

James Vanlangen
David D. N. Vann
Stephen S. Voetsch
Robert J. Voigt
John E. Von Gohren
Daniel R. Vortherms
David W. Walker
Jay W. Wallin
Harvey T. Walsh III
Steven D. Walton
Brian D. Ward
James A. Ward
Richard C. Warner
Thomas C. Warren,
Jr.
Patrick A. Wasilewski
Theodore J. Wasyliw
Bernard T.
Wawzenlak
James M. Weckerly

Alan M. Weigel
Charles W. Welkel
Robert S. Wels
Michael R. Weiss
Michael K. Welch
William J. Welch III
Christopher G. Wenz
Richard C. West
Thomas S. Wetherald
Alan B. Whiting
Peter D. Whitney
Scott W. Whitney
Robert A. Wiesenber
Richard D. Wilckens
Calvin R. Wilder, Jr.
Charles D. Willett, Jr.
Bryan S. M. Williams
James M. Williams III
John S. Williams
Edward T. Williamson

Michael L. William-
son
Mark S. Wilsey
Duane A. Wilson
Clifford C. Wilson
George H. Wilson
Joseph A. Wilson, Jr.
Robert J. Wilson
Mark R. Winsor
Gustav A. Wirth
James E. Wise II
John D. Withers
Thomas M.
Wittenschlaeger
John A. Wolfe
Thurston E. Womble
Chester W. Wong
Charles C. Woodward,
Jr.
The following-named (Naval Reserve
Officers Training Corps candidates) to be
permanent ensigns in the line or staff corps

Devertt D. Woolwine
Robert O. Wray, Jr.
Charles R. Wright
Paul T. Wright
David C. Wyatt
William J. Yalen
Leslie K. Yamashita
Brian S. Yanagi
David W. Yip
Richard A. Yocum
David G. Yoshirhara
Mark F. Young
David W. Zaiss
Eric Zeigler
Bradley D. Zell
James E. Ziolkowski
Glenn L. Zitka

of the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualifications
therefor as provided by law:

Lawrence R. Baun
Robert J. Gallagher

The following-named temporary chief war-
rant officer to be appointed a permanent chief
warrant officer, W-2, in the line, in the U.S.
Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor
as provided by law:

Norman C. Horn

The following-named Navy enlisted can-
didate to be appointed a permanent chief
warrant officer, W-2, in the line, in the U.S.
Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor
as provided by law:

Lewis E. Stoops

The following-named (U.S. Navy officer) to
be appointed a temporary commander in the
Medical Corps in the Reserves of the U.S.
Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor
as provided by law:

Brian S. Saunders

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WE MUST CHANGE OUR WAYS

HON. ROBERT W. DAVIS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1979

● Mr. DAVIS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, despite both the recent efforts to achieve stability in the Middle East and the detection of plentiful sources of fuel within our hemisphere, our Nation's most vital import remains gaged by the will of foreign nations. This extreme dependence must be eliminated.

The decrease in production of oil by a once reliable supplier and the recent OPEC price increases have strained our economic productivity. We can regard this current strain as an indication of a future way of life. Thus, it is essential that this dependence on Middle Eastern oil be acknowledged by all.

We can satisfy our demand for energy only by encouraging the utilization of domestic energy resources and by gradually preparing our livelihood for the eventual depletion of our conventional energy sources.

Our current consumption of fossil fuels is exorbitant. Alternative energy sources must be developed and commercialized. In the meantime, however, we must recognize that our ability to cope with the future relies on a prompt social adaptation to new patterns of energy production.

In this regard, I would like to submit for the RECORD the following article which appeared in the Alpena News:

DIVERSIFY ENERGY SOURCES

The Khomeini government in Iran wants to resume oil exports to the industrialized countries, including the United States, and may even invite Americans back to work in its oil fields. There is no reason, however, for any of Iran's oil customers to feel relieved.

The United States, Japan and Western Europe would do well to consider a worst-case scenario where the availability of Iranian oil is concerned. Even if Ayatollah Khomeini manages to consolidate his power and quiet his country, it is doubtful that Iran's

oil exports will return to the previous level of 5.5 million barrels a day—10 percent of the supply for the non-Communist world, and five percent of U.S. imports.

Energy Secretary James Schlesinger is not exaggerating, then, when he warns that the collapse of Iranian production poses a problem as serious as the 1973-74 Arab oil embargo. The embargo caused a sharp drop in supplies, but it lasted only a few months. The Iranian curtailment will last indefinitely.

Moreover, the ayatollah's new "Islamic republic" is showing signs of regarding its oil supplies as a weapon, the way some Arab leaders do. It can be presumed that Iran in the future would go along with any attempt by the Arab states to use oil to create pressure against Israel, a step which the deposed Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi refused to take. Thus, whether stability or further chaos lies ahead for Iran, its oil is nothing to count on.

None of the 18 nations belonging to the International Energy Agency has experienced a supply cutback serious enough to trigger the emergency sharing requirement of the IEA. It is possible, however, that if supplies get tighter later this year, we will be obliged to share some of our oil with other IEA members.

So far, increased production by Saudi Arabia and other exporters is covering more than half of the loss of Iranian oil on the world market, but the scramble for reduced supplies is driving up prices to the point that this is little comfort. Some oil has gone for a record \$22 a barrel—57 percent above the \$14 posted price of the OPEC cartel. An OPEC meeting in March could bring increases in the official price above those already scheduled for the balance of this year—a potential threat to economic growth and a setback in the fight against inflation.

What is emerging is not so much a visible "shortage" of oil but the kind of scarcity that disrupts the market for a commodity and bids up the price. It is beside the point whether our situation is any better or worse than it was during the embargo five years ago. This is simply the same problem, surfacing again to remind us of the vulnerability of our energy supplies to distant political events and the necessity of paying the going price for crude oil in the seller's market.

The cure for the problem is the same as it was five years ago: to diversify our energy sources so we rely less on oil, and particularly oil from the volatile Middle East to stimulate new production of oil here and

abroad, and to reduce our per capita energy consumption through conservation.

The Japanese and Western Europeans are miles ahead of Americans in adjusting their economies and life-styles to the changing realities of the energy market. Where oil is concerned, we remain the country of conspicuous consumption, representing five percent of the world's population and using 30 percent of its energy resources. We can wring our hands because a revolution in Iran threatens our pursuit of the good life, but no one can say we didn't have fair warning.●

WULF ZALMANSON, SOVIET JEWISH DISSIDENT, IS RELEASED FROM PRISON

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I have some good news that I wish to share with my colleagues. Along with four other Soviet Jewish dissidents, my adopted prisoner of conscience, Wulf Zalmanson, has been released from prison.

Wulf was one of those tried and sentenced in the first Leningrad trial in 1970, and he received a sentence of 10 years at strict regime in a labor camp. I "adopted" Wulf about 4½ years ago, and have been writing to him and to Soviet officials on his behalf since that time.

Wulf had 14 months of his sentence still to be served when the personal pardon, signed by Soviet President Brezhnev, secured his release. Anyone who has ever given any thought to the conditions under which political prisoners exist in the Soviet "gulag" will surely rejoice to learn that a man has been spared 14 months of "strict regime." Furthermore, Wulf has been granted an exit visa to leave the Soviet Union.

To my knowledge, this personal pardon granting release to Wulf and the four others, all of whom were sentenced in the Leningrad trials and none of

whom were eligible for early "parole" under Soviet law, is unprecedented. I hope and pray that this may be a harbinger of a new Soviet policy toward minorities and political dissidents, and that all prisoners of conscience in the Soviet Union may soon be released.●

ABYSMAL RECORD OF U.S.S.R. IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are concluding the SALT negotiations with the Soviet Union, it is well to remember the abysmal record of the U.S.S.R. in international relations.

My attention was recently directed to a letter, written by the Truth About Romania Committee to the Soviet Ambassador at the United Nations. The letter, which is self-explanatory, follows for the Member's attention:

TRUTH ABOUT ROMANIA COMMITTEE,
New York, N.Y., March 31, 1979.

H. E. Mr. OLEG ALEKSANDROVICH TROYANOVSKY, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative of the U.S.S.R. to the United Nations, New York, N.Y.

MR. AMBASSADOR: The Romanian Community of Greater New York is demonstrating today to protest the forcible annexation by your country, the Soviet Union, of three Romanian provinces inhabited by over 3½ million Romanians and to re-assert the rights of these people to self-determination.

You will certainly recall that on June 26, 1940, your government, taking advantage of the turbulent situation then prevailing in Europe, addressed an ultimatum to Romania demanding the cession, within four days, of the Romanian provinces of Bessarabia, Northern Bukovina and the Hertza district. Without awaiting the reply of the Romanian government, the Soviet armed forces invaded these territories the next day. Romanian troops were disarmed and the civilian population was prevented from fleeing.

This brutal and unprovoked act of aggression was devoid of any historic or ethnic justification. It was the direct consequence of the Non-Aggression Pact Stalin and Hitler concluded on August 23, 1939. By a secret protocol appended to the Pact, the two powers bearing responsibility for the outbreak of World War II, petitioned Poland and the Baltic countries. Germany declared herself disinterested in the fate of Bessarabia, while the Soviets affirmed their own interest in these Romanian lands.

France and Great Britain had given a guarantee to Romania, but were no longer in a position to honor it: France lay prostrate and Britain was in the process of evacuating its last troops from the continent. These were the conditions in which a whole province (Bessarabia), half of another (Bukovina) and the district of Hertza involuntarily came under Soviet rule. These were overwhelmingly Romanian-inhabited territories. They had formed the eastern half of the Principality of Moldavia from its very beginnings in the 14th century.

Following the incorporation of these lands, the Soviet Government undertook a brutal

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

8691

drive to russify its inhabitants. The Cyrillic (Russian) alphabet was substituted for the Latin in order to render more difficult the contact of the younger generation with Romanian culture; ancestral customs were prohibited; cultural ties with Romania were broken; hundreds of thousands of Romanians were deported to distant areas of the USSR, while other nationality groups were brought in to replace them.

The rape of Bessarabia, Northern Bukovina and the Hertza region stands out as an undeniable example of Soviet imperialism, of Soviet callousness toward weaker nations and, in the post-World War II years, of Soviet brutality in dealings with other "socialist" states. It stands as a permanent indictment of the Soviet rulers and their propagandistic slogans "about peace" and "friendship among peoples."

Americans of Romanian descent and Romanians residing in the U.S. strongly protest the continued colonialist subjugation of 3.5 million Romanians of Bessarabia, N. Bukovina and the Hertza region. They demand that the Soviet Government respect:

1. The 1711 Treaty of Lutzk between Tsar Peter the Great and Dimitrie Cantemir, ruler of Moldavia by which the river Nistru (Dniester) was recognized as the border between the Russian Empire and the Principality of Moldavia;

2. The decision of the freely elected representatives of the people of Bessarabia which on March 27, 1918 proclaimed that "by virtue of historic and national rights and on the basis of the principle that every people has the right to determine its fate, hereafter and forever unites with the Mother Country, Romania"; as well as the similar decision taken by the duly authorized representatives of Bukovina, on November 15, 1918;

3. The Declaration of the Ukrainian Rada of June 26, 1919, which recognizes the river Nistru as the final border with Romania;

4. The Charter of the United Nations which sets forth the fundamental right of people to self-determination (Chapter I, article 1, para. 2).

We believe to be speaking for the silenced people of Romania in declaring:

That the Romanian people never recognized and shall never recognize the incorporation of Bessarabia, Northern Bukovina and the Hertza region by the Soviet Union;

That the only way to redress the injustice inflicted on the Romanian people is to restore to the people of the aforesaid land the full exercise of their human rights including self-determination;

That there can be no friendly relations between the Romanian and Russian peoples as long as justice is not done.●

SENSIBLE INSIGHTS ON ENERGY CONSUMPTION

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Michael W. Hoff of Indianapolis, Ind., has sent along some sensible insights which do not require a Department of Energy to bring about:

APRIL 16, 1979.

Congressman ANDY JACOBS, Jr.,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JACOBS: I have been watching with great interest the attempts by the Government to reduce oil consumption

in the United States. I use the word attempt since most of the programs have not met with the expected success.

The main thrust of these programs seems to be aimed at the areas of largest consumption such as transportation. I have yet to see a program aimed at areas of small consumption that when put together account for a large portion of the consumption.

As an example, I use a gas powered lawn mower. Each time I cut my grass, I use about a half gallon. During a normal cutting season I will use in excess of eight gallons. Using my consumption as average, that would mean about 240 gallons would be consumed in a season on my street alone! I would be afraid to venture a guess on the consumption in the 11th District from lawn mowers alone. Think of the savings in both energy and money if push mowers were used instead of gas powered mowers! I think that this is a very practical alternative which I am going to put into practice.

Another idea I would like to present is to show home owners just where they need to put insulation to reduce heat loss in their homes. There was an insulation company in one of the northern states that offered to use infra-red film and take pictures of your home to show where heat loss was occurring. If you contracted with the company to correct heat losses, the pictures were free. If you didn't, you paid only for the processing of the film. It may have been a gimmick to get customers, but it helped greatly to reduce energy waste.

I would imagine that you and your staff could come up with even more ideas for savings by small users such as lawn mowers and small recreational "gas guzzlers." I would appreciate any thoughts you may have on this subject.

Keep up your good work in Congress!

Respectfully,

MICHAEL W. HOFF.●

HUMAN RIGHTS IN POLAND

HON. JAMES J. BLANCHARD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to call my colleagues' attention to an incident which took place in Poland a little over a month ago. It has not received much publicity—but it is an incident which holds great significance for the cause of human rights. It stands as a clear and vivid example of the continuing repression of basic freedoms under Communist regimes in Eastern Europe.

On March 21, in Warsaw, Jacek Kuron, a Polish literary figure and one of the organizers of the well-known committee for the defense of the workers in Poland, was brutally attacked. The attack came after a "free university" lecture, which was to be held in Kuron's apartment, was canceled because Kuron's father had suffered a sudden heart attack. Despite numerous calls for help, no ambulance arrived—instead, a group of 50 men armed with night sticks broke into the apartment.

Kuron's wife and son and two other members of the committee for the defense of the workers were also severely beaten, suffering possible brain concussions and internal injuries. Kuron's father witnessed the beatings and suffered

a second heart attack. The others were able to get him to a hospital only when the attackers left.

We cannot remain silent in the face of such brutal methods of intimidation and suppression. We cannot sit back and allow the victims of this oppression to stand alone and unsupported. We must make certain that incidents like this are made public; that violations of human rights are held up to the spotlight of world attention; and that those who are responsible are called to task.

By speaking out, we will at least be telling those who are most directly involved in the fight for their human rights and freedom—and, therefore, the most vulnerable—that they are not fighting alone.

Mr. Speaker, I call on each of my colleagues to join me in condemning the brutal attack on Jacek Kuron and his family and associates.●

ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF BETH EL SYNAGOGUE

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, April 28, the congregation of Beth El Synagogue in New Rochelle, N.Y., will gather to celebrate its 70th anniversary.

I am looking forward to attending the celebration and am pleased to share with my colleagues excerpts of "The Beth El Story: 1909-1979" written by Jacob Goldner:

THE BETH EL STORY: 1909-1979*

(By Jacob Goldner)

Three score and ten years ago, on March 3, 1909, fifteen humble men with high aspirations, representing about fifty Jewish families in New Rochelle, applied for a certificate of incorporation as a religious institution in order "to foster, encourage, promote, induce and advance the study of the Hebrew language and its literature."

How they would "kvel" in the knowledge that their descendants and successors not only carried out these lofty aims, but in the course of time developed this institution to its present high level of Jewish community service and national prominence in the family of Synagogues associated with the Conservative Movement known as the United Synagogue of America. Among the founding leaders whose descendants are still associated with Beth El were Israel B. Cohen, Max Goldstein and Ben Seidenstein. Their successors in early Beth El leadership included Maurice LaVine, Israel Streger, Alfred M. Hackman and Maxwell James.

Not by any stretch of imagination or science fiction could David Hays, the first Jew born in New Rochelle—who arrived in 1732—nor even the fifteen founding fathers of Beth El in 1909, have ever envisioned the present Beth El architectural gem with its three separate superb facilities for serving three basic functions of a House of God (Beth El): 1) a magnificent Sanctuary that serves as a House of Worship; 2) a functional School Wing that serves as a House of Study; and 3) a Community Center with its outstand-

ing auditorium (used also as a Ballroom) and meeting room facilities serving as a House of Assembly.

It was not until more than a century after the Hays family, particularly in the 1880's and 1890's, when the East European Jews fled from religious persecution, that any substantial numbers found a haven in New Rochelle as did the Huguenots, those other refugees from religious persecution two centuries before.

It was not until 1904, however, that the first Synagogue was erected in New Rochelle by the Orthodox Congregation Anshe Shalom on Bonnefoy Place in South New Rochelle. A few years later, in 1908, Temple Israel, a Reform congregation was organized. In 1909, Beth El (or Hebrew Institute, as it was then called) came into existence.

In 1950, Beth El's modern era began when, at the urging of some of its foresighted leaders, a four and one-half acre parcel of real estate, known as the Ernst Estate, bordering on Northfield Road on one side and North Avenue on the other side, was purchased. Almost immediately, plans were launched for the erection of a new Synagogue and Community Center. The purchase, perhaps not entirely planned that way, nevertheless, was perfectly timed to coincide with the boom in New Rochelle's Jewish population in the Fifties that saw the number of Jewish families grow to nearly four thousand by 1960 as contrasted with just about two hundred at the turn of the century.

One of the most important and exciting decisions in the history of Beth El was made at the May, 1964 meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Synagogue. By unanimous vote, the Board adopted a resolution for the immediate planning and then construction of a new Synagogue to face North Avenue adjacent to the Community Center structure. In November, 1964, President Stanley I. Batkin, in furtherance of the Board's decision, appointed Sydney Mitchell to lead a million dollar New Synagogue Fund Raising Campaign. The Drive was now officially under way and plans were soon submitted for the construction of "a contemporary building with strong infusions of tradition" to quote President Batkin. Eventually, the cost of Beth El's new Sanctuary was to exceed a million and a half dollars.

We shall temporarily conclude this continuing story by quoting from our esteemed Rabbi Melvin N. Sirner's remarks, when notified of his election as Spiritual Leader of this congregation at the Congregational Meeting on May 10, 1976.

"Happily, Beth El Synagogue begins the coming new era with many valuable and treasured assets. As I have attempted to say many times, I believe that our greatest assets—and those of the entire Jewish people—are, first and foremost, human beings—*Nashamot*."

"We are blessed with a long history and a core of veteran members of long standing whose interest in the Jewish life of our community—let it never be forgotten—has been steady and steadfast, spanning many years, often decades. Their wisdom and experience have benefitted us all, and we shall always value their help.

We have also been successful over the years—indeed to this very moment—in attracting many new Jewish families and individuals to our Synagogue. They come due to the depth and breadth of our religious educational, cultural and social programming. I am also confident that most come seeking and finding a sense of warmth, a feeling of community, a concern for the uniqueness which inheres in every individual.

I hope they find in Beth El a religious place which conducts its Services—those with a capital "S" and those with a small "s"—in a religious manner.

I believe that through great effort we have created a paradigm for integrating the veteran with the newly affiliated; for combining the wisdom of years with a receptivity and openness to the new and innovative. It seems to me that it is this combination which has given vitality and creativity to our people who have spanned millennia and lived in nearly every corner of the globe. It is this same unique and delicate combination which remains as a continual challenge to us in the future.

I know that there is so much good we can do. I assure you it can only be done together."

We pray that Beth El Synagogue in the years to come will remain true to its name "House of God"—and will continue to serve as a place for congregational prayer as well as one for lonely meditation; as a haven where one can, in the sanctity of God's presence, share life's moments of joy and find solace in time of sorrow; as a place for study and education; as a place to relax from daily mundane problems in an atmosphere of social congeniality; as an institution for the perpetuation of Jewish values; as an institution that will always be ready when needed to serve this congregation and the Jewish community from the cradle to the grave; and will continue to fulfill those modest objectives of the fifteen signers of the original certificate of incorporation in 1909 "to foster, encourage, promote, induce, and advance the study of the Hebrew language and its literature." ●

ASIAN COMMUNISM—WITHOUT ROMANCE

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, during this Nation's involvement in Vietnam, there were persons in the United States who idealized the Communist regime in North Vietnam as a freedom-loving, fair government. At the same time, these individuals cited the Governments of South Vietnam and the United States as cruel aggressors who would make capitalist slaves of the people of Vietnam. Time has proved these critics of our intentions to be wrong, as is pointed out in the following commentary by Mr. George F. Will, titled "Asian Communism—Without Romance." I commend it to your and my colleagues' attention.

ASIAN COMMUNISM—WITHOUT ROMANCE

(By George F. Will)

For several decades, since the Soviet Union lost its allure, many "progressives" have admired Asian communism—from a safe distance, of course. For such people, 1979 is becoming tiresome.

In January, Vietnam attacked Cambodia: War really is hell for a "progressive" when neither side can be called fascist. Cambodia's slaughtering of communists was an embarrassment, but so, too, was Vietnam's attack. It refuted the myth of "peace-loving" Hanoi, a myth concocted to serve the supreme myth: That Hanoi's war of aggression against South Vietnam was merely a welling-up of nationalist ardor.

Then China, which "progressives" have said "has so much to teach us," attacked Vietnam, destroying villages to "teach them a lesson." And in Paris, Jean Lacouture, a prolific journalist revered by Hanoi's Western

*Source Material: Gabriel B. Schonfeld and Stanley I. Batkin.

friends, denounced himself and others for having been "vehicles and intermediaries for a lying and criminal propaganda . . . spokesmen for tyranny in the name of liberty."

Lacouture confessed "shame for having contributed . . . to the installation of one of the most oppressive regimes [Cambodia's] history has known." And "with regard to Vietnam, my behavior was sometimes more that of a militant than of a journalist. I dissimulated certain defects of [North] Vietnam at war against the Americans. . . . I believed it was not opportune to expose the Stalinist nature of the [North] Vietnamese regime."

Michael Ledeen, writing in *Commentary*, says Lacouture's recantation is part of "the debate among French intellectuals over the nature of Communism—a debate which has now reached historic proportions." In France, philosophy, like wine, matures slowly, and some French philosophers, having read Solzhenitsyn, have concluded (better late than never) that the Gulag is the essence, not an accident, of communism.

It is quite French, this lighting upon the obvious with a proud sense of original discovery, but it is nonetheless welcome, especially because the debate is spilling into Italy. The debate there is helped along by an irony: As an Italian commentator has noted, Rome has a communist mayor who knows nothing about real communism, and a pope who knows everything about it.

And now comes another affront to "progressive" sensibilities—the movie "The Deer Hunter," winner of the Academy Award as best picture of the year. It is, primarily, a sympathetic treatment of the working-class young Americans who fought the Vietnam war. Although it deals admiringly with some martial virtues (such as bravery, loyalty and disciplined ferocity), it is in no way a celebration of war or of America's Vietnam involvement.

Nevertheless, it has been denounced by those among Hanoi's friends who cling to the old cause as if clinging to life. They detest the movie's stirring love of country, and even more its portrayal of Vietnamese communists as brutal, especially in the treatment of prisoners. That their many brutalities did not include one shown in the movie—forcing prisoners to play Russian roulette—is not the principal point of controversy. Those who denounce the movie as "reactionary" reveal how much their opposition to the American policy was rooted in anti-Americanism and a romantic assessment of Asian communism.

Captain John McCain of the U.S. Navy has not seen the movie. He saw too much of the reality. He was a POW for nearly six years, and experienced some of the "defects" of the North Vietnamese that the likes of Lacouture thought it would not be "opportune" to expose.

One day his captors told him he would be taken to meet someone identified as "an American actress who is for peace." He refused to see the actress, in part, he says, because he did not expect her to be the sort of person who would go home and tell the truth.

He also refused because of the experience of a POW who had agreed to meet with some other Americans in the "peace" movement. The "peace" people commanded the POW to confess war crimes. When he refused, repeatedly and adamantly, he heard a "peace" person suggest to his captors that "this young man needs to be straightened out in his thinking." He was hung by his wrists until an arm pulled from its shoulder socket.

For refusing to see the actress, McCain was confined for four summer months in an unventilated cubicle five feet long and two feet wide, and he was beaten and starved. Other prisoners suffering similar abuse also were made to suffer Jane Fonda's voice: The North Vietnamese piped into the cells recordings in

which she urged prisoners to actively oppose U.S. policy, and told the world how well the prisoners were being treated.

McCain recounts this without passion. He is a professional who understands that he must know the enemy, but not take things personally. ●

ATTACK ON PROFITS MISLEADING

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the administration's rhetoric on the subject of profits is a disgraceful exhibition of political doubletalk. The administration obviously does not respect the fundamental principle of the free enterprise system.

An analysis of this misuse of the profits issue by the well-known columnist, Allan C. Brownfeld, appeared April 5, in the *Lima, Ohio, News*. His article follows:

ATTACK ON PROFITS MISLEADING

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

President Carter's chief political adviser, Hamilton Jordan, has criticized business profits in the U.S. as "unnecessarily high," suggesting that the administration may take steps to curb them.

The chairman of the Council on Wage and Price Stability, Alfred Kahn, stated, "The very large increases in profits of American corporations will strengthen the widespread belief that many American businesses are not assuming their full responsibility to fight inflation. . . . The large increase puts business on trial in the eyes of the American people."

The fact is it is the Carter administration and not American business on trial—and it is the Carter administration which is responsible for our mounting inflation. It is this administration which has pushed for three increases in the minimum wage and has expanded the federal budget by 25 percent in two years. It is the administration which has presented a budget calling for a minimum deficit of \$30 billion—and then told us it was "austere."

If one examines the figures carefully it becomes clear that dollar profits per unit of output in the past year actually declined about 1.5 percent while employee compensation per unit of output rose 8.1 percent. Government is trying to make profits "a scapegoat" for its own bad policies, said Jack Carlson, chief economist of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Other businessmen point out that profits were not genuine because they contained a large inflationary element. When the costs of replacing inventories and capital equipment are correctly accounted for, they state, profits were far too low, especially if productivity, and living standards, which are falling, are to be raised.

The Wall Street Journal criticized the administration for what it called "predictable demagoguery." The Journal declared, "If you are puzzled about why the Carter administration is suddenly demagoguing corporate profits remember that it needs a scapegoat as its 'voluntary' wage-price program careens toward the total collapse that was always inevitable and is now imminent with February's 15 percent inflation."

"The question about profits ought to be whether they are high enough to keep the

economy growing at the rates we would like. By this measure, despite the surface figures, the picture is dismal. The reported figures are seriously misleading because inflation produces a gross mismeasurement of corporate profits. Billions of dollars in inventories, plant and equipment used up in production are misreported as taxable profits instead of business costs."

Economists point out that true profit picture for last year is nothing like the 26 percent fourth quarter-to-fourth quarter gain in nominal terms highlighted in the government's report. After adjustment for inflation impact on depreciation and inventory valuations, pre-tax profits in 1978 were up only 10.7 percent from the year before, not much greater than the inflation rate. These, in addition, are official depreciation figures, which underestimate capital consumption and overstate true profit.

As a percentage of gross domestic product in the U.S. corporate profits in 1978 were only 5 percent, actually lower than the year before and about the average level for the inflationary 1970s. By contrast, the average return to industry from 1947 through 1965 was 8.6 percent. To return to a healthy economy, many economists argue, profits will have to be higher. The *Journal* states: "If profits were so great, the stock market would be booming, the economy would be rapidly accumulating capital and productivity growth would be rising rather than falling. The mismeasurement of profits causes real economic problems without being employed for political demagoguery. A responsible government would take greater pains to put profits in their proper perspective."

Those working men and women who believe that high profits are against their own interests rather than necessary for their living standard to improve should examine the subject more carefully. If they do, they will find that all of us have an interest in profits. Without profits, there is no capital to invest and the economy comes to a halt, leading to unemployment and stagnation.

This was well understood by Samuel Gompers, who served as president of the American Federation of Labor from 1886 to 1924. He said, "The worse crime against working people is a company that fails to make a profit."

Profits have essentially three major functions: (1) a guide to prudent decisions; (2) a basic motivation for economic activity; and (3) a source of economic power and financial resources.

Former Treasury Secretary William Simon recently declared his concern "that the negative attitudes about profits held by much of the general public . . . may lead to restrictive public policies that would further reduce profits. This would curtail the pace of capital investment needed to create more jobs and to prepare for future growth and the real purchasing power of most Americans would suffer accordingly. It is important to realize that profits lead to more capital investment, more jobs, higher wages and, for most Americans, an increased real standard of living."

Instead of educating the American people to the realities of economics, the Carter administration is playing upon widespread economic ignorance to make a scapegoat of business and of profits. Even if such a policy were politically successful in the short run, it would be economically disastrous in the end.

"If we want to continue to improve the standard of living of Americans in the future," stated William Simon, "the best way to do so is to emphasize the successful aspects of our impressive economic system—in particular the role of profits."

Alfred Kahn and the others know this reality. Why do they choose to make political capital instead of economic sense? ●

INTELLIGENCE CHARTER LEGISLATION NEEDED

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the following editorial which appeared in the April 15, 1979, edition of the Louisville Courier-Journal.

As the editorial suggests, there are many complex issues to be considered in developing charter legislation for the Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Among such issues are: The morale and effectiveness of the Nation's intelligence agencies; the need—which undergirded last year's foreign intelligence wiretap legislation—to give intelligence agents clear legal operating guidelines; the national need for effective intelligence gathering; and, the need to protect Americans against violations of their human and civil rights.

Though the issues are complex, they should not deter the Congress from drafting charter legislation.

I hope the distinguished House Select Intelligence Committee—of which I am privileged to be a member—will take up this vexing but vital national issue.

The editorial follows:

CIA FAILURES MUSTN'T SLOW CONGRESS
PUSH FOR REFORMS

Though the barrage of criticism now is not as heavy as in the mid '70s, the Central Intelligence Agency is under fire again. This time, though, the complaints aren't directed at spying on American citizens and "dirty tricks" abroad. Instead, there is growing concern these days that the CIA is failing in its basic job: collecting and analyzing useful foreign intelligence and getting the results to policymakers, including the President.

The charges are serious. And so is the belief in some quarters that recent intelligence failures—in Iran and Afghanistan, for instance—are an argument for turning back the clock. By that reasoning, an effective CIA is one accountable neither to Congress nor to the American people, and efforts to reform the agency therefore must be dropped.

That's absurd. The sweeping investigations of the CIA in recent years by Congress, the press and President Ford's special commission undoubtedly contributed to its morale problems. They also have made the intelligence agencies of friendly nations wary of cooperating too closely with the CIA. But the CIA's most basic problems—the ones that seem to have led to its recent failures—precede the storm of adverse publicity of 1974-76.

One of these problems is the agency's heavy reliance on technical means of gathering information. Satellites, spy-planes and electronic eavesdropping are essential for monitoring military construction, missile tests, and deployment of troops, tanks and aircraft. But the most accurate reconnaissance satellite imaginable couldn't have foretold the Islamic revolution that forced the Shah to flee.

PREOCCUPATION WITH RUSSIA?

The lack of good political intelligence from Iran also reflects another CIA weakness. According to some close observers of the agency, the CIA for many years has devoted too

much attention and resources to the Soviet Union, at the expense of intelligence-gathering elsewhere, especially in Third World countries. Yet U.S. interests, especially when we are so dependent on imported oil, can be greatly affected by political movements that have little or no connection with Russian intrigues. (Lev Navrosov, a writer who left the Soviet Union in 1972, argues that the CIA does a poor job gathering economic and political information even within the Soviet Union, despite enormous effort).

President Carter's appointment of Admiral Stansfield Turner to head the CIA may have compounded the agency's problems. Admiral Turner is, by most accounts, abrasive and aloof. Morale at the agency, already battered, has worsened. In 1977, he eliminated more than 800 mostly low-level jobs. Earlier this year, another 250 employees—many of them middle- and senior-level management officials—quit or retired.

The latest wave of resignations and retirements led Benjamin Schemmer, editor of the *Armed Forces Journal*, to write recently in *The Washington Post* that Admiral Turner has been a disaster. The CIA chief, according to Mr. Schemmer, is so eager to please the Carter administration that he has skewed agency reports to support administration policies.

Mr. Schemmer, and others, also charge that under Admiral Turner the CIA's traditional imbalance between information collection and analysis has tilted even more toward collection. The result, say the critics, is that the agency is swamped with more raw data than it can evaluate. Without analysis, much of the information is useless to the President and his foreign affairs advisers.

It's almost impossible for an outsider to tell whether these criticisms are valid. Admiral Turner, of course, defends his stewardship of the CIA. And while he concedes there are morale problems at the agency, he argues that this "hasn't affected the output of the organization."

Perhaps he's right. But if the current disenchantment with the CIA's performance means there will be changes, President Carter should move cautiously. Politics may dictate that Admiral Turner be replaced. But the agency has had five directors in six years. Another change at the top might simply create more confusion.

More important than the fate of Admiral Turner, though, is the move in Congress to adopt a charter for the CIA and to reorganize the intelligence community. It is essential, if the abuses of the past aren't to be repeated, that the CIA know and play by the rules.

The CIA has an essential but unpleasant role. Its agents can't be expected to behave like Boy Scouts. But they and their bosses can be expected to concentrate on their primary mission—gathering and analyzing intelligence—without engaging in dirty tricks that embarrass our country or invade the privacy of her citizens.●

CURB WELFARE ABUSE

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that I first introduced last year to curb a still very serious abuse of the welfare system. Many aliens take advantage of public assistance funds

soon after arriving in this country. This differs from the problem of illegal aliens. Aliens legally admitted into the United States, according to figures supplied by GAO, receive over \$72 million under the supplemental security income program each year.

Supplemental security income, or SSI for short, is a welfare program for people who are aged, blind, or disabled. It distributes between \$5 and \$6 billion annually to individuals who have not paid social security taxes long enough to be eligible for social security disability benefits or old age and survivor insurance. Funds for SSI come from the general revenues, not from the social security trust fund.

SSI has been used by some aliens with legitimate need, but many exceptions occur. Frequently, the following happens:

An alien wishes to immigrate to the United States and finds an American sponsor, as required by U.S. law. The sponsor becomes responsible for the immigrant's initial stay in the country by signing an affidavit.

In the affidavit the sponsor agrees to provide for the alien's needs should the alien become indigent within 30 days after arrival in the United States. Unfortunately, however, these affidavits cannot be legally enforced under current law. And aliens have applied for SSI payments prior to the termination of the 30-day requirement.

A recent GAO report indicates that of those aliens receiving SSI payments, 15,000 began collecting within 6 months of their arrival in the United States, 23,000 collected within a year, and more than 35,000 collected within 3 years.

The bill I am introducing would help correct this problem by providing a 5-year residency requirement before most aliens could qualify for SSI benefits. It would also change the legal status of the affidavit signed by the alien's sponsor. The affidavit would be treated as a legally binding contract.

Mr. Speaker, taxpayers are revolting against the fraudulent and wasteful use of tax dollars. This bill would help correct a major deficiency in our welfare system.●

THE CATASTROPHE IN IRAN

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it is painfully obvious that the major share of blame for the loss of Iran, formerly a strong friend of our country, to an extremist, virulently anti-American dictatorship headed by Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, belongs to the United States Government. Virtually every action taken by the administration toward Iran based on a warped and bizarre "human rights" program having no basis in the realities of the Iranian situation served

to destabilize and undermine the Shah's authority. And finally, when at the strongest urging of American officials the Shah was persuaded to leave Iran instead of staying to rally support, and his designated Prime Minister, Shapour Bakhtiar, showed he was incapable of ruling or of commanding the loyalty of any Iranian faction, our Government sent our Embassy military attachés and Gen. Robert E. Huyser to convince the Iranian military leaders not to stage a coup against Bakhtiar and take control of the country.

Writing for the North American Newspaper Alliance, Col. Robert D. Heini, Jr., has written the following article on the loss of Iran comparing it to measures taken in Vietnam which I commend to your attention:

THE CATASTROPHE IN IRAN

(By Col. Robert D. Heini, Jr.)

Not that it should be any surprise, but the first foreign power to recognize the world's newest theocracy, that of Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, has been the Soviet Union.

It is exactly 40 years since Molotov, then Stalin's foreign minister, told Von Ribbentrop, his opposite number in Berlin: "The focal point of the aspirations of the Soviet Union is south of Batum and Baku, and in the general direction of the Persian Gulf."

We need to be reminded of this remark. It underpins a judgment that doesn't yet seem to have penetrated the minds of the American public, let alone—based at least on his public statements—that of President Carter: In the destruction of the Shah and his succession by the baleful, xenophobic Ayatollah proclaiming an "Islamic republic," the United States, in terms of vital interests, has sustained a loss more grave than that of the war in Vietnam.

If ever the world has witnessed a high-stakes zero-sum game, it has been this century's contest between Russia and the West for Persia, its oil and its gulf.

For four decades, the very decades since Molotov staked out Russia's aspirations in Iran, the United States, gradually replacing Britain in what Kipling called "the great game," has invested its influence, diplomacy, intelligence assets, assistance and tutelage, and, above all, its national power in keeping Iran in the Western camp.

Since 1953, this effort has entailed unremitting support for Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi, ardent modernizer, iron ruler and firm friend.

All this has now been swept away.

It is platitudinous to the point of fatuity for President Carter to express "continued hope for very productive and peaceful relations with the new government of Iran."

Within less than 48 hours after Carter said, in February, "The people of Iran will continue to be our friends," the U.S. embassy in Tehran was being overrun and sacked by heavily armed guerrillas.

Pollyanna reactions such as the above give us an example of what Henry Kissinger meant when he recently characterized the administration's foreign policies as "childlike."

In briefest terms, U.S. national interests which have been compromised by the Shah's fall include the energy lifelines of NATO, Israel, Japan and, yes, the United States; the strategic balance of the Middle East and Indian Ocean; and the stability of the Persian Gulf.

By contrast, no one to this day has yet been able to define, in terms of hard national interests, what our strategic aims ever were in Vietnam and why. No conceivable objective for the Vietnam war approaches any one of those which have already been lost or gravely jeopardized by events in Iran.

By the criteria of modernity, sophistication, security and money value, the U.S.-supplied weaponry lost with the disintegration of the Shah's armed forces greatly surpasses on all counts what was written off with the fall of South Vietnam.

In Southeast Asia, the Communists got old-model M-48 tanks. In Iran, Ayatollah Khomeini now has up-to-date M-60s, samples of which are no doubt already on their way to Russian analysts.

And what is the status of over 75 F-14 fighters bought by the Shah, accompanied by their more than 500 top secret Phoenix missiles, with associated "black boxes," representing some of the most advanced and closely guarded air warfare technology the United States can boast? The short answer is that they all now belong to the ayatollah.

As a Pentagon spokesman euphemistically put the matter, these and other highly classified U.S. technological tidbits "are in the hands of the Iranian armed forces and are presumably being secured by them." What a relief.

In Vietnam, the rough dollar value of U.S. arms lost at the end was \$2 billion. According to hasty figures put together by the Defense Department, four times that amount of U.S. arms, about \$8 billion, remains in Iran. It's a safe bet that little or none of this enormous heap of military materiel will be applied to any future purpose the United States would find useful, or in support of any imaginable Western interest.

It's another safe bet that Soviet intelligence and technical analysts are now having a free run amid the U.S. weaponry and the secret files and communications equipment of the embassy ransacked during its period in guerrilla hands.

To protect or advance U.S. interests in Southeast Asia, which were more trivial by several orders of magnitude, Presidents Kennedy and Johnson ultimately committed 549,000 U.S. troops to Vietnam.

To signify U.S. concern over the impending fall of the Shah, the administration's belated signal was to fly an unarmed detachment of 12 fighters to Saudi Arabia.

When we merely asked to position 69 U.S. Marines at a Turkish-U.S. NATO base, Incirlik, to be ready to reinforce the 19 Marines at our Tehran embassy, the Turks demurred. While the embassy was being sacked and overrun, the 69 Marines were resting on their arms at Lajes in the Azores, still roughly 8,000 miles from the scene.

No doubt the time is past when, like Lord Palmerston over a century ago, we can say the proper messengers of foreign policy are a frigate and a battalion of the line.

On the other hand, when confronted by a debacle on the order of that sustained by U.S. interests in Iran, the president of the United States ought to be able to suggest more in the way of a national response than abiding by the 55-mile speed limit and turning our thermostats down to 65 degrees. ●

SOVIET UNION'S ABYSMAL HUMAN RIGHTS RECORD

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, several of our distinguished colleagues have recently completed a trip to the Soviet Union. In conjunction with their visit, the Soviet Government has granted pardons and exit visas to five Jews imprisoned for attempting to escape the coun-

try. In addition, a number of other Jews who had previously been denied permission to emigrate were given exit visas. This event should serve to focus our attention once again on the Soviet Union's abysmal human rights record, for although it is a step in the right direction, much more remains to be done.

Earlier this month the Freedom Van, composed of six relatives and friends of Soviet Jewish prisoners, visited Washington. One of the participants in this worthwhile event was Amner Zavurov, brother of prisoner of conscience Amner Zavurov.

Amner Zavurov was born December 26, 1950, in Shakhriyab, U.S.S.R. Until his arrest in December 1976 he worked as a matchmaker, and as a mechanic. In April of 1974 the Zavurov brothers applied for permission to emigrate to Israel. But for the last 5 years they have been the target of an incredible series of moves by the Soviet authorities, moves which, unfortunately, are typical of the treatment the Soviet Union has given its Jewish citizens.

The brothers received their exit visas in August, 1975. When they attempted to use the visas, they were told that they had been revoked because of anonymous letters the authorities had received against them. The Zavurovs were not told of the contents of the letters, nor were they allowed to learn the identity of their accusers.

Without their visas, the Zavurov brothers could not emigrate. Nor could they obtain work, since their internal passports had been confiscated after their visas were granted.

As a result, in December 1976, Amner and Amnon Zavurov were sentenced to 14 days in prison for "parasitism." Less than a month later, Amner Zavurov was sentenced to 3 years in prison for failing to have an internal passport.

Amner Zavurov could have accepted the return of his passport after his visa was revoked. In fact, he was ordered to do so by Soviet authorities. And yet, to accept the passport would have meant the end of his efforts to emigrate, the end of his dream of freedom. It would have meant resigning himself to a life of subjugation in a totalitarian state. This Amner Zavurov was unable to do.

In February of 1978, two of the Zavurov brothers were allowed to emigrate to Israel. Amner Zavurov remained in prison, because he would not give up his dream of living as a truly free man.

Amner Zavurov is a victim of perhaps the most oppressive legal system in the world today. His case is only one instance of the Soviet Union's frighteningly lengthy record of human rights violations, and some might ask why we should concern ourselves with a single man, of no particular importance to the world at large. And there are those who would attack us for intervention in Soviet internal affairs. The path we must follow, however, is clear cut.

This country was settled by many men and women who knew only too well the horrors of a police state, the fear of the knock on the door late at night, the feeling that in every shadow someone was watching and listening. There are

those in America today who will never forget such memories. Nor must the rest of us forget our own history. Our national heritage of freedom and justice will not allow us to turn our backs on the victims of tyranny, wherever it exists. As long as there is one Amner Zayurov anywhere in the world, imprisoned on trumped-up charges, none of us is truly free. ●

THE EMERITUS STATUS: KEEPING THEM BUSY

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I have had serious differences of opinions with the Legal Service Corporation over how it should best spend its money.

However, the following article from the April 16, 1979, Washington Post, illustrates that the corporation does sponsor some innovative, effective programs:

THE EMERITUS STATUS: KEEPING THEM BUSY (By Lawrence Meyer)

Larry Mirel was teaching a course in poverty law at George Washington University Law School when the idea came to him. One of Mirel's students was a retired lawyer who wanted to work for a poverty law program in Washington, but he was afraid that he didn't know enough about the subject or the procedures. More than that, the retired lawyer was afraid his younger colleagues would reject him because of his age.

But where the retired lawyer had a problem, Mirel saw an opportunity to tap an available source of trained, seasoned legal talent. After a little preliminary work, he had a grant from the Department of Labor and was ready to give his idea a chance.

Mirel's idea could not have been simpler: On the one hand, Washington had any number of people who needed legal services of one kind or another but couldn't afford to pay for them. The demand for public interest lawyers far outstripped the apparent supply. On the other hand, Mirel had a gut feeling that some, if not many, of Washington's retired attorneys might want to keep a hand in their profession.

"There's a big difference between slowing down and stopping," Mirel said. "When you retire, you retire absolutely. That's nonsense." What he had in mind for lawyers who wanted to slow down but not stop was something in between—"emeritus" status.

Mirel set about to marry the need for skilled lawyers with the supply of older men and women who wanted to perform a service for the community for little or no pay. With a little help from the D.C. Bar, law schools and the D.C. chapter of the Federal Bar Association, Mirel sent out questionnaires to retired D.C. lawyers asking if they were interested in doing any work in public interest law.

About 90 retired lawyers said they were interested in doing some kind of work—full-time, part-time, in court, research, without pay or in a few instances for the minimum wage—either in principle or to establish eligibility for Social Security payments. Eventually, Mirel found positions for between 40 and 50 of those lawyers who said they were interested. He might have placed more, but he had some fairly firm rules that he followed.

Organizations who said they could use help had to have a clear idea what they were going

to do with their emeritus lawyers. Work space had to be available, along with necessary office support when needed. The atmosphere had to be dignified.

About half of the people Mirel has placed in Washington are working for the Legal Services for the Elderly program of the American Association for Retired Persons. Others are working for Friends of Superior Court, representing the interests of battered children when their parents appear in court.

A former National Labor Relations Board attorney set up a hearing procedure for the United Mineworkers pension fund, at the fund's request, and then trained retired miners to serve as hearing examiners.

Mirel is convinced that there is no reason why his idea won't work in other parts of the country and for other professions. He has a grant from the semipublic, federally funded Legal Services Corporation to study the possibility of setting up pilot projects in three other locales—Los Angeles County, Cincinnati and in Iowa.

He has indications in California that the climate there is every bit as receptive as Washington's. During a recent visit, Mirel met a lawyer in his 70s who moved to California from the Midwest because his wife wanted to live in the sun. The lawyer, who had spent his professional life in courtrooms defending insurance companies, was being bored to death.

The man found his own solution. He walked into a Legal Services program Office and volunteered his services. He now works from 8 a.m. until 6 p.m. five days a week drilling eager, but green, young lawyers in courtroom tactics. "He's teaching them the tricks of a lifetime, and they love him," Mirel said. "And he's a happy man, doing what he wants to do."

Despite apprehensions expressed by Bar association officials that lawyers would object to cut-rate competition, Mirel says that no such complaints have been made.

In fact, he now is exploring the possibility of starting similar programs for other professions. An engineer in Missouri, for example, is trying to put together an emeritus program for retired engineers.

In Washington, Mirel says he has found both the school board and teachers' union receptive to the idea of using retired teachers as tutors for students having a hard time in school. To ensure the union's support, Mirel says he wants each position filled to be certified by the union as being non-competitive and nonfillable by any active, salaried teacher.

Despite all the rhetoric of the last 25 years about using leisure time to greater advantage and enhanced pleasure, this country has not made any significant breakthroughs in finding ways to keep our older citizens active and productive when they want to be. From an economic perspective, considering the problems we face, we are wasting an enormous resource, especially at a time when rising prices and increased taxes make it even more difficult to cope with those problems.

About 24 million Americans are older than 65. That number will double in the next 50 years. In 1940, for each retired person, there were nine active workers. There now are six active workers for each retiree, and by the year 2000 there will be only three working for every retired person.

The population of the country is growing older but it is also growing more experienced. That's the other side of the coin. Some people who reach age 70, Mirel points out, "really don't want to work. They want to retire. Others are sick. Some need money. Leaving out those, I think you're left with hundreds of thousands of professionals who are ready for this kind of thing." ●

SIXTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1979

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we take special recognition of the 2 million Armenians who were massacred by the Ottoman Turks in 1915. This was the first instance of genocide warfare in the 20th century and remains one of the most shocking and deplorable acts ever perpetrated by one people against another. However, this historic event not only threatened the Armenian people with extinction which was the goal of the tyrants of the Ottoman Government; but also produced an unfortunate precedent, that of world inaction.

While we are caught up in the events of today and in trying to ascertain the future, it is important for us to review the events of the past. One such event was the systematic massacre of the Armenian people. Again, this year, we should remember those martyrs, and rededicate ourselves to a renewed reverence for human life.

The history of the Armenian people has been marked by long periods of subjugation to foreign rule. As early as the 16th century, nearly the whole country was overrun and held by the Ottoman Turks. The coldblooded massacre in 1917 by the Ottomans sought to completely eliminate the possibility that Armenia might someday become independent. Today, the historic Armenian area in what is now Turkey, is totally devoid of Armenian people, while the Soviet Union holds the Armenian people captive in the area known as Soviet Armenia.

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

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

Nevertheless, despite the crimes of the Ottoman Government, the Armenian people survived. In 1918, through the

efforts of President Woodrow Wilson, the boundaries for a free and independent Armenia were established. The little republic was formally recognized by the United States. However, weakened by the genocide, the Republic of Armenia fell 2 years later—this time to the Soviet Union. Today, there are tens of thousands of Americans of Armenian descent living in the United States, upholding the principles of liberty and justice we all cherish so dearly. But the scars of the crimes committed against their ancestors still remain.

The Armenian people have demonstrated throughout history, their fortitude, stamina, and tenacity in maintaining their church, culture, and language. The existence today of this Armenian spirit is the foundation that will lead to the ultimate restoration of a free Armenian nation.

In remembering the severe injustices suffered by the Armenian people, we remind ourselves that crimes of this kind must not be repeated, and pledge to remain vigilant in opposing all such atrocities. ●

STATE OF NEW YORK RECOGNITION OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR FOR WILLIAM JAMES INCIDENT AT LANZERATH

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a lot in recent weeks about the Battle of the Bulge, the heroism of 18 men of the Intelligence and Reconnaissance Platoon of the 394th Infantry Regiment, 99th Division, and particularly an undecorated hero of that incident, Pfc. William James (Tsakanikas).

Two bills (H.R. 3225 and H.R. 3407) have been introduced in the House of Representatives, and in the Senate, Resolution 135—on Will James' behalf. The purpose of the legislation introduced by Senator JAVITS and me is to authorize the President to take appropriate action to award the Congressional Medal of Honor to Pfc. William James Tsakanikas, posthumously.

Gov. Hugh Carey of New York issued a proclamation on April 6, proclaiming April 7, 1979, as, "Incident at Lanzerath Recognition Day." The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION

On December 16, 1944, an American Army intelligence and reconnaissance platoon of 18 men halted an entire column of German panzers, paratroopers and SS troops during the opening hours of Hitler's Ardennes offensive to encircle the American divisions in the Bulge and to seize Antwerp, Belgium.

The extraordinary bravery and heroism demonstrated by this American platoon has gone largely unchronicled and unrecognized. If Hitler's troops had not been held in the village of Lanzerath, Belgium for those critical 18 hours, the Germans could have won

the Battle of the Bulge, and the entire face of the war in Europe would have been dramatically changed.

One of the undecorated heroes of the platoon was a New Yorker, PFC William James. He died in June, 1977, after undergoing 36 operations to reconstruct his face as a result of severe wounds suffered during his courageous stand in 1944 against overwhelming odds. On Opening Day of the 1979 baseball season at Yankee Stadium, his widow was honored and threw out the first ceremonial ball.

It is highly fitting for all New Yorkers to recognize the unsurpassed heroism exemplified by this platoon in the annals of World War II history. Efforts to bring recognition to its members should be encouraged and supported.

Now, therefore, I, Hugh L. Carey, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim April 7, 1979, as "Incident at Lanzerath Recognition Day" in New York State. ●

CAESAR BELTRAN, 1979 CALIFORNIA SMALL BUSINESSMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, there are times when we learn of success stories so compelling that the mere retelling does not come close to describing adequately the pain, suffering and simple hard work that are necessary for an individual to succeed in our American system.

Today, I am happy to relate to my colleagues an incredible tale of an industrious man of foreign birth, who invested his life savings and borrowed additional funds to go into business for himself 12 years ago and today has built that business into one grossing more than \$2 million a year.

That man, Caesar Beltran, who lives in Tustin, Calif. in the 40th Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, has been selected for his outstanding management and success to be the 1979 California Small Businessman of the Year by the U.S. Small Business Administration.

It was in 1967 that Mr. Beltran and his wife, Fay, pooled their resources, borrowed what they could, and bought a small neighborhood grocery store in Santa Ana, Calif.

The first year the store, called La Chiquita or "Little One" in Spanish, grossed \$73,000, a pittance for the low-profit grocery business.

But as the years went by, Caesar Beltran built his business steadily, without benefit of Federal loans or subsidies, repaying the original indebtedness and even sustaining a crushing loss as the result of an armed robbery.

Six years after Caesar and Fay Beltran opened their business, there were enough savings to purchase a full market, the Norriss Superette in Santa Ana. Last year, Mr. Beltran was able to purchase a second store, La Grand Market, also in Santa Ana.

Building on this success, the earnings

from the two stores, Caesar Beltran was able to finance the start-up of a liquor store. Even though he sold La Chiquita, the original store, it remains in family hands, with Caesar's brother, Jim, now owning and operating the store.

Mr. Beltran is a native of Chihuahua, Mexico, arriving in Orange County with his family when he was 4 years old. He attended Irvine Grammar School on the Irvine Ranch, graduated from Garden Grove High School and attended Fullerton Junior College.

In addition to his business activities, Caesar Beltran also has been active in his community. He has sponsored a girls' softball team, a boys' soccer team, and helped organize a Cub Scout pack. He is active in the Mexican-American Grocers Association and was a vice president and a member of the founding board of directors of El Banco del Pueblo, now known as the Santa Ana State Bank.

Caesar Beltran, his wife, Fay, their children Cindy, 11, and Kris, 9, and other members of their family will be present at a luncheon on May 3, 1979, in Santa Ana, when community leaders of Orange County will join with Federal officials to salute him as the California Small Businessman of the Year for 1979.

I am proud of Caesar Beltran, just as I am sure that all Members of this body are proud to know of a man who has made an important contribution to his community, his State, and to America. ●

WGSM EXPRESSES SOME WELL-REASONED THOUGHTS ON THE FUTURE OF NUCLEAR POWER IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, thousands upon thousands of words were written and spoken in the wake of the near-disaster which occurred last month at the nuclear power plant at Three Mile Island, Pa. Unfortunately, much of the discussion was highly emotional and did little to enlighten an already confused public.

However, a radio station serving my Fourth Congressional District, WGSM, Huntington, Long Island, aired an editorial on April 8, just 10 days after the accident, which performed an admirable public service in offering some calm, responsible, judicious, and well-reasoned thoughts to WGSM listeners on the accident, and its possible effects on the future of nuclear energy in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the thoughts expressed in the WGSM editorial are of value to all of us in the U.S. Congress as we begin to review the nuclear energy policies of our Nation in the light of the Three Mile Island accident. I offer the editorial to my colleagues at this time for their thoughtful consideration:

THREE MILE ISLAND

It's easy to jump to conclusions about the near catastrophe at the Three Mile Island

nuclear plant. The anti-nuclear forces are calling for a cessation of construction of nuclear plants or, at least, of the plants manufactured by the company that constructed the Three Mile Island facility and they're even asking for the closing down of all nuclear plants.

Nuclear manufacturers are claiming that the concern about Three Mile Island is largely unwarranted. They point out there was no explosion, no one was killed, no one was even hurt and, indeed, that the emergency systems at the plant worked.

WGSM believes neither conclusion is justifiable and both are presumptuous and premature. Only time will tell if the hundreds of thousands of people who live in the vicinity of the plant will be affected adversely in future years. The imminent, uncontrolled danger at Three Mile Island, the touch and go nature of the entire event indicates we don't know as much as we thought we did about controlling nuclear energy. Present technology and procedures need a long, hard look, but, closing down or cessation of construction of nuclear plants is not warranted at this time.

We keep talking about the development of alternate energy sources. The world is running out of oil. Nuclear energy is one of those sources. It is part of the energy mix of the future. It will not solve all our problems. It's an expensive method of producing energy and a limited one as well. But, without it, our energy problems will be even worse than they are now.

If the public did not know it before, they must know now, nuclear power is not and never will be without danger. But, we can do better. Nuclear plants should be monitored directly by the federal government so that malfunctions can be detected instantaneously. Trained federal disaster teams, of the sort sent out after an airplane crash, should spring into action at the first hint of trouble and be in charge of the situation. One government spokesman, perhaps the team chief, on the scene should disseminate information and deal with the press.

The training of personnel at nuclear plants, the design of systems and the safety of basic construction can be improved. It should not, for instance, be possible for one person to override an emergency back-up system and jeopardize hundreds of thousands of lives as seemingly happened at Three Mile Island.

If there are no long term negatives from the mishap at Three Mile Island and this scary episode causes us to reappraise the role of nuclear energy, it could be a blessing in disguise. ●

AMENDING THE DEFINITION OF AN UNRELATED TRADE OR BUSINESS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN QUALIFIED CONVENTION AND TRADE SHOW ACTIVITIES OF CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

HON. ED JENKINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from the definition of an "unrelated trade or business" the qualified convention and trade show activities of a section 501(c)(3) organization. This bill was passed by the House of Representa-

tives last year as H.R. 12828 under a suspension of the rules but was unable to receive Senate consideration in the final weeks of the 95th Congress.

Under the code, section 501(c)(3) organizations are generally considered charitable organizations. Under the provisions on exempt organizations, an organization's "unrelated business taxable income" is its gross income from any unrelated trade or business less deductions which are directly connected with the carrying on of such trade or business. An "unrelated trade or business" is a trade or business the conduct of which is not substantially related to the exercise or performance by the organization of its exempt function.

The Tax Reform Act of 1976 amended section 513 of the Internal Revenue Code to exclude from the definition of "unrelated business taxable income" any income derived from a qualified convention and trade show activity carried on by an organization which is exempt under section 501(c)(5) and section (c)(6) of the code and which conducts regularly as one of its exempt purposes a convention or trade show activity which stimulates interest in, and demand for, the products of the industry in which the organization's members are generally engaged. It is believed that section 501(c)(3) organizations were inadvertently overlooked in the effort to complete congressional action of that act.

A colloquy between Senator Long and Senator TALMADGE during the Senate's consideration of the conference report on the act indicates that section 501(c)(3) organizations were entitled to inclusion under the act although the conference committee draft had left it out. My bill would clarify this point.

Specifically, my bill would exempt from "unrelated business taxable income" any income derived from an otherwise qualified convention and trade show activity, including the leasing of exhibition space to suppliers who take orders from the organization's members, if a purpose of the organization in sponsoring the activity is the education of persons engaged in the industry on the development of new products and services or new rules and regulations affecting the industry.

The effective date in this bill is October 4, 1976, to coincide with the date of enactment of the Tax Reform Act of 1976. The revenue effect is negligible according to estimates of the Joint Committee on Taxation made last year. The bill was projected to decrease budget receipts by less than \$1.0 million annually.

This bill will benefit charitable organizations which sponsor conventions to educate their members. These organizations under the existing Treasury interpretation cannot exclude income derived from their lease of space to exhibitors from their "unrelated business taxable income." Public hearings held in the Subcommittee on Miscellaneous Revenues of the Committee on Ways and Means last year documented the desirability of enactment of this bill.

Hopefully, the House will complete the action that we began last year by passage of this bill. ●

A LOOK AT THE FORGOTTEN TAX CUT OF 1948

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, this week's edition of Human Events has an excellent article on the 1948 tax cut—the forgotten tax cut of American history.

The 1948 tax cut blunted the expected post-war recession and expanded jobs and production, without any noticeable increase of inflation. Most importantly, the tax cut allowed the working people of America to take home more of their paychecks.

I suggest there are lessons to be drawn from the 1948 tax cut which Congress should apply today.

There's one more reason why I think the Human Events article on the 1948 tax cut is significant. It is written by Frank Gregorsky, a junior at West Georgia College, where I taught geography and history until last year. Although he is still a year away from graduation, Frank's excellence in scholarship and writing is demonstrated by this achievement.

Finally, I am pleased that Frank will be serving as the LBJ intern in my office during his spring academic quarter. Frank has an active mind and a deep interest in better Government. His excellent research, good ideas, and commonsense are helping me to better serve the people of Georgia.

I invite each of my colleagues to read his article, which is reprinted here.

1948 TAX CUT: SOME LESSONS FOR 1979

(By Frank Gregorsky)

The fight for permanent reductions in the federal income tax will take on new importance if the U.S. economy slips into a recession this year. Advocates of the Kemp-Roth bill have already done much to convince the Congress and the public of the multiple benefits such a cut would bring to the nation, yet they spent much of 1978 contending with the pious hypocrisy of big-spending liberals. The latter claim that a tax cut the size of Kemp-Roth would cause "roaring inflation."

The tax cut forces will face similar arguments during this session of Congress, but important historical evidence exists which virtually demolishes liberal claims that permanent tax cuts will greatly worsen the inflation rate. This evidence is even more compelling than that of the 1964-65 Kennedy-Johnson tax cut, which has often been cited as proof that Kemp-Roth will do what its backers predict.

A Republican-controlled Congress passed a sweeping cut in the federal income tax in 1948. President Truman and his Keynesian advisers attempted to stop it, and predicted it would cause more inflation. Yet it made no obvious impact on inflation, and actually prevented the 1949 recession (one of the smallest of the post-war slowdowns) from being much worse than it was.

After the 1946 elections, the Republicans controlled Congress for the first time since the days of Hoover. They had exploited labor unrest, shortages, and high taxes, as well as the perception that Harry Truman was beyond his depth in the White House.

While not actually the majority leader, Sen. Robert A. Taft of Ohio called the GOP's shots on domestic policy in the upper chamber. He agreed with the move to cut taxes being launched by some of his House colleagues in early 1947, and complained that federal, state and local taxes constituted 30 percent of the national income. Taft said that high taxes discouraged "the use of brains, ability and hard work which lies at the very basis of developing our productivity, our prosperity, and our jobs."¹

From March through July 1947, Round 1 of the tax fight between Truman and the GOP Congress raged. Two tax cuts were passed by impressive margins. Each was successfully vetoed by the President. Both bills would have cut taxes by from 30 percent in the lowest brackets to 10 percent in the highest brackets, as well as raised the personal exemption for those over 65 from \$500 to \$1,000. The first bill was to have been retroactive to Jan. 1, 1947; the second would have delayed the cuts until July 1, 1947.²

Leon Keyserling, Truman's CEA chairman, told his boss that such a massive tax cut was dangerous in view of 1947's double-digit inflation. Truman also preferred to keep his options open, since the government was running a slight budget surplus. He thought he might need it for foreign aid or social welfare spending.

Those seeking a tax cut, according to Susan Hartmann's masterly study, *Truman and the 80th Congress*, said that "In the long run . . . the tax reduction would contribute to a high level of employment and business activity by strengthening managerial and investment incentive" (emphasis added), and serve as a "hedge against recession and cumulative deflation."³ The more conservative Republicans in Congress also viewed a tax cut as a way to prevent the President from enlarging New Deal-type programs.

Administration forces said that labor and material shortages were limiting production; therefore more risk capital would only be a sop to business and fail to expand the economy. Unemployment in 1947 averaged 3.9 percent, and that year saw a 12.3 per cent rise in consumer prices.⁴

Truman's two vetoes had made him the victor in Round 1. Round 2 began in January 1948, when Truman asked Congress for a forerunner of the McGovern "\$1,000 Demogrant." The President wanted a \$40 tax cut for every taxpayer and each dependent, to be offset by raising the corporate tax rate from 38 to 50 percent. Republicans revolted that such a scheme would be more inflationary than anything they had come up with, because all of the effective relief would go to those that spent all of their income.⁵ Actually, Truman knew his "shift-the-wealth" plan did not stand a chance in Congress, but it was to serve as a political prop for his populist electioneering in the 1948 campaign.

By late March, congressional Republicans had brought to the floor a tax cut bill designed to attract scores of moderate Democrats. It did, passing in both houses by veto-proof majorities.

Built upon the previous year's bills, the new bill included a feature popular with Democrats (but fought by Truman)—income splitting. This allowed a married couple with only one working spouse to divide their annual income by two, file a joint re-

turn, and take even greater advantage of the new lowered rates.

For a single person with no dependents, the bill cut taxes by from 10 to 100 per cent in the under-\$10,000-brackets. Singles above that level got cuts of from about 10 to 5.5 per cent, on a more-or-less declining basis up into the highest income brackets. The income-splitting provision had the effect of vastly increasing the tax break for marrieds in certain middle-income brackets. For example, a couple with two dependents earning \$20,000 would be entitled to a 34 per cent cut in their federal income tax.⁶

Truman's veto and the successful vote to override it both came on April 2, 1948. Noted the New York Times, "It was one of the worst defeats the Democratic President had suffered at the hands of the Republican-controlled legislature. . . . The House ballot was 311 to 88. . . . The Senate completed enactment of the bill by 77 to 10. . . . The tax cuts are retroactive to January 1. Employers will begin withholding at the lower rates on May 1. Overpayments in the first four months of the year will be refunded by the Treasury after taxpayers have made their final returns for 1948."⁷

"Reductions in taxes on 1948 income are provided every one of the 54,500,000 individual taxpayers," said U.S. News & World Report. "Some are to save much more than others, but the average saving is to be 21 per cent. The taxpayer base will be narrowed. With higher personal exemptions [raised from \$500 to \$600] for everybody and special exemptions for blind and aged persons [an additional \$600], about 7,400,000 low-income taxpayers will be dropped from the rolls."⁸ Of the \$4,772,600,000 cut, only \$199 million did not come from income taxes—it went for cuts in estate and gift taxes. There were no specific tax breaks for business.

It is important to note the relative bigness of the revenue loss Congress was voting—\$4.77 billion out of a federal budget of about \$40 billion in the space of one year. This is proportionately a greater cut than is involved in either the Kennedy or Kemp-Roth measures, which were or would be spread over two and three years respectively.

Also, it is very unlikely that a GOP Congress would have voted such a cut without an eye toward the \$7-billion surplus the U.S. Treasury was sitting on in April 1948. This surplus did not seem to be acting as a brake on inflation, and Republicans preferred to pump it back into the economy via tax cuts rather than let the Democratic Administration earmark it for public works or foreign aid.

Surplus or no, Truman's veto message hit hard on the danger of fueling inflation: ". . . to reduce the income of the government by \$5 billion at this time would exhibit a reckless disregard for the soundness of our economy and the finances of our government. . . . The bill would greatly increase the danger of further inflation, by adding billions of dollars of purchasing power at a time when demand already exceeds supply . . . and when government expenditures are necessarily rising."⁹

Truman, as do his Democratic descendants in 1979, ridiculed the GOP pitch on incentive. "It has been argued that tax reduction now would furnish incentives for more active investment and business enterprise and, consequently, more production. The plain facts show that neither funds nor profit incentives are lacking for investment and business enterprise at present tax rates." As his evidence, the President mentioned record corporate profits and industrial expenditures. "The resources and labor force of this country are fully employed. Under these circumstances, tax reduction could only result in higher prices—not in higher production."¹⁰

Truman made a stronger case for his anti-inflation warning than did opponents of the Kennedy tax cut in 1963 or opponents of the Kemp-Roth tax cut in 1978. After all, was unemployment not already low? Weren't corporate profits at new highs? Was demand not peaking? Was incentive not adequate with the present tax rates? Was inflation not better dealt with through controls (a Truman favorite) than through misguided efforts to boost production? Truman's economists no doubt felt sure they were giving him sound advice.

The Consumer Price Index in 1948 dropped slightly from mid-January to mid-March, then resumed its upward movement sharply in April. The tax cut went into effect May 1, and the rate of increase in the CPI slowed somewhat.

June, July and August saw rises greater than May's but less than April's. September saw another price decline which—surprise—began a trend that carried well into 1949. When food prices are separated from other items in the CPI, they are found to be the real culprit, contributing to most of the April through August price increases.¹⁰

The Index of Industrial Production began to rise in April. Second and third quarter corporate profits rose sharply, after having stayed level in the first quarter. The unemployment rate was about 1 percent lower in October than it was in April. By December 1948, the CPI was about where it had been on the day the "inflationary" tax cut took effect.¹¹

As Time said about the bill when it passed Congress, the 1948 tax cut "at least and at last paid some attention to the usually overlooked middle class."¹² Everyone had benefited from it, in fact—the poor, the blind, the old, and, indirectly, business. On top of this, statistics indicate it had at least a mildly positive impact on the 1948 economy. Production and profits went up, unemployment went down, and the tax cut's effect on inflation was negligible or nil. Perhaps the increased production cancelled out what might have been expected to be an inflationary surge. In any event, 1948's overall rate of inflation was over 4 percent less than that of 1947.¹³

The Administration was probably dumbfounded but happy at this turn of events. Truman's economic credibility was diminished, but opponent Tom Dewey declined to defend the record of the Republican Congress against Truman's slashing attacks.

What if Robert Taft had won the Republican presidential nomination and faced Truman that fall? With his commitment to limited government, he surely would have spelled out the lessons of the tax cut. As it turned out, the voters (or at least the 49 percent that voted for Truman) repudiated the works of the 80th Congress by making its successor Democratic.

Truman's 1949 State of the Union speech came in the midst of falling prices and fears of a recession. Despite this, he asked Congress for a \$4-billion tax increase—as well as higher Social Security payments, more "public power" and cradle-to-grave national health insurance. One month later the economy went into a five-month recession, which lasted through July 1949.

By late spring, the White House had given its tax hike idea a quiet burial. Sen. Walter George (D-Ga.) had publicly stated that Truman's tax program, if passed, would cause a "sizable depression."¹⁴ George and many other Democrats in Congress were no doubt doubly satisfied with their votes to override Truman's veto the previous spring.

Remember that, as the recession started in February, the Treasury was beginning to refund all the taxes that were overpaid in the first four months of 1948 (due to the retroactive nature of the tax cut). If this money

Footnotes at end of article.

had stayed in the Treasury, how deep would the recession then have been? As icing on the cake, the 1948 tax cut that had increased everyone's standard of living was almost a year later working to modify a recession observers had feared would be much worse when it finally came.

How mild was the recession of 1949? Mild enough so that the GNP in constant dollars managed to grow that year (as it did not in the recession years of 1954, 1958, 1970 and 1975), although by only a tiny bit. Average unemployment in 1949 was 2 per cent higher than in 1948, but this was "compensated" for by a 1 percent drop in the CPI during 1949.¹²

"The recession of 1949 is turning out to be largely a businessman's recession," wrote U.S. News & World Report in August. "Business has reduced its buying [and] made sharp cuts in spending for new plant and equipment. Individual consumers, on the other hand, have gone ahead, spending freely."¹³ A good case can be made that, had the tax bill included some breaks specifically for business, this "businessman's recession" would never have occurred at all!

Anyone, Keynesian or otherwise, would have to agree that the tax cut Truman tried to thwart and later sought to repeal (which would have been the effect of his tax hike) forestalled an economic disaster which his liberal CEA did not even see coming as late as January 1949. This, in my view, is one compelling reason why the liberal Keynesians who write our economic history seem to pretend that the 1948 tax cut never happened.

Noted H. A. Holmans: "If there ever was a case of broadly sound economic measures being taken in very good time through good luck rather than good judgment, this was it."¹⁴

Thirty years later another Democrat sits in the White House. As did Truman, Carter prefers to battle inflation with "controls" rather than increased production. As did Truman, Carter has grandiose designs on the Treasury for programs like national health insurance. As did Truman, Carter opposes any plan to transfer large sums of money from the government back to the taxpayers. As did Truman, Carter chooses to fight inflation ineffectively rather than hedge against recession constructively. As did Truman, Carter will not even utter the word "recession" until we are knee-deep in one.

If Democratic myopia at the top levels of power is as bad or worse than it was then, there is always hope for enlightenment elsewhere. Taft and his troops said that government was eating up 30 percent of the national income in 1948. Kemp and his allies can point to a 45 percent figure for government today. Taft said production and incentive would bring lower prices—Kemp has been saying that for years. Taft said that \$10 billion for social welfare programs was turning the nation against its individualistic heritage. HEW is spending 20 times that amount today—and just about anyone favoring a tax cut in 1979 has the right to know what Joe Califano is doing to make this economy more robust!

The liberals say spending cuts must accompany tax cuts, yet they vote against both. The 80th Congress managed to cut a little from Truman's fiscal 1948 budget, but they voted a tax cut many times larger than the amount they trimmed the budget. If this was done in 1979, say the liberals, massive inflation would be touched off. It is the same thing their ancestors said in 1948.

The cut of 1948 was proportionately bigger than anything Messrs. Kemp and Roth propose in 1979, yet a booming, inflated economy, with higher demand and lower unemployment than we have today, put all that extra money poured back into it to work, producing (1) more goods, diminishing or

negating attendant inflationary pressures; and (2) more jobs, bringing down unemployment. As an added bonus, the 1948 tax cut saved the U.S. from having to face a severe recession in 1949. There is far greater chance of such a decline now, in 1979, as the American economy staggers under masses of regulations, limping along with a growth rate less than half its inflation rate.

The historical precedents of free market tax policies will serve well those who are fighting to save the American economy for the 1980s.●

FOOTNOTES

¹ James T. Patterson, Mr. Republican: A Biography of Robert A. Taft (Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston, 1972), p. 373.

² Susan Hartmann, Truman and the 80th Congress (University of Missouri Press; Columbia, 1971), pp. 74-79.

³ Ibid., p. 75.

⁴ Campbell R. McConnell, Economics (sixth edition) (McGraw-Hill; New York, 1975), front flap.

⁵ "The Presidency," Time (Jan. 19, 1948), p. 19.

⁶ "Revised Rates for Taxpayers in Various Categories," the New York Times (April 3, 1948), p. 2.

⁷ "Congress Kills Veto, Taxes Cut \$4.8 Billion," the New York Times (April 3, 1948), p. 1.

⁸ "Text of President Truman's Message in Vetoing Tax Reduction Bill," the New York Times (April 3, 1948), p. 2.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ "Chart of the Consumer's Pocketbook," the New York Times (April 3, 1948), p. 2.

¹¹ Commerce Department charts as seen in "The Annual Economic Review," published in U.S. News & World Report (Jan. 13, 1950) pp. 64-68.

¹² "The Congress," Time (April 12, 1948), p. 20.

¹³ McConnell.

¹⁴ As quoted in U.S. News & World Report (April 8, 1949), p. 46.

¹⁵ McConnell.

¹⁶ "Business Leveling Out Now for Upturn Early in 1950," U.S. News & World Report (Aug. 19, 1949), p. 11.

¹⁷ Holmans, United States Fiscal Policy, 1945-1959 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 100.●

THE PROBLEM OF FRAUDULENT ADVERTISING UPON THE ALASKAN ECONOMY

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues, a problem that has turned into a perennial affair. Every spring, publications in the lower 48 States seem to contain fraudulent ads telling job seekers to send in a certain amount of money in exchange for information that will get them high paying jobs in Alaska.

For example, some ads state that some "1,320 current employers—exist—in the Arctic." This is false. In conjunction with this falsehood, they offer to refund the paid-in fee of \$9.95—and the \$1 goodwill deposit—if the applicant does not obtain Alaskan employment within 90 days.

It is disheartening to learn that many

unemployed people in the contiguous 48 States read these ads and then blindly take off for Alaska. These people arrive in Alaska broke, disappointed, uninformed and without means to return to the lower 48.

Mr. Speaker, Alaska has the highest unemployment rate in the Nation, and for the foreseeable future, we have enough residents to fill all job openings. For your information, and for the information of my colleagues, the State of Alaska's Department of Commerce and Economic Development has estimated the overall rate of unemployment for 1978 to be 9.5 percent. The 1979 forecast is 9.8 percent. In some areas like Fairbanks, the current unemployment rate ranges from 14 to 17 percent.

I am not proud of these statistics, nor am I trying to discourage people from moving to Alaska. I am only cautioning people to research the facts about Alaska before attempting to take up residence in the 49th State.

Historically, Alaska has endured what is known as a "boom-bust" economy. As you know, for a period in the 19th century, thousands of people flocked to the fields of the Klondike in search of gold and fortune. The discovery of oil and vast quantities of other precious resources have only served to perpetuate this "boom-bust" economy. During the "boom" periods, jobs were plentiful to a certain degree. Currently, however, Alaska is going through a period of transition. The "boom" of the trans-Alaska pipeline is over and Alaskans are attempting to develop a more predictable and stable economic base. Misleading advertisements placed in certain publications only serve to do a disservice to Alaskans as well as the readers.

I urge my colleagues to take the responsibility of educating the constituents in their respective districts on this matter. Instruct them to disregard the myth about Alaska; encourage them to discover the facts about the Nation's 49th State.●

NEED FOR THE CVN CARRIER

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, last year, when President Carter vetoed the defense authorization bill, he did it because the bill contained funds for a nuclear aircraft carrier. At that time, he also said that he would, in the fiscal year 1980 authorization bill, request funds for an aircraft carrier, but he did not say what kind. I think he should ask for the best we can build—the CVN, the Nimitz-class nuclear aircraft carrier.

I would not go into the reasons why we need the CVN. The reasons are many, varied, and compelling, and the following article by former Secretary of the Navy J. William Middendorf and former Chief of Naval Operation Adm. Thomas

H. Moorer, U.S. Navy, presents them most convincingly. I would hope that all of us here will have a chance to study their essay prior to our deliberations on the fiscal year 1980 defense authorization bill:

THE UNITED STATES NEEDS ANOTHER
NUCLEAR CARRIER—NOW

(By J. William Middendorf II and
Adm. Thomas H. Moorer)

On the 26th of March, Israel's Prime Minister Menachem Begin and Egypt's Anwar Sadat, with U.S. President Jimmy Carter acting as witness, signed the peace treaty between their two nations which history may later record as the first step toward a permanent and lasting peace between all nations in the Mideast.

That it was, however, only the first step of many which must still be taken was dramatically emphasized the very next day when OPEC (the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) announced it would increase the basic price of oil by 9%—to \$14.54 a barrel—and also permit each member country of OPEC to impose additional surcharges of as-yet-undetermined amounts.

The new OPEC increase (the first of several retaliatory measures taken) was the seventh since 1 January 1973, when the price was only \$2.59 per barrel, and has caused serious apprehension among Western nations already concerned about the recent change of government in Iran and the increasingly dangerous military threat against Saudi Arabia and other countries in the Persian Gulf/Arabian Sea area.

Because of that threat, the Defense Department is now reportedly considering organization of a new U.S. naval force—which would be called the Fifth Fleet—to patrol those areas of the Indian Ocean considered essential to the interests of the United States and its allies around the world.

But those naval forces—which means, for most practical purposes, the Navy's carrier task forces—are already stretched very, very thin, and they are constantly overworked.

One reason they are overworked, of course, is that in one crisis situation after another successive commanders-in-chief have realized that the carriers are often the only immediately deployable instrument of national military power available to them. The most recent crisis sorties were those made by the USS *Constellation*, ordered by President Carter twice within a matter of weeks to the Indian Ocean.

It is worth noting that the *Constellation* was accompanied by two tankers. The tankers slowed her down, but without them she could not have continued operations.

Besides being overworked, our carriers are also overaged. Before another carrier of any type could be operational, only four of the 13 carriers now in the fleet would be less than 25 years old. The operational life of some of the larger-deck carriers is being stretched out, at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, through what is called a "service life extension program," or SLEP, but if experience with similar makeshift programs in the past teaches us anything it is that we almost always wind up with less capability than needed or anticipated, and at a much higher cost than originally projected.

All of the foregoing argues compellingly, in our opinion, for construction of at least one more nuclear carrier (or CVN) of the Nimitz class for the U.S. Navy.

As most informed Americans are aware, one of the major issues to be decided by Congress in its consideration of the Defense Department's budget for the new fiscal year (FY 1980) starting on 1 October is whether the aircraft carrier requested in the budget submitted by the President should be nuclear-powered or conventionally-powered.

There is no debate over whether the Navy needs another carrier. The President, the Secretary of Defense, Navy officials both civilian and uniformed, and the cognizant committees of Congress all are in unanimous agreement that the Navy does need at least one more aircraft carrier.

There are many—and we include ourselves in this category—who believe several more carriers are needed if the Navy is to be able to responsibly carry out all the worldwide missions which have been assigned to it.

The most important of those missions—except for conduct of full-scale combat operations—is crisis response, as President Carter recognized in his use of the *Constellation*.

"Calling out the carriers," of course, is nothing new. Former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, in a speech at the Naval War College in Newport, R.I., said "In the crisis in which I was involved, the use of naval power, particularly the carrier, turned out to be almost invariably the crucial element."

In that same connection, it may also be recalled that on 15 April 1970 the late General Earle G. Wheeler, then serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (following an earlier tour as Army Chief of Staff) testified that, even after the Vietnam War would be over, the Navy would need 16 carriers—"not on the basis of a peacetime situation, but on the basis of a possible future war. . . ."

"We must recognize," General Wheeler told a Joint House-Senate Armed Services Subcommittee, "that if we have a war in which the Soviet Union is involved the war is not going to be confined to the Atlantic Ocean or to the Atlantic region. The Soviet Union is a two-ocean country as well as the United States, and therefore we will have a requirement for a carrier force to be deployed in the Pacific area."

"In addition to that," he continued, "we are going to have to have something for contingencies. After going over a great number of mixes of carriers needed under varying realistic contingencies, I came down on the number of 16 as being within a prudent level of risk."

In the nine years that have passed since General Wheeler's testimony, of course, the United States has suffered the loss of access to most of her important overseas bases and, with its allies, has grown much more heavily dependent on Persian Gulf oil.

During the same time frame the Soviet naval threat has increased—in both quality and numbers—at a much more rapid pace than earlier expected. It used to be asked, by those who opposed the U.S. Navy's carrier construction programs, why the Soviet Union doesn't build aircraft carriers, if they're such an essential part of a strong navy.

That question is no longer asked. The USSR has two small carriers operational—the Kiev and the Minsk (both of which were on fleet exercises in the Mediterranean last month)—and are building one more, possibly two. Some analysts also believe a large new surface ship now under construction in the Soviet Union might be the USSR's first nuclear carrier.

Despite the increased Soviet naval threat, despite the increased dependence of the United States and its allies on overseas sources of oil and many other raw materials, and despite the loss of several more overseas bases formerly available to U.S. land-based aircraft, it has been decided—largely because of what is referred to as "cost considerations"—that the U.S. Navy now only needs 12 aircraft carriers.

It also has been decided by the present administration—again, because of cost considerations—that the carrier requested in the FY 1980 budget should be conventionally-powered rather than nuclear-powered.

To further reduce initial acquisition costs

of the FY 1980 carrier—which according to present Defense Department plans is the last one the Navy will ever be permitted to buy—the administration decided at the same time it should be a ship of a completely new "CVV" design and, at 62,500 tons, much smaller in size—and considerably less capable—than either the 94,000-ton Nimitz-class CVNs or the 81,000-ton (conventionally powered) John F. Kennedy CVs which are now the mainstays of the Navy's carrier force.

Last year, it will be remembered, the President vetoed the defense authorization bill because Congress had included in it funds for a nuclear carrier, CVN, which the President had not requested and which he said at the time would be: (1) too expensive; and (2) not needed. (He also said the same money could be better used on procurement of several smaller ships; to date, those ships have not been requested. In fact, the President has further reduced the Navy's five-year ship-building plan.)

For a number of reasons, not all of which were directly related to the comparative merits of a nuclear carrier vs. a conventional carrier, Congress failed to override the President's veto. A substitute bill virtually identical to the vetoed bill, but minus the carrier authorization, was then passed and signed into law.

The President had said in his veto message he would include funds for a new carrier in his 1980 budget request. He did not, however, specify what type of a carrier.

There are many knowledgeable defense analysts—in the Navy, in Congress, in the academic world, and in the media—who vehemently disagreed with the President's veto decision. They believed, and still do, that the overwhelming body of evidence and empirical data accumulated over the past quarter-century of nuclear-ship operations conclusively proves that another CVN would be not only significantly more combat-capable than either a CV or CVV, but also considerably more cost-effective than either of the latter ships—and perhaps even less expensive in absolute terms.

But that is irrelevant, for all practical purposes. It is not necessary to rehash last year's budget debate to suggest that, *this year*, the economic, political, and national security milieu in which defense budget decisions must necessarily be made have changed so much, and so recently, that the assumptions upon which the President's budget request is based are no longer valid.

Preparation of the annual Defense Department budget request is a long and complex process, which starts more than a full year before the approved request is submitted to Congress (at the beginning of the congressional session). Congress itself then conducts, through its Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, months of hearings—during which literally thousands of pages of testimony are developed before shifting to floor debate six to nine months later and finally enacting authorization and appropriations legislation for the President's signature. (The authorization bill tells the Defense Department and the Services what they can and cannot do and what programs may or may not be funded; the appropriations bill contains the legal authority to spend money for the programs authorized. A program can be authorized but not funded; it cannot be funded without first being authorized.)

The bills which eventually reach the President's desk *always* differ in numerous respects from those originally introduced—sometimes because of changes requested by the administration itself; sometimes because Congress differs from the administration in its perception of the nation's defense needs; and sometimes simply because outside events dictate changes not possible to anticipate.

That is what has happened this year. With-

in the past several months the United States has lost the right to use bases and facilities in Iran which were an integral part of the U.S./NATO defense structure in that important area of the world. The United States has also, within the same time frame and for reasons which may long be debated, broken formal relations with Taiwan thus incurring the risk of permanently losing the excellent port and air facilities on that island which for the past 25 years served this country, in effect, as a "fixed site aircraft carrier" strategically positioned off the east coast of the Asian mainland.

Whatever the political merits of the President's decision to recognize the People's Republic of China, the fact remains that part of the price paid is the possible (many would say probable) non-availability, for the foreseeable future, of an important overseas land base.

The loss of overseas bases is not an isolated phenomenon, unfortunately. The country's operational overseas base structure has been reduced from the 105 that existed 10 years ago to fewer than 40 today. (Among the more harmful recent losses are those of Cam Ranh Bay and other bases in Vietnam now being used by the Russians—just as they are also using former Wheelus Air Force Base in Libya. The United States is a double loser in such instances.)

Whether we stay or leave, overseas land bases cost money—much more money in the long run than do aircraft carriers. It is worth recalling that it cost the United States over \$525 million just to build the massive complex of air bases used in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam War. Additional hundreds of millions of dollars were spent building logistics support facilities, petroleum and ammunition storage dumps, and defense installations.

Those assigned to defend our land bases in Vietnam, let there be no doubt about it, did their job well. Despite their best—and often heroic—efforts, however, over 400 allied aircraft were lost from ground attack alone, and more than 4,000 more aircraft were damaged.

In contrast, during the whole Vietnam War not one sea-based aircraft was lost or damaged on board any U.S. carrier as a result of enemy action.

Nevertheless, our overseas base structure is still immensely important to our overall defense program, and the loss of such previously available bases and facilities in Iran and Taiwan, and the annually less viable tenure of U.S. base rights in many other countries, plus an added burden on the Navy's already overworked aircraft carriers and makes it mandatory that those carriers be, if at all possible, increased in number. It also makes it imperative that the high quality of the carriers now in the fleet not be diminished in any way by the addition of ships of lesser capability, lesser endurance, and more limited in range, speed, payload, and safety—it has been repeatedly demonstrated that smaller and less capable carriers suffer much higher accident rates, in both peace and war.

There are other unanticipated changes which have also dramatically altered the FY 1980 defense planning assumptions.

One such change is the still precarious peace agreement between Egypt and Israel; another is the volatile situation on the Persian Gulf threatening the pro-Western regime in Saudi Arabia and her smaller neighbors. Lacking land bases in the immediate area, the only way the United States can contribute to continued stability in the region is through use of sea power.

And sea power in this instance, as almost everywhere else in the world, means aircraft carriers.

Aircraft carriers are over the horizon and out of sight. They do not violate national sovereignty or offend local political sensi-

bilities. They are immune to insurgents, revolutionaries, and guerrillas and to changes in government which are so often followed by changes in national policy which say in effect, "Yankee Go Home!"

But carriers are far from invisible to those who threaten the peace. They are a message to friend and foe alike that the United States Navy is offshore, a short jet flight away, ready to carry out its defense commitments and to protect American interests in the area and the interests of America's allies.

Carriers are quickly deployable. The same carrier which today is enjoying a port visit to Naples could be in the Eastern Mediterranean tomorrow ready to provide powerful assistance to Egypt or Israel if either of those countries is attacked. And a carrier brings with it all of the airplane fuel, supplies, ordnance, spare parts, and repair and support facilities needed by the 90-plus aircraft it carries.

But why a nuclear carrier? Why not the CVV which the President has requested or the "compromise" option, another conventionally-powered Kennedy-class CV?

The answer can be stated briefly: A CVN is faster, safer, more combat capable, and more quickly deployable—and has infinitely more range—than either a CVV or CV; it is also much cheaper to operate.

Surprisingly, another CVN may, in addition, actually cost less to construct than a CVV. It is certainly more cost-effective than either the CVV or the CV. It could be delivered to the Navy at least a full year earlier than the as yet undesigned CVV could be delivered, and probably almost as soon as another CV could be operational.

Those statements require and deserve amplification.

Insofar as military characteristics are concerned:

The CVN carries 90-95 aircraft; the CVV 50-64.

The CVN has twice the propulsion power and carries 2.5 times as much aircraft fuel, and 1.5 times as much aircraft ammunition, as the CVV could carry.

The CVN has four aircraft elevators, four catapults, and four propeller shafts; the CVV would have two of each. (The Navy has not within the past 40 years built a carrier with only two shafts.)

The CVN has a higher maximum speed (classified, but officially conceded to be "about five knots faster" than any conventional carrier). The CVN can, in fact, with one shaft down, continue operations at a speed almost equal to the CVV's maximum speed.

The most important CVN advantages, however, are those which flow from nuclear propulsion. The CVN can literally steam around the world at maximum speed without ever having to refuel. The CVV (or the CV, for that matter) is limited by the fuel it could carry and also by the availability of the slow-speed refueling ships which have to accompany conventionally powered ships or rendezvous with them along the way.

There are also a number of intangibles which favor the CVN—intangibles which in a crisis could mean the difference between mission failure and "mission accomplished." The CVN has greater seakeeping qualities, for example. That translates into a more stable platform, which means fewer aircraft accidents, fewer lives lost, lower repair and replacement costs and the ability to sortie more aircraft more often, regardless of foul weather conditions. (Because of its freedom from fuel constraints the CVN can often avoid storm areas entirely by following a more circuitous transit; the more limited conventional carriers seldom have the same option.)

The more heavily armored CVN is also

much more survivable in combat; its high speed makes it a tougher target both to find and to hit, and its heavy armor and high degree of compartmentation combine to ensure that, even if it is hit (by anything less than a nuclear weapon), it probably would not even have to cease regular operations.

The myth of "carrier vulnerability," by the way, is just that: a myth. A heavily armored high-speed ship at sea presents a rapidly moving, and maneuvering, target extremely difficult to find, much less to hit and to hurt. It is infinitely easier to target and destroy our fixed-site shore-based ammunition dumps, fuel depots, and air fields. The punishment a modern nuclear carrier can take was—unfortunately and unintentionally—demonstrated in 1969 when nine 500 pound bombs (the equivalent of six Soviet cruise missiles) exploded on the flight deck of the USS Enterprise, the Navy's first nuclear carrier (and the only non-Nimitz CVN). Despite the damage done, the Enterprise could have resumed flight operations within a matter of hours. Today's carriers, with a higher degree of compartmentation, better sprinkling systems, and generally improved fire fighting and damage control techniques, are even tougher and more survivable.

Now, the matter of cost:

According to the administration's budget presentations, the acquisition cost of the CVV would be about \$1.6 billion; another CVN would cost an estimated \$2.4 billion.

However, consider the following:

Incredibly, the cost of fuel is not included in that cost comparison. The CVN's reactor will permit it to steam for 13 years prior to re-coring. It is impossible to estimate the delivered cost of the fuel (literally millions of barrels) a CVV would use in a similar 13-year period of operation. The delivered cost which includes refining, processing, and storage costs as well as the very high costs of the tankers (convoyed and protected by other oil-burning ships) needed to carry and transfer the fuel to the carriers, can be three or four times the per barrel cost at the wellhead.

At last year's prices, according to several independent cost studies, the cumulative cost of CVV fuel and other expenses not calculated in the administration's analysis would have been sufficient to virtually wipe out the CVN/CVV differential. At today's new and higher OPEC prices, which almost certainly will be substantially increased several more times in the next 13 years, the combined ship-plus-fuel cost calculations should now favor the CVN by a large margin.

Among the "other expenses" not included in the administration's cost analysis, incidentally, were such line items as: the acquisition, operating, and personnel costs for the surface combatants needed to escort the tankers during a conflict situation; the extra base facilities therefore needed in the United States and overseas; the very high cost of the aircraft more likely to be lost from a CVV or CV than from a CVN; and the incalculable cost of the extra lives also more likely to be lost.

Just as incalculable, of course, are the horrendous costs which might be incurred by not having enough combat aircraft available when and where they are needed in time of crisis.

Or by having them available in sufficient numbers—but either too far away to do any good, or unable to get to the combat zone until three or four days after they are most needed.

In today's high-speed world of supersonic jets and instantaneous around-the-world communications, that three or four days might mean a new cost differential which would have to be counted in terms of battles, perhaps even wars, won or lost.

All of the arguments which, in our shared opinion, make the CVN such a logical choice over the CVV apply with almost equal validity in a comparison between the CVN and the CV. (The CV would cost an estimated \$143 million more than the CVV to build, and proportionately more to operate over a 13-year period. It would be just as dependent on logistics support. It would carry not quite as many aircraft as the CVN, it would be less survivable than the CVN, and it would carry only half as much aviation fuel and two thirds as much aircraft ammunition as would a CVN.)

There is a final point of almost overwhelming importance which should be considered: Those who advocate construction of a CVV, or even a "compromise" CV, take it for granted that the oil needed by those oil-burning ships will be available anytime and anywhere it is needed. That is a most dangerous assumption to make in building a ship which might have to be deployed on short or no notice anywhere in the world—including: (1) Constellation-like sorties to the vast reaches of the Indian Ocean where the United States has one small refueling base, at Diego Garcia (the nearest alternative is Subic Bay in the Philippines, 4,000 miles away); or even (2) at a time of another oil crisis, to the more narrow confines of the Eastern Mediterranean to help preserve the new peace between Egypt and Israel.

Persuaded by the logic of the above cost considerations, and even more by the overwhelming greater combat capabilities of the CVN, there are already many members of both the House and Senate, Republicans and Democrats alike, who are committed to authorizing another Nimitz-class CVN in the FY 1980 defense budget approved by Congress.

Such action, they recognize, would risk another confrontation with the President. Too many confrontations of that type are not good for the country. And they are not good for our overall national defense program.

Another such confrontation should therefore be avoided if at all possible. And it could be avoided. The President himself could dramatically demonstrate his own continuing dedication to defense, as well as to preservation of the peace agreement in the Middle East which he helped engineer, by informing Congress that, in view of the many changes in the world situation which have occurred since this year's defense budget was prepared, he now supports construction of another nuclear carrier.

We most urgently recommend that he do so forthwith.●

GENERAL SALAN'S ANALYSIS OF CHINESE VIETNAMESE CONFLICT

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Raoul Salan, 80, who was the French commander for Indochina 30 years ago, is still one of the greatest Western military authorities on Southeast Asia. Following the Chinese invasion of Vietnam, the French economic and political weekly, *Valeurs Actuelles*, on March 5, 1979, carried the following interview with General Salan which provided information not found in U.S. press articles on that invasion, which my staff has translated as follows:

CXXV—548—Part 7

GENERAL SALAN'S ANALYSIS OF CHINESE VIETNAMESE CONFLICT

"Giap must be back in his little rubber-soled shoes at this minute." As he spoke General Salan unfolded the map of upper Tonkin where the Chinese attacked on February 17. He knows this region, every post, every village, every road and every crater. Forty years ago the French commander-in-chief in Indochina ordered him to prepare a defense of that zone, from Mon Cay to Cao Bang.

"I marked out the entire frontier," he recalled.

During the preceding wars, against the French expeditionary corps and the American forces, Giap's troops held the heights and fired on the valleys. Now the situation is reversed. What American aviators called "the craters of death", because they were packed with artillery, are now in the hands of the Chinese divisions.

Formerly number two under General de Lattre de Tassigny, then Commissaire of the Republic in Tonkin and commander-in-chief in Indochina in 1952 and 1953, General Salan went on to analyze the situation for *valeurs actuelles*.

"They (the Chinese) have launched their affair well," he resumed. He based his judgement on three observations covering the climate, the topography and the population.

It was the perfect moment for an attack. The climate is excellent. The dry season will last until April 15. On the Russian frontier with China, on the other hand, it is mid-winter with temperatures as low as thirty degrees below zero (—20°F fahrenheit).

As for the terrain: The general described the frontier from Lao Cai, the gateway to China, to Dien Bien Phu, the exit towards Laos:

"The Chinese have built up their offensive on all of the good roads leading into Upper Tonkin. They hold the heights, they control the connecting roads and the two railroads. All of that zone is bordered by Kwangsi, in China, and is known as the country of a hundred thousand mountains. The same mountains continue into Vietnam.

It is obvious that the Chinese hold the advantage. They know every inch of the sector. In reality they have never quit it. Until 1940 Chinese pirates were active as far as Lang Son. Then the French built a line of small military fortifications on the summits. Later these were destroyed, then reoccupied and reconstructed by the Vietminh during the war in Indo China. It is this line which the Chinese invaded last week.

They are well installed there, perched on high, grassy peaks. These mountains are so covered with vegetation they have a natural camouflage covering countless paths leading down the Chinese side of the mountains over which supplies and munitions can be brought. It is an ideal field for the sort of war the Chinese fight: artillery on one side and men with their small arms and bearers on the other."

Then there is the population. "This is the third advantage of the Chinese," according to General Salan. "It is their country. All the length of the frontier one finds the Nung tribes, with the Chinese language and character, the Tho tribes, also of the same race as the Chinese and living on both sides of the frontier. With them are the Thais who by tradition have been friends of the Chinese.

Is it in the interest of the Chinese General Staff to go any further? Mr. d'Orowal asked.

"I do not believe that they will push on to the plains, General Salan replied. It would be a mistake. They would come out on the inundated delta. That is where we got bogged down. On the contrary, by staying on the heights they have undoubtedly inflicted heavy losses on Giap's army.

Mr. Teng Hsiao-ping quietly observed: A

myth has had its day—that of the invincibility of the Vietnamese Army which boasted that it was the third military power of the world."

According to General Salan, Giap and Pham Van Dong (the head of the Vietnamese government) have grown old. They have committed two tactical faults and an error of judgment.

"Their first fault: The expulsion last year of two hundred thousand Chinese from Vietnam. In so doing, Pham Van Dong made Mr. Teng lose face. It was an unsupportable affront.

The second fault: The direct, massive invasion of Cambodia. General Salan has known for a long time that this was Giap's intention. It was inscribed in a telegram Ho Chi Minh addressed to his troops before his death and was made public in General Salan's book, "Indochine Rouge", published by Presse de la Cité in 1975.

This telegram, dated September 20, 1952, and decoded by French cryptographers, said: "Our strategic aim is to retake all of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, from the gate of China to Point Camau, from the coast of Indochina to the shores of the Mekong."

Giap took over twenty years to execute Ho Chi Minh's order. He did it, but in going too far he gave the impression that he was going to over-run the Indochinese Peninsula, including Thailand and Malaysia."

"In occupying Cambodia," said General Salan, "the Vietnamese gave the Chinese cause to worry when they were already on the alert on their northern frontier. So they decided to bar the gate in the south.

The error of judgment which Pham Van Dong committed was to think for a minute that his alliance with Moscow would intimidate Peking and that the Russians were totally committed to stand by him. What he did was give Peking an opportunity to demonstrate that an alliance with Moscow is not an assurance against any eventuality.

By attacking in mid-February, the Chinese gave themselves two months, before the end of the dry season, to wear down and break one by one the Vietnamese divisions that would be brought up to face their positions. This threw all of the Vietnamese occupation forces in Cambodia and Laos off balance.

General Giap keeps some ten heavy divisions in Cambodia but these are not enough to assure complete control. When he had to displace them to the Chinese front he ceased to be master of the situation. This was the trap that Teng Hsiao-ping intended for him."

When they had shown Giap what they could do the Chinese pulled back. The entire operation was an expression of Chinese contempt for Giap and his army, for more and more Chinese have boasted over the past 6 months that it was their generals who in reality defeated both the French and the Americans and that Giap was only a front.

What will happen next is anyone's guess as Russian naval units leave other waters to join Soviet Russia's 725 warships of all classes in the China Sea.●

TURKISH AID AND THE CYPRUS PROBLEM

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, the House on March 29 approved a foreign military assistance bill which included \$202 mil-

lion in military aid for Turkey. On that date, I addressed my colleagues, pointing out that there has not been substantial progress toward a just solution of the Cyprus problem since this body lifted the embargo on arms to Turkey last year.

Now the administration is requesting an additional \$150 million in military and economic assistance for Turkey.

In each of his 60-day reports to the Congress since the lifting of the embargo, the President has certified that Turkey is acting in good faith on the Cyprus problem. Yet all of the evidence suggests otherwise. Thirty thousand Turkish troops continue to occupy the island. Military exercises have been conducted in northern Cyprus by a government which we are told is teetering on the brink of financial catastrophe. Thousands of Greek Cypriots remain unaccounted for, 4 years after the illegal Turkish invasion. Hundreds of thousands of Greek Cypriots are still waiting to return to their homes in the occupied area.

The status quo on Cyprus, Mr. Speaker, does not reflect good faith actions by Turkey. Instead, continued Turkish intransigence is an affront to the House of Representatives, which itself acted in good faith in lifting the arms embargo.

Still another indication of Turkish refusal to respond to that act is the Turkish Government's policy toward the Greek Orthodox Church. More than anything else, this policy deeply wounds the Church's members around the world. Mr. Zachary Paul Geaneas, a career Foreign Service Officer assigned to the United States Mission to the United Nations, has recently prepared a monograph entitled "The Cross and the Crescent."

Mr. Geaneas' incisive analysis details the repressive Turkish policy toward the Church and suggests that this policy can only redound to the disadvantage of Turkey.

Turkey's policy toward the Greek Orthodox Church is but one facet of the continuing tragedy of Cyprus and her people. I strongly commend to my colleagues, Mr. Geaneas' excellent assessment of this grave problem, which follows:

THE CROSS AND THE CRESCENT
(By Zachary P. Geaneas)

The resurgence of religion as a potent force throughout the world has been clearly documented during the past several years. Most recently, the world has seen the power of an overwhelming Islamic fundamentalism. This new and vital force has had its effect upon the political arenas and its power is being clearly demonstrated in Iran where two governments were overthrown. Pakistan, Afghanistan, Turkey and, to a lesser degree, other Arabic nations also have been affected.

Many fear this resurgence, this return to the basic values of the Muslim and Christian religions. Others are concerned that a jihad or holy war will be declared against the Christian and other non-Islamic countries. I do not believe that this is a possibility. On the contrary, as men of God, the clergy of Christianity and the mullahs of the Islamic faith have more in common than most of us realize. Both religions advocate belief in God and passages of their Holy writings, the Holy Koran and the Bible, are astonishingly similar.

I believe that the Cross and the Crescent can and will exist, as they already have for

so many centuries, in close proximity without serious conflicts or difficulties. Some alarmists, and fortunately they are few, believe that either the Cross or the Crescent must be supreme. Such beliefs are a disservice to God. The two religions are compatible and will coexist to the benefit of all our societies.

Unfortunately, unscrupulous leaders frequently use religion to fan emotions and to raise brother against brother. History is replete with such incidents and wars—perhaps the most infamous are the Crusades. Despite these events, and some of them are continuing to date, the coexistence and cooperation of Christianity and Islam throughout the centuries is rarely recorded in the annals of history.

Wars, like crime, get the front pages. Brotherhood, morality, love, charity, and the cohabitation of millions of people of these two major faiths are rarely recorded or even mentioned. A good example of this has been the ability of the Greek Orthodox Christians and the Muslim Turks to live with each other under the Byzantine and Ottoman Empires as well as the Turkish Republic.

The Patriarchate has been situated in the world renowned city of Constantinople/Istanbul for the better part of two millennia. Unfortunately, because of events that occurred in recent political history, the basic policy toward the church changed drastically. Despite increasingly hostile national policies, the majority of the Turkish and Greek people were able to live together, respecting each other's religious and cultural heritage.

The present status of the Patriarchate is an impediment to the freedom of religion that both Christianity and Islam so clearly profess. A brief examination of this situation as well as the simple expeditious way that it can be rectified is worthy of consideration.

Some time ago the College of Cardinals was convened in Rome to elect the head of the Catholic Church. For most Americans it was a very reasonable, practical and certainly a democratic way of electing a leader. More than two hundred cardinals travelled to Rome from throughout the world, first to represent their people at the funeral of Pope Paul and then to elect his successor. With the untimely death of Pope John Paul I, they again returned to Rome to be present at his funeral and to elect his successor, Pope John Paul II. It was clear to the entire world that their deliberations would be private and certainly without any outside interference. Upon their election of the new Pope, his name was announced to the waiting world.

When Patriarch Athenagoras died a number of years ago what transpired? How was his successor elected?

With the announcement of the death of his Holiness, Patriarch Athenagoras, the entire Orthodox world was plunged into mourning. The Primates of the National Orthodox Churches sent messages of condolence and many were present at the funeral services. The scenario up to this point is quite similar to what an American would expect to happen. The first glaring difference occurred when Archbishop Iakovos prepared to travel to Turkey as the head of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America and as a member of the United States Government's delegation to the Patriarch's funeral.

Because Turkish politicians had taken exception to Archbishop Iakovos' earlier activities on behalf of the Patriarchate, the Archbishop was refused entry into Turkey and thus denied the opportunity of paying his last respects to the Patriarch. Despite worldwide concern and pressure from people as well as governments, the Turkish bureaucracy remained implacable and refused to issue a visa to the Primate of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America.

Political expediency and distrust of anything Greek prevented the bureaucrats at that time from doing the compassionate and correct thing in permitting the Archbishop to enter Turkey. Thus the Archbishop was denied the opportunity of representing the millions of American Orthodox Christians at the funeral ceremonies.

The next discordant note was that the Orthodox Church, represented by the Holy Synod, could not be solely responsible for the election of the new Patriarch. The Holy Synod was required to submit to the governor of Istanbul a list of Bishops from whom the next patriarch would be chosen. To be eligible the bishops had to be Turkish citizens; this precluded the candidacy of Bishops living in the diaspora.

Upon receipt of the list, the Governor struck out names of those Bishops whom he believed could be troublesome to Turkish policy. It is quite astounding that a political official could play such an important role in the selection of a religious leader. Such interference could be minimally acceptable if, and only if, the Church and the State were of the same religion. In this instance, the Turkish State is Moslem and the Church, Orthodox Christian. That such a procedure would shock the conscience of the world would be anticipated by any reasonable person. Despite this heavy handedness, and because the Western World is not aware of the procedures for the selection of a Patriarch, this sequence of events elicited minimal adverse public opinion.

The Orthodox Church is not organized in the strong centralized manner of the Church of Rome. Orthodox Churches are decentralized on a national basis and there is a Patriarch for each of the Orthodox Churches of Romania, Russia, Bulgaria, etc. However, all national Orthodox Churches recognize the primacy of the Bishop of Constantinople in theological matters. This is not a new situation but one that has existed throughout the centuries. During the past fifty years the Turkish politicians have taken many actions which were inimical to the interests of the Patriarchate and the Orthodox Church in Turkey.

The closing of the world renowned Theological School of Halkis was accomplished with hardly a murmur of protest from the Christian West. Libraries and schools were closed. Church properties were confiscated or at best declared national treasures so that control over these historic sites no longer vested in the Patriarch. As a result of this action, Orthodox ecclesiastical treasures are controlled by the Turkish Government. It is said that even in the very modest office building occupied by the Patriarchate, minimal repairs have to be agreed by the Turkish bureaucracy.

At best, the Patriarch and the Holy Synod are tenants by sufferance without any assurance that they could continue to occupy these historic premises in the future. Disinterest and an inherent distrust of all things Greek, are the motivating factors of the deterioration that is bordering on the deliberate destruction of churches of great renown. As a result, ecclesiastical treasures are slowly disappearing with the passage of time.

Yet, these policies were not limited to the physical properties of the Patriarchate but extended to interference in the international travel of members of the Holy Synod. Recently, the Turkish Government, announced to the world that such travel restriction would be lessened. Again, instead of condemning such restrictions, public opinion noted their lifting with a sigh of relief instead of condemning all interference in church affairs.

Even a casual observer would conclude from the very few examples noted above, that Turkish political policy was predicated upon continually restricting the activities of the

Patriarchate until it either withered or was forced to move.

If such be the policy, it would be prudent for the Turkish government to reexamine its goals as far as the Patriarchate is concerned. Its status must be changed from that of a virtual prisoner to an invaluable asset which would bring many advantages to the Turkish people. First, such action would result in moral approval from people of all faiths who believe in freedom of religion. Secondly, millions of dollars of foreign exchange would pour into the Patriarchate for restoration, maintenance and operation of historic churches, schools, museums and other church properties.

Large sums of money would come into Turkey every year to fund religious and charitable projects which would benefit people of all religions. Thirdly, hundreds of thousands of the Orthodox faithful would visit Istanbul each year to worship at the seat of Orthodoxy. Untold millions would be spent by these visitors and as a result tourism would become a viable source of foreign exchange for a hard pressed economy.

The Turkish people could be the recipient of these many and important benefits without the expenditure of a Turkish lira. First, an agreement, mutually advantageous, would permit the Patriarchate to function without interference in church affairs. These agreements could be worked out in a carefully worded concordat which would spell out the freedom of action as well as the responsibilities of both parties.

Secondly, church properties, especially those of religious, historic and architectural importance, would be returned to the Patriarchate so that the essential process of restoration may be begun immediately. A magnificent gesture which would wipe away the residue of centuries of hate and misunderstanding would be the return of one of the foremost churches of Christendom, Agia Sophia, to the Patriarchate. World opinion would understand and applaud such action.

Failure to do so would be detrimental to Turkish interests and its mere presence, in a state of disrepair would be a continual reminder of religious and political intolerance. Agia Sophia, restored, would rank with St. Peter's in Rome and St. Paul's in London.

The world is seeing changes that appear to be solving deeply ingrained disputes in Africa, in the Middle East and in Asia. With good will, the Turkish Government and the Patriarchate could resolve their differences, live in peace and bring economic, political and religious advantages to all people. ●

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT L. TRACHTENBERG

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and my constituents in the 15th Congressional District of California, I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to Associate Commissioner Robert L. Trachtenberg who has announced his resignation from the Office of Hearings and Appeals of the Social Security Administration, effective May 1, 1979.

Since coming to the Office of Hearings and Appeals in 1974, Bob Trachtenberg

has truly succeeded in his assigned mission of reducing the backlog of social security claims awaiting hearings and providing claimants with fair and prompt hearings. As a member of former Congressman Bernie Sisk's staff at that time, I vividly remember the numerous complaints Mr. Sisk received from constituents who were waiting for their hearings to be scheduled or for decisions to be issued on their claims. Complaints to many congressional offices became such a sore issue at that time that the chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee, the Honorable James E. Burke, had some harsh remarks about the crisis in the disability insurance program during hearings his subcommittee held in 1975. Chairman Burke pointed out that:

You have the people of this country up in arms. I recently made a trip around my district and half the people who talked to me were concerned with disability appeals they had pending.

He went on to say:

We cannot sit here and allow that condition to exist. Every Congressman on the floor asks me daily what we are doing about this.

In the spring of that year, the appeals backlog in the Office of Hearings and Appeals had reached an alltime high of 113,000 cases. With the use of strong management initiatives and congressional assistance, under Bob Trachtenberg's direction the Office of Hearings and Appeals reduced the backlog to 74,416 pending cases by December of 1978. Of course, these results were not attained without the hard work and sincere dedication of the corps of administrative law judges and support staff throughout the country.

And, as might be expected, Bob Trachtenberg has also weathered some criticism of his efforts by various groups both in and out of the Office of Hearings and Appeals, over the manner in which the desired results were obtained, but that is usually the case when one is confronted with a difficult job to do as Bob Trachtenberg was.

Throughout my tenure with Congressman Sisk and during my own brief term in public office, however, I personally have not been aware of any instance in which a judge presiding over social security disability cases in my congressional district was called upon to sacrifice his judicial independence to achieve the goals of the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Instead, during my association with Bob Trachtenberg and the judges serving the Social Security Administration, I have found a dedication to fairness and an open willingness to serve the public. Under Bob Trachtenberg's leadership, claimants who formerly had to wait 1 year or more for a hearing can now expect to receive a quality hearing and a decision within 150 days.

I think this in itself is evidence that the Office of Hearings and Appeals has met and can continue to meet the mandate of 1975. I think, too, that the record will show that Bob Trachtenberg and

the personnel of the Office of Hearings and Appeals have worked well as a team to achieve results with which anyone concerned about expeditious and accurate service would be pleased.

I want to express my personal thanks to Bob Trachtenberg and the personnel of the Office of Hearings and Appeals, and I want to wish him success in his new appointment as the Deputy Commissioner for the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration of the U.S. Public Health Service. I know that I speak for my predecessor, the Honorable Bernie Sisk, and for the people of the 15th District of California in extending our thanks for a job well done. ●

THE ADMINISTRATION'S EDUCATION BUDGET

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget for fiscal year 1980 has been the subject of considerable discussion in this body recently.

As the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, the proposed education budget has been a particular concern of mine.

I was impressed with the objectivity of an analysis of the budget request for education which has been prepared by the staff of the Democratic Study Group, under the able chairmanship of Dave OBEY, who also serves with distinction on the Appropriations Committee. It is an excellent examination of the contents of the budget and the implications for education.

Mr. Speaker, because this report will be helpful as we make some hard decisions in the weeks and months ahead, I insert it at this point in the RECORD as a resource for all of us:

THE ADMINISTRATION'S EDUCATION BUDGET

This DSG Special Report deals with the Carter Administration's proposed FY 1980 education budget and the impact the proposals would have on states, local school districts, and students.

The Administration has requested a total of \$14.3 BILLION in new budget authority for education programs. The reductions proposed by the President include the elimination of Category B impact aid funds (\$288 million) and a \$262 million cut in college student loan programs.

Although the education budget has not generated the intense controversy which marks other Administration domestic budget proposals, education groups will mount a major effort to restore funds for impact aid, higher education student loan programs, and education programs for the handicapped as well as to increase funding levels for other programs above their FY 1979 levels.

This DSG Special Report contains the following sections:

I. Introduction, page 3.

II. The Education Budget, page 5.

III. Arguments For and Against Specific Cuts, page 13.

SECTION I. INTRODUCTION

The primary goal of federal education programs is to assure all Americans equal access to a good education. The Federal Government's share of the cost of elementary and secondary education is 8.8%, with state and local governments assuming financial responsibility for the rest. For higher education, the Federal Government provides 21% of the total spent. In providing funds for education, the Federal Government attempts to:

Help states and localities improve their education systems.

Provide enriched education for the disadvantaged and the handicapped.

Provide federal assistance to help support higher education.

Promote research and the dissemination of information in the field of education.

Compared with other social spending programs, education does not fare badly in the Carter budget. Nevertheless, the total request for budget authority is \$276 million less than the FY 1979 level. Most education programs were held to approximately the same dollar figures as in 1979, with few programs receiving increases. The majority of budget cuts

are in two areas—impact aid and college student assistance.

Although budget cuts for education are not as deep as had been originally feared, many education groups are concerned about cuts in specific programs, notably impact aid and college student assistance and the fact that inflation has reduced the real dollar amounts available for education.

President's budget request

The President has requested \$14.3 billion in new budget authority for FY 1980, \$276 million less than budget authority in FY 1979. The Administration proposes to eliminate \$288 million in funds for the Category B impact aid program and to cut \$262 million from student loan programs. The budget asks for \$658 million (\$258 million for FY 1979 and \$400 million for FY 1980) for a new concentration grants program for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to be targeted to areas with high concentrations of poor children, and a \$58 million increase in the largest of the education programs for handicapped students.

SECTION II. THE EDUCATION BUDGET AND ITS IMPACT

This section summarizes President Carter's FY 1980 budget request for education pro-

grams and its impact on students, states, and local school districts eligible for educational assistance. The education budget includes funds for the elementary and secondary education programs for low-income students, impact aid, programs for handicapped pupils, and college student assistance and loan programs.

Overview

The Administration has requested a total of \$14.34 billion in new budget authority for education programs for FY 1980. This represents a \$276 million cut from the FY 1979 level and is \$1.1 billion less than CBO estimates is required to maintain education programs at their current level of activity. FY 1980 outlays are estimated at \$13.32 billion, up from \$12.66 billion in FY 1979. The increase in outlays results because most education programs are funded one year in advance; thus, the higher outlays reflect higher funding in prior years. The following table compares the Administration's FY 1980 budget request with the estimated FY 1979 funding level and with the Congressional Budget Office's (CBO) "current policy projection," an estimate of the funds necessary to maintain the current level of program activity:

EDUCATION BUDGET

(In millions; fiscal years)

Program	Administration estimate, 1979	Administration request, 1980	CBO current policy projection, 1980	Difference between administration request and CBO current policy	Program	Administration estimate, 1979	Administration request, 1980	CBO current policy projection, 1980	Difference between administration request and CBO current policy
Elementary and secondary education:					Research and education aid:				
Budget authority.....	\$7,765	\$7,730	\$8,394	-\$664	Budget authority.....	\$1,339	\$1,405	\$1,468	-\$63
Outlays.....	6,517	7,016	7,599	-492	Outlays.....	1,272	1,330	1,388	-58
Higher education:					Total:				
Budget authority.....	5,507	5,200	5,575	-375	Budget authority.....	14,611	14,335	15,437	-1,102
Outlays.....	4,873	4,887	5,225	-337	Outlays.....	12,662	13,323	14,210	-887

Over half of the \$276 million cut proposed by the Administration is due to a reduction in budget authority needed to continue current policies in the basic educational opportunity grant (BEOG) program for college students. According to the Administration, the decrease is possible because anticipated higher family incomes will reduce the total number of eligible students by 130,000. The other major cut in the education budget is the elimination of all Category B funding for impact aid.

Program Summaries

Higher Education Student Assistance

The Administration has requested \$262 million less in budget authority for student loan programs in FY 1980 than was requested in FY 1979. The following chart compares the FY 1979 amounts with the FY 1980 requests:

(Budget authority in millions; fiscal years)

Program	1979	Administration request, 1980	Difference between 1979 and 1980
Basic education opportunity grants.....	\$2,600	\$2,444	-\$156
National direct student loans.....	329	235	-94
Guaranteed student loans.....	972	960	-12
Supplemental education opportunity grants.....	340	340	-----
College work study.....	550	550	-----
State incentive grants.....	77	77	-----
Total.....	4,868	4,606	-262

CBO estimates that an additional \$340 million is required to keep student assistance

programs at their current levels. The Administration asserts that the most important student assistance programs can be continued at or near current levels with less than current funding because higher family incomes will make approximately 130,000 students ineligible for loans, and because improved management control and improved collections on old loans reduce the need for higher levels of funding. The President's student aid proposals however, are dependent on tenuous assumptions—particularly the assumptions of fewer eligible students and improved loan collections. CBO estimates the impact of the Administration's budget request will be fewer available loans, fewer loans for low-income students, and loans of smaller amounts.

Basic Education Opportunity Grants (BEOGs).—The Administration has requested \$2.4 billion for the BEOG program for FY 1980, \$156 million less than the FY 1979 level. Of the amount requested, \$726 million actually represents funds left over from previous years rather than a request for new budget authority.

The BEOG program is the principal form of higher education student assistance and may be supplemented by loans from other assistance programs. The Administration estimates that its request will provide 2.6 million students with individual grants of up to \$1,800 in the 1980-81 school year. The average grant is estimated to be \$940, an increase of \$50 over 1979.

CBO estimates that the Administration's request falls \$753 million short of what will actually be needed to fully fund BEOGs in 1980. Estimates of BEOG program costs have traditionally been inaccurate and low, and chances of inaccuracy are greater this year because of changes made by the Middle Income Student Assistance Act passed last Con-

gress. CBO and numerous education groups believe that the Administration has underestimated how much money will be needed to fully fund the program.

The Administration's budget estimates are based on a prediction that, due to the elimination of fraud and abuse, there will be a higher rejection rate, thereby continuing the decline begun in FY 1978 in the number of individuals participating in the program. CBO asserts that the FY 1978 decline in program participation resulted more from confusion over new procedures than from student ineligibility. The Administration's projections are also based on estimates of future economic growth, which may be overly optimistic. In addition, the President's budget proposals do not include an extra \$15 million which HEW officials feel will be required if the Administration succeeds in phasing out social security post-secondary education benefits to the children of retired, disabled, or deceased workers.

The Administration has given oral assurances that it will request supplemental funds for BEOG's should its initial request prove inadequate. Most education groups believe that will be necessary.

The impact of underfunding the BEOG program will be greater competition for student loans in other programs, with students from low-income families likely to be most adversely affected.

National Direct Student Loans (NDSL).—The Administration wants to cut budget authority for the National Direct Student Loan program to \$94 million below the FY 1979 level—to \$235 million for FY 1980. Under the NDSL program, loans are distributed to schools by the Federal Government and the schools are responsible for collecting on the loans.

The Administration's request does not meet the statutory minimum appropriation of \$286 million set by Congress in the Middle Income Student Assistance Act. The Administration assumes that, despite the budget cut, program participation will decrease by only 1% from 914,000 students to 902,000, because it expects schools to intensify their efforts to collect debts from students who have defaulted on loans. This will enable it to make a large cut in funds with only a marginal decline in student participation. The government's ability to improve collections is limited. In fact the most recent HEW figures show that the number of defaults has increased from 600,000 to 700,000.

The cut in the NDSL program could hurt low-income students who cannot attend college without government assistance. Should the Administration fail to increase collections by the 30% it estimates is necessary to maintain current participation levels, students from low-income families will receive fewer or smaller NDSLs.

While the Administration believes that full funding of BEOGs will offset the decline in NDSLs, it may not provide increased assistance to low-income students. The increase in BEOGs will accrue almost entirely to middle-income students.

CBO claims that the Administration's estimates overstate the number of grants that will be available to students under NDSLs. Should schools decide to increase the average loan to take into account the 16% inflation rate since 1978, only 853,000 students would be eligible for NDSLs in FY 1979 and 786,000 in FY 1980. Should schools, however, keep the average loan amount at the FY 1978 level of \$710, it will be worth 16% less in real dollars.

Guaranteed Student Loans (GSL).—GSLs are unsecured loans provided to students through private lenders on which the government pays a 7% interest subsidy on behalf of each student as well as a special allowance to lenders to encourage their participation. The budget request represents the cost of the subsidy and the special allowance to the government.

The Administration proposes to cut funds for this program to \$960 million in FY 1980, \$12 million less than in FY 1979. CBO's current policy projection for the guaranteed student loan program is just over \$1 billion. While the difference is not a large one, CBO estimates that it will result in \$200 million less in loan capital available in FY 1980, totaling only \$2.4 billion rather than the \$2.6 billion the Administration estimates will be available. This means that 1.1 million students rather than 1.2 million will receive loans.

The impact of the reduction in GSLs will be felt primarily by low-income students with the greatest financial need. Fewer loans will increase demand and competition between middle- and low-income families. Higher-income families have a decided advantage because they are more likely to have established banking relationships and because private lenders see them as less likely to default on loans.

Fewer GSLs to low-income families combined with the cut in NDSLs could severely handicap low-income students in their effort to get a college education.

College Work Study (CWS).—The Administration has requested \$550 million in FY 1980 for the college work study program, which provides part-time employment for students. This is the same level of funding as in FY 1979. Unspent FY 1979 funds combined with FY 1980 funds may not be sufficient to continue the current level of services for this program if social security student benefits are eliminated. CBO, however, asserts that CWS is probably being overfunded. Increased demand by middle-income students for BEOGs could reduce the demand

in the CWS program. CBO also believes that the Administration's estimates of increased participation from 796,000 students in FY 1978 to 990,000 students in FY 1980 is too high.

Elementary and secondary education

The President is requesting \$7.7 billion for elementary and secondary education programs for FY 1980, an increase of \$65 million over FY 1979. The major cut in this category is the elimination of \$288 million in Category B impact aid. Smaller cuts are recommended in various programs for the handicapped, although the largest of the programs to benefit the handicapped would receive a \$58 million increase over the FY 1979 funding level. Funding of Title I of the elementary and secondary education Act, which is the largest federal elementary and secondary education program and provides funds to low-income school districts for the education of poor children, would not be increased.

Title I—Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).—Title I is the largest federal elementary and secondary education program. It provides funds to low-income school districts for the education of poor children and to states for state agency compensatory education programs.

The Administration has proposed funding Title I at the FY 1979 funding level of \$3.1 billion, and amount that CBO estimates is \$218 million below the amount required to maintain current services. While outlays will increase from \$2.6 billion in FY 1979 to \$2.8 billion in FY 1980 (reflecting past budget increases for the program), CBO figures show that an additional \$211 million in outlays would be needed to maintain current services.

In addition, the Administration is requesting budget authority of \$658 million (\$258 million for FY 1979 and \$400 million for FY 1980) for a newly authorized compensatory education program. This program provides grants to areas with higher concentrations of low-income students.

Although the proposed funding of the new grants program may partially offset the reduction in real dollars for present Title I programs for those school districts that qualify for additional grants, CBO asserts that if the total amount of funding for Title I is compared for 1979 and 1980, the President's FY 1980 budget still falls \$105 million short of what is required to maintain the current level of services.

Impact Aid.—The Administration proposes to eliminate all Category B funds within the impact aid program. Impact aid is designed to help compensate school districts for the cost of educating students where the local tax base is reduced because of federal property ownership or student enrollment is higher due to the presence of a federal employer. Districts which include military bases, government offices, Indian lands, and public low rent housing are eligible for impact aid. Currently more than 4,000 school districts—25% of the school districts in the nation—receive impact aid.

Unlike most federal education assistance, impact aid can be used to pay for general operating costs such as heating, utilities, teachers' salaries, and instructional materials. Because impact aid funds are used to meet costs incurred by the entire school system, 23 million elementary and secondary school age children would be hurt indirectly by a cutback in aid. Impact aid is divided into two categories: Category A includes children whose parents live and work on federal property or on Indian lands; Category B includes children whose parents live or work on federal property.

The Administration's proposal to eliminate entirely \$288 million in Category B aid in FY 1980 would affect more than 4,000 school

districts with 23 million children throughout the country. It could result in higher local property taxes, decreased quality of education, or both. Although Category B aid represents just over half of the total amount of impact aid, there are far more children benefiting from Category B assistance—2 million children—than from Category A—356,000 children. Of the 2 million children counted for Category B aid, 712,000 are poor children living in low rent public housing. CBO estimates that \$346 million would be required for Category B in FY 1980 to maintain current impact aid service levels because of rising education costs.

Education of the Handicapped.—There are several federal programs for educating handicapped children. The largest of these is the state assistance grant program which provides funds to school districts for each enrolled handicapped child. Other programs for educating handicapped children include the special education personnel development program and the preschool incentive grant program that provides special education for children under age five.

Although the Administration proposes to increase funding for state assistance grants from \$804 million in FY 1979 to \$862 million in FY 1980, its request is approximately \$400 million below the amount needed to sustain the level of federal financial commitment mandated by law. As the number of handicapped children served by the program increases and as local education agencies develop more comprehensive delivery systems, education groups believe that more funds will be needed.

CBO asserts that even the small cuts proposed by the Administration for the special education personnel development and preschool development grant programs will result in a lack of adequate funds to maintain current services. The Administration is proposing a \$2 million cut in funds for the special education manpower development program from \$57 million in FY 1979 to \$55 million in FY 1980. The impact of the cut, combined with inflation, could result in 5,160 fewer persons receiving special training—91,990 in FY 1980 compared to 97,150 in FY 1979. The impact of the \$2.5 million cut in the preschool incentive grant program—from \$17.5 million to \$15 million—will result in a lower per pupil expenditure. The per pupil expenditure of \$80 in FY 1979 will be cut to \$67 in FY 1980. CBO estimates that \$85 per pupil is the amount required to continue to provide current services.

Vocational Education.—The Administration is proposing to fund vocational education programs at their FY 1979 level of \$682 million in FY 1980. Vocational education groups assert that an additional \$300 million is needed in FY 1980 if vocational educational programs are to accomplish the objectives for which they were established. Since 1974, the increase in federal support for vocational education has averaged only 3% annually, well below the rate of inflation.

The impact of the President's budget would be most severe on the group that needs vocational training the most—unemployed youths in economically depressed central cities. A larger amount of funds could help to decrease the flow of unskilled youths into the labor market by providing them with school-based training and help to stem the further deterioration of the nation's central cities.

SECTION III—ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST SPECIFIC PROPOSALS

This section summarizes the arguments being made by proponents and opponents of specific proposals in the Carter Administration's education budget. (See note at end of section.)

Higher education student assistance

Arguments for the President's Budget.—Supporters of the President's budget argue

that the most important student assistance programs can be operated at a higher level than in FY 1979 despite the spending reduction. Improvements in management control, detection of fraud and abuse, and collections from loan defaulters will make this possible. The reduction in funds for BEOGs is the result of rising family incomes which will eliminate some students who were previously eligible to participate in the program. All other students remain eligible, and, should the request for BEOGs prove too low to serve all eligible students, the Administration will request supplemental funds to assure full funding. Insofar as the cut in NDSLs is concerned, only 12,000 fewer students will be eligible for these loans, and BEOGs should be able to offset the decline in this program.

Arguments Against the President's Budget.—Opponents of the Administration's budget request for student assistance programs argue that it will hurt low-income students. They have greater need of financial help to attend college than other students. Yet, additional funds for BEOGs will accrue almost entirely to middle-income students. With more lower- and middle-income students competing for fewer NDSLs, fewer students from low-income families will be able to qualify for aid. Increased demand for BEOGs and other student aid programs could also create a larger demand for GSLs. As with NDSLs, greater competition for loans among middle- and low-income students would favor higher income families. Middle-income students are less likely to default, their families are more likely to have established banking relationships and private lenders seeking to maximize profits are more likely to lend to middle-income families. The Administration's FY 1980 student aid proposals are dependent on favorable assumptions that could easily go awry. If assumptions of fewer eligible students or improved collections prove wrong, fewer students will be able to attend college. The Administration's argument that the reduction in number of BEOG recipients is based on rising family incomes which eliminate some students who were previously eligible for loans is misleading, because the increase in income is due to inflation rather than an increase in real income.

Impact aid

Arguments for the President's Budget Eliminating Category B Payments.—Supporters of the proposal to eliminate impact aid Category B payments argue that the program is costly and wasteful, and point out that every President since Eisenhower has tried to end it. Impact aid funds are not used well to help those most in need; therefore, the program should have a lower priority in a time of budget austerity. Funds saved by eliminating Category B have been put into programs which can directly benefit the disadvantaged. Thus, education programs for the disadvantaged will actually increase \$220 million over their FY 1979 level. Contrary to opponents' claims, school districts with Category B students do not necessarily lose tax revenues or experience financial difficulties. Because impact aid funds are not distributed based on real need, many wealthy school districts receive large sums of money merely because of the presence of tax-exempt federal property.

Arguments Against the President's Budget Eliminating Category B Payments.—Opponents of the President's proposal argue that eliminating Category B payments could result in an increase in local property taxes or a decrease in the quality of education, or both. The Federal Government is obligated to compensate districts for the loss of revenues associated with the presence of tax-exempt federal land holdings or federal employers. The loss in revenues hurts the districts' ability to cope with increased student enrollments. The U.S. government owns \$101 billion in tax-exempt property. Most dis-

tricts view impact aid money as a payment in lieu of taxes and use the funds for schools' general operating expenses, including heat, utilities, teachers' salaries, and instructional materials. Abruptly ending Category B payments would throw numerous local school budgets into chaos. School districts that rely on impact aid will face critical budget shortfalls forcing them to raise property taxes or lower the quality of education. Elimination of funds would hurt not only 23 million students who directly and indirectly benefit, but would add to the inflation burden on families. Congress should be going after waste in the federal budget, not important education programs.

Handicapped education budget

Arguments For the President's Budget.—Supporters of the Administration's budget for educational programs for the handicapped argue that it is adequate to meet the educational needs of handicapped children. Except for small cuts in three programs, funding levels will remain the same as they were in FY 1979. More important, funding for the largest of the programs—the state grant program—has been increased by \$58 million. For those programs which have been cut, the cuts can be made up through other programs. Support for preschool programs can be provided through the state grant program; the objectives of the early childhood education program can be accomplished at a lower funding level; and, personnel receiving special education training can obtain support under the state grant program.

Arguments Against the President's Budget.—Opponents of the President's budget for educational programs for the handicapped argue that it does not live up to the federal mandate that all handicapped children are entitled to a free and appropriate education. Present financial resources are inadequate and the government's budget will throw more of the cost of educating the handicapped on the backs of state and local governments which are already hard pressed for funds. Full funding of early education programs are especially critical because studies have shown that with early intervention some handicapped conditions are reversible. It has also been shown that the multiplying consequences of a disability can be sharply curtailed if children are given attention at an early age. Schools are already laboring under a tremendous financial burden, and lack of adequate funding for programs for the handicapped will exacerbate those financial problems and lower the quality of education.

NOTE.—The arguments presented in this section are not DSG's arguments nor do they represent a DSG evaluation of the President's budget. As indicated, they are the arguments which supporters are making on behalf of the budget and which opponents are making against it. DSG attempts to summarize the arguments on both sides as strongly and cogently as possible.●

A BUSINESS PERSPECTIVE

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● **Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON** of California. Mr. Speaker, to help my colleagues who are having a difficult time explaining why the Federal Government spends so much of the taxpayers money, I have one area where Federal spending is actually helpful—the procurement business.

Each year, the Federal Government

awards thousands of contracts worth billions of dollars to small and minority businesses across the country. I try to acquaint local businessmen and women in the Los Angeles area with how they can expand their opportunities through an annual conference.

This Federal Procurement and Trade Conference has met with a great deal of success. One of the reasons is the assistance I receive from major prime contractors in southern California—the aerospace industry.

These companies have an outstanding record in helping small and minority businesses. Opportunities are increasing and the result is a better economic outlook for our area.

This year, conference participants heard from Mr. Lawrence Kitchen, president of Lockheed Corp. Lockheed has an excellent record in their small and minority business program. According to Mr. Kitchen:

Lockheed spent \$359 million last year with small businessmen.

In recognition of their efforts, the Office of Minority Business Enterprise (OMBE) presented Lockheed with an award of excellence for their contribution to minority businesses.

I would like to include Mr. Kitchen's remarks in the Record because they address the problem of government interference in our free enterprise system.

Perhaps if government listened more, the budget would not have a deficit. As we all know, unnecessary regulation, paperwork, and redtape cost money, too.

The remarks follow:

POPULISM: DANGEROUS TO OUR HEALTH
(Remarks by Mr. Lawrence O. Kitchen)

Thank you, Congressman Wilson, ladies and gentlemen, for that kind reaction. I'm honored to be here among friends, a precious commodity each of us has need for from time to time.

In preparing for this moment, I obtained a list of those who have talked at Charlie Wilson seminars in the past. It's a heavyweight list. People like Senator Cannon, Secretary McLucas, Bob Anderson, Allen Puckett. Men of truly awesome stature.

Reminds me of the time God talked St. Peter into a round of golf.

God teed off first and hit a terrible slice into the woods. St. Peter got set, but before he could tee up his ball, there was a small earthquake in the woods. As fate would have it, the shaking was right under God's ball, which bounced out of the woods and into the center of the fairway. It was barely rolling, but a huge, solid-gold eagle swooped down, picked up the ball, flew 300 yards up the fairway and dropped the ball on the green. Then an after-shock came. The edges of the green slowly rose. The green became a funnel with the first hole at the bottom. God's ball rolled into the cup for a hole-in-one. St. Peter watched all this without saying a word. Then he turned to God and said: "Okay, do you want to play golf, or do you want to fool around?"

As much as I'd like to be out on the course, I won't fool around any longer.

Today, I'd like to focus on some things that should be of interest and concern to all businessmen. Be they large or small. Perhaps, along the way, I can puncture a mistaken premise or two voiced by people often labeled as "populists."

You know the populists. I'm sure. They are the descendants of a short-lived political party in this country back in the late 19th

century. The Populist Party represented agricultural interests, advocated the free coinage of silver and wanted the government to control monopolies. Today, the populist has no party, but he claims to represent the common people. Common on the populist's terms of course. Populists use others to advocate their own strong beliefs along the way and, if they are seekers of public office, to pick up some stray votes at election time. Whereas experienced officeholders like Charlie Wilson have their fingers on the pulse of their constituents, populists don't restrict themselves in any way. They have the uncanny ability to know what to say on any given subject at any given time . . . anywhere. A populist, to hear him or her tell it, is everyone's advocate for the (quote) common good (unquote).

A populist never labels himself because it restricts his flexibility. I'd like to talk to you for the next few minutes about the approach of the populist as he uses a variety of groups to reach his objectives. Notably, the news media, business people, and . . . most important to this group . . . how the populist uses small businessmen.

The populist needs a large audience to spread his message. So, he turns to the news media. There he finds some allies, not because they are necessarily anti-business or anti-free enterprise, or certainly not because they are against democracy. It's just that good news is not what makes people turn the knob, good news doesn't make big headlines that you can read when you pass the newspaper rack. News, basically, is confrontation—by word or otherwise. The populist also benefits from the prevalent view of many that big is bad.

So, when a company or a businessman is reprimanded, that merely fuels the long-time thinking of many inside and outside the media. It also provides additional fodder for the populist to use later. Some of his discoveries warrant closer inspection, but few challenges to the populist are as effective as his original statement.

Now, let's consider television from the entertainment standpoint. One of our modern conveniences: You can do almost anything except drive a car while watching it. And from some of the things I see on the freeway, it seems some people are even trying that. Television has become a tremendous influence on human behavior. Television also has created the stereotyped businessman for its entertainment shows.

If you want to test this for yourself, simply take a few mental notes tonight when you switch on the set. Whenever a businessman appears in a show . . . and it isn't often, by the way . . . decide for yourself what kind of image he has. In the main, you'll find he's either an odd-ball, a cheat or both. Certainly not a nice person, and nobody we'd care to know. This is curious, especially to those who know that the three major television networks are three of this country's largest businesses.

When a person gets most of his information from the media and his concepts of life from televised entertainment, it's part of the reason why anti-business attitudes flourish. The other part is our own fault but, I'm happy to say businessmen are agreeing to publicly appear more often now and to shun the once tried-and-true low key approaches. We have a need to be heard.

So, you're wondering, what does this have to do with small businessmen? In a word . . . plenty. Lockheed spent \$359 million last year with small businessmen: 60 percent of our purchase orders were placed with people just like you. No doubt with some of you. We have obligations as a supplier of equipment vital to the future of this and other countries. Obviously, if we succeed it is due greatly to the efforts of you, our suppliers. Without your dedication and your cooperation, it would be an impossible task

for Lockheed or any other major contractor. You are the heart of this free enterprise system we all want to preserve. We could learn a lot from the individual efforts you give every day. Without sounding like a preacher, I just want to tell you we're proud to do business with a great many capable and essential small businesses.

Together, we both must challenge those who use us in the name of populism. Neither our image or yours is enhanced by some of the rhetoric that flows so freely back in Washington. You'll hear almost everything on capitol hill if you stick around long enough—and probably see most of it published in the Congressional Record.

Washington, D.C. presents a forum for every viewpoint. Everyone has a cause, and the more aggressive and more articulate capture the spotlight. My sense of what is right is strained and I become irritated when certain individuals and groups perpetuate distorted views of the real world. Over the years, outrageous statements develop into accepted facts.

Such as the myth, always expressed in overblown words, that big business is taking advantage of small business. Small businessmen don't complain about big business: they complain about big government.

Let's consider the minority businessman. For openers, he is of an ethnic group labeled as a minority. Correct? And minorities, from past performance, are exploited by majorities. Correct? The conclusion, therefore, has to be that minority businessmen are denied access to the mainstream or are exploited by majority businessmen. Correct? No! And here's why such a conclusion is totally wrong.

First, I think you'll agree that companies of all sizes are in business to make money. Surely not all of them succeed, but, suffice to say, they're trying.

Second, it follows that money will be made and people will be employed if the overall economic climate is sound. In order to make the climate sound, you certainly don't exclude anyone to the advantage of someone else, not if his success makes your community thrive. That wouldn't make sense. Empty stores and vast unemployment are alternatives detrimental to all.

Minority businessmen are, of course, small businessmen. They have a lot of catching up to do and aren't sufficiently developed to qualify as a big business. They need a hand, a lot of encouragement. Big businesses need to talk with the minority businessman about what he sells and how it can be used. There should be a sales training program to help the minority businessman to refine his marketing skills. Big businessmen should implement their purchasing programs to include, for consideration, what the small minority business has to offer. Minority business opportunity days should be arranged so that qualified minority suppliers can meet potential users of their goods and services.

I'm pleased to report that all this is being done, right now, in Los Angeles. Lockheed and more than 100 other major corporations are members of the Los Angeles regional purchasing council. It's really a million-dollar connection between big businesses and smaller ones. Good sense, and good business for everyone.

There are 42 regional purchasing councils in the United States and we're involved in most of them. Last year, Lockheed, alone, made 14,732 awards of business to 545 minority firms, an increase over 1977 of 36%. Those awards totalled 15 million 800 thousand dollars.

Like everyone else, we are faced with legal and paperwork barriers in the path to a healthy economy. But, at least, the basic size standards for small business haven't changed very much. And rules of thumb on such things as the number of employees a small business can have, and the amount of money

they can make, are tangibles we can zero in on.

You can be sure we will overcome the red tape, as we did last year when nearly 82 percent of some 30,000 suppliers to Lockheed were small businesses.

We do business with suppliers in 49 of the 50 states. Our involvement with small business grows each year. Last year, our Lockheed-California company added 896 new small businesses to the roster of our suppliers.

Now, in these closing minutes, I'd like to offer a few suggestions of how to deal with the populists. Populists have been effective in recording our national priorities so that economic strength becomes secondary to international idealism and domestic transfer payments. They are hostile to business activities and suspicious of business motives.

Business, however, is mellow today. The "Caveat Emptor" style of doing business was deplorable and, while the pushing by consumerists and environmentalists served as a strong momentum, I believe the necessary changes in business philosophy came about primarily from intense competition in the marketplace.

Now, though, the string of populist victories is bringing us rapidly to the point where a businessman's fate is like the no-smoking warnings on cigarette packages. First, it was hazardous to partake: now it's plain dangerous. While we once believed there was a choice between free enterprise and socialism, the spectre of government-owned production and distribution is no longer the threat. The populists have found that control is possible without ownership. And they are getting that control—through taxation, through legislation, through regulation, through bureaucratic processes, and—as I said back at the beginning—through access to Americans, via publicity and the press. The control is there under the guise of (quote) making business more responsive (unquote).

Business, large and small, need to do some protecting of our own. We can penetrate the smoke screens of rhetoric, but we can't do it by waiting for someone else to speak out. There is a very real threat to us, amounting to a rip in the fabric of American free enterprise. It will get larger unless we are determined to do something about it.

Let's talk to our elected representatives about what we do and how efficiently our system can work. Let's challenge the doubters, and those who believe what they hear about big business exploiting small business, and about the so-called oppression of minority businesses. Let's shine the light of reality on a climate of negativity. And let's tell our own story, the story of free enterprise, instead of patting ourselves on the back and hoping someone else will do it for us.

It would be a shame if we lost our free enterprise system for any reason, but it would be a great tragedy were we to let it die simply because we didn't realize it was wounded.

Thank you very much.●

HOSPITAL COST CONTROL AND THE SHUR SYSTEM

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters from hospitals and hospital associations detailing some major objections with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's proposed system for hospital uniform reporting. I have also talked to hospital

administrators who voiced strong objections and concerns with complying with the proposed SHUR system.

HEW is considering implementing the SHUR system which will require thousands of dollars of additional administrative cost at a time when H.R. 2626, the President's hospital cost control proposal, is being considered by the Ways and Means Committee and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. H.R. 2626 would limit hospitals from increasing rates more than 9 percent per year. While the President's proposal has problems of its own which would place tremendous hardships on hospitals, implementation of SHUR would almost make it impossible for hospitals to stay within the 9 percent guideline considering the additional cost which would be associated with compliance.

The Ways and Means Committee and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee should review the proposed SHUR system in order to determine if it is consistent with section 19 of Public Law 142 which mandated functional reporting by hospitals. After reviewing some of the comments I received from hospitals, it would appear that section 19 may have to be amended in order to reduce the burdens it places on hospitals. Certainly, both committees should consider holding hearings to determine if any amendments are necessary.

In order that the Members of the House can benefit from some of the excellent letters I referred to earlier, I am placing two representative samples in the RECORD at this point. Hopefully the Department of HEW will take into account the objections expressed in these letters. I urge all my colleagues to read the following letters and contact HEW requesting that the SHUR system be modified to meet the concerns of our hospitals which can ill afford the burdens SHUR would place on them.

INDIANA HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
Indianapolis, Ind., April 5, 1979.

Mr. LEONARD D. SCHAEFFER,
Administrator, Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. SCHAEFFER: The Indiana Hospital Association offers the following comments relative to the proposed rule, Uniform Reporting Systems For Health Services Facilities and Organizations, File Code PCO-185-P.

The Indiana Hospital Association is opposed to implementation of the proposed system.

The following comments are significant reasons why the IHA has taken this position:

1. Hospitals are not opposed to uniform reporting—under our rate review system hospitals report pertinent, useable financial and statistical information that permits comparison of hospital operations.

2. Hospitals do object to uniform accounting—that's what SHUR creates. It discards existing systems unless hospitals want to maintain records on a functional basis for the government and also maintain existing systems for day-to-day operating purposes.

3. Executive Order 12044 calls for a study of the economic impact of proposed regulations. No study was completed before the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking was published. SHUR will require substantial expenditures for implementation purposes and additional expenditures to maintain the system once it is implemented. At the same time,

HEW and the Administration are calling for controls to limit hospital expenditures.

4. HEW will not test the system both as to actual cost of implementation and the benefit to be derived, because they do not want to delay implementation. Substantial expenditures may be made for a system that is not effective.

5. Government has mandated the system yet will only participate in the costs involved to the extent of Medicare/Medicaid patient load.

6. HEW wants payment to hospitals tied to the reporting system. It's on a functional basis and does not accommodate the differences between hospitals nor would it define accurately the cost of delivering care to Medicare/Medicaid patients. A principle of the Medicare/Medicaid program is that the government pay all of the costs associated with delivery.

7. Efforts to impact on reimbursement should be by the policy and regulation process, not as a by-product of a reporting system.

8. The requirements relating to functional cost centers must be modified so that only material amounts influencing a user's interpretation of the operation are reclassified.

9. Tremendous amounts of data are to be supplied. Who will use it and in what way? According to the proposed regulations, "upon request, any agency or organization" can get the information.

Different agencies require somewhat the same data but they do not coordinate their collection efforts. Information is available on existing reports that has not been utilized.

10. SHUR is not a system designed to fit a need—it is designed to provide any data that anyone might conceivably want.

11. The impact will be enormous on small hospitals because many of them have neither the technical staffing to implement the program nor the resources to purchase the expertise. Staffing to maintain the system may not be available in many communities.

12. HEW has taken authority for the plan from the Medicare/Medicaid Anti-Fraud and Abuse bill—this system does nothing to enhance detection of fraud and abuse.

13. Government Study of Implementation Costs of SHUR Manual—The IHA closely reviewed the two Indiana hospitals participating in the HEW financed study to estimate the cost of implementing the SHUR program. In reviewing these studies, the IHA learned that the CPA firm conducting the reviews was basing their cost estimates of SHUR implementation on the use of sampling techniques for determination of the reclassifications of wages and salaries from responsibility accounting centers to functional cost centers.

This technique violates the explicit instructions of the SHUR manual (page 1.29 of the September 1978 draft). The CPAs, when confronted with this fact, stated that implementation costs would be increased by approximately 30%, if sampling techniques were not allowed for these reclassifications. They further stated that it was their understanding that all of the 50 hospitals participating in the project were relying on sampling techniques specifically prohibited by the September draft of the SHUR manual.

While the IHA has not seen the final reports of the estimated implementation costs of the SHUR program, there is a strong concern regarding validity of the study if these errors were duplicated in the other 48 hospitals participating in the study.

14. Technical Comments—There are several technical matters with which the IHA has strong concern with the SHUR manual in its present form.

A. Materiality.—Most of the reclassifications which will be identified in the SHUR manual are immaterial and produce changes in functional cost centers which have little or no value from a comparative analysis

standpoint. The threshold for materiality should be raised markedly.

B. Depreciation.—The requirement to record depreciation on major movable equipment by cost center will result in substantially increased costs for hospitals in obtaining appraisals, etc.

C. Inventory.—Maintaining usage records (for perpetual inventory) for pharmacy inventory is a practice that is not common in Indiana hospitals. The manual requires this if floor stock is maintained or transfers to other departments from pharmacy are made. The costs of maintaining this pharmacy inventory would be quite substantial in most Indiana hospitals.

D. Sampling.—Sampling and estimation techniques which are specifically prohibited by the SHUR manual would, in the opinion of IHA, result in valid, material reclassifications of expenses in most cases.

E. FICA taxes and employee fringe benefits.—Direct identification of FICA taxes and other payroll related fringe benefits would prove to be extremely expensive and not cost effective. Allocation of non-payroll related fringe benefits could be performed by HEW on a computerized basis as a result of any revised SHUR reporting form.

F. Non-routine maintenance.—Allocation of non-routine maintenance distorts comparisons, requires extremely complex recording of wages and salaries, FICA taxes and other costs. Results are potentially more misleading than helpful.

G. Data processing.—The allocation of data processing costs on CPU time is not an adequate basis of allocation. This time consuming chore would distort the functional costs as presently requested, and does not result in accurate allocation of data processing costs.

H. Many of the standard units of measure (sums) are not kept by Indiana hospitals and would be extremely expensive to generate.

Conclusion.—The uniform reporting system, which as stated above, is in essence a uniform accounting system, does not generate uniformity of operations. Many other factors, beyond the accounting system's capability, must be considered if comparability of hospital data is the true objective of the SHUR program. These items would include case mix, age of facilities, size of nursing units, seasonal population trends, medical staff composition, and many other factors.

15. Many of the major accounting firms in the country, as well as independent smaller firms are opposed to SHUR. That is strange when one considers the revenue opportunities the system offers them.

16. Alternative.—Expand present system of reporting direct costs, perhaps allocate them in a more detailed manner, with the objective of producing data which can be used to better compare hospitals to one another, and to be able to do so without undergoing the costly process of implementing a totally new system.

The Indiana Hospital Association urgently requests that comments offered by all hospitals and organizations be given careful consideration by HCFA with the objective of modifying the system to make it more effective in attaining its purposes, less burdensome to the industry, and much less costly to implement and maintain.

Sincerely,

ELTON TEKOLSTE,
President.

HOWARD COMMUNITY HOSPITAL,
April 17, 1979.

ADMINISTRATOR,
Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am a certified Public Accountant with sixteen years' experience in Public

Accounting and eleven years' experience in hospital accounting, eight of which have been as a Chief Financial Officer at this 200 bed hospital with a Comprehensive Regional Mental Health Center.

I have devoted a considerable amount of time and effort in analyzing your System for Hospital Uniform Reporting. The limitations on my time preclude my doing a complete analysis, however I have found several areas of great concern.

My first concern is the extreme difficulty in understanding and complying with this tremendously long and difficult document. In the certification statement you have to certify that you have "reconciled to reflect the Chart of Accounts, definitions, principles and statistics prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare . . ." How enormously difficult and expensive. We estimate that to get the system in place would cost us between \$25,000 and \$30,000 and the annual maintenance of this system would entail an additional \$15,000 to \$20,000. And all this in an era when we are making a very strong effort to contain our costs.

I think the reclassifications would cause us more trouble than anything that I came across in this system. If you can find a practicing C.P.A. who thinks that your tests of materiality are appropriate, I would appreciate your letting me know. At any rate, let me discuss some of the reclassification problems:

1. In our Laboratory we have people and use supplies in common. It would be next to impossible with our size operation (over 4,000 admissions) to use any rational method to divide the Lab into Clinical, Pathological, Blood, and Blood Processing. To accomplish the required break downs would surely exceed whatever gains are involved.

2. In Data Processing, I believe that your statistic is gravely flawed. As I understand it, we are to charge out our DP costs based on central processing time. That is not where the expense is. Our Programmers have developed an in-house system and programming time should be charged to the user or users that will benefit. The machine operator's time should be charged to the length of the run and not to the CPU time, which is quite different. And the key-punchers' time should be charged to the departments for whom they are punching charges, doing inventory, payroll, accounts payable, statistics, cash receipts, personnel information, preventive maintenance and so forth. I firmly believe that you should consider leaving Data Processing as a cost center and not requiring reallocation.

3. In our Accounting office we handle the Data Processing control. Frankly, I did not see this issue addressed, but is the cost of this service to be charged to the Data Processing Department?

4. We have a very great problem in the Business office area because we have a Patient Representative system which has to be allocated to areas as diverse as Admitting, Billing, Credit and Collections, Social Services, and Communications. They also do Out-Patient work and they relieve some of the business office jobs occasionally. In the interest of simplification, may I suggest that the business office be used as one cost center and the allocation merely be among in-patient, out-patient, emergency, ambulance and other appropriate services. In that general vein, may I also suggest that total costs of the Emergency Room be allocated between the emergencies treated on an Out-Patient basis and Emergency cases that are admitted.

5. Each functional cost center would have to have wages and FICA taxes and fringe benefits allocated to the cost center to which the employee worked. And when the employee has to be charged out of such a

functional department, all the wages and fringes must follow. This could be done but only with enormous difficulty. We would have to have an extremely sophisticated computer system to handle the charging and allocations of something as simple as wages and fringes in these various cost centers.

6. From my reading, I understand that patient transportation has to be reclassified to ancillary departments. What if the person is transported to more than one ancillary department? Patient transportation in has been handled by the Nursing Unit, Volunteers, Service Representatives and others on occasion. Patient transportation out has also been handled by people working in a number of departments. May I suggest that patient transportation be used as a cost center and then allocated out rather than reclassified? Patient transportation simply does not need to be allocated. In the normal course, the ancillary department that provides the service also provides the transportation that is required.

7. EMT's from our Ambulance Service are currently stationed in the Emergency Room where they help and occasionally they work on nursing units. We do reclassify from Ambulance time into Emergency Room time now. I think only a minor part of their work should be classified to in-patient routine. But we have many other problems with nursing allocations. I understand you to mean that our nursing personnel that gives Psychiatric Ancillary Services has to be set up as a separate cost center; no charge would be made for this service. In our in-patient Psychiatric Unit I do not know what kind of Psychiatric Ancillary Services these people could give. In your revision I would appreciate very much your discussing the distinction between nursing personnel working in a Psychiatric Unit giving Psychiatric Ancillary Care. Also, minor amounts of time that nursing would spend drawing blood, getting specimens, doing discharge bed making, passing trays, cleaning up spills, etc. would have to be charged out to various other cost centers. Has the difficulty and expense of such nit-picking entries been submitted to any kind of cost-benefit analysis?

8. If I may, let me give my understanding of some of the other reclassifications that would have to be made under your system. Whoever changes light bulbs has to be charged to maintenance of plant. The Administrator's Secretary typically performs functions for the Medical Staff and a number of Department Heads; her time would have to be allocated accordingly. The IV teams would have to be classified as an in-patient routine function and allocated in that way and emergency IV's would have to be classified between the emergency patients admitted and the emergency patients treated and released. We would have to divide oxygen therapy into departments called Respiratory Therapy and Pulmonary Functions. When the Receiving Department takes in a delivery of pharmaceutical items, the costs of the Receiving Department would have to be reclassified to Pharmacy. This is also true when the Receiving Department brings in Dietary goods. If any department cleans its own area (such as Surgery, Dietary, Laundry, Maintenance) that department has to reclassify all this expense to Housekeeping.

In order to comply with your requirement that Equipment Depreciation be directly charged to the functional cost center, we would need to retain an appraisal service to make a detailed break down. You even go so far as to require that if more than one department utilizes the same equipment, depreciation has to be prorated to two or more users. Something like this would be most difficult to accomplish. If you think I exaggerate, please consider that we are a 200 bed hospital and that we have something on the order of 6,000 pieces of equipment.

The inventory as I understand it in the SHUR Manual will require considerably more work in record keeping and in pricing. May I point out that inventories are a small portion of hospital assets and the expense involved simply does not justify an extremely sophisticated system. In our case inventories are 2.125 percent of our total assets. Does it really matter if we show them as 2.124 percent of our assets or 2.126 percent of our assets?

You have an extremely complicated system for identifying compensation and hours worked. As I read it you have eleven classifications, some of which would require subclassifications if they are to be meaningful and be used with any appropriate system that we have in place at the present time. In Indiana, we have used a system of hours and rates for certain bench-mark positions, which has been very useful to the Indiana Rate Review System. Perhaps you could consider something on that order.

In addition to all the other burdensome work that you are creating for us, you are making us keep approximately fifteen statistics that we do not keep now and which I do not believe are routinely kept by hospitals. Perhaps some of these are valid and would prove useful, but some of them are also ridiculous:

1. You ask for laundry processed. Normally when the laundry comes in it is weighed and that is the statistic that is commonly used. Now we would have to weigh the production of finished laundry which is taken to many areas instead of the dirty laundry which comes into a centralized point. It seems to me that that should be rethought.

2. You asked us to keep track of surgery minutes. To what purpose? You could have anything from a biopsy under a local anesthetic to a complicated procedure that could use several technicians. The cases that different hospitals do are very diverse. When you mix up extremes such as is required under your system, you will get a meaningless answer.

I feel strongly that the Indiana Rate Review System, with its prospective reimbursement, has been most successful. We have saved the citizens of this state an enormous amount of money, because our rates are approximately 18% under the surrounding states. In our Rate Review process we have a system of Uniform Reporting that does not get into fantastically detailed financial and statistical data. May I suggest that in your Uniform Reporting, you would be well advised to review the Indiana system. In short, Uniform Reporting is a worthy concept, but the SHUR System, is far too burdensome and expensive.

Very truly yours,
RONALD GREEN, C.P.A.,
Director fiscal service.

"ADEQUATE CIVIL DEFENSE CAN HELP NATION SURVIVE"

HON. DONALD J. MITCHELL
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has an urgent need for a civil defense system that will help maintain the strategic balance and adequately protect our populace in the event of a nuclear war. The United States is already 10 years and \$10 billion behind the Soviet Union in civil defense preparedness. Yet there remains a great

lack of understanding on the part of some Americans as to the aims and needs of our civil defense program. This problem has been thoughtfully addressed by Mr. John Bex, director of Region Two, Defense Civil Preparedness Agency. I would like to share his analysis of the problem with my colleagues in the House:

ADEQUATE CIVIL DEFENSE CAN HELP NATION SURVIVE

(By John E. Bex)

A great amount of news media coverage is being devoted to civil defense during its present discussion period. While much of the material has been supportive, some reflects a strong opposition to any sort of civil defense capacity for the people of this nation. In fact, contempt toward civil defense seems to be something of a cottage industry for some individuals.

For the concerned opposition, I'd like to share these thoughts:

In anticipation that a nuclear exchange could occur in anger or by accident, we have these options: 1) Do nothing; 2) plan for seeking nearby shelter; 3) plan for evacuation to a distant, more secure area should time permit.

In the '50s it was thought that we would only have a few hours advance notice. Now, it is felt that we could have possibly a longer period, up to several days or a couple of weeks. Knowledgeable authorities have stated that the kill area of the total U.S.S.R. missile arsenal, if all impacted upon U.S. soil, would cover no more than 4 to 5 percent of all land area. Then it is reasonable to assume that, if one had the time and inclination, one could find secure shelter from fallout effects in the other areas of our country, where chances of survival would be good.

But what is it about civil defense that makes the small opposition so vocal? Civil defense has always been the element of national security most intimately related to citizenry; civil defense provides a system for reducing vulnerability of people and communities to damage, injury and loss of life and property resulting from disaster. Elected and appointed officials at the state and local levels of government depend on their civil defense organization for support in carrying out their disaster-related responsibilities.

Part of the reason for this "down-with-civil-defense" syndrome is a lack of understanding of civil defense reflected in such allegations as (a) the American public is not sold on civil defense, (b) civil defense cannot work, (c) civil defense measures make war more thinkable and are provocative, and (d) civil defense is gigantically expensive.

The allegations reflect a lack of knowledge of the facts, contribute to misinformation and serve to foster erroneous conclusions.

PUBLIC IS NOT SOLD ON CIVIL DEFENSE?

A large body of available public attitude information shows a consistent level of public support for all kinds of civil defense programs—fallout shelters, blast shelters and evacuation. Few public programs command such a broad base of passive support. Survey data since the 1960s show that 87 percent of the population surveyed are in favor of fallout shelters; 50 percent of the people surveyed felt that a person should go along with any fallout program the government proposes, while more than two-thirds of our people would not be opposed to "strategic evacuation."

According to research, the public regards civil defense as a government responsibility. People associate civil defense with national defense and trust the government in this area. They believe what needs to be done is

being done. They believe more is being done than is the case and feel that even this is not enough.

CIVIL DEFENSE CANNOT WORK?

More than six out of every ten Americans estimate chances for survival in the event of nuclear attack are bad. People who live in highly industrialized urban areas estimate their chances as worse. Studies indicate that adequate civil defense can definitely reduce the vulnerability of the U.S. population to nuclear attack. For example, if there were no civil defense, about 20 percent of the population would survive. With in-place fallout protection provided, about 38 percent of the population would survive. With extensive relocation (evacuation) plus some fallout protection, between 71 and 87 percent would survive. With in-place blast and fallout protection, about 90 percent of the people would survive.

Civil defense cannot save all because in a war there will always be casualties. With knowledge and skillful use of modern protective measures, mass means of destruction will not destroy masses of people, but only those who neglect the use of those measures.

CIVIL DEFENSE MEASURES MAKE WAR MORE THINKABLE AND ARE PROVOCATIVE?

Survey data do not show preparedness measures make war seem more acceptable, more probable or less probable. The Soviets have been spending about one billion rubles per year on civil defense measures over the recent past. They do not seem to have worried whether it might be "provocative" to the U.S. Survey data show that just about two-thirds of the samples feel that such measures "make no difference" one way or another in this regard or that civil defense systems would be provocative.

CIVIL DEFENSE IS GIGANTICALLY EXPENSIVE

It's not as expensive as our national highway system; not as expensive as our growing defense budget. There must be a formula that proves by spending a dollar for Civil Defense at a certain level, you can save the expenditure of 10 on defense.

Building underground shelters that would protect all of our population with respect to fire and blast truly would be expensive. Our Congress, in the past, has ruled this option out.

If it is true, certainly one of our biggest concerns is the fact that the Russian people are being conditioned to the thought that you can fight a nuclear war and survive. This thinking and understanding on the part of the Russian people should be changed. Inasmuch as thus far no effort is being made on our part to bring this about, Crisis Relocation Planning (evacuation of likely target areas) appears to be a viable inexpensive option.

Civil defense warning systems over the years have undoubtedly saved thousands of lives. Recent example: Cincinnati warning its population about the 1974 April tornadoes; only three lives were lost. Civil defense training, education and public information is most important and very inexpensive.

On June 19, 1978, the president caused the long-stalled disaster preparedness pendulum to swing off dead center. He announced to Congress (and Congress approved) a comprehensive reorganization of the federal government's emergency preparedness and disaster program.

This announcement, widely applauded both in and outside of the disaster preparedness circle, is hailed as a major step in meeting vital public needs in times of grave hardship.

But along with the major surgery performed on reorganization, there is need to apply the scalpel to existing civil defense

programs, not to do away with civil defense, as suggested by the small opposition, but to carve out a viable civil defense program.

The subject of civil defense merits national public debate.●

AIRCRAFT NOISE

HON. JOSEPH L. FISHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, in Northern Virginia the phrase "the dawn comes up like thunder" has a very real meaning. For the thousands of citizens unlucky enough to live under or near the flight paths of planes using either National or Dulles Airports, the morning brings the roar of jet aircraft, at times without respite. And the noise and the air pollution continue all day, often long past the elusive 10 p.m. cutoff time.

To try to reduce the problem, I have introduced legislation to require the Federal Aviation Administration, which owns and operates National and Dulles Airports, to prepare and implement noise abatement plans for both airports. The plans would have to follow the outline described in the Airport Noise Abatement Policy published by the FAA in 1976. This document outlines measures that airport operators can take to reduce noise. These measures include aircraft operating procedures on landings and takeoffs, various operating restrictions, shifting flights to other airports, advice on land use planning, and other activities to be done in cooperation with State and local government officials. As the operator of two major airports, the FAA has the opportunity to be a leader in implementing its own suggestions and in abating aircraft noise. Unfortunately, it has not done so, but my bill would start the process in motion. The bill sets deadlines for each step of the planning process, including public hearings.

The FAA can also respond to citizen concerns about airport noise in its revision of the Metropolitan Washington Airport Policy, published in draft form in March 1978. The FAA can tailor the policy statement to reduce the use of National, where jet noise is a major problem, in favor of Dulles, which is designed for jet aircraft. The draft statement fell short of this goal. Recent press reports about the revised policy statement indicate little additional progress. The FAA is proposing to strengthen its night curfew, which is a vital step in providing relief from noise. It is also proposing to increase the operations allocated to commuter airlines. However, other aspects of the proposed policy trouble me. By removing the 650-radius limitation on flights, the way is opened for new long distance flights to come in at times when the hourly quota is not currently filled. In addition, the quieter wide-bodied aircraft which will be permitted into National will carry additional passengers, thus burdening airport facilities and

ground transportation. Each wide-bodied aircraft operation should be a substitute for two smaller, noisier planes. This would help reduce operations and overcrowding at National Airport as well as noise.

I hope that some of these problems can be eliminated and further improvements made in the policy statement before its final version is published.

While some noise must be expected from the operation of an airport, the FAA can take more steps to reduce the negative impact of National Airport on the citizens of the Washington metropolitan area. The bill that I have introduced to require noise abatement plans will require the FAA to make the efforts to reduce noise that it should have been making for years. There is still a chance for the FAA to improve its policy statement for metropolitan airports to better serve the citizens of this area. The struggle to make the airports good neighbors has been going on for a long time and I hope that we can see progress soon.

I am pleased to report that my five colleagues from the Washington metropolitan area are cosponsors of the noise abatement bill and that Senator MATHIAS is introducing the same bill in the Senate.●

RESPONSE TO OIL COMPANY PROFIT STATEMENTS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the recent overly large profits shown in the first quarter statements of the major oil companies come as no surprise to anyone who is familiar with the industry.

These profits come at a curiously opportune time: The administration has announced its support of a windfall profits tax, and there could scarcely be a better example of the concept of "windfall profit" than we see here. The necessity of such a tax is plain. My only real question is whether the tax proposed by the President is adequate to do the job. I suspect it is not. I am confident Congress will give this matter its closest attention when this legislation is finally drafted and presented for consideration, and I can promise my own close and undivided attention to the subject.

Another related matter will deserve careful review in the same context. This is the question of the end to which these profits are to be put. If they go to increased exploration for oil and gas and the development of alternate sources of energy and conservation, or if they go to ways in which the reserves which we can use may be better utilized, I will be both impressed and surprised.

I would not, I regret to say, be shocked to see a significant effort on the part of the oil companies to devote these increased funds toward the acquisition of wholly unrelated businesses and activities: Department stores, circuses, other

conglomerates, and the like. That clearly cannot be allowed. I expect that there will be strong pressure brought to bear on the Congress to prohibit these types of expenditures, or even to require divestiture of the diversified activities by oil companies which have developed in the past. I have introduced legislation on this subject before. I would expect to consider carefully the necessity of such legislation in the very near future, if attempts are made by the oil industry and their friends to let these industries use these revenues in this way.●

THE GOP AND NHI

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party's position on national health insurance is symptomatic of the reasons Republicans are still in such a minority position. The diagnosis given by Mr. Stanton Evans, one of the wisest political thinkers in Washington, in a recent issue of *Private Practice*, is very much to the point, as is his prescription. I would like to call it to my colleagues' attention, especially my Republican colleagues.

THE GOP AND NHI

(By M. Stanton Evans)

Political analysis trying to dissect the problems of the Republican Party need look no further than the issue of national health insurance. The Party's halting approaches to this important topic wrap in one convenient package the strategic confusions which have kept it mired in minority status for so many decades.

As often occurs in Washington, the discussion begins with a paradox: in an era of general disenchantment with government spending and regulation, health care remains one of the principal areas where it is still considered respectable, if not obligatory, to recommend a further dose of government intrusion. When it comes to airline or trucking regulations, even Senator Edward Kennedy, arguing for deregulation, contends that government is the source of the trouble rather than the remedy for it.

But Kennedy and his allies seem unwilling to generalize these lessons to the workings of our medical economy. While pushing for deregulation elsewhere, Kennedy has simultaneously been pressing hard for massive government intrusion into the realm of medicine, above and beyond the sizable interventions we already have.

The paradox goes even further. On this issue it would appear Senator Kennedy reigns virtually supreme. He is the capital's dominant spokesman on the health care question, and is constantly being quoted on the alleged need for national health insurance. His criticisms of our private health care delivery system are given enormous weight, even when they have small relevance to the facts. Exactly how and when he will push for NHI are perennial topics of speculation.

The Republican Party, in the meantime, has been conspicuous by its absence. Republican spokesmen are seldom quoted on health care issues, and if their statements or proposals are picked up at all, they are usually handled in perfunctory fashion. The real debate on national health insurance, so far

as the media is concerned, is between Senator Kennedy, with his demand for comprehensive NHI, and President Carter with his piecemeal approach to the same objective. The Grand Old Party is not a serious factor in the equation.

The how and why of this peculiar situation tell us a good deal about the functioning of our political system, and about the condition of the Republican Party. They also make it relatively plain that there is going to be a lot more Federal intervention in the medical economy unless the Republican Party and other professed friends of private enterprise in Washington experience a sudden change of outlook. The course presently being pursued by the GOP is such as to make additional interference a virtual certainty.

On the face of it, there is no good reason for the continued momentum of political debate in the direction of NHI—of any description. Every opinion survey and virtually every political observer is agreed that the American people have had it with big government and big spending, and they would prefer increased reliance on private enterprise and local initiative. These are attitudes directly counter to the push for NHI.

The record of the private health care system, moreover, is not only good, but excellent. Under this system, we have seen average life expectancies increase from 49 years at the turn of the century to better than 70 years today; infant mortality rates have been cut in half in recent decades; major diseases have been eliminated; our physician-to-population ratio is the highest in the Western world.

Not surprisingly, given these accomplishments, most people, when questioned on the subject, say they are satisfied with the quality of medical care they receive.

In view of all this, why should we be witnessing a continued drift of public discussion in favor of further government intrusion into health care, up to and including demands that our medical system be taken over by a government monopoly? Why would a nation, generally happy with the quality of its health care and wary of big government, so much as consider national health insurance?

The answer to these questions is wrapped up in a single four-letter word: cost. The overwhelming problem with our health care delivery system today is said to be the problem of expense: it costs too much, allegedly, to spend a day in the hospital; the technology we are using is said to be too expensive: we have overbuilt and oversupplied our medical centers; we are spending too large a percentage of GNP on health care, etc.

Several possible rebuttals suggest themselves, and have been made effectively in this journal and elsewhere. For the moment, however, let me pass over the contradictions in the argument to acknowledge its basic nub of fact. As anyone who examines the movement of the hospital price index can see, during the past decade there has been an authentic problem of rapidly increased medical spending. The share of national resources devoted to health care has been rising, and the price of an average stay in the hospital has been moving steadily upward. And it is this perception, above all others, that is being used by proponents of NHI to advance the cause of government intervention.

It is precisely here that the performance of the Republicans—or lack of it—comes into play.

For it is clear that past intervention in the medical economy has caused the rise in cost that is being used to further arguments for expanded government intervention. To expand that level of intervention will only serve to make the problem worse. The proper remedy, therefore, is not to increase the government's role, but to decrease it.

To be specific, we now have reams of data from academic and official sources showing that the impact of Medicare and Medicaid—along with Federal tax favoritism toward group insurance plans—is chiefly responsible for the boom in health care costs since the middle 1960s. Because of these factors, our system of health care payment has been dramatically shifted to a third party basis in which someone other than the patient picks up the tab for medical services at the point of consumption. The effect has been a predictable explosion of demand, to which supply has only recently begun to catch up.

For some reason, Republican spokesmen in the official party structure exhibit almost no awareness of this evidence. If they know of it, they have apparently made a secret pact among themselves never to bring it up in public, as they sit back and let Senator Kennedy pound home the idea that rising health care costs are somehow the doing of the private sector. The result is that the Federal government's responsibility for the recent explosion in health care spending is a leading non-fact of our political discussion.

Why Republicans are so reluctant to dig in on this question is a bit of a mystery. Part of the problem, apparently, is that there is no major Republican figure who has staked out the issue of health care in a manner comparable to Kennedy's. The problem at this level may be said to be one of inattention; there just hasn't been anybody tending store for the GOP, doing his homework, tracking the effects of the existing programs.

If there is any hope of improved performance in this area, it rests with younger members of Congress who have exhibited interest in such issues. Phil Crane of Illinois, Mickey Edwards of Oklahoma and Ron Paul of Texas come to mind—all with solid backgrounds on the health care issue. However, all of these legislators have been drawn into other critical areas of debate in Congress, and none is presently functioning as a health care specialist for the GOP.

One sign of potential improvements is the work that is being done by the House Republican Research Committee, chaired by Representative Trent Lott of Mississippi. The committee has a Task Force on Health Policy headed by Representative Jim Martin of North Carolina, a former professor of chemistry who understands medical issues and pays attention to them. Under his direction, the Task Force has done some excellent research on health care problems and is trying to evolve appropriate legislative responses. Technically, this is the closest thing the GOP has yet developed as a counterweight to Kennedy's operation.

In substantive terms, the GOP has problems that are more serious still. One will search official Republican Party literature in vain for any clear exposition of the nature of our cost problems in the realm of medical care or of other aspects of the subject. Most of the available Republican utterances reflect a feeble understanding of economics, lack of acquaintance with the factual record, and lukewarm commitment to the Kennedy line, with changes here and there in matters of detail and emphasis.

Consider in this respect a brochure, brought out in December by the Republican National Committee, entitled "A Statement on National Health Policy." The work of the RNC's "Advisory Council on Human Concerns" (headed by former Housing and Urban Development Secretary Carla Hills) and, more specifically, of the subcommittee on health (headed by former Senator Hugh Scott), it is a pathetic document. Anyone reading it with any care could hardly wonder that the Republican Party is virtually impotent in the shaping of health care policy, since it has so little to say for itself and manages to say even that so badly.

To begin with, there is no discussion anywhere in this pamphlet of the facts concerning health care costs and their source. There are glancing allusions to the costs of Federal regulation generally and to "mismanagement" in the Medicaid programs, but no acknowledgement of the massive costs and spending problems created by the Federal government. Indeed, the document treats the Medicaid program as something good that needs to be made even better, if only the Carter administration would permit it to happen.

The reports asserts, for instance: "Despite the strides made through the Medicaid plan, 8 million persons below the poverty level are not eligible. And 49 million others live in areas inadequately served by health resources. To make care available to these Americans who lack access to medical services must be an immediate national goal. That no comprehensive administration policy currently exists to meet this need is inexcusable. We must particularly recognize the special needs of the inner-city and rural poor who do not qualify under Medicaid."

In other words, a Republican Party that allegedly favors private enterprise and wants to hold the line on Federal spending, has no real criticism to make the Medicaid program, speaks of this acknowledged fiasco in terms of the "strides" it has made, and attacks the Carter administration for having no "comprehensive policy" for making the program even bigger.

The rest of the pamphlet is written in a similar vein, frequently stressing real or imagined problems in the private delivery of health care services and suggesting various forms of government action to redress the problem. One passage is a virtually litany of charges against the existing health care system:

"While 94 percent of Americans have some health protection, it is not always adequate, and six percent, or 12 million persons, have no protection at all. That 12 million Americans still lack medical attention because they either cannot afford it or have inadequate facilities nearby, it [sic] is a problem. Health care costs have been rising at a rate substantially greater than the rate of inflation. Seven million Americans this year will spend more than 15 percent of their incomes for health services. Many of our young people are dangerously under-immunized against crippling childhood diseases. The aged are too often neglected and left to substandard institutions through lack of other alternatives."

Evidently, the drafters of this Republican statement believe they can steal the Democrats' thunder on the health care issue by making their own denunciations of the private health care system in equally vigorous language. The principal difference is that the GOP—so far at least—retains a formal attachment to the idea of private medicine and a ritualistic opposition to comprehensive NHI. It believes that the problems thus described "can be solved without the Federal government taking over the financing and control of all US health services as some have proposed."

Suggested remedies from the Republican standpoint are pretty much a hodge-podge of *ad hoc* proposals, leading off in every conceivable direction: voluntary cost control efforts by hospitals, control efforts at the local level implemented by the states, extensions of Medicaid and Medicare coverage, Federal guarantees of private insurance programs, Federal provisions for catastrophic health expenses, mandatory provision of health insurance by private suppliers, more and better training for para-professionals, encouragement of HMOs, etc.

Apart from the merits or demerits of these proposals on other grounds, the most striking thing about them is that none so much

as mentions the authentic problem in our health care economy today: the warping of our system of medical payments and incentives to encourage consumers to think of medical services as "free." No one reading this document would have any clear notion of the source of the "problems" in our health care system, and certainly would not absorb the message that the problem of cost is a creation of existing Federal programs.

On the contrary, the reader of these passages could only conclude that Senator Kennedy is right, after all: the major problems in our health care system are caused by deficiencies in the private market, and that these must be corrected by government action—although not, in the Republican view, the particular action preferred by Kennedy. The nature of the problem, in other words, is agreed to by all parties to the discussion, with the disagreements being limited to the question of how, exactly, to set about correcting things.

By approaching the matter in this fashion, the Republicans are making it virtually certain that further government intervention in the medical economy will occur, and that problems in our health care delivery system are going to be intensified. The battle is over before it has begun since the GOP, by its assertions and the nature of its legislative proposals, has accepted the Democratic analysis of the situation and bought the liberal definition of the issue. The problem is effectively defined as the failure of private enterprise; the solution as some further form of government intervention.

The very issue that most needs discussing in the debate about national health insurance is thus defaulted at the outset; all parties agree to focus their ire on private medicine, and to avert their gaze from the disaster created by government intervention. The public is thus deprived of essential information and is led to conclude that the problem with our medical economy is exactly the opposite of the factual record.

From all of which it may be seen that the Republican Party—with the Honorable exceptions alluded to—is actually aiding, rather than impeding, the drive for further government intervention in our medical economy. Indeed, it can be argued that, in a sense, the GOP is doing even more than Senator Kennedy to propel the country in this direction, even though this is not its objective.

The difference is that when Kennedy says the things he says or fails to say other things he might, his performance is to some extent discounted for partisan, personal, or ideological reasons. But when the Republican Party comes along in alleged opposition and actually confirms the gist of Kennedy's argument, the debate is effectively ended. There can be little doubt about a point on which Kennedy and the Republican National Committee agree. By making the critique of private medicine unanimous, the draftsmen of the GOP are helping to insure the triumph of the medical collectivists. ●

SALUTE TO A HUMANITARIAN

HON. S. WILLIAM GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues the work of a fine member of my New York constituency, Ms. Vera Kay.

Ms. Kay has devoted her life and her substantial talent to the design of orthopedic appliances. She is one of the most respected and admired persons by the orthopedic surgeons and doctors for her ability in dealing with patients, and her dedication to the designing and fabricating of orthopedic appliances.

Now retired, Ms. Kay is still making the best use of her talents by volunteering 3 or 4 hours a day at the Lenox Hill Brace Shop in New York City.

In 1977, Vera Kay was honored by the mayor of New York City with a certificate of appreciation which read:

To Vera Kay for outstanding contributions as a designer of Orthopedic appliances for the relief of human suffering, and her voluntary efforts on behalf of those with Orthopedic problems.

I would like to add my words of appreciation to Vera Kay for all that she has done for those afflicted with orthopedic problems.●

SOCCER—FAST GROWING ADDITION TO OUR SPORTS SCENE

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 29, 1979, in my home district, the Pennsylvania Stoners soccer team will play its first home game in the American Soccer League. Today I would like to recognize that team as it enters the world of professional sports.

I find the recent growth of soccer's popularity in the United States and the country's increased interest in physical fitness to be very closely related. At a time when Americans everywhere are discovering and enjoying the benefits of a healthy, more active lifestyle, soccer is a sport that fits into that lifestyle especially well. Played on a large open field, with almost constant action, the game requires tremendous amounts of stamina and endurance. For many spectators, it becomes a natural inclination to join local youth and recreational soccer programs. There, to a lesser degree, they develop those same qualities of stamina and endurance while strengthening their cardiovascular and respiratory systems. Soccer, based on the simple skills of running and kicking a ball, encourages participation and good health. For health reasons alone, I welcome the Pennsylvania Stoners to the Lehigh Valley.

Additionally, led by General Manager Jeff Mohler and Coach Willie Ehrlich, the Stoners have made every effort to build their team around a nucleus of local high school and college players. I see this as a great way of fostering a strong bond between the team and the community, and giving residents still another reason to be proud of their community. The Lehigh Valley has a tradition of outstanding local soccer teams, including some of the best high school talent in the Nation, year after year.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

In conclusion, I join my constituents in welcoming the Pennsylvania Stoners as a vibrant and positive addition to the Lehigh Valley, and wish the team success this season and in seasons to come.●

WINDFALL PROFITS TAX WOULD WORSEN ENERGY PROBLEMS

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, since Government is the cause of our present energy problems, more Government—in the form of a "windfall" profits tax—would only worsen the situation.

Recently Dr. Paul Craig Roberts has discussed this in the Wall Street Journal. I would like to bring his article to my colleagues' attention, by inserting it in the RECORD:

OIL POLITICS

(By Paul Craig Roberts)

Energy was never a problem for Americans until the government stuck its nose into it. The further in the nose went, the worse the problem became.

Of course, it is not the same problem for everyone. As the government knows, there's opportunity in adversity. The budget for the new Department of Energy is already equal to half of the after-tax profits of all the major oil companies combined, and it gets all that money without having to supply a single gallon of gasoline to the consumer.

For decades the oil industry managed to maintain the nominal price of gasoline constant, which meant that it fell in real terms. But gradually cheap energy was undermined by the government. In 1954 an old statute was reinterpreted so the government could regulate natural gas producers. Holding down the price reduced the supply and shifted a larger percentage of energy use to oil.

In the late 1960s the attack on cheap energy intensified. The depletion allowances were reduced, which lessened the accustomed profitability of the oil industry even as clean air standards forced coal users to switch to oil. Miles per gallon declined as safety and environmental regulations added weight and exhaust emission controls to cars. In 1971 the government slapped price controls on domestic production and, after the 1973 embargo, established a maze of regulations that subsidized the importation of foreign oil.

But the real blow came when the U.S. government helped the Arabs set up their oil cartel. Few people know this story because it is not in the government's interest to tell it, and the oil companies are intimidated.

It became clear to the oil companies that the OPEC governments—which had been gradually shoving them out of their equity in the oil that they found and developed—intended to turn the companies into tax collectors by forming a cartel and driving up the price to foreigners. The companies appealed to the Justice Department for an antitrust waiver so they could present a common bargaining front to the Arabs. They got it, but it didn't do them any good. G. H. M. Schuler, director of European operations for Bunker-Hunt Oil Co., testified before a Senate subcommittee in 1974 that State Department officials undercut the oil companies' bargaining position by telling the Arabs that the companies did not have the support of the U.S. government.

Some idealists in government saw in oil a

way of extracting more foreign aid than the congressional appropriations process would disgorge. They actually believed that the Arabs would use the money to underwrite the economic development of the entire Third World.

Other sectors of the bureaucracy went along with the scheme for their own reasons. Patriotic elements, worried about the decline in American resolve and fearful that congressional liberals would rather put more Americans on welfare than defend our interests abroad, saw in the scheme a way of providing the shah and the Saudis with money to beef-up anti-Communist forces in the Persian Gulf and to pay African governments to expel the Russians. Since humanitarians and cold warriors each had a stake in the cartel, there was no incentive for either to point out the U.S. government's role in setting it up.

Much of the story is lying there in the public record. "Oftentimes the representative of the United States," testified Mr. Schuler, "becomes the representative of the country to which he is accredited." The lesson, said Mr. Schuler, is that once the producing states "recognized that they were not going to be restrained by the joint action of the industry, and that governments were not going to support industry, then the only thing to hold them back was their own self-restraint, and I do not think that is a realistic expectation. So the U.S. government and the oil companies by retreating in the face of demands, created a momentum which continues to carry through."

But our government learned a different lesson from the Arabs—how to turn the oil companies into tax collectors. The President is going to free the oil price so the government can tax the higher profits at higher rates. Some tongue-clickers are sure that talk about a windfall profits tax is just a political cover. But they badly underestimate the government's need for revenues so it can balance the budget without cutting into its spending programs.

Senator Long, oil friend or not, is nevertheless under pressure to come up with revenues for his colleagues to spend in order to fend off an attack on his own prerogatives. Big spenders have let him know that his Finance Committee cannot expect to continue handing out billions of dollars through "tax loopholes" when their spending programs are running dry. Sen. Long perceives that big spenders, cornered by the public's demand for a balanced budget, are dangerous animals. They will strip the Finance Committee of its hand-out power in order to replenish their own before they starve in their corner.

Freeing price but not profit is not decontrol. By skimming profits so deeply, the government would strip the oil companies of the ability to establish a private energy industry on the basis of new technologies and new energy sources. That task would fall to the government.

The President deserves more credit as a good agent of the government than he is getting. If he pulls this one off, he will be taking two steps forward under the guise of one step backward.●

FLUNKING FAIRNESS TEST

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in the News-Sun of Sun City, Ariz., was recently brought to my attention by Mr. W. J. Welbourne of Sun City. As we will be considering the im-

plementation legislation for the Panama Canal treaties in the near future, I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

FLUNKING FAIRNESS TEST

If President Carter worked out an arrangement with Australia after telling the Aussies it wouldn't cost them a cent and then we sent Australia a bill for \$5 billion, it would be an affront to Americans' sense of fair play.

We have no doubts whatsoever that the outcry from the American citizenry would be so great that the President would be forced to abrogate the treaty in order to let the Aussies off the hook.

Should Americans—or American presidents—be less fair to the American people?

President Carter told the American people they would not have to shell out money for giving away the Panama Canal to Panama. His Panama Canal Treaty negotiators told Congress that the American people would not have to shell out money for giving away the canal.

Now it seems that the treaty which would not cost us anything will cost us between \$4 billion and \$5 billion. For a country which is broke and heading for another \$29 billion deficit (if all goes well—even broker if bad news develops), \$4 billion is a heckuva lot of nothing.

Incredible as it sounds, the U.S. even plans to leave \$70 million in the cash register when we pull out so that the Panamanians can have some operating funds. Nobody sells a liquor store or dress shop in Sun City and leaves even a penny in the till for the new owner. What kind of nonsense is our government attempting to pull off?

Sorry, Mr. Carter. We think you ought to tell the Panamanians we got a bad deal—if anybody has to shell out \$4 billion, it ought to be the buyer, not the seller. The only fair thing to do is to cancel the deal right now. If Panama wants to work out something fair, then new negotiations could begin at any time.

But a deal simply isn't fair unless it's fair to all.●

SECRETARIES DAY

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, the week of April 22-28, 1979, has been designated National Secretaries Week. The enormous contribution that secretaries make to the vitality of our national enterprises is often overlooked. Indeed, without the dedication and steadfastness of our secretaries, the work of the Congress and the Nation would come to a standstill.

I, for one, believe that the fine work of secretaries merits not only a special week, but also, a special day. That is why I am asking my colleagues to join with me in the following proclamation to designate today, April 25, 1979, as Secretaries Day.

PROCLAMATION—SECRETARIES DAY, APRIL 25, 1979

Whereas, in recognition of the secretary, the week of April 22-28, 1979, has been designated as Secretaries Week; and

Whereas, in keeping with the finest tradition of their profession, secretaries are accepting vital responsibilities and are performing important roles in commerce, industry, government, education, and the professions; and

Whereas, the efforts of these professionals and their many contributions to the nation's progress are significant; and

Whereas, to recognize the secretaries now doing their jobs diligently and to encourage others to enter this worthy career, it is essential that rightful acknowledgment be given their talents;

Now, Therefore, I Toby Roth, Representative of the 8th Congressional District of Wisconsin, do hereby proclaim the day of April 25, 1979, as Secretaries Day, and ask that all business and industry join in giving due recognition to this group, paying special attention to Wednesday, April 25, 1979, as Secretaries Day.●

THE GREAT OIL SHORTAGE

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, here is the disturbing eloquence of one of my fellow Hoosiers.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,

April 20, 1979.

Hon. Andrew Jacobs, Jr.,
11th District Congressman,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I hope this letter is not routinely shipped to your Indianapolis office for a cursory reply since I have already contacted that office by telephone and received no satisfaction.

My problem and the problem of many of your constituents is the astronomical cost of home heating fuel coupled with the hue and cry of the politicians and oil companies of a great oil shortage. Well, I have 200 gallons of fuel oil sitting in my basement and my tenant has 150 gallons of fuel oil sitting in the basement next door which Muesing Oil Company of Indianapolis refuses to pick up and recredit our accounts for a portion of the cost. Admittedly, this 350 gallons of oil will not solve the oil shortage; however, if there is a real shortage of oil this amount of fuel surely should not be wasted. We are asked to sit in uncomfortable homes and offices with the thermostat set at 65 degrees in winter and 80 degrees in summer while the oil companies are gouging us to death with high prices of fuel oil and gasoline for our cars, yet you and other politicians are doing nothing to curb these greedy corporate giants. If the oil shortage is real, why are the oil companies not being asked, or better forced, to make some sacrifice and conserve?

It appears to me that, all Muesing Oil is concerned about is that the 350 gallons of fuel oil has been sold to me and my tenant at a profit (cost 59.9 cents a gallon) and they do not want it back at any cost because they have enough oil to service their customers. An oil shortage? Who is fooling whom?

I am asking that pressure be brought to bear on the distributors of oil in general and Muesing Oil in particular to pick up and conserve oil remaining in homes after the former customers like myself have been forced to convert to cheaper natural gas furnaces due to the outrageous escalating cost of fuel oil. Is there no justice or must the consumer be forever left to the mercy of the corporate giants?

A copy of my letter dated 2 April 1979 sent to Muesing Oil is attached for your information. As of this date, I have received no reply.

Sincerely,

(Ms.) VIRGIE L. HORNBERGER.●

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY ALUMNUS OF THE YEAR

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, recently a capacity crowd, including President Carter, filled the Milwaukee Performing Arts Center to honor my good friend Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI as the Marquette University Alumnus of the Year. I was privileged to be among those honoring CLEM, from whom I have learned so much in the 25 years we have both represented Milwaukee in Congress. I want to share with my colleagues the remarks made that evening by President Carter and Rev. John P. Raynor, S.J., president of Marquette University, and CLEM's own moving address.

REMARKS AT SPECIAL RECEPTION, MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY ALUMNI ASSOCIATION ANNUAL AWARDS DINNER, MARCH 31, 1979

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI: Mr. President, Father Raynor, Mayor Maier, fellow alumni, I'm really thrilled. This is a personal privilege and a great honor for me to welcome the President of the United States—the peacemaker—our President, Jimmy Carter, to our state, to our community and to the University. As they say in Congress: I now yield to President Raynor, because I believe only a President should introduce the President.

Rev. JOHN P. RAYNOR, S.J.: Thank you very much, Congressman Zablocki. Ladies and gentlemen, we're very happy to have you here this evening. As you know, Marquette University sponsors this event in order to pay tribute to distinguished winners of our alumni service awards and also to the "Alumnus of the Year" of Marquette University—the Honorable Clement J. Zablocki. I'm very pleased to have you out in such numbers to pay tribute to these people. Among other things and other assets, we honor Clem Zablocki tonight because of his outstanding service to his country. And it gives me great pleasure indeed, to see that in our honoring of him, he's managed to attract to our presence tonight another admirer of great stature. So without further ado, ladies and gentlemen, I want to introduce to you, with great pleasure and out of great sense of privilege, the President of the United States.

THE PRESIDENT. Father Raynor and Chairman Clem Zablocki, distinguished alumni and friends of Marquette University:

It's a great honor for me to be here. The last time I was at Marquette, I had achieved some degree of fame or notoriety during the campaign. And I will always remember that a large group of students were banging on the walls and pounding on the door, demanding the right to come into the auditorium which was already very crowded. This was quite a remarkable change from the earlier part of my campaign. [Laughter]

And because of the dramatic difference that occurred here at Marquette, I'll always remember with a great deal of gratification and friendship the attitude that your students expressed toward me.

You're honoring a very fine statesman, a man who is the chairman of one of the most important committees in the Congress.

When I was growing up as a Georgia young man, we almost took for granted that the chairmen of the important committees were Southerners. [Laughter] But I noticed that the Banking Committee, which is one of the most important of all, is headed by Henry Reuss, and the committee that has control of

all the foreign affairs the House Foreign Affairs Committee, is headed by Clem Zablocki, both from this community.

I don't know what is the basis for this remarkable achievement. Obviously, sound judgment on the part of the voters, but maybe it's something in the Milwaukee beer that—[laughter]—

Clem and I have a good partnership when important matters arise. He's one of the very few leaders in Congress to whom I have to turn with increasing frequency, because his sound judgment and his awareness of not only parochial but national and international affairs is a great reservoir of advice and counsel and strength for me.

I've called on Clem also, because of his remarkable rapport with different people around the world, to represent me in important affairs. When Mrs. Meier died, I asked Clem to go to Israel to represent me. And with the investiture of Pope John Paul II, Clem, without too much urging on my part—[laughter]—agreed to go and make a great sacrifice to represent me there. It was a glorious event.

Clem has an achievement that I can't claim. He is the only person that I know personally who has played poker with my mother and won. [Laughter] Every time I see my mother, she says, "You have got to get that man Clem Zablocki back to play poker with me. I cannot stand to ruin my reputation by being a permanent loser."

Representative ZABLOCKI. \$2.65.

The PRESIDENT. \$2.65—Mother will never forget it.

[Laughter.]

But I might also say that when we have important international events that take place, Clem is there. He's one of the top congressional advisers to our own negotiating team trying to hammer out the terms of a strategic arms limitation agreement with the Soviet Union. And I think this is the kind of role that Clem Zablocki plays in a very quiet and modest and unpublicized way, that the people in this room, who love him and admire him, ought to know about.

When I had extreme difficulty the last 18 months in arranging the basis for negotiating the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel, Clem Zablocki could always give me a sense of the Congress. And immediately after the signing ceremony Monday, I met with a tiny group of key congressional advisers. Clem Zablocki was obviously at the top of the list, to tell him the terms of the treaty, the agreements that had been consummated, and ask his counsel on how to proceed in the future. And now, of course, the honoring of American commitments in the House of Representatives is in the hands of Clem Zablocki, and I'm proud of it.

In many ways, a university is measured by the quality of its alumni. Marquette is a remarkable university because of many reasons. That's obviously one of them. I know that sometimes there are disappointments in things like the NCAA playoffs—[laughter]—which I will not mention tonight. But if the NCAA included as an athletic event the production of remarkable and distinguished alumni Clem Zablocki alone would still have Marquette in the finals. And I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for producing such a great statesman and a personal friend. And I want to express my admiration for your sound judgment in choosing him the Outstanding Alumnus of the Year.

Thank you very much for letting me be part of it.

ALUMNUS OF THE YEAR—REMARKS BY HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

Father Raynor, Alumni Association President Dr. Paul A. Dudenhofer, Mrs. Friedman,

Alumni Award recipients, Fellow Alumni, and distinguished guests:

I am deeply honored to be here tonight to receive the 1979 Alumnus of the Year Award. I wish to thank the Selection Board for selecting me, and I thank you all for allowing me the opportunity to share this memorable experience with you. It is my great honor to be included with Janice Babcock, Margo Huston, Dr. Herbert Engel, Mr. James Harwood, and Dr. Russell McKenzie, in receiving awards at the 1979 Alumni Recognition Dinner.

I realize that politicians are not the normal recipients of this award, and I must admit that I was somewhat surprised at being chosen.

I sincerely want to express my appreciation for this distinguished award, and I would like to take this opportunity to tell you briefly what Marquette has meant to me.

When I reflect upon Marquette University, I am overwhelmed by the many ways in which Marquette affected my personal, and therefore, public life. I can honestly say that while I was attending this University I did not realize that so many of my later choices and decisions would ultimately rest upon the solid moral foundation I was obtaining at Marquette.

In all my classes—History, English, Math, Ethics—there was an underlying theme of Judeo-Christian morality that was to be a guiding force in many future decisions.

In discussing Christian education recently, Father Theodore Hesburgh of Notre Dame used four words to describe the approach to education that Christian institutions should take. These are: Competence, Compassion, Commitment, and Consecration.

I believe Father Hesburgh touched upon the key characteristics, but I would add one more particular to Marquette: Excellence. As Father Caldwell underscored in his homily at this afternoon's ecumenical thanksgiving service,

Marquette's dedication to moral and intellectual excellence has instilled its alumni with the goal to be good at whatever we choose to do, and to take personal responsibility for all actions.

Looking back at my years at MU, one individual in particular comes to mind. I would like to single out Father Raphael Hamilton, my English-History Professor. More than anyone else, Father Hamilton influenced my development at Marquette, particularly my spiritual development. Besides being my teacher, Father Hamilton was my Confessor! Of course he would not remember—after absolution he forgot who he forgave!

I can't recall whether at class or in confessional, nevertheless, I will never forget when he told me, "Greater than all the wealth in the world is your reputation and self-respect." Father Hamilton's words remain with me in my work in the U.S. Congress to this very day!

The counsel and guidance he offered in his most compassionate way took me through the pitfalls, temptations, and tribulations which were prevalent even when I went to college!

I would like to personally and sincerely extend my appreciation to him for sharing his knowledge and many insights with me.

Another professor of mine, Dr. William Lamers, former director of the School of Speech, had an influence on the career I chose. It was Dr. Lamers with his excellent oratorical ability who awakened my latent interest in politics. Dr. Lamers and his use of the spoken word made me realize the value of open and direct communication with those individuals with whom we live and work. I am deeply indebted to him also.

And, of course, there are others, but time does not permit me to name them all. These two are illustrative, not exclusive.

My friends, Marquette's reputation as a distinguished institution of higher learning ranks with the top universities. Almost 43 years ago, as if by osmosis, MU instilled intellectual excellence. In 1936 I left Marquette with cautious anxiety and unbounded eagerness.

At Marquette:

I learned to dream, but not to let my dreams go unbounded;

I learned to work toward change when I saw evil, but not for the sake of change alone;

I learned (in the words of the late John F. Kennedy) "That we cannot doubt our institutions without doubting ourselves first."

Marquette University, I am convinced, educates the "whole self." It instills in its students ambition—moral courage—a set of values—a sense of priorities—a respect for our fellow-man—and above all, a love of God.

It is this "wholeness" which, in my opinion, typifies education in the true sense. For, in developing our spiritual selves as well as our intellects, our contributions to society will take on extra meaning.

They will be purposeful. They will be responsible. And, they will be moral!

In this approach to education, we see Marquette's deep commitment to excellence materialized. We see Marquette producing individuals intellectually prepared to meet the challenges of the world and morally ready to follow their consciences. Even if the individuals may not fully realize upon graduation—as I did not—but all of us gathered here know it now!

In my work in the U.S. House of Representatives, I have been faced with many decisions which tested my commitment to my underlying moral values and personal code of ethics.

In issues ranging from the Middle East, to the elderly, to business and industry, to fiscal policy, a Member of Congress is faced daily with difficult and often sensitive questions.

Less than one week ago we witnessed the historic signing of the Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel. Amid the many complexities, the historic animosities, the religious differences, and the intense emotions, a satisfactory treaty was agreed upon.

Special interests had to be overcome, compromises worked out, and unpopular decisions made!

I commend Egyptian President Sadat, Israeli Prime Minister Begin, and President Carter for persevering in their quest to achieve peace in the Middle East. Undoubtedly these three statesmen typify what I am discussing here today.

These great leaders followed their consciences and implored God in working towards the Treaty.

While this treaty is only a beginning, I hope we will soon see a permanent peace in the land where, ironically, the Prince of Peace began His teaching.

May we all learn from the example set by Mr. Sadat, Mr. Begin, and Mr. Carter.

Father Raynor, fellow alumni, and friends, I am deeply moved today. I am sincerely grateful for receiving the 1979 Alumnus of the Year Award, and I am proud to be associated with our distinguished University.

In receiving this award, I can assure you that it will be a further incentive to continue applying the principles learned during my years at Marquette!

I can only pledge to try to uphold the standards of excellence I learned at Alma Mater. All...

"Ad Majorum Dei Gloriam"

"For the greater honor and glory of God." ●

ALASKA: CONSERVATION OPPORTUNITY OF THE CENTURY

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I cosponsored a strong Alaska lands bill last year, and once again this year, because the wildlife, scenic, and wilderness values of the remaining federally owned lands in Alaska will benefit the American people for centuries to come.

The Udall-Anderson substitute is more far-reaching than any land or wildlife measure we have considered during the 17 years I have been privileged to represent the people of Maryland's Second Congressional District in the House. Our upcoming votes on this bill may be remembered as the conservation votes of the century.

The values and benefits of the Udall-Anderson substitute to H.R. 39 are great, but the price tag is small. This bill puts 110 million acres into the national park system, the national wildlife refuge system, and the national wild and scenic rivers system, all without cost to the taxpayers. There are no acquisition costs, because these lands are Federal lands, which the taxpayers already own—purchased for less than 2 cents an acre from the Russians in 1867.

The contrast with our other conservation programs is remarkable. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, I can assure you we cannot buy land for 2 cents an acre these days. The vital expansion of the Redwoods National Park, which the Congress approved last year, will cost \$400 million. We could have spared the taxpayers that expense if the Congress of a hundred years ago had done for the redwoods what the Udall-Anderson substitute does for our heritage of wildlands and wildlife of Alaska.

This bill will also give Alaska's economy a significant boost and greater stability. Last year, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee examined and refined the boundaries of the proposed conservation areas, revising them to leave out lands having high value as sources of minerals, fossil fuels, or timber.

The result was last year's House-passed bill, of which the Udall-Anderson substitute is a further refinement. Moreover, the lands of greatest development potential have already been selected by the State of Alaska and by Alaskan Natives, and most of this will undoubtedly be developed. In fact, the Udall-Anderson substitute would speed up the transfer of these selected lands to the State and to the Natives.

As to the high values of the land selected by the State of Alaska, it is interesting to note the assessment made by the Alaska Department of Natural Resources: Their purpose was to assess those lands already selected, out of their unprecedented 104-million-acre statehood grant of Federal lands, and thereby to target selections of the remaining

30 million acres of their entitlement. That Department's November 24, 1977, assessment notes:

The existing state selected lands provide a wide ranging balance of resource lands which can be used to support the Alaskan economy. In many cases, state selections have high graded lands for particular resource potentials. This is exemplified by our selection at Prudhoe Bay for oil and gas resources and our selection of much of the best agricultural land in the state in the Matanuska, Susitna and Tanana River valleys.

Perhaps more important in the long run is the favorable impact the Udall-Anderson substitute would have on Alaska's tourist industry. The protection and growing public use of the new national parks, preserves, wildlife ranges, and wild rivers will result in lasting, stable income for Alaskans through tourism and related activities.

Mr. Speaker, the Udall-Anderson substitute to H.R. 39 is good for wildlife, good for wilderness, good for the American people.●

GAYLE HEGEL—PREMIER SWIMMER

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to an outstanding young woman from my district, Ms. Gayle Hegel of Washington Township.

A resident of Whitman Square, Gayle was recently acclaimed by a local paper as one of the "premier swimmers" in the country.

Her career goes back to age 8 with the Whitman Square Swim Team and her coach, Hugh Merkle. Mr. Merkle entered Gail in the Gloucester County YMCA's year-round program, which she stayed with for 7 years. During all that time, Mr. Merkle taught and practiced with her, and he is still giving his support and guidance to her as she advances in the swimming world.

Currently holding well over 500 trophies and awards, Gayle is now swimming with the Mount Laurel Jersey Wahoos. She recently represented the Wahoos in the National AAU Championships in Los Angeles. She came away from the meet with a fourth place finish in the 200-yard individual medley, timed at 2:03.1 and a sixth place in the 400 individual medley timed at 4.22. Gayle also holds various State and national records, all of which compliment her position as the No. 4 swimmer in the United States.

Graduating from Washington Township High School this June, Gayle will begin a 4-year career at the University of North Carolina on a full swimming scholarship. But before she gets to North Carolina, she will be heading for San Diego, Calif., to compete in the Seventeen Magazine Open Meet from June 22 to 24.

This sprint across country is nothing new to Gayle, who gets up at 4 a.m. 3

days a week to train. She is often flying or driving around the continent, racing in Montreal, Florida, Kansas, Nebraska, South Carolina, Massachusetts, Colorado, and many more. Later this year, Gayle will be traveling to Texas to compete in the 1980 U.S. Olympic trials.

I have had the opportunity to watch Gayle swim on a number of occasions with the Gloucester County YMCA, and can say firsthand that we in the First Congressional District are certainly proud of this young woman's achievements.

Her parents, Connie and Ray, and brothers Brad, Bruce, Glenn, and Chris, encourage and support Gayle in all her efforts, and none feel they could be more proud of her than they already are.

Gayle Hegel is a credit to the district, and as we in the community are looking forward to her continued success during her career at North Carolina, I am both pleased and honored to have the privilege of noting her accomplishments at this time.●

THE ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY FAILURE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, when "inconsistency and a lack of fairness" are seen as the essential qualities of foreign policy, when foreign policy moves are greeted with "derision" by ones allies and when those allies wonder if it is safe to be a friend any more—wouldn't you say there are unmistakable signs of a debacle in foreign affairs?

I certainly would. And that is why an article by Lisa Myers of the Chicago Sun Times should be required reading. Ms. Myers' article contains all of the views quoted above plus much more evidence of the continuing decline in confidence shown by other nations in the administration's foreign policy. Our Nation is now perceived—and, I fear correctly—as a nation that zigs and zags its way through a series of blunders. This is the price our Nation has played for the promises, the unkept and indeed unkeepable promises made by candidate Carter in 1976.

At this point I wish to place in the RECORD, "Is Carter Foreign Policy Taking the Right Zig?", by Lisa Myers from the Chicago Sun Times, April 22, 1979:

IS CARTER FOREIGN POLICY TAKING THE RIGHT ZIG?

(By Lisa Myers)

WASHINGTON.—A respected European diplomat interrupted an interview to take a call from the home office. His government wanted to know what to make of an action by President Carter, whether it signaled a change in U.S. foreign policy.

"I told them that with this President one can never be certain," he recounted, "but that it appears that Carter's zig-zag approach to international affairs has taken a new zig."

Inconsistency and lack of firmness. To date, they are the hallmark of Carter's for-

sign policy, say a host of allied ambassadors interviewed by The Sun-Times.

In fact, perhaps the only predictable foreign policy trait of the Carter administration, some contend, is that it will either underreact in the face of adverse world events or make such grave tactical blunders as to appear weak in its response.

So, are U.S. allies distraught, wondering whether it pays or even is safe to be a friend of the United States anymore?

No, they are concerned, to be sure. No sane person relishes seeing the nation on which he relies for ultimate security in a period of decline both real and perceived.

But the vast majority of Western diplomats profess cautious optimism that the United States has begun to shake off the tortuous memories of Vietnam and reassume its proper role as the leader of the Free World. Once that happens, when it signals it is ready and willing to protect its vital interests, the seemingly endless string of global challenges and insults will decrease, many believe.

"When the U.S. nation as a whole reflects strength and self-confidence, we won't have to live with all the problems that we worry about today," said a European ambassador.

The diplomats, who insisted on anonymity, base their hopes on recent moves by the Carter administration and fundamental changes of attitude within Congress and the American public.

In the wake of the Iranian revolution, Carter has sought to ease apprehension about the reliability of U.S. commitments abroad through military and diplomatic efforts to shore up friendly governments. The leading example is North Yemen, which was on the verge of being overrun by its Soviet-supplied and Cuban-assisted neighbor, South Yemen. Because of North Yemen's close ties to Saudi Arabia and its location at the mouth of the Red Sea, it was viewed as both strategically and symbolically critical that the Persian Gulf state not become a victim of Soviet proxy forces.

Carter responded to the challenge by ordering the U.S. aircraft carrier Constellation to steam toward the Persian Gulf. Moreover, he invoked emergency legislation to speed delivery of \$390 million in armaments, including F-5 fighter planes and tanks, to the embattled nation. When the Constellation left recently, the carrier Midway took its place.

"It is exceedingly important that he sent weapons this time, rather than unarmed fighters," one diplomat said. During the crisis in Iran, Carter sought to reassure the jittery Saudis with a flyover of unarmed U.S. jet fighters—a move cited with derision by Western observers.

Also pointed to as encouraging were statements by Defense Sec. Harold S. Brown and Energy Sec. James R. Schlesinger that the United States was prepared to intervene militarily if vital Saudi oilfields were threatened.

"Only a year and a half ago, such statements would have been sharply criticized both on Capitol Hill and in the media," an ambassador said. "This time, even [Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Frank] Church (D-Ida.) endorsed the idea."

Church's response reflects a broad change of attitude within Congress as to the appropriate U.S. role in the world, observers say, a recognition of the limits of passiveness and the need for a more aggressive American posture.

Public opinion polls detect a similar concern among the general public. A survey by the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations found that Americans want the United States to play "a more important role" as a world leader and are willing to spend more for defense to achieve that end.

It is important to note, however, that the

public's willingness to sacrifice money and, perhaps, lives is limited to close allies in Western Europe and Japan, as well as immediate neighbors. That, diplomatic observers say, is one of the major dilemmas confronting Carter, because Soviet challenges are not likely to occur in those places, but in areas where the United States has interests but no treaty commitments.

It is in the Third World, the ambassadors concur, where the United States has been most lacking in its response to Soviet adventurism. Most believe the mistakes date all the way back to when Cuban troops invaded Angola in 1975. Congress blocked plans by then-Sec. of State Henry A. Kissinger to intervene when the troops first were introduced on the African continent. Since then, the Cubans have been active throughout the Horn of Africa and observers see little hope of routing them.

Smaller allies complain that the United States has been remiss in coming to their aid, even when all they seek is some weapons for which they are willing to pay. The case of Morocco, a proven ally that sent troops to Zaire to help fight invading Soviet-equipped forces, is often cited as an example of how U.S. allies are left wanting while Soviet-aligned nations are outfitted to the teeth. Threatened by hostile Algeria on the east and rebels on the south, Morocco is embittered over the administration's delay of certain weapons shipments and a 25 per cent reduction of military sales credits.

The extent of America's perceived decline as a world power is mirrored by a Gallup Poll showing that the majority of British think the Soviet Union already is the most powerful country in the world, and West Germans polled split evenly over whether America or the Soviet Union is on top.

Perhaps more worrisome is that American, West German, Dutch, Japanese and British citizens believe 1979 will be a year in which Soviet power continues to grow and America's power continues to shrink.

The diplomats stress that it is critical that the United States reverse its image, which has contributed to Soviet mischief-making and led the Kremlin to believe it can operate "without fear of punishment" in most parts of the world.

"I see no need for immediate worry provided that the U.S. at vital moments shows readiness to act," one ambassador said.

But, added another: "Continuation of the U.S. retreat will allow the Russians to score more wins, and allies will wonder what to do. I could see the West Germans having very grave doubts. It's very dangerous for the allies." ●

NATALIE PELAVIN—COMMUNITY LEADER

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to honor a prominent community leader in my district, Natalie Pelavin. For the past 2 years, Mrs. Pelavin has served as president of Temple Beth El, one of two Jewish congregations in the Flint area. Now, as her term draws to a close, I take great pride in affording her the recognition she so richly deserves.

Mrs. Pelavin is also a national board member of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, and a past president

of the Temple Beth El Sisterhood. She is a member of the National Women's Division of the United Jewish Appeal and the Women's Communal Service Committee of the Council of Jewish Federations. Mrs. Pelavin is also very active in the Flint Jewish community, serving on the board of governors of the Flint Jewish Community Council, as well as the Council's Jewish Education and Executive committees.

Mrs. Pelavin is a vice president of the Valley School. It is an independent school in the Flint area which plays an important role in the community, and Mrs. Pelavin plays an important role in the administration of Valley.

Mr. Speaker, individuals like Natalie Pelavin are an invaluable asset to all of us, for they contribute so much to the community. I wish her, her husband, Michael, and her sons, Mark and Gordon, continued success and good fortune. ●

SUPPORTERS OF ALASKA LANDS LEGISLATION

HON. BO GINN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the organization, Georgians for Alaska, I would appreciate having printed in the RECORD, the following list of organizations in the State of Georgia which support the Udall-Anderson version of H.R. 39, the Alaska lands legislation:

ENDORSORING ORGANIZATIONS

Albany Audubon Society.
Albany Humane Society.
Aquanaut Diving and Engineering Co., Inc., Atlanta.
Association for Georgia Archaeology.
Athenians for Clean Energy, Athens.
Athens-Clarke County Humane Society.
Athens Group-Sierra Club.
Atlanta Audubon Society.
Atlanta Council of Camp Fire Girls, Inc.
Atlanta Group-Sierra Club.
Atlanta Track Club, Inc.
Atlanta Whitewater Club.
Augusta Audubon Society.
Augusta Humane Society, Inc.
Bartram Trail Society, Inc., Lithia Springs.
Benedictine Oceanography Club, Savannah.
BioScience Club, Georgia Southern College, Statesboro.
Blue Ridge Mountain Sports, LTD of Georgia, Atlanta.
Blue Ridge River Touring, Carlton.
Buckhorn Mountain Shop, Inc., Gainesville.
Burke-Screven Bird Study Group, Sylva, Ga.
Chattahoochee Chapter of Trout Unlimited, Atlanta.
Chattahoochee Valley Humane Society, Columbus.
Chattahoochee Wilderness Society, Atlanta.
Chehaw Wildlife Society, Inc., Albany.
Cherokee Audubon Society, Rocky Face.
Cherokee Garden Club, Atlanta.
Coastal Georgia Audubon Society, Brunswick.
Coastal Group-Sierra Club, Savannah.
Cohuttas Chapter of Trout Unlimited, Marietta.
Columbus Audubon Society.

Council of the Georgia Academy of Science.
Dalton Humane Society.
Deep Dene Garden Club, Atlanta.
Dekalb Humane Society, Inc., Decatur.
Diving World USA, Atlanta.
Dogwood City Grotto, Smyrna.
Ems and Outs (of the Unitarian Universalist Congregation of Atlanta).
Environmental Law Society, Emory University School of Law, Atlanta.
Film Forum, Atlanta.
Flint River Chapter of Trout Unlimited, East Point.
Georgia Animal Welfare Alliance.
Georgia B.A.S.S. Chapter Federation (Bass Anglers Sportsman Society).
Georgia Botanical Society.
Georgia Canoeing Association.
Georgia Chapter of American Society of Landscape Architects.
Georgia Clean Air Council.
The Georgia Conservancy.
Georgia Environmental Council.
Georgia Federation of the Blind.
Georgia Herpetological Society.
Georgia Ornithological Society.
Georgia Solar Coalition, Inc.
Georgia Tech Sport Parachute Club.
Georgia 2000.
Georgia Wilderness Society, Macon.
Georgia Wildlife Federation.
Golden Temple Natural Foods, Atlanta.
Hall County Humane Society, Gainesville.
The Hambridge Center, Rabun Gap.
High Country, Inc., Atlanta.
High Country Outdoor Rentals, Inc., Atlanta.
Historic Savannah Foundation, Inc., Savannah.
Hurricane Creek Protective Society, Alma.
H. V. Jenkins Outings Club, Savannah.
Jonah's Diving World, Inc., Augusta.
Ladies Golf Association of Dalton Golf and Country Club.
Macon Amateur Astronomers Club.
Morrow Junior Woman's Club.
Mountain Ventures, Decatur.
Museum of Arts and Sciences, Macon.
National Registry of Bicycling Roads, Decatur.
Nature's Last Stand Cafés, Atlanta.
Ocmulgee Audubon Society, Macon.
Ogeechee Audubon Society, Savannah.
The Ogeechee Canoe Club, Savannah.
Osborne Travel Service, Inc., Atlanta.
The Ossabaw Foundation, Savannah.
Peachtree Garden Club, Atlanta.
Rosewood Garden Club, Tifton.
Sand Hills Garden Club, Augusta.
The Savannah Jaycees.
Sevananda Natural Foods, Atlanta.
Southern Unity Network/Renewable Energy Projects, Atlanta.
Touch the Earth, Georgia State University, Atlanta.
Trustees Garden Club, Savannah.
Upper Flint River Audubon Society, Jonesboro.
Wilderness Southeast Outfitters, Inc., Savannah.
Wolfcreek Wilderness School, Inc., Blairsville.
Added since March 26, 1979:
Buckhead House of Travel, Atlanta.
Friends of the River, Atlanta.
S. E. Expeditions, Inc., Clayton. ●

SMOKING, DRINKING, AND DISABILITY

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 2, 1979, I introduced H.R. 3374, a bill that would help the social

security disability trust fund pay for cigarette-related and alcohol-related disabilities through an increased excise tax on cigarettes and a surcharge on alcohol. This would reduce the payroll tax from 6.65 to 6.6 percent in 1981. The bill currently has 12 cosponsors.

The disability trust fund would have been exhausted by this year without payroll increases and increased allocations to the fund from the old age, survivors and health insurance portions of social security. Smoking and drinking have a definite influence on the actuarial soundness of the disability program.

Data obtained from the social security disability rolls show that in an average year, \$1.08 billion is expended for 45,000 awards linked to smoking. In 1969 there were roughly 35,000 such awards costing \$840 million. By 1975 these awards dramatically increased to 53,000 at a cost of \$1,272 billion. Total disability awards linked to smoking in the 7 year period were 315,000 in number costing \$7.56 billion.

Three diagnoses account for most of the disability linked to smoking:

First. Malignant neoplasm of the trachea, bronchus and lung: In 1969, 7,000 disability awards were made with this diagnosis, of which 83 percent or 5,810 can be linked to smoking. The number of awards increased to 12,433 in 1975, of which roughly 10,300 were linked to smoking. Costs per year linked to smoking were \$140 million in 1969, increasing to \$247 million in 1975.

Second. Bronchitis and emphysema: On the average, 18,000 new disability awards are made each year, of which 67 percent or 12,000 can be linked to smoking, costing \$288 million per year.

Third. Ischemic heart disease: This is the diagnosis most frequently made in the disability program. In 1969, 68,453 awards were made with this diagnosis, of which 22 percent or 15,000 were linked to smoking. Numbers of awards increased steadily to 122,223 in 1975, of which 27,000 were linked to smoking. Costs per year were \$360 million in 1969, increasing to \$648 million in 1975.

Alcohol consumption also has a significant role in depleting disability funds. In 1978, as part of an effort to evaluate the effect of alcoholism on social security disability beneficiaries, information was obtained through a study of cases reviewed by the Social Security Administration medical consultant staff. The study estimated that \$876 million is paid yearly to disability insurance beneficiaries for whom there is some evidence of alcoholism or alcohol abuse. The study was limited to the information available in the claims folder and this figure does not include the cost of providing medicare protection to these disabled people. No new evidence was obtained.

The Social Security Administration does not obtain sufficient information through the disability claims and determination process to identify which disabilities are caused by alcohol abuse or alcoholism. HEW, however, has found that alcohol has a pervasive effect on the gastrointestinal tract, the liver, and the bloodstream. The brain and nervous system, heart, muscles, and endocrine system are also affected.

Alcohol is associated with cardiomyopathy, a disease of the heart muscle. Diseases of the coronary arteries, such as angina pectoris and myocardial infarction, increase with heavy alcohol consumption. Atrial fibrillation, a cardiac arrhythmia, appears in individuals free of overt heart disease, who are heavy consumers of alcohol.

The rate of total cirrhosis deaths increased by 36.6 percent from 1960 to 1970, followed by a gradual leveling during the early 1970's and a decrease of 6.3 percent from 1974 to 1975. Even though this decrease is encouraging, liver cirrhosis still ranked as the sixth most common cause of death in the United States in 1975, with up to 95 percent of the cases estimated to be alcohol-related.

Indisputably, alcohol is one cause of cancer. Heavy drinking increases the risk of developing cancer of the tongue, mouth, oropharynx, hypopharynx, esophagus, larynx, and liver.

Alcohol has a synergistic effect with tobacco that increases the risk of cancer. For example, one study showed that the risk of head and neck cancers for heavy drinkers who smoked was 6 to 15 times greater than for those who abstain from both. Another study showed a risk of esophageal cancer 44 times greater for heavier users of both alcohol and tobacco, as compared to 18 times greater for heavier users of alcohol only and 5 times greater for heavier users of tobacco only.

Research shows that alcohol often plays a major role in such violent events as motor vehicle accidents, and home, industrial, and recreational accidents.

Given these findings, one can hardly contend in good faith that cigarettes and alcohol have a minimal effect on the disability trust fund. The time has arrived for abusers of these products to help pay for their damages rather than spreading their costs through all of the sectors of society. I urge everyone to support H.R. 3374. ●

CINCO DE MAYO—1979

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, 1979 marks the 117th anniversary of the Battle of Puebla. Known more widely as the Cinco de Mayo, this occasion celebrates a memorable event in the history of our neighbor to the south, the great nation of Mexico.

On Cinco de Mayo, the 5th day of May in 1862, the ill-equipped and greatly outnumbered Mexican Army defeated the French regular forces sent by Napoleon III to invade and capture Mexico. The full story behind this famous day is one I would like to share with you today, as millions of people in my home State of California and throughout this Nation prepare to observe this grand day in history.

Ever since the New World was first colonized, the countries of Europe had thought of these new-found lands as the

source of fabulous riches. Enormous shipments of gold and silver were sent across the Atlantic Ocean, much of it from Mexico, during the time that country was ruled by Spain.

When the people of Mexico rebelled against this robbery of its treasure by a foreign power and formed their own government, all of Europe waited, watched and wondered if this experiment in independence would fail. European powers loaned money to the new Mexican Government, some intending to collect much more in return. When President Benito Juarez ordered a temporary suspension of payments on foreign debt in order to fight internal battles, Spain, Great Britain, and France were greatly angered and threatened to invade Mexico.

The Mexican nation came to terms with each of these European powers with the exception of France. The French refused to accept a settlement proposal and seized this as an opportunity to expand the Napoleonic Empire. French forces invaded the country and marched toward Mexico City.

Mexican troops under the command of Ignacio Zaragoza, the youngest General of Mexico at that time, were sent to the City of Puebla to halt the advance of the foreign troops. Joining the people of Puebla, Zaragoza's forces gave the French their first defeat on Mexican soil and proved that the French Army was not invincible, even though it was regarded as the finest in the world. The episode gave the people of the new nation the strength and inspiration to endure the eventual conquest by the French and to arise again 3 years later to drive out the foreign invaders and regain independence.

Mr. Speaker, overcoming foreign tyranny is part of our own history, too. Like our Fourth of July, the Cinco de Mayo is a time to recall past events which have made possible the freedoms we enjoy today in our hemisphere. It is also a good time to celebrate those rich customs and traditions we have inherited from the Mexican people. They have influenced our everyday living, adding a diversity and interest which characterizes many parts of our Nation.

On May 5, those of Mexican ancestry everywhere, including of course the Chicanos of California and elsewhere in our own country, will show an expression of solidarity by celebrating a proud moment in Mexican history. We should all join in observing this day as a landmark in a fight for freedom and the protection of a heritage we all share and enjoy to this day.●

NO MORE NUKES?

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the troubles at Three Mile Island Nuclear Power plant in Pennsylvania have generated a critical mass of hysteria, but not much light on this important subject.

No form of mass energy production is

completely safe, but I think it is significant that no one was hurt, let alone killed, in what everyone calls our most serious nuclear plant accident.

Thirty thousand men died in Pennsylvania mining coal, from 1870 until 1950. Men still die in West Virginia and other states, when mine shafts collapse or coal gas explodes. Medical scientists estimate that between 20 and 100 people die each year from lung disease, per coal-fired generating plant, because of the pollution produced. But no one suggests we outlaw coal.

The extensive safety systems at Three Mile gave days of warning to people in the area. There is no warning if a hydroelectric dam bursts or a tanker blows up.

Oil and gas can provide the vast majority of our energy needs, if the industry were deregulated with no new taxes added, so that profits could be reinvested in new exploration and production.

But nuclear energy will probably continue to be a vital and necessary alternate form of energy—far safer than coal and infinitely more practical than solar energy or windmills.

I say probably, because we don't really know what the free market would provide in nuclear energy, because of government subsidies.

Under the Price-Anderson Act, two pools of private insurance companies provide up to \$140 million per incident in nuclear plant liability insurance. The government provides coverage above that, with liability limited to \$560 million.

Insurance for nuclear plants—and everything else—should be left to the private sector. Not only would this save tax money, but it would prove the safety (or danger) of nuclear energy.

If the free market made insurance available, then everyone would know the plants are safe. No insurance company would risk hundreds of millions of dollars without being sure.

If no insurance were available at economic rates, the plants wouldn't be built. And those already constructed would have to be shut down, since no utility would dare operate without insurance.

I believe we need nuclear energy, but I shouldn't make that decision. The free market, with its input of millions of creative minds, should decide.

If we leave energy decisions in the hands of government, we will end up shivering in cold, dark homes (or sweltering in hot ones), with empty gas tanks in our cars and silent businesses and industries.

Energy will determine the economic future of our country. It must be taken out of the hands of politicians and bureaucrats.●

TRIBUTE TO WESLEY L. MOORE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention, and

that of my colleagues, to a dedication service planned in my congressional district for the late Wesley L. Moore, a member of the Westwood Community School District Board of Education from 1968 until his death last July.

In memory of Mr. Moore, and in tribute to his outstanding community service, the Westwood Board is planning to dedicate an athletic field in his honor, and also will select two high school students each year to receive the Wesley L. Moore Memorial Award for promoting racial unity and understanding in the community.

The school board, in announcing these plans, adopted the following resolution:

Whereas, Wesley L. Moore's ideals and goals, while serving the Westwood Community School District for 10 years, represents the best in all of us, and

Whereas, Our hope is that what he strived for and dreamed of our becoming will continue to make new inroads and unite this District until one day we can and shall stand as an example to all people everywhere as to what can be achieved when people work together for the good of all humankind, and,

Whereas, Wesley L. Moore always felt the need to constantly learn and improve on what is good, and change what is bad,

Now Therefore be it resolved that the Allen-Robichaud Athletic Field be dedicated in his honor and hereafter to be known as the Wesley L. Moore Memorial Park, and,

Be it further resolved that annually two students from the District High School shall be honored with the award of the Wesley L. Moore Memorial Award for distinction in promoting racial unity and understanding in the Community . . .

Mr. Speaker, I would also like at this time to have printed a biography of Mr. Moore, presented to me by Dr. Paul R. Hunt, superintendent of the Westwood Community School District:

BIOGRAPHY: WESLEY L. MOORE, 1926-78

Wesley L. Moore was born in Detroit, Michigan on August 5, 1926. His parents were William Henry and Clara Moore. Wesley was the youngest of three children; including a brother, William, and a sister, Geraldine.

He gained his education through the Lindbergh School, Henry Ford Trade School, Dearborn High School and Henry Ford Community College, all of which are located in the City of Dearborn, Michigan.

Wesley served his country honorably in the armed services branch of the United States Marines. He was in service from April of 1944 to August 1946.

On August 2, 1952, Wesley married his high school sweetheart, Shirley Wilson. From this union, five children were born: Kim Wesley, September 10, 1954; Kyle Rollin, November 19, 1957; Christopher Hoyt, January 25, 1959; Kelly Allison, June 11, 1962; and Curtis Keller, May 14, 1966.

As with many young couples, Wesley and Shirley lived in several locations during the first part of their marriage. Their first home was on South River Park, Inkster. They moved to Black Lake, Michigan, then to Pine Street in Taylor and finally to their home on Hanover in Dearborn Heights, in 1959, where they have resided for twenty years.

Wesley was an insurance salesman during the earlier part of his marriage. He later worked at Ford Motor Company and was employed at American Motors at the time of his death.

He was a very civic minded individual and was always involved in trying to make life a little better for other people. He served on the Board of Appeals for the City of Dearborn Heights. He was President of the Thorne

School P.T.A.; a member of the Board of Directors of the Dearborn Heights Baseball League; Coach of the Dearborn Heights Baseball League (his son, Kim, played on his team which was called the "Wild Cats"); District Commissioner for the Boy Scouts, where Kyle and Chris were involved. He was first elected to the Board of Education in 1968 where he held various officer positions for ten years: 1968, Treasurer; 1969, Secretary; 1970, President; 1971, Trustee; 1972, Trustee; 1973, President; 1974, President; 1975, President; 1976, Trustee; and 1977, Treasurer. Died July 19, 1978 while still in office.

Before Wesley was elected to the Board, there was great unrest and fear among faculty and students alike because of the deep racial problems erupting in the district at the Junior and Senior High Schools. He began asking questions and did not get satisfactory answers. The financial status of the district was terribly upsetting to him and answers were hard to get. Wesley and Shirley thought, in great length, of selling their home and moving away, but they realized that this was the real outside world that their children would someday have to face, so they decided to stay and try to make this District a responsibility to undertake. Wesley decided to run for the Board of Education and fight for what he believed this community badly needed. He went into the race for the Board of Education an unpopular candidate. He promised no favors and bowed to no one for votes for fighting for what he believed in.

During his tenure on the Board of Education, he always voted for what he, in all fairness, thought was right. He often stood alone in his convictions. He fought long and hard to change old ways of bookkeeping and budgeting. Through his efforts, an auditing firm was brought in to clear up any misunderstandings of finance. Business office procedures were brought up-to-date and expenditures brought to the Board for approval. He strove for good, strong, stable leadership in administration. He convinced other Board members that they were running a business and should be responsible for the community as such.

Wesley tried to rise above the petty non-important issues in the system to try to get the best for all students. He always tried to make the best of a situation by inserting a bit of humor into heated discussions. Many times his humor was misunderstood but he would stoically plod on, trying to bring order out of chaos. If Wesley heard of a child being expelled from school, he would personally visit the child's home to find out the facts of the case. When the Band Program ordered some uniforms and they were late in arriving, Wesley personally picked them up so that the students would have them for a performance. He spent many hours a day dealing with personal problems of parents and for students alike. He cared enough to always hear both sides of a story before making a judgment. He listened to community problems and, although he did not always agree or decide in your favor, he was fair and honest in his opinions. According to his wife, many, many times he spent sleepless nights fighting within himself, digging deep for seemingly unsolvable elusive answers to the problems in Westwood.

In striving to bring about peaceful race relations in the District, Wesley tried valiantly to mediate the hostile reactions of troubled people. He moved back and forth across the District trying to get people to respect each other, regardless of color. He carried the cross of frustration and distrust on his shoulders. Although he felt frustrated and defeated in this area, it was definitely through his efforts that many people, black and white, began to be able to appreciate one another. The seeds of peace which he planted will, in the long run, grow up into

a tender plant of love and respect of each individual in the Westwood Community School District.

Wesley L. Moore is sadly missed in the District; however, the good works he did for his fellow man will stand as a monument through the sands of time. ●

DINGELL CALLS FOR CLARIFICATION OF CBO ANALYSIS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, since the President announced his intention to decontrol domestic crude oil prices over the next few years, several studies of the inflationary impacts of the President's proposal have been made. One such study was published by the Congressional Budget Office on April 16, 1979. There has been some confusion with respect to the estimates of the inflationary impacts of the President's proposal that were presented in the CBO study. I wrote to Dr. Alice Rivlin, Director of CBO, about the apparent misrepresentation of some of the inflation estimates in that analysis. As a result of that letter, CBO has revised the original April 16 analysis.

In order that any misunderstanding about the results presented in the original CBO study may be clarified, I would like to insert my letter to Dr. Rivlin in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 23, 1979.

Dr. ALICE M. RIVLIN,
Director, Congressional Budget Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. RIVLIN: I am deeply concerned that the Congressional Budget Office's analysis of April 16, 1979, appears to have represented incorrectly the inflationary impacts of the President's crude oil decontrol proposal. I am writing to you in the hopes that any misunderstandings about the meaning of the inflation estimates in CBO's analysis may be clarified.

Page 8 of the CBO analysis states:

"CBO's initial estimates are that the rate of inflation would be about 0.1 percentage point higher in 1979, 0.3 percentage point higher in 1980, and 0.6 percentage point higher in 1981. The cumulative impact from now until the end of 1981 of the President's proposals is to increase the price level about 1 percent, which corresponds to an estimated 5 cents per gallon on gasoline. In subsequent years, there may be an additional 0.25 to 0.5 percent increase in the level of prices attributable to the feedback effects of the initial price rise associated with decontrol. Thus, the cumulative increase in the overall price level may be as high as 1.5 percent by 1983." (Emphasis Added)

My staff has talked with the members of your staff that prepared the analysis; they tell me that the words used in the paragraph above do not accurately describe what the numbers represent. The numbers described as changes in the "rate of inflation" were derived by calculating the amount by which expenditures for a fixed amount of goods would increase as a result of the President's decontrol proposal (increased expenditures attributable to decontrol, divided by the Gross National Product and then multiplied by a "ripple" factor). They thus do not represent changes in annual inflation rates but

instead represent increases in the general price levels or, equivalently, cumulative changes in the annual rates of inflation. According to CBO's estimates, the changes in the annual rates of inflation would actually be 0.1 for 1979, 0.2 for 1980 and 0.3 for 1981, which when added for all previous years yield the numbers presented in the analysis (0.1, 0.3 and 0.6 respectively). If these numbers are interpreted as annual rates of inflation, the increase in prices resulting from the President's proposal is significantly overstated.

When interpreted correctly, as described above, CBO's analysis indicates that the increase in the price level is .6 percent by the end of 1981. The hypothesized 1 percent increase, which was incorrectly characterized as the increase in the price level, is actually the sum of the increases in the price levels for the preceding years: 0.1 percent plus 0.3 percent plus 0.6 percent. The figure was therefore derived by adding the sums of the changes in the annual inflation rates over a period of time. Likewise, the indicated 1.5 percent increase by 1983, which was derived from the 1.0 percent number, does not represent the amount by which prices would increase beyond base case levels as a result of the President's program.

If these adjustments are not made, CBO's estimates of the inflationary impact of the President's proposal appear to be nearly three times as high as those made by the staff of the Energy and Power Subcommittee. However, when properly represented, the apparent differences are significantly reduced: CBO's estimate of a .6 percent change in the price level by 1982 is close to the Energy and Power staff's estimate of a peak impact of .5 percent.

In order to correct any misunderstanding of the results of your analysis, I believe that you should clarify those results by precisely describing the methodology used in estimating the inflationary impacts of the President's Program and characterizing the results obtained. The result of such a clarification can only eliminate what is presently a false issue in the debate.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman. ●

LEARN TO EARN—CONFIDENCE THAT ENDURES

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Joseph V. Machugh, the Bernard Baruch of Capitol Hill, has hit the nail on the point again, to wit:

LEARN TO EARN—CONFIDENCE THAT ENDURES

Few realists would challenge validity of concept—restoration of confidence in United States, its government and its people—is our current top priority. The word is of Latin derivation, meaning trust and respect; and is intangible like the word personality. Both readily are recognized; but, for each there is no central ingredient. Rather it is a compendium of specifics that make up personality and inspire confidence. The analogy recalls a cleavage of view on governmental restraint during World War II. The National Administration urged a piece-meal approach whereas that perennial Presidential Advisor, Bernard M. Baruch consistently advocated overall control.

Precisely how is confidence established among individuals, groups or nations? Early in Writer's career a loan was needed but

collateral was not available. Bank offered a "character loan" insisting on repayment by monthly installments. Confidence prompted the loan and repayment confirmed respect. Achievements (significant jobs—well done) fire the fuels of confidence. They constitute firm foundation for respect. Confidence never is born full-grown nor is it won instantaneously. It takes time (perhaps much time) and testing for its consummation. Foundation and tests are building-blocks for "the house of confidence" proceeding under aegis of that implicit law of gradualness. Who ever saw evening shadows lengthen, springtime buds sprout on tree-branches or watched piquant, human adolescence in actual process of development?

Shortly after World War Two, the media reported Baruch as saying: "America was so strong militarily, industrially and psychologically—as to be able to repel attack by any single enemy or from any conceivable combination of hostile opponents." What hardy soul today would venture a similar assertion? So, what was basis for original assertion? America had been preponderant supplier of men, money and material throughout that War—which ended abruptly with American Atomic Bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki! The Manhattan Project-development of the A-Bomb was a superb achievement in secrecy. Reconstruction aid for war-torn Europe under the Marshall Plan was unprecedented. Finally, with exclusive Atomic Monopoly, United States offered unilaterally (though never accepted) to give a proposed International Authority all secrets and administration for that powerful weapon. Such foursome of dynamic leadership—the figurative diet on which confidence both feeds and thrives.

That earlier confidence can be revived but probably only by stages of transition, couple with a truly spiritual approach—using talents bestowed on a select few qualified to lead a march of progress in ultimate best interest of the human species. Its acid test: Will formidable challenges be resisted and will confidence endure? Spectaculars, like their sparked euphoria, often substantially subside. In Arthurian Legendry the sword-Excalibur, magically fixed in stone to be withdrawn by rightful King of England; and only Arthur did so. When mortally wounded, Arthur ordered Sir Bevidere to cast it in the lake—from whose water an arm clothed in white samite appeared to receive it.

Holy Writ says humility is touchstone for lasting success, implying avid desire to place one's own interest at the bottom and those of others at the summit. There is an infallible guideline to success, achievement and happiness. Since durability is the evaluant of confidence—could any admonition be more salutary for the welfare of all mankind than this trenchant and cogent counsel: learn to earn the pearl of great price—confidence that endures.●

THE ELECTION IN ZIMBABWE-RHODESIA

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. As the ranking minority member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I want to congratulate all the people of Zimbabwe-Rhodesia—be they black or white—on the success of their recent election. The Rhodesian people should be commended for the way in which they have carried out

the mandated election—an election not only observed with intensity by the international community but also influenced by conflicting outside pressures.

Among those outsiders are the Soviet-backed Patriotic Front guerillas, who have made every effort to frustrate the Rhodesian election process. Under rival leadership, the Patriotic Front has not only condemned the Rhodesian internal settlement but the overall democratic process as well. As the Washington Star pointed out in an April 18 editorial:

Rival guerilla leaders Joshua Nkomo and Robert Mugabe are contemptuous of the deal. But they are contemptuous of democracy, too. They care little for the wishes of most black Rhodesians, who are believed to favor the peaceful route to majority rule.

Moreover, the Washington Post, in an April 23 editorial, stated that—

... It is inconceivable that the United States would expect the Patriotic Front, if it won the war, to hold elections of any kind.

What has been so equally troublesome is the administration's tragically misguided policy toward the Rhodesian settlement, and in particular, its belief that the so-called Patriotic Front must be brought into the political process. The administration has provided nearly blind support for the Patriotic Front. Moreover, the administration continues to balk on whether or not to lift sanctions against Rhodesia, an action required by the Congress if free and fair elections have been held and the new government has made a good faith effort to end the guerilla war.

Now that a civil rights activist from the respected human rights organization, Freedom House, has stated that Rhodesia, "has never had so inclusive and free an election," now that Rhodesia has complied with nearly every request the United States has made, now that nearly 65 percent of Rhodesia's black voters have cast ballots approving the internal settlement, it is time for the United States to lift the sanctions against Rhodesia. Our Government should immediately take the necessary steps to support the people of Zimbabwe-Rhodesia—not the people of the Marxist-oriented patriotic front. In short, we must continue to convey our concerns for the establishment of a free and democratic society in Zimbabwe-Rhodesia.

To be sure, the recent election in Rhodesia is a good beginning—but only a beginning. Under the leadership of the newly elected Prime Minister, the people of Rhodesia—unlike many other nations—can look forward to a future shaped by the democratic process as well as improved human rights.

Now that the people of Zimbabwe-Rhodesia have spoken, they wait with anticipation and concern the decisions of the United States and other major powers which will directly influence the ability of their new black majority government to cope with serious economic problems, aggravated by trade sanctions. If we truly support the democratic process in Africa, the United States should demonstrate its support for this democratically elected government by promptly lifting the sanctions now in effect.●

ISRAEL AND THE SUN

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today in the wake of the Iranian oil cutoff and the Three Mile Island accident, it is especially important that we consider the great potential of solar energy. One nation which has made great strides in the solar area is Israel, a nation sadly lacking in petroleum reserves but blessed with plenty of sunshine. A recent article in the ADL Bulletin (published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith) by Daniel S. Mariaschin, director of ADL's Middle Eastern Affairs department, represents an interesting look at the Israeli commitment to solar power.

I recommend Daniel S. Mariaschin's excellent article to my colleagues:

THE SUN—ISRAEL'S ENERGY ALLY

(By Daniel S. Mariaschin)

In the light of the political upheaval in Iran and the general unreliability of foreign oil sources, new interest has focused on an alternative energy source—solar energy. While the Administration's budget for fiscal 1980 includes a \$644 million request for solar research and development, it falls short of expectations. The U.S. still has far to go in matching Israel's commitment to solar energy and its practical applications.

First-time visitors to Israel are immediately struck by the rooftop solar panels dotting the city skylines. The *dudei shemesh*, as they are called, symbolize the resolve of Israelis to overcome an accident of history and nature—the lack of domestic oil reserves and sufficient lumber as sources of fuel.

Israelis may bemoan the fact that their small nation was deprived of the vast petroleum bubbling underneath the barren landscapes of their often-hostile Arab neighbors. But ingenuity abounds in Israel, and long before it became fashionable in the oil-starved industrial West, a way was found to make hay from the more than 300 days of available sunshine. From its outset as a nation, Israel has been experimenting with and developing solar energy for residential and industrial use.

The solar panels were given impetus with major improvements developed in the early 1950's by Dr. Zvi Tabor, a scientist at Hebrew University. His system absorbs the sun's rays and through a simple network of copper tubing heats up to sixty gallons of hot water per day in metal tanks, sufficient for the average Israeli family.

One such family—my in-laws—was among the first in Petah Tikva to use the solar panels. In need of hot water for a family of eight, my father-in-law found the panels reliable, cost effective, and sufficient for the entire family. On overcast days, the backup electrical heating system is switched on.

Well over 30% of all domestic hot water heating in Israel is generated by the sun. It is a growing business in Israel, with four manufacturers producing the rooftop panels. One of them—Miromit—has entered into an arrangement with a firm in Denver, Colorado to produce the panels for sale in the United States.

Turning to a wider application of solar energy, Israel's huge Tadiran Electronics has developed a solar-powered absorption chiller which can provide air conditioning as well as space heating and hot water for apartment buildings, schools, hospitals and other institutions.

According to Yehoshua Tidhar, spokesman

for Tadiran's Applied Solar Devices Division, the absorption chiller's initial investment is substantially more than a conventional system, due largely to local plumbing costs. But, Tidhar adds, "By 1985, environmental and economic factors will make institutional and residential solar air conditioning cost effective and more beneficial than conventional systems."

Israeli technology has also developed a prototype incorporating the heating elements into the residential roof itself. Says Arthur Shavit, director of Research and Development for Israel's National Energy Authority, "You have to build a roof for a house anyway. Such a rooftop solar system is an improvement over the old system, it is more aesthetic and just as functional."

Israeli officials say their research is ahead of other countries, in some respects, as with the extraction of energy from solar ponds, where heat retention is conducted through a system of layers of salt. The cost is only 5% of the regular collectors, though somewhat less efficient.

Solar ponds have a variety of applications for heating, cooling, and water desalination. A few ponds are in operation on a small scale in Israel, most being one-half to one acre in size. They are ideal where adequate land is available at relatively inexpensive prices, and in addition to being practical, they are rarely disruptive to the environment. One such pond, for example, near the Dead Sea resort area, will soon provide both heating and cooling for a hotel now under construction.

Some cooperative ventures with American institutions are underway. A year ago a joint solar energy workshop was held in Israel with U.S. Department of Energy participation. There is also a working relationship with the State of California, including the establishment of a foundation to fund solar energy research and to exchange information and equipment.

Israel's leadership in solar energy research is all the more startling when one considers its budgetary restrictions—the current solar energy research and development budget in Israel is some \$2 million. Energy research must compete with dozens of other needs for its share of Israel's budget, already burdened by one of the highest inflation rates in the world.

Solar energy is no panacea for oil independence, says the Energy Authority's Shavit. "We believe that a realistic target is not to be independent of oil, but to substantially reduce our dependence on petroleum by one-half through imports of coal, exploitation of oil shale reserves, nuclear energy and solar energy."

Israel's growing technological relationship with the sun is one bright spot in the often clouded picture of the Middle East. Israeli ingenuity, confronted with the challenge of being oil poor and an annual imported petroleum bill close to \$1 billion, has turned to the sun for at least part of the answer to its energy needs. ●

CHANGES AHEAD FOR MOTORISTS

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge that America's energy problems are closely related to its transportation problems. In a recent interview in U.S. News & World Report, Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams reviewed the Federal transportation policy

and how it is responding to our energy needs. Among his observations:

First. Increasing gasoline mileage in autos is the single most productive step we can take to reduce demand on our petroleum supplies.

Second. At present, public transportation systems would be swamped if there were a 10-percent shift from automobiles. We have to build up this option for the future.

Third. Amtrak is incapable of making a dent in the intercity travel market, when viewed in the aggregate. A basic national grid of rail lines should be preserved, however, and we should support track improvement projects in places where there is a demonstrated market for train travel.

Fourth. Our highway system is falling apart faster than it can be repaired. Money for new highways must be channeled to the preservation of existing roads.

I commend the Secretary for his comments and I believe that these policies are absolutely necessary if we are to shift our transportation policy during a period of constrained Federal spending. Improvements in auto mileage, a focusing of Amtrak's efforts, and acceleration of highway maintenance all can occur without increased spending if the proper policies are implemented. In one area, however, increased spending definitely is required: that of public transportation. The fiscal year 1980 transit budget proposed by the administration has, in effect, \$400 million less buying power than the 1979 budget has—the result of holding the budget constant during a period of steep inflation. Secretary Adams has said that he wants increased investment in public transit, and the President has approved the idea if the funds come out of his proposed Energy Security Fund.

Regardless of where the money comes from, we must step up our spending on public transit. Money is needed not only for new rail transit systems (erroneously lumped together as "subways" in the U.S. News interview), but also for preserving the systems we have and for expanding bus fleets. The administration time and again has acknowledged these needs, but the required financial commitment has not been forthcoming.

I urge my colleagues to skim this interview with Brock Adams and to support efforts in this Congress to increase the Federal investment in public transportation.

The interview follows:

[Interview with Brock Adams, Secretary of Transportation]

CHANGES AHEAD FOR MOTORISTS

Q. Mr. Secretary, are motorists any better prepared to cope with a shortage of oil now than they were at the time of the Arab embargo of 1973-74?

A. Yes, to the extent that several new subway systems are coming on line—as in Washington, D.C., and Atlanta. We've put approximately 1 billion dollars into the New York subway system.

And we have improved gasoline mileage in autos, so people can go farther with whatever gas they have. But we have not scratched the surface of the total problem.

Q. How soon, if at all, do you expect lines to begin forming at gasoline stations?

A. I can't answer that, because I am not

privy to matters such as the oil companies' reserve levels, the number of tanker ships en route or the adequacy of storage facilities. I don't know anybody in government, really, who is.

The oil market is completely in the hands of the American companies domestically and a cartel abroad that supply the American people with this information. We do talk to them. But the companies don't tell you that refining capacity in a region is overloaded, or that a company's supply of crude oil is inadequate, until it happens.

Q. Are any special steps being taken by the Department of Transportation in anticipation of gasoline shortages?

A. We are attempting to show people, particularly employers, how they can van pool and car pool their people to work. We do this in the federal government, as well. If you can get four people in a car—as opposed to just one—it becomes quite an energy-efficient vehicle.

We are also fighting to maintain the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit. This saves 200,000 barrels of oil a day. If we had full compliance, we'd save another 200,000. To put it into perspective: We got 500,000 barrels per day from Iran.

We've also gone after the auto industry to raise the gasoline-mileage rates. If we can get the mileage up, the petroleum used by automobiles could drop from as much as 7½ million barrels per day to 4½ to 5 million barrels.

At the Department of Energy, there is an allocation plan—if we get to that point—for where the oil is sent and how much people will get and when they'll get it.

Q. Why does the government take out after the auto industry so vigorously?

A. Because I want them to save our country.

Q. And to "reinvent the automobile," as you put it recently?

A. You bet. We face a shrinking total supply of petroleum. Our only protection is for Detroit to give us more miles per gallon in cars, or a car that uses different sources of energy—such as an electric car that in effect runs on coal. It's a national problem because everybody's in the automobile.

I'll get as many people out of cars and into mass transit as I can, but the most I can see doing so is 15 to 20 percent, if all works well.

Q. Will the auto industry succeed in meeting the legal requirement that each company's fleet of new cars average 27.5 miles per gallon by 1985?

A. I have no doubt, technologically, that they can do it.

Q. Then why is Detroit resisting the requirement so hard?

A. Their problem is economic and commercial. They're worried about selling those cars—afraid people will keep the larger cars they have now rather than buy new ones. Their marketing people are very nervous.

Q. Is there justification for those fears?

A. I don't think so, but they do. I can recall two recent newspaper headlines: One read, "Detroit Says Americans Will Not Buy Fuel Economy." The second headline said Washington, D.C., dealers cannot get enough Volkswagen Rabbits or Oldsmobile diesels to sell people, because the gas mileage is so good. You've got to pay to get on the waiting list for them.

Now, to me, that means the American people will buy fuel economy.

The industry's other problem is the development cost. Any change the companies make is so costly that they are very conservative in changing to any kind of new operation.

Q. Have you tried to deal with those concerns?

A. We've met with the auto companies twice. We've said the government is not just trying to cause a fight and that we want them to help us solve a national problem. I think that message is getting through.

I spoke with Henry Ford in Detroit not long ago. The last thing he said at a press conference was, "This isn't an automobile-industry problem; it's a national problem. And we're glad somebody finally is listening to what our problems are."

Q. Still, don't the companies want the mileage requirements scaled down?

A. Yes, because the faster the mileage must rise, the earlier they will have to incur development costs. If you're shifting, as Ford is, to a very advanced fuel-injection engine, you have to change production lines all across the country. It costs money, and they have to recover that money. So they would like to do it at a slower pace. What I must say to them is that I don't know how much time we have left.

Six months ago, two truisms existed in the energy area: One was that Iran was our safest and most stable source of oil in the Middle East. The second was that the Saudis would hold down the price, no matter what. Both of those axioms went out the window. So when you ask me how soon gas lines will form or how much time we've got to get a more fuel-efficient car, all I can say is that we'd better do it as quickly as we can.

I'm willing to listen to the industry's plea for more time, and to look at its problems so that nobody gets put out of business. But I can't sit here and say it's going to be all right and that they have an indefinite period of time to boost gas mileage.

Q. Are you saying, though, that you might indeed give the auto companies more time to meet the mileage requirements?

A. I don't think they have made a case for it yet. If we give them more time, our fleet of cars turns over more slowly, our oil imports rise faster, our dollar drain is more. It's a very bad time for a Secretary of Transportation to be saying to the American public: "The price of fuel is going up. Its availability is dropping. But we really are not going to try to get you a better car."

Q. So your strategy is to hold Detroit's feet to the fire—

A. I wouldn't phrase it that way, but I am pretty hard about it. I should add that the auto companies are trying. That's why I have suggested that the government take over some of the basic research for the industry. They are using all their engineers and all their resources just to meet the short-term goals. I am trying to get out of them a research agenda I can take to the President and say: "These are the things we have to do."

Q. Do your efforts to mandate more gasoline mileage collide with other government policies—such as the Environmental Protection Agency's exhaust-emission rules?

A. There's no question you have a conflict between emissions out of a diesel engine and a diesel's fuel economy. This has to be resolved by technology.

Q. Why not resolve it politically, by easing air-pollution rules for diesels?

A. I don't see how it can be, because politically the clean-air forces and the fuel-economy forces have their feet firmly planted. It's an unusual thing in politics—that both sides are able to marshal a majority for conflicting positions.

The environmental groups can manage a majority in Congress that says, "My God, we're not going to put out something that may cause cancer or will foul the atmosphere." But a majority also will agree, "We've got to have a more efficient engine." So I don't think we're capable yet of getting a political solution.

Q. Is public transportation a reasonable alternative for Americans in the event of another gasoline shortage?

A. Not at the present time. If we had a 10 percent shift of people away from their automobiles, it would swamp us—overload the public-transportation system. Trains, planes

and buses all share only 15 percent of the travel between cities; the other 85 percent go by car.

Q. So when there is a gasoline shortage, what's going to happen?

A. People are going to drive.

Q. And travel less, too?

A. That is right, until we can build back their choices. My job now is to make people aware of that fact, and to build as many new public-transportation options for them as we can—before they're needed.

In a market-oriented society, it's very hard to build something and say, "You're going to have an operating loss on this until the day comes that people can't go in cars."

When that day comes and people can't drive as much, they would instantly want a public-transportation system, and operating losses would vanish. But you can't build a subway, for instance, in less than five years.

Q. Isn't it contradictory to talk about alternative choices for travel at the same time that you recommend to Congress that Amtrak's passenger-train routes be cut by 43 percent?

A. No. Amtrak's problem is that it is too large for the equipment and management organization that it has. And it has an insignificant impact on transportation. If you filled every train to standing room only, you still would carry less than 1 percent of the people traveling between cities.

We've tried to concentrate the money where we know people ride trains—in the Northeast corridor. We know that train travel in the Northeast can be brought to a point where it probably will break even financially. Outside the Northeast, you should preserve a national "grid" of passenger trains.

In the plan we gave Congress for restructuring Amtrak, you'll notice there's one route across the top of the country, one across the middle, one across the bottom, one down each coast and one down the middle.

From there, you can expand, as states or local areas want to share in the loss of a particular train.

Q. But if you have your way on cutting Amtrak routes, as of next October 1, hundreds of towns are going to have one less option in public transportation—

A. Not hundreds, really. We will serve most of the major metropolitan areas, and we'll carry 90 percent of the people who are riding Amtrak trains now.

You see, for every \$3 of Amtrak costs, taxpayers pay \$2 and passengers \$1. I cannot justify that. Passengers ought to pay at least half the costs systemwide. In some areas, like the Northeast corridor, they will pay the full cost.

Besides, people go to meetings and say, "We want a passenger train here." But then you get up the next morning, and there's nobody on the train. So I have no problem shrinking Amtrak to a smaller size.

Q. Your department acknowledges that highways are falling apart today faster than they can be rebuilt or replaced. Do we have more highways than we can afford to keep up?

A. Not if we shift our money away from building a great, new highway system and put it into repairing what we already have. Right now, we do not have the money to repair all the roads, and the old system of having the states pay for repairs has come to the point where governors say they can't do it, either.

Q. So if present trends continue—

A. But they aren't. We turned the corner in last year's highway legislation. We got Congress to agree that gaps in the interstate-highway system will have to be finished by the early 1980s, or the gaps won't be built. Then the money will shift over for resurfacing, repair and so on.

I'm not sure that's enough, though. That's why I insist that if oil producers are to be allowed more money for their "old" oil, whose

price is still controlled, then a portion of that money should be put into our roads and public transportation.

But if last year's law doesn't stick—if we go back to spending most of our 4-cents-a-gallon federal gasoline tax on new constructions—then, yes, we'll be in bad trouble.

Q. Do you advocate a higher federal gasoline tax?

A. I tried for 5 cents more last year, and lost. I told Congress: "The nickel is going to vanish in the total size of gasoline-price increases that will occur in the next two years; you won't even find it. You're going to pay it to the Arabs, instead." Well, that's what happened.

Q. Will President Carter ask Congress this year to further deregulate the trucking business?

A. We have just sent up a railroad-deregulation bill, and what happens on trucking depends upon what kind of success we have with railroads. Right now, the railroads are in very shaky condition.

When we move on truck deregulation, the first thing we'd want to deregulate would be truckload transportation—things such as paper products, food shipments, chemicals and heavy-industry goods.

Those are the same commodities that railroads compete for. So we have to deregulate rails if we're going to deregulate trucks.

Q. How far will you go in seeking to remove government control over railroads?

A. Our proposal would allow railroads to price their services up and down as the marketplace dictates, so they can get back into some lines of business they have lost.

Q. Will you encourage development of new subway systems?

A. Yes, but carefully—very carefully. We're still paying off the commitments that were made by the prior administration. It has taken us three years, and some we're still paying for.

Q. Are subways too expensive to build?

A. They are very expensive. I am telling people seeking new subways that they've got to show us how they will pay for their share of the project and how they will meet operating losses. I want to see an assured local source of funds, which is a sign that everybody there wants the subway.

It's a far cry from the old system, which was: "Well, if the federal government will put up 80 percent of the money, we'll scramble up some money some way and hope it gets finished."

Q. Are you about to authorize any new subways in the U.S.?

A. No.

Q. What cities are asking for them?

A. Detroit wants one, but doesn't have its plans finished. Miami's is approved but not under way. Atlanta is building an east-west subway and is proposing a north-south line. I have not approved ones being sought in San Juan and Honolulu. Buffalo is going ahead with a "light rail" system that is mostly above ground.

Q. If this country cannot afford to support Amtrak in its present form, can it afford transit buses for the handicapped that cost \$250,000 apiece?

A. It's a real problem. But the law Congress passed and the guidelines drawn up by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare lead to the inevitable conclusion that you must have transportation accessible to the handicapped, which drives up the cost of buses as well as subway systems.

Q. But haven't American bus manufacturers indicated they won't bid to make such buses, because of the financial risks involved with new technology?

A. We won't know until the bids are opened on May 3. But if they don't bid, the buses will be made overseas, and we'll pay what it costs. We'll need 3,000 buses a year for cities.

What bothers me is that American manufacturers spent seven years getting ready for this new type of bus. And now that we get to the point of giving the go-ahead, they say they can't do it. What's been going on the last seven years? If the thing was impossible, someone should have gone to Congress and said so. I don't think it's impossible. But I don't build buses.

Q. Outsiders sometimes get the impression that the government, when it comes to energy and transportation, is a two-headed monster—the Energy Department going off in one direction and the Transportation Department trying to catch up or heading the other way—

A. I know, and it bothers me. I argue from time to time with the Department of Energy because it concentrates on production. It represents, in effect, the producers and refiners. We represent consumers—the people who drive automobiles and ride on airplanes, trains and buses.

I think that if you're going to give producers more money for their petroleum, a portion of that money—as much as 13 billion dollars a year—should go into mass-transportation projects. We could repair the interstate highways, construct coal roads, assist Amtrak and help develop alternative fuel sources such as coal gasification or oil shale.

I did not win that fight with the Department of Energy in the first two years. I'm prepared to make it again.

Q. With any different result?

A. I hope so.

Q. Why?

A. Because of our experience of the last two years. My department went up with a whole series of transportation bills, and we passed them all because people understood them. In other words, various groups could see that something was coming out of our legislation that was a plus. Americans are basically optimists, and they like that. The same kind of plus has to be built into the transportation-energy plan.

You don't just say to people that they're going to suffer; you have to add, "Out of this we will give you alternative choices for travel." I'd like to give this idea a try again, because the proposal got dropped completely the last time around, and it was a tragedy. ●

REVENUE SHARING AND FEDERAL SPENDING

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mrs. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues attention a column by David Broder which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, April 8, 1979. As I am sure my colleagues are aware, Mr. Broder is a highly respected columnist and reporter, and in this case his comments on the general revenue sharing program point to the heart of the question.

The idea behind the general revenue sharing program was to reverse the flow of money and power to Washington by returning a small portion of the Federal income tax revenue to the States and localities for them to spend as they saw fit, rather than as Washington officials ordered. This decentralization has proven extremely efficient and as an advocate of a restraint on Federal spending, I feel we must realize that the

two concepts are not mutually exclusive.

Mr. Broder's column follows:

ANOTHER VICTIM: REVENUE-SHARING

(By David S. Broder)

One of the most painful lessons of our time is that "reforms" have unintended consequences. The liberals have littered the landscape with programs famous for the perversity of their effects. To cite but two examples: In the 1960s, "urban renewal" left great scars on the hearts of cities, and in the 1970s, campaign finance "reforms" spurred a flood of special-interest contributions.

Not to be outdone, the conservatives, in this time of growing influence, are proving that they can be every bit as shortsighted in the causes they espouse. As a case in point, consider the mounting evidence that the great conservative "tax revolt" may very well spur a new centralization of government power.

Proposition 13 in California has been hailed as the herald of a conservative charge against free-spending bureaucrats. But the main effect of the rollback in local property taxes has been to send local officials scrambling to Sacramento, seeking state funds to finance vital local services.

The upshot: A setback for home rule and local responsibility, and an increase in the authority of the state government.

A similar result may come from the current conservative drive for a balanced federal budget. Just as Proposition 13 shifted spending decisions, and therefore governmental power, from the localities to Sacramento, the balanced-budget drive is fueling a shift of power from the state to Washington, D.C. It is doing this by posing an imminent threat to one of the few federal programs of recent years, designed to increase, rather than hamper, local decision-making.

That program is general revenue-sharing, which currently sends about \$4.6 billion a year of no-strings aid to localities and \$2.3 billion of unencumbered money to the states.

The state portion of revenue-sharing is a prime target for this year's budget-cutting drive. The House Budget Committee has recommended its elimination from the fiscal 1980 budget and the Senate may well echo that judgment.

The argument is that, with all states being able to balance their budgets this year and many showing a surplus, it makes no sense for the deficit-ridden federal government to pump money into their coffers. That argument is coming not only from liberals who have opposed revenue-sharing ever since Richard Nixon pushed it into law in 1972, but from many budget-balancing conservatives as well.

Rep. Ralph Regula (R-Ohio), the ranking Republican on the House Budget Committee, says: "I've supported revenue-sharing in the past, but we're at the point where we don't really have any revenues to share." Sen. Henry Bellmon (R-Okla.), the ranking Republican on the Senate Budget Committee, another long-time supporter, says: "My position now is that revenue-sharing is a good idea that didn't work. The state legislatures are telling us to balance the budget, and we have to take that mandate seriously."

Both Regula and Bellmon said they would prefer to make the cuts in the categorical-aid programs, which make up the bulk of the \$80 billion of aid Washington sends to state and local governments. But the programs—replete with guidelines and directives and legislative mandates manufactured in Washington—are, predictably, not the ones the Washington legislators or bureaucrats want to eliminate.

As Senate Budget Committee Chairman Edmund S. Muskie (D-Maine), another long-time supporter of general revenue-sharing, concedes, "It will be a very tempting target,"

because the simplicity of this program makes it easier to save money fast than in those programs where dollars take a long time passing through the bureaucratic maze.

Sen. Lloyd M. Bentsen Jr. (D-Tex.), who is out to kill revenue-sharing with the states, sees the prospects for success "getting better as we go along, because it's so much harder to kill other programs, so this looks more and more appealing."

What is forgotten—or minimized—in the current debate is that general revenue-sharing had a philosophical as well as a fiscal rationale. The idea behind it was to reverse the flow of money and power to Washington by diverting a small portion of the proceeds of the federal income tax to the states and cities, for them to spend as they saw fit, rather than as Washington officials ordered.

Sen. Richard G. Lugar (R-Ind.), one of the few balanced-budget advocates who is still a proponent of revenue-sharing, argues that the threat to that program is "just part of the huffing and bluffing the spenders do to make the bad dream [of a balanced budget] go away."

He reserves some criticism for fellow conservatives who would sacrifice revenue-sharing to the cause of a balanced budget. "They don't look at the whole cloth," Lugar says, "or realize that restraint on spending and devolution of authority are not mutually exclusive at all."

Lugar may be right philosophically, but political trends are likely to prove him wrong. State governors believe they can muster the political clout to keep revenue-sharing alive through 1980. But even they are not optimistic about what will happen then. Sooner or later, the balanced-budget "reform" will almost certainly doom revenue-sharing and accelerate the centralization of spending power in Washington.

Irony, yes. But that's the way it is with "reforms." ●

WELCOME JOHN E. MOSS

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, for 12 years I had the honor of knowing and serving in the U.S. Congress with John Moss. He was a dedicated and tireless public servant. His contributions were many. When he retired last year the U.S. Congress lost a valuable resource. The American people lost an able advocate.

This week John Moss returned to the Capitol to visit with some of his former colleagues. It is fitting that he returns in a new role as honorary chairman of the National Committee for Automobile Crash Protection. In that position he continues his longstanding advocacy of safer automobiles. The committee is a coalition of more than 50 medical, insurance, labor, consumer, law enforcement, and disability organizations which advocate the early implementation of automatic crash protection, such as air cushions and automatic safety belts, in automobiles. Those of us who have listened to countless hours of testimony on this subject and those of us who see the value in saving the 9,000 lives and preventing the hundreds of thousands of injuries with these safer cars, appreciate his continued advocacy and wish him well.

Several weeks ago the Washington Post printed an article entitled "The Man Who Perfected Oversight." Especially in this Congress, which I notice the press has dubbed "the oversight Congress," we could search for but it is doubtful that we could find a better model than John Moss.

I insert the Washington Post article in the RECORD:

THE MAN WHO PERFECTED OVERSIGHT

(By Ward Sinclair)

It never fails. Just when they find a use for the wheel, the inventor is not around to explain it. So it goes on Capitol Hill where this year's reinvention of the wheel is something called "oversight."

The papers will be full of talk this year about the 96th Congress being the Oversight Congress. The sense of that term is that enough laws have been passed, enough Big Issues confronted and it is now time for a pause. They will go back and study what they have wrought.

The truth of the matter is that oversight is one of the lesser understood and least exercised functions of Congress. It is overseeing the functions of government and the actions of its officials. In a word, it is investigation. All congressional committees have an oversight role, but few take it seriously. It is messy, it takes time and concentration and, should one dare a cynical thought, it has little appeal to the yonug and chi-chi Boob-Tube Babies who increasingly inhabit the House and Senate.

So whatever the meaning, oversight is "in" and now that Congress is about to rediscover this wheel, the past master of the art—and be not mistaken, it is an art—has gone home to retirement in Sacramento.

At noon on Jan. 3, for the first time since 1953, John E. Moss was no longer the representative from California's 3rd District. Too bad. For if this is in fact the Oversight Congress, as its leaders have proclaimed, Moss would have been in hog heaven had he stayed.

In many ways, at least in recent times, John Moss had to be considered the inventor of oversight. For two decades, his subcommittee investigations put a relentless light on almost every imaginable kind of federal and corporate misdeed. Moss flayed, groused, flayed, pestered and then flayed some more as he charged along on his legislative Rocinante.

IMPRINT ON GOVERNMENT

But why John Moss? Why this mild, not very colorful, onetime appliance dealer and real estate salesman from the Central Valley? The best answer seems to be that Moss somehow figured that a congressman was supposed to come here and take names and kick tail. So he did, to a fare-thee-well.

By the time Moss left Washington he had achieved something that others can lay only spurious claim to: an imprint on the way life is lived in the United States, an imprint on the way government governs.

Almost single-handedly, over enormous resistance, Moss championed the Freedom of Information Act of 1966 that opened government files to the public. Subsequent amendments in 1975 refined the law further and opened the process even more. Most of his colleagues and admirers agree the FOIA was the brightest of the gems Moss left behind.

But laws broadening the scope of the Federal Trade Commission, tightening securities regulation, establishing automobile and tire-safety standards, providing product-warranty protection and setting up a Consumer Product Safety Commission are among the other major legacies. The list is more impressive because Moss never was chairman of a full committee, the usual power base of the super-doer.

The subcommittee level, to which he was limited by the seniority system, was where Moss as overseer compiled his lengthy record as the House's gadfly. His last assignment, as chairman of the Commerce Committee's subcommittee on oversight and investigations, gave him rein to look into almost anything that tweaked his pique.

In the 95th Congress, in 1977 and 1978, the inquiries and investigations rolled at floodtide: the world uranium cartel, FBI foreign security surveillance, Air Force contract shenanigans, accountants' practices, hospital care and unnecessary operations, natural gas shortages, drug costs, college athletics, HEW birth-control policy, pesticide regulation all came under the subcommittee's investigative eye.

The results then, as before 1975, when Moss directed oversight investigations by other Commerce subcommittees, often meant hearings that attracted the press and reports that made Moss a front-page name all over the country.

ASSESSING THE RECORD

In a world where ego-tripping is *de rigueur*, there's an almost sour grapes view among some of Moss' old House Democratic colleagues, conceding that he did some big things but that all in all he wasn't the most effective congressman a district might have. To be sure, Moss made enemies, not a few of them in the House, where he violated the old-boy codes by calling the drones by their real names. His detractors—mostly Republicans and corporate captains—liked to say he was arrogant and unfair, publicity-happy, a power-crazy left winger.

One day before he left for home, Moss looked back to ponder the record. The criticism, if anything, mostly amused him. He treated it the same way he treated critical reactions to his votes: "Too many people want to be popular around here. I don't really give a damn. If it's the right vote, it will become popular."

The notion that he was antibusiness or a shill for the lefties amused him equally. "Actually," he said, "I am very conservative. People who want to dismantle the regulatory machinery of government are not conservatives, as many of them claim. They are very radical. That machinery is there because abuses occurred: The FTC, the Federal Reserve, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission. These things, you just don't tear down and destroy. Those cries come from people who claim regulation is onerous."

Typical of this don't-give-a-damn attitude was what Moss did in early 1973, when those early rockets from Nixon's Watergate started bursting. Moss called on the House to get the machinery ready to deal with a presidential impeachment. The House, typically, decided to wait awhile after less blunt but more timorous souls prevailed.

"The leadership told me I was premature," Moss recalled, "but the thing of concern to me was that the House do its job . . . The pardon of Nixon [by Gerald Ford] interfered with the role of the House. The House should have completed its impeachment action. We were less than we should have been on that occasion. I don't think the country would have been hurt by an impeachment. I like nice clean pages of history."

PRaise FROM NADER

Ralph Nader, who is not given to soaring praise of your public servant, thinks the clean pages of history will show Moss to be "one of the greatest members of Congress of this century." Before Nader was inspiring legions of young idealists into their own oversight of corporate and governmental waywardness, Moss had been there already. "Nobody perfected oversight as John Moss did," Nader said.

The curious thing is that Moss came to

Congress in 1953 with none of the polished tools one might expect a bulldog investigator to have. He did have, however, a high indignation level, a basic sense of right and wrong and a belief that Congress was intended to be something more than a rubber stamp for vested interests.

He was born in Utah, the son of a coal miner, but moved to California with the family as a boy. He attended a Sacramento college for two years, then went into business and Democratic politics. He was a state assemblyman for two years before his election to Congress in 1952.

His victory that year was by four-tenths of one percentage point and, as Moss remembered it, "by all that was holy, I was surely destined to be a one-termer." He seemed to seal his fate when he voted against California's interests, citing constitutional grounds, on the controversial Tidelands oil legislation. "With that, the opposition savored victory. But, in 1954, I got 62 percent of the vote. People said they admired my courage and that became a rule with me—to vote the way I think I should vote."

So with relative electoral security at home and armed with his idea that he was a part of the most representative segment of the federal government, Moss was a natural for the investigative work his subcommittees did. Before there was such a thing as "consumerism," Moss was practicing it on Capitol Hill. "I just have a strong feeling that when I buy something I am committing my dollars and my confidence to a product and I have a right to get a commitment of quality. It is wrong to sell people things that are dangerous to them in normal use."

The trouble with Congress, he continued, is that not enough of its members are looking much beyond the next election—they're too busy with their political careers to let sensitive and potentially damaging issues get in the way.

"Congress is not doing the kind of work that ought to be done. We ought to be monitoring the executive branch much more closely here. Take the General Services Administration. That is an incredible situation. What were the committees with the proper jurisdiction doing when these scandals were occurring? That is where the failure occurs."

BELIEF IN CONGRESS

Michael Lemov, a Washington attorney who once was Moss' chief counsel on consumer oversight—remembers him as "a brave man in a town of compromisers . . . While he was not a lawyer, he knew as much law as there was to be known about legislation. He also had a great belief in Congress as an institution. Whenever he took up the gavel, he felt he was representing an institution created by the Congress, and he was very strict and demanding in public as a chairman."

"In private," Lemov went on, "he was gentle and fair—revered by his staff—and he would never end a meeting until the other side had finished its presentation. Never blew his top, never raised his voice."

In public, with the gavel in hand, though, Moss gave another impression. He could be downright nasty with witnesses who spouted mumbo jumbo. He was unforgiving of malefactors and curt with bureaucrats who didn't want to share information with Congress.

"You have to hold a tight rein on a hearing," was the way Moss explained that. "Maybe I was too tight . . . But I think if we are to preserve our system, we have to be certain that nothing shatters the integrity of this institution."

Moss had a simple formula for conducting his subcommittee inquiries. He hired the brightest investigators he could find and then let them go where the leads took them. He made up his mind that he would be pre-

pared to take "all the heat your opponents can put on you."

"Every Congress needs an SOB who ignores courtesy and convention. Moss did it without compromise. It's pretty glib to call a man courageous, but he was. He was persona non grata to a lot of members of the House—and that is what made him so essential around here," said one of his admirers.

Thomas Greene, a young lawyer from Sacramento who was Moss' last general counsel, said the congressman's "secret," such as it was, was that "he always perceived himself as a man from Sacramento—never a part of the Washington establishment, never got into the big power game. He never said he was a crusader. He would feel uncomfortable saying that. But he had a sense of where he was going. In that area of the country, you can't be too outrageous and continue to be elected."

John Moss did his thing and now he's gone, maybe to teach in California, maybe to go back into business, but, at 63, not regretting for a minute that he could walk away from Washington cold turkey.

"You actually do represent the people when you come here. You are selected to speak for them and it is a great opportunity. But Congress should not be a career, and staying here should not be more important than the quality of your work." ●

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISABILITY PAY BILL

HON. JOSEPH L. FISHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, illness and disability arising from their employment have forced a number of persons into early retirement and reliance on Government disability programs for income. In 1976, however, Congress made changes in the tax treatment of disability income and sick pay that reduced the benefits on which these retirees had relied. Living on a fixed income, these disabled retirees can not afford a tax increase they could not foresee or had any reason to expect when they retired.

Today, with several of my colleagues, I am introducing legislation to correct this inequity in the Tax Reform Act of 1976. Although I voted for the Tax Reform Act and strongly supported many of its reform measures, I did so despite my strong objection to the provisions affecting disability pensions and sick pay.

Prior to passage of the Tax Reform Act, employees under 65 who retired, because of disability were entitled to exclude from taxable income up to \$5,200 a year of disability payments received. Although the Tax Reform Act retains the exclusion, severe restrictions are placed on its availability. It requires that the taxpayer must be permanently and totally disabled, defined as "unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of a medically determinable physical or mental impairment reasonably expected to result in death, or which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months." In addition, the employee must substantiate proof of disability and certify that the disability

status assigned was approved under procedures acceptable to the Internal Revenue Service.

Of perhaps greater importance to northern Virginia residents is a second new requirement that reduces the \$5,200 annual exclusion \$1 for each dollar of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income over \$15,000. Thus, a disabled retiree would no longer be entitled to any portion of the \$5,200 exclusion when his adjusted gross income reaches \$20,200. This provision blatantly discriminates against married couples by requiring that the disabled retiree's income be combined with that of his spouse in determining his adjusted gross income.

Undoubtedly, abuses occurred when certain persons were improperly classified as disabled upon retirement; nevertheless, I believe that Congress overreacted and penalized those who had legitimately retired on disability. Instead of urging that the standards to be met in order to qualify for disability status be tightened at the employer's level, the approach adopted in the Tax Reform Act fixes a rigid standard in the tax laws, thus changing the conditions under which a substantial number of disabled people had previously retired.

My bill will enable those who retired on disability on or before October 1, 1976, or who were entitled to retire on disability on or before that date, to continue to receive the \$5,200 annual exclusion for disability payments received. Neither the new test nor the income ceiling would apply to those covered by this bill.

Also, my bill will further promote fairness under the tax laws by placing civil service and private disabled retirees under roughly the same standards as military retirees. A provision I sponsored in the Tax Reform Act specifies that persons who had joined the Armed Forces as of September 24, 1975, are protected under the law as it existed prior to enactment of the Tax Reform Act. I would like to extend this protection to retirees from civil service and private employment. It is only fair that they not be penalized by a change in the tax laws.

Congress should move this legislation forward to protect persons whose reliance on existing disability and tax programs was undercut by the 1976 legislation:

H.R. —

A bill to provide that individuals who retired on disability before October 1, 1976, shall be entitled to the exclusion for disability payments under section 105(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 without regard to the income limitation in such section, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of section 505 of the Tax Reform Act of 1976 (relating to changes in exclusions for sick pay and certain military, etc., disability pensions) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN EXISTING DISABILITY CASES.—In the case of any individual who—

"(1) retired on or before October 1, 1976, and

"(2) either retired on disability or was entitled to retire on disability,

such individual shall be deemed to have met the requirements of section 105(d) (1) (B) of

such Code (as amended by subsection (a) of this section), and the provisions of section 105(d) (3) of such Code (as so amended) shall not apply."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1975. ●

THE DELANEY CLAUSE—A REPORT BY THE CHAMPAIGN-LOGAN COMMITTEE

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the following is a report prepared by the Champaign-Logan County Committee of the Seventh Ohio Congressional Youth Advisory Committee on modifications to the Delaney clause.

Members of the Champaign-Logan Committee included: John Auldridge, chairman; Tim Smith, vice chairman; Sally Neff, secretary; Dave Adkins, Vicki Allison, Alan Boogher, Randall Chamberlain, Don Grubbs, Jeff Hellman, Clara Manahan, Dixie Pencil, Shelly Plaisted, Cheryl Shaffer, Jeff Standley, Bonnie Ward, Keith Weiskittle, Pam Willis, and Rose Wischmeyer.

The report follows:

THE DELANEY CLAUSE

An old yiddish proverb states, "Ever since dying became fashionable, life hasn't been safe." We have started off with this quote because it pertains to what our paper will be about. The risks that are taken everyday by each of us have come to be expected and accepted as a part of living.

The topic our group has chosen deals directly with the hazards which may come about simply by our being here on this earth. The Delaney Clause involves all of us. It is the Food and Drug Administration's way of protecting the population of the United States from dangers in its food supply.

The Delaney Clause states:

"... no additive shall be deemed to be safe if it is found to induce cancer when ingested by man or animal, or if it is found, after tests which are appropriate for the evaluation of the safety of food additives, to induce cancer in man or animal. . . ."

Presently in the United States, two additives saccharin and nitrites have been found to induce cancer when ingested by animal, thus applying the Delaney Clause and should be banned. Due to public harassment they have been put on probation awaiting amendment. If reasonable changes are not proposed the Delaney Clause must remain the same or be dismissed completely.

This paper consists of our findings and ideas on the issue of whether we should keep the Delaney Clause or modify it or dismiss it completely for a better plan. Our proposals follow:

THE CRITERIA FOR A CARCINOGENIC FOOD ELEMENT TO BE ALLOWED

I. The substance is a unique food additive or ingredient for which there is no safer alternative.

II. The substance is an essential nutrient which can be used to enrich or fortify foods and must be used by some people as a dietary supplement.

III. Removal of the substance would create a much greater risk to the general public than would its continued use.

IN REGARD TO TESTING

I. Tests should only be made on humans or species genetically similar. Humans are not rats.

II. The amount of ingestion will be equal to a level that the average person would consume daily.

III. The test will be reviewed by a seven member board as appointed by the Secretary.

IV. Label the product with a warning stating what the chances are of getting cancer are.

V. Educate the public. It may cost money, but look at how much the Federal government wastes each year.

Following the inclusion of parts IV and V by amendment, the Council adopted the modifications to the Delaney Clause by a vote of 77 to 1.

Our group wishes to pose a question to all who are present here today. A simple show of hands will suffice in answering our question. The question is: Is there anyone at this moment who is experiencing difficulty with their vision in that they are seeing double, have drooping of the eyelids, weakness of muscles, dilation of pupils, vomiting or difficulty of breathing and swallowing? Maybe these problems describe how you feel: a fever, muscle pains, sweating, chills, vomiting and swollen eyelids.

If you don't have these symptoms, you are fortunate indeed, but it is possible that you could get them. These symptoms are of the diseases botulism and trichinosis. Botulism is a term applied to a rare type of food-poisoning caused by the toxin arising from the presence in improperly preserved foods of the *Clostridium botulinum*. Trichinosis is a disease caused by eating raw or improperly cooked flesh of pigs or other meat-eating animals infected with the larvae of a round worm, trichina.

Both diseases can be acquired from food products that have not been properly preserved. Nitrites are used extensively in curing pork products and some fish products.

Nitrites perform three functions. They provide the reddish color that we are accustomed to in cured meats, provide the distinctive flavor of cured meats, and prevent the formation of botulism. If nitrites were to be banned because of the Delaney Clause, these maladies could definitely occur.

The problem with banning nitrites is that there are no known safer alternatives. You simply can't have cured products that look red and fresh, smell fresh, or taste fresh and disease free as we know them without nitrites. You can salt pork bellies, but they are not bacon. They would come from the same piece of meat as bacon, but would be white or gray in color and would be quite salty to taste.

Second, an alternate substance for nitrites will take time to develop. Hundreds of substances have been tried over the years, and nobody has come up with an adequate substitute. There is also an additional factor in that any alternative compound would be subject to the same kind of scrutinizing tests that nitrite is being subjected to now. Within the span of time between having nitrite and having a substitute, the disease factor arises. People may experiment with, for instance, homemade smoked sausage. Many more would be eating pork as fresh meat. Present cooking and storage habits would need to be retaught as spoilage would occur sooner.

Convenience will be lost and higher prices will be gained because of changed packaging procedures and safety requirements. To prevent botulism, products treated with sodium nitrite will need to be kept in cold storage or irradiated or packed in a sterile can to be safe.

Industries, meat retailers, processors, distributors and farmers would suffer greatly because all previously cured meats would

have to be kept under frozen conditions. This would present quite a distribution problem and other handling difficulties. It has been estimated that pork production with respect to cured meats is a \$12.5 billion business, so you can see it would have a devastating effect on the hog business in the United States.

Recent and continuing advances in analytical instruments have made it possible for chemists and biochemists to detect relatively very small amounts of potentially dangerous material with ease. As the instruments become more refined and detect even smaller levels of these materials, we tend to lose perspective when we consider their dangers. Trace amounts, within the range of our bodies' tolerance, become items of concern when perhaps they should not be.

It now has been found that nitrates when added with ascorbate (Vitamin C, and Vitamin E works in much the same way) do not form nitrosamines, the cancer causing agent of bacon, and these ascorbates still let it act as a preventive of food poisoning and preserve the taste and color of bacon. Even after cooking, no nitrosamines are formed. It has also been found that nitrosamines are everywhere around us—in the air, water, certain common fresh vegetables, several industrial fluids, and even cosmetics. But the bulk of human exposure to nitrites comes from inside our own intestines, where they are produced by our own bodies' "manufacturing" system.

In view of these new discoveries, it is useless to try to eliminate nitrites in food because most of the nitrites we come in contact with everyday are within our bodies. And as yet, there is no practical way known to eliminate whatever hazard there may be to us from internal exposure.

We do know that our bodies can usually repair the effects of carcinogens in general and the effects of the nitrosamines in particular. This means that we don't need to get completely rid of the nitrosamines and carcinogens of other types from our environment. What we do is focus our attention on curbing carcinogenic substances we have control over. Sodium nitrite is not one of them.

Latest release from the Federal Food and Drug Administration . . . Mom's apple pie causes cancer. Every day you hear some other nutrient or ingredient has been banned by the F.D.A. One of the major elements that is under federal controversy is the food additive Saccharin.

Saccharin by definition is a crystalline cyclic imide with a chemical composition of $C_6H_4(CO)(SO_2)NH$, with its sweetness varying from 200 to 700 times that of sucrose in solution of varying concentration of some form of the amide of ortho-tovenesulfonic acid. It often is used in the form of its soluble sodium derivative as a sweetening agent that has no food value.

Saccharin reportedly causes bladder cancer in test animals. When you consider the carcinogenicity of any food additive you must consider the test used to determine the carcinogenic level. Test rats that developed cancer had received saccharin in a dosage as high as five percent of their daily diet. This is equivalent to an adult human drinking an average of 1,000, 355 milliliter (12 oz.) diet soft drinks daily for a lifetime. In another study done in Canada, the dosages of saccharin fed to the rats were in excess of the amount that a consumer would receive from drinking 800, 12 oz. diet sodas daily for a lifetime.

Dr. Irving I. Kessler of John Hopkins University studied the overall mortality rate from bladder cancer of 21,447 diabetics who underwent treatment at a large diabetes clinic in Boston during a 26 year period ending in 1959. Among other results Dr. Kessler found that bladder cancer mortality for men

and women combined was only 71% of what would be expected in a similar group of people in the general public.

In their paper entitled "Bladder Cancer Mortality in Diabetics in Relation to Saccharin Consumption and Smoking Habits," Dr. Bruce Armstrong and the world renowned epidemiologist Sir Richard Doll of Oxford University, England, compared 18,733 bladder cancer patients with 19,790 individuals suffering from some other forms of cancer to determine if there were more diabetics among the other groups. They reported that "we were unable to find evidence of risk of bladder cancer in diabetics. Some who must have consumed above average amounts of saccharin for twenty years." They concluded that "the data are reassuring and encourage the belief that saccharin is not carcinogenic to man in amounts commonly used by diabetics."

Pamphlet after pamphlet, report after report, state the same facts, yet the federal government wants to ban saccharin. In banning saccharin the federal government would cause much more harm than good. The reaction of the public alone could cause a war between them and the federal government.

Dr. Michael S. Kramer, a pediatrician at Yale, says "the danger of the war on cancer is as that it is threatening to become a war on common sense. The proposed ban on saccharin will almost certainly adversely affect the health and perhaps even shorten the lives of diabetics to say nothing of the potential increase in the remaining population. The fact that all that sugar and all those calories may represent a greater health risk in terms of diabetics, cardiovascular disease, and tooth decay does not even appear to have been contemplated. . . ."

Even according to the government there is no evidence that saccharin has ever caused cancer in human beings. In spite of all those facts the FDA wants to ban saccharin. We oppose this idea!

The world food supply grows smaller every day and if we keep outlawing substances and nutrients we will never be able to meet the needs of the people twenty years from now. Delaney has served us well over the past twenty years but every concept must need change. If we review in our minds the evidence presented we must foresee a change in the status of Delaney. Scientific technology has advanced since 1958 when the Delaney clause was first introduced. At that period technology could only measure parts per million. Today, in 1979, they measure parts per trillion. The law has not advanced in proportion to technology. After a brash critique, we can foresee a type of transcending idealism in the original piece of legislation. But in trying to apply this, it falls far short of the original expectations. You must realize we are not mandating a repeal of the clause, only a modification that would permit the basic risk/benefit concept to be applied. The allies of Delaney call for a strict interpretation but give no alternative for the diabetic in relation to the saccharin element of Delaney. In respect to the nitrite uprising there has not been a substance proven to be as effective against the botulism virus as nitrate.

Through persistent research and heated deliberation we have heard the testimonies of many famous officials in their fields. And we as a committee have drafted a modification for Delaney. It makes the clause more workable and feasible economically in respect to the health and safety of the American people. We never can hope to achieve a zero-risk world. All technology and advancement would be stopped or abolished. We must match one risk against the other or as some would call it a risk-vs-benefit. We as a committee would like to submit the modification to the Delaney Clause as outlined. ●

ASBESTOS HAZARD IN SCHOOLS

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the severe health hazards associated with the exposure of workers, their families, schoolchildren, and others to asbestos and asbestos materials has become a major issue for the Nation and for Congress. I have introduced legislation to help States and local communities to clean up imminent hazards in the thousands of schools where deteriorating or easily damaged asbestos materials pose a significant health danger to millions of children.

But this legislation only begins to touch on much broader, and more costly problems such as compensation for the victims of asbestos exposure, their families, and survivors. HEW has estimated that 67,000 people may die from asbestos related diseases in each of the next 30 years.

It is imperative that Members of Congress familiarize themselves with these issues. Fortune magazine, one of the leading business publications in our country, has just published a very important story on the asbestos issue. I want to share this story with all of my colleagues, because it not only provides a thorough history of the problem, but points to some of the major decisions which this Congress may have to make concerning solutions, some of which might cost the taxpayer billions of dollars.

The article follows:

ASBESTOS

In 1898, Henry Ward Johns, founder of the Johns-Manville Corp., died from a chronic lung condition that doctors now believe was asbestosis, a disease caused solely by inhaling asbestos fibers. Today, John's death can be viewed as a grim omen: J-M, the free world's largest asbestos-fiber producer, is beset by more than 1,500 lawsuits brought by people who have been stricken by asbestos-related diseases. If asbestos turns out to be the unprecedented industrial-health tragedy that many predict, the wave of claims could mount over the next two decades, exhausting J-M's insurance coverage and causing a serious drain on the company's resources.

J-M is not the only defendant in the torrent of litigation. Owens-Corning, Raybestos-Manhattan, Keene, and other past or present asbestos manufacturers are also involved, often as codefendants. But as the industry's leader, J-M is in the vortex of the controversy. While vigorously defending itself in the courtroom, it has also embarked on an effort to shift the financial burden of the health claims to the federal government. Because many of the claimants worked with asbestos insulation while building ships during World War II, the Denver-based company is suing to force the government to indemnify it for some claims by shipyard workers. It is also lobbying hard for a government program that would cut off future lawsuits. Since smoking aggravates some asbestos-related health problems, J-M supports a compensation program financed partly by the tobacco industry. The asbestos industry would kick in, too, but most of the money would come from taxpayers.

THE JURIES ARE SPLIT

J-M is shielded against most lawsuits from its own employees, who are entitled to

nothing more than workmen's compensation payments. Most of the plaintiffs, therefore, are insulation workers who handled J-M's products while working for someone else—e.g., in a shipyard or a construction company. They contend that J-M and the industry had a duty to provide a warning of the health dangers of asbestos years before they actually did. J-M began putting cautionary labels on its products in 1964, and argues that until then it lacked sufficient evidence of the risk to workers who used asbestos products but weren't involved in making them. The company has settled about 250 of the claims out of court. Only twelve have been tried by jury, and no clear pattern has emerged. Juries have ruled for the plaintiffs exactly half the time.

What is clear is that this grayish-white, fibrous mineral has snuffed out many human lives. That is a bitter irony because when employed as a fire retardant, asbestos has also saved lives. With its quality of heat resistance, and its remarkable strength and flexibility, it has found more than 3,000 applications. Because of this, nearly everyone has some exposure to asbestos, from the child who sits in a schoolroom under a flaking asbestos ceiling to the household handyman who saws and sands some types of wall-board. The latest worry involves the dangers posed by asbestos-lined hairdryers, which can blow fibers into the user's face. No one knows what risks to health are involved in these consumer situations, or whether they will result in lawsuits years from now.

The worst exposures have occurred in the workplace, where asbestos has caused disabling and often fatal disease. Asbestosis is a non-malignant scarring of the lungs that has been blamed for the deaths of 7 to 10 percent of asbestos workers surveyed in epidemiological studies. The disease can make breathing so difficult that victims cannot climb a flight of stairs without sitting down to rest every few steps. Mesothelioma, a cancer of the linings of the chest or abdominal cavities, also associated exclusively with asbestos, usually kills victims within a year after symptoms appear. The preeminent asbestos-disease researcher, Dr. Irving J. Selikoff, director of the Environmental Sciences Laboratory at New York's Mount Sinai School of Medicine, has found mesothelioma in about 7 percent of the asbestos workers he's studied, and even some cases among wives who merely shook out work clothes. The mineral also increases the risk of lung cancer, which accounts for up to 20 percent of deaths among asbestos workers.

For John A. McKinney, fifty-five, J-M's chairman and its chief executive since 1977, the asbestos problem has its personal side. Several of his friends have died of asbestos diseases, including a J-M labor-relations man, a plant engineer and a plant manager. Such memories make him sympathetic to the plight of victims, but the silver-haired McKinney is vigorous in putting up the best possible defense. A lawyer who joined J-M in 1951 as a patent counsel, he spends about half of his time on the asbestos problem, directing the company's strategy and meeting with legislators and security analysts. The company has had trouble both on Capitol Hill and on Wall Street. During a series of congressional hearings on asbestos last fall, the price of J-M's stock plunged about 20 percent, and it hasn't recovered.

A DECLINING INDUSTRY

Asbestos litigation is almost a separate business at J-M. Policy is determined by McKinney and his staff of four attorneys in Denver; it is relayed to regional lawyers, who work part time for J-M in four cities and supervise the forty-eight local lawyers handling the individual lawsuits.

McKinney acknowledges that the health and litigation problems have helped push the company into diversification. Last fall J-M acquired Olinkraft, the forest-products company with sales of \$447 million. Some

uses of asbestos have been abandoned—in insulation, for example—and the government has banned all spray-on applications. As a result, asbestos has ceased to be the growth industry it once was, and J-M and its competitors have been scrambling to develop substitute products. Asbestos still accounted for 19 percent of J-M's operating income last year on just 7 percent of sales (without Olinkraft), down sharply from 37 percent of operating income in 1976. Nonetheless, the company posted sales of \$1.6 billion and earnings of \$121.6 million last year, both records.

So the future importance of asbestos to J-M may lie mainly in the courtroom. The outcome there is shrouded by imponderables: the number of lawsuits that will ultimately be filed and the possibility that Congress will pass a compensation program. The wild card, though, is the possibility of punitive damages, which are not covered by insurance. Although punitive damages haven't been awarded so far, evidence produced during the last year has made the plaintiffs' attorneys more prone to ask for them.

RESTORING TO SELF-INSURANCE

The costs of the litigation haven't yet been burdensome, since most of the settlements, jury awards, and legal fees have been covered by J-M's liability policies with Travelers Corp. J-M will not talk about its coverage prior to 1947, except to say that it has some. In terms of potential liability, this is an important period because millions of workers were exposed to hazards in the wartime shipyards.

In 1947, J-M signed the first of a series of policies it would hold with Travelers for the next thirty years. Its aggregate coverage under the policies is \$16 million, with a \$5,000 deductible for each claim. In addition, the company took out \$348 million in backup coverage with other insurers that could be called on if the primary coverage was exhausted.

Unable to estimate the liability that might arise from present levels of asbestos exposure, insurers stopped writing new primary asbestos coverage in the mid-1970's. When Travelers refused to renew its policy for the 1977 fiscal year, J-M was forced into a system of self-insurance. It has to pay the first \$3.5 million of any claims that relate to asbestos exposure in fiscal 1977, \$5 million in 1978, and \$12.5 million in 1979. Beyond those amounts, which operate like very large deductibles, it is insured for a maximum of \$50 million in each of those three years.

But the new move may not do the company much good. It is the \$364 million available during the 1947-76 period that will be drawn upon for the bulk of the payments. The company's financial liability is being prorated among the policies in force during the period in which the injured party was exposed to asbestos. The long periods of exposure involved in present claims fall largely in the years before 1976.

Is the \$364 million adequate? Already there is strain on the \$16 million in primary coverage, which the company admits will be exhausted in about two years. The pace of settlements has been accelerating—139 of the 250-odd settlements were reached in 1978, at an average cost to the company of \$15,400. Plaintiffs actually receive several times that amount—sometimes as much as \$100,000 or more—because about ten companies are often involved as defendants, and they split the costs of settlements. Jury awards have varied widely; the largest was \$750,000, but that was later reduced to \$275,000.

For J-M, the biggest risk lies in the surging number of new lawsuits. New filings have risen from 159 in 1976 to 792 last year, with recent monthly totals running at an annual rate of almost 1,600. Increasing publicity about the problem has undoubtedly helped to generate many of the new claims. "I've talked to about fifty of our clients about

Johns-Manville stock," says one analyst. "After I explained the situation, two said their fathers had worked with asbestos in the shipyards and had died of cancer. They both asked me if I knew a lawyer who would file suit for them."

McKinney thinks the number of suits is reaching a peak right now. The publicity about asbestos disease, he says, has probably flushed out most of the potential claims. More important, argues J-M's corporate medical director, Dr. Paul Kotin, dust-control efforts over the last twenty years have begun to pay off in reduced incidence of disease. These safety efforts consist primarily of improvements in ventilation, various techniques to "lock in" the fibers in products containing asbestos, and use of respirators. Kotin also argues that federal standards on asbestos exposure, which mandated significantly lower dust levels in the 1970's, have created safe working conditions.

ASBESTOSIS AT LONG BEACH

But Kotin acknowledges that J-M's is a minority position. Many doctors feel that asbestos levels were dangerously high before an emergency federal standard was set in December, 1971, and that the present dust levels postpone the manifestation of disease but don't prevent it. Although the incidence of asbestosis appears to be related to the duration as well as the intensity of exposure, cases of mesothelioma have resulted from periods of intense exposure as short as three months.

Nobody has exact figures on the number of people who were exposed to asbestos in the past, or what their exposure levels were. But recent examinations of shipyard workers suggest that claims could continue to be filed until the turn of the century. At the Long Beach Naval Shipyard, about a third of the workers employed seventeen years or longer have X-ray evidence of asbestosis, yet are still able to work. A similar picture has emerged from other shipyards, and it is a distressing one because these postwar workers generally had a much cleaner work environment than their predecessors.

The National Cancer Institute believes that "the major public health impact of asbestos-related cancer is just beginning to be reflected in overall cancer statistics," and estimates that more than two million people will die from asbestos-related cancer. The industry has attacked those estimates as being wildly overblown. Selikoff of Mount Sinai won't be drawn into the numbers game, but says: "It's clear that a very large number of people are involved."

J-M claims that N.C.I.'s estimate of two million cancer deaths is high by at least a factor of ten. Even if that is so, J-M future liability could be very high. Based on the average settlement cost to J-M of about \$21,000—\$15,400 to the plaintiff, plus legal fees—it would take only 17,000 settlements before the company approached the limits of its insurance coverage for the period 1947 to 1976. Even if estimates of deaths are heavily discounted, it is easy to speculate that the number of awards could be much higher. But J-M asserts its insurance coverage is more than adequate, based on its view that the problem has peaked and that its legal defenses will prevail in most cases.

AN "UNAVOIDABLY UNSAFE" PRODUCT

Actually, J-M may find it difficult to keep its share of the settlements and awards as low as \$15,000 apiece because evidence produced during the pretrial discovery phase of the lawsuits has been eroding the company's legal defense. Like many important drugs that carry the risk of serious side effects, asbestos is categorized under product-liability law as "unavoidably unsafe." Such products must be accompanied by a warning to the ultimate user or consumer, who can then determine whether to expose

himself to the hazard. The failure to give an adequate warning makes the product "unreasonably dangerous," and liability attaches to any injury. The manufacturer is held to the skill and knowledge of an expert, and he has an affirmative duty to test his product to discover dangers.

For J-M, the complicated legal theories can be boiled down to two questions. The first is, when did the health hazards to insulation workers become foreseeable, triggering the warning-label requirement? Second, once the warning was issued, did it adequately communicate the extent of the danger? J-M contends that knowledge of the asbestos hazard in the early years pertained only to workers in the industry, not to people who handled insulation products, which contained about 15 percent asbestos. There was no reason to warn insulation workers, J-M argues, until Selikoff came down from Mount Sinai in 1964 with his tablets of stone.

But there is evidence, some of which has surfaced in the past year, to suggest that a warning label should have been used at least as far back as the early 1950's. The first published report of asbestosis in an insulation worker appeared in U.S. medical literature in 1932, and although it would be years before a full-scale epidemiological study would be carried out, American and British medical journals from the 1930's on carried reports of disease among both manufacturing and insulation workers.

In the leading court case, *Borel vs. Fibreboard Paper Products Corp.*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in 1973 upheld a jury verdict in favor of an insulation worker who had contracted asbestosis and mesothelioma after working with asbestos from 1936 to 1969. The court noted the medical literature and said that the jury could properly have concluded that the injury to plaintiff Borel "was foreseeable to the defendants at the time the products causing Borel's injuries were sold." Even though Borel and other insulation workers weren't handling pure asbestos, the dust levels were so high that Borel frequently had to blow out his work clothes with an air hose at the end of the day. The court said that "a known risk" predated the 1964 study, and affirmed the jury's conclusion that the defendant manufacturers, which included J-M, breached their duty to warn. The court also said that the warning labels the company began using in 1964 failed to communicate the seriousness of the risks.

Actually, the Navy Department and the U.S. Maritime Commission had recognized the risk to insulation workers from high dust levels as early as 1943. In their booklet published that year, "Minimum Requirements for Safety and Industrial Health in Contract Shipyards," they noted that asbestosis was a disease that could arise from "any job in which asbestos is breathed," listing such tasks as sawing, cutting, or handling asbestos or asbestos mixtures.

While important, such evidence is not as significant, at least legally, as actual firsthand knowledge, which the plaintiffs also claim the company possessed. Beginning in the 1930's, J-M had a division that hired crews of workers to install insulation on construction sites. Some of the workers began making workmen's compensation claims for asbestos diseases against J-M and other manufacturers with similar divisions, and compensation-board records show that settlements were entered against J-M in the 1950's.

DR. SMITH'S RECOLLECTIONS

Further evidence that J-M should have labeled its product sooner has been given by Dr. Kenneth Wallace Smith, who was J-M's corporate medical director from 1952 to 1966. In two sworn depositions before his death last year, Smith said he told J-M executives and lawyers as early as 1952 that he believed insulation workers "were exposed

to the same potential hazards" as manufacturing workers. Smith said he urged that a warning label be used on the company's asbestos products, but his recommendation was turned down.

In its defense, J-M has maintained that individual case reports and compensation claims were not sufficient, that only the kind of study released by Selikoff in 1964 could have formed the basis for issuing a warning label. Until then, the company says, it relied largely on a 1946 study of shipyard insulation workers that failed to show any significant evidence of disease. Although the study was an important one at the time and was done by four government consultants, the government's position in 1946 was anything but clear—since three years earlier, those shipyard guidelines had listed asbestos as a disease of insulation workers. As for Dr. Smith, the company has produced testimony to contradict his assertions.

A DEADLY COMBINATION

J-M is also arguing that smoking is responsible for the large number of lung-cancer deaths among asbestos workers. Asbestos alone increases the risk of lung cancer among nonsmokers about fivefold, but the combination of asbestos and smoking is unbelievably deadly—increasing the risk by a factor of sixty or more. Unfortunately, in the absence of precise information about the causes of cancer, juries often have to choose between two jousting expert witnesses, one blaming asbestos, the other smoking.

Now J-M has to contend with that wild card—the possibility of punitive damages. Plaintiffs seeking such awards must prove not just negligence, but willful misconduct. They think they can show this on the basis of J-M's failure to use a warning label until years after it allegedly had direct knowledge of a hazard. Their evidence includes those old workmen's compensation awards to insulators as well as correspondence passed among industry executives in the 1930's, which shows an attempt by some executives to hold down publicity about asbestos disease. J-M, whose lawyer at that time, Vandiver Brown, was one of the correspondents, argues that far from covering up the problem, the company was sponsoring studies of asbestosis among manufacturing workers.

This new evidence, which surfaced last year, has been submitted to only one judge in connection with a request for punitive damages. He evidently wasn't impressed and refused to allow the jury to consider such damages. Last August, another judge considered the same evidence but only in connection with a request for a new trial of a case that J-M had won. He ordered the new trial, saying that the correspondence showed "a conscious effort" to "downplay, or arguably suppress, the dissemination of information to employees and the public for fear of the promotion of lawsuits." Although J-M steadfastly maintains that punitive damages will never be awarded, the exposure of the documents creates a new element of uncertainty that may make J-M more eager to settle out of court.

SHIFTING THE BILL TO WASHINGTON

In the long run, J-M's lobbying effort in Washington may be more important to its financial health than anything that happens in the courtroom. The company is supporting a bill introduced by Representative Millicent Fenwick, whose New Jersey district is the home of J-M's largest plant. The bill would establish an asbestos-compensation system patterned after the coal miners' black-lung program, which is administered by the U.S. Department of Labor and financed by the government and by coal operators.

Some type of "white lung" program is probably the only fair and orderly way to compensate victims of asbestos disease. Reliance on the legal system to resolve what

could easily be tens of thousands of cases—each one requiring extensive depositions, discovery motions, expert witnesses, and the like—would be slow and costly. Considering the vagaries of fifty different state product-liability laws, the results of the cases would hardly be consistent. Already, for example, dozens of claims have been dismissed because of local filing rules.

Many critics of a government remedy claim that lawsuits offer the best payout, but that just isn't so for the majority of cases. Even large jury awards can easily be cut in half by lawyers' fees and expenses, while a compensation system could provide adequate payments with adjustments for inflation.

The more controversial question is who pays for the program. Fenwick's bill, once effective, would bar new asbestos suits in favor of the federal program and give plaintiffs with pending suits the option of continuing in court or applying under the program. Initially the Treasury would finance the plan, but eventually it would be funded half by mandatory payments from the asbestos and tobacco industries and half by the taxpayers. However, taxpayer liability would be open-ended because if the fund proved inadequate, the government would pay the excess claims.

It's unlikely that Congress will pass a compensation program that has such a grip on the taxpayers' wallets. Nor should it, since the federal government's legal responsibility for the present health problems seems limited. But there is justification for some government contribution to the compensation of wartime shipyard workers. In the frenzied push to build naval and merchant vessels for the war, shipyard employment soared from 168,000 in 1940 to 1.5 million in 1943. The 700 fatal accidents in the shipyards in 1943 suggest that safety procedures were often overlooked in the haste to fill wartime production quotas. The government, which had shipyard standards covering the handling of asbestos, apparently failed to see that they were strictly enforced. Consequently, the shipyard workers who have fallen ill with asbestos disease are the last uncounted casualties of the war.

MORE YEARS OF UNCERTAINTY

Regardless of the liability formula, no asbestos-compensation program is likely to be enacted in the near future. Most of organized labor favors a comprehensive approach to occupational-disease compensation, and another competitor is certain to be Senator Harrison Williams' longstanding effort to write national minimum standards to upgrade state workmen's compensation systems. All this adds up to more years of uncertainty about J-M's financial liability. For McKinney, the lawyer who became C.E.O., the courthouse surely holds no attraction anymore.●

CONTINUING CRISIS IN FOSTER CARE

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the most recent in a long series of studies of the foster care system in the United States was released. This study, by the National Commission on Children in Need of Parents, once again documents the terrible conditions under which tens of thousands of children needlessly exist, and the manner in which Federal inaction and antiquated laws contribute to, and even en-

courage the perpetuation of, this unjust and costly system.

The membership of this commission included some of the leading figures in the American business community. These members, who deserve the gratitude of the Congress and the public for their work, include:

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON CHILDREN IN NEED OF PARENTS

Mrs. Griffin B. Bell, Atlanta, Ga. and Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Charles Duncan, Houston, Texas and Washington, D.C.

Christopher F. Edley, Executive Director, United Negro College Fund, New York, N.Y.

Marshall K. Evans, former Vice-Chairman, Westinghouse; Chairman, Children's Hospital, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Larry Gelbart, Playwright, Beverly Hills, Calif.

Miss Dorothy Height, President, National Council of Negro Women, New York, N.Y.

Kaye Kiddoo, Corporate Director, Manpower Resource, Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, California.

Charles Kirbo, Attorney, Atlanta, Ga.

Philip M. Klutznick, Chairman, Urban Investment and Development Co., Chicago, Ill.; former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

James H. Maloon, Executive Vice President, Pan Am Airways.

Baldwin Maull, former Chairman, Marine Midland Banks; Director, St. Regis Paper Co., Niagara Mohawk Paper Corp., Princeton, N.J.

William S. Ogden, Executive Vice President, Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, N.Y.

Cornelius W. Owens, former Executive Vice President, A.T. & T., Director, New York Stock Exchange; W. R. Grace and Co., Atlanta, Ga.

Harvey C. Russell, Vice President, PepsiCo, Purchase, N.Y.

Charles J. Scanlon, Vice President, General Motors Corporation, New York, N.Y.

Robert Schneider, Director, Public Affairs, Xerox, Stamford, Conn.

Mrs. James M. Sibley, Atlanta, Ga.

J. Henry Smith, Former Administrator, Human Resources Administration, NYC, former Chairman, Equitable Life Assurance Society, New York, N.Y.

Marletta Tree, Partner, Llewellyn Davies Associates; Director, CBS; Pan Am Airways, New York, N.Y.

Malcolm Wilson, former Governor, State of New York; Chairman, Manhattan Savings Bank, New York, N.Y.

They have thoroughly studied the foster care system, and they have joined a long list of individuals and organizations who have declared it a bankrupt program.

"With some admirable exceptions, the foster care system in America is an unconscionable failure, harming large numbers of the children it purports to serve." This emerges as the unanimous verdict of the National Commission on Children in Need of Parents after months of inquiry.

Two years ago, when I first introduced "The Foster Care and Adoption Reform Act," I said that my own investigations and those of many others had clearly established that the foster care system currently operating, encouraged the break-up of the family and even subsidized it. Since that time, there has been an unrelenting and unchallenged stream of studies, reports, hearings, and investigations which have unanimously concluded:

Many children in foster care do not belong there;

There are less costly alternatives to many types of foster placements;

Many children are in overly restrictive, overly costly placements;

Preventive service programs, periodic reviews of placement, improved case planning and reunification services can not only dramatically reduce the number and duration of placements, but can save substantial amounts of money;

Many children in foster care could be, and should be, adopted, but the absence of a federally supported adoption subsidy program maintains thousands of children in foster care, even though subsidized adoptive placements are less expensive and far better for the health and well-being of the child.

These conclusions, backed by an exhaustive amount of research and statistical evidence, have been reiterated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; numerous State studies; child welfare and social service organizations; the New York City comptroller; social welfare research organizations; the Children's Defense Fund; the General Accounting Office; and many others.

In the last Congress, the legislation which would have significantly improved the foster care and adoption system, H.R. 7200, narrowly missed enactment, having been subjected to repeated and wholly unnecessary delays in the Senate. This year, the new bill, H.R. 3434, is already moving swiftly in the House, backed by strong bipartisan supporters. Again, all eyes concerned with the well-being of children will be on the Senate.

Is it possible that the U.S. Senate alone will fail to recognize the plight of these 500,000 children, and will again delay enactment of these overdue and noncontroversial reforms? It is my personal hope that the conclusions of the report of the National Commission serve to stimulate the Congress and all concerned people to press for the swift enactment of H.R. 3434.

Let me merely cite portions of the conclusions of this important report:

First. Approximately 500,000 American children are presently in foster care;

Second. The courts are often the cause of children unnecessarily spending years in foster care;

Third. The way in which Federal aid is provided encourages keeping children in foster care and discourages finding them permanent homes;

Fourth. Foster care is administered by staffs to overburdened, poorly paid, and often unprepared professionally that they are ill equipped to free children for adoption and find homes for them;

Fifth. Inadequate support payments to foster parents contribute to frequent turnover of homes and thus mean more moves for foster children;

Sixth. Taxpayers and contributors to charity are not getting their dollar values for foster care spending in this country;

Seventh. Children virtually become lost in foster care;

Eighth. There is in America no "cohesive" system of foster care worthy of the name.

These are sobering conclusions. There is no need for more studies, and the children cannot afford to wait. There can be no surer test of a Member of Congress commitment to children and families than that indicated by his or her support for H.R. 3434. ●

CASE AGAINST NUCLEAR ENERGY IS A BUM RAP

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Petr Beckmann, professor of electrical engineering at the University of Colorado and expert on nuclear energy, also publishes and edits an extremely useful newsletter called "Access to Energy." This publication is distinguished by its hard-headed, nonhysterical approach to nuclear energy—an approach that is particularly valuable in these days.

The May issue contains material that I would very much like to bring to my colleagues' attention, as a necessary antidote to the ravings of the antinuclear zealots.

No form of mass energy production is completely safe, as was demonstrated when the Liberian oil tanker exploded in Nederland, Tex., recently.

But, as Dr. Beckmann demonstrates so eloquently, the case against nuclear energy is a bum rap.

THE GRAND DISASTER: WHY NO CASUALTIES?
(By Petr Beckmann)

Everybody knows that the greatest "catastrophe" in the history of nuclear power resulted in zero dead, zero injured and zero diseased; but not everybody can see through the four big frauds promulgated by the media and by the politicians catering to them.

"It was a close shave; a meltdown was only narrowly averted." This is two frauds in one. First, there never was a time when a meltdown was close; it was held off by several lines of defense and would not have set in even if further malfunctions had occurred. Second, a meltdown would not have been the end of the world, either: The purpose of the containment building is to contain radioactivity after a meltdown has taken place, and even if it, too, fails, there would still have to be a very unusual weather situation before there could be large-scale loss of life.

The third fraud is "Scientists told us that an accident like this is virtually impossible, but now it has happened." What scientists have been saying, and continue to say, is that there is an extremely low probability of a nuclear accident with massive loss of life. This writer, for example, does not have to rewrite a solitary line of his book *The Health Hazards of Not Going Nuclear*, and does not hesitate to recommend it to those who wish to understand why the zero death toll at Harrisburg was not merely "lucky." Politicians who now pretend to have been duped into thinking that a nuclear accident, especially one with no loss of life, was impossible, not only falsely claim that they were told engineers are infallible and mechanical failures unheard of, but in effect they now pompously proclaim that they were dumb enough to believe it.

The fourth fraud is that "The much touted safeguards failed on Three Mile Island." They

did not. Nuclear safety is not based on this or that gadget, but on two principles by which to contain any unforeseen events that might occur. One is the defense in depth, a multi-layered system of defense built around the only danger point, the reactor core.

The two major bulwarks of this defense are the Emergency Core Cooling System and the containment building. Both were the main targets of the anti-nuclear obstructionists, and both performed superbly. Every honest scientist and every informed citizen will be reassured by a defense system that stood up to a freakish series of five independent, horrible failures and human errors under the most aggravating conditions.

The second principle of nuclear safety is the slowness of a nuclear accident. Had more defense lines been penetrated (or had they, as before, been disabled by error), more countermeasures, up to and including evacuation, could have been taken. A meltdown, which is not the last line of defense, takes many hours and gives plenty of advance warning. Alas, it was this very advantage of slow evolution (6 days) that enabled the cannibals to fan the hysteria to fever pitch.

Worse than the frauds, perhaps, was a stupendous omission. 845 MW is a lot of power, and when much energy is pent up, it is always dangerous. But nobody compared the dangers. A dam break can kill 100,000 people in a matter of minutes. Where is the first, second, and seventeenth dam when the first fails? What kind of emergency cooling do the LNG tankers docking 3 miles from downtown Boston have? Where are the evacuation plans when a gasoline refinery blows up?

No one died at Harrisburg, and no one ever came close to it.

But generating electric power by fossil fuels kills some 20,000 Americans a year by air pollution, transportation and industrial diseases. There will now be a few more dead, injured and diseased added to that toll because TMI Unit 2 no longer delivers the power that is safer. And already the media, and the politicians who cater to them, are calling for that toll to increase by slowing, or even stopping, nuclear power.

Predictably, those who opposed the safest form of power on the grounds of safety oppose it even more now that its safety has been vindicated in battle.

HOW IT HAPPENED

What happened at Three Mile Island (3MI) is this:

At 4 a.m., on March 28, when the 845 MW reactor was running at 98% capacity, there was a malfunction in the feedwater flow on the turbine side. Both auxiliary pumps tried to take over automatically, but (in violation of NRC regulations) the valves had been left shut so no water could get through. The turbines tripped (went out of service) automatically and normally. On the reactor side, the loss of the heat sink in the steam generator resulted in an increase in temperature and pressure, which generated a reactor trip signal; the reactor "scram" (instant interruption of the chain reaction by full insertion of the control rods) occurred automatically and normally.

Increased pressure should be handled by the pressurizer's steam cushion and relief valve (just as in a household pressure cooker). It was, and the relief valve worked normally, but it stuck and failed to close—a second failure, and one that caused much further trouble.

The steam escaping from the relief valve goes into the relief tank where it is quenched in cold water. But when the relief valve stayed open, the steam was followed by water and forced out the rupture disks (that's what they are for: As with freeze plugs in an automobile engine, it is better to lose the plugs than the machine). A path was now provided for the water to leak out from the pressure vessel through the pressurizer and

the still open relief valve to the floor of the containment building, and the water began flowing out. As soon as the pressure and the water level dropped, the big moment in 22 years of nuclear power history had come: The first occasion for the Emergency Core Cooling System to be activated in a real emergency.

It would never work, the Naders had been yelling; the steam wouldn't let the water in, the tests were on too small a scale, they were nothing but staged theatrics and computerized eyewitness.

Now the big moment had come. Within seconds, years of anti-nuclear propaganda were shattered as the ECCS came in, automatically, instantly, reliably. It can take bigger holes than an open relief valve, injecting water much faster than it leaked out through the stuck valve in the pressurizer, so that water and pressure were restored almost immediately and everything would have been OK—if the operator had realized that the water was leaking out through the relief valve (which could have been closed, or failing that, there are provisions for putting the ECCS into a closed circuit pumping the water through the sump back into the reactor).

Instead, he did what amounted to lighting a third match in a gasoline refinery: He switched off the ECCS. (Don't blame him with hindsight—yet. He may have been fooled by correct, but misleading pressurizer readings.) The water again leaked out through the open valve, but this time the ECCS had been disabled, part of the core was exposed, hydrogen was produced in a reaction between the zirconium cladding and water at high temperatures, and by the time the open relief valve was detected and closed, and water restored to the vessel, the now famous hydrogen bubble had coagulated. It allowed only slow circulation of the cooling water and slow reduction of its temperature (turning the pumps on at full power would have risked damaging them severely, and there were many safer options open).

In the meantime, a fourth match in our analogous gasoline refinery had been lit: The radioactive water on the containment floor was pumped automatically into the take-up tanks in the auxiliary building and—fifth match—overflowed them. Whether this pump came on by a fishy coincidence (5.5 min after the ECCS had been activated), or by a design error that fails to test the water for radioactivity (for example) is not known to this writer. But once again, there is defense in depth even here: The filters in the drains let out virtually no radioactive material other than Xenon, an inert gas that reacts neither with the filters nor with the human body and does not give it an internal dose (see below).

The final mishap occurred on Friday, 3/30, when the water was pumped back into the containment building (where it should have stayed harmlessly all the time); some water was spilled, giving rise to a puff of radioactivity. It resulted in a miniscule dose in Pennsylvania, but gigantic headlines in New York.

SAFETY PRINCIPLE VINDICATED

There are no second and third chances in any other large-scale energy facility; but on 3MI, after a chain of five independent, hair-raising failures, there were plenty of backups before a meltdown was even close. But what if everything else had failed and a meltdown had actually taken place?

It would have taken hours for the pressure vessel alone to melt, during which time the neighboring population could have been evacuated, just in case the containment building would have cracked and let out radioactive gases.

But in all probability it wouldn't have. What makes us so confident?

An item that the Pulitzer-prize hunting scaremongers had missed: At 2 p.m. on 3/28

the instruments in the containment building recorded a pressure spike, which was almost certainly a hydrogen explosion. While the would-be reporters were speculating about an explosion of the hydrogen bubble inside the reactor vessel (where there was little or no free oxygen, and no possibility of a spark to set it off), an explosion had already taken place in the containment. Why would the building that withstood the explosion (it must also withstand a 300 mph hurricane and the impact of a jetliner at landing speed) fail to contain gases at much lower pressures?

But the defense in depth, which kept a meltdown remote at all times, is only half of the principle of nuclear safety. The other half is the slowness with which the danger approaches, giving the defenders ample time for countermeasures. Within hours, the industry had flown in teams of experts; one such team engaged in almost Naderite "what-if" fantasies. What if the pump fails? We use the other primary loop (our figure shows only one of two). What if that fails, too? We have the ECCS. What if both loops fail because the power fails? We have a diesel stand-by generator. What if that fails, too? Let's fly in another. And they did.

There is not just the defense in depth; there is also the time to bolster it in the places where it might grow weak. On both counts, nuclear safety has withstood a test in the field, under the most aggravating conditions, with plenty of resilience to spare.

Yes, there will be a lot of recriminations and rethinking in the industry. We will wait for the full explanation before jumping to conclusions about human failures, design errors or even darker possibilities. On the other hand, the incident revealed at least three highly reassuring items:

The ECCS has now been tested under "battle conditions" and came through with flying colors.

The containment building, which is meant to contain radioactive gases after a meltdown, withstood a hydrogen explosion.

Perhaps most surprising of all, the core, which had been assumed to melt after exposure of a few minutes, was actually exposed (partially, top only) for three separate periods: 1½ hours, ½ hour, and 6 (six!) hours, respectively. No doubt the exposed parts of the fuel rods will be found badly damaged, bent and burst; but they did not melt (almost no uranium was found in the water coming out of the core). The Rasmussen Report was wrong here, after all, at least for this type of zirconium core: It was far too pessimistic.

RADIOACTIVITY

The sum total of radioactivity released in the Harrisburg Grand Disaster was 80 millirems (official testimony by HEW Secretary). That is as much additional radiation as a certain kind of person would receive by moving from Pennsylvania into the editorial offices of this newsletter (elevation 7,200 ft in the ore-rich Rockies) for less than a year. What kind of person? The kind that stood naked near the plant 24 hours a day for the entire episode.

But that is not all, for rems alone do not tell the whole story. Practically all of this was due to Xenon, which is inhaled and breathed out again without reacting with the body. How about iodine, which gets into the food chain and lodges in the thyroid gland, possibly causing thyroid cancer? The level of iodine activity was 1/20 (one twentieth!) the level resulting in Pennsylvania from the fallout from the Chinese bomb tests in 1976 (when all those protest demonstrations were held against Red China by the Fondas, Naders and Ellsbergs, remember?).

This time the iodine level in milk was only 22 picocuries/litre (pC/l); the EPA and NRC

start kicking when it reaches 1200 pC/l. Patients given radiiodine in diagnostic tests leave the hospital with up to 30 millicuries (30 billion pC) in their bodies and radiate a lot more than the milk "affected" by the Pennsylvania non-disaster. Not long ago, a lady who was given such a test went on vacation with her husband immediately afterwards. He was given a dosimeter by researchers of the U. of Mich. to see how much radiation he would absorb from his wife (most of it in the first two days). After they returned, his dosimeter was read: 2.5 rems! That is 12 times more from his wife than the "victims" in Pennsylvania received from the reactor in all of the "nuclear nightmare."

And we are still talking about iodine given to healthy patients. Patients with cancer of the thyroid are given up to 2 curies, or 50 billion times more than is found in a quart of "contaminated" milk.

But the most important comparison is the milk before and after the Grand Disaster. There was no significant change.

In fact, the milk imbued by William Penn was only slightly less radioactive than it is now.

WHY WAS THE HYDROGEN BUBBLE NOT FORESEEN?

It was. Engineers knew about the reaction that produces hydrogen and immediately diagnosed the trouble. (Remember that they had no direct access to the core, and had to make inferences from instrument readings and computer simulations.) What they had not foreseen was a sequence of events (including the ECCS being switched off manually) in which the core would remain exposed for more than a few seconds or minutes.

In a way, the incident is similar to that at Browns Ferry: Everybody knew that the insulation could catch fire, but nobody foresaw a wise-guy who would use the open flame of a candle on it. After the Browns Ferry fire, hundreds of miles of cable were pulled out in plants under construction and replaced by cables with fire-resistant insulation. When the dust settles from the 3MI incident, there will be many changes, and one of them will doubtlessly be a provision to bleed off any gases that might lodge in the cooling loop.

But the next incident, and by the iron laws of probability there will eventually be one, will be of yet another kind, except that it will again be unforeseen. Nobody, least of all a federal bureaucracy (which is now being clamored for) can foresee everything. But the trick of nuclear safety is not to foresee everything, it is to contain anything.

The principle of guarding against the unforeseen, whatever it may be, by a multilayered defense, and by providing the time to bolster that defense where necessary, paid off at Browns Ferry, paid off at Harrisburg, and will pay off again in the future.

The impossibility of applying this principle to other power sources, with their diluted dangers, is what will continue to make them less safe. ●

CURTAIN THE DAVIS-BACON ACT

HON. TOM HAGEDORN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1979

● Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Speaker, members of the building and construction

trades department of the AFL-CIO have been in the halls of the House office buildings this week to lobby on behalf of the Davis-Bacon Act. They are interested in maintaining this act in its present form because they directly benefit from the artificially high wages that this act sets for Federal construction projects.

I have been interested in curtailing the effect of Davis-Bacon for the past 3 years. The first vote to reform the prevailing wage provision of the act gained only 35 supporters. Today, there are 73 cosponsors of my bill to repeal the act. Because of the growing interest in Congress in repeal and because the American people who must pay the higher wages are beginning to learn about how inflationary and inequitable this act is, those who directly benefit from the act are certainly afraid that a special interest statute might be taken away from them.

I welcome the lobbying efforts of the unions. I have advocated greater public awareness of the act so any merits and the definite problems associated with the prevailing wage concept can be fully discussed.

The General Accounting Office report recommending that the Congress repeal the act will be released very shortly. At that time the cosponsors of the repeal bill, H.R. 1900, will call for hearings by the Education and Labor Committee. I hope that those who support Davis-Bacon will join in this request for hearings. If they feel that this act should be maintained and that it is so good for the American people who must pay the wages, I do not see any reason why they should not support these hearings to help get this matter settled to the satisfaction of all. If they are not willing to support open hearings on the so-called merits of the act, perhaps there is something wrong with Davis-Bacon that they do not want the rest of the country to know about. ●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of the Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of all meetings when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an interim procedure until the computerization of this information becomes operational the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in 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 26, 1979, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED
APRIL 27

9:30 a.m.

*Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Economic Stabilization Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on the administration's anti-inflation program, and to review the relationship between fiscal policy and inflation.

322 Russell Building

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

Environment and Public Works
Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on the safety procedures taken by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in relation to the recent nuclear reactor accident in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

4200 Dirksen Building

Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Generally
Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 103 proposed Save Our Schools Act, and S. 449, proposed Charitable Organizations Preservation 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

*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.

6626 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

Foreign Relations

To receive testimony on supplemental economic and military assistance request for Turkey.

4221 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on the nomination of James H. Duffy, of Maryland, to be a Commissioner of the Postal Rate Commission.

3302 Dirksen Building

*Labor and Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 988, to extend assistance programs for biomedical research.

4232 Dirksen Building

APRIL 30

9:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Rural Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the impact of the Administration's standby gasoline rationing plan on both rural development and agricultural production and marketing.

457 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Nutrition Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings to evaluate the progress in the past decade of eliminating hunger in America.

322 Russell Building

Finance

Energy and Foundations Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the energy taxation policy for tax proposals relating to energy production.

2221 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Handicapped Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on proposed amendments to the Rehabilitation Act (P.L. 93-516).

4232 Dirksen Building

Select on Ethics

To hold hearings on the investigation of Senator Talmadge's alleged abuse of certain financial reporting rules of the Senate.

1202 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on the following nominations: Mary P. Bass, of New York, to be Inspector General, Department of Commerce; Frank Saburo Sato, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of Transportation; and Eldon D. Taylor, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

224 Russell 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

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting on pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

To hold hearings to examine the rate of price and wage inflation when combined with stagnant consumer demands and high unemployment.

6226 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on S. 967, proposed Impact Reduction of Energy Resources Act.

3110 Dirksen Building

2:30 p.m.

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

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

9:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 593, proposed Elderly and Handicapped Act, S. 740, proposed Homeownership Opportunity Act, and S. 745, Housing and Community Development Amendments.

5302 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works
Regional and Community Development Subcommittee

To markup S. 914, proposed National Public Works and Economic Development Act, and S. 971, proposed Energy-Related Economic Development Act.

4200 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

To mark up S. 390, proposed Antitrust Procedural Improvements Act.

2228 Dirksen Building

Select on Ethics

To continue hearings on the investigation of Senator Talmadge's alleged abuse of certain financial reporting rules of the Senate.

1202 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Credit and Rural Electrification Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 836, establishing telecommunications facilities for broadband services in small towns and rural areas.

322 Russell Office Building

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the National Park Service.

1233 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting on pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

Finance

To resume consideration in closed session of issues relating to the implementation of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations.

2221 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services Subcommittee

To receive testimony on the nuclear proliferation situation in Pakistan and India.

357 Russell Building

Governmental Affairs

Permanent Investigations Subcommittee

To hold hearings to investigate alleged improper practices within the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

3302 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Child and Human Development Subcommittee

To receive testimony from children on issues Congress should consider affecting youth in the coming decades.

4232 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.

Select on Small Business

To resume markup of proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1980 for the Small Business Administration.

424 Russell Office 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

*Energy and Natural Resources
Parks, Recreation, and Renewable Resources Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 490, proposed Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and S. 495, to provide for the establishment of the Frederick Law Olmsted National Historic Site in the State of Massachusetts.

3110 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Permanent Investigations Subcommittee
To continue hearings to investigate alleged improper practices within the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.
3302 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

9:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 301, and S. 745, bills to amend housing and community development laws relating to labor standards.
5302 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Consumer Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed fiscal year 1980 authorizations for programs administered by the Federal Trade Commission.
6226 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Regional and Community Development Subcommittee

To continue markup of S. 914, proposed National Public Works and Economic Development Act, and S. 971, proposed Energy-Related Economic Development Act.
4200 Dirksen Building

*Judiciary

To hold hearings on S. 961, proposed Speedy Trial Act Amendments Act.
2228 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Constitution Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 506, proposed Fair Housing Amendments Act.
457 Russell Building

Select on Small Business

To continue markup of proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1980 for the Small Business Administration.
424 Russell Building

Select on Ethics

To continue hearings on the investigation of Senator Talmadge's alleged abuse of certain financial reporting rules of the Senate.
5110 Dirksen Building

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

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting on pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

Finance

To resume markup of S. 570, to establish a system of stand-by percentage limitations on allowable rates of increases in hospital revenues (Hospital Cost Containment).
2221 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Permanent Investigations Subcommittee
To continue hearings to investigate alleged improper practices within the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.
3302 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

Rules and Administration

To hold hearings on S. 817, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1980 for the Canal Zone biological area of the Smithsonian Institution; S. 927, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1980 for future development of the southern area of the original Smithsonian Institution building; and on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1980 for the Federal Election Commission to reimburse states for their record keeping expenses.
301 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings on the nominations of Harold Duane Vietor, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of Iowa; Norman W. Black, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of Texas; George E. Cire, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of Texas; James DeAnda, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of Texas; George P. Kazen, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of Texas; and Gabrielle A. Kirk McDonald, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.
2228 Dirksen Building

2:30 p.m.

Governmental Affairs

Permanent Investigations Subcommittee
To continue hearings to investigate alleged improper practices within the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.
3302 Dirksen 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 make up 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

Governmental Affairs

Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Federal Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the Federal Government's responsibility for radiation protection.
357 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting to mark up S. 209, to regulate Federal laws relating to private sector pension and welfare programs.
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.
S-126, Capitol

Select on Small Business

To continue markup of proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1980 for the Small Business Administration.
424 Russell Building

Select on Ethics

To continue hearings on the investigation of Senator Talmadge's alleged abuse of certain financial reporting rules of the Senate.
5110 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

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

International Finance Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1980 for international affairs programs under the Department of Treasury.
5302 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

Business meeting on pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

Finance

To continue markup of S. 570, to establish a system of standby percentage limitations on allowable rates of increases in hospital revenues (Hospital Cost Containment).
2221 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Permanent Investigations Subcommittee

To continue hearings to investigate alleged improper practices within the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.
224 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Governmental Affairs

Permanent Investigation Subcommittee

To continue hearings to investigate alleged improper practices within the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.
3302 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on the nomination of Janet L. Norwood, of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics.
4232 Dirksen Building

3:00 p.m.

Environment and Public Works

Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee

To mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1980 for

programs of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

4200 Dirksen Building
MAY 4

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the testing provisions of the Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976.

235 Russell Building

Environment and Public Works

To mark up pending calendar business.

4200 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 252, proposed Anti-Arson Act.

6202 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Antitrust, Monopoly and Business Rights Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 600, proposed Small and Independent Business Protection Act.

457 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources

To hold oversight hearings on the applicability and enforcement of sandstone and gravel mining operations under the Federal Mine Safety and Health Program

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Rural Housing Subcommittee

To hold hearing on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1980 for all existing rural housing programs.

5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting on pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

MAY 7

9:30 a.m.

Finance

Energy and Foundations Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on the implementation of the energy taxation policy for tax proposals relating to energy production.

2221 Dirksen Building

Select on Ethics

To resume hearings on the investigation of Senator Talmadge's alleged abuse of certain financial reporting rules of the Senate.

1202 Dirksen Building

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

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Business meeting to mark up proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1980 for international affairs programs under the Department of Treasury and proposed authorizations through fiscal year 1984 for programs under the Export Administration Act.

5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting on pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

Special on Aging

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of homecare services for older Americans.

1318 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

To resume hearings to examine the rate of price and wage inflation when combined with stagnant consumer demands and high unemployment.

6226 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

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

To resume markup of pending calendar business.

4200 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Federal Services Subcommittee

To resume hearings on the Federal Government's responsibility for radiation protection.

357 Russell Building

Judiciary

To resume markup of S. 300, proposed Antitrust Enforcement Act.

2228 Dirksen Building

Select on Ethics

To continue hearings on the investigation of Senator Talmadge's alleged abuse of certain financial reporting rules of the Senate.

1202 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

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Business meeting to mark up S. 593, proposed Elderly and Handicapped Act, S. 740, proposed Homeownership Opportunity Act, and S. 745, Housing and Community Development Amendments.

5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting on pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

Finance.

To resume markup of S. 570, to establish a system of stand-by percentage limitations on allowable rates of increases in hospital revenues (Hospital Cost Containment).

2221 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 assume 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

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

To continue markup of pending calendar business.

4200 Dirksen Building

Select on Small Business

To resume markup of proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1980 for the Small Business Administration.

424 Russell Building

*Select on Ethics

To continue hearings on the investigation of Senator Talmadge's alleged abuse of certain financial reporting rules of the Senate.

6226 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

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue markup of S. 593, proposed Elderly and Handicapped Act, S. 740, proposed Homeownership Opportunity Act, and S. 745, Housing and Community Development Amendments.

5302 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

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting on pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

Finance

To continue markup of S. 570, to establish a system of stand-by percentage limitations on allowable rates of increases in hospital revenues (Hospital Cost Containment).

2221 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the National Academy of Science report on saccharin and food policy programs.

4232 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

To resume hearings to examine the rate of price and wage inflation when com-

April 25, 1979

lined with stagnant consumer demands and high unemployment.
5110 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

MAY 10

9:30 a.m.
*Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 685, proposed Nuclear Waste Policy Act.
3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
To continue markup of pending calendar business.
4200 Dirksen Building

Select on Ethics
To continue hearings on the investigation of Senator Talmadge's alleged abuse of certain financial reporting rules of the Senate.
1202 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 resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1980 for rural housing programs, flood insurance programs, and crime and riot insurance programs.
5302 Dirksen Building

Finance
To continue markup of S. 570, to establish a system of stand-by percentage limitations on allowable rates of increases in hospital revenues (Hospital Cost Containment).
2221 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.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up pending calendar business.
5302 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

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting on pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

MAY 14

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 968, to expedite processing of applications from Midwestern residential, agricultural, and industrial consumers for crude oil transportation systems.
3110 Dirksen Building

Select on Small Business
To resume hearings on the effect of Government regulations on the production and utilization of coal.
6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the roles of women in health and science.
4232 Dirksen Building

MAY 15

9:30 a.m.
Select on Small Business
To continue hearings on the effect of Government regulations on the production and utilization of coal.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Governmental Affairs on S. 332, proposed Consolidated Banking Regulation Act.
5302 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs on S. 332, proposed Consolidated Banking Regulation Act.
5302 Dirksen Building

MAY 16

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting on pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the roles of women in health and science.
4232 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.
Select on Small Business
To hold hearings on the nomination of Paul R. Boucher, to be Inspector General, Small Business Administration.
424 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Select on Ethics
To resume hearings on the investigation of Senator Talmadge's alleged abuse of certain financial reporting rules of the Senate.
6226 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

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting on pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to investigate drug reform programs.
4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 18

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed legislation to investigate drug reform programs.
4232 Dirksen Building

MAY 21

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Milwaukee railroad system.
235 Russell Building

2:30 p.m.
Finance
Health Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the provisions of home health benefits under the Medicare and Medicaid programs.
2221 Dirksen Building

MAY 22

9:30 a.m.
*Energy and Natural Resources
To resume hearings on S. 685, proposed Nuclear Waste Policy Act.
3110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 796, proposed Railroad Deregulation Act.
235 Russell Building

Select on Small Business
To hold hearings on the availability of investment capital to small businesses.
424 Russell Building

MAY 23

8:00 a.m.
*Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on employment programs administered by the Department of Labor.
6226 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 885, proposed Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act.
3110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the activities of the banking system.
5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 796, proposed Railroad Deregulation Act.
235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of mental health policy programs.
4232 Dirksen Building

MAY 24

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To continue hearings on S. 885, proposed Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act.
3110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 35, to amend the Credit Control Act.
5302 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on the implementation of mental health policy programs.

4232 Dirksen Building

MAY 25

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue hearings on S. 35, to amend the Credit Control Act.

5302 Dirksen Building

JUNE 6

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 870, proposed GI Bill Amendments Act, S. 830, to eliminate the State's required payment in the educational assistance allowance program provided for veterans, and S. 881, to provide for the protection of certain officers and employees of the VA assigned to perform investigative or law enforcement functions.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 796, proposed Railroad Deregulation Act.

235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 796, proposed Railroad Deregulation Act.

235 Russell Building

JUNE 12

9:00 a.m.
*Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 689, proposed Veterans' Disability Compensation and Survivor Benefits Act.

6226 Dirksen Building

JUNE 19

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the activities of programs administered by the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977.

3110 Dirksen Building

JUNE 20

9:00 a.m.
*Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 759, to provide for right of the United States to recover the costs of hospital, nursing home or outpatient medical care furnished by the Veterans' Administration to veterans for non-service-connected disabilities to the extent that they have health insurance or similar contracts.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To resume oversight hearings on the activities of programs administered by the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977.

3110 Dirksen Building

JULY 12

9:30 a.m.
*Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the efforts made by the Veterans' Administration to provide information on benefits due incarcerated veterans.

6226 Dirksen Building

CANCELLATIONS

APRIL 27

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Transportation.

1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 1

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, April 26, 1979

The House met at 11 a.m.

Rev. Robert M. Bock, senior pastor, First Christian Church, North Hollywood, Calif., offered the following prayer:

Amidst symbols and places reflecting our rich heritage, our Father, we give thanks for this day and for the opportunity to shape our destiny.

For endless gifts You have given us as a nation and as a people, we express our deep gratitude.

Today we pray Your special blessing and guidance upon the Members of this House, individuals called forth as servants among us, devoting their lives and talents to this Government for the good of all people.

Grant them the wisdom of Solomon, the patience of Job, the love of Jesus in their trusted and difficult task.

Use their work and lives to further create a world of lasting peace—a society of equality and freedom.

We pray in Your holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Chirdon, one of his secretaries.

REV. ROBERT M. BOCK

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

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to welcome, as our guest chaplain, the Reverend Robert M. Bock, senior pastor, First Christian Church of North Hollywood, Calif. I thank him for his inspiring opening prayer.

Reverend Bock received his masters of divinity at Christian Theological Seminary, Indianapolis, Ind., did graduate study at the Chateau de Bossey, Geneva, and is a doctoral candidate at the San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, Calif. He serves a congregation of approximately 500.

Reverend Bock is a greatly respected community leader who has served 16 years on the Los Angeles County Board of Education, and is presently serving as its president for the seventh time. He has worked tirelessly to improve the quality of education for our youth and to prevent aimless young people from the violence and waste of street gang life.

Reverend Bock is my good friend, JIM CORMAN's constituent. JIM regrets he cannot be here to personally welcome Reverend Bock, but he was called unexpectedly to the White House this morning.

□ 1105

Mr. BRADEMAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I want only to say how pleased I am to welcome Mr. Bock in that he was born in my home community of South Bend and went to high school there. So I want warmly to welcome him as well.

Mr. DANIELSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

● Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to welcome Reverend Bock to this Chamber today. He becomes the first member of the clergy from the 21st Congressional District to ever receive this high honor. Reverend Bock originally came to California for what he thought was a brief stay. Eighteen years later he is serving his congregation and the community with distinction and dedicated effort. Reverend Bock's wife and two sons were unable to be with us today, but I know they share in this moment of pride. I welcome Reverend Bock and thank him for his message.●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in respect to the Reverend Robert M. Bock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 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.