times published an interview between Will Grimsley of the Associated Press and Frank Robinson, now a coach with the Baltimore Orioles. Mr. Robinson, a star outfielder with five major league teams and the only man to win the Most Valuable Player award in both leagues, was also the major's first black manager. More significant, he is a proud, articulate and outspoken black athlete, with numerous astute observations on the problem I have described. A copy of the article follows:

FRANK ROBINSON: DOORS CLOSED
(By Will Grimsley)

MIAMI.—“The black ballplayer might as well face it,” said a disillusioned Frank

Robinson. "When he gets through doing his thing on the field, he better look elsewhere—there is no other place for him in baseball.

"It's sad, but it's true."

The words are an echo out of the past, from the lips of another man named Robinson—the late Jackie Robinson (no kin). A couple of decades ago, Jackie was rattling the game's foundations with the same explosive rhetoric.

It didn't change things then. It isn't changing them now.

Although most of the country's old racial barriers, in society as well as sports, have been erased—largely due to Branch Rickey's bold move of signing Jackie Robinson to a Brooklyn contract in 1947—one bastion remains unscathed.

That, argues Frank Robinson, is that the black man was created to toil—whether it be on the river levees or on the athletic field—and never to direct or lead.

"Why don't we have black managers and black general managers in baseball?" he asked rhetorically. "Why aren't more retired black stars in radio and TV? Why aren't there more black quarterbacks in pro football?"

"I'll tell you. It's a throwback to the slave days. There is a misconception that blacks don't have the intelligence to be leaders. They have muscles, and speed and natural skills. When these skills wear out, they have nothing else to offer.

"So people think. That is what discourages me."

Robinson, still a lean, sleek athlete at age 43, was a standout player for the Cincinnati Reds for 10 years before joining the Baltimore Orioles where he played on four World Series teams.

He is a certainty for the Hall of Fame. He was named to the all-star team 11 times. He is the only player to win the Most Valuable Player award in both leagues.

He became the first black man to manage in the majors. Late in 1974, he was traded by Baltimore to the Cleveland Indians and named to manage the team, starting in 1975. He held the post until June 18, 1977 when he was released. He had a fling last year at managing Rochester in the triple-A International League but was not rehired after a losing season. He rejoined the Orioles as a coach.

"I don't intend to be a coach the rest of my life," he said. "If nothing comes my way, I must look somewhere else."

"Robby got a bad deal at both Cleveland and Rochester," an Oriole spokesman said. "He did a good job at both places with lousy material. I think the trouble was a clash of personalities."

Robinson indicates the motives ran deeper. They probably, he hints, had to do with the color of his skin.

"There are so many outstanding black guys in baseball who would make good managers," he insisted. "Maury Wills, Bill White, Larry Doby . . . I don't like to name anybody because I'd leave some worthy person out. But the talent is out there. It ought to be tapped."

For years, baseball men plugged the Dodgers' late Jim (Junior) Gilliam as prime managerial material. People wondered why Hank Aaron, Ernie Banks and Willie Mays got more than token front office posts.

Aaron, the home run king, never gave a hint that he had dugout aspirations. Hall of Famer Ernie Banks was regarded as too much of a "rah rah guy," Mays said. "I couldn't stand to manage—I'd be itching to play."

Frank Robinson is an exception. As a player, he was an inspirational leader, called "The Judge" by his teammates. Like Jackie Robinson, he is gutsy, strong-willed respected, not afraid to be disliked.

He is managerial stuff. And he has a legitimate gripe. ●

CORPORATE FARMING

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the voices which warn of the growth of corporate farming in the United States seem to be increasingly numerous and strident. The facts are to the contrary, at least in the heartland of American agriculture. This theme is well treated in a commentary by the editor of the State Journal Register of Springfield, Ill. Editor Ed Armstrong's commentary follows:

CORPORATE FARMING NOT THREAT YET

(By Ed Armstrong)

A great amount of concern has been expressed recently by parties ranging from the American Agriculture Movement to the U.S. secretary of agriculture about the demise of the family farm.

There have been warnings that a few corporations may get control of food production in this country with the result that the consumer will be at their mercy in regard to food prices.

Agriculture Secretary Bob Bergland told National Farmers Union members a couple of weeks ago: "I, for one, do not want to see an America where a handful of giant operators own, manage and control the entire food production system. Yet that is where we are headed."

It may be the direction in which we are headed, but we are still a long way from there.

The American Farm Bureau Federation is much less concerned about the trend, perhaps because it is dominated by the larger, more successful farmers. But it cites some figures from the U.S. Census Bureau to back up its claim that corporate farming is not yet, at least, much of a threat to the family farm concept.

According to the Farm Bureau, corporate farming accounts for 11 percent of the land being farmed and 18 percent of the value of agricultural products sold.

That looks like a sizeable hunk, but there's a ringer in the term "corporate farm." The Farm Bureau says 79 percent of all corporate farms are family owned and operated. In many instances family farms have found it to their advantage to incorporate, primarily because of tax laws.

The farm organization claims that agricultural corporations with more than 10 shareholders produce only 5.3 percent of total U.S. farm sales, and only 3 percent of all corporate farms are operated by conglomerates.

Corporate farming is not presently a big thing in much of the Midwest. It is concentrated in the cattle feeding areas of the West and Southwest and in the big fruit and vegetable producing states such as California, Florida and Hawaii.

Is it coming our way? I don't see much evidence of it.

Other trends that Bergland cited are, however, more apparent. He said tax laws encourage high-income non-farmers to pay more for land than its productive worth because of benefits of investment credits, capital gains taxes, accelerated depreciation and other tax devices. That, he said, encourages the trend toward fewer and fewer farms.

Undoubtedly there's some truth to that analysis, but it appears to me that in Illinois it is the big farmers, perhaps stimulated by

the same tax laws, who are bidding up the price of land beyond its productive worth.

Other forces also share responsibility for encouraging larger farm units. Mechanization and specialization are the principal ones. Equipment is bigger, so one operator can handle more acres, and because the equipment is more expensive, the operator has to have more acres to pay for it. Many farmers raise grain only—little or no livestock—and that takes more acres too. Some livestock people have massive operations, so they have a big investment on fewer acres.

Land ownership in Illinois is not concentrated in a few hands. A look at a plat book—a book of maps showing land ownership—proves that. I counted approximately 150 different owners of land in one typical township of 36 square miles in Central Illinois. That figures out to an average of less than 200 acres per owner.

It doesn't mean the average farm size is less than 200 acres. Many of those plots are rented to farm operators who till several hundred acres. Many plots are owned by absentee landlords—often heirs of persons who worked the land in earlier years—and are now managed by banks.

It is understandable that those who revere the small family farm as a way of life are unhappy with trends toward bigness, but bigness is a trend throughout our economy.

Still, I see no evidence that corporate farming is really very near in central Illinois. ●

A FRIEND IN NEED

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been drawn to a report in a U.S. Marine Corps newspaper about an award made by the Armed Forces Benefit and Aid Association to a recruit who gave his time and efforts to help friends in need.

The award went to L. Cpl. Russell K. Harmon, whose home is in the 12th Congressional District of New Jersey.

The report details unstinting service given to others and reflects creditably on Lance Corporal Harmon and on the Marine Corps.

I have extended my congratulations and personal commendation to L. Cpl. Harmon and am pleased to submit the report from the San Diego Marine Corps Recruit Depot paper Chevron, for the attention of my colleagues:

A FRIEND IN NEED

Lance Corporal Harmon, a unit diary clerk, was recently recognized by the Armed Forces Benefit and Aid Association for "notable and outstanding achievement" in the aid of a local service family during a period of extreme hardship.

His award reads in part: "upon discovering friends EN2 (engine man second class) Steven Snell, United States Navy, and his wife Candace had both suffered broken kneecaps, LCpl. Harmon volunteered to assist them during their immobility. During this period, LCpl. Harmon has done all the driving for the Snell family, including shopping and daily trips to and from the Naval Hospital where Steven is assigned temporarily. Housecleaning, laundry and assisting with the Snell's five-year-old daughter were also involved."

The 21-year Marine was introduced to the Snells while participating in a bowling league.

The Newark-born, Roselle, New Jersey-raised Marine plans to attend college at Montclair State in New Jersey when he leaves the Corps. He said that he would like to study industrial security after which he would like to launch a civil service career.

Marines are noted for their loyalty and devotion, and LCpl. Harmon has upheld that reputation through his unwavering devotion and loyalty to his duty and his friends.●

TAX RELIEF

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that proposes a solution to an historical inequity within our Tax Code. As you know, people in the United States are taxed at a standardized progressive rate. Unfortunately, this creates a very real problem for taxpayers who live in States with above average living costs for they are taxed at an equal rate to people residing in States with below average living costs.

The two bills that I propose today would rectify this inequity. My first bill is designed to allow a tax deduction based on the cost of living in certain areas. The second measure would allow non-Federal employees, working in States where Federal employees receive an income exclusion level on the cost of living, to be eligible for the same exclusion.

Throughout the history of our Nation, the Tax Code has addressed and attempted to correct inequities within the tax system. I believe that our forefathers in 1787 demonstrated the need to maintain flexibility, sensitivity, and the necessity of having laws that generally apply to every American. At the same time, our forefathers showed us the importance of recognizing unique and uncommon situations. It only follows that in the situation described above, the law should be amended to account for the special needs of areas with high costs of living.

Our tax brackets are progressive so that the higher one's income, the higher the rate of taxation. The progressiveness of this system has gone relatively unchallenged, however, the assumption that needs to be questioned is the notion that one's income has the same buying power in all parts of the country and should, therefore, be taxed at the same rate. The economy of certain areas result in cost and price structures that are unique to the respective areas. The tax code unfortunately does not take this into account for taxes are levied as though the cost and price structure of each area were comparable. Taxpayers living in high cost areas whose high income levels reflect the cost of living in their State are taxed as if their income level represented a greater purchasing power. In essence, these people are pen-

alized by virtue of their residences. My fellow Alaskans and I pay the highest per capita tax in the country, nearly double that of the next highest taxed State. This, however, does not represent a level of affluence double to residents of the other 49 States, but rather nominal incomes adjusted for the high cost of living; that is, food, shelter, and clothing. In addition, Alaskans on fixed incomes are faced with an extra burden as they pay their taxes under the current law.

I would like to point out that Alaska is not the only State that encounters this high cost situation. Hawaii and many Eastern States have the same problem. Mr. Speaker, the bill I am proposing would remedy this inequity by allowing an individual to deduct a percentage of income equal to the percentage by which the cost of living exceeds the national average.

I am also proposing an alternative measure that would allow a non-Federal employee residing in high cost States to have an income adjustment to account for these costs. Currently, civil service employees in Alaska receive a 25-percent cost-of-living adjustment from the Federal Government. This assistance is a nontaxable adjustment that is added to the base pay of Federal employees, but it is not available to non-Federal employees living under the same cost-of-living conditions. This tax burden upon employees within the private sector is a disincentive, therefore, this bill would equalize their tax responsibility with those federally employed workers. The bills which I have introduced in this regard contain limitations upon Federal employees who receive a nontaxable cost-of-living allowance.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation that I have introduced will correct some inequities within our tax system. This Federal tax relief will particularly aid States where the cost of living is significantly above the national average. In short, these measures would negate a perpetual disincentive to live in States where there is a high cost of living and instead encourage economic and social progress in these areas.

I urge my colleagues to carefully consider the bills which I have proposed.●

EMMETT KELLY, A PANACEA OF OUR ILLS

HON. EDWARD P. BEARD

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, Emmett Kelly's death on March 28, 1979 leaves a genuine void in American society. When times were bleak, circumstances were dreary, and things were blue, his "Weary Willie" characterization made people smile. His uncanny brand of humor made happiness contagious.

Emmett Kelly's incomparable style

brought joy and vitality despite national depression, war, and turbulence. His "Weary Willie" enriched the lives of all he touched. With his passing goes an American symbol whose contribution to our national heritage is unrivaled.

His own words best describe the kind of panacea he was for us:

I am a sad and ragged little guy who is very serious about everything he attempts—no matter how futile or how foolish it appears to be. I am the hobo who found out the hard way that the deck is stacked, the dice "frozen", the race fixed and the wheel crooked, but there is always present that one tiny, forlorn spark of hope still glimmering in his soul which makes him keep on trying.

All I can say beyond that is that there must be a lot of people in this world who feel that way and that, fortunately, they come to the circus...

By laughing at me, they really laugh at themselves, and realizing that they have done this gives them a sort of spiritual second wind for going back into the battle.●

WHEAT CARTEL

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the grain merchants and traders at the Kansas City Board of Trade have asked me to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article by Fred Kiewit of the Kansas City Star in opposition to a proposal for establishing a wheat cartel. The Board of Trade of Kansas City, Mo., Inc., has been both a cash grain and wheat futures contract market for more than 100 years. My friends there feel that the article is of topical interest and makes some significant points that should be remembered as the wheat cartel issue is considered:

WHEAT CARTEL IDEA: ECONOMICS, MORALITY QUESTIONABLE

Farmers at the National Farmers Union convention whooped it up here last week when three U.S. and Canadian senators said the time seemed ripe for major world grain producers to establish a wheat cartel.

There is just one thing wrong with the proposal from an economic viewpoint—to say nothing of the moral implications: It wouldn't work.

The reason an international agreement to fix world wheat prices would fail is simple.

First, unlike petroleum—which the senators used as an example when speaking to the Kansas City convention—wheat could be grown almost anywhere in the world. Could be, that is, if the price was right.

Second, there are many substitutes for wheat in both the human food and livestock feed categories, whereas there is no reliable substitute now available for oil when it comes to powering a mechanized western society.

Those two reasons do not even begin to address the moral issues of further restricting the distribution of a vital food source in a world where at least 500 million of the world's more than 4 billion persons already are malnourished.

Nor do they consider that the world's biggest wheat producer by far, the Soviet Union, likely never would be a party to

the cartel. The USSR itself probably could undermine the combined efforts of the U.S., Canada, Australia and Argentina to raise wheat prices to levels suggested by the senators.

The same fundamental logic ought to put to rest a proposal by Rep. James Weaver, D-Oreg., who urges that a federal agency be created to sell U.S. grain and thus create for this country the equivalent of the oil cartel. And even the suggestion of a government monopoly, of course, set off shock waves in U.S. grain trade.

That is not to say Sen. George McGovern, D-S. Dak.; Sen. Henry Bellmon, R-Okla., and Sen. Hazen Argue of Canada were engaging in a bit of film-flam when they appeared on a seminar discussing the next steps in pricing grain in world markets. The problem facing wheat growers in exporting countries is serious: Many of them are selling wheat for less than the cost of production, while importing nations through various protective schemes are enriching national treasuries and their own farmers with that same wheat.

Bellmon pointed out that Japan which buys U.S. wheat for around \$3 a bushel through a government agency, resells the same wheat to its own domestic users for roughly three times that price. The European Economic Community does about the same thing, using the proceeds from U.S. wheat to subsidize its own inefficient agriculture, which then competes directly with U.S. farmers.

"I believe our countries ought to work together to see to it that money goes, not to governments, but to our farmers," Bellmon said.

Argue said the collapse of talks in Geneva that were designed to lead to a new International Wheat Agreement now opens the door to some other kind of action, namely a multinational agreement involving the four major exporters.

McGovern said he thought a cartel might help insure that growers receive at least their cost of production, plus a reasonable profit. He said the price of a bushel of wheat probably should be between \$4 and \$5 on the world market. The South Dakotan also said the four exporters control about 85 percent of the wheat moving internationally, and that they could set the world price. With the collapse of the IWA talks and the probability they will not be resumed in time for action this year, McGovern said "the door is now open for our government and others to move with a clear conscience."

McGovern also observed the grain producers of the world also have been watching the actions of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), and have seen the value of co-operation instead of cut-throat competition.

The three presented one side of the coin accurately and fairly. But they failed to mention, or even acknowledge, that coin has another side.

Ignoring the fact that other similar commodity agreements, including earlier wheat pacts, historically have not worked because of breakdowns resulting from intense economic competition, experts and long-time observers on the grain trade narrow the current problem down to basics. Oil, of course, has been the exception; yet even among the OPEC nations there is continuing a lot of argument over pricing.

Those familiar with world wheat trade take the USSR as one nation that could upset any pricing cart. The USSR normally grows about twice as much wheat as even the United States, whose production in 1978 was about 2 billion bushels. In the USSR, wheat is both a feed and a food grain, whereas in the rest of the world, wheat is utilized almost exclusively as a human food. The USSR, of course, is subject to crop failures more than most other producing nations because of its geographical

location, but in most years it is self-sufficient in wheat, both for feeding and for human food. At times of plenty it also is an exporter mostly within its trading bloc.

The authorities explain that if a price cartel among the western producers boosted the world wheat price to \$4 or \$5 a bushel, the USSR would simply join the action, sell its wheat abroad for a bit less and then import corn or grain sorghums for one-half the price for livestock and poultry feeding. Roughly one-third of the wheat grown in the USSR now is consumed as feed. That quantity thrown on the market would quickly be the end of any efforts to stabilize world wheat prices at an artificial level.

That is just one example. There are others involving rice, barley and other types of grains.

The key variety would be rice, whose use as human food far exceeds that of wheat. Americans fail to consider the role of rice because they don't grow or consume much. But in most other areas of the world, especially throughout Asia, the Middle East and Africa, the consumption of rice dwarfs the use of wheat. Yet they are to some extent interchangeable, and an artificially high price of wheat would do one of two things depending upon economics: Stimulate the production of wheat in rice areas and thus increase the supply of wheat, or increase the human appetite for rice at the expense of wheat. In either event, most authorities are certain, wheat and its growers' cartel would suffer.

Another inescapable result is that a high world price for wheat would create a production surge across the world where it can be grown successfully. And given the wide variety of adaptable wheats now being bred, that grain could be grown on every continent and in almost every climate. World grain production in a few years would be turned heiter-skelter.

"The minute you start fixing price by government decree instead of demand, you begin to affect something else in this delicately-balanced world agricultural picture," one authority said.

Like any complex issue in today's world in which national destinies have become intertwined, there would be secondary effects the senators failed to address. One grim option is that certain governments would simply let some of its people die of starvation. It has happened.

Then there is the matter of storage, for example, that is highly important. It so happens the United States, Canada and to an increasing degree the USSR are the only nations with the storage capacity to put their grain aside while waiting for buyers for their \$4-\$5 wheat. In commercial off-farm storage alone, the U.S. can hold about 7 billion bushels of grain, roughly twice the capacity it had just 20 years ago. On-farm capacity, never accurately measured, adds enormously to that total.

But the rest of the world is in more or less a hand-to-mouth situation. Indeed, storage capacity in some of the emerging nations is limited to burlap bags piled on a loading dock and covered with plastic or grain dumped in crude structures, including mud huts. Obviously, if such countries grew wheat, and most of them might, their production would have to be used at home, sold immediately or left to rot.

"When you grow wheat in those countries, you have to sell what you won't need in the extremely short run," a Kansas marketing specialist noted. "To heck with the price. The only country that really can store grain over the long term is the United States."

Another student of world grain marketing noted the combined wheat exports from the United States and Canada in the crop years of 1972-73 and 1973-74 were only about 2

percent of the reported available food supplies of all kinds in the world, according to the Rome-based Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). The exports from those two leading producers totaled 1.7 billion bushels each year.

"I don't believe history records any monopoly has been able to have its way when it controls only 2 percent of the world supply of a good or its substitute," the spokesman said.

No one argues that the three senators and others of a similar bent are not individuals trying earnestly to solve a sticky situation. But the best that specialists in the matter see coming out of it all is persuasive conversation. Any attempts to blackmail the world on wheat as the OPEC nations have been able to do in petroleum surely would backfire and result in an even more unenviable predicament for the struggling wheat producers.

One doesn't have to go very far back in history to find an example. In the early years of this decade, when the world experienced a food shortage and the United States was fighting an earlier round of food inflation, a previous U.S. administration embargoed soybean shipments to Japan at a time when there was no real shortage of soybeans.

Japan, thoroughly alarmed because it could no longer count on the U.S. as a dependable supplier, invested hundreds of millions of yen in developing soybean production in Brazil. That country is now on-stream as a significant soybean producer, though a drought this year admittedly has cut its current crop.

"That soybean area never will come back out of production, though there will be weather fluctuations," one observer noted. "It is there to stay. The same thing could happen in wheat production through any artificial manipulation of the price."●

CLAY HYDER TRUCKING CO. WINS 1978 FLEET SAFETY CONTEST

HON. ANDY IRELAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that on March 28, Clay Hyder Trucking Co. of Auburndale, Fla., was honored as the grand prize winner in the 1978 fleet safety contest conducted by the common carrier conference—irregular route, an affiliate of the American Trucking Association.

The award was presented to William Bostick, vice president of Clay Hyder, at the 31st annual meeting of the conference in Palm Springs, Calif. The conference represents more than 500 irregular-route motor carriers in the 48 contiguous States.

Clay Hyder was selected a unanimous winner of this prestigious national safety contest on its effective driver training, maintenance of equipment, participation in safety programs and organizations and safety incentive programs and overall contribution to highway safety.

Clay Hyder trucks logged 20,492,614 miles in 1978 with an accident ratio of 2.49 per 1 million miles—an outstanding achievement.

I would like to congratulate this fine

Florida trucking company on its outstanding accomplishment and give a special salute to Mr. Guy Bostick, president of Clay Hyder Trucking Co., for dedication to highway safety.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. ●

SAVAGERY IN CAMBODIA

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, since the fall of Cambodia to the Khmer Rouge we have been hearing a steady stream of horror stories from this small Asian country. The savagery of the Communist forced migrations and labor programs have been well documented by those survivors who managed to escape the slaughter. There does not seem to be any end to the inhumanity. Cambodia has been ravaged by an invasion from Vietnam and now, according to a Newsweek magazine reporting team, the carnage continues under the new rulers.

Since the collapse of the pro-West governments in Cambodia and South Vietnam we have not seen much of the peace and prosperity that many claimed would arise in Southeast Asia. I remember many critics of America's involvement in Vietnam declared that it was the United States that was causing all the bloodshed. It has been almost 4 years since the United States had any influence in this area. Since that time the Soviet Union and Communist China have held sway over events in that part of the world. The bloodshed continues at an alarming rate. We will probably never know the full body count under Communist rule.

This week we will be considering the International Development Cooperation Act of 1979, H.R. 3324. I will be offering an amendment to prevent any of our tax dollars from going directly or indirectly, to either Cambodia or Vietnam. Given the bloodshed that we have witnessed I do not think that our Nation should reward two of the worst offenders of human rights by being a partner in aiding their savage regimes. For my colleagues information I submit the Newsweek article entitled "Cambodian Carnage" into the RECORD. I hope they bear it in mind when they consider H.R. 3324:

CAMBODIAN CARNAGE

(When Vietnam conquered Cambodia early this year, its avowed purpose was to put an end to the murderous ways of the Khmer Rouge regime. But the carnage in Cambodia goes on. From Bangkok, Newsweek's Holger Jensen reports:)

For the eighteen men, women and children of Ching Ha village in northwest Cambodia, the arrival of Vietnamese troops nearly three months ago marked a brief but real liberation. More than a hundred of their fellow villagers had been executed for minor infractions—or had simply died of overwork, starvation or lack of medical care—during the preceding four years of Khmer Rouge savagery. The Vietnamese fed the peasants, gave them pots and pans and told them that they were free to travel. So when their pro-

tectors moved on to the larger town of Sisophon, 10 miles away, the emaciated survivors of Ching Ha tagged along.

In Sisophon, the Vietnamese largesse ended as more and more refugees crowded into the town. The group from Ching Ha—believing claims that the new Heng Samrin government and its Vietnamese allies had established full control of the countryside—decided to return home to harvest the rice crop they had left behind. Halfway there, they were captured by a band of 30 Khmer Rouge guerrillas, who bound their hands and led them to a camp close to the Thai border. The next morning, their captors marched them into the forest and set upon them with axes. "I fell after being hit in the face," 24-year-old Suen Mot recalled last week at a refugee camp in Thailand. "When they had finished, they left. I thought I was going to die, but later I found I could move." As Suen crawled away from the killing ground, he came across a youth called Pum, whose throat had been slashed, deeply but not fatally, from ear to ear. The two then managed to drag themselves across the border to safety.

What they do best: Suen's report and others like it, as well as a remarkably frank commentary broadcast on Radio Phnom Penh last week, indicate that the Vietnamese invasion has not ended Cambodia's agony. In some ways, it has deepened and perhaps prolonged the suffering. The 100,000 Vietnamese troops control major towns and road junctions. But the Khmer Rouge have free rein in the countryside and continue to do what they do best—kill people. Refugees from villages only briefly occupied by the Vietnamese say that the Khmer Rouge returned as soon as the invaders left and executed anyone who had had any dealings with them, even those who had only accepted food. The refugees talk also of Khmer Rouge cadres who were captured by the Vietnamese and turned over to Cambodian civilians to be killed.

Ty Kim An, a 34-year-old former schoolteacher who wandered through Battambang Province for a month before he managed to reach Thailand, told his debriefers: "I saw dead, stinking bodies along the roads, heard the guns every night and saw many burned-out trucks and tanks." Geng Son, 33, who lived on a farming commune just outside the Cambodian capital, said that when the Vietnamese forces arrived they threw open a Khmer Rouge warehouse and allowed the people to take anything they wanted—rice, sugar, fish sauce, radios and bicycles. Geng took a bicycle and pedaled 300 miles across Cambodia to the Thai border with his wife on the crossbar. "Many bridges were destroyed," he said. "At some places along the road there were piles of dead civilians with their throats slit. At other places there were dead Vietnamese and Khmer Rouge. I was never far from the sights, the sounds and the smells of killing."

Self-protection: Last week's broadcast by Cambodia's new revolutionary council painted a picture of bloodshed and anarchy. Conceding that Vietnamese attempts to annihilate Khmer Rouge holdouts "have not been completely successful," the new regime disclosed that it had been forced to issue weapons to Cambodian villagers for self-protection. In areas where the Vietnamese are in firm control, it admitted, corrupt officials have been "toying with the job" and mistreating the people. "Some have gone so far as to keep concubines in the collectives to serve their own pleasure," the broadcast said. It warned that such a situation could lead to a revival of the "feudal system"—a reference to the days of deposed Prince Norodom Sihanouk. Indeed, the report cited one incident in Kratie Province where rebel forces "waved Sihanouk's flag and boasted

that they were Sihanouk's forces to mislead public opinion."

The commentary did not specify whether it was criticizing Cambodian or Vietnamese officials. But Hanoi remains in firm control of the revolutionary council. It has sent one of its most able diplomats, Vo Dong Giang—a chain-smoking theoretician with weaknesses for fancy watches and English cigarettes—to act as its proconsul in Phnom Penh. Experts in Bangkok saw Giang's hand in the priorities spelled out by Radio Phnom Penh: first, the extermination enemy forces "before the end of the dry season in July," followed by the improvement of living conditions.

Helplessness: Meanwhile, the killing goes on. Cambodians are still fleeing their country at the rate of 1,000 a month, and refugee officials in Thailand say the new arrivals are in even worse shape than their predecessors, so dazed by the hardships they have endured that they can barely function. "They can't build their own shelters, they don't want to go anywhere and they don't want to do anything," says a camp worker. "They're zombies." ●

THE SAFETY FIRST CLUB OF MARYLAND

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the activities of the Safety First Club of Maryland, a nonprofit citizens' organization formed in 1956 to promote safety on our streets and highways. I have just received the following letter from Mr. Maurice Shochatt, executive vice president of the club:

The Safety First Club of Maryland will feature the theme, "Master Motor Menace" at the organization's 23rd "Leader in Lifesaving" Anniversary Banquet to be held May 1, 1979, at the Mercantile Club in Baltimore, Md. "Leader in Lifesaving" Awards will be presented at the Banquet to the Hon. Benjamin L. Cardin, Speaker of the Maryland House of Delegates, the Motor Vehicle Administration of the State of Maryland and David Seidman, President of the Safety First Club of Maryland.

The organization's major objectives are to help reduce traffic accidents and fatalities; Stress the importance of traffic safety among our youth; Work for the passage and enforcement of statutes aiming to reduce our tragic traffic toll; and give recognition to the deserving for attainments in the field of traffic safety.

The Safety First Club of Maryland believes that traffic supervision and control belong in the sphere of duly-constituted experts and authorities. Nevertheless, such groups as the Safety First Club of Maryland can render services through planned and consistent safety programs, campaigns and activities aimed at helping to reduce the mounting toll.

To help call attention to the "Master Motor Menace" theme of the organization's 23rd Anniversary Banquet, the Safety First Club of Maryland is disseminating the "I'm Just A Steering Wheel" message, prepared by the Joseph Katz Advertising Company to stimulate interest in traffic safety. The company was headed by the late Joseph Katz, a Board member of the Safety First Club, who gave the organization full permission to reprint the message whenever deemed appropriate. The text is as follows:

"I'm just a wheel. A steering wheel. And you're my captain. Behind me you're the lord and master of a miracle. You can make me take the kids to school. You can turn me down the sunny road toward town. With me you can guide your goods to the market place . . . you can rush the sick to be healed . . . you can go in minutes to places hours away. You can do magic.

"Yet, in the blink of an eye, in the tick of your watch, I can turn deadly killer. I can snuff out the life of a kid still full of life—maybe your kid. I can twist a smile into tears. I can wreck and cripple and destroy. I can deal out death like the plague. And I'm no respecter of persons. A child, a grandmother, even you, my friend . . . It's all the same to me.

"I'm sensitive, I respond instantly in the hands you give me. Give me calm hands, steady hands, careful hands . . . and I'm your friend. But give me unsteady hands, fuzzy-minded hands, reckless hands . . . then I'm your enemy, a menace to the life, the happiness, the future of every person, every youngster riding, walking, playing."

I was made for pleasure and usefulness. Keep me that way. I'm in your hands. I'm just a steering wheel. And you're my captain. Behind me you're the lord and master of a miracle . . . or a tragedy. It's up to you!

Citizens in Maryland and elsewhere are urged to join the Safety First Club of Maryland in its "Crusade for Safety" to protect their lives, their dear ones, their neighbors, and their fellow Americans.●

HELP FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES IN ALASKA

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills that would correct inequities that exist for Federal employees in Alaska.

The first bill would amend title 5 of the United States Code to provide additional cost-of-living adjustments in civil service retirement annuities of certain retired employees in Alaska as long as they continue to live in Alaska. Each retired employee who has performed 10 years of service in Alaska prior to separation and after the beginning date of his annuity, who continues to live in Alaska would receive an increase of 25 percent as long as he lives in Alaska. This is also applicable to the annuity of survivors of the retired employee.

I have also introduced a bill that will help clerical and managerial employees of the Alaska Railroad. These workers were brought under the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act in June of 1940. This law requires that a railroad employee retire at age 62 with 15 years of service. There is no provision exempting clerical workers from this requirement, which is an unjust restriction since they do not face the same hazards as railroad transportation employees.

This bill would exempt clerical and managerial employees from this provision.●

STATUS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1979

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep Congress advised of the effect of its spending and revenue actions compared to the overall totals set in the second budget resolution, section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 requires periodic reports to be issued to the Congress. As chairman of the House Budget Committee, I submit to Congress from time to time, these parliamentary status reports reflecting the current level.

The House Budget Committee today is notifying the Speaker of the House of the current levels of congressional action on the budget compared to the spending ceilings and revenue floors established by the second budget resolution for fiscal year 1979, which was adopted on September 21, 1978. Under the Budget Act a point of order lies against any measure that would cause the spending ceilings or the revenue floor established by a concurrent resolution on the budget to be breached.

The estimate of current level included in this report covers all enacted budget authority, including the continuing resolution, and estimates of entitlement authority and other mandatory spending items which require further appropriations action.

This report also includes reestimates of the fiscal year 1979 budget which were submitted by the President in his January 22, and March 15, 1979, budget submissions. A complete review of these revisions has been conducted by the Budget Committees and the Congressional Budget Office and these agreed upon reestimates have been incorporated in the new levels.

Today's report indicates that the following amounts in the second budget resolution for fiscal year 1979 are still available: For budget authority, \$3,181 million and for revenues, \$8,765. Outlays to date for fiscal year 1979 have exceeded the resolution ceiling by \$3,943 million.

The outlay ceiling has been breached primarily because the costs of certain ongoing programs and activities directly responsive to the economy have been reestimated and have turned out higher than was anticipated in the second budget resolution last year. These programs and activities such as interest on the debt and unemployment are directly responsive to the economy. As interest rates increase, as they have in the past months, mandatory payments for interest on the Federal debt have increased by almost \$4 billion. Virtually all of the increase is for programs and activities funded under law already enacted at the conclusion of the last session of Congress. In other words, the outlay ceiling has not been breached because Congress has spent more since

the second budget resolution was agreed to, but rather because outlays for ongoing programs and activities are now estimated to cost more primarily because of the impact of the economy on the budget.

It now becomes necessary, if Congress is to handle emergency or urgent funding situations, which Congress faces from time to time, to revise the second budget resolution for fiscal year 1979. This should be done in May when we consider the first budget resolution for fiscal year 1979.

A copy of my letter to the Speaker and of the committee's report are attached:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1979.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On January 30, 1976, the Committee on the Budget outlined the procedure which it had adopted in connection with its responsibilities under Sec. 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide estimates of the current level of revenues and spending. I am herewith transmitting the status report under H. Con. Res. 683, the Second Budget Resolution for FY 1979. This report reflects the resolution of September 21, 1978, and estimates of budget authority, outlays and revenues based on all completed action on spending and revenue measures as of close of legislative business April 2, 1979.

Sincerely,

ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
Chairman.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON THE STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1979 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 683

(Reflecting completed action as of
March 29, 1979)

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Appropriate level -----	555,650	487,500	448,700
Current level-----	552,469	491,443	457,465
Under resolution -	3,181	—	—
Over resolution --	—	3,943	8,765

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Any measure providing budget or entitlement authority which is not included in the current level estimate and which exceeds \$3,181 million for fiscal year 1979, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of budget authority for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 683 to be exceeded.

OUTLAYS

Any measure providing budget or entitlement authority which is not included in the current level estimate and which would result in outlays for fiscal year 1979, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of outlays for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 683 to be exceeded.

REVENUES

Any measure that would result in a revenue loss exceeding \$8,765 million for fiscal year 1979, if adopted and enacted, would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 683.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1979.

HON. ROBERT N. GLAIMO,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section
308(b) and in aid of section 311(b) of the

Congressional Budget Act, this letter and
supporting detail provide an up-to-date
tabulation of the current levels of new bud-
get authority, estimated outlays and esti-
mated revenues in comparison with the ap-
propriate levels for those items contained in
the most recently agreed to concurrent res-

olution on the budget. This report for fiscal
year 1979 is tabulated as of close of business
March 29, 1979.

This report incorporates CBO reestimates
for FY 1979 resulting from review of the
President's 1980 budget data.

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
1. Enacted	547,449	486,248	457,500
2. Entitlement authority and other mandatory items requiring further appropriation action.....	5,744	5,228	—
3. Continuing resolution authority.....	—	—	—
4. Conference agreements ratified by both Houses.....	-724	-34	-35
Current level.....	552,469	491,443	457,465
Second concurrent resolution.....	555,650	487,500	448,700
Under resolution.....	3,181	—	—
Over resolution.....	—	3,943	8,765

Sincerely,

ALICE M. RIVLIN, Director.

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT SUPPORTING DETAIL, FISCAL YEAR 1979 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MARCH 29, 1979
[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays		Budget authority	Outlays
I. Enacted:			Function 600:		
Permanent appropriations and trust funds...	268,679	247,448	Department of Agriculture:		
Previously enacted (95th Congress, 2d ses- sion)	343,997	304,026	Food stamp program.....	245	245
Offsetting receipts (including amounts gen- erated by current appropriation action)	-65,206	-65,206	Child nutrition.....	150	10
Enacted this session:			Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:		
Sale of silver dollars (P.L. 96-2)	-20	-20	Assistance payments program.....	91	91
Deferral resolution (S. Res. 50)	—	1	Federal old-age and survivors insurance (pay)	—	72
Total, enacted.....	547,449	486,248	Department of Labor:		
II. Entitlement authority and other manda- tory items requiring further appropriation action (Anticipated supplementals includ- ing pay):			Unemployment trust fund—pay raise....	—	1
Function 050:			Office of Personnel Management: Civil Service retirement and disability (pay)	—	1
Department of Defense:			Railroad Retirement Board:		
Civilian and military pay raises.....	1,849	1,843	Railroad retirement account (pay)	—	1
Retired pay.....	156	156	Regional rail transportation protective account	57	57
Function 150:			Function 700:		
Payment to Foreign Service Retirement Fund	4	4	Veterans Administration:		
Offsetting receipts.....	-4	-4	Compensation and pensions.....	1,025	972
Export-Import Bank (pay)	—	*	Readjustment benefits.....	377	223
Function 350:			Function 750:		
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (pay)	—	1	The Judiciary: Court of Appeals, salaries of judges.....	4	3
Function 370:			Function 800:		
Federal Home Loan Bank Board (pay)	—	2	Office of Personnel Management:		
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corp. (pay)	—	*	Payment to civil service retirement.....	335	335
Function 400:			Offsetting receipts.....	-335	-335
Department of Defense: Panama Canal Corporation (pay)	—	1	Function 920:		
Department of Transportation:			Allowances: Civil agency pay raises.....	742	736
St. Lawrence Seaway Company (pay)	—	*	Total, entitlements.....	5,744	5,228
Coast Guard retired pay.....	4	4	III. Continuing resolution authority.....	—	—
Federal-aid highways (pay)	—	5	IV. Conference agreements ratified by both Houses	—	—
Function 500:			First rescission bill, 1979 (H.R. 2439)	-724	-34
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:			Total current level, as of March 29, 1979	552,469	491,443
Grants to States for social services.....	189	189	Concurrent resolution of September 23, 1978	555,650	487,500
Student loan insurance fund.....	243	—	Over ceiling.....	—	3,943
Human development services.....	57	57	Under ceiling.....	3,181	—
Function 550:					
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:					
Grants to States for medicaid.....	554	554			
Federal hospital insurance (pay)	—	4			

NOTE.—Detail may not add due to rounding.●

SUSPENSION REFORM

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing an amendment to House Rule XXVII which would reform the procedure known as suspension of the rules. As my colleagues know, this procedure has traditionally been reserved for minor, noncontroversial matters since only 40 minutes of debate are allowed, no amendments may be offered, and a two-thirds vote is required for passage of a measure under this procedure.

The need for reform of the suspension procedure became apparent in the last Congress when a record number of bills were considered under suspension (453), comprising a record 28 percent of all measures passed by the House. Just a decade ago, in the 90th Congress, when more measures were actually reported, passed and enacted, only 167 were considered under suspension, comprising only 10 percent of the measures passed by the House. Clearly, the reliance on the suspension procedure by the leadership in the last Congress had grown all out of proportion to its intended use, especially when one considers all the bills involving expenditures in the hundreds of millions of dollars which were brought up under suspension.

In recognition of this overuse and abuse of the suspension procedure, the Democratic Caucus at the beginning of this Congress took a peculiar, two-step approach to the problem. On the one hand, the caucus adopted an amendment to its rules establishing guidelines for the Speaker to follow in scheduling matters under suspension. In essence, these guidelines prohibited the Speaker from scheduling any matter under suspension which involved expenditures in excess of \$100 million in any fiscal year, but permitted the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee to exempt the Speaker from this requirement. The caucus also proposed an amendment to the House rules eliminating the requirement for a second, or question of consideration, on suspensions unless a copy of the measure was not available at least 1 legislative day in advance of its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, while the caucus guidelines may be sufficient in curbing the use of the suspension procedure for consideration of bills which may involve the authorization or appropriation of large sums of money, one must ask why this was dealt with in the caucus rules and not in the House rules. Presumably, the Speaker could easily secure an exception to the guidelines through the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee which he chairs, and yet the House would be deprived of a vote on whether that matter should be considered under suspension by virtue of the elimination of the seconding requirement.

The resolution I am offering today would close this loophole by establishing suspension criteria in the House rules and giving the House, not the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, final authority to determine by majority vote whether a measure should be considered under suspension if any of these criteria are breached.

Specifically, my resolution would prohibit the consideration of a measure under suspension unless the committee of jurisdiction or chairman and ranking minority member of that committee specifically authorize its consideration under suspension, the House is given advance notification by at least the last legislative day of the week preceding the scheduled suspension, and the bill does not authorize or appropriate in excess of \$50 million for any fiscal year. If a point of order is sustained against the consideration of any motion to suspend the rules for violation of any of the above criteria, it would then be up to the House to decide by a vote on consideration whether to proceed with the bill under suspension. In effect, the resolution restores the old seconding requirement for those cases in which any of the criteria are breached.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include a table of comparative data for the 90th through 95th Congresses and the text of my resolution.

The information follows:

COMPARATIVE DATA: 90TH TO 95TH CONGRESSES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

	90th	91st	92d	93d	94th	95th
Measures reported.....	1,745	1,542	1,401	1,363	1,495	1,490
Measures passed.....	1,659	1,642	1,469	1,914	1,624	1,615
Public bills enacted						
into law.....	640	695	607	651	588	634
Yea and nay votes.....	478	443	457	632	807	1,035
Measures considered						
under suspension....	167	185	194	255	325	453
(a) Passed.....	(159)	(181)	(184)	(254)	(300)	(420)
(b) Failed.....	(8)	(4)	(10)	(1)	(25)	(33)
Suspensions as per-						
cent of total meas-						
ures passed.....	10	11.3	13.2	13.3	20	28

Sources: Daily Digest, final issues; Congressional Research Service.

H. RES. 204

Resolved, That Rule XXVII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended in the following ways:

In Rule XXVII, clause 1, designate the existing paragraph as paragraph "(a)" and add the following new paragraph:

"(b) It shall not be in order to consider a motion to suspend the rules and pass a bill or resolution unless—

(1) consideration of the bill or resolution under a suspension of the rules has been specifically authorized by (A) the committee having jurisdiction over the bill or resolution, by rollcall vote, in open session and with a majority present; or (B) the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee having jurisdiction over the bill or resolution in a written request to the Speaker;

(2) the House has been notified orally, while the House is in session, by at least the last legislative day of the week preceding the scheduled consideration of the bill or reso-

lution under a suspension of the rules as to: (A) the number of the bill or resolution; (B) its short title or a brief description; (C) whether any amendment will be offered thereto; and (D) the date on which it is scheduled to be considered; and the text of any amendments to be offered thereto, together with the notice, shall be printed in the appropriate portions of the Record on the day on which such oral notice is given to the House; and

(3) the bill or resolution does not authorize or appropriate in excess of \$50,000,000 for any fiscal year."

Rule XXVII, clause 2, is amended to read as follows:

"2. If a point of order is sustained against the consideration of any motion to suspend the rules and pass a bill or resolution for failure to comply with any provision of clause 1(b) of this rule, it shall nevertheless be in order to consider such motion if consideration is agreed to by a majority of those present and voting, a quorum being present, and such question shall not be subject to debate."

Rule XXVII, clause 3(a), is amended by striking the words "or has been seconded pursuant to clause 2 of this rule" ●

SAM FRIEDEL

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1979

● Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a saddened heart that I join my colleagues on this occasion in paying a special tribute to a distinguished former Member of the House of Representatives, Sam Friedel.

Sam came to the House of Representatives the same year I did. In fact, we were both members of the spirited 83d class. I knew and worked closely with Sam for 18 years. Sam was a popular and well-respected Member on both sides of the aisle. He was a no-nonsense Member of the House, hard-working, conscientious, and dedicated to representing the interests of Maryland's Seventh District. A consummate, grassroots politician, Sam understood so well the important maxim that all politics are local.

Many of us remember Sam's important work as the chairman of the House Administration Committee, as well as his distinguished service as the ranking member of the Commerce Committee. Most importantly, we remember Sam for the admirable qualities of integrity, fortitude, and principle and as a dedicated and devoted public servant who always put first the interests of his beloved home State of Maryland.

Sam was privileged to enjoy a long and satisfying life. Those of us who served with him were honored and proud to have worked with such a great American and fine public servant.

My wife, Millie, joins me in expressing our sincere condolences to the family of Sam Friedel. ●

SUBURBAN GUN PLAY

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, in all the hue and cry over gun controls, we often overlook the fact that the misuse of firearms is a problem that is just as ubiquitous in the quiet suburbs as it is in the big cities.

Lowell Blankfort, former publisher of the Chula Vista Star-News who now writes a weekly column for the newspaper, has documented recent shootings in San Diego's South Bay area, a mostly suburban area which is part of my congressional district. The six cases cited by Mr. Blankfort all occurred since the first of this year, and all within a limited area.

While it is true the victims might have been attacked in any event, the assailants could not have attacked with such deadly impunity if they had not had handguns.

Mr. Blankfort is a skilled and provocative writer, and his essay is eminently readable regardless of how one feels about gun controls.

The article follows:

HAVE GUN, WILL . . . ? ?

(By Lowell Blankfort)

Nineteen-year-old Armando Lopez of National City and a half dozen friends from the Chula Vista-National City area were relaxing on a bench near the Organ Pavilion in Balboa Park after seeing a Sunday night movie.

Suddenly another group of youths came up to them, informed them it was their "territory" and told them to beat it. Not wishing any hassle, Armando and his friends did just that. As their car was about to leave, Armando stuck his head out the window. The next thing he remembered was a burning in his neck. He had been shot.

The bullet lodged in his throat and came within a hair's breadth of killing him. A surgeon removed it, and later a young suspect, also 19, was arrested. Armando still wonders why anyone would try to kill someone for sitting on a park bench.

Lori Risk, 17, a Chula Vista High School student, was sound asleep in the bedroom when her boyfriend's 17-year-old brother began cleaning the new gun he had bought just that morning. Lori never woke up. The boy forgot he had put in a cartridge that morning, the gun accidentally discharged, and the bullet went through Lori's brain.

Thomas Hequet, 31, of Chula Vista and his former wife had their problems. Early this month, Hequet had one he never anticipated. Making a phone call at a bar on Broadway, he turned and saw his wife brandishing a pistol. She fired four bullets into him, wounding a finger, his right elbow and a shoulder. Doctors say he will recover.

Nobody is sure exactly what happened, but police say it seems to have had something to do with a dispute over a girl friend. Anyway, Joe Gonzalez, 21, a Chula Vista, and a companion were trying to break into an apartment along Imperial Beach's waterfront where several people they knew had gathered.

There were guns around and shots were fired, and suddenly Joe Gonzalez lay dead.

Police, at first called it murder and arrested a couple of youths, then released them, saying self-defense was involved. But

whoever's at fault, including himself, Joe Gonzalez no longer lives.

John Thrasher, in his early 20s, answered a knock on the door of his Paradise Hills home early last week. The callers were two youngsters, under 18. One pointed a gun at Thrasher and shot him through the throat. Thrasher was hospitalized, and one of the youngsters arrested. Police said drugs were involved.

Ray LaDuke, 44, had been told that driving a taxi can be a dangerous business. Now he knows it. Two passengers ordered him to drive them to the corner of 3rd St. and E Ave. in National City. When he got there, they pulled out a gun, made him surrender his wallet—then shot him through the head.

Somehow, though in agony, he managed to call on his radio for help. Otherwise, he would have died.

Now I have no way of knowing for sure whether—if there were tighter controls on guns—Lori Risk and Joe Gonzalez would be alive today, or Armando Lopez and Thomas Hequet and John Thrasher and Ray LaDuke would have been spared the pain and anguish of hospitalization, or whether it would be safer to sit on park benches or drive taxis for a living, or even be sure you'll wake up when you go to sleep.

After all, as the Gun Lobby insists, people can do each other in by other means if they're so determined (though a gun is a lot simpler to use than, say, a knife, and a lot less risky too).

But I do know that all of the above gun incidents (plus others I don't have space for) have taken place merely since the first of this year, not in New York or Chicago or Los Angeles, but in our own South Bay.

I do know that the U.S. is the only country in the world without effective handgun control laws—and also has the highest handgun death rate of any country in the world.

And, I do know that, if you or someone in your family owns a handgun, you are twice as likely, as the average American to be murdered, accidentally shot or commit suicide.

Public opinion polls show that, by overwhelming majorities, Americans favor federal handgun registration laws and requiring permits for buying a rifle. Even among gun owners, 71% favor gun control.

Yet the gun lobby, primarily the National Rifle Assn., its coffers filled with millions from gun and ammunition manufacturers, continues to terrorize our legislators into burying gun-control legislation.

It's time the vast majority show their feelings are as strong as the NRA-brainwashed minority. An initiative for gun control laws is being talked in California. And public officials should be put on notice that, if they don't vote gun control, they will become targets for defeat.

Only then will gunplay stop being an increasing part of the American way of life—and death. ●

MILDRED PEPPER

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, deepest sympathies and sorrows are with my distinguished colleague, CLAUDE PEPPER, in the death of his lovely wife, Mildred.

Mildred was so strong, yet sensitive and creative, and her strength so personified the best of her generation that moved this Nation to greatness.

I am sure that all of us who know of and benefited from Mildred's noble and humanitarian efforts toward a better and healthier world, stand in recognition that her passing is a real loss, both to her family and to mankind. ●

PAX AMERICANA

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, since the Second World War, the world has been dominated by what became known as the "Pax Americana." The United States took its place as one of those rare nations which, at a certain period in time, extend their influence to cover the known world. The Romans and the British each influenced the world far beyond their own borders.

The question is now being asked, will the Pax Americana go the way of the Pax Romana?

In a recent CBS radio broadcast, Ben Wattenberg addressed that question.

He said, and I agree, that the Pax Americana gave to the world a belief in the value of the individual, and not just in philosophical terms, but in a living, breathing, workable democracy in which the individual is prized.

Do we have the ability to continue influencing our world and making our invaluable contribution? Yes; if we have the will to do so.

Mr. Wattenberg's inspiring and thought-provoking remarks follow:

REMARKS OF BEN WATTENBERG

I'm Ben Wattenberg.

Suddenly, foreign policy has taken center stage in the theater of American politics. Revolution in Iran, assassination in Afghanistan, insult in Mexico, incursion in Vietnam, war in the Yemen, abandonment in Taiwan—and, now, with hope in our hearts, perhaps the beginning of peace in the Middle East.

President Carter's critics have said that America is in retreat. The president has said it's a new world, that a policy of restraint is in our own best interest. But both sides agree that foreign policy will be one of the greatest issues of the 1980 election. Well, it should be. For what is at stake is of monumental importance. Quite simply, the issue is this: Is the American Century ending?

After World War II, America became, for a third of a century, a member of the most select club in human history. From ancient Greece and ancient Rome, to France of the 17th century, to England of the 19th century, certain nations at certain times have dominated their world, controlled events and made great history.

After World War II, America's military force was the mightiest in the world. Our technology spread around the globe. Our movies and our television shows were watched in a hundred lands. Our music set the world's tone. Our currency was the world's standard.

In ancient times, when Rome's power ruled the world, it was called "Pax Romana"—the Roman Peace. In our era it was called "Pax American." And now we must wonder if

it's coming to an end. I think the answer to that question is self-contained in the answer to another question: Did the dominance of the American Century indeed yield one of those great creative moments in history? I think it did.

First, it's been an era of general peace—not total peace, but general peace. Second, it's been a time of massive prosperity, not only for rich nations but for poor nations, too. Third, a noble idea has spread under the umbrella of Pax Americana. The notions that men can rise above class or station, that men can speak their own mind and that they have status above the state—these are the only insurgent and radical ideas of our time, and they have an American taproot.

Can all this continue? Well, I think history tells us that great cultures only flourish under the umbrella of great power. We and our allies can still have that power; we can still wield it with both fortitude and moderation if we agree that it's worth it. If we do, I think the American Century can continue. And if we don't, sooner or later you may not be hearing six divergent—viewpoints on Spectrum from me, Ben Wattenberg, or from anyone else. ●

IMPROVING GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for April 4, 1979, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

IMPROVING GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE

Whenever I visit and talk to people in the Ninth District or see the comments of constituents who write to me, I get a message that is loud and clear: "Make the federal government work better!"

The attitude of Hoosiers in particular and Americans in general is plainly one of disappointment with government. They believe that they are not getting their money's worth from government. They feel that government is more often a burden than a help to them. We in Congress need to address ourselves to legislative solutions to the many problems which have eroded the people's trust and confidence in public institutions. That trust and confidence can be restored only if workable solutions are found.

I am sponsoring several bills in the 96th Congress which should help us tackle many of the problems of government. The bills will not solve all the problems immediately, but they are a start toward a smaller, more efficient, and more compassionate federal sector. The following are some of the bills I have introduced so far:

The Sunset Act of 1979: This bill would require that all federal programs be reviewed and reauthorized at least once every ten years. It would terminate funding for any program which Congress did not reauthorize. It would also specify that all programs of a similar nature be reviewed at the same time and in relation to one another. Quite simply, the object of this bill is to have Congress determine which programs are needed and which are not, and to eliminate those programs that have outlived their usefulness or have duplicated the functions of other programs.

The Legislative Oversight Act of 1979: While the Sunset Act proposes to have Congress review programs already in existence, this bill would have Congress provide more guidance for programs from the beginning.

A major problem with the structure of government today is that Congress (which is constitutionally mandated to make the law) passes vague legislation, leaving it to executive agencies (which are legally directed to carry out the law) to write rules and regulations to "fill the gaps". Unfortunately, the rules and regulations do not necessarily follow congressional intent. This bill would require that all legislation authorizing new programs contain language setting out the objectives and planned annual accomplishments of the programs. It would also require agencies to submit annual reports on progress toward their goals.

The Administrative Rulemaking Reform Act: More commonly known as the "congressional veto," this bill would allow either the House or Senate to examine proposed rules and regulations, and to reject them if they appeared to be excessive, unreasonable, or outside the bounds of congressional intent. Under this bill, Congress could more fully exercise its power as the national law-making body. The congressional veto is the best device I know to control runaway bureaucracy.

Amendments to the Administrative Procedures Act: These amendments would require executive agencies to publish economic impact statements for all new rules and regulations. In the context of comprehensive cost-benefit analyses, the impact statements would show the effects of the rules and regulations on consumers, businesses, markets, and government bodies. Too frequently, the full effects of rules and regulations are not considered. This bill would ensure that all effects were considered.

The Biennial Budgeting Act: This bill would aid Congress in its review and reauthorization of programs by creating a two-year budget cycle. The first year of the congressional term would be devoted to a detailed examination of programs, and the second year would be used for the actual appropriation of funds. Passage of this act would surely make sunset review much easier. It would also force Congress to take its responsibility for oversight much more seriously.

Paperwork reduction bills: I have submitted two bills to reduce the burdensome amount of federal paperwork. The first, the Paperwork Redtape and Reduction Act of 1979, would establish an Office of Federal Information Management Policy responsible for handling a centralized and more efficient information system. The second, the Federal Assistance Paperwork Reduction Act, would make several changes in application procedures for federal grant-in-aid programs to cut and consolidate the paperwork required in applying for and maintaining federal funding.

Through these bills and others, many of my colleagues and I are attempting to overcome many of the difficulties that have cropped up as government has grown in size and complexity. Such legislation can help to restore trust and confidence in government by improving government performance. ●

COMMUNITY GATHERING PLACE

HON. DAN LUNGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday a local community in my district, Hawaiian Gardens, will dedicate their new city hall and community complex.

This long-awaited center will provide

the people of Hawaiian Gardens not only with place to conduct the business of government, but a social and fitness center as well.

The complex will house where the local charitable and civic groups in Hawaiian Gardens can hold meetings.

It will provide space for city councilmen to meet directly with their constituents.

It will also have a full-size gymnasium, special gymnastics room, boxing and weight lifting room, a crafts center, handball and racket ball courts, and men's and women's locker room.

In short, it is a real community gathering place not just another government building housing courts and offices.

This center is a little jewel to the people in Hawaiian Gardens.

I hope this facility will bring their local government closer to them, and provide an opportunity to build even closer ties among the people of Hawaiian Gardens. ●

THE VIETNAMESE GULAGS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, since the fall of Saigon international aid has been going into the now united Communist Vietnam. The United States provides tax dollars to help finance the international organizations that funnel aid to Vietnam and other Communist countries. I think it is a sad commentary that after years of sacrifice to stop communism we are asking our taxpayers to watch their money being laundered through organizations and into Communist Vietnam. Today Vietnam is one of the worst violators of human rights in Asia. The following article, from *Le Monde* describes part of the tragedy happening in Southeast Asia:

GULAGS IN NAME OF SECURITY

(By Roland-Pierre Parlingaux)

HO CHI MINH CITY.—Since May 1975, a curtain of silence has fallen in Vietnam on the subject of human rights, in general, and the fate of hundreds of thousands of detainees, in particular. In Hanoi and former Saigon, questions on this subject are considered, at best, "unfriendly," and at worst, intolerable "meddling in Vietnam's domestic affairs." So it is not possible to get an idea, even an approximate one, of either the number or the state of the prisoners, whether former military officers and government employees of the old Saigon regime now undergoing "reeducation," political detainees or Buddhist and Catholic priests, or common criminals.

With Vietnam on a war footing and squaring up on the Chinese and Cambodian frontiers to the "fifth columns" and "agents" of those countries, civilian and military security services once more hold unchallenged power over the population in the North and the South. But does the situation justify the present Communist regime of Hanoi behaving today exactly as the anti-Communist government of Saigon used to do and routinely resorting to repression and preventive detention on mere suspicion or on the

strength of a denunciation, which it has elevated to a civic duty? Does it justify Hanoi's herding into camps of all those who do not fit in with the new order? The question has been asked often enough in the past to be asked again today.

Last April I put the number of former collaborators of the Saigon government now being held in camps and prisons at 80,000, half of whom were in the North. Vietnamese refugees and opponents of the Hanoi government living in Paris say the total figure is 800,000—ten times higher and back it up with fully documented details. The Vietnamese authorities counter such allegations with a stolid silence or react with propaganda which cannot help but reinforce one's worst suspicions. For instance, didn't Hanoi keep claiming that the lawyer Tran Van Tuyen was alive and well even after he had died in prison? One example which doesn't lead one to have faith in Government pronouncements.

The Vietnamese leaders had declared that after three years all detainees held in "re-education" camps and not liberated would be tried in people's courts for their "crimes." Three and a half years have gone by and most of the prisoners are still in camps. None seems to have been formally tried. Besides, it is clear the problem isn't even one of justice, which in any case is synonymous with power. It depends on the goodwill of 17 men in the party's political bureau. "Re-education" is not a punishment in the ordinary penal sense. At best it is an administrative measure of unlimited duration imposed by the victor on the vanquished.

Moreover, the military authorities appear to be transferring detainees from the camps under their jurisdiction to those run by the prison administration. Nobody knows what the status of a "re-educated" person would be following such a transfer.

Celebrating National Day on September 2, Hanoi announced that prisoners would be released. A few appear to have been freed. In the South, in some *chays* (usually a group of about 400 detainees, but the number varies according to the size of the camp), one or two prisoners were let out. But not one of a wide sampling of 100 former Vietnamese officers and government employees married to Frenchwomen, who on this account would be entitled to come to France once they are liberated, had been freed up to the end of September.

Visits to prisoners are impossible in the North, and only irregularly permitted in the South. Sometimes three to four months elapse between visits. The duration of the visits, which take place in the presence of guards, varies between five and 15 minutes. Food is scrappy, health care and medicines generally nonexistent. It should be pointed out, though, that here the population is hardly better off where shortages are concerned.

In the South, instead of being given a genuine political re-education, General Thieu's former soldiers and government employees are forced to clear jungle land and build dykes, often close to the Cambodian border, in Tay Ninh and Phuoc Long provinces. Up to 10,000 prisoners worked at one time in the latter province. Output norms are high, working conditions arduous, and malaria is endemic. In the North, especially in the Ten Bai region, I learned from very reliable sources, the cold and the lack of food result in "a high death rate." Detainees have been employed everywhere in clearing minefields.

Hanoi is gradually releasing men who can be immediately re-employed, like doctors, technicians and teachers in particular. However, once released, they still need six months to recover their civic rights. They must spend three months of this period on earthwork

projects, either doing the whole stint at one go or in spells of ten or 15 days at a time. After that, they must find work, and for this they must bribe corrupt bureaucrats. Those who aren't authorized to live in cities are practically forced to set up in the "new economic zones" with or without their families, or try to get out of Vietnam.

No less alarming is the situation in the prisons. The names of penitentiaries of sinister fame we used to hear about in the days of the Saigon government are cropping up again in conversations. These were the names which mobilised a part of world public opinion against Saigon. At the time the Democratic Republic of Vietnam quite rightly never let a chance go of denouncing the inhuman gulag. Now that they are in power, these same leaders are filling it with "reactionaries," "saboteurs," "conspirators," "enemy agents" and "traitors." However, unlike what used to happen before, no foreign investigating commission is allowed to verify the accuracy of these ignominious assertions. The well-known militants who, under the old regime, courageously devoted themselves to defending political prisoners have all gone silent. Some are in official jobs, others behind bars.

Ho Chi Minh City's big Chi Hoa prison, which before April 1975 held some 10,000 people crowded in degrading conditions, is again said to be full. Extensions are said to be underway in Le Van Duyet prison, in the south of the city. Its four-by-eight metre cells which used to hold up to 35 prisoners each until this year are now said to contain over 50, with the prisoners taking turns to sleep. I was told of similar prisons in the provinces, but of course these stories cannot be verified.

Last month (September) the authorities arrested a surgeon from a Saigon hospital who, it was said, talked too freely, complaining about working conditions and the lack of facilities. The same fate befell Cao Giao and Thai Lang last June, two journalists well known for their independent judgment and opposition to the former Saigon regime.

With three other French journalists, I tried to find out what had happened to a number of people whose names we submitted to the authorities. But it was a sheer waste of time. We did receive a few answers from officials. Here are some of them.

Huynh Tan Phat, former president of the provisional revolutionary government and now a Vice-Premier, said: "Almost all the detainees have been freed. A very small number are still held. I don't have a list. Prisoners are freed everyday." On the subject of those who helped the revolution, in particular the PRG, who are still held in prisons, he had this to say: "One must beware of those who disguise themselves as revolutionaries in order to play the enemy's game. There are camps administered by the army and camps under the ministry of the interior (security). If you have lists of names, go inquire at the ministry. It will give you the answers."

Lu Ki Ky, secretary-general of the Association of Vietnamese Journalists, assured that "95 per cent of the prisoners have been freed." But out of how many? That he didn't know. Despite his official position, "he knew of no journalists who were arrested in the South." To his mind, the West had a wrong idea of detention camps. "It would be more to the point to consider them as camps for creating and learning." And he went on to compare them, absurdly, to "big chicken farms."

"Before releases are granted," Ky said, "the people of every village, every neighborhood must be consulted. It's up to the people to decide. If a release is granted prematurely, the people will not be happy."

When he was asked who, besides "the people" constituted the "competent authorities," he answered curtly: "It's none of your business." And when taxed about incarcerations

without trial, he had this to say: "This is our regime."

It could be the last word. But an unnamed official had another to add: "Right now, security takes priority over everything else. It's not possible in the present circumstances to free people who could make use of their freedom to threaten us from within." ●

THE VALUE OF TUITION TAX CREDITS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, as the costs of a postsecondary education continue to rise, students and parents are faced with the likelihood of reduced choices as they approach the education marketplace. The sad reality today is that many students must secure more than a good scholastic record in order to enroll in a good college; they must also secure outside financial assistance. As this problem becomes more pervasive, the citizens of our Nation, individually and collectively, stand to lose.

To address this problem, I have introduced a bill which would provide a tax credit of \$1,000 for expenditures of tuition, fees, books, supplies, and equipment required for enrollment and instruction at an institution of higher education or a vocational school. The full credit may be granted to those with a tax liability equal to or greater than the amount of credit offered, while those paying less than \$1,000 in taxes would be eligible to receive a credit equal to their tax liability. Immediately following its passage, this bill would provide the full credit of \$1,000 for every subsequent taxable year.

A credit of \$1,000 is necessary to meet current expenses in financing a college education. The College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) reports that between the 1970-71 school year and the 1976-77 school year, the average tuition and fees for 4-year colleges rose 54 percent at private institutions and 57 percent at public institutions. In CEEB's report, "Student Expenses at Post-Secondary Institutions, 1978-79," evidence indicates that this rising trend in educational costs continues. From the 1977-78 school year to the 1978-79 school year, budgeted costs increased 5.3 percent for resident students at public 4-year institutions, and 6.1 percent for resident students at private 4-year institutions. Figures for nonresident students in each category increased approximately 5 percent as well. These figures support the CEEB's observation that over an 8-year period—since school year 1970-71—increases at public 4-year institutions have risen by 64.8 percent, while costs have increased by 74.5 percent at private 4-year institutions.

While there has been a continuing increase in college expenses, there has also been a decline in those attending postsecondary institutions. In the "National Center for Educational Statistics Bulletin," December 1978, Marcie D. Eldridge, administrator, NCES, cited that:

For the second time in three years enrollment in the nation's colleges and universities is down.

Increasing costs could eventually restrict those pursuing a postsecondary education. Without a bill of this type, we are endorsing financial discrimination against middle income Americans.

Morgan Frankel, an analyst in taxation from the Economic Division of the Congressional Research Service, studied the benefit of a \$1,000 credit for middle income families. His report indicates that those with incomes under \$15,000 would represent 51.3 percent of the cumulative percentage for the tax benefit, and those with incomes under \$25,000 would bring the cumulative percentage benefit to 83.6 percent.

This tax credit proposal will not create another bureaucratic regulation. In his column, "A Valuable Tuition Credit," Washington Post, March 26, 1978, George F. Will cited this key virtue: "A tax credit involves no administrative burden" and is not merely a "... routine bureaucratic reflex." This concept enables the amount of credit to be subtracted directly from the amount owed by the taxpayer, hence these funds are utilized by the citizens rather than the Government for the means of education desired.

In his book, "Crisis in College Finance? Time for New Solutions," Roger A. Freeman sums up the urgent need for a program to insure the freedom of choice and diversity for our Nation's young people pursuing the high level of education which we have thus far afforded them, saying:

The scope and depth of knowledge available and required are growing at an explosive rate; the nation's future depends increasingly on having its citizenry more broadly educated, yet more thoroughly trained in science, technology, and other special fields.

The cost of a tuition tax credit plan has been discussed in dollar terms as a "revenue loss," however, in the long run, the program would become a "revenue investment" as the revenues would lead to higher learning, better job opportunities, and consequently a more productive economy providing the Federal treasury with higher tax revenues.

As a former college educator, I firmly believe that the key to America's future lies in its young people. Revenue loss can be printed simply in terms of dollars and cents, but a monetary investment in our future cannot be itemized. Our tax system recognizes the need to encourage capital investment by business to keep the economy strong. Our tax code must also reflect the realization that educating our young people is an equally sound investment in the future of our country. Education is the key to an informed electorate which, in turn, provides the foundation for our democracy. As our third President, Thomas Jefferson, founder of the University of Virginia, appraised the value of education, so would I:

I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education. ●

U.S. AID FOR RHODESIA ELECTIONS

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that the Carter administration should reevaluate its position on the upcoming elections in Rhodesia. The Birmingham News recently ran an editorial by James J. Kilpatrick dealing with that very issue which I would like to share with my colleagues:

WHY WON'T U.S. AID RHODESIA ELECTIONS?
(By James J. Kilpatrick)

It is worth returning to the Rhodesian issue one more time, if only to plead with President Carter to reconsider the obstructionist position he and his advisers have taken. In this critically important matter, Mr. Carter is dead wrong; the senators who oppose him are dead right.

Barely a month remains before Rhodesia is to conduct elections to a new biracial parliament under the newly approved constitution. These are not sham elections. They represent a profoundly serious effort by white and black leaders to create a truly viable republic in the heart of southern Africa.

Now, "viable" is one of those useful words that have been damaged in bureaucratic handling. It means "capable of living," and that is precisely what is at stake next month in Rhodesia-Zimbabwe—the birth of a government that is capable of surviving the terrible stresses that will follow in the spring and summer.

CIVIL WAR THE ALTERNATIVE

The United States makes all the difference. With our help, and Britain's, the infant will pull through; without it, the effort will die. Chaos and civil war most surely will follow.

What is asked of Mr. Carter at this point? Only that he authorize a team of observers for the April elections. It seems little enough to ask. After all, this is the key element the United States has been demanded for years—free elections open to all Rhodesians over the age of 18.

But the elections will have little meaning if they are not certified as free and open by neutral observers. Without such certification, United Nations sanctions will remain in effect.

A bipartisan group of senators clearly comprehends the situation. The group includes such liberals as McGovern of South Dakota, such moderates as Schweiker of Pennsylvania and DeConcini of Arizona, and such conservatives as Hayakawa of California. They are willing to have a look; they perceive nothing that is wrong, and everything that is right, in sending observers.

What are Mr. Carter's objections? The president himself has never spelled them out. Various spokesmen have complained that the elections cannot be regarded as open if the guerrilla factions of Robert Mugabe and Joshua Nkomo "are not allowed to participate."

That was how U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young put it a few days ago. But only their own obduracy prevents the ZANU and ZAPU factions from voting with everyone else.

It also is complained that there never has been a multi-party conference that would bring Mugabe and Nkomo together with leaders of the transitional government: Smith, Muzorewa, Sithole and Chirau. But Ian Smith months ago tried to negotiate with Nkomo as the better of the two terrorist commanders; Nkomo's rebels responded

by shooting down an unarmed civilian plane and then slaughtering the survivors.

Until passions cooled, a conference could not have succeeded. Now Smith has renewed his offer to meet. Mugabe and Nkomo have refused, and Mugabe has published a list of "traitors" he intends to execute when he seizes power. The list include Muzorewa, Sithole and Chirau.

Still further, it is complained that the new constitution gives 28 percent of the seats in parliament for 10 years to whites who constitute 4 percent of the population. Senator Hayakawa makes the point that this has been the pattern in Africa as one-time colonies have achieved independence.

FORMULA USED BEFORE

When Tanzania was created, 30 percent of the seats went to 1 percent of the population. In Kenya, 30 percent of the seats went to 4 percent. In Zambia, half of the 30 parliamentary seats were reserved for 84,000 Europeans; half went to 3.5 million blacks. Such provisions are transitional, and they are essential.

Finally, it is objected that to dignify the April elections, even by sending neutral observers, would be to alienate such states as Mozambique, Angola, Tanzania, Zambia and Botswana. But is it supposed that these states would sever all relations with the West and make war upon Zimbabwe? Nonsense!

The situation could be peacefully resolved—but nothing will be peacefully resolved so long as Mr. Carter refuses to go the first mile. ●

REMEMBERING REV. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago today Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. was tragically assassinated in Memphis, Tenn. The passing of time ordinarily has a way of dulling or tarnishing the memory of our national leaders. Such has not been the case with the memory of Dr. King. In America's history he stands among a small number of great leaders for whom respect, affection, and admiration have grown with each passing year.

Martin Luther King, Jr. possessed extraordinary qualities. He was a deeply religious man, the son and grandson of two prominent ministers, at whose church—the Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta—he too became a minister. In his religious practice and his preaching of the social gospel that it is man's duty not only to have faith, but also to serve others (according to Luke: "To heal the brokenhearted, to free the captives, to set at liberty them that are bruised") Dr. King transformed the religious and secular life of the American people and, indeed, of peoples throughout the world.

Dr. King's stature rests on many other qualities: A singular self-discipline and steadiness, an unshakable faith in the basic goodness of man, a dedication to raising up the lives of the disadvantaged, exceptional courage, and an irrepressible dream for racial and economic justice.

Like the great teacher before him, his guiding lights—Christ, Socrates, Gandhi—Martin Luther King, Jr. engaged

individuals in a process of seeking after the truth. He was convinced in the basic goodness of individuals, but he also knew that ignorance was widespread and change, frightening. Many critics accused Dr. King of fomenting violence through his actions. They were unable to see that the tragic violence that occurred during the civil rights struggle did not arise out of the nonviolent civil disobedience of Dr. King's movement, but out of the conditions of anger, antagonism, tension, and violence that existed very close to the surface of everyday life. In Dr. King's words, the tension that already existed had to be "exposed, with all the tension its exposure creates, to the light of human conscience and the air of national opinion before it can be cured."

Martin Luther King, Jr.'s tireless efforts in the North and South were largely responsible for the vitality of the civil rights movement and the passage of the landmark civil rights laws in the 1960's. It may be said that his counsel influenced Presidents Kennedy and Johnson in moving them toward leadership on civil rights. In all of his activities during the civil rights movement, Dr. King spoke for all people. "Black and White Together—We Shall Overcome" was Martin King's credo to the last. I do not think it is an exaggeration to say that Dr. King helped change the face of America.

Martin Luther King, Jr.'s memory is honored in a great many ways, at home and abroad. Thirteen States, as well as most major cities in the United States, honor him through public holidays or days of observance. Dr. King's gravesite in Atlanta has become a national shrine at which world leaders have paid their respects.

In each Congress from the 90th Congress onward, I have introduced in the House of Representatives a bill to designate Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday a national holiday. I thank 118 of my colleagues who have joined in cosponsoring this legislation, H.R. 15; and invite my other colleagues to earnestly consider supporting and cosponsoring the bill. Twenty-six Senators have joined Senators BAYH, KENNEDY, and DOLE in cosponsoring S. 25, the companion bill. President Carter has also endorsed the Martin Luther King, Jr. national holiday bill.

I am aware that the public holiday is an honor that, heretofore, has been reserved only for President Washington, Columbus, and great national events. May I respectfully suggest that this honor also be conferred on Dr. King, who was the leader of the greatest modern example of popular political action in this country. Martin King caused a rebirth in this Nation, a reaffirmation of the ideas of freedom and justice which is the cement which binds us together.

We ought to have a way to honor this great human being and reaffirm the ideals he lived and died for. To honor him through a national holiday would also, of course, bestow a great honor on black Americans and represent another step forward in reconciling the lives and

dreams of all the peoples who compose this Nation.

Dr. King championed justice and liberty for all Americans. He exemplified a very special ideal in human history—the ideal of serving one's fellow brothers and sisters. In teaching us how to live in justice and in freedom, and how to die as well, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. taught us a great deal, indeed. ●

CARNEGIE AWARD FOR HEROISM

HON. DAVID F. EMERY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. EMERY. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, 1979, an 11-year-old resident in my district was rescued from certain death on an ice-floe in Maine's 30-degree waters by an 18-year-old who risked his own life to save a stranger. In recognition of this act of selfless courage, David Harrison of Kennebunk has been nominated to receive the Carnegie Institute's coveted award for individual heroism.

As we celebrate the International Year of the Child, it seems especially appropriate to share with you the following account of this remarkable incident and to commend the courageous young Maine man who risked his life to save another. [From the Journal Tribune, Jan. 29, 1979]

KHS SENIOR RESCUES 11-YEAR-OLD

(By John Young)

KENNEBUNK.—It was just another winter Sunday afternoon for 18-year-old David Harrison.

The Kennebunk High School senior decided to visit a friend, Tammy Phillips, and drove down to her family's Great Hill Road home at Kennebunk Beach.

A few minutes later, he would be swimming through the near-freezing ocean, risking his own life to rescue a stranger.

Harrison says he was talking with Tammy on the sun porch of her parent's home about 2 p.m., when Mrs. Brian Phillips—in near-hysterics—interrupted.

Their attention was then fixed on two young boys, caught on an ice floe which was heading out to sea in the rapid currents of the nearby mouth of the rain-swollen Mousam River.

Harrison says the two boys, later identified as Scott Carney, 11, of Kennebunk Beach, and Paul Chaisson, 14, of Portland, "tried to land themselves before they hit the tidal water," using sticks as oars.

They were not successful.

Harrison ran from the Phillips' house as the boys tried to make a swim for shore. He was followed by the Phillips' dog, Thaddeus.

At the water line, Harrison says he dropped his shoes, coat, watch and wallet and ran into the churning tidal waters—where the temperature was estimated to be in the mid-30s.

Chaisson, the older of the two castaways, was able to swim out of the main current under his own power, says Harrison, but was unable to stand up because of the effects of the frigid water.

By this time, another Kennebunk High student, Robert Thibodeau, had arrived on the scene, and Harrison says he helped Chaisson get to shore.

That left 11-year-old Scott still in the main current of the river—rapidly moving out in the ebbing tide.

But first, Harrison says he had to deal with Thaddeus, who thought the whole episode was, "fun and games."

Harrison says he was swimming to the younger boy, but the dog kept interrupting the rescue, trying to retrieve Harrison's hat. After the dog put him under water once, Harrison says he finally got Thaddeus turned around, back toward the shore, and he began the 50-yard swim to Scott.

The 11-year-old had been under water once by the time Harrison reached him. He grabbed Scott's collar for the long swim back.

All three were then taken to the Phillips' home. Shortly afterward, Scott and Paul were taken to Webber Hospital in Biddeford by the Kennebunk Fire Department ambulance. The two were treated there for hypothermia and shock and released, according to Kennebunk Police Officer Kent Burdeen, who arrived at the scene shortly after the rescue.

Harrison says he was revived with a hot shower and some rum at the Phillips' house.

Harrison, at school this morning, told the Journal Tribune in a telephone interview that he had taken basic first aid classes at the high school, and had been enrolled in Red Cross swimming classes, although he's never had any lifesaving instruction.

Harrison says he learned later that the two boys were playing on an ice floe in a calm tidal pool, but the current of the river and the rapidly-ebbing spring tide turned the game into a life-and-death situation.

Although his actions Sunday may be considered heroic, Harrison says he's "trying to keep low," today in school. ●

SIGNIFICANT SAVINGS CAN BE REALIZED BY ELIMINATING LANGUAGE MINORITY GROUP PROVISIONS FROM THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which will not only cut enormous expenses from State and Federal Government budgets but also eliminate a great deal of confusion and dissension. This legislation is entitled "The Voting Rights Act Repealer Amendments of 1979" and will eliminate the requirement that so-called language minority groups be included within the provisions of the Voting Rights Act. It has the support from a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Though I was an enthusiastic supporter of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and 1970, the amendments in 1975 have been fraught with difficulty and expense diverting funds from many more worthwhile projects to assist minority groups.

Under the mistaken belief that certain minority groups in this country were being discriminated against in the electoral process because of a lack of proficiency in English, the Congress amended the Voting Rights Act with provisions which sought to remedy this

alleged discrimination. These amendments provide that a State or political subdivision is now subject to the provisions of the Voting Rights Act if a single language minority comprises 5 percent of the total voting age citizen population, and if the illiteracy rate of that group is greater than the national averages. The act defines "illiteracy" as failing to complete the fifth primary grade.

The effect of these standards is that a State, county, city, or town must provide ballots and ballot information in the languages which meet the 5-percent test.

Many Members of Congress and officials at the Department of Justice, which is charged with enforcing these provisions, are beginning to realize the mistake which has been made. Numerous cities and towns across the country are being forced to spend thousands of dollars to provide bilingual ballots printed in such obscure languages as Cantonese, Tagalog, and Mandarin, even though no members of these minority groups reside within the voting district.

One example of how the current law works is found in the city of San Francisco. The registrar of voters has had to bear the exorbitant cost of printing registration materials, ballots, and ballot information in Cantonese, Mandarin, Spanish, and Tagalog.

Very shortly, the General Accounting Office will release a report of its study of these provisions of the Voting Rights Act. It is my hope that the GAO has concluded that the statute is not only unenforceable, but unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, the bilingual amendments of 1975 are overbroad and unnecessary. In order to lift the outrageous burden on many of our cities and towns, I am introducing this legislation to repeal the 1975 bilingual amendments to the Voting Rights Act. I am including a detailed section-by-section analysis of this legislation:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 2. This section strikes language from §4(a) of the Voting Rights Act which incorporates a reference to the bilingual trigger established by the 1975 Amendments in §4(b). Section 2 does not affect the traditional coverage of the Voting Rights Act accomplished by either the 1965 or the 1970 Amendments.

Section 3. This section deletes from §4(b) of the Voting Rights Act the bilingual triggering provision added by the 1975 Amendments. Section 3 does not affect the traditional triggering mechanism with respect to the Voting Rights Act of 1975 or the 1970 Amendments.

Section 4. This section deletes §4(f) of the Voting Rights Act which was added by the 1975 Amendments to the Voting Rights Act. Section 4(f) of the Voting Rights Act is the heart of the bilingual expansion accomplished by the 1975 Amendments. That section prohibits English-only elections by finding an English-only election to be a literacy test equivalent to the literacy test imposed in the old South. Section 4(f) also mandates the printing of all registration or voting notices, forms, instructions, assistance, or other materials or information relating to the electoral process, including ballots, in the language of any covered language minority group. Section 4(f) was not part of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 or the 1970 Amendments and its repeal will not affect

traditional coverage under the Act in any way.

Section 5. This section deletes from §5 of the Voting Rights Act, the preclearance requirements, based upon coverage by the bilingual triggering mechanism added by the 1975 Amendments. This section does not affect the preclearance requirements of §5 with respect to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 or the 1970 Amendments.

Section 6. This section limits the coverage of the Voting Rights Act to the fifteenth amendment of the Constitution by deleting references to the fourteenth amendment in §§3 and 6 of the Voting Rights Act which were inserted by the 1975 Amendments. Reliance on the fourteenth amendment is unnecessary since traditional fifteenth amendment guarantees have proven sufficient in our ten years of experience under this Act. The voting guarantees of the fifteenth amendment sufficiently safeguard any abridgement of voting rights on account of race or color. The courts have had little trouble in protecting the rights of language minority groups under the fifteenth amendment. This section in no way affects rights protected by the Voting Rights Act of 1965 or the 1970 Amendments.

Section 7. This section deletes a cross-reference in §§2, 3, 4(a), 4(d), 5, 6, and 13 of the Voting Rights Act to the guarantees established in §4(f)(2) of that Act. Section 4(f)(2) is repealed in §4 of this bill and any cross-reference in the Act to it must be eliminated. Section 7 in no way affects voting guarantees protected by the Voting Rights Act of 1965 or the 1970 Amendments.

Section 8. This section deletes the definition of "language minorities" and "language minority" groups from §14(c) of the Voting Rights Act. Repealing the other bilingual provisions of the Voting Rights Act removes the need for a definition of language minority groups. This section does not affect the protection of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 or the 1970 Amendments.

Section 9. This section deletes §203 of the Voting Rights Act which imposes bilingual election requirements in locations where language minority groups have a lower degree of education than the national average. The onerous requirements of §203 are identical with the requirements in §4(f) which is repealed in §4 of this legislation. Section 9 also contains technical amendments re-numbering successive sections in Title 2 of the Voting Rights Act. This section does not affect traditional protections of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 or the 1970 Amendments. ●

CUBA

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, this week we will be considering foreign aid to a number of countries. As the House considers H.R. 3324, the foreign aid bill, I hope my colleagues keep in mind that indirectly we have been aiding some of the worst violators of human rights in the world. I provide, for my colleagues' attention, two recent examples of people whose human rights have been abridged:

RETURNED PRISONER CITES INHUMANITY IN CUBAN JAIL

(By Otis Perkins and Dick Hogan)

"When you are an American in Cuba it's hell, baby," said Garland J. Grant, who described in an emotion-choked voice how

prison guards gouged out one of his eyes with a bayonet and beat another American prisoner to death in a Cuban prison.

Grant, 27, of Milwaukee, Wis., is among six Americans who returned voluntarily from Cuba Tuesday to face air piracy charges that could result in life prison sentences.

Grant was the only one of the six to grant an interview Friday inside the Duval County Jail where he is being held pending his return to face the skyjacking charges in Milwaukee.

He was dressed in a red flowered sport shirt and grayish trousers.

He said he returned to the United States "because I found out I didn't like the Cuban government . . . Cuba is nothing but a pawn of the Soviet Union."

"I'm glad I got to Cuba. It cost me my eye and almost my life," he said, but he learned that Communist Cuban government is prejudiced against blacks.

Grant said he went to Cuba by accident, that his intended destination was Africa where he said he wanted to live. He said he was concerned about black Americans in the United States, but soon learned Cuba was far more racist than the U.S. He said he still wants to go to Africa.

Grant said he was in jail all but two of his seven and a half years in Cuba. Why did he return to the United States, knowing he could spend the rest of his life in prison?

"I am 27 years old," Grant said. "I feel like I'm a thousand years old. I knew I'd probably die in prison there."

He couldn't control his emotions as he recalled the death of another friend he knew as Allen Switzer, who had lived in Chicago.

Switzer was originally from Chicago and came to Cuba via Jamaica. He was put in prison for 12 years because the Cubans said he stole a car radio, Grant said.

He recalled that Switzer wore a "P" on his shirt. A drunken guard wanted to know what the "P" was for, and Switzer replied, "prisoner of war."

The guard then "asked him what his nationality was and he said North American." Grant said, "He told him, 'Don't you know that if you're in this country, Americans are dogs?'"

Grant said the guard beat Switzer's head against a steel gate, that Switzer complained the next day of headaches and died after being taken to a hospital.

Grant said that after Switzer died at a hospital, guards asked him and several other prisoners, "Do you know judo?" and tried to get them to sign papers saying they had been responsible for Switzer's death.

Calm throughout most of the interview, Grant became violently emotional while describing the prison protest on Oct. 24, 1974, the day after Switzer's death, when he and seven other prisoners went up on a water tank to protest the killing.

They refused to come down until they were allowed to talk to officials from the Cuban Department of Immigration or Department of the Interior, Grant said.

Guards went up on the prison roof and pointed AK-47 rifles at them, Grant said, but they still refused to come down, so guards with sticks and machetes surrounded the water tower, and firemen came in with water hoses to force them to come down, he said.

The water was forcing the prisoners off the tower but then "the wind changed and the water started going back on the Cubans."

After that happened, he said, "the gates opened up and guards started coming in with sticks and machetes." They forced the prisoners off the tower by throwing rocks at them and savagely beat them once they were on the ground, he said.

Becoming increasingly more agitated as he recalled the event, Grant told how a guard stabbed him in the eye. "At first I thought it was just swollen." But when he was

taken to a hospital after a four-hour wait, a Russian doctor told him it would have to come out.

He said that at the hospital he was "yelling at them, calling them names in Spanish." They gave him a form to sign for his consent to have the eye removed, he said, and when he refused to sign told him they would remove it anyway.

He also raised his shirt to display long scars, which he said were from wounds inflicted by guards' bayonets.

Conditions in Cuban prisons were "inhuman," Grant said. On a typical day food consisted of half a cup of milk and a piece of dry bread in the morning, rotten fish for lunch, "and a lot of rice," which was mainly what prisoners were fed, he said.

When reminded that he faces a possible life sentence for his alleged crime, Grant said, "life is a gamble," and that an American prison would be "paradise compared to the Cuban prisons." Air piracy, a federal offense, carries a prison term of from 20 years to life.

He said he plans to write a book about his experiences in Cuba called "Castro's Paradise, Black Man's Problem," explaining that he feels black Cubans are being exploited by being sent to Africa to fight in wars financed by the Soviet Union.

A REPORT FROM CUBA—CASTRO'S POLITICAL PRISONERS

(By Theodore Jacqueney)

"In our terrible plight, new winds of hope reach Cuban political prisoners," Eleno O. Oviedo wrote to President Jimmy Carter in a letter smuggled out of Cuba from a Havana area prison in February.*

Using the same underground postal service a few days later, Miguel Groero Morales wrote to the new American President to say that although his 15-year sentence was up on March 15, his prison term was being extended because he refused the government "rehabilitation" plan which requires political prisoners to renounce their political beliefs. In protest, he planned a hunger strike. A close friend had died in a similar hunger strike response to another sentence extension for rejecting "rehabilitation," Groero wrote. The political prisoner told the president that he "loves life" even though he has been in prison for 15 years, but said he is determined to strike because he will not recant his religious beliefs or his views on democratic liberties.

Both letters were forwarded to the White House in March by Elena Mederos, Fidel Castro's first minister of social welfare and now the publisher of *Of Human Rights*, a magazine devoted to Cuban political prisoner issues.

In the 18 years Castro has governed Cuba, not one political prisoner has been amnestied. Only those who submit to the ideology of their jailors are freed. Last October, when I travelled in Cuba, one dissident leader told me, "When I heard on a foreign radio broadcast of the Organization of American States investigating political prisoners in Chile, I cried. Why don't they come here and look into our political prisoners, who have been treated as harshly as in Chile and have been in prison so much longer?"

I visited Cuba with an invited group of Ripon Society Republicans, neglecting to mention my human rights interests to

* Oviedo wrote that he had served more than two years in the U.S. Army after leaving Cuba, and had been employed by a Florida fishing concern when he and his companions, taking refuge from a storm, were kidnapped from Bahamian territory by Cuban naval forces in 1963.

CXXV—460—Part 6

Cuban U.N. officials charged with clearing visitors. Once in Havana I rarely went on the programmed official tours. Instead I called on the ex-prisoners, families and friends of prisoners and other underground opponents of the Castro regime to whom I had brought introductions.

TRADE UNIONISTS

Estimates of current Cuban political prisoners range from about 5,000 to more than 50,000. In comparison, Soviet dissident Andrei Sakharov estimates the USSR may hold about 10,000 political detainees: whatever figure is used for Cuba, in proportion to population (9.5 million Cubans, more than 250 million Soviets) Cuba has far more political prisoners.

Among these prisoners are many trade union figures who fought against the old Fulgencio Batista regime with Castro but were imprisoned in the early 1960s as the Cuban Revolution became Communist. Among the imprisoned Cuban labor leaders whose release has been sought in public human rights petitions from many other Latin American trade unionists are:

Reinold Gonzales, national leader of the banking workers union;

Gabriel Hernandez Custodio, secretary general of the pharmaceutical workers union;

Arturo Martinez Pagalday, organizational secretary of the retail clerks union in Havana province;

Herberto Hernandez, secretary general of the Cuban Workers Confederation in Camaguey province;

Pedro Forcade, secretary general of the chemical workers union;

Aldo Cabrera, secretary general of the food processors union;

Reinaldo Nunez, a leader of the Catholic workers union;

Rodolfo Rlesgo, a leader of the journalists union; and many others.

Perhaps the most celebrated Cuban dissident is Huber Matos, once Amnesty International's "political prisoner of the year." He was a commander in Castro's rebel army and became military governor of Camaguey province following revolutionary victory in January 1959. Ten months later he resigned, protesting increasing Communist domination of the new government, and was arrested on the now-ironic charge of "slandering the revolution by calling it 'Communist,'" a charge later changed to "treason."

Ping-ponged around the island's worst prisons for more than 17 years, Matos has been held *incommunicado* in La Cabana prison for the past six years. Members of his family, including his father who is now more than 90 years old, have tried repeatedly to visit him during this period, always unsuccessfully.

PRISON CONDITIONS

Earlier this year Matos was moved from La Cabana to Moraltos prison, about ten miles east of Havana, along with about 900 other political prisoners. Although his present conditions are unknown, his treatment at La Cabana was described to me through communications with his prison mates when I was in Havana. Throughout his six years in La Cabana he was kept in a totally dark, 60 square meter underground cell with between seven and sixteen other men. The prisoners were permitted to see daylight only three times per week, for two-hour periods. The cell was so hot and humid that "in the summer they have to carry water into the cell to pour over themselves. Otherwise they could not live, because of the heat," I was told.

Almost all political prisoners in La Cabana—called "plantados"—allegedly suffered the loss of many teeth; a few had lost all. Prisoners also complained of infestations of rats, mice and "all kinds of insects." The inmates reported steadily worsening vision caused by the lack of light, limb paralysis,

hair and eyebrow loss, stomach ulcers and circulation problems. Severe psychological or nervous disorders were also described to me: uncontrollable head-flickings, eyedartings, rapid gestures and sleeplessness, with some prisoners reported screaming through the night.

A comparison is striking: The case of former Chilean foreign minister Orlando Letelier, murdered in ostentatious gangland style, with possible complicity of right wing Cuban exiles, received enormous publicity in the U.S. The case of nearly-murdered Huber Matos, Jr., shot up with comparable Mafia methodology, is almost ignored here. Americans are properly outraged at the predations of the Chilean DINA secret police, with its possible link to the Letelier assassination. But not a word about the Cuban DGI, which in turn may be tied to the Matos shooting, as ruthless a secret police apparatus as DINA, as connected with political prisoner abuses at home and assassinations abroad.

The Cuban government wants the embargo lifted and U.S. trade resumed to try to spur its stagnant economy. "End the embargo" was the repeated demand of Cuban officials I encountered, and communicating this message seemed to me to be their government's main purpose in inviting Americans to the island.

To my surprise, Cuban dissidents in Cuba to whom I spoke agreed! Castro opponents with whom I spoke want passionately to resume trade and diplomatic relations with the U.S., although for very different reasons than the government officials. It means opening up Cuba to penetration," explained one implacable Castro foe who took great chances introducing me around to other dissidents and prisoner families. Repeatedly dissidents told me that they hoped for an increase in American diplomats, businessmen, journalists, tourists and other visitors in Cuba.

Whether all Cuban dissidents would agree—or whether this should be the decisive consideration for U.S. policy toward Cuba—I don't know. But this was the view expressed by the dissidents to whom I spoke.

My friends and I hear about the underground in Russia," said another dissident, "about Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov and others of the Russian resistance. Do you think we do not have our Cuban Solzhenitsyns, our Sakharovs? How could we not, when we are so close to your country and respect the ideas of your country, the democratic process, freedom, liberty? Of course we have people like them here. But how is the world to know, and how can they be protected by world opinion, like the Russians, if there are not journalists here to meet them and write about them, if Castro can arrest them and they disappear?"

Political prisoners in La Cabana prison who provided me the information on Huber Matos also sent a message, put together in consultation: Tell the world we are suffering in Cuba's prisons. You asked about "human rights" in Cuba. In Cuba, these two words are unknown. Cuba and Cubans would like to be free. Help them please. And guard the liberty you have. ●

THE CHALLENGE OF THE FCMA

HON. JOHN B. BREAU

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. BREAU. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this Congress I assumed the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and

the Environment of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. Over the past few years, this subcommittee has been engaged in a continuing effort to revitalize the U.S. fishing industry. The first major step in this effort was the passage in early 1976 of the Fishery Conservation and Management Act, commonly known as the 200-mile Fishing Zone Act.

A major contribution to the development of this legislation was made by a then freshman Member from the State of Washington, Congressman DON BONKER. He labored long and hard to assure that the subcommittee was aware of and responded to the needs of fishermen and related industries in the State of Washington and the Pacific Northwest. DON continues to be an active and effective member of the subcommittee and I intend to make good use of his fisheries know-how as we consider further steps to realize the great potential of this vital American industry.

In recognition of his efforts, DON was asked to make the principal address at the Northwest/Alaska 200-mile Fisheries Impact Conference held in Seattle, Wash., on February 27 and 28. This conference was organized by the Washington State Department of Commerce and Economic Development, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the Pacific Northwest Regional Commission, and the Washington Public Ports Association. It brought together a large gathering of fish processors and harvesters and many others interested in the development of our underutilized species of fish and shellfish.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman DON BONKER's remarks on that occasion provide an excellent insight into the opportunities available to America's fishermen and processors and some of the problems which must be overcome if we are to realize those opportunities. For that reason and because my subcommittee intends to bring related legislation before the House later this session, I would like to share his speech with my colleagues and through them with all those interested in the future of our fishing industry.

THE CHALLENGE OF THE FCMA (By Hon. DON BONKER)

Our fish and timber resources are unparalleled in the world. Perhaps that is why we have been so complacent while foreign fishermen have scooped up our fish and our logs have been floated away from our shores in ever-increasing numbers. While the export of logs has helped to some degree in American jobs and the value of the dollar, the potential that could be achieved by exporting finished product instead of raw resource far outweighs the benefits of such exports. And, as such discussion pertains to fish, we have in the past defaulted nearly completely by standing by as foreign fleets harvested our fish resources and exported to us the processed product.

But we slowed the process in 1976 by enacting the Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Its provisions that protect fish products within 200 miles of our coasts from foreign harvest provide us the opportunity to expand greatly the impact of fisheries on the United States economy.

I say "opportunity" because while we have seen some progress toward domestic usage, we have not yet scratched the surface of the potential that exists. And the benefits will be realized only if we exercise our opportunity. The opportunity will not disappear, rather it will remain as long as the FCMA stands in the statutes. But a failure on our part to open the door to opportunity relinquishes that opportunity to foreign fishermen who stand ready to continue their harvest patterns of the past.

Why? How can this be so? It always intrigues me when I receive correspondence on a law Congress has passed that demands my intervention because provisions of the law are being ignored or disobeyed. Such is the case with the FCMA. The Unilateral Act by the United States Congress to set aside an economic zone within two hundred miles of our shores was undertaken primarily to protect and preserve the fish resources within the zone for domestic use. However, the position of the United States in the world community as a responsible leader did not allow such unprecedented action without recognition of the food needs of the world and the preponderance (nearly one-fifth) of all available seafood in the economic zone we had established. So, the exclusiveness of the domestic use of fish resources within the zone extended only to the limits of capacity for harvest and processing by United States industry. Any stocks that exist beyond that are to be provided for foreign interest on a permit system managed by the Commerce Department.

While many assumed passage of the FCMA would require all foreign fishing vessels to abandon our shores, just the opposite is true. If all foreign fishermen are to leave, it is incumbent upon us to develop an industry that preempts their rights within 200 miles of our coasts by utilizing the full potential of the fish stocks found there.

There is ample incentive to do so. A dramatic increase has occurred in domestic seafood consumption in recent years opening expanded markets. The latest available statistics show annual per capita consumption is approaching 20 pounds, up nearly seven pounds in the past two decades. If the current price increases in beef continue, I am confident our per capita consumption of beef, nearly 150 pounds, will fall off while seafood consumption leaps upward.

At the same time worldwide demand for seafood has marched steadily higher. This fact, coupled with a reduction of foreign fishing in the zone, could provide major markets that are already well established, unlike the nearly fledgling domestic markets.

Another incentive is the similar action taken by other countries to reserve the waters within 200 miles of their shores for use by their own nationals. As a result, nations like Japan that consume the major portion of available seafood products have found themselves with less and less fishing area and more and more dependence on imports.

An additional incentive is the possibility of reversal of what is happening in many of our fisheries on fully utilized species. By developing harvest and processing capacity on these newly reserved underutilized stocks we can perhaps relieve the pressure on our fully utilized species.

The contributions of such development of fisheries to the United States economy could more than double, expanding from just over seven billion dollars to over 15 billion dollars. In the process, literally hundreds of thousands of jobs would be added.

Right now, while the United States ranks sixth among the fishing nations of the world, it accounts for only four percent of world landings. And again that is despite the fact that one fifth of the world's fish resources

occur within 200 miles of our shores. Foreign fishermen continue to harvest nearly two million metric tons of fish within that zone that under the allocation system that permits them to fish on stocks unused by domestic fishermen.

So, as I have indicated, the incentives for development of the total fishing industry exist. But such development is perceived differently by the various segments of the industry. There are those who want the role of government reduced to the smallest possible. There are those who want harvesting capacity fully developed and assured before marketing or processing capacity is addressed. There are those who want domestic harvest and export of raw product. Some want joint ventures to take advantage of existing foreign technology and foreign demand. And, there are those who shrewdly foresaw the enactment of the FCMA and invested heavily in domestic industry to avoid their interests and those of the foreign nations they represent.

But underlying all these diverse opinions of the direction we should pursue to realize the full potential of what we have carved out for this nation by enactment of the FCMA is an incredible amount of investment by those pioneers who traditionally have been in the forefront of any expansion undertaken. Spearheaded by the hard-nosed, weatherbeaten, independent, small businessmen cusses that man our fishing fleets, new keels for large, modern vessels are being laid at an unprecedented rate. And, as was demonstrated when domestic harvest of tanner crab increased spectacularly, processing capacity expanded to absorb it and Japanese fishermen relinquished the major portion of another species. As domestic harvest increases on other species I have been assured by several of those who dominate the processing industry that capacity will expand to absorb it.

What should the government's role be in this development process? And what special role should I play as chairman of the subcommittee on international development? Does my increasing seniority on the merchant marine committee, dominated by congressmen from the Pacific Northwest (three from Washington), give us an advantage that could be exploited to expedite development of our fishing industry in the Pacific Northwest? I am confident that such is the case.

As a matter of fact, major legislation that will be cosponsored by a majority of the members of the merchant marine committee, including chairman Murphy of New York, is being drafted by my staff in conjunction with his. We are addressing a number of issues in the legislation as we attempt to approach a total development package that best responds to the needs of existing industry.

Perhaps of primary importance is a consolidation of present federal involvement in fisheries. No less than eleven federal departments and agencies are involved in administering the fragmented hodge-podge that makes up fisheries policy in our government. Even consolidation, central to forming the foundation for the steps to come, is viewed in many different ways from outright paranoia to indifference. And the motives of those who advocate it are often suspect.

But beyond that we have an obligation to review the present structure of government to assure that it lends itself to realization of the potential established when we reserved the waters within 200 miles of our shores for domestic use after years of abdication of the sea's bounty to foreign fishermen. We must coordinate the management of the fish resources in cooperation with the states. We must stand as partner to the en-

the fishing industry to assist in providing the financial help to build fleets that can harvest the seafood necessary to meet domestic and worldwide demand, to provide the research facilities that allow us to follow the most direct path toward full utilization of our fish resources by developing the vessels and gear for efficient harvest, the technology for processing, and a distribution and marketing system that is responsive to changing and increasing demand.

Such a partnership should not be intrusive. However, standing back and throwing money at various segments of the fishing industry is not needed or, in many cases, wanted. We should be ready to make funding available whenever and wherever it is needed but only on a basis where there is a demonstrated desire by the segment of the industry involved. And then, we should assure the program initiated is designed with participation by those who will be impacted by it.

We have begun to see major changes already in the fisheries economic zone. The number of foreign vessels fishing off our shores has fallen rapidly, although actual harvest numbers have not changed so dramatically. All manner of speculation exists about why this is so, and the observer program now initiated and scheduled for expansion will give us first hand information to answer all questions. This retrenchment of foreign fishing effort has not been accompanied, to date anyhow, by appropriate increases in domestic harvest and we must determine why this is so.

This leads naturally to another area of importance that legislation must address. The uncertainty that surrounds nearly every fishery is universal. The fact is that we really don't know what has happened in the past or what is happening presently in the harvest of fish resources. As I said, the observer program on foreign vessels will begin to fill some gaps in our knowledge, but the harvest figures generated by domestic fleets have not been handled in a way that promotes confidence by those who are going to have to be encouraged to invest large amounts of money if the fishery industry is to develop properly. I feel we must remove any obstructions that exist, or are thought to exist, that would preclude enthusiastic financing when funds are needed for expansion. I believe a consolidation of the many data collection functions will serve as the most practical method reducing the uncertainty and raising the confidence of the financial community in the future of the fishing industry.

We must move on another front if we are to realize the full potential of the FCMA. The current high reliance of several fish consuming nations on the fish resources within our economic zone provides us with ready made markets. Our government, however, must begin to remove the trade restrictions that have developed in past years. The fact that many nations have been forced to curtail their fishing effort because of adoption of 200 mile economic zones by so many nations (78) will assist in this. But our state department must be made to understand and fully support the emerging nature of fishing and its increasing importance to our nation and the world. Only in this way can we facilitate the elimination of any trade restrictions that are not in the best interests of our domestic fishing industry.

Finally, I would like to comment on another area that is impeding the effort to move positively to develop a strong, modern fishing industry to meet the challenge of the FCMA. Any consolidation of views or support might be of unestimable importance. The very nature of the harvesting and transportation operations made up as I mentioned before of independent-minded entrepreneurs

have succeeded in promoting a higher degree of confusion than is normal in congress as we debate the different approaches that should be taken. Just when we are satisfied we are on the right track on an initiative that will greatly benefit our domestic fishing industry, another voice is heard taking us to task because our action is perceived to be either unduly advantageous to a segment other than their own or not fully conceived to offer the greatest possible advantage to the broadest range of the industry.

If it were possible to encourage a consolidation of views I would be willing to undertake the task. Every report and analysis I have read about problems we face in bringing our fishing industry to a competitive status with that of the nations who have long exploited our fish resources begin their discussion with the caveat that nothing can really be accomplished until our industry is totally unified on all issues. Of course that is not true, but any consensus could make the task of successfully moving some necessary legislative initiatives a much easier one.

I am excited about the positive future that lies before us. I believe we can form alliances, both within the fishing industry and between it and government that will allow us to change the entire structure of fishing nations in the world. We have already, in just a few years, changed this nation's attitude from one of laissez-faire to near belligerence in its policy on fishing and fish resources. The reversal of nearly 20 years of uncurtailed over-fishing on our fish stocks is underway along with domestic development of the industry. We have taken the first faltering steps and are at the end of the diving board. It is time to jump in and finish what is only begun. ●

SOLVING THE HUMAN PROBLEMS OF EXPOSURE TO TOXIC SUBSTANCES

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the opportunity to address the Senate Human Resources Committee on a subject that concerns me deeply—the exposure of Americans to toxic substances and the illnesses and diseases caused by such exposure. A related and no less important problem is the difficulty which persons injured and damaged by such materials face in obtaining compensation for their losses.

My remarks to the Senate committee dealt with this subject and a separate but related aspect of S. 420, the National Workers' Compensation Standards Act of 1979, my longstanding interest and involvement in the question of product liability insurance reform, dealt with under section 10 of the bill.

TOXIC SUBSTANCES

First, with respect to toxic substances, I fully support the efforts of that committee to enact nationwide standards for the award of compensation for work-related injury, illnesses, and disease. Such uniformity is long overdue. This is especially important in the occupational disease field since our understanding of disease caused by occupational exposure is only beginning to deepen. The benefits of es-

tablishing uniform compensation policies across the Nation in a developing area such as this are great.

Another very important feature of the bill which I fully support is its call for research on both the cause and effect relationships between disease and chemical exposure, and on the adequacy of a variety of compensation mechanisms. This latter study of the compensation systems would complement a study which I earlier proposed as an amendment to the Toxic Substances Control Act. The study to be conducted by the Council on Environmental Quality has been authorized at a funding level of \$2 million by the Consumer Protection Subcommittee of the House Commerce Committee.

My goal for this study is that it provide the Congress with information needed to formulate wise legislative policies which will adequately deal with the whole range of issues relating to human exposure to toxic substances. Thus, the study will define the scope of the human exposure problem in our country. A second key feature of this study would be to identify and evaluate a wide variety of options for compensating persons injured or damaged by exposure to toxic substances both outside and within the workplace.

The study will also include an analysis and evaluation of the various options for financing compensation programs. Finally, the study is to provide recommendations which address both the critical questions of social policy as well as the practical issues of how to design and carry out one or several compensatory systems. Thus, in many respects, it would be complementary to the study proposed in section 14(b) of S. 420.

However, Mr. Speaker, as much as I support these several features of the proposed National Workers' Compensation Standards Act of 1979, in the vital area of compensation for work-related illnesses and diseases, I want to express my fear that the bill may not go far enough. In specific, the highly tentative nature of the "advisory" role which the bill foresees for Federal standards relating chemical exposure to human injury threatens to limit the effectiveness of this program as a compensation mechanism for work-related diseases. It may be so toothless that it will not serve the major objective of the bill, which is to bring uniformity to workers' compensation programs across the country.

In the past 10 years, we in Congress have recognized that the proliferation of chemical and other substances manufactured and used in our country poses a potential threat to the health of our citizens and our environment. In response, the Congress passed a number of important bills aimed at protecting human health and environmental quality by regulating such substances to limit or prohibit their release into the environment. Examples of such legislation include the Toxic Substances Control Act, the Clean Air and Water Acts, the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and the Occupational

Safety and Health Act, to name just a few.

I think it fair to say that while the long-term goals of each of these acts were to protect our citizens from unreasonable exposure to hazardous substances, they do not deal with the question of how to compensate persons already injured or suffering damages from exposure to such substances, nor do they consider compensation for future exposure-caused injuries and damages. Thus, our unfinished environmental agenda should include dealing with the real and often tragic human problems caused by toxic substance exposure.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I predict that the decade of the 1980's will see a shift in focus from concern for the physical environment to the human environment and specifically upon health effects of exposure to environmental contaminants. As we begin to take control of the physical environmental problems, we should shift our focus to the impacts of past and continuing exposure to toxic substances, both in and out of the workplace, upon our population.

We are only now beginning to appreciate the scope of the chemical exposure problem for our population. We are able only crudely to estimate the numbers of persons who may be suffering ill effects as a result of chemical exposure. Our knowledge of possible occupational exposure, while certainly not complete, suggests that the problem in the workplace may be huge and spread across a wide range of worksites. For example, while the worker in a chemical plant producing pesticides may seem a likely candidate for exposure to toxic chemicals, we also know that certain hospital workers may also be among the highest risk persons. Undoubtedly, there will be many more discoveries in this field.

Although the focus of the Senate hearing was workers' compensation, and thus, exposure in the workplace, I also chose to say a few words about another type of exposure with which I have become painfully aware in the recent past. I refer to the nonoccupational exposure to chemicals, a problem which may be even more severe than occupational exposure, and about which we know even less.

As many of you know, Niagara Falls' Love Canal is in my congressional district. In the Love Canal, we have an example of persons exposed to and injured by toxic materials purely by virtue of where they live. Unfortunately, the Love Canal is not unique. Nor are the issues it raises about liability for human injuries caused by chemical exposure and the possible mechanisms and funding to compensate victims of such exposure.

Although exposure from abandoned hazardous waste dumps may seem only tangentially related to the subject of occupational exposure, I suspect that the relationship is, in fact, very close. In many instances, dump sites are located very near an operating plant or factory. In my own congressional district, for example, we have no less than six cases—and who can say more will not be found—where fumes and effluent from abandoned hazardous waste sites are affect-

ing and possibly injury workers on the job every day.

Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to address some of these problems through legislation of my own. To limit exposure from one source of chemical exposure; namely, abandoned hazardous waste disposal sites, I have introduced H.R. 1048, the Hazardous Waste Control Act. This act would address the Love Canal and the estimated 800 to 1,000 similar abandoned toxic waste dumps across the country by amending the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act to provide for the identification, reclamation, and monitoring of such sites.

Another of my legislative proposals directly addresses the human problems caused by chemical exposure. I refer to H.R. 1049, the Toxic Tort Act.

The Toxic Tort Act would:

First. Create a Federal cause of action for victims of toxic substances, permitting them to seek redress against negligent manufacturers.

Second. Establish an independent agency within EPA to compensate victims of pollution-related injuries regardless of fault. This agency would function, in principle, like a workers' compensation system.

Third. Require EPA to study the relationships between exposure to toxic substances and human disease and authorize EPA to make a "requisite nexus" finding. This would overcome the problem of proving causation with traditional proof requirements.

Fourth. Modify the proof and limitations, requirements which claimants must meet in State workers' compensation proceedings and in court actions, permitting the use of the presumption based on EPA's "requisite nexus" findings.

Fifth. Subrogate EPA to the rights of the injured party, enabling EPA to seek reimbursement from a negligent manufacturer.

As you can see, my Toxic Tort Act addresses several of the same issues addressed by S. 420, the National Workers' Compensation Standards Act of 1979. I would like to focus on two of the key features of these bills and explain what I consider to be the optimum for legislation to address compensation for toxic exposure-related disease and illness.

My bill proposes establishment of a so-called requisite nexus or cause-and-effect determination, between exposure to a toxic substance and the possible health effects from that exposure. The Toxic Pollutant Compensation Agency, an independent office within the Environmental Protection Agency would make the requisite nexus determination. This finding would necessarily precede any award of compensation. However, once made, the requisite nexus would create a rebuttable presumption of causality and thereby provide the standards for compensation in workers' compensation proceedings in all the States.

It would also provide standards for compensation for nonworkplace toxic exposure which would also be handled through the Toxic Pollutant Compensation Agency.

The Toxic Tort Act acknowledges the fact that before we can consider compensation for injured victims of exposure caused illness or disease, we must have a major research effort into the relationships between exposure and disease, and it makes provision for such an effort. But once that determination is made, it would, through the rebuttable presumption and liberalized statute of limitation, facilitate, without mandating, compensation of innocent victims.

I need not remind the Congress that the state-of-the-art of knowledge which can match exposure to a particular chemical with a specific illness is rudimentary at best. Only for a few selected diseases, such as black lung for coal miners and certain cancers of asbestos workers, do we have a reasonable understanding of the cause-and-effect relationship between exposure and disease. Thus, I applaud the efforts of the Senate committee to include within S. 420 a mandate to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct studies of diseases and recommend standards for:

One. Determining whether particular diseases arise out of and in the course of employment;

Two. Establishing criteria for diagnosing diseases; and

Three. Establishing criteria for determining whether death or disability is due to such diseases.

This mandate in many respects parallels that proposed by my "requisite nexus" determination. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I consider the matter of improving our knowledge and understanding of the relationships between exposure and disease so critical that I would recommend to this subcommittee the option of creating a separate study bill so that if, by some chance, S. 420 did not pass the Congress, this research could begin.

The second issue which I raised regarding S. 420 also deals with the disease section of the bill. With respect to occupational diseases, S. 420 would allow the Secretary of HEW to propose standards for the compensation of work-related diseases to the Labor Secretary who then may propose a recommended Federal standard. After a relatively comprehensive scientific and public review of the standard, the Secretary of Labor may then publish the standard as an advisory standard which each State's workers' compensation agency may choose to implement.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the published standard is only an advisory standard which the States may or may not choose to follow in their workers' compensation programs represents a serious difficulty in the occupational disease compensation provisions of this bill. It is true that the bill affords the Congress the opportunity to enact mandatory standards, but only after a 3-year time period has elapsed after publication of the advisory standard. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the problems of work-related disease and illness caused by exposure to toxic substances are so important and so critical as to warrant the setting of mandatory standards once the

necessary cause and effect determination between exposure and a disease is made.

PRODUCT LIABILITY

During the 95th Congress, the House Small Business Subcommittee which I chaired engaged in a most extensive investigation into product liability insurance—the other subject included in S. 420 on which I, during the Senate hearings last week, commented.

Because of my own longstanding interest in this subject, I have followed developments concerning product liability insurance in the Senate. I am immensely pleased to note that the approach recommended by Senators JAVITS and WILLIAMS in section 10 of S. 420 adopts the conclusions reached by my subcommittee last year and embodied in H.R. 11788, introduced in the 95th Congress on March 23, 1978, and H.R. 1675, reintroduced this Congress on January 13, 1978.

Our investigation, of course, dealt with a number of product liability issues. Among them, however, we singled out workplace injuries as occurrences worthy of special consideration. The data available to our subcommittee indicated that workplace injuries, while accounting for a small portion of the number of product liability claims, account for a very substantial portion of claims payments. Specifically, 10.6 percent of all persons receiving product liability payments are injured in the course of their employment; however, these account for in excess of 42 percent of all product liability bodily injury payments made, and on the average represent more than three times the mean bodily injury payment made per incident.

Therefore, by dealing with the workplace injury problem, a substantial impact will be made toward alleviating the total product liability difficulties. In connection with our studies in this area, we considered several different proposals, including making workers' compensation the sole source for recovery, and alternatively, applying comparative fault doctrines to apportion damages between the manufacturer and employer.

We rejected the first of these due in part to the present inadequate compensation levels in effect under many of the State systems. Workers presently can seek redress in two ways—through the workers' compensation system and through litigation against the manufacturer of an unsafe product. To eliminate this second right without providing a counterbalancing change in benefit levels would, we felt, be inequitable at least and possibly a deprivation of the worker's constitutional right.

However, even if compensation levels could be raised, there are still three other grave reservations with this approach. First, making workers' compensation the sole source of recovery with increased benefits is likely to produce significant increases in worker's compensation insurance rates for all employers. Moreover, the fact that the entire burden for these product liability claims would be shifted to the workers' compensation system might cause the insurance industry to panic with respect to pricing

this insurance in much the same way that it is panic pricing product liability insurance.

Furthermore, making workers' compensation the sole source would result in two related undesirable effects. Capital goods manufacturers, whose goods are used in the workplace, will lose their incentive to make sure that their products are manufactured with appropriate safety features, since only the employer's workers' compensation carrier will be liable in the event of injury. Moreover, this lack of incentive to manufacture safe products can result in blatant disregard by such manufacturers for the safety of the worker, resulting in a host of unsafe products coming into the workplace.

The proposal to permit the manufacturer recourse against the employer on a theory of indemnity or contribution was likewise found to be unacceptable. From the vantage point of the total insurance system, this would not appear to reduce the overall claims paid nor act as a disincentive to litigation on the part of injured employees. Because it would be creating a cause of action where one does not now generally exist,* it is thought that, if anything, this would effect an overall increase in the aggregate rate of product liability and workers' compensation rates; while it might over time reduce product liability rates, it would almost certainly increase workers' compensation rates. Hence, this too was rejected.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, my subcommittee opted for the same approach which Senators JAVITS and WILLIAMS also later decided to adopt, which is contained in S. 420: Injured employees should maintain the right to bring suits against manufacturers. However, the workers' compensation carrier's lien and/or right of subrogation for the benefits that it disburses to the injured employee should be eliminated. Further, the employee's recovery would be reduced by the amount of workers' compensation benefits he has received. The effect of this is to leave the injured employee with the same benefits he would otherwise have under the present system, while at the same time cutting off the right of the workers' compensation carrier to shift its liability. A manufacturer at fault will be responsible to the injured employee, but for a reduced payment. This would remove the incentive for the workers' compensation carrier to institute litigation against manufacturers, and would reduce the overall insurance transaction costs since there can be no apportionment between employers and manufacturers.

This approach, in my judgment, balances the need for equity and the desirability of reduced transactions costs. Workers will not lose, but society as a whole will gain. I am pleased at the progress we have made toward adopting this concept so far, and I hope that the Senate Human Resources Committee retains this concept as it continues its deliberations on this matter.

* New York, California, Illinois, and, to an extent, Minnesota are the exceptions.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, I am, indeed, grateful for the opportunity you have given me today to share my views on these important subjects with you. I support the concepts embodied in S. 420, for, good as it has been, I believe that the time has come for reform of our workers' compensation system.

In particular, I applaud the balanced approach it contains with respect to the product liability issue—a recommendation which closely parallels one my Small Business Subcommittee came to independently last year.

I also applaud the bill's acknowledgment of, and emphasis upon, the need for more research into questions relating to toxic substances. Certainly we need to know more—far more—about cause and effect relationships between exposure to certain chemicals and particular diseases; it is equally important that we look carefully into the options we might use to compensate innocent victims of toxic exposure both in and outside the workplace.

However, I believe that the bill could go further in providing a mechanism for compensating persons who are injured by exposure to toxic substances in the workplace. One of the problems with respect to workers' compensation generally is the disparity among the various States' programs. S. 420 seeks to deal with this by reducing some of these disparities.

Yet, with respect to workers' compensation for exposure to toxic substances, the bill's provisions would rely, at least initially, on voluntary acceptance of this new basis for benefits on the part of the States. In this economic climate, I have to wonder whether any State would take the risk of imposing additional costs on its workers' compensation system, and thus on the cost of doing business in that State, without any assurance that other States would do the same.

I would urge you, then, to give serious consideration to making the toxic substances standards that would be developed under this bill mandatory standards to be applied by all of the States in their workers' compensation schemes.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much encouraged by the initiative S. 420 represents, and with this one proviso I support it wholeheartedly. Congress can and should seek to deal with the very serious human problems which emanate from exposure to toxic chemicals, both in and outside the workplace, and I want to urge my fellow Members of the House to help meet this need by fully supporting this bill, hopefully with the change I have suggested, or a similar bill when it is considered in the House during 1979. ●

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the accuracy of our distinguished Speaker in the realm of political prog-

nostication is virtually legendary. Last fall, for example, he predicted that Republicans would gain about 10 seats in the House, and his forecast turned out to be far more accurate than mine at the time.

However, I have just come in possession of a fund-raising letter signed by THOMAS P. "TIP" O'NEILL, JR., whose contents would indicate that his famed political radar may not be so infallible after all.

The letter, sent out under the auspices of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, was an appeal for contributions for the Democratic candidates who lost in yesterday's special elections in California and Wisconsin.

In it, my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts warned that the outcome of those races, "2,000 miles apart, will broadcast to the Nation the status of the Democratic Party." It certainly did, and I leave to my colleagues to conclude what that status is.

However, the Speaker went on to note that, and I quote, "the DCCC has budgeted \$91,720 for the final efforts in these campaigns."

Since Federal law limits direct contributions from organizations such as the DCCC to a maximum of \$10,000 in yesterday's elections, or \$20,000 total for both campaigns, I am at a loss to understand how the additional \$71,720 was to be legally contributed.

I know that the Speaker is a staunch supporter of the Federal Election Campaign Act. Therefore, I am perplexed that he would appeal for contributions that would exceed those limits by so much.

Perhaps it was a typographical error at the DCCC; or perhaps the Speaker simply misread the numbers, just as he has misread the mood of the electorate in these two elections.

Following is the full text of the letter:

DEMOCRATIC CONGRESSIONAL
CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FELLOW DEMOCRAT: April 3 is a crucial day for the future of the Democratic Party, as we know it, and I need your help. Let me explain why . . .

Our Democratic Party—yours, mine, John Kennedy's, Lyndon Johnson's, Hubert Humphrey's, and Jimmy Carter's—faces a severe test on Tuesday, April 3, 1979—election day in San Mateo, California and Oshkosh, Wisconsin. The outcome of these two congressional elections, over 2,000 miles apart, will broadcast to the nation the status of the Democratic Party.

The two Democrats on the ballot April 3 are representatives of the new generation of political leadership in our Party and our nation. Joe Holsinger, the top assistant to my friend, Leo Ryan, who was murdered in Guyana, and Gary Goyke, the campaign manager in Wisconsin for Hubert Humphrey, are leaders needed in the United States Congress. They share our commitment to a greater America—one that believes in the strength and decency of its people. The Republican alternatives in both districts are the familiar, tired, negative voices of the past, opposed to any progress.

As Speaker of the House, I know the importance of every single vote in the Congress. One vote is often the difference between success for Democratic policies de-

signed to serve the best interests of the American people or a collapse to organized special interests. Your financial assistance is needed to insure that support for Democratic policies and programs continues.

The most important thing that you can do is to provide immediate financial support to keep the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee (DCCC) working to elect Joe Holsinger and Gary Goyke. The DCCC is a small organization composed of specialists in campaigns committed to the election of Democrats in the Congress.

I'm writing to you to make a personal appeal on behalf of the DCCC—their best efforts are not enough! The Republicans will overwhelm us with money. The Republicans have spent an average of \$275,000 in each special election held since January, 1977—we lost four out of six. They are already spending this amount—and more—in California and Wisconsin.

You and I can't afford to watch two more votes lost on the auction block rather than at the polls.

The DCCC has budgeted \$91,720 for the final efforts in these campaigns. A \$20 contribution from 4,586 staunch Democrats will make the difference!

You know the candidates . . . you know the Republicans' financial advantages . . . you know we need your contribution and we need it now.

Please rush your contribution to us today. With your help, I know we can win! Sincerely,

THOMAS P. "TIP" O'NEILL, JR.

P.S. Our opposition is banking on the hope that you will ignore my letter until it is too late. Thank you. ●

AN \$82 BILLION MYTH

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mrs. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much in recent weeks concerning Federal aid to State and local governments. In response to the call of many State legislatures for a balanced Federal budget, many lawmakers here in Washington have focused a critical eye upon the \$82 billion in "aid" given to States and localities. What is not heard in the debate is much discussion as to the nature of such aid and the circumstances surrounding the growth of these programs over the last 18 years.

I recently came across an article by Floyd and Terry Hyde which discusses aid to State and local government and the "\$82 billion myth." The article, which appeared in the National Journal, illustrates that of the \$82 billion, over \$50 billion represents transfer payments and other aid to individuals. Oftentimes the only State and local connection is that such programs happen to be administered through State and local entities. Other programs, such as pollution control and highways, could more accurately be described as aid to States and localities. However, even here we should not lose sight of the fact that expenditures in many of these areas came at Federal instigation. Further, many of these programs have been mandated by the Fed-

eral Government with resultant increases in local property taxes.

Unfortunately, as often happens, one misconception begets another. Many of those who cite the \$82 billion figure also have come to the regrettable conclusion that the only way to balance the budget is to cut the general revenue-sharing program. Initially, their prime target is to eliminate State participation in general revenue sharing. Later, revenue sharing aid to localities is certain to come under similar attack. It is ironic that balancing the budget should be accomplished by cutting the most efficient of all the aid programs. We should keep in mind that only 0.1 percent of all revenue-sharing moneys are used for program administration.

Revenue sharing stands for local decisionmaking. Since its inception in 1972, the program has acted to counter the steadily increasing role of Washington bureaucrats and their burdensome regulation of local affairs. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we would better serve the taxpayer by carefully examining the 492 categorical programs and eliminate those which no longer serve a useful purpose, rather than focusing congressional ire on general revenue sharing.

Our colleague, Mr. WYDLER, has introduced legislation extending general revenue sharing for another 4 years. As a member of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and Human Resources of the Government Operations Committee, I have been pleased to cosponsor the legislation introduced by our ranking minority member. The gentleman from New York has also circulated to Members of the House a letter detailing why State governments should be retained in the program. Given the important nature of the subject I think it appropriate to call additional attention to Mr. WYDLER's position by including his letter in the RECORD. I would also ask that the article from the National Journal be included. I am hopeful that my colleagues will find these views informative as they begin to consider the future of the general revenue-sharing program.

The material follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1979.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I recently introduced legislation, H.R. 2291, extending the general Revenue Sharing program for another four years. Since February 22nd, twenty-three Members have agreed to cosponsor this legislation, and I would like to take this opportunity to encourage additional members to support the bill.

There are ample reasons to extend general Revenue Sharing upon its expiration in October 1980. Revenue Sharing strengthens local decision making, thwarts the increasing role of the Washington bureaucracy in local affairs, and is relatively inexpensive for the Federal government to administer. In fact, on this last point, during 1978, only .1 percent of all revenue sharing expenditures were used to administer the program. This compares favorably with other programs such as HUD's Community Development Block Grants, in which administrative costs ran at approximately .7 percent of the entire program. Operational costs in categorical programs run much higher. Simply put, general revenue sharing is one

federal program that performs in an effective and economic fashion. It is the last one that should be cut to balance the budget.

I also believe that state governments should be kept in the program. Unfortunately, much misleading information about the fiscal condition of the states is being disseminated. It is certainly true that all states cumulatively project a surplus of 4.3 billion for 1979. However, almost half the surplus is held in just three states: Texas, Alaska, and California. The attached table illustrates that many other states are not nearly as financially secure. In addition, since most

states (48) are required to retain a balanced budget during the entire year, prudent management requires that states retain 4-6 percent of revenues in the form of surplus balances. As the attached chart indicates, state governments nationwide project a 3.6 percent average surplus for 1979, well within the accepted norm. Finally, state governments currently pass through approximately 30 percent of their revenue sharing monies to localities. Cutting out the states is sure to increase the property tax levies in many places.

We all know that the current drive to cut

revenue sharing is fueled by Congressional resentment over the constitutional convention/balanced budget drive. In the alternative, we should carefully examine the 492 categorical programs currently on the books and decide where cuts can be made. Cutting one of the only federal programs which has low delivery cost and no bureaucracy is not a responsible way to proceed.

Back a proven program that is the best example of federalism.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. WYDLER,
Member of Congress.

TABLE A-1.—PROJECTED STATE GENERAL OPERATING FUND RESOURCES, EXPENDITURES, AND BALANCES, FISCAL YEAR 1979

(Dollar amounts in millions)

State	1979 projected resources (including 1978 balances forward)		1979 projected expenditures		1979 projected balance ¹	1979 projected operating balance as percentage of 1979 expenditures	State	1979 projected resources (including 1978 balances forward)		1979 projected expenditures		1979 projected balance ¹	1979 projected operating balance as percentage of 1979 expenditures
	1979 projected resources (including 1978 balances forward)	1979 projected expenditures	1979 projected balance ¹	1979 projected operating balance as percentage of 1979 expenditures				1979 projected resources (including 1978 balances forward)	1979 projected expenditures	1979 projected balance ¹	1979 projected operating balance as percentage of 1979 expenditures		
Alabama.....	\$1,495.5	\$1,495.2	\$0.3	0.02	Nebraska.....		574.1	550.8	23.3	4.2			
Alaska.....	1,976.1	1,375.0	601.1	47.3	Nevada ²								
Arizona.....	1,053.6	1,023.6	30.0	2.9	New Hampshire.....	235.0	219.0	16.0	7.3				
Arkansas.....	772.5	772.3	0	0	New Jersey.....	4,421.6	4,394.4	27.2	.6				
California.....	18,357.7	17,578.4	779.3	4.4	New Mexico.....	760.7	683.5	77.2	11.3				
Colorado.....	1,254.0	1,208.0	46.0	3.8	New York.....	12,041.2	12,022.9	18.3	.2				
Connecticut.....	2,149.6	2,142.2	7.4	.4	North Carolina.....	2,578.0	2,577.9	.1	.004				
Delaware.....	556.7	539.7	17.0	3.2	North Dakota ²								
Florida.....	3,050.7	3,021.4	29.3	1.0	Ohio.....	4,895.9	4,719.7	176.2	3.8				
Georgia.....	2,487.4	2,379.6	107.8	4.5	Oklahoma.....	779.7	779.7	0	0				
Hawaii.....	915.4	907.9	7.5	.8	Oregon.....	1,287.9	1,035.8	252.1	24.3				
Idaho.....	319.0	319.0	0	0	Pennsylvania.....	5,786.0	5,786.0	0	0				
Illinois.....	6,944.0	6,848.0	96.0	1.4	Rhode Island.....	613.5	603.3	10.2	1.7				
Indiana.....	1,913.6	1,789.9	123.7	6.9	South Carolina.....	1,400.1	1,400.0	.1	.01				
Iowa.....	1,594.3	1,491.9	102.4	6.9	South Dakota.....	195.2	185.7	9.5	5.1				
Kansas.....	1,100.1	988.2	111.9	11.3	Tennessee.....	2,457.0	2,456.5	.5	.02				
Kentucky.....	1,734.2	1,715.9	18.3	1.1	Texas.....	4,085.1	3,383.0	702.1	20.8				
Louisiana.....	3,857.1	3,819.6	37.5	1.0	Utah.....	665.5	656.9	8.6	1.4				
Maine.....	471.7	459.0	12.7	2.8	Vermont.....	207.4	207.4	0	0				
Maryland.....	2,500.2	2,298.0	202.2	8.8	Virginia.....	2,289.0	2,276.5	12.5	.6				
Massachusetts.....	3,656.4	3,601.0	55.4	1.5	Washington.....	3,011.9	2,839.6	172.3	6.1				
Michigan.....	4,260.7	4,256.4	4.3	.1	West Virginia.....	999.7	965.1	34.6	3.6				
Minnesota.....	3,174.0	3,142.0	32.0	1.0	Wisconsin.....	4,960.8	4,866.7	94.1	1.9				
Mississippi.....	944.7	892.2	52.5	5.9	Wyoming.....	217.0	182.0	35.0	19.2				
Missouri.....	1,716.2	1,578.4	137.8	8.7	Total.....	122,968.0	118,675.5	4,292.5	3.6				
Montana.....	250.3	240.1	10.2	4.3									

¹ Balance does not equal resources minus expenditures in some States in view of statutory provisions to transfer part or all of the year-end balance to a separate fund for uses including debt service, capital outlay, tax refunds or rebates, and future-year expenditures.

² The reports from these States were incomplete and therefore were not included in this report.

Source: Fiscal survey of the States 1978-79, National Governors' Association.

HOW A BUDGET MYTH BECOMES REALITY: FEDERAL NON-AID TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

(By Floyd H. Hyde and Terry Hyde)

To those of you who have succumbed to the myth that federal grants to state and local governments currently exceed \$82 billion annually, and who believe that this now constitutes over 25 percent of their total expenditures, you are wrong; but, at least, you are in good company.

President Carter said it on March 27th, 1977: "... total assistance to state and local governments has already been increased by some 25 per cent, from \$68 billion in FY '77 to \$85 billion in FY '79."

David Broder of *The Washington Post* said it on January 25, 1978: "In 1960, the federal government sent \$7 billion to states and cities—a little less than 15 per cent of their total expenditures. In 1970, federal aid reached \$24 billion and provided almost 20 per cent of the state/local budgets. This year, it is estimated to be over \$80 billion and to account for 27.5 per cent of state/local expenditures."

Senator Hart (D-Colo.) said it on January 31, 1979: "Every one of these states that is passing these resolutions to balance the federal budget is taking a ton of money from the federal government every year, \$82 billion all told this year."

Senator Bumpers (D-Ark.) said it on January 31, 1979: "Total federal aid to state and local governments will approximate \$85 billion in 1979, or nearly twice as much as the estimated federal budget deficit for fiscal year 1979 of \$48.5 billion."

EVERYBODY'S SAYING IT

Newsweek said it on January 29, 1979: "Aid to state and local governments would stay static at \$85 billion, equivalent to a 7 per cent loss to inflation."

U.S. News and World Report said it on January 29, 1979: "The federal government accounts for more than \$1 out of every \$4 spent by state and local governments—about \$85 billion this year."

Stuart Elzenstat, President Carter's Domestic Advisor said it on January 25, 1979: "Federal aid to state and local governments has now reached \$82.9 billion."

Senator Muskie (D-Ma.) in March of 1977 said he supported the Administration's decision not to allocate tremendous amounts of money to cities in distress, citing \$54 billion in urban grants already in effect.

If these eminent Americans and prestigious publications have said so, it must be right. Right? Wrong!

In fact, those federal grants to state and local governments (including school districts) which actually become a working part of their own budgets total approximately \$43 billion including \$8.8 billion in CETA (Comprehensive Employment and Training Act) monies which are passed through to individuals. (In light of the new CETA Act which prohibits the substitution of CETA employees for regular city personnel, and makes them truly temporary additional jobs, it is clear that local governments for the most part, will receive no benefits from the program. Most local officials point out that the cost of supervising and training temporary employees as "add-on" personnel, while socially desirable,

presents more of a burden to them than a benefit. Thus, we maintain that this program should not be included in the category of federal aid to state and local governments.)

If CETA monies and social services funds to individuals (\$3 billion) are deducted, a more realistic and accurate figure of \$31.2 billion is obtained. This figure represents the "honest" amount of federal aid to state and local governments. Thus, more than \$50 billion of the widely-accepted \$80 billion-plus does not reach state or local governments at all. Of a total of \$532 billion in FY '80 outlays, actual state and local aid represents little more than 5.5 per cent of the total federal budget.

How could there be such a wide discrepancy between the conventional wisdom and what we maintain is the "honest amount" of federal aid?

DOCUMENTING THE MYTH

The answer lies in the method in which the President's Office of Management and Budget compiles and categorizes various kinds of programs and benefits identified in the budget. Specifically, the Special Analyses budget document aggregates, without distinction, those programs giving aid directly to individuals; those that pass aid through state and local governments to individuals; those that provide aid to autonomous entities other than state and local governments; those that fund other federal activities; and those that do provide aid directly to state and local governments to be used by them for specified national objectives. In fairness to President Carter, this federal bookkeeping

practice did not begin with his Administration, but the rhetoric that accompanies this data in the FY '80 budget documents and which is so oft-repeated by Administration spokesmen generates additional confusion and misunderstanding.

To illustrate, the following list contains items selected from the "Selected Analyses, Budget of the United States Government, 1980," pages 212 through 246. The text of this analysis states "... federal grant-in-aid outlays to state and local governments are estimated to be \$82.9 billion in 1980, slightly above the estimated 1979 total of \$77.9 billion." Yet the actual items include such categories as:

[In millions]	
Direct payments to individuals:	
Supplemental security income.....	\$50
Medicaid.....	12,354
Public assistance.....	6,704
Veterans benefits.....	87
Student assistance.....	77
Work incentives.....	365
Food stamps (administration).....	342
Child nutrition program.....	2,521
Housing payments.....	2,674
Refugee assistance.....	75
Payments to autonomous entities other than State and local governments:	
The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA).....	125
The Corporation for Public Broadcasting.....	152
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.....	91
Commodity Credit Corporation.....	75
Center for Disease Control (Atlanta).....	109
Funding of various strictly Federal activities:	
Land and water conservation.....	287
Agricultural cooperative research.....	98
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.....	167
Office of Surface Mining Enforcement.....	76
Fish and Wildlife Service.....	88
Aid for federal highways (trust fund).....	6,761
Airports trust fund.....	570
Drought assistance.....	2
Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	18
Indian education.....	67
Unemployment trust fund.....	720
Unemployment trust fund (administration of payments).....	1,055
U.S. forest management.....	24
Federal Railroad Administration.....	82

Although listed as such, these items are not grants-in-aid to state and local governments at all. While the argument can be made that most of them are worthy expenditures, they belong neither in the budget document entitled "Federal Grants to State and Local Government" nor in the narrative for the special analysis of such aid.

Additionally, this method of data aggregation further creates confusion, in that it implies that such funds go directly to state and local governments to be used by them for inclusion in their own budget. The accompanying text on page 226 is clearly misleading: "Table H-7 also shows grants-in-aid as a per cent of state and local expenditures. This per cent has increased from 15 per cent in 1965 to 27 per cent in 1978, and is estimated to continue to finance almost one-fourth of total state and local expenditures through 1980."

MYTH BEGETS MYTH

Thus, the \$82 billion myth spawns another oft-repeated piece of mis-information. If \$82.9 billion were, in fact, funneled into state

and local budgets, it would constitute more than 25 percent of their total expenditures. However, using the accurate figure of \$31.2 billion, we find that federal aid actually constitutes only about 10.4 per cent. Of this amount, the budget does not indicate how much remains with the states and how much is actually received by local governments. The remaining \$51.7 billion might better be described as federal *non-aid* to state and local governments.

What is the significance of the above analysis? If federal aid to state and local governments is *not* \$82.9 billion but, actually, no more than \$32.1 billion, one might still ask, "What difference does that make?"

The fact is that, at this writing, major questions affecting the future of our nation's cities are being debated in Congress and within the Administration. Central to each of the debates is the constant repetition of the myth that "state and local governments are already receiving \$82 billion in federal aid."

On January 31, 1979, Senator Lloyd Bentsen of Texas introduced S. 263 on the floor of the U.S. Senate. The bill proposes to amend the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 which provides for general revenue sharing by eliminating states from the program. In co-sponsoring the bill, Senator William Proxmire of Wisconsin urged that the *entire* program be abolished, presumably because of his oft-repeated public statements that federal aid to state and local governments has reached \$82 billion annually. And it was in this environment that Senators Gary Hart of Colorado and Dale Bumpers of Arkansas also voiced approval of the bill.

It is critically important that, in the frenzy to respond to Proposition 13 fever, accurate information should be placed before Congress and the American people. It could make a great difference, for example, in determining the future of general revenue sharing, to know that Congress would be cutting \$6.8 billion from \$32.1 billion, a 21 percent cut, rather than an 8 percent cut in federal aid to state and local governments, should the entire program be eliminated.

In order to obtain a balanced picture of the extent of federal aid to state and local governments, the collection of revenues must also be considered. During the past several decades, in spite of any increase in federal aid, local government's share of the total tax dollar has dwindled dramatically, clearly out of all proportion to any claimed level of increased aid. If all federal, state and local taxes are combined into one single tax dollar, we find that, in 1930, local government kept 50 cents of every dollar, state government 17 cents, and the federal government 33 cents. By 1978, the federal government collected 67 cents of every tax dollar, state government 20 cents and local government 13 cents.

Whenever the issue of the adequacy of federal aid is discussed, this critically important data must also be added to the equation. For every additional one cent retained, an additional \$5 billion would be available for use by local governments. This would create a great opportunity for real savings in reducing the costly overhead of an ever-increasing federal bureaucracy. In light of these facts, it may well be that the national debate ought not to be about general revenue sharing alone, but it should include a discussion of general revenue *retention* by local governments.

Thus, it is hoped that the \$82 billion myth will be dispelled and that by using correct data, both as to actual grants and as to the sources and amounts of all governmental revenues, Congress and the American people can make better-informed and more equitable decisions regarding federal aid to state and local governments. ●

A GALLUP POLL SHOWS STRONG SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC FINANCING

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a Gallup poll published recently shows that a majority of the American people continue to support public financing of congressional campaigns.

It is important to note that the Gallup survey polled the public about a system far more extensive and far more costly than the partial public financing system proposed in H.R. 1.

The Gallup survey asked voters if they would favor a system of total public financing in which the Government would provide each candidate for Congress with a fixed amount of money for his or her campaign and in which contributions from all other sources would be prohibited.

Fully 57 percent support this proposal, while only 30 percent consider it a "poor idea." These results mirror the findings of a 1977 Harris survey which, by a 49 to 28 percent margin, also confirmed public support for "having all primary and general elections for the House of Representatives and U.S. Senate publicly financed, as Presidential primaries and elections are now financed."

H.R. 1 would not prohibit private contributions. Instead, it provides for a mixed campaign financing system consisting of small contributions from individuals on the local level, public matching funds, party funds and PAC funds.

The system envisioned by H.R. 1 would be far less costly than that proposed in the Gallup or Harris polls. Thus I believe it is safe to assume, Mr. Speaker, that H.R. 1 would command even greater support from the American public.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that campaign costs are out of control and are forcing candidates to become increasingly dependent upon so-called special interest PAC's to finance their campaigns. H.R. 1 would provide an alternative source of financing and at the same time would provide a means of putting a ceiling on campaign spending.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD an article from the April 2, 1979, issue of the Washington Post which describes the Gallup poll on public financing:

LIMIT ON CAMPAIGN SPENDING IS URGED FOR HILL CANDIDATES
(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—In the face of the staggering amount spent on campaigning in last fall's political races, a majority of the American people, 57 percent, believe the federal government should provide a fixed amount of money for the election campaigns of candidates for Congress and at the same time prohibit all other contributions.

The cost of running for Congress has greatly increased in recent years. In fact, it has been reported that in last fall's Senate and

House contests some 875 candidates for 470 seats spent almost \$150 million on their primary and general election campaigns, a record amount. Only two years earlier, the comparable figure was below \$100 million.

Political observers feel that, in addition to inflation, the key cause of the vast increase in campaign spending has been the escalation in contributions from political action committees. It is estimated that these groups, which represent corporate, labor and other special interests, gave \$35 million or more to congressional candidates last year.

Those who favor limiting, by statute, the amount available to each candidate argue that this would eliminate the reliance of candidates on special-interest groups—which could have an undue influence on a candidate's position on important issues.

The proposal to limit congressional campaign spending has broad bipartisan support in the current survey, with 54 percent of Democrats supporting the idea.

Here is the question asked:

It has been suggested the federal government provide a fixed amount of money for the election campaigns of candidates for Congress and that all private contributions from other sources be prohibited. Do you think this is a good idea or a poor idea?

Here are the national results as well as the findings by political affiliation:

	Good idea	Poor idea	No opinion
National -----	57	30	13
Republicans ----	54	32	14
Democrats -----	57	29	14
Independents --	60	30	10

Virtually the same results were obtained when the question was first asked, in 1977.

The findings reported today are based on personal interviews with 1,512 adults, 18 and older, in more than 300 scientifically selected localities during the period Feb. 2-5. ●

ORDER OF THE AZTEC EAGLE AWARDED TO CONGRESSMAN E "KIKI" DE LA GARZA

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the press release on the award by the Mexican Government of the Order of the Aztec Eagle to our colleague, Representative E "KIKI" DE LA GARZA, of Texas, which I referred to in my 1-minute speech earlier today:

Former Mexican Ambassador to the United States, Jose Juan de Olloqui—now Deputy Minister of Foreign Relations—advised Representative E (Kiki) DE LA GARZA Monday, February 12, that Mexican President Jose Lopez Portillo had instructed his Department to confer on the Texan Mexico's highest award to foreigners—the Order of the Aztec Eagle.

The Order of the Aztec Eagle was established in December 1943 by then President Manuel Avila Camacho as an award to foreign Heads of State, foreign diplomats and other foreigners who have rendered distinguished service to the Republic of Mexico.

DE LA GARZA, whose family has lived on the border for many generations, said today

he had tendered his personal thanks on Tuesday, February 13, to President Lopez Portillo and Minister of Foreign Relations Santiago Roel for the honor conferred on him, his family, and the border area of the country he represents in the Congress. Plans for the presentation of the medal have not yet been made, DE LA GARZA said.

Representative DE LA GARZA said, "This decoration represents the character of our border country, the generations of cooperation, good-will and understanding that have existed among the people on both sides of the Rio Grande."

Shortly after DE LA GARZA was notified about the Mexico decoration Speaker of the House of Representatives Tip O'Neill named the South Texan Chairman of the United States-Mexico Interparliamentary group for the second successive year, the third time DE LA GARZA will actually have served in this capacity. The Parliamentary group will meet in Mexico in May.

The last Member of Congress to have received the Order of the Aztec was Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana when he was majority leader of the U.S. Senate. He is now U.S. Ambassador to Japan. ●

PUBLIC FINANCING MAY BE FRINGE GROUP FINANCING

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, one fear many of us have had for a long time about public financing is that any system which is fair to established third parties will also encourage new fringe parties.

H.R. 1 does nothing to solve this problem. In fact, the bill would increase the problem. Candidates would be able to qualify for matching funds once they were qualified for the general election ballot. Major party candidates would have to wait until any primary and runoff election was complete before they could receive money.

But most States allow third party and independent candidates to qualify for the general election ballot well before the primary. Conceivably they could even use up all the funds allocated for a district.

The Atlanta Constitution wrote an excellent editorial on this March 22, 1979, and I would like to share it with the Members:

FRINGE FINANCING

Hold it. We're not ready to finance just anyone who wants to run for Congress. But that apparently would be the result of a loophole in the proposed public financing bill for congressional candidates.

As it now stands, candidates sponsored by fringe groups such as the vegetarians or single-issue groups such as the anti-abortionists could edge out candidates of major political parties for federal matching funds.

Under the terms of the legislation recently introduced in the House, the government would make available \$180,000 in public matching funds in each congressional district, or a maximum of \$60,000 each for three candidates. However, the bill contains no provision for pro-rating the funds if there

is a shortage of funds or an abundance of qualified candidates. As now written, the funds would be distributed on a first-come, first-served basis.

This means that in states where candidates can qualify by obtaining a small number of signatures on a petition, small special interest groups could conceivably form political parties and raise enough private funds and beat the major parties to the punch for the federal matching funds.

That clearly—whether you support or oppose federal matching for congressional candidates—is not the purpose of the legislation. The loophole should be closed. Sponsors of the legislation say this can be accomplished easily in a number of ways, including establishing a pro-rating system or delaying federal funds until after the primary process. Whatever, let's do it, post haste. ●

NUCLEAR HEARINGS SCHEDULED ON SAFETY, WASTES, AND RADIATION

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy Research and Production, I have scheduled hearings on three of the leading issues concerning nuclear energy. The hearings, to be held during May and June, will focus on nuclear power plant safety, high-level nuclear waste management and low-level radiation.

The three nuclear energy subjects to be considered are those that have recently received the most publicity and that are of current concern to Members of the Congress. The hearings will provide a thorough review of the latest technical information and policy options on these important subjects; and the Congress will then be able to make informed decisions on them.

Members, or a staff member, are, of course, invited.

First, 3 days of hearings are scheduled for May 15, 16, and 17 on the subject of nuclear waste management, including consideration of the high-level wastes at West Valley, N.Y.; the inter-agency review group report on nuclear waste management; and proposed legislation mandating the establishment of a Government nuclear waste repository.

Next, 3 days of hearings are scheduled for May 22, 23, and 24 on nuclear reactor safety. These hearings will consider federally supported nuclear safety research and development programs and the implications of the recent incident at the Three Mile Island nuclear power plant.

Finally, 3 days of hearings are scheduled for June 5, 6, and 7 on the subject of low-level radiation. These hearings will review the findings of current studies on the sources and effects of low-level radiation.

Hearings are tentatively scheduled to be held in room 2318 of the Rayburn House Office Building beginning at 10 a.m. Witnesses will be announced later.

May 15, 16, 17—10 a.m., nuclear waste management, 2318 Rayburn Building.

May 22, 23, 24—10 a.m., nuclear reactor safety, 2318 Rayburn Building.

June 5, 6, 7—10 a.m., low-level radiation, 2318 Rayburn Building.●

THE U.S.S. "SARATOGA" SHOULD BE OVERHAULED IN PHILADELPHIA

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, in July of 1976, the Department of the Navy recommended, on the basis of an initial study, that the U.S.S. *Saratoga* and the Navy's three other *Forrestal*-class aircraft carriers be overhauled as part of the service life extension program (SLEP) at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard.

Since then, this proposal has been studied in depth by other experts at the Pentagon, and in every case they have reached the same conclusion. The overhaul of the U.S.S. *Saratoga* can best be accomplished at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard.

Despite all of these studies, nearly 3 years have passed and the Navy's recommendations still have not been implemented. I think it is time to bring this foot dragging to an end, and to assign this work to Philadelphia where it belongs.

The simple fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard is one of the finest surface ship repair yards in the business, whether public or private. Since 1975, the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard has a record of no cost overruns or cost claims, and of consistent on-time delivery. This impressive record is unmatched by any other facility which has been considered for this work.

The Philadelphia shipyard possesses both the extensive carrier repair facilities, and the experienced skilled employees, that are needed to carry out this portion of the SLEP program. The shipyard contains two carrier drydocks, a carrier pier, and all of the modern, specialized equipment which is needed for carrier overhaul work. The labor force at the Philadelphia shipyard has had a low turnover rate through the years, and many of its employees have had experience with carrier repairs.

I am deeply disturbed by the injustice which would result from a decision not to assign this work to Philadelphia. The economic consequences of such a decision would be felt, not only in Philadelphia, but throughout the entire Northeast part of the country.

If this work is awarded to Philadelphia, it will create an estimated 12,000 jobs in the region by 1985, and generate a payroll of more than \$135 million. However, if this work is not assigned to Philadelphia, it will result in the direct loss of 1,300 jobs by 1980, and the indirect loss of at least another 1,300 jobs.

In fact, it is possible that the future of the entire Philadelphia Naval Shipyard hinges on the assignment of this overhaul program. That means the fate of some 20,000 jobs is up in the air at this time, in a region which has suffered nothing but economic setbacks at the hands of the Defense Department during the past few years.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop the migration of defense dollars and defense establishments to the South at the expense of the Northeast region. I need only call your attention to the Pentagon's recommendation last week that the basic training mission be disestablished at Fort Dix, N.J. This outrageous recommendation is only the latest in a long series of attempts by the Defense Department to dismantle military facilities in the Northeast.

This migration of military facilities is not only placing the Northeast at an economic disadvantage, but it is also reducing our Nation's defense capabilities. An imbalanced geographical arrangement of defense establishments is clearly not in the interest of our national defense. In the case of Fort Dix, this is the only basic training facility in the entire Northeast. Since the Northeast provides 20 percent of the recruits for the All-Volunteer Army, it is only fair and reasonable to have some military presence close to home. The entire New Jersey congressional delegation intends to fight this proposal to shut down the training mission at Fort Dix, and I hope that other Members will be joining us in this effort.

The same holds true for the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. How is it in our national interest to jeopardize the future of this facility, and to burden this region with yet another economic hardship? This portion of the SLEP program has already been delayed for 3 years. Any further delays are only going to reduce the Navy's defense capabilities in the 1980's. I think it is time to quit playing games with this program, and to get this work underway in Philadelphia where it belongs.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform you of my plight in travel to Washington from my home district in Iowa this past weekend. Due to an airline stoppage, I was rerouted and found difficulty in boarding a plane that would bring me to Washington in time for the House proceedings on Monday, April 2. Thus, I was absent for recorded votes on:

Roll No. 70: Santa Ana Indians bill.

Roll No. 71: Call of the House.

Roll No. 72: Previous question on debt limit bill.

Roll No. 73: Final passage on debt limit bill.

Had I been present, I would have voted

"aye" to the Santa Ana Indians bill; "aye" to the previous question on the debt limit bill; and "no" to final passage of the debt limit bill.

I respectfully request that my absence for these important votes be noted in the RECORD.●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE ALVIN G. BLAU OF NEW JERSEY, DISTINGUISHED MAYOR, OUTSTANDING CITIZEN, AND COMMUNITY LEADER

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 7, 1979, the residents of North Haledon, my congressional district and State of New Jersey will gather in testimony to the lifetime of exemplary public service of an outstanding citizen, community leader, and good friend, the Honorable Alvin G. Blau, the former distinguished mayor of the borough of North Haledon, whose dynamic and energetic endeavors in community improvement and development are applauded by all of us.

Mr. Speaker, Mayor Blau has, indeed, earned the respect and esteem of all of us for the quality of his leadership and standards of excellence in his dedicated service to our fellow citizens. He has been a resident of the borough of North Haledon since 1950 and served as the borough's esteemed mayor from 1961 to 1978. During his tenure as the community's chief executive officer, he served as the treasurer of the New Jersey Conference of Mayors.

Al Blau is a prominent realtor and has been a staunch supporter and active participant in many civic and cultural endeavors. He is past president of the Passaic County Board of Realtors and a member of the North Haledon Planning Board. He has served as a member of the Board of Trustees of the North Haledon Library and is a former trustee of the Greater Paterson Mental Health Center.

The mayor organized the community's Cultural Center Committee and Swimming Pool Committee which were instrumental in establishing two major landmark recreational facilities for the relaxation and enjoyment of the people of the community—young and adults alike. In 1958, he organized and has served as chairman of a vitally important lifesaving facility, the Blood Bank in North Haledon. He is a founder of the North Haledon Stamp and Coin Club.

Mr. Speaker, we also commend Alvin Blau for his sincerity of purpose and personal commitment in seeking to help the young people of our community. He organized the Youth Guidance Council and served for 10 years as Cub Master of Pack 70 in North Haledon.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to seek this national recogni-

tion of Alvin Blau and all of his good works. His compassion, benevolence, leadership, and dedicated public service has truly enriched our community, State, and Nation. We do, indeed, salute a distinguished citizen, community leader, and great American—the Honorable Alvin G. Blau.●

IOWA WINNER OF VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, this year's Iowa winner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars' Voice of Democracy contest is Barbara Regina Mattingly of Newton, Iowa. I am privileged to serve as Barb's Representative in Congress and take special pride in sharing her prize winning speech with my colleagues in the House.

It is as follows:

IOWA WINNER OF 1978-79 V.F.W. VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

America. A land of freedom, plenty, and happiness. From her sparkling eastern seacoasts to her majestic western mountains, America is truly a land richly endowed with proud and timeless ideals. America. A country whose very cornerstone is her proud heritage of freedom, plenty, and happiness. Why do I care about America? The answer should be apparent. I care about America for her ideals of freedom, plenty, and happiness. But the answer is not so simple as that, for I care, not so much about American ideals, as about American realities—realities which are a product of those ideals. Freedom, plenty, and happiness are abstract concepts which I can't understand or appreciate unless I can exercise freedom, enjoy plenty, and experience happiness. I care about America because I can experience her realities—the fruits of her ideals.

I care about America because she is a reality of freedom. The ideal of "freedom" is hard for me to appreciate, but I can appreciate the real freedoms I exercise in day-to-day life. I'm free to pursue any career which interests me. I'm free to attend any college I choose. I'm free to travel anywhere I desire. I'm free to choose the clothes I wear. I have the freedom to decide my life's course—from its least important detail to its most crucial moment.

Thousands of Americans before me have fought, died, and given up their freedom to protect mine. Because of them, I appreciate even more deeply the chance to exercise my freedoms. I care about America because America—and my fellow Americans—have given me the opportunity to exercise real freedom over my life.

I care about America because she is a reality of plenty. The idea of "plenty" means little to me—until I stop to think about the abundance of good food, clothing, and shelter which do surround me every day. In so many countries of the world shelter is scanty, clothes are a luxury, and food is non-existent. Growing up in America I have never wanted for anything.

For two hundred years men have struggled to make America the rich, prosperous nation it is. I care about America because so many before me have cared. And I care about America because I appreciate so much

the reality of plenty which she has provided for me to enjoy.

I care about America because she is a reality of happiness. The ideal of "happiness" is difficult for me to appreciate until I remember all the happy moments I experience every day. Moments like going out for pizza with the gang, opening family gifts at Christmas, reading a book beside a fire, or making ice cream on the Fourth of July. When I think of all the happiness I experience every day, I smile and know that happiness is a reality for me. I care about America because she has enabled me to experience happiness in everything I do. I care about America because she has made happiness more than an ideal for me—America has made happiness a reality in my life.

Why do I care about America? Why do I care about a free life? Why do I care about a plentiful life? Why do I care about a happy life? Why do I care about America?

I care about America because of her proud heritage of the ideals of freedom, plenty, and happiness. I care about America because so many of my ancestors have cared and have struggled so hard to preserve those ideals. But above all—I care about America because she has transformed those ideals into the wonderful realities of my life of freedom, plenty, and happiness.●

ENERGY CONSERVATION AND GASOLINE RATIONING CONTINGENCY PLANS

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing resolutions of approval relating to energy conservation and gasoline rationing contingency plans which were submitted to the Congress on March 1, 1979, by the President pursuant to the provisions of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (EPCA).

The resolutions of approval conform to the procedural requirements of EPCA and have been introduced solely to provide the vehicle for the consideration of these plans within the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and by the entire House. The introduction of the resolutions should not be construed as an indication of my position on each particular plan.

Under the provisions of EPCA, the President is required to develop a gasoline rationing contingency plan and one or more energy conservation contingency plans and then to submit them to Congress for review. The President has submitted a rationing plan and three conservation contingency plans relating to: First, emergency weekend gasoline sales restrictions; second, emergency building temperature restrictions; and third, emergency advertising lighting restrictions. Each plan would become a standby plan only if both Houses of Congress approve the plan within 60 days of continuous session. The plan could not be implemented unless the President made a finding that putting the plan into effect is required by a severe energy supply interruption or in order to fulfill obligations of the United States under

the international energy program, and has transmitted the finding to the Congress together with a statement of the effective date and the manner for exercise of the plan. In addition, the gasoline rationing contingency plan, if approved by Congress within 60 days, may not become effective unless the President's request to activate the plan is not disapproved by either House of Congress.●

WILLIAM B. THORNTON HONORED

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. William B. Thornton on being selected as the 1979 recipient of the Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce "M" Award.

I have known Bill for many years and this community service award is well deserved. He is a man of numerous achievements in Manchester. He is a native of the town and the State. According to the "M" Award Committee, Mr. Thornton has made "Manchester a better place to live and earn a living in understanding and harmony."

Bill has been involved in many areas of interest in Manchester including the Economic Development Commission, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Redevelopment Commission. In addition, Mr. Thornton has expressed his concern through his direct involvement in the community; as a member of the South Methodist Church, a 32d degree Mason and Shriner, a member of the Kiwanis Club, and an adviser to the instructors of the handicapped. His worthy achievements also include being a member of the associate board of the University of Hartford and a director of the University of Hartford Construction Institute.

As a respected leader of Manchester and Connecticut, Bill Thornton is president of Manchester Sand and Gravel Co. He also is a founder of the Connecticut Construction Industries Associations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me in commemorating Bill Thornton for receiving this privileged recognition from his community. A recent article explains Bill's achievements in greater detail. I have included this article at this point:

CHAMBER AWARD GOES TO WILLIAM THORNTON

MANCHESTER.—The Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce has announced that the 1979 "M" Award will be presented to William B. Thornton.

Thornton will be officially recognized on April 4 when the Chamber holds its 78th annual banquet. Being honored along with Thornton in the Chamber's annual celebration of local achievement are previously announced 1979 Community Service Award recipients Robert J. Digan, Dr. Douglas H. Smith and Monsignor Edward J. Reardon.

A Manchester native and the President of Manchester Sand & Gravel Company,

Thornton is a graduate of Dartmouth College and also attended Amos Tuck School of Business.

Married to the former Lois E. Smith, Mr. and Mrs. Thornton are the parents of three children, Sandra Lee, a student at Kingswood-Oxford School; Steven, a graduate of the University of Maine now associated with Manchester Sand and Gravel Co.; and William, a graduate of Gettysburg College living in Union Bridge, Md.

In selecting the recipient of the 22nd "M" Award, the Chamber's selection committee adhered to the same set of criteria used since 1957. "The "M" Award recipient must be a stable, well respected member of the community. He or she must have a time proven history of involvement in several community oriented projects which have benefited the welfare of the town as a whole. Qualities such as leadership, ambition, determination, and achievement are important. Wealth and social status are not. Finally, the single most important consideration takes into account the efforts of the individual to make Manchester a better place in which to live and earn a living in understanding and harmony," said the chamber announcement.

Thornton's contributions to Manchester have been many and varied, but have almost always been carried out with a minimum of fanfare and public recognition, the chamber noted.

A member of South Methodist Church, he is a 32nd Degree Mason and a Shriner. He is a former director of the Manchester Water Co., a member and past director of the Chamber of Commerce, a member of the Manchester Kiwanis Club and an advisor to the Instructors of the Handicapped.

Thornton's efforts on behalf of Manchester have also included involvement with the Republican Town Committee, membership on the Redevelopment Commission, CDAP, the town Economic Development Commission and various advisory panels.

An area in which Thornton has had a major impact is the growth and progress of Manchester Memorial Hospital. He has been an incorporator since 1957 and was elected to the Board of Trustees in 1961. He is a member of the hospital board's executive committee and has been chairman of the MMH Long Range Planning Committee for ten years.

Thornton is also active within the Manchester business community, having been elected as incorporator of the Savings Bank of Manchester in 1958 and a director in 1966. He is also a member of the SBM Executive Committee and Audit and Examination Committee. In addition, he is a past ten-year member of the Manchester Advisory Board for the Hartford National Bank & Trust Co.

An added area in which Bill Thornton's impact has been felt is the One Hundred Club of Connecticut. A charter member, he is presently a vice president of the organization after terms on several boards and committees.

He is also a member of the Associate Board of the University of Hartford, is a director of the U of H Construction Institute and a director of the Hartford Chapter National Football Foundation.

Within the construction business, Thornton is a founder and former officer of both the Connecticut Ready-Mix Concrete Association and the Connecticut Construction Industries Association. He is a member of the Board of Directors of the National Sand and Gravel Association and the National Ready-Mix Concrete Association.

He has also sponsored and furnished contributions to a wide range of local youth athletic groups, the Band Shell and NETS Tennis Tournament.

"In spite of all that can be researched and documented about Bill's background and involvement, the fact remains that few people in the community will ever realize the full impact of all he has done. His desire to work quietly and behind the scenes has hidden many of his accomplishments, and has served to make the Chamber of Commerce even more pleased to be able to present him the 1979 "M" Award. Bill Thornton typifies community concern, and is an example to all who would work for their town," said James Britanfeld, president of the chamber.

The April 4 Chamber of Commerce Annual Banquet will serve as a festive conclusion to the Chamber's 1979 celebration of local achievement. Ticket information can be obtained by contacting the Chamber office at 257 East Center Street.●

A RESOLUTION FROM THE GEORGIA STATE SENATE

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a resolution passed by the Georgia State Senate commending the work of the National Rifle Association in its efforts to prevent Government control of firearms. I applaud the action of the Georgia Senate as a genuine statement of the views of a majority of Georgians who oppose gun control.

The resolution follows:

GEORGIA STATE SENATE RESOLUTION

A resolution supporting the position of the National Rifle Association on restrictive firearms legislation; and for other purposes

Whereas, the National Rifle Association is now, and for more than a century has been, this country's most effective spokesman against any erosion of the constitutional right to keep and bear arms; and

Whereas, the National Rifle Association correctly maintains that legislation or regulations having the effect of registering or restricting lawful acquisition, possession or use of any particular type of firearms, such as handguns, would represent a giant step toward governmental control of all firearms; and

Whereas, the National Rifle Association correctly maintains that governmental control of firearms would result in disarming law-abiding citizens while criminals would continue to possess and use firearms unlawfully; and

Whereas, such a result completely negates any argument that gun control is an effective method of crime control; and

Whereas, the position of the National Rifle Association on this vitally important issue represents the viewpoint of the vast majority of Georgians.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate that this body hereby goes on record as complimenting the National Rifle Association for its fine work.

Be it further resolved that the Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed to transmit an appropriate copy of this Resolution to the Honorable Jimmy Carter, President of the United States, to each member of the Georgia Delegation to the United States Congress, and to the Honorable Lloyd M. Mustin, President of the National Rifle Association.●

WE NEED TO EXPORT OUR GREEN THUMB

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, over the last few months I have been discussing the need for this country to pursue a new foreign policy with developing countries and nonaligned countries. For instance, we offer to feed and defend developing countries but do not put equal effort into helping these countries develop their own productive capacity. The application of some of our advanced technology to the food production needs of developing countries would be an excellent area to begin a new aid policy.

Efforts are underway to revise our food aid policy to give it more of a technology transfer orientation and place less emphasis on simply shipping food abroad. We are also going to be considering the establishment of a Federal Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation in the near future. This Institute would aid in setting up technological cooperation and technology transfer efforts with other countries and agriculture and related technologies should be given a high priority.

As an example of the technology that will become available in the near future, the following article details a trial underway in Kentucky that applies our best climate prediction, communications, and information processing technologies to farming. Since rural areas are marked by low population densities, they stand to benefit most from this system that allows direct access to a central information source on terms that the individual can set. The potential for developing countries is even greater since they lack the communications network, and frequently the extension service, that we enjoy. Using communications satellites, linking small village information centers to central data banks will allow these countries to leapfrog over copper wire and microwave relay communications systems. And combined with a successful extension system, such as the one being used by David Benor in India, developing countries can stretch their scarce money resources. The promise will become real, however, only if we see the potential and act on it.

The article follows:

GREEN THUMB HOLDS PROMISE FOR FARMERS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The nation's pesticide bill could be cut an estimated 20 percent with the help of a new science called agricultural weather and a little black box known as "green thumb."

Beginning in October, two counties and approximately 200 farmers in Kentucky will test the box, which is a communications device, and the system devised by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the National Weather Service (NWS), according to Howard F. Lehnert, Jr., national program leader of the agricultural weather project and on the staff of USDA's Extension Service.

Lehnert and Harold A. Scott, who is chief

of NWS's Agricultural Services, teamed up over a year ago to develop this means of getting weather and agricultural data to the country's 3,150 counties and 2.5 million farmers.

"Everything in agriculture is controlled by weather," Lehnert said in a recent interview. "Many biological systems—seed germination, crop development, water needs, crop maturation, weed growth, drying—depend on temperature, storms and the like. By correlating weather and agricultural information, it is possible to greatly reduce the farmer's risks and improve production efficiency."

By combining entomological knowledge, for example, with rural weather observations, the presence of a particular insect appearing at a point in the growing cycle that will cause damage to a given crop can be predicted. Green thumb will be used to let the farmer know precisely when to scout his fields for the expected pest and when not to spray his short-lived pesticide—thus saving on the use of the chemicals with environmental as well as cost benefits, Lehnert stated.

The green thumb box is the key to the agricultural weather (AGWX) dissemination system, he said. By connecting the antenna of the farmer's home television set to his telephone line, the box effectively turns the TV into a computer terminal.

To access the system for the latest local weather, agricultural or market information, the farmer will call a special number at his local County Extension agent's office and be connected to a microcomputer, Lehnert explained. After selecting one item from many blocks of information available, the farmer sits back and the data is loaded at 300 bits/sec. into a 4K RAM memory in his green thumb box.

The telephone connection to the micro is then automatically terminated, and the farmer can view the information at his leisure. If he wants another block of data, the farmer must call the county computer again, Lehnert stated.

The county micro feeding the area's green thumb boxes can be updated by the County Extension staff according to local needs. The computer will also be loaded hourly with state and national information on a dial-up basis by the state computer.

A minicomputer housed in the state university will serve as a "post office" or collecting point for weather and agricultural information for the state, the USDA official said. This machine will be dedicated to the AGWX system and will be loaded with data by the State Extension staff, the state NWS Forecast office and on a dial-up basis by a computer at the National Meteorological Center in Marlo Heights, MD.

This national computer—again a mini—will call each state in turn on an hourly basis to provide radar information and special weather elements forecasts developed every six hours, five days a week, Lehnert added.

Scott and Lehnert would like to see data dumped into the farmers' boxes at 1,200 bits/sec. but fear such a speed will make the terminals—eliminated to cost anywhere from \$600 to \$3,500—too expensive. Farmers will lease or buy the box and will pay for the local phone call to access the county computer. Eighty-five percent of the nation's farmers can reach their county offices with a local call.

Lehnert and Scott also hope to achieve a data transfer rate over switched phone lines from the national computer to the state computers and on to the county machines at 2,400 bits/sec. They are concerned, however, that the communications lines will only handle 1,200 bits/sec reliably.

The green thumb project is one part of a four-part Extension Service and NWS program, Lehnert said. The federal government wants to obtain and disseminate weather

observations from local areas. With a large enough keyboard, a green thumb box can be used by farmers to add local weather observations to the AGWX system.

Research in Nebraska has shown that the use of rural weather data in irrigation scheduling can reduce irrigation water needs 35 percent. That translates into \$42 million in savings for the state annually, Lehnert said.

NWS and the Extension Service also want to develop weather and agricultural products for farmers. Finally, the government plans to institute a comprehensive educational program to teach farmers how to get the most out of agricultural weather information.

The Extension Service believes it, too, can realize savings from the AGWX system in dollars and personnel time currently devoted to farmers through publications, mail, mass media, personal visits and the telephone. Green thumb should also improve service to the public by tailoring information to local needs, Lehnert stated.

He and Scott expect that mass media serving farmers can access the system and relay information from it to the farmers when they are in the fields or on the road. The private sector may also find green thumb a useful tool for marketing its wares to the agricultural community, Lehnert added.

The Extension Service and NWS are currently preparing a request-for-proposal (RFP) for the computers and the green thumb boxes. That proposal should be on the street within the month, Lehnert said. While he "would like to see the system provided by a single vendor," the USDA official stated that the government will not permit any manufacturer to "lock the system up. There will be nothing in the green thumb box that will generate a royalty payment to its manufacturer," Lehnert stated.

Asked whether USDA and NWS have considered using the British viewdata system, which also links the TV set to the phone lines and will soon be marketed in the United States, Lehnert said no. "The key difference between green thumb and viewdata is that the British TV-decoder-telephone system is interactive.

"In England, the Post Office also runs the telephone network and its interest is in keeping users on the system as long as possible. With green thumb, the farmers pay Ma Bell, so we want the calls to be as short as possible," Lehnert said.

He noted, however, that green thumb boxes could have a full ASCII keyboard, permitting farmers to talk to the computer and to each other.

Other agencies have been approached by or have contacted the Extension Service about adding their existing databases to the AGWX system. The Federal Aviation Administration, for example, could use green thumb to disseminate pilot briefings on weather conditions.

Similarly, The National Marine Fisheries has talked with fisherman about carrying green thumb-type boxes on board their boats to monitor weather and market information. A demonstration of such a system to fishermen in New England was enthusiastically received, Lehnert said. ●

CUTTING BACK ON REDTAPE

HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing a bill today that

would reduce the paperwork burden on private foundations and charitable trusts which are treated as private foundations under the tax code.

This legislation is identical to the bill which I introduced last year, and which was incorporated into H.R. 12578, the Miscellaneous Revenue Measures Act of 1978. That legislation passed the House of Representatives, but did not clear the Senate, because of a lack of time.

This bill could consolidate the current tax reporting requirements for private foundations by combining the current annual report and annual informational filing into one report. There are over 22,500 private foundations in the United States, and most of us are familiar with the fine, humanitarian work they perform. Enactment of my bill would save an estimated 58,000 man-hours and 100,000 sheets of paper, thus freeing the foundations to go about their job of helping people. The legislation would increase the amount of information on foundations available to the public by consolidating the reports, yet it would do so at a reduction in expense to the foundations, and without requiring any additional information from them.

This bill is a responsible method of cutting back on redtape and duplication in the Federal Government, and I hope that it will receive favorable consideration again this year. ●

REMARKS ON CABLE SATELLITE PUBLIC AFFAIRS NETWORK

HON. GEORGE THOMAS LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, the cornerstone of democracy is an informed and enlightened public. Today thousands of citizens of the State of Texas will be better informed and more knowledgeable about the workings of their Government because of the Cable Satellite Public Affairs Network. I look forward to the day when my congressional district in Houston is served by a cable system so that my constituents can view the workings of this Congress. C-SPAN, which has been transmitting from the House floor since March 19 will enable millions of Americans to keep in touch with the daily deliberations of the House of Representatives.

I can think of no greater example of an industry serving the public interest than the efforts of the cable television industry in cooperation with C-SPAN to bring to the people of this country the legislative proceedings of their Congress. I am confident that this innovative use of our telecommunications system will not only strengthen our democracy but will contribute to a greater confidence on the part of the American people in their elected officials.

Thank you. ●

TRIBUTE TO JIM McDERMOTT

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on April 8 at the Glen Island Casino, Jim McDermott, the Iona College adviser to the athletic department, will be inducted into Westchester County's Sports Hall of Fame.

Jim McDermott came to Iona College in September of 1947 following a career of coaching at LaSalle Academy in New York City. During his 13 years at the academy, his basketball teams achieved a record of 210 victories, 40 losses.

During the year of Mr. McDermott's arrival at Iona, the school converted an Army recreation building into its one athletic facility. During the 1948-49 season, the Iona Gaels were invited to participate in the first National Catholic Basketball Tournament in Denver and their outstanding record brought them back for the following 3 years.

By 1953, Iona had achieved national recognition and major college classification now known as division I in basketball. At this time, Iona was well recognized nationally as the "little school with the tough basketball program." Thirty-eight appearances at New York's Madison Square Garden playing many of the best teams in the Nation added to the national respect of Iona as a basketball school.

Unfortunately, starting in 1964, Iona had no home court for its games. Home games were instead played in four different high school gymnasiums. Despite this handicap, Mr. McDermott was ranked in the top 20 basketball coaches in America from 1967 to 1973 when he retired from coaching. His Iona record of 325 victories against 250 losses speaks for itself:

IONA COLLEGE, NEW ROCHELLE, N.Y.

McDermott did not confine his activities to basketball alone. He doubled as baseball coach for twelve years with a winning percentage of over 60%. He served as Director of Athletics until 1976. When he became Athletic Director, Iona sponsored six teams in intercollegiate competition. When he retired as Athletic Director to become Assistant to the President in Athletic Affairs, the program had expanded to eleven men's teams and five women's teams.

In 1974, McDermott realized his dream. Iona opened its new multimillion dollar complex climaxing 27 years struggle on his part to propel what was considered a small school into big time athletic recognition. His achievements were many, and recognition by his peers and community were well recognized as indicated in the honors awarded him as an athletic administrator as well as coach.

McDermott had originally instituted a Basketball Camp. With the new complex, he added an all-round Sports Camp for boys and girls which was highly successful.

Among his many achievements, Mr. McDermott has been: co-founder, twice President of the Middle Eastern College Athletic Ass'n; co-founder, past President of the New York Metropolitan Basketball Coaches Association; past President of the Metropolitan Athletic Directors Ass'n (40 colleges);

past President of the Metropolitan Baseball Conference—initiated Fall Collegiate baseball in this country; co-ordinator of the Queens-Iona Relays, now the Iona Relays, a two day track carnival servicing close to 100 colleges, and over 200 high schools.

He has ranked in the Top Twenty Basketball Coaches of America from 1967-1972 and ranked tenth in active coaches in 1973: was elected to Citizens Savings Bank (Helms Foundation) Basketball Hall of Fame, and was a recipient of three awards from the National Association of Basketball Coaches. (The Merit Award 1969, The Honors Award 1969 and the Distinguished Service Award for contributions to college basketball 1973).

He received the Niagara University Award for great contributions to basketball in 1972 and the Metropolitan College Baseball Conference Award for contributions to college baseball.

His work also brought him the city of New Rochelle commendation/citation for basketball coaching record and service to the Community in College Sports Administration and he is a recipient of the highest honor awarded by the Iona College Alumni Association—The Cornelia Award—for service to Iona College—joining such recipients as Cardinal Spellman, four Iona past Presidents and six members of the Iona Board of Trustees.

Finally, he was elected to the first CHSAA Hall of Fame 1978.●

THE PRODUCTIVITY HOAX

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, concerns about the rate of increase in productivity in the American economy are mounting. Certain official figures indicate that the rate of increase in productivity has dropped over the past decade. Unfortunately, the fine print of these figures, the basis on which they are calculated, has not generally been scrutinized. While the major definition and measure of productivity is the number of units of output per man-hour of production labor, the other measure that indicates a drop in productivity defines productivity in terms of the wages (in constant dollars) that workers receive, rather than the quantity of goods they produce. Defined in this way, assertions that productivity has declined are really assertions that real wages have declined (which is, indeed, true). This manner of measuring productivity is, obviously, without merit; perhaps fit for polemics, but not for sound analysis.

When productivity is measured, however, in terms of output per man-hour of production labor, the figures on productivity are quite different. For example, for manufacturing production, the BLS index of manufacturing productivity increased by 3.5 percent in the 4th quarter, 1978, over the same period in 1977. This rather considerable increase in manufacturing productivity is even more noteworthy when one considers that real spendable earnings of workers in manufacturing industries has been increasing by only 1 to 1½ percent per year—one-

fourth the rate of the increase in productivity.

While there is in existence a commission studying productivity, as far as I know the results are not yet in. In the meantime, there is all manner of speculation about the causes of the alleged lagging productivity. Some attribute it to inadequate capital investment in industry. Others attribute it to regulations governing the environment that are imposed upon industry. Still others attribute lagging productivity to the habits of the work force. There is, of course, no precise measure, that I know of, to gage productivity in service industries.

Obviously, the subject of productivity is clouded in a great deal of misinformation and inadequate information. Recently, I came across a very fine article on productivity written by Victor Perlo, a distinguished economist and author, whose career traces back to the New Deal and notable work as a member of the Roosevelt administration. He has also authored a number of books, including "American Labor Today" (1968), "Dollar Crisis: What it Means to You" (1969), "Unstable Economy: Booms and Recessions in the U.S. Since 1945" (1973), and "Economic Racism, U.S.A." (1975).

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article, "The Productivity Hoax," written by Victor Perlo, that appeared on February 15, 1979 in the Daily World:

THE PRODUCTIVITY HOAX

(By Victor Perlo)

Jimmy Carter's economic program stresses austerity and sacrifice for working people. It is enthusiastically carried out by employers, through limits on wage increases that ensure further declines in real wages, following the 3.5 percent decline in real spendable earnings of private economy workers reported for the fourth quarter of 1978.

The President wrote in his economic report:

A large part of the worsening of inflation last year, however, stemmed from poor productivity. Over the past decade or more, the rate of growth in our productivity had been slowing. In late 1977 and throughout 1978, the slowdown in productivity growth reached serious proportions. Last year the productivity of our economy increased by less than 1 percent.

Moreover, the economic report bases its policies on the assumption that slow productivity growth will continue.

Subsequently, the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) published the claim that productivity increased only 0.4 percent in 1978.

These calculations are wrong. The method is unsound. The government officials are publicizing figures which defraud workers, and virtually suppressing figures which show that labor productivity, in actuality, is increasing at a normal rate.

Productivity of labor means the number of units of output per man-hour of production labor. The BLS calculates indexes in this way for separate industries.

But in its overall index used by the President it does not follow this procedure. Instead it bases "productivity" mainly on what workers get paid (in constant dollars) for their production rather than how much they produce. As any worker knows quite well, these are quite different. In U.S. manufacturing today, as shown by census figures, production workers get paid barely one-fourth of what they produce, as measured

by value added by manufacture. And that share has been steadily declining.

To compute "productivity," the BLS defines production as the "real" gross national product (GNP) in the private domestic economy. As the BLS writes:

GNP is equal to income received by labor and property for services rendered in the current production of goods and services, in addition to capital consumption allowances, indirect business taxes, and several other minor items. (BLS Handbook of Methods, Bulletin 1920, p. 220).

This so-called measure of production is then adjusted to "real" terms with a price index. The largest component in this measure of production is "compensation of employees." Property income is only partly included, and its upward trend is minimized.

Thus the largest element in the BLS's "real" production is "real" compensation of employees. When this is divided by man-hours worked, the largest element in the resulting calculation of "productivity" is real wages per man-hour worked. So the trend in productivity, thus calculated, follows the trend of real wages, with certain upward adjustments.

The alleged slowdown in productivity since 1967 is nothing other than the slowdown and later downturn in real wages. It represents not an actual decline in productivity growth, but a failure of labor to make gains from the very substantial increases in productivity.

The Federal Reserve Board index of manufacturing production represents, insofar as possible, a composite measure of changes in the physical volume of manufacturing output. The BLS publishes an index of man-hours worked by production or nonsupervisory workers in manufacturing. The production index divided by the man-hours index, both on a 1967 base, gives a reasonably objective index of productivity.

Between 1967 and 1978 the index of manufacturing production increased 45.5 percent, while man-hours of production workers increased only 1.5 percent. Thus productivity per man-hour increased 43.3 percent, for a compound rate of 3.3 percent per year. The index of productivity increased each year. The 1978 increase was less than average at 2 percent, but the slowdown was limited and temporary. In the fourth quarter of 1978 productivity was 3.3 percent higher than in the fourth quarter of 1977, regaining the normal rate of increase.

The BLS also calculates an index of productivity in manufacturing. Over the long run, that index is adjusted to the same faulty basis as the general BLS productivity index. But over a short period it also uses the Federal Reserve Board index of manufacturing production. The BLS index of manufacturing productivity increased 2.5 percent in 1978, and 3.5 percent in the fourth quarter of 1978 over the same period of 1977.

But these figures for manufacturing workers are ignored by Carter and the press.

In order to have a fair share of the gain in productivity during 1978, factory workers should have received in the fourth quarter real wages 3.3 percent higher than in the same quarter a year earlier. In fact, their real spendable earnings were 2.2 percent lower. Thus they are entitled to a 5.5 percent catchup increase (3.3 percent plus 2.2 percent) in addition to what they require to cope with the certain 8-10 percent inflation and higher productivity of 1979.

The next showdown between labor and the management/government gangup is in the trucking industry. There's no mention of the teamsters' productivity in government propaganda. Between 1967 and 1977 the volume of freight carried by intercity carriers increased 66.2 percent (American Trucking Association Statistics). Man-hours of truck-

ing and trucking terminals production workers increased 6.2 percent. That means an increase of 56.5 percent, or 4.6 percent per year, in productivity. In the first nine months of 1978 (the latest available), freight carried increased 8 percent over the same months of 1977, while man-hours increased 3.2 percent. That means teamsters' productivity per man-hour increased 4.7 percent during 1978.

But in October, 1978 (the latest month available), their real spendable weekly earnings were down 2.5 percent from the same month of 1977.

Since 1967 their gain in real spendable earnings was only 13.6 percent, or 1.2 percent per year—one-fourth the rate of their increased productivity.

To make up for higher productivity and lower real wages in 1978 teamsters are entitled to a catch-up raise of 7.2 percent (4.7 percent plus 2.5 percent) in addition to what they need to cope with higher living costs and as a reward for higher productivity during 1979.

The 7 percent ceiling which Jimmy Carter and the trucking companies want to impose will assure teamsters of a further cut in real earnings, and an even more drastic cut in their share of the values created by their labor.

The New York Times quotes unidentified economists who use the falsely reported decline in productivity gains as an excuse for an ultra-right attack on workers, minorities, women, and youths. Since Jerry Flint, the Times reporter, quotes Charles L. Schultze, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, at the start of the article, and since most of the arguments are identical with those expressed more discreetly in the council's economic report, it is not unlikely that the unidentified economists are the President's economic advisers.

Here are some of the "reasons" these economists give for "low productivity" (New York Times, Jan. 27).

"Equal-opportunity rules that mean the hiring of the less efficient, the less educated and the less skilled to promote equality among the races and sexes."

This is an outright racist slander, and an attack on affirmative action for minorities and women. What evidence is there that Black workers are less productive than white workers on the same job? None. Or women than men? Indeed, there is overwhelming evidence that Blacks have to have superior qualifications to get an equivalent job. For the most part, Blacks with equal qualifications, skills and education are hired for inferior jobs, at lower pay, to whites with the same or less skill and education.

"The baby boom that followed World War II, which has poured millions of youths, with no work experience, into the work place."

This is a comparable slander against the youth to justify attempts to slash the minimum wage for youth and the summer youth jobs program, and maintaining 50 percent unemployment rates among minority youths in the cities.

"A decline in the work ethic, which means that today's worker is more interested in the 'me' in his life than in keeping his nose to the grindstone."

Unlike the capitalists, who are more interested in paying billions in bribes for armament contracts and enjoying their tax-free three-martini lunches and company resorts!

"Featherbedding established and sustained in union contracts."

The old chestnut, justifying the assault which has already gone far to destroy those standard working rules with which organized workers formerly were able to protect themselves against accidents and speedup.

"The social demands of society for a cleaner, healthier environment, which diverts

money that might have gone to increase productivity."

Most expenditures for environmental control are in manufacturing, where, clearly, productivity increases are substantial. Furthermore, expenditures to improve the working environment and safety and health often increase productivity, not reduce it. This is nothing but propaganda to justify the current fierce employer offensive against the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and Carter's cuts in safety and environmental budgets, in real terms. The appropriations for OSHA and the Mine Safety and Health Administration, taken together, are increased 3.3 percent, which means a cut of 5 percent in real terms.

"Tax policy that does not encourage investment in the tools that increase manufacturing efficiency."

That's really a joke, just following the latest round of tax cuts for corporations and the wealthy, with record "tax incentives" for investors, who are shockingly favored over workers and other ordinary consumers. It's also a joke with the just released figures on soaring machine tool orders, and the Federal Reserve Board index of business equipment production for December, 1978 at an all-time high of 169.3 (1967 = 100) as compared with 150.3 for industrial production as a whole.

Over the past two years, fixed investment, in constant dollars, increased 19.7%, as compared with 8.8% for personal consumption.

To defend their basic interests, workers and their unions must expose the fraudulent anti-labor, racist propaganda of the government and big business concerning productivity.

This calls for reversing the Carter Administration policies. It calls for slashing the inflationary military budget. It requires freezing monopoly prices and rolling them back. It calls for cutting taxes on workers while closing the \$100 billion—plus of big business and wealthy individuals' loopholes, that, together with the military budget, are responsible for the inflationary government deficits. ●

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE R. & D. PROGRAM

HON. ROBIN L. BEARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. BEARD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recent events in Iran have focused attention on the fragile nature of the U.S. intelligence gathering network which monitors Soviet ICBM weapons testing. In order to verify compliance with SALT—present and future—treaty provisions, and to assess Soviet capabilities and programs, a variety of different data gathering methods under the umbrella of national technical means are employed.

One such program is the ballistic missile defense R. & D. program. For many years the BMD radars at the U.S. Kwajalein Missile Range have been monitoring tests of U.S. reentry systems. In this way, critical software and discrimination algorithms have been developed by BMD and are then used extensively in other systems for assessment of intelligence data. The Kwajalein range itself is the primary source for monitoring of Soviet space missions and for the important

space object identification (SOI) program.

The participation of the BMD program with the Air Force in the shipboard Cobra Judy radar program will lead to a capability to gather reentry measurements data on Soviet flight test vehicles that does not exist now. These particular sensors will become more significant as the impact of the loss of access to radars located on foreign soil is realized.

Although very significant and of current interest, contributions to the intelligence gathering network are only collateral benefits of the BMD technology. In fact, the primary significance of the BMD program was recognized by the House and Senate Armed Services Committees in 1978 when they recommended to the Department of Defense that the BMD R. & D. program, which had been subject to budget fluctuations, be stabilized at a constant level of real purchasing power. In doing so, the Senate recognized the value of continued BMD research to national defense.

Since the ratification in 1972 of the treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union on the limitation of antiballistic missile systems, the DOD has maintained a ballistic missile defense research program directed at providing the necessary technical expertise and subsystem components required to meet an emergency situation if the treaty were abrogated. The research program has studied the means to provide rapid deployment options at the same time it pursues longer range goals of more effective systems such as exo-atmospheric nonnuclear intercepts. Subsystem hardware and technologies developed by this program, such as the optical probe/exosphere discrimination algorithms have already been considered applicable to another critical area: the Air Force early warning and attack assessment system. The probe would be used to strengthen and augment the warning system and could provide a means to reconstitute the warning quickly, in the event that the primary early warning satellites were attacked.

In the present environment of Minute-man vulnerability the BMD program takes on even more significance. In addition to having application to fixed silo defense—should that option be exercised—BMD provides a means to enhance the effectiveness and flexibility of the preferred basing system to correct the growing vulnerability. This system, the Multiple Protective Structure (MPS) system, depends upon deception for its survival. Such deceptive basing, when applied with BMD, may well provide a cost-effective combination. For example, suppose there are 4,000 aimpoints in the MPS system and 200 missiles deceptively based within them. Such a system, with no defense, is designed to survive an attack by Soviet R/V's in sufficient number to destroy 2,000 aimpoints and still provide the United States with 100 surviving missiles. If defense is now introduced, also deceptively—that is, only the aimpoints which contain a real missile are defended—then the attacker must at least double his attacking force to achieve the same effect. He must attack all the

aimpoints at least once—in the simple case of a single interceptor defending each missile—to exhaust the defense before proceeding with his primary attack. Stated another way, BMD deceptively based might be able to effectively double the number of aimpoints in the MPS system.

Finally a vital BMD research program provides the country with the means to monitor Soviet activities and capabilities in these areas. In order to maintain confidence in our ability to monitor Soviet compliance—or violation—of the existing ABM treaty, such a program is a minimum necessity.

To maintain an effective technology base requires motivation. In particular, maintaining an effective BMD research program in the presence of an ABM treaty is a difficult task. The House and Senate Armed Services Committees, in recognition of this problem, attempted to stabilize the BMD R. & D. program in real purchasing power. However, the DOD has ignored this direction and submitted a fiscal year 1980 budget request which is \$13.2 million below the 1979 authorized funding level in real dollars. Such action, if not corrected, will hamper the BMD programs efforts to reduce the lead time for a low altitude defense of the ICBM force and to conduct a fiscally efficient demonstration of an exo-atmospheric intercept. Both these programs deserve the support of Congress in their own right. Perhaps more important is the adverse impact of a budget reduction on efficient program management and the political effects of sending such a message to the Soviet Union, especially in the current environment. ●

HYDROELECTRIC ENERGY

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills which, if adopted, could provide important assistance to the development of an energy resource of great importance to New England and other regions of the country. I speak of small-scale or low-head hydroelectric development.

In a recent report sponsored by the New England Congressional Caucus on New England's Rural Energy Sources small-scale hydroelectric development was characterized as an obsolete technology whose time has come again. The preliminary estimates, the report notes, suggest that potential annual savings of between 7 and 19 million barrels of oil could be realized from the reclamation and retrofitting of New England's small-scale hydroelectric dams. This would represent between 1 and 4 percent of the region's energy needs.

A thoughtful and impressive effort by the New England Energy Congress, which is sponsored by the New England Congressional Caucus and Tufts University, also highlights the importance of hydro development for the region. A prelimi-

nary report published in November 1978 asserts that 25 percent of the region's needs, equivalent to better than 500,000 barrels of oil per day, can be met by alternate sources of energy by the year 2000. This total reflects a commitment, which must be undertaken and adequately financed, to double the contribution of hydroelectric energy to the power pool by the end of the century.

Other surveys have forecasted even greater energy savings which could be achieved through the reactivation of New England's unused dam sites. A study prepared for the New England River Basins Commission identified over 1,900 dams, once used for power generation, which could be refurbished and could produce as much as 15 percent of the additional generating capability which will be needed by New England over the next 10 years.

I am confident that similar studies, if undertaken elsewhere, would reveal equally impressive statistics. This country moved away from small dam power generation when other sources of energy, particularly coal and petroleum, offered cheap and efficient fuel for large scale electricity generation. We are now in a period of learning brought about by the pressing fuel crisis and, not surprisingly, we are finding that some of the old technologies, undertaken with modern efficiency, on a small scale are effective, cheap, safe, and environmentally sound.

In a recent meeting with a congressional delegation concerned about the development of alternate sources of energy, President Carter indicated strong interest in rapid development of small-scale hydroelectric projects. His interest is welcome and echoes the already considerable public involvement in this issue. Unfortunately, the public concern has outstripped the Federal Government's ability to respond expeditiously to requests for licenses to construct hydroelectric facilities at small dams. The backlog of license applications at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is immense and the small number of employees assigned to this task is inadequate.

FERC has made and is continuing to make attempts to shorten the processing time for license approval, but the numbers involved are overwhelming. A logical solution to this problem is to give those States with the proven capability to issue licenses with due regard for environmental, ecological and historical considerations, the authority to do so. I know that some States may not be prepared at this time to undertake such responsibilities, but others, such as Vermont, already have established mechanisms which, if anything, are even more rigorous in their protection of public interests in licensing matters than are the relevant Federal regulations. The net result of the current situation in which both individual States and the Federal Government must approve licenses has been unnecessary delays. Most small-scale hydro developers have limited resources and therefore delays or additional licensing requirements often discourage planning or make their projects economically risky.

In response to the now confused picture for small-scale hydro developers the Senate and House of the State of Vermont passed a joint resolution which was signed by Governor Snelling on March 27 urging that FERC be requested to create a more coordinated and expeditious licensing procedure and that the Department of Energy be requested to create financial incentives to encourage the development of smaller hydro sites.

The bills I am introducing today speak to these concerns and also reflect some of the recommendations of the New England Energy Congress which I referred to earlier. One of the measures would authorize FERC to enter into cooperative arrangements with individual States to relegate to those States licensing authority for small hydroelectric projects at existing damsites. The other piece of legislation appropriates funds to the Department of Energy for loans to assist the construction of small-scale hydroelectric projects. Congress authorized \$100 million for this effort under section 403 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978. Regrettably, in a spirit of false economy, the administration has not requested an appropriation for this effort. The bill I am introducing seeks to remedy this oversight.

Small-scale hydroelectric development offers the possibility of providing energy-poor sections of this country with a relatively inexpensive, environmentally sound alternate mode of energy production. Given the coming crunch in energy we in this House have an obligation to act as speedily and effectively as possible on this important issue. ●

**PFC. WILLIAM JAMES TSAKANIKAS
CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF
HONOR BILL GAINING SUPPORT
IN HOUSE**

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I reintroduced a bill (H.R. 3407) for myself and 15 of my colleagues as cosponsors, authorizing the President to award the Congressional Medal of Honor, posthumously, to William James (Tsakanikas).

Entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, March 26, 1979, on pp. 6249-6250, are my remarks on introducing the original legislation (H.R. 3225); the text of H.R. 3225, and the Parade magazine article by Jack Anderson of Sunday, March 25 titled "Why This Dead Hero Should Get the Medal of Honor."

I have received phone calls and letters from across the country this past week—all supporting our efforts in this regard. This past Sunday—April 1—the White Plains Reporter Dispatch, White Plains, N.Y., carried another article about Will James (Tsakanikas) that I would like to share with my colleagues, and I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

CXXV—461—Part 6

MEDAL OF HONOR SOUGHT FOR WW II HERO

(By Steve Burgard)

"Private William J. Tsakanikas, 19, of 29 Park Ave., has been missing in action since the German push into Belgium before Christmas, the War Department notified his parents yesterday." The Reporter Dispatch, White Plains, Jan. 6, 1945.

"No Germans broke or retreated. The range was so close that James (Tsakanikas) could see their faces. He tried to divorce his mind from the faces. With his grease gun, his .50-caliber machine gun, and occasionally his M-1, he tried to imagine himself firing at movement, not at men." The Bitter Woods by John Eisenhower.

William James survived the firefight that endless December day during World War II and lived through his subsequent capture by the Germans to return home to Westchester.

He dropped his Greek surname "Tsakanikas," retaining his middle name, had a family and was as active as a painful combat injury, sustained on Dec. 16, 1944, permitted. He died in 1977.

Last week, Rep. Richard Ottinger, D-Mamaroneck, submitted James' name to Congress for the Medal of Honor, the country's highest military award, for his action in delaying a German thrust during Adolph Hitler's desperate Ardennes offensive.

As a result of the publicity, the New York Yankees have asked his widow, Peg, to throw out the first ball opening day at Yankee Stadium Thursday.

Also present will be a St. Louis chiropractor, Dr. Lyle Bouck, who 34 years ago was a young first lieutenant, James' platoon leader, sharing a foxhole with him in the tiny town of Lanzerath, Belgium.

The Yankees are trying to locate other members of their platoon in the hope of bringing as many of them together as possible.

James and Bouck were in the 18-member Intelligence and Reconnaissance Platoon of the 394th Infantry Regiment of the 99th Division, charged, as Bouck now explains, with "observation, watching, alerting the division to troop movements."

It was a proud unit and well-trained—but not for combat, the role selected by fate.

In the early morning hours Dec. 16, the unit was subjected to a heavy artillery barrage and members dove into foxholes at their position near Lanzerath. There was a tank destroyer battalion in the town, but after the attack the battalion pulled out to the rear.

On radio orders, Bouck, James and two other men went on a scouting mission into the town. "The four of us went into the town and saw huge columns of Germans coming, some across fields, some across roads," Bouck recalled Thursday.

When they returned to position, Bouck called for artillery support. It never came. "There wasn't any way to get out without being exposed," Bouck said.

Eighteen men were on their own against hundreds of enemy paratroopers.

The platoon had a good position at the edge of a wood line. James and Bouck shared a foxhole; James had a submachine gun.

When the Germans arrived, a firefight began and continued all day. The last orders Bouck received before his radio was blasted from his hands were, "Hold at all costs."

In darkness, the Germans moved in and took the platoon position, hole by hole. In an assault on the James and Bouck foxhole, a blast from a German burp gun hit James in the head, destroying the right side of his face.

The captured men (eventually liberated by American forces) were taken to a cafe in the town, where James, then semiconscious, was later to recall hearing a cuckoo clock. The clock, later obtained by a friend, now

hangs on the living room wall in the tidy home of Peg James.

"Funny," she said last week, "it stopped chiming after Bill died."

Time, the dispersal of the troops and the agonies of life in German camps left returning American veterans like Lyle Bouck eager to put the past behind.

It was 20 years later, when John Eisenhower, son of the former president, began researching the Ardennes campaign, that the significance of the Dec. 16 encounter became apparent.

Without knowing it at the time, the men of intelligence platoon were in the thick of the German thrust in the Battle of the Bulge. There was no immediate thought of medals, although Bouck points out that everyone in his platoon received the Combat Infantryman's Badge, the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star.

"We were just doing what everyone else was doing," Bouck insists. "We got talking about it later and discovered, 'My God, we were in the center of Hitler's main spearhead.'"

Like collaborators on a jigsaw puzzle Eisenhower talked with James, Bouck and other survivors to piece the Dec. 16 story together. Two Americans died that day; all other platoon members were injured and captured.

Nobody can say for sure how many Germans died at Lanzerath. Bouck, who avoids giving a body estimate, says, "It was a lot, whatever a lot means."

In recent years, White Plains attorney Basil Filardi, a lifelong friend of James, has made it a personal campaign to push for a Medal of Honor.

The effort faces stiff odds. A technicality requires that the recommendation be filed within two years of the act. Nevertheless, Ottinger went to Congress with legislation last week.

Filardi said last week, "When you know Bill's background—when you know how much it took not to run and say, 'to hell with this'—to stay and man those guns—you just want to see justice done."

What kind of man was James? "He was a wonderful husband and a good father," his widow said. "He didn't talk much about the incident till the book (Eisenhower's "Bitter Woods"). He didn't know what he had done."

She continued, "He wasn't bitter." Not bitter, that is, after capture by the Germans, a failed escape attempt and, later, dozens of operations on his face, an ordeal of physical pain scarcely imaginable.

James lived in agony. He held a number of jobs, but couldn't stick with any because he "was always having to go off to the hospital."

He was active in civic affairs, was a conservative Republican and served as Rye Town GOP chairman from September 1975 to February 1977.

A son, Ed, 29, a broker for Muehlstein and Co., credits Peg with sustaining his father through his parents' years together. The couple met at a Veterans Administration hospital where she was an Army nurse.

"He never would have been able to do without mom's support," he said.

There are three other boys, Larry, 30, Doug, 26, and Gary, 23.

But it was James' inner resources which seemed to carry his heroic life beyond the wintry day in Belgium in 1944. "Never getting bitter, living with pain day in and day out—he was a kind of heroism that went on until he was 52," Ed said.

His father was a deeply religious man who believed strongly in God and duty. "Dad's feeling about fate was that you don't go looking for trouble, but when it comes, you meet it," Ed said.

He concluded, "One of his strongest teachings was, '(You are) made by God to walk straight, talk straight and take the consequences. Later on, when I was old enough to

understand, he added . . ." Ed smiled, ". . . Think straight." •

REBIRTH OF PANAMANIAN DEMOCRACY

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

• Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, the administration failed to gage the tremors in Iran; and official forecasts of political life fell far short of the mark. Even now, I think, we are being treated to a replay of official misperception in the so-called Republic of Panama. I ask that my colleagues take heed, put their ears to the ground and listen to the rumblings of discontent in Panama.

This morning I was privileged to receive a remarkable document signed by representatives of the Panamanian political opposition. The unity of these elements, virtually all of the political dissidents of Panama, from right to left, have joined in an unprecedented show of unity. They are united in calling for a democratization of Panamanian political life and in adopting a set of comprehensive goals to accomplish that task. Years of repression, police state violence, Marxist infiltration, and flagrant abuse of public trust has not destroyed the aspirations of the Panamanian people for political liberty. They press on, and look with hope to a brighter future. The years of frustration may yet erupt into an outburst of indignation. How events will unfold is yet to be determined. I am quite sure that the gentlemen in the State Department are "monitoring the situation." I sincerely hope that their sensors are sharper than in Iran and others, and we are not caught offguard in defending or sympathizing with a regime that has long since lost its legitimacy.

I submit the document for the RECORD:
NATIONAL AGREEMENT FOR THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF THE REPUBLIC

The signers, in our capacity as authorized representatives of the national political groups concerned over the present state of the Republic, make a firm appeal to Panamanians to belligerently oppose the present government, laying aside all sectarian ambitions and interests, with a view to changing the elements of the present political system which hinder the effective attainment of democracy and freedom in Panama. The systematic violation of human rights and the manipulation of news have not been sufficient to prevent an ever-growing number of Panamanians, once having freed themselves from fear, from demanding the immediate replacement of a regime which constitutes a standing insult to the dignity of the citizens. Such a situation, evident to all, obliges the government to attempt to mask its dictatorial nature through harmless constitutional reforms and through the artificial formation of official political parties aimed at giving an appearance of legitimacy to a regime which, by its origin and nature, is in opposition to the most elementary principles of freedom and democracy.

Even though the expedience of these years obliges us to reject the guarantees which the present leaders offer, whenever in practice the exercise of the freedoms is limited by the shameless meddling by the author-

ities in all the political processes, we affirm our determination to fight with all the effective legal means at our disposal, in order to reconstruct the unity of the Panamanian family, guarantee the harmonious development of our economy and obtain social peace for our fellow citizens.

If official interfering closes the mentioned path, the Panamanian people and the political leaders of the democratic opposition will adapt their patriotic actions to the circumstances and the historic responsibility will fall on those who, by usurping power, use it to deny the national majorities their decision-making power and free choice of a sure democratic direction.

In order to direct the country along that path we announce our unwaivable decision to:

I. Fight for the full recovery of democracy in our country, in order to quickly replace the dictatorship that has plunged the Republic into chaos and divided the Panamanian family.

II. Demand that the public power emanate directly from the will of the popular majorities, expressed in free elections, in which all political parties participate, under the guarantee of an Electoral Tribunal which is independent and in which the political opposition will have effective and adequate representation.

III. Fight so that a real functional separation of the Legislative, Executive and Judicial Organs will prevail, without interference from the public force.

IV. Reiterate the need for an immediate direct presidential election as the only means to assure the social, political and economic reconstruction of the Republic, inasmuch as the designation of the Chief Executive through the indirect method has not returned peace to the Nation or even to the governmental sector.

V. State the urgency of directly electing all the members of the Legislative Branch, in elections to be held soon and which will guarantee the true representation of those elected, through equal, direct and secret suffrage.

VI. Insist that the independence, seriousness, impartiality and capability of the Judicial Branch and the Public Ministry be guaranteed and that they be granted their own resources and autonomy to administer them and that the Judicial career be reestablished. As long as the country does not have full confidence in its branches of justice, there will be neither tranquility nor progress.

VII. Establish local governments that correspond to the national situation and which have adequate income. As a result we maintain that all of the local authorities must be elected directly and that the efforts tending to restrict or eliminate income from the corregimientos [local areas], districts and provinces with the excuse of passing them on to the common funds of the State, be rejected.

VIII. Foster a democratic education which meets the needs of a people eager for culture and progress, which meets the aspirations of the educations and which puts an end to the rapid decomposition suffered by educational institutions due to the improvisations of the current regime.

IX. Require that any person may, in practice, found and operate, in complete freedom, the newspapers, radio broadcasting stations or any other means of social communication, without any type of restriction. In this respect, we will fight so that there will be no limit on the freedom of expression or the independence of the radio newsmen, through press laws which restrict or eliminate the possibility for the citizens to state their opinions permanently in the means of communications.

X. Demand a juridic and administrative regime that will guarantee the effective and

full operation of individual public and political liberties and in general, the most absolute respect for human rights as defined in the International Conventions that Panama has subscribed to in that area, and that specifically freedom of expression, freedom of gathering, freedom of worship and freedom of not feeling fear be respected.

Bearing in mind the considerations and ends enumerated, the parties and groups which subscribe, without losing their autonomy, nor their capacity to determine privately the juridic status and the future of their respective organizations, join in a National Opposition Front (FRENO) [which means "brake" in Spanish] to which will be able to belong all of the political parties and civic organizations that adhere to the principles and aims contained in the present declaration, whose activities will be coordinated by an executive committee.

PANAMA, March 20, 1979.

Signed by representatives of the Independent Democratic Movement, National Liberation Movement, Christian Democrat Party, Agrarian Labor Party, Liberal Party, Progressive Party, Social Democrat Party, Patriotic Feminine Union, Union of National Renovation (URNA), Third Nationalist Party, Republican Party, Pro-Panamanian Party.

(Translated by Wesley Kerney and Deanna Hammond, CRS Language Services Section, March 1979.) •

MEMORY NIGHT FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

HON. H. JOEL DECKARD

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

• Mr. DECKARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives that I have received the honor of presenting appropriate awards to the families of James Earl Gresham and Walter Krausenklau on the evening of April 7 in Dale, Ind. The evening of the 7th has been designated as Memory Night by the Abe Lincoln Post No. 444 honoring veterans of World War I from the Eighth Congressional District.

Many of our residents in Indiana distinguished themselves serving in World War I, and two in particular deserve special recognition. James Earl Gresham is honored as having been the very first American to step on foreign soil, and was the first American to be killed on foreign soil. His grave among a cluster in France is appropriately marked "Here lie the first soldiers of the great Republic of the United States who died on the soil of France for justice and liberty, November 3, 1917."

Walter Krausenklau, a native of Lamar, Ind., deserves special recognition as well tonight. Walter is recognized as being the only resident from Dale that was killed in action in World War I. Our heritage has been enriched, because of his sacrifice on October 14, 1918. In light of the fact that our Nation is now suffering from an apparent lack of patriotism, I am especially delighted that I represent a district with such a fine sense of patriotic and civil activity. •

THE HISTORY OF THE SHORTER WORK WEEK

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the second national All Unions Conference and legislative lobby to shorten the work week takes place on Friday, April 6, 1979, beginning at 9:30 a.m. in the Cannon Caucus Room, 345 Cannon Building. Nearly 1 year ago, I had the privilege of participating at the first national conference held in Dearborn, Mich. That conference and the several hundred trade unionists who participated generated more enthusiasm and determination than I have witnessed in many a year. This second conference represents a major step forward in melding together the citizen and trade union movement for a shorter work week, that has evolved at the grassroots, with solid congressional and national support. The second conference, hosted by the Greater Washington, D.C., Central Labor Council (AFL-CIO), will draw more than 100 labor organizations from 20 States and representatives of 19 national and international unions, as well as several key central labor councils.

The mission of this second conference to shorten the work week is to win support for the idea of combating unemployment by spreading work among the greatest number of persons in the labor force. Work spreading—the sharing of employment rather than unemployment—is to be accomplished by reducing the work week, to 35 hours, eliminating compulsory overtime, and raising the premium rate for overtime work to double-time, thereby encouraging employers to hire new workers. The direction the conference is taking is a solid one and, I believe, enjoys greater support in the Nation than most existing economic policies. The movement to shorten the work week will continue to gain adherents because its goal is to increase employment, not unemployment; spread work rather than countenance a permanent, unemployed underclass in society; increase the sense of economic security among all working men and women, not decrease it; and raise productivity in the workplace, not stifle it.

The history of the shorter work week is a long and distinguished one. It tells the story of the determination of working people to improve their working lives, the conditions under which they work and the things they are working for. It extends back in American history nearly 200 years. A synopsis of its major events follows, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues.

The history of the shorter work week follows:

HISTORY OF THE SHORTER WORK WEEK

Forty years have passed since the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, which established the standard 40-hour work week. The reduction in the workweek during that period accounted for substantial gains in employment. There is strong reason to believe that today a similar reduction in the stand-

ard workweek, coupled with stronger incentives to employers to hire new workers rather than use their existing workforce on overtime, would generate substantial new employment.

The information below summarizes the history of efforts to reduce the workweek in the United States, and the struggles of the labor movement to accomplish this goal.

A little more than a century and a half ago, the average American worker was at the job from sun-up to sundown.

1791—earliest recorded strike for shorter workweek hours in the U.S. by Philadelphia carpenters.

1827—Boston and Philadelphia carpenters strike for a 10-hour day. These early strikes for shorter hours failed, but the movement continued.

1835—The great Philadelphia general strike in which every union eventually turned out. Three weeks later, the strike was won, and the 10-hour day was enacted by city government and spread to the rest of the country. By the end of 1835 the standard work day for skilled mechanics was 10 hours.

1837—Economic depression began with the panic of 1837 through 1841, which wiped out the gains of the vast majority of workers who were forced to return to 12 and 14 hour days.

1840—President Martin Van Buren established a 40-hour week for federal employees.

1840's and 1850's—Many employers circumvented the few state laws which established 40-hour workweeks by forcing workers to sign release clauses or including them on black lists.

1860—despite heavy resistance by employers, 10 hours became the standard working day for most skilled workers and in most factories; hours reduced from 13-11 hours.

1865—With the end of the Civil War and the return of soldiers to their jobs, the need for shorter hours in order to reduce unemployment intensified. Movement towards the 8-hour day increased.

Ira Steward, "Father of the 8-hour day," and his Machinists' and Blacksmiths' Union lead the 8-hour-day struggle through legislation.

1868—The 8-hour day movement declined. The legislation Congress passed in June 25, 1868 proved to be defective. Value of the 8-hour day was emasculated by the insertion of nullifying clauses.

1873—A 6-year depression killed the hope of a decent 8-hour day.

1880's—The Haymarket tragedy and the general employers' counteroffensive after May 4, 1886, slowed, but did not end, the struggle for a shorter workday.

1890—The carpenters and joiners led the movement for the 8-hour day. The union had reported it won the 8-hour day for over 46,000 workers in 137 cities and nearly 30,000 had reduced their hours from 10 to 9.

1900-1910—During the opening decade of the 20th Century, struggles were waged on all three fronts—for the 10, 9 and 8-hour day.

1910's—Building trade unions, and the International Typographical Union launched campaigns and won 8-hour days. The ITU and other unions spent millions fighting off employers' efforts to increase working hours.

1926—The Fur Workers Union of New York went on strike and won the five-day forty-hour week; the first group of American workers to win this milestone.

1929—The Great Depression stirred much demand and action for a shorter workweek.

1933—A bill declaring compulsory 30-hour workweek promised to create 65 million jobs with no cut in pay. FDR, big business and later the courts opposed this bill.

1938—Compromise legislation called "Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938" was enacted. The 5-day, 40-hour standard was established. ●

EFFECT OF HIGHER ENERGY PRICES

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, with each day I become increasingly concerned by this Nation's energy problem. I am especially disturbed by the effect of higher energy prices on the already shrinking wallets of the American people and their growing lack of confidence in official statements. My constituents do not believe that they are being given honest information.

I share their concern. Before I am prepared to vote in favor of the President's emergency proposal, I will require the answers to several crucial questions. Among these questions are: To the best knowledge of this administration, is there really an oil shortage? Was the recent rise in energy prices necessary? Is it consistent with the President's inflation-fighting policies? And what plans have been made to cushion the effects of higher energy prices on the American people—especially those on low and moderate incomes?

I would like to share with the House a letter which I recently sent to Secretary of Energy James Schlesinger expressing my concerns regarding this matter:

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 20, 1979.

HON. JAMES R. SCHLESINGER,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Energy,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: The House Commerce Committee, of which I am a Member, will soon vote on the emergency fuel measures proposed by the administration. While I wholeheartedly supported President Carter's original call for a new national energy policy, I am increasingly concerned by present administration attitudes and practices. Specifically, I would like answers to the following very serious questions.

To the best knowledge of this administration, is there presently an oil shortage or have large oil companies begun to hold back on supplies deliberately?

Was the recent rise in energy prices actually necessary? Do you consider it in line with the President's guidelines to control inflation? If not, was any effort made to convince oil companies to abide by their guidelines?

Increasing fuel costs will mean hardship for many on fixed or marginal incomes, especially the elderly, for whom proper supplies of heating fuel are absolutely essential. What plans are now underway to cushion the effects of these price rises? How soon will these plans go into effect?

The proposed rationing system counts only the number of cars rather than people in a household. This system is weighted against working class districts like mine, where people share family automobiles. What is the rationale for choosing to allocate rationed fuel to vehicles rather than individuals.

My constituents, like myself, feel deliberately exploited by the atmosphere of doubt and sudden rise in price over the past few weeks. Without satisfactory answers to these questions, I will be unable to support the administration position at this time.

Sincerely,

BARBARA A. MIKULSKI,
Member of Congress. ●

VIETNAM VETERANS ACT

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on March 20, 1979, the Vietnam veterans in Congress reintroduced the Vietnam Veterans Act, H.R. 3102. I would like to submit for the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of that bill for my colleagues who are concerned about the past neglect of the Vietnam veteran and would like to cosponsor that bill:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS VIET NAM VETERANS ACT, H.R. 3102

The Viet Nam Veterans Act, authored by the Viet Nam Veterans in Congress, amends Title 38 of the U.S.C. in order to correct longstanding inadequacies in Viet Nam veterans benefits. The bill reaches employment, health, education, and housing problems. It is divided into Titles, with one Title for each area. The final Title, V, commissions a study of veteran policy.

Practically every provision in this bill has its precedents in programs that have actually been part of the World War II GI Bill or that are currently underway or have been tested in states or local governments. None of them are revolutionary—they are merely evolutionary.

TITLE I—EMPLOYMENT

Viet Nam veteran employment initiatives have been predominantly limited to special consideration under public sector job programs. The two major exceptions have been marked by failure. The 1977 HIRE program developed a large number of job "pledges" but produced an inadequate record of actual hires. The VA's on-the-job training program has declined markedly, with enrollees down 50% between 1974 and 1977. It is held back by a basic structural limitation that precludes direct monetary incentives to employers.

Title I provides an alternate private sector employment program targeted on the needs of veterans with serious employment problems through a creative use of GI Bill entitlement to provide direct employer reimbursement. A second VVIC proposal, the targeted tax credit for employers of Viet Nam vets was passed into law last year.

Section 101: Job Voucher Program. This section creates new use for existing GI Bill education entitlements. Under the provision's approach, a veteran may use up to one year of his GI Bill entitlement as a "voucher" which will provide employers direct monetary reimbursement. Eligibility would be confined to veterans meeting needs tests similar to those under CETA. The amount of the subsidy will equal the amount of the payment under full-time education enrollment: Section 1682(a)(1) of the GI Bill—\$311 for a single veteran, \$422 for a veteran with two dependents. Any use of the entitlement as a voucher will be subtracted from the veteran's total period of entitlement under the GI Bill, which presently runs to a maximum of 45 months. Employer eligibility for reimbursement is conditioned on provision of a training program and a provision requiring retention of the veteran six months beyond the expiration of job voucher benefits.

Precedents: A job voucher program was tested in Orange County California with a \$5 million Labor Department grant from 1972-1974. That voucher program was also tested in pilot projects in Philadelphia and Los Angeles. A Harvard professor, Dr. Martin Feldstein, has written often on the job voucher concept and has received much

publicity in Fortune, Time and other publications.

Interrelation: This program, in conjunction with the enacted tax credit, is designed to provide alternative employment incentive programs to meet the needs of different employers. Section 102(b)(3) of the act, accordingly, precludes attempts to "double claim" a veteran under both programs.

These alternatives seek to complement the existing OJT program by providing a more specialized design. As distinct from the existing OJT program, these alternatives target in on the hard to employ. The OJT program is not need based. To give employers serious incentives to hire veterans with employment problems, they provide flexible direct employer incentives which are not supplied under the existing OJT program.

Section 102: Outreach. An effective program requires outreach, including both advertising and community-based services. Section 102 mandates a VA program of outreach to inform both veterans and prospective employers of the provisions of the act and their advantages.

TITLE II—HEALTH CARE

Section 201: Readjustment Counseling. Viet Nam veterans have faced significant readjustment problems that have resulted in disproportionate suicide and divorce rates, among other problems. A large number of veterans have been affected: the multi-year Cleveland study suggests 25-33% of non-combat and 40-50% of combat veterans face serious readjustment problems. Unfortunately, the VA has felt that its ability to deal with these problems is limited both by their failure to appear until a significant time after military service, which leads to questions of VA responsibility, and by the fact they do not always constitute serious enough disorders to be defined as a disease.

This section grants the VA special and new authority to treat readjustment problems. (To receive counseling, a veteran must request it within one year of discharge or two years of enactment, whichever comes later.) To help ensure that these services will actually be used by Viet Nam veterans who might need them and who are, in many cases, suspicious of the VA, the section is designated to leave maximum room for the use of contract services. In addition, the contracting approach prevents the need for the VA to construct a huge counseling apparatus for a program which will only have to be phased out in a relatively limited time.

Precedents: Psychological readjustment legislation like that contained in Section 201 has passed the Senate in each of the last four Congresses, only to die in the House. Most recently, on March 9th, the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee reported S. 7, which provides for psychological readjustment and drug and alcohol abuse treatment within the VA. The obstacle once again appears to be the House. While much attention was provided to World War II veterans to take care of shell shock problems, no systematic program for dealing with Viet Nam veterans' psychological problems was ever set up.

Section 202: Alcohol and Drug Abuse Treatment. In June, 1977, in testimony before the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee, Administrator Max Cleland emphasized the continued inadequacies in VA alcohol and drug abuse programs. The President's Commission on Mental Health estimates 1,400,000 Viet Nam veterans (16%) need treatment for alcoholism and 200,000 to 400,000 (5%) need treatment for drug abuse. The serious implications of substance abuse require that the VA develop a comprehensive drug abuse program. Section 202 grants authority to do that along with specific mandates on types of treatment.

To ensure an effective response to the problem, treatment is provided for veterans who served in Southeast Asia and received

discharges under other than honorable conditions but who have not committed any of the more serious actions that bar veterans from benefits under Section 3103. Many veterans who developed drug problems during their service in Viet Nam received undesirable or bad conduct discharges because of those drug problems. To bar those veterans from treatment prevents them from breaking the circle of drug abuse, bad discharge and further drug abuse. In addition, special contract authority is allowed to place veterans in treatment programs with members of their family when necessary.

Special coordination provisions seek to develop employment prospects for individuals receiving treatment under the program and seek to ensure that all veterans are adequately informed of their rights under military law if they have been discharged under conditions other than honorable.

Precedents: Drug and alcohol abuse programs were in the Senate Health care bill, S.7 and the Senate 1976 Amnibus Health Care Act. The alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health programs of HEW spend over \$175 million a year.

Section 203: Choice of Health Care Facilities. For veterans who served in Southeast Asia, special options are provided for choice of facility for treatment under Sections 201 and 202. The veterans may be eligible to receive treatment from community mental health centers under the Community Mental Health Center Act, 42 USC 2689 et. seq. but the prospect of reimbursement by the VA would provide added incentive to treat Viet Nam veterans. In addition, to ensure the availability of services and to underline the over-all intent of this title to maximize contracting, this section specifically provides for contracting for private services, whenever necessary, to ensure the availability of mental health care. Payment is limited to "reasonable" charges, but to ensure the barriers to use are not created by partial payment requirements, the VA is authorized to pay 100% of such "reasonable" charges. In addition, as a cost-saving measure, payment is excluded under this section where a veteran is enrolled in any other insurance plan providing for benefits similar to those under this section.

Precedents: Allowing Viet Nam theater veterans the option of seeking psychological counseling from the provider of their choice, allows veterans to do what Medicare and Medicaid patients can do and what users of the Defense Department's CHAMPUS program can do: select their own doctor. The VA itself already does extensive contracting.

Section 204: Ombudsmen for Patients. Despite the lapse of time since a 1970 Life Magazine article first exposed inadequate health care conditions in VA hospitals, care continues to be inadequate in many ways. According to a \$6 million study by the National Academy of Sciences in 1977, both the quality of surgical care and the VA hospital environment were often deficient. To meet these needs in part, this section provides for each VA hospital to have a patient representative or ombudsman, hired by, and accountable to, the GAO, to assist veterans with complaints and to provide Congress with an oversight capacity in the hospital system.

TITLE III—EDUCATION

A serious impediment has existed to adequate use of the GI Bill by Viet Nam veterans: the GI Bill's statutory limitations allowing a veteran only ten years' use after discharge. For many veterans from the early period of the war, when benefits were inadequately low, the ten-year delimitation date has, in effect, excluded them from the GI Bill. Title III corrects this problem.

Section 301: Extension of the Delimitation Date. While some delimiting date may be necessary, the existing limitation works real inequities on veterans from the early period

of the war when the GI Bill provided inadequate payments—only \$100 per month—lower, without considering inflation, than Korean War payments. These veterans now find, when they try to take advantage of the post 1972-74 benefits program, that use is limited by the delimiting date. Eleven percent of all Viet Nam era veterans had only a year and a half after 1974 to get a college degree. This section extends the delimiting date for veterans who were discharged before December 31, 1969. Use of the new delimitation date for purposes of graduate training is excluded. The ten-year delimiting date continues to apply to veterans discharged after December 31, 1969. This partial and controlled extension not only limits costs, but it also focuses the delimitation date extension on those who need it, giving all veterans an equitable chance to use the benefit changes enacted in 1972-74.

Precedents: A delimitation date extension of a more limited nature passed the Senate in 1977. A major House effort was made in 1975 and 1976 to extend the delimiting date. An earlier effort in 1974 was successful in giving people 10 years instead of the eight contained in the GI Bill.

Section 302: Repeal of State Matching Requirement. Two years ago, the House limited a Senate-passed reform measure that offered Viet Nam era veterans a program of "tuition acceleration". Under a tuition acceleration program, a veteran who, upon completing school still has some unused entitlement, is allowed to use that entitlement to pay off any outstanding VA loans taken out to meet high tuition costs. Under the House modifications, however, the ability to do that was made contingent upon states providing a matching grant. In addition, the House required that the states set up a new fund specifically designed to meet that requirement. No state has yet passed matching legislation. Many states simply cannot afford to. The result is that the House provision has precluded tuition acceleration. Section 302 simply repeals the state matching requirement.

Precedents: Knocking out the state matching requirements restores the legislation to the condition in which it passed the Senate in 1977 unanimously.

TITLE IV—STATE HOME LOAN PROGRAM

The existing home loan program has been plagued by a number of problems. The first is that the VA ceiling on allowable interest rates, which is sometimes below the market rate, results in veterans being forced to compensate the seller for assessed points in one way or the other. This often means a higher selling price for veterans. In addition, the level of home loan guarantees, now \$25,000, is not adequate to ensure a loan for an average priced home in today's market. While the original intent was that the guarantee should be for 60 percent of the loan to serve in place of the down payment, the average home now runs \$52,000 to \$58,000 and is rising daily. The result is that veterans who cannot personally supplement the VA loan are being forced to buy mobile homes and generally cannot compete in the first-home market.

Section 401: State Home Loan Program. This section attempts to encourage answers to the home loan problem. For example, in California, a special bond issue has been floated that meets both of these problems. First, it provides additional money to make available higher loans. Second, since the money comes from a special fund, it is lent at below market rates. Section 401 authorizes the VA to pay the administrative start-up costs for states to establish similar programs. The state programs need not reproduce the California approach. They need only provide direct loans at interest rates below the prevailing market rate.

TITLE V—COMMISSION

The problems of Viet Nam era veteran policy have been relatively unstudied. While the President has established an inter-agency review of Viet Nam veteran policy, that review has remained within the confines of existing programs and has not brought into renewed question the underlying needs and structure of all veterans benefits. Not since President Eisenhower appointed the Bradley Commission has such a study been undertaken. Title V commissions a study that renews the mandate of the Bradley Commission.

THE STRENGTH OF PATRIOTISM

HON. ROBIN L. BEARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. BEARD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is troubling to me that, in the aftermath of Vietnam, the word "patriotism" has taken on almost negative tones. During the Vietnam era, patriotism was viewed by a vocal minority as a rallying point for those who chose to fulfill their commitments to the U.S. military with honor. In the years since Vietnam, as a result of our experience there, it seems there has been a deemphasis in our schools and in other aspects of our society on teaching our children the sense of patriotism that made this country what it is today. That aspect is patriotism as a source of strength and pride that enables us to survive—as individuals and as a Nation—when circumstances make it all but impossible to do so.

I would like to share with my colleagues a poem that symbolizes to me the strength derived from love of one's homeland that helped a POW from Tennessee survive 7 years as a prisoner of the North Vietnamese. The poem was written by William Porter Lawrence while a prisoner in North Vietnam. Upon his return in 1973, it was designated the State Poem of Tennessee by the State legislature. It is with a great deal of honor and pride that I present this poem to my colleagues and it is with a great deal of honor and pride that I can say Rear Adm. Bill Lawrence is a friend of mine.

Read Adm. Lawrence is now superintendent of the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis.

The poem follows:

OH TENNESSEE, MY TENNESSEE

(By William Porter Lawrence)

Oh Tennessee, my Tennessee
 What Love and Pride I feel for thee,
 You proud old state, the Volunteer,
 Your fine traditions I hold dear.
 I revere your many heroes
 Who bravely fought our country's foes,
 Renowned statesmen, so wise and strong,
 Who served our country well and long.
 I thrill at thought of mountains grand,
 Rolling green hills and fertile farm land,
 Earth rich with stone, mineral and ore,
 Forests dense and wild flowers galore,
 Powerful rivers that bring us light,
 Deep lakes with fish and fowl in flight,
 Thriving cities and industries,
 Fine schools and universities,

Strong folks of pioneer descent,
 Simple, honest, and reverent.
 Beauty and hospitality
 Are the hallmarks of Tennessee.
 And o'er the world as I may roam,
 No place exceeds my boyhood home.
 And oh how much I long to see
 My Native land, my Tennessee. ●

ASLEEP AT THE WHEEL

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Aviation Administration is indulging in a dangerous flight of fancy. The FAA appears to believe that pilots have greater than human endurance; that they can undergo the rigors of flight for extended, exhausting durations; and that the strain of long hours in the cockpit will not have telling, treacherous effects on the safety of the journey.

Present FAA regulations permit pilots to fly their craft for up to 12 hours in a 24-hour period. Who would be safe driving an automobile for such a long haul? Should we expect pilots, whose task is more delicate and demanding than driving, to be any more resistant to exhaustion and strain?

Fatigue has been identified as a major factor in many air catastrophes, yet the FAA has left the applicable regulations unreviewed, unresponsive, and unsafe. The details of this deplorable state of affairs are well-depicted in the following article by Jack Anderson which I wish to share with my colleagues:

FAA CONTINUES TO IGNORE PILOT FATIGUE PERIL

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON.—While exhausted airline pilots are dozing off in their cockpits, federal officials are snoring at their desks—unconvinced that pilot fatigue is a serious threat to safety in the air.

The Federal Aviation Administration is content with rules for pilots' hours that have gone virtually unchanged since 1934. Yet its own files are bulging with foreign accident reports that list pilot fatigue as a factor.

The ground collision that killed 571 persons at Tenerife in 1976 is an example. The Spanish accident report states that the KLM pilots were beginning to feel fatigue when they roared down the runway without clearance and smashed into a Pan Am Jet.

A Pan Am jet crashed into the Pacific shortly after takeoff from Tahiti in 1973, killing 78. The French accident report cited "fatigue resulting from the long flights made over the 18-hour period preceding the accidents" as a likely cause.

In 1977, a Fleming International cargo jet crashed on takeoff at St. Louis, killing the crew of three. According to investigators, the cause was the fatigued pilots' poor judgment and failure to follow proper procedures.

The list goes on and on. But accident reports don't tell the whole story. National Transportation Safety Board officials told us fatigue is cited in U.S. reports only when there is evidence that the pilots had been carousing when they should have been sleeping.

THEY KNOW IT

The pilots themselves know the score. "It's common as rain to see pilots napping," Capt.

William Hoover told our reporters Moira Forbes and Tom Rosenstiel.

Another pilot told of a dangerous takeoff on the seventh leg of a day-long flight. "We were so tired we drifted up to a higher altitude than we were supposed to be at, into the pattern of incoming flights," he said. "The ground controllers caught us and told us to get back down."

The story of one transcontinental cargo flight is famous among pilots. Flying at night from New York, all three pilots were asleep as the plane approached Los Angeles. While the tower tried frantically to wake them up, the plane flew over the airport and kept going. When they finally did come to, the crew found they were out over the ocean.

Two pilots told an Air Line Pilots Association task force their method for preventing such situations; two of the crew would sleep, while the third set a kitchen timer to ring every 25 minutes in case he too dozed off.

The FAA still thinks pilots are all iron men—lone eagles immune to the fatigue and boredom that overcome earthbound mortals. Reflecting this attitude, the agency's chief surgeon, Dr. H. L. Reighard, told us: "Fatigue is a subjective factor. Only the pilot knows if he is suffering from it." This is like letting every motorist decide when he's too drunk to drive.

What are the FAA rules on pilot work hours? In brief, on domestic flights, pilots can fly eight hours in a 24-hour period; on overseas flights, 12 in 21. That would be grueling enough, but the rules govern only time in flight—not pre-flight preparation or ground delays.

SIX DAYS RUNNING

Incredible as it seems, the crew of an international flight could fly for six days straight and still meet FAA rules, as long as extra crewmen and bunks are provided.

In the 1960s, when the jet boom really got going, the FAA assigned Dr. Stanley Mohler, then director of the Civil Aeromedical Research Institute, to study the problem of multiple time-zone crossings. He concluded that pilots' "behavioral integrity" was sometimes "degraded" by the long-distance flights across several time zones, causing significant impairment of psychological performance.

Mohler recommended changes in the regulations, but the FAA was unable to get the airlines and the pilots to agree on the proposed changes, so it dropped the idea.

There are some in the FAA who recognize the problem. An inspector told us, "In some flights, fatigue factors are excessive and the regulations are inadequate."

The airline industry disagrees. "Fatigue as a safety problem has not been demonstrated," a spokesman for the Air Transport Association said. Tightening the rules in unnecessary, he said—and, of course, would be very expensive.

So far the FAA goes along with the airlines, and the only changes come about as a result of contract provisions worked out between pilots and the individual airlines. In other words, because the FAA is shirking its duty, the safety of millions of air travelers may depend on the bargaining skill of a pilots' union negotiator. ●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of the Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—desig-

nated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of all meetings when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

An interim procedure until the computerization of this information becomes operational the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, April 5, 1979, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 6

- 9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Credit and Rural Electrification Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 261, proposed Agricultural Subterminal Storage Facilities Act. 324 Russell Building
- Armed Services
General Procurement Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed military procurement authorizations requests for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Defense. 224 Russell Building
- Judiciary
Antitrust, Monopoly and Business Rights Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 600, to preserve the diversity and independence of American business. 5110 Dirksen Building
- 9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To mark up S. 357, proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980, and S. 354, proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1979, both for NASA. 235 Russell Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Budget
To continue markup of the first concurrent budget resolution setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority. 6202 Dirksen Building
- *Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 755, proposed Regulation Reform Act. 3302 Dirksen Building
- Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and the Humanities Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the regulation of the treatment of independent students in the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant program. 4232 Dirksen Building
- Labor and Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of Influenza liability issues. 1202 Dirksen Building
- Joint Economic
To receive testimony on the employment-unemployment situation for March. 6226 Dirksen Building

- 2:00 p.m.
Select on Intelligence
Budget Authorization Subcommittee
To mark up, in closed session, proposed fiscal year 1980 authorization requests for intelligence operations of the Federal Government. S-407, Capitol

- 3:30 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1980 for the U.S. Marshals Service's Witness Protection program of the Department of Justice. 2228 Dirksen Building

APRIL 9

- 9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 663, to establish an Earth Data and Information Service which would supply data on the Earth's resources and environment. 457 Russell Building
- *Judiciary
To resume markup on S. 373, proposed Court-Annexed Arbitration Act, S. 237, proposed Magistrate Act, S. 567, to allow the U.S. Attorney and Assistant U.S. Attorneys for the Eastern District of New York to reside within 20 miles of the district, S. 300, proposed Antitrust Enforcement Act, S. 241, proposed Justice System Improvement Act, to be followed by consideration of the following nominations, David O. Belew, Jr., to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, Robert M. Parker, to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas, Mary Lou Robinson, to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, Harold B. Sanders, Jr., to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, and Martin F. Loughlin, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of New Hampshire. 2228 Dirksen Building
- Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S.J. Res. 28, to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States. 318 Russell Building
- Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To mark up S. 440, proposed Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act, and S. 525, proposed Drug Abuse Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act. 4232 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To resume joint hearings with the Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee on Energy Resources and Materials Production on S. 493, proposed Deep Seabed Mineral Resources Act. 3110 Dirksen Building
- Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Resources and Materials Production Subcommittee
To resume joint hearings with the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation on S. 493, proposed Deep Seabed Mineral Resources Act. 3110 Dirksen Building
- Finance
Social Security Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the activities of programs administered by the Social Security Administration. 2221 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
 *Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 To hold hearings on S. 709, proposed authorizations for fiscal years 1980 and 1981 for the U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.
 235 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
 Environment and Public Works
 Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
 To mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1980 for programs under the Toxic Substances Control Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, Ocean Dumping Act, and to consider the Environmental Protection Agency's recommendation to extend the period of availability of authorizations for wastewater treatment construction grants.
 4200 Dirksen Building
 APRIL 10

9:00 a.m.
 Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
 Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on S. 593, proposed Elderly and Handicapped Act, S. 740, proposed Homeownership Opportunity Act, and S. 745, Housing and Community Development Amendments, and other related proposals.
 5302 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
 Antitrust, Monopoly, and Business Rights Subcommittee
 To mark up S. 390, proposed Antitrust Procedural Improvements Act.
 5112 Dirksen Building

Veterans' Affairs
 To hold hearings on S. 196 and S. 741, bills to extend certain veterans' health benefits programs through fiscal year 1980.
 6226 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
 Environmental and Public Works
 Regional and Community Developments Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1980 for the Public Works and Economic Development programs.
 4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
 Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
 Environment, Soil Conservation, and Forestry Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed legislation to create a Department of Natural Resources.
 324 Russell Building

Appropriations
 Interior Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Fish and Wildlife Service.
 1223 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
 Energy Conservation and Supply Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on S. 688 proposed fiscal year 1980 authorizations for the Department of Energy.
 3110 Dirksen Building

*Finance
 To mark up S. 350, S. 351, S. 748, and S. 760, bills to encourage and facilitate the availability, through private insurance carriers, of basic health insurance at reasonable premium charges.
 2221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1980 for the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere.
 S-146, Capitol

Select on Intelligence
 To mark up, in closed session, proposed fiscal year 1980 authorization requests for intelligence operations of the Federal Government.
 S-407, Capitol

3:00 p.m.
 *Energy and Natural Resources
 Business meeting on pending calendar business.
 3110 Dirksen Building
 APRIL 11

9:00 a.m.
 Energy and Natural Resources
 To hold hearings on the nomination of June Gibbs Brown, of Colorado, to be Inspector General, Department of the Interior.
 3110 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on S. 663, to establish an Earth Data and Information Service which would supply data on the Earth's resources and environment.
 457 Russell Building

Judiciary
 To hold hearings on S. 414, proposed University and Small Business Patent Procedures Act.
 2228 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
 To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1980 for the Land and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice.
 318 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Federal Emergency Management Administration.
 1918 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
 Financial Institutions Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on S. Con. Res. 5 and S. Res. 59, both relating to the equity for the small saver.
 5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 To hold hearings on S. 758, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1980 and 1981 for programs under the International Investment Survey Act.
 6226 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1980 for programs under Sec. 305 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, and title III of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972.
 235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources
 Energy Conservation and Supply Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on S. 688, proposed fiscal year 1980 authorizations for the Department of Energy.
 3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
 Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
 To resume markup on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1980 for programs under the Toxic Substances Control Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, Ocean Dumping Act, and to consider the Environmental Protection Agency's recommendation to extend the period of availability of authorizations for wastewater treatment construction grants.
 4200 Dirksen Building

*Finance
 To continue markup on S. 350, S. 351, S. 748, and S. 760, bills to encourage and facilitate the availability, through private insurance carriers, of basic health insurance at reasonable premium charges.
 2221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1980 for the Ocean Pollution Research and Development and Monitoring and Planning Act (P.L. 95-273), and Title II of the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act (P.L. 92-532).
 235 Russell Building

Environment and Public Works
 Regional and Community Development Subcommittee
 To mark up proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1980 for the Appalachian Regional Commission, and for Title V Regional Action Planning Commissions to promote economic growth.
 4200 Dirksen Building
 APRIL 12

9:30 a.m.
 Energy and Natural Resources
 Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on S. 496, to increase the authorization ceiling for Title I of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act of 1974.
 6226 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
 Resource Protection Subcommittee
 To markup proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1980 for programs under the Solid Waste Control Act, and for the Environmental Protection Agency's research and development programs.
 4200 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
 Constitution Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on S.J. Res. 34, to extend the term of office of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to 4 years.
 5110 Dirksen Building

Select on Small Business
 Government Procurement Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on the impact on small businesses of the International Procurement Code being negotiated as part of the multilateral trade agreement.
 424 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of the Treasury.
 1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
 Interior Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Bureau of Mines.
 1223 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
 Transportation Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Transportation.
 1224 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
 Financial Institutions Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on S. Con. Res. 5 and S. Res. 59, both relating to the equity for the small saver.
 5302 Dirksen Building

- Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 796, to imple-
ment railroad deregulation.
235 Russell Building
- Energy and Natural Resources
Parks, Recreation, and Renewable Re-
sources Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on the
National Park Service's concession pol-
icy.
3110 Dirksen Building
- 2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget
estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the
Department of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building
- APRIL 23
- 10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings on United
States activities in Antarctica.
3110 Dirksen Building
- APRIL 24
- 8:00 a.m.
Appropriations
District of Columbia Subcommittee
To receive a briefing on proposed budget
estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the
Government of the District of Co-
lumbia.
S-126, Capitol
- 9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Regional and Community Development
Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed author-
izations for fiscal year 1980 for the
Public Works and Economic Develop-
ment Programs.
4200 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget
estimates for FY 1980 for the Depart-
ment of the Interior, to hear congres-
sional witnesses.
1223 Dirksen Building
- Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Economic Stabilization Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on the
administration's anti-inflation pro-
gram, and to review the relationship
between fiscal policy and inflation.
5302 Dirksen Building
- *Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 611, pro-
posed Communications Act Amend-
ments, and S. 622, proposed Telecom-
munications Competition and Deregula-
tion Act.
6226 Dirksen Building
- *Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 688, proposed
fiscal year 1980 authorizations for the
Department of Energy.
3110 Dirksen Building
- Labor and Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcom-
mittee
To resume hearings on preclinical and
clinical drug testing by the pharma-
ceutical industry.
154 Russell Building
- APRIL 26
- 8:00 a.m.
Appropriations
District of Columbia Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget
estimates for fiscal year 1980 for gov-
ernmental direction and support serv-
ices for the government of the Dis-
trict of Columbia.
S-126, Capitol
- 9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To continue oversight hearings on the
conditions, trends, and new ap-
proaches to linking education, health,
and work in the coming decade.
4232 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed bud-
get estimates for fiscal year 1980 for
the Department of Housing and
Urban Development.
1318 Dirksen Building
- Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed bud-
get estimates for FY 1980 for the Office
of Surface Mining Reclamation and
Enforcement, Office of Water Research
and Technology.
1223 Dirksen Building
- Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed bud-
get estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the
Department of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building
- Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Economic Stabilization Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on the
administration's anti-inflation pro-
gram, and to review the relationship
between fiscal policy and inflation.
5302 Dirksen Building
- *Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 611, proposed
Communications Act Amendments,
and S. 622, proposed Telecom-
munications Competition and Deregulation
Act.
235 Russell Building
- *Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 688, proposed
fiscal year 1980 authorizations for the
Department of Energy.
3110 Dirksen Building
- Environment and Public Works
Water Resources Subcommittee
To mark up proposed authorizations for
fiscal year 1980 for the Water Re-
sources Council.
4200 Dirksen Building
- Labor and Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcom-
mittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation
on biomedical research programs.
154 Russell Building
- 1:30 p.m.
Environment and Public Works
Resource Protection Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed authoriza-
tions for fiscal year 1980 for programs
under the Noise Control Act (P.L. 95-
153).
4200 Dirksen Building
- 2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed bud-
get estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the
Department of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building
- APRIL 27
- 9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on the
Civil Aeronautics Board's plan to
implement the Airline Deregulation
Act (P.L. 95-504).
235 Russell Building
- Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Gener-
ally Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 103 proposed
Save Our Schools Act, and S. 449, pro-
posed Charitable Organizations Pres-
ervation Act.
2221 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget
estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the
Department of Housing and Urban
Development, and the Neighborhood
Reinvestment Corporation.
1318 Dirksen Building
- Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed bud-
get estimates for fiscal year 1980 for
the Department of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building

*Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 611, proposed Communications Act Amendments, and S. 622 proposed Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act.

6226 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources Parks, Recreation and Renewable Resources Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on the National Park Service's concession policy.

3110 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed legislation on biomedical research programs.

4332 Dirksen Building

APRIL 30

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources Handicapped Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implications of the Randolph-Sheppard Act Amendments of 1974.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

*Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 611, proposed Communications Act Amendments, and S. 622, proposed Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act.

235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources Business meeting on pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

MAY 1

8:00 a.m.

Appropriations District of Columbia Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for public safety services and educational services for the government of the District of Columbia.

1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources Child and Human Development Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Older American Volunteer Program Act (P.L. 93-113).

4232 Dirksen Building

*Veterans' Affairs

To mark up S. 330, to provide for a judicial review of the administrative actions of the VA, and for veterans' attorneys fees before the VA or the courts, and on proposed legislation extending certain veterans' health benefits programs through FY 1980.

412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations Interior Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the National Park Service.

1223 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

*Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 611, proposed Communications Act Amendments, and S. 622, proposed Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act.

6226 Dirksen Building

MAY 2

8:00 a.m.

Appropriations District of Columbia Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for judicial services, and transportation services and assistance for the government of the District of Columbia.

1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary Constitution Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on the title I provisions under the Speedy Trial Act of 1974.

2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for HUD and independent agencies.

1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations Interior Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Smithsonian Institution.

1223 Dirksen Building

*Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 611, proposed Communications Act Amendments, and S. 622, proposed Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act.

235 Russell Building

MAY 3

8:00 a.m.

Appropriations District of Columbia Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for human support services for the Government of the District of Columbia.

1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works Resource Protection Subcommittee

To markup proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1980 for programs under the Endangered Species Act, Anadromous Fish Act, and Noise Control Act.

4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for HUD.

1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations Interior Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Energy.

1223 Dirksen Building

Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Transportation.

1224 Dirksen Building

*Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 611, proposed Communications Act Amendments, and S. 622, proposed Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act.

6226 Dirksen Building

MAY 7

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Transportation.

1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Transportation.

1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 8

8:00 a.m.

Appropriations District of Columbia Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for economic development and regulation services for the government of the District of Columbia.

1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations Interior Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Energy.

1223 Dirksen Building

*Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Transportation.

1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

*Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Transportation.

1224 Dirksen Building

*Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 611, proposed Communications Act Amendments, and S. 622, proposed Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act.

6226 Dirksen Building

MAY 9

8:00 a.m.

Appropriations District of Columbia Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Temporary Commission on Financial Oversight of the government of the District of Columbia.

1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations Interior Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Energy.

1223 Dirksen Building

*Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Transportation.

1224 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.

*Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Transportation.

1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

*Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Transportation.

1224 Dirksen Building

*Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 611, proposed Communications Act Amendments, and S. 622, proposed Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act.
6226 Dirksen Building
MAY 10

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations Interior Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Energy.
1223 Dirksen Building

Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 685, proposed Nuclear Waste Policy Act.
3110 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
*Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 611, proposed Communications Act Amendments,

and S. 622, proposed Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act.
6226 Dirksen Building
MAY 11

10:00 a.m.
*Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 611, proposed Communications Act Amendments, and S. 622, proposed Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act.
235 Russell Building
MAY 15

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To resume hearings on S. 685, proposed Nuclear Waste Policy Act.
3110 Dirksen Building
MAY 17

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building

CANCELLATIONS

APRIL 6

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
To resume hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1980 for the Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice.
2228 Dirksen Building

APRIL 10

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the role of the Federal Government in providing educational employment.
6226 Dirksen Building

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, April 5, 1979

The House met at 11 a.m.
The Reverend A. L. Wyrick, United Faith Foundation, Fresno, Calif., offered the following prayer:

We beseech Thee, almighty God, graciously incline Thine ear to this assembly set before You. Hear us, O God of our salvation. In these troubled hours confronting our Nation, hours which demand decisions of the greatest magnitude, we humbly ask for divine guidance in correctly deciding every issue before this House.

Never allow us to overlook the tragedies of injustice, nor allow our ears to grow deaf, our hearts weary of hearing the cries of the needy of our Nation and the world.

Allow us to know the inner joys of being compassionate and to lay up heavenly treasure through our kindnesses to all who reach out to us.

Grant us wisdom for today and we shall ever adore Thee. Lead us! Most merciful Lord, in the name of Thy holy Son, Jesus. 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Chirton, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 41. An act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to convey any interest held by the United States in certain lands located in Bell County, Ky., to the Board of Education, Bell County, Ky.; and

S. 832. An act to extend the authorization for the Federal Election Commission.

REV. A. L. WYRICK

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

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, the prayer this morning was given by Rev. A. L. Wyrick, an ordained Baptist minister who is also president of the United Faith Foundation of Fresno, Calif., in my district.

Known by his friends as Reverend Al, he has directed the United Faith Foundation in its numerous charitable works, including the support of food and other supplies to children in Haiti, Mexico, India, Thailand, Hong Kong, and Brazil. All this is done without regard to their religious beliefs.

I am pleased to note that Mrs. Wyrick is also here with us, as our guest today.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the inspirational message that Reverend Al has brought us. I am sure you join me in welcoming him and his charming wife to Washington and to the House of Representatives.

SOVIET JEWISH PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana. Mr.

Speaker, several of my first-term colleagues and I today had the privilege of greeting six relatives and friends of Soviet Jewish prisoners of conscience. These freedom fighters are here on a nationwide tour with a freedom van to bring attention to the plight of those who have been imprisoned in the Soviet Union on falsified charges for their real "crime" of applying for exit visas to Israel.

My colleagues and I are concerned about these cases of injustice and about the refuseniks—those who have been refused exit visas to Israel in contravention of the Helsinki accords and other international agreements. I am announcing that my colleagues and I are participating in the campaign organized by the National Conference on Soviet Jewry called Intervention 96, whereby Members of the 96th Congress adopt refuseniks. We feel it appropriate that we, the newest Members of Congress adopt those who have been waiting the longest for exit visas.

Mr. Speaker, we believe with Thomas Jefferson that liberty is a disease that is catching, and it is our duty to further its spread. Whatever enhances freedom and liberty around the world enhances it here at home.

□ 1105

"SHATTER THE SILENCE VIGIL 1979"—DR. MARKS SOLOMOVICH KOVNER

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to participate in the "Shatter the Silence Vigil 1979" on behalf of Dr. Marks Solomovich Kovner, a "refusenik" living in the Soviet Union.

Dr. Kovner's tale is a familiar one,

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House Proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.