



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 96<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

## SENATE—Friday, May 9, 1980

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1980)

The Senate met at 1 p.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable MAX BAUCUS, a Senator from the State of Montana.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we do not pray for easy lives, but that we may be strong "to bear the strain of toil and fret of care." We do not pray for tasks equal to our powers, but for powers equal to our tasks. Transfigure every duty, great or small, into service to Thee. May we give love, comradeship, and assistance to all with whom we work. Grant us new power, enduring faith, and abiding joy this day that we may "more perfectly love Thee and magnify Thy holy name." Amen.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. MAGNUSON).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1980.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MAX BAUCUS, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. BAUCUS thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the majority leader is recognized.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE).

### GENOCIDE CONVENTION: LET US NOT WAIT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Abba Eban, Israel's former Minister of Foreign Affairs, once wrote:

It is saddening to record that, with one or two exceptions, the family of nations at large paid little heed as, in Europe, an ancient people was being harassed savagely to death.

He was speaking of the holocaust of World War II. During that time over 6 million Jews were systematically annihilated under the Nazi regime simply because they were Jewish.

It began with one move—and then another—from racial laws to government decrees, from ghettos to mass murder.

Although reports of what the Nazis were doing filtered out, for the most part, the world remained indifferent. Sadly, but truthfully, our own Government was one of those which waited so long to translate knowledge of these atrocities into action.

How was it possible for the world to stand by without halting this horrible and massive destruction of humanity?

The reason cited most often is the fact that the magnitude of the Nazi genocide was so vast, so unprecedented, that it could not be comprehended.

The holocaust may not be mankind's first experience with genocide. But it is by far the most horrendous. And, unfortunately, it was not the last.

In 1944, the United States finally assumed an active role in rescuing the Jews of Europe from Hitler and the horror of the Nazi genocide. For millions of victims, however, it was too late.

Mr. President, for over 30 years this body has been hesitating to ratify the only international treaty which seeks to prevent such a tragedy from ever again happening. This treaty is the Genocide Convention. And during those years, millions more have fallen—victims of this most horrible crime of genocide.

The time for us to renounce this most shocking and hateful crime is long overdue. After 30 years, Mr. President, the time has come for us to ratify the Genocide Convention.

Mr. President, I thank my good friend, the majority leader, and I yield the floor.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator please withhold that for a moment?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Yes.

### RESIGNATION OF SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announces that he has received a communication, which the clerk will read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:  
MAY 7, 1980.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
President of the U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I do hereby resign my position as U.S. Senator for the State of Maine effective close of business (midnight) May 7, 1980.

Sincerely,

EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The communication will lie on the table.

### ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the orders for the recognition of the two leaders or their designees, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to exceed 2 hours, and that Senators may speak therein up to 5 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS FOR 30 MINUTES

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 30 minutes.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:16 p.m., recessed for 30 minutes; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. BAUCUS).

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 2:07 P.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 15 minutes.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:52 p.m., recessed until 2:07 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PRESIDENT CARTER'S ABSENCE AT THE FUNERAL SERVICE OF PRESIDENT TITO

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, like many Americans, I am deeply disappointed that President Carter did not attend the funeral service of President Tito, of Yugoslavia.

This decision is a serious policy error that damages U.S. standing and credibility throughout the world. The leaders of the Soviet Union and other nations should not infer from President Carter's absence that his decision represents majority thinking in this country. Most Americans admire the independent stance taken by President Tito and Yugoslavia, and that we feel that Yugoslavia's continued independence and na-

tional sovereignty is strategically vital to a stable world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—FIRST CONCURRENT BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, upon the disposition of the amendments that were specified last evening to Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, Order No. 699, first concurrent budget resolution, fiscal year 1981, and amendments in the second degree thereto on Monday, the Senate proceed immediately to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 307, which is the companion measure; that all after the resolving clause be stricken and the language of Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, as amended, be considered as having been adopted as a substitute therefor; that the question be immediately put on agreeing to the House concurrent resolution as amended; that immediately following the vote, which will be considered as having been reconsidered and the motion to reconsider laid on the table, the Senate be considered to have insisted upon its amendment and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses; and that the Chair be authorized to name the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, let me withdraw my request.

The request was withdrawn.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. On the question of reconsideration of the vote on passage of House Concurrent Resolution 307, would such motion be debatable under the law?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would not be debatable under the precedents.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, and am I wording this correctly now, with respect to Monday's events I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the disposition of the amendments to Senate Concurrent Resolution 86 that was specified

last evening, and any amendments thereto in the second degree, that the Senate proceed immediately without debate to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 307; that all after the resolving clause be stricken and the language of Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, as amended, be considered as having been adopted as a substitute therefor; and that the question be immediately put without further debate or amendment, or motion, on agreeing to the House concurrent resolution as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BAKER. Reserving the right to object, I do not plan to object, the language of the request just made by the majority leader appears to me to be the housekeeping detail that would ordinarily be attended to at the conclusion of the consideration of a measure of this sort.

It is necessary, as I understand the rules and precedents, in order to place the Senate in a position to proceed to the next step, that is, request for a conference with the House of Representatives.

I believe it is implicit, in the unanimous-consent request which was granted early this morning, that on conclusion of the debate and conclusion of the amendments listed, together with any second-degree amendments thereto, that all the time for debate on this measure shall have ended.

I believe that the majority leader has done nothing in this request to contravene that and that the only remaining action to be taken by the Senate following the action he has described in his request would be the usual and routine opportunity to make a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted and/or a motion to table that motion. On the basis of that understanding, Mr. President, I will not have an objection to the request of the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the minority leader, and I ask the Chair if the minority leader's observation is not accurate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is accurate.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

#### THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON FAMILIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a recent article in the Wall Street Journal, "Mr. Carter's Family Plans," summed up the administration's record by observing that:

Four years after Jimmy Carter's campaign promises, the American family doesn't appear any better off, and it may be worse off, than in the pre-Carter years.

That is an important observation, especially as we head into the three regional meetings of the White House Conference on Families, scheduled to begin June 5 in Baltimore.

As an introduction to what must be a lengthy presentation, I submit for the RECORD the Journal article.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 1, 1980]

MR. CARTER'S FAMILY PLANS  
(By Timothy D. Schellhardt)

WASHINGTON.—Remember all that political palaver about the plight of the American family?

The family's plight was a campaign theme that Jimmy Carter discovered and popularized during his 1976 presidential campaign. Reeling off statistics documenting increases in divorce, illegitimate births, runaway youth and impoverished Americans, Mr. Carter attacked the Ford administration's economic and social policies as being anti-family. He promised a slew of "pro-family" initiatives—tax reform, welfare-system overhaul and comprehensive health insurance, among others—and pledged as President to "reverse the trends we have seen toward the breakdown of the family in our country."

Four years later—how fares the family? All things considered, the American family doesn't appear any better off, and it may be worse off, than in the pre-Carter years. The statistics that candidate Carter enjoyed reciting in 1976, for the most part, have continued to sour. And the President has failed to keep many of his promises for helping the family.

"PAID ONLY LIP SERVICE"

Indeed, that 1976 campaign theme—saving the beleaguered family—may well come back to haunt Mr. Carter this fall if, as expected, he is the Democratic nominee. Already his likely opponent, Republican Ronald Reagan, contends the President has "paid only lip service to the family." An administration adviser, Columbia University sociologist Amital Etzioni, agrees. The family, he says, hasn't been "an active, strong priority" with Mr. Carter.

If that's true, and an examination of the record suggests just that, it raises some questions. One wonders, for instance, whether Mr. Carter's 1976 emphasis on the subject merely represented a blatant exploitation of the emotional content of the issue, as well as a means of stilling the troublesome abortion issue. One wonders whether Mr. Carter simply discovered that in this capital it's easier to make a promise than keep it. And, while almost every government decision undoubtedly has some bearing on the family, one wonders to what extent that institution can be changed by any President or any government policies; presumably, social and cultural influences count more heavily.

What underlies these questions and concerns? First, consider some of the statistics Mr. Carter frequently rattled off in 1976 and examine what has happened since.

Two of every five marriages end in divorce, he noted then; that ratio hasn't improved. One child in eight was then born out of marriage; it now one in six.

One child in seven was living in a single parent household in 1976; the proportion has now become one child in five. Children in foster homes then numbered 350,000; now they total 500,000.

Only one-third of U.S. families could then afford to buy a home; that share has since plunged to less than 5 percent.

In 1976, Mr. Carter complained that the price of a home had risen \$16,000 and mortgage interest rates had climbed 50 percent during eight years of Republican White House rule. However, since he's been President, the median price of an existing home has jumped by \$18,400 and mortgage interest rates have nearly doubled.

Candidate Carter also liked to talk about how inflation forces many wives to seek paying jobs contributing to the disintegration of the "traditional" family—the husband as wage-earner, the housewife mother, and their children. Yet in the first three years of his presidency, the number of two-earner families climbed by 2.2 million. Despite this rise, however, the median family income barely kept pace with inflation. Another government measure—the inflation-discounted income of a worker earning the average wage and claiming three dependents—actually declined 8.4 percent. These indicators suggest a further weakening of the family since 1975.

To be sure, not all the statistics have grown worse. Since 1976, the number of new jobs has risen significantly, by about nine million. This gain has helped reduce the number of Americans on welfare by about 1.75 million and the number of poverty-level Americans by almost 500,000.

But those figures can't compensate for the persistent, omnipresent inflation that many sociologists and experts on the family contend may have the greatest impact on the family structure. Prices, which climbed at a 7 percent annual rate while Mr. Ford was in office, have been surging at an average 11.6 percent clip during the first 39 months of Mr. Carter's presidency. Just lately, of course, inflation has far out-stripped that average.

"There's no question that inflation and the economy contribute to the pulls and stresses within the family," says Alfred McDonald of the Center for the Family at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Says Carol Stack, director of Duke University's Center for the Study of the Family and the State, "inflation has a devastating effect on families, especially those on fixed incomes."

Even more than the dismal data, Mr. Carter's unkept campaign pledges bother some people who expected much more than the President has delivered. "His rhetoric about the family hasn't been translated into important legislation or potent administration initiatives," contends Alfred Kahn, a Columbia University professor of social policy.

In speech after speech in 1976, Mr. Carter outlined specific "pro-family" steps he would take. He proposed changing the nation's tax system to prevent discrimination against families, but he has since abandoned pursuit of a major overhaul of the tax structure. It continues to penalize married couples by making them pay more in taxes than they would have paid if they remained single.

Two years ago Congress did erase a so-called "anti-grandmother" tax provision that candidate Carter decried in 1976; that provision had disallowed a child-care deduction if a family employed a relative closer than a cousin to babysit, but the President's own Treasury Department at first opposed the change.

The welfare system Mr. Carter criticized hasn't been overhauled, although he has sought substantial changes. The national day-care program he called for in 1976 hasn't materialized, either. And the national health insurance system he advocated isn't likely to clear Congress any time soon.

Congress has been debating most of these issues for years, so perhaps it's not surprising that the President's proposals haven't passed. But in 1976 candidate Carter noted the slowness of the lawmakers on these measures and maintained that he could muscle his bold plans through Congress without many changes.

In any case, the President has neglected to use his own authority for action to ease family strains. Candidate Carter maintained that transfer and assignment policies in the armed services don't consider their impact on the military family. But there hasn't been any major move to alter them since 1976. He also decided urban renewal programs that uproot homes, families and entire neighborhoods. Yet no discernible changes have followed.

AN OFFICE FOR FAMILIES

Last October, President Carter announced that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was creating an office for families. Yet six months later, that office has no director, only one professional staffer and no funds for action this year.

Mr. Carter has been three years late in fulfilling one oft-repeated 1976 promise: the convening of a White House Conference on Families soon after becoming President. Such a conference will be held this summer in three cities, but expectations for results aren't high. The planners can't even agree on a definition of "family," and delegate-selection conventions in several states have become nasty confrontations between interest groups, mainly pro- and anti-abortion advocates.

The White House conference, administration consultant Etzioni says, "isn't going to be successful." Acknowledges another administration official: "We wish the whole thing would go away. It's been a nightmare."

Certainly, Mr. Carter can't be faulted for expressing concern about the erosion of family values and structure. Furthermore, the question of the government's proper role in influencing family life is worth considering.

But, through indifference or inability to fulfill expectations he raised in 1976, Jimmy Carter may have seriously hurt the chances for any meaningful future dialogue on the family by presidential candidates. The public may distrust whatever the politicians say.

And that's a shame.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed, that gloomy picture hardly begins to tell the complete story of the Carter Administration's policies regarding the American family. To tell the whole story, perhaps the best place to begin is with the President's Conference on Families and with those in charge of it, John Carr and Jim Guy Tucker.

With friends like those, President Carter does not need enemies. Their stewardship of the White House Conference on Family has virtually eliminated any chance that that expensive project could be really useful to the families of this country. To understand why, let us begin with a brief biography of Mr. Carr:

Carr, John L.; b. Aug. 11, 1950; s. John L. & Joan L. (O'Neill) C.; B.A. cum laude, Coll. of St. Thomas, Minn. 1972; Crosier Sem. Minn. 1968; wed Linda Marie Kach, June 13, 1975. Legis. Coord., Urban Affairs Com., Minn. 1972-74; staff mem. Joint Ret. Legis. Coalition, Minn. 1972-74; prog. coord., Twin City Area Urban Corps., Minn. 1969-72, 1975. coord. for spl. issues, US Cath. Conf. Office of Domestic Soc. Dev. 1976-77, Coordinator for Urban issues. USCC Office of Domestic Social

Development, Exec. dir., Full Employment Action Cel., Natl. Comm. for Full Employment, 1977-79. Curr. exer. dir., White House Conf. on Families, 19—. Mem. Cath. com. on Urban Ministry; bd mem., Natl. Housing Conf. Leadership conf. on Civil Rights Common Cause, Mem., Wash. Intl. Staff Col. interreligious Coalition on Housing; National Ad Hoc Low-Income Housing Coalition, convenor; Housing panel, Mediating Structures Project; Full Employment Action Council; Natl. Com. for Full Employment; Natl. Cath. Conf. on Interracial Justice, bd. mem.; bd. mem., ADA, editor, Full Employment and Economic Justice A: 330 Independence AV. SW Washington DC 20201.

It is a mystery how Mr. Carr's involvement with a series of liberal social activist committees has qualified him to administer a White House Conference on Families. But then, in the context of Carter administration appointments, nothing surprises us any more. Even so, it is a matter of the greatest import that the day-to-day administrator of this country's official Conference on Families is a board member of the Americans for Democratic Action.

The ADA is as pro-family an organization as any other group committed to abortion on demand, homosexual rights, and Federal control of health care, housing, education, and the economy. Its political agenda can be summed up as the statist imposition of the views of the secular humanist movement upon every man, woman, and child in America, for their own good, of course. And one of its board members is running the White House Conference on Families. That is hardly reassuring.

#### THE CRUCIAL ISSUE: WHAT IS A FAMILY?

At the very outset, it is essential to remember that President Carter appointees have actually changed the name of the upcoming White House conference; for that change of title reveals a change of agenda which threatens the families of America.

It was initiated as a conference on the family. That needed no explanation. After all, we all know what a family is: two or more individuals who are related by blood, marriage, or adoption. That includes extended family systems, the so-called nuclear family (limited to parents and children only), single-parent families, the wonderful adoptive families whose devotion we must admire, the troubled families whose problems we must share, the welfare families whom we must assist. In short, the whole range of Americans who, in incredibly diverse circumstances, are holding their families together, sometimes under great social and economic duress.

But that was not good enough for the managers of the White House conference. They changed the name of the conference. Henceforth, it was not for the family; it was for families. But why make the noun plural? After all, every family in the land was represented by the singular form of that word. The explanation came from one Rhonda Glickman, handling public relations for the conference. As quoted in the March 1980 issue of the *Right Woman*, Ms. Glickman admitted, "The name was changed from the White House Conference on the Family to the White House

Conference on Families so that we would not be advocating any one particular lifestyle."

One particular lifestyle? Marriage, perhaps? Chairman Jim Guy Tucker was quoted by the Child Protection Report (hardly a conservative source) in April, 1979, as saying that a family should be defined as "one or more adults living together with or without children," a definition which, in the words of the Child Protection Report, "even gay activists would have trouble quarreling with."

Another definition of the family that is popular in conference circles is the one proposed by the American Home Economics Association. This one, I caution, is worth reading closely:

A family is a unit of two or more persons who share resources, share responsibilities for the decisions, share values and have a commitment to one another over time. Family is the climate that one 'comes home to' and it is the network of sharing and commitments that most accurately describes family, regardless of blood, legal ties, adoption, or marriage.

A few years ago, the followers of one crazed killer referred to themselves as "the Manson Family." According to the definition of the American Home Economics Association, that is just what they were. And in their—familial?—footsteps walked the hundreds of poor deluded souls who were members of Jim Jones' "family" in Guyana. But these were not the people whose living arrangements were supposed to be considered by the original White House Conference on the Family, before its title was changed and its real purposes became clear.

Now that the conference is for families, plural rather than singular, it can expand its scope to address all sorts of living arrangements. Communes, homosexual couples, footloose teenage runaways, may all be families.

That is the heart of the controversy surrounding the conference. That is why many pro-family Americans are standing up against the power of all the President's men. They know, far better than the administration's advisers, what a family is and, even more important, what a family is not.

Because of their concern for the American family, these citizens have attempted to become involved in the White House conference, just as President Carter urged us all to do. But they have been met with accusations and exclusion by the conference organizers. A pattern is becoming crystal clear: this White House conference is not for the people. It is for the professionals and the activists and the politicians. It is for those who make a living by analyzing the family and providing social services. In State after State, it is for the appointees of powerful officials. And most of all, it is for the political benefit of Jimmy Carter.

#### THE CARTER CONFERENCE: PART OF THE REELECTION CAMPAIGN

From its inception, the Carter conference could have been choreographed by the Keystone Cops. It was proposed by candidate Carter in 1976. At the time, some observers suspected it was a gim-

mick to placate pro-life voters, who had come to realize that Mr. Carter had managed to take all sides of the abortion issue within the space of 1 year.

True to his word, Carter as President announced plans for the conference, to be held in December 1979. Even before Secretary Califano could announce the appointment of Patricia Fleming as conference director, she resigned in a dispute over whether there should be a codirector, who would be white, male, Catholic and from an "intact" household, thereby, one supposes, giving the conference the kind of affirmative action balance which is so dear to HEW Secretaries.

When Fleming quit, so did former HEW Secretary Wilbur Cohen, one of the architects of the Great Society, whose fanciful structures are now falling down on the heads of the American taxpayers. Cohen cited ill health as his reason to step aside from the post of conference chairman; whether or not his indisposition was related to the departure of Patricia Fleming really does not matter.

After this fiasco, Carter postponed the conference until 1981, a decision which was later to be reversed. And when it was, the conference had been scheduled for the weeks leading up to the Democratic Convention of 1980, right where it could be mistaken for a finale to the Carter reelection campaign.

To replace Wilbur Cohen, the President tapped a former Congressman from Arkansas, Jim Guy Tucker. From all reports, he is a likable gentleman who, with his wife and children, makes a picture of the all-American family. In the old definition, of course.

His sensitivity to family issues, however, seems limited. As a member of the House of Representatives, for example, he disregarded family rights in education: As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, he voted to gut a tuition tax credit bill by denying tuition tax relief to parents of elementary and secondary school pupils. And when the bill came to the floor, Mr. Tucker stood with Mr. Carter, against educational freedom and for governmental control of schooling.

On abortion, too, Mr. Tucker's voting record was dismal. He supported efforts to weaken as much as possible the Hyde amendment, which restricts Federal funding of abortion. In that context, perhaps he can better understand why his chairmanship of the White House conference has not been universally acclaimed by profamily Americans.

Mr. Tucker proceeded to appoint as director of the conference John Carr, whose revealing biography we have already seen. And to add impressive window dressing to the enterprise, the President appointed a 40-member national advisory committee to be the official focal point for the conference.

#### THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

In appointing its national advisory committee, the Carter administration was following the pattern of its previous committees, on the International Women's Year and on the International Year of the Child. Once that pattern is

understood, then much else becomes clear.

The President may believe that, because his committees and commissions include members of minority groups, the panels must be representative of all Americans. Nothing could be farther from the truth. In fact, he has confined his selection almost entirely to bona fide liberals. With few exceptions, the ideological range is from liberal to far-left. The President seems taken with professional social activists who make their living, on campuses or in government offices, as self-appointed advocates for the poor, the sick or the troubled. Mixed in with these individuals are more prestigious persons, prominent men and women whose names lend respectability to an enterprise which they may be too busy to superintend. I submit the administration's list of members of its advisory committee.

The list follows:

Members of the National Advisory Committee are:

James A. Autry, Des Moines, Iowa, Editor of *Better Homes and Gardens* magazine and President of the Epilepsy Foundation of America.

Charles Bannerman, Greenville, Mississippi, Chairman of Delta Foundation and Director of Mississippi Action for Community Education, a community organization working in depressed areas of the Mississippi Delta. He is Co-Chair of the National Rural Center and Rural Coalition.

Carolyn Shaw Bell, Dover, Massachusetts, chairs the Department of Economics at Wellesley College. She is the author of numerous books including *Coping in a Troubled Society* and *The Economics of the Ghetto*.

Jeanne Cahill, Atlanta, Georgia, President of Cahill Properties, Inc., former Executive Director and Chair of the Georgia Commission on the Status of Women. She works with the Center for Battered Women and Children in Atlanta.

Betty Caldwell, Little Rock, Arkansas, Professor and Director of the Center for Early Development and Education at the University of Arkansas; author and researcher in early childhood development.

Ramona Carlin, Smolan, Kansas, is past President of the Central States Synodical Unit of the Lutheran Church of America, and has been active in the International Year of the Child, March of Dimes and the 4-H. She and husband, Governor John Carlin, are dairy farmers.

Gloria Chavez, Los Angeles, California, President of the United Neighborhood Organization for the Federation of East Los Angeles, a low-income community organization working on food, housing and health issues.

Leon F. Cook, Minneapolis, Minnesota, President of American Indian Resource Services, recently served as an elected representative on the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians Tribal Council.

Mario M. Cuomo, New York, New York, Lieutenant Governor of New York. An Attorney and past Secretary of State, Lt. Governor Cuomo will serve as a Deputy Chairperson of the White House Conference on Families.

Mary C. Detrick, Elgin, Illinois, National staff member, Church of the Brethren. An ordained minister, she works in areas of youth ministry, family life, marriage enrichment and aging. She is the past President of the National Council of Churches Family Life and Human Sexuality Commission.

Manuel Diaz, Jr., New York, New York, Associate Professor, Fordham University Graduate School of Social Service. Diaz is

currently a Board member of the Family Service Association and has served with the Puerto Rican Family Institute and New York Urban Coalition.

Ruby Duncan, Las Vegas, Nevada, founder and chief officer of Operation Life, a social service and advocacy center for low income families.

Karen Fenton, Missoula, Montana, is director of the Human Resources Development Programs of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes in rural Montana.

Norman S. Fenton, Tucson, Arizona, Presiding Judge of the Pima County Conciliation Court. Judge Fenton received the 1978 Distinguished Service to Families award of the National Council on Family Relations and Chaired the Arizona Governor's Task Force on Marriage and the Family.

Guadalupe Gibson, San Antonio, Texas, Associate Professor of the Worden School of Social Service, Our Lady of the Lake University; Director of the "La Chicana in Mental Health" project of the National Institute of Mental Health. She will serve as a Deputy Chairperson of the White House Conference on Families.

Robert B. Hill, Washington, D.C., Director of Research for the National Urban League. He is the author of *The Strengths of Black Families*, and numerous other monographs and papers on the subject of Black Families.

Robert C. Hill, Portland, Oregon, Chairman of the Metropolitan Youth Commission. Mr. Hill, 18, is the youngest panel member and a member of the Portland Public School Advisory Committee.

Charlotte G. Holstein, Syracuse, New York, Past President of the New York State Association for Human Services and a member of the Board of Governors of the American Jewish Committee. Ms. Holstein currently serves on the Advisory Board of the Director of the State Division for Youth of the New York State Council on Youth.

Harry N. Hollis, Jr., Nashville, Tennessee, Director of Family and Special Moral Concerns for the Christian Life Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention. He is a member of the National Council of Family Relations and the Association of Couples for Marriage Enrichment.

Jesse Jackson, Chicago, Illinois, National President of Operation PUSH (People United to Save Humanity), and founder of EXCEL, a national program designed to increase student achievement.

A. Sidney Johnson, III, Bethesda, Maryland, founder and Director of the Family Impact Seminar at George Washington University. Johnson served as staff director to then Senator Walter Mondale's Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth.

Michael M. Karl, M.D., St. Louis, Missouri, a Professor of Clinical Medicine at Washington University. Dr. Karl is a leader in the Jewish Family Services movement.

Coretta Scott King, Atlanta, Georgia, President of the Martin Luther King Center for Social Change. Mrs. King is Co-Chair of the Full Employment Action Council and a member of the Black Leadership Forum. Mrs. King will serve as a Deputy Chairperson of the White House Conference on Families.

Judith Koberna, Cleveland, Ohio, Treasurer of the Buckeye-Woodlawn Community Organization. She is a licensed practical nurse and has a deep interest in ethnicity and neighborhood concerns.

Olga M. Madar, Detroit, Michigan, President Emeritus of the Coalition of Labor Union Women and a retired UAW Vice President. She is a member of the Board of Directors of the Girl Scouts of America and the Wayne County Commission on Aging.

Maryann Mahaffey, Detroit, Michigan, President Pro Tem of the Detroit City Council and Professor in the School of Social Work in Wayne State University. A former President of the National Association of So-

cial Workers, Councilwoman Mahaffey will serve as a Deputy Chairperson of the White House Conference on Families.

Harlette P. McAdoo, Columbia, Maryland, Professor in the School of Social Work of Howard University. Professor McAdoo has served as a principal investigator of an HEW research grant on family factors related to occupational and educational mobility in Black middle income families.

Georgia L. McMurray, New York, New York, Deputy General Director for Program, Community Service Society of New York. She is a former Commissioner of the agency for Child Development of the Human Resources Administration of the City of New York.

Patsy Mink, Waipahu, Hawaii, National President, Americans for Democratic Action. Ms. Mink, an attorney, was a member of Congress from 1965 to 1977 and currently is an instructor of law at the University of Hawaii.

Rashey B. Moten, Kansas City, Missouri, Executive Director of the Kansas City Catholic Charities. Mr. Moten is the former President of the National Conference of Catholic Charities.

Richard J. Neuhaus, New York, New York, Associate Pastor, Trinity Church; Pastor Neuhaus is the author of *To Empower People* and co-director of a national research project sponsored by the American Enterprise Institute on Mediating Structures and Public Policy.

Robert M. Rice, Parkridge, New Jersey, Director of Policy Analysis and Development for the Family Service Association of America. The founding Chairperson of the Coalition for the White House Conference on Families, Dr. Rice is the author of *American Family Policy: Content and Context*.

Ildaura Murillo-Rohde, Seattle, Washington, Professor and Associate Dean of the School of Nursing of the University of Washington. A marriage and family therapist, she is the Chairperson-Elect of the National Coalition of Hispanic Mental Health and Human Services Organization.

Donald V. Seibert, New York, New York, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the J. C. Penney Company, Inc. Mr. Seibert is Chairman of the Task Force on Inflation of the Business Roundtable, chairs the Board of the National Retail Merchants Association and serves as a member of the Board of the United Way of America. Mr. Seibert will serve as a Deputy Chairperson of the White House Conference on Families.

Hirsch L. Silverman, West Orange, New Jersey, Chairman of the Department of Education Administration at Seton Hall University. Professor Silverman is the Chairman of the National Alliance for Family Life and the author of fourteen books dealing with the areas of psychology, philosophy and education.

Eleanor C. Smeal, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, President of the National Organization for Women, and an active participant in a variety of advocacy organizations.

Barbara B. Smith, Salt Lake City, Utah, General President of the Relief Society of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. She is active in the PTA and the Holladay Child Care Center.

J. Francis Stafford, Baltimore, Maryland, Auxiliary Bishop of the Archdiocese of Baltimore and Chairman of the Bishops Committee on Marriage and Family Life of the United States Catholic Conference.

J. C. Turner, Washington, D.C., President of the International Union of Operating Engineers, AFL-CIO. Mr. Turner serves on the Board of the National Urban League, National Consumers' League, and the YMCA.

Harold Yee, San Francisco, California, Director of Asia, Inc., a research institute for direct service agencies. Mr. Yee, an economist, serves on several San Francisco school advisory committees.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There are many outstanding women and men on the National Advisory Committee. Whether their social and political views coincide with mine, or with those of any other Member of Congress, is beside the point. The point, simply, is that an overwhelming majority of this advisory committee was certain to think in terms of governmental "solutions" to family problems. The majority of the advisory committee is so tied in to the academic-bureaucratic-activist network that feeds off Federal programs that they can be counted on to support more such programs, more spending, more Government meddling in the affairs of the family.

Tilted as the Advisory Committee on the White House Conference may be, it is not the entire governing structure behind the conference, which was to be managed, in fact though not in public by a private, exclusive, unappointed, unofficial group known as the Coalition for the White House Conference on Families.

**THE COALITION FOR THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON FAMILIES: THE INSIDE-OUTSIDE JOB**

Founded in 1976, the Coalition for the White House Conference consists of 54 organizations of all sorts: religious, professional, and activist. Established under nongovernmental auspices, the coalition quickly emerged as a very powerful force behind the conference. Because this was a private group, the Carter administration could not be held accountable for its activities. Because it was private, the President need not face questioning or criticism about its membership of their agenda, its tactics, its staffing, or its exclusivity.

I submit for the RECORD the list of member groups of the Coalition for the White House Conference on Families.

The list follows:

**COALITION FOR THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON FAMILIES**

**MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS**

Academy of Psychologists in Marital, Sexual and Family Therapy.  
Aid Association for Lutherans.  
Action for Children's Television.  
American Association of Marriage and Family Therapists.  
American Association of Sex Educators, Counselors and Therapists.  
American Association of University Women.  
American College of Nurse Midwives.  
American Home Economics Association.  
American Mental Health Counselors Association.  
American Personnel and Guidance Association.  
American Public Welfare Association.  
American Red Cross.  
Americans for Indian Opportunity.  
Aspira of America, Inc.  
Association of Couples for Marriage Enrichment.  
American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy.  
Association of Family Conciliation Courts.  
Association of Administrators of Home Economics.  
B'nai B'rith Women.  
Child Welfare League of America.  
Coalition for Children and Youth.  
Council of Jewish Federations, Inc.  
Cuban National Planning Council.  
Family Service Association of America.

Future Homemakers of America.  
Institution on Pluralism and Group Identity, American Jewish Committee.  
Jewish Welfare Board.  
National Alliance for Family Life, Inc.  
National Alliance for Optional Parenthood.  
National Association of Extension Home Economists.  
National Association of Social Workers, Inc.  
National Coalition of Hispanic Mental Health and Human Service Organizations.  
National Conference of Catholic Charities.  
National Congress of Parents and Teachers, (National PTA).  
National Council for Homemakers-Home-Health Aide Services, Inc.  
National Council of Churches.  
National Council of Jewish Women.  
National Council of Negro Women.  
National Council on Family Relations.  
National Council on the Aging.  
National Extension Homemakers Council, Inc.  
National Gay Task Force.  
National Military Wives Association, Inc.  
National Network.  
National Retired Teachers Association.  
American Association of Retired Persons.  
National Urban League.  
North American Society of Adlerian Psychology.  
Parents Without Partners, Inc.  
Planned Parenthood-World Population.  
Synagogue Council of America.  
United States Catholic Conference.  
Volunteers of America.  
Women's Action Alliance, Inc.  
Young Women's Christian Association National Board.  
Zero Population Growth.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That list includes many admirable organizations, groups of dedicated people, whether volunteers or professionals, whose commitment and contributions to American family life have been considerable. I know that, to most of the members of those fine organizations, the White House Conference on Families must seem like a perfectly reasonable way to assist in the development of profamily policies.

What concerns me, and what may come to concern those mainstream organizations which lent the use of their names to the coalition, is the membership in it of groups like the National Gay Task Force, Zero Population Growth, Planned Parenthood (which was caught in 1978 distributing vicious antireligious cartoons), and the American Association of Sex Educators, Counselors, and Therapists.

First the name of the conference was changed: Families, rather than Family. Then some rather inappropriate groups joined the coalition for the White House Conference on Families. Then, another revealing incident occurred last year.

To see whether it was possible for profamily organizations to work within the framework of the coalition, the Eagle Forum, an organization of patriotic women who oppose ERA, abortion, and Government meddling in family life, applied for membership in the coalition. Back came notice of acceptance. Perhaps the coalition would be neutral ground after all, where diverse views could be represented and common cause discovered.

It was not to be. When a representative of Eagle Forum appeared at a subsequent meeting of the coalition, ready

in good faith to take her seat as a member, she was informed that there had been a mistake. No new members could be admitted to the coalition without approval of the other member groups. Delay became denial. The coalition had become an exclusive country club, where certain kinds of people need not apply.

If, in fact, the coalition for the White House Conference on Families were a purely private outfit, its exclusivity would be its own business. But it has an intimate relationship with the conference leadership. Although their union is not official, it is the equivalent of a common law marriage.

For example, an official report from the White House Conference on Families, dated August 1979, announced that there would be "a workshop for State coordinators" of the upcoming conference. Entitled "Families and Social Policies—Building Consensus and Reducing Conflicts," the workshop was held November 1, 2, and 3 at the Wingspread Conference Center, Racine, Wis.

That sounds pretty official. This national meeting was to train the State coordinators who will actually run the State meetings on families and then, presumably, play major roles in the national conferences. But this conference was not put on by the Government. It was cosponsored by the Johnson Foundation, the Institute for Pluralism and Group Identity, and the coalition for the White House Conference on Families. Inside-outside, and all locked up tight.

The coalition can include or exclude whomever it wishes. Homosexual activists in, anti-ERA women out. Sex therapists in, profile leaders out. Zero Population Growth in, Eagle Forum out. And the Carter administration can profess absolute innocence about it all, because the coalition is a "private" affair.

**ANOTHER TRACK IN THE RECORD: THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF THE CHILD**

Not dismayed with the debacle of the IWY National Women's Conference, the Carter White House moved on to the International Year of the Child. It too had a national commission, using Federal funds to propagandize the public. I submit for the RECORD an article, "Taxpayers Foot Bill," from Human Events, November 11, 1978, along with a detailed report on the IYC prepared by the Republican Study Committee in the House of Representatives.

Under IYC auspices, the chairperson of the National Commission on the IYC, Mrs. Andrew Young, endorsed the North Carolina plan, officially entitled, "A Child Health Plan for Raising a New Generation." The plan specifies that "family planning services, including pregnancy testing, sex education, and contraceptives, should be available to all sexually active persons regardless of age." What a way to celebrate the International Year of the Child. It is too bad Mrs. Andrew Young did not stop to think about the terrible effects on young people, their families, and society in general, of the free distribution of contraceptives without parental knowledge or consent.

First and foremost, there is the ques-

tion of the proper use of tax money. It was bad enough that Mrs. Young used her official position as head of a national commission to foster such ideas. But it is even worse to spend the taxpayers' dollars on free contraceptives, smuggled to youngsters by federally funded social workers, in the name of kiddie liberation.

In the aftermath of the Commission on the International Year of the Child, is it any wonder that many Americans are suspicious of the President's intentions concerning his White House Conference on Families?

The material follows:

[From Human Events, Nov. 11, 1978]

**NEW "YEAR OF CHILD" PANEL WILL PUSH FOR MORE SPENDING**

If you liked the United Nations' International Women's Year (IWY), you're going to love its sequel, the International Year of the Child (IYC), scheduled for 1979.

As most Human Events readers will recall, our government's contribution to the IWY festivities was the creation of a national IWY commission, which used over \$5 million of the federal taxpayers' money to stage an elaborate series of meetings around the country, culminating in the National Women's Conference in Houston, Tex., last November 18-21. Not unexpectedly, given the militant feminist dominance of the commission, that confab wound up endorsing virtually every goal of the radical women's lib movement, including ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment, government-funded abortions, "gay" rights, universal day-care at taxpayers' expense, and on and on.

Well, just as President Carter (like President Ford before him) stacked the IWY commission with women's lib militants, he has now created a "National Commission on the International Year of the Child, 1979," and similarly skewed its membership to the left of center.

While Bella Abzug was named by Carter to head the IWY commission, for instance, her counterpart on the IYC panel is Mrs. Jean Young, wife of United Nations Ambassador Andrew Young. Other appointees include Marian Wright Edelman, founder of the Children's Defense Fund; Carroll M. Hutton, director of the United Auto Workers Education Department; the Rev. Eileen W. Lindner of the National Council of Churches; and actress Marlo Thomas, who has become well-known for her espousal of liberal and feminist causes.

Under the terms of an Executive Order signed by the President last April 14, the commission—consisting of 25 private individuals and four liberal members of Congress—is directed to "plan for and promote the national observance in the United States of the year 1979 as the International Year of the Child. . . ."

"In promoting this observance, the Commission shall foster within the United States a better understanding of the special needs of children," with "special attention to the health, education, social, environment, physical and emotional development, and legal rights and needs of children. . . ."

"The Commission may conduct studies, inquiries, hearings and meetings as it deems necessary. It may assemble and disseminate information, issue reports and other publications. . . ." It shall also "make recommendations to the President on national policies for improving well-being of children. . . ."

"Boiled down, this means that the Commission has a mandate to rev up the propaganda machine in favor of any and all liberal programs having any connection, no matter how tenuous, with children and youth. To date, the Commission's work has

not progressed beyond its preliminary stages. will not warm the hearts of conservatives."

Thus, a draft "working paper" used as the But already there are signs that its efforts basis of discussion at the Commission's September meeting, a copy of which was obtained by Human Events, lists the following as being among the "concerns" expressed by Commission members:

The need to assure that quality day care will be available for the children of parents "who need or opt for" such services.

The need for children to "grow up in a society in which health care is available to all irrespective of ability to pay."

The need to "provide an environment which is free of risks to health and well-being such as smog and pollution; an adequate and potable supply of water; adequate green space and recreational space."

The need to assure "that in meeting the needs of the children in our country it is not at the expense of Third World children, i.e., that we exploit their resources to meet our needs."

Though somewhat bland, these statements clearly show the direction in which the Commission is heading. Before its work is concluded, the Commission will almost certainly flesh out these preliminary ideas into full-blown resolutions in favor of universal taxpayer-funded day care such as championed by Vice President Walter Mondale; comprehensive national health insurance on the Kennedy model; more stringent environmental and land-use controls, and so forth.

Such promotion of controversial issues wouldn't be so bad if it were funded by voluntary contributions. Instead, the taxpayers will foot the bill whether they agree with such programs or not. And it won't come cheap.

With its full-time staff of 14 headquartered in the New Executive Office Building near the White House, the Commission has already spent nearly a half-million dollars, most of it in the form of gifts from the Justice and State departments. And according to Commission Program Coordinator John Campbell, the panel expects to use another \$1.3 million over the current fiscal year—with the bulk of this money coming from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

In an effort to prevent HEW spending for this purpose, Sen. Jesse Helms (R.-N.C.) on September 27 offered an amendment to the Labor-HEW appropriations bill stating that "None of the funds appropriated under this Act may be used for expenses or activities of the National Commission on the International Year of the Child, 1979." Helms argued that the best way for the United States to participate in the IYC would be for the plethora of private organizations concerned with children in this country to use their own funds to carry out appropriate activities on a voluntary basis. Tax dollars, said Helms, should not be used.

But though the Senate accepted Helms' amendment, it was knocked out in conference. So, once again, the liberals are using tax dollars to lobby for more and bigger spending programs in the future. And they wonder why there's a tax revolt taking place.

**UNINVITED GUESTS: THE AMERICAN PEOPLE INTRUDE**

Mr. HUMPHREY. When Andrew Jackson was inaugurated as President in 1829, for the first time in our history large numbers of common people turned out for the White House celebration, which formerly had been reserved for the well placed and the affluent. Washington society was shocked by the unexpected intrusion of what they considered the lower elements in the country, people whose only claim to attend was their citizenship in the Republic.

That is what has happened to the White House Conference on Families. Many profamily Americans took seriously the President's urging to participate in their own States' conferences. They turned out in large numbers, in places like Virginia and Oklahoma. They expressed their concerns about the future of the family and proposed their own solutions.

Then the roof fell in. The official conference organizers, in State after State, put out the word that their professional control of the conferences was being imperiled. A kind of hysteria prevailed, if we may judge from press reports, as liberal activists realized that they would not be allowed automatic control of the proceedings. Wild accusations were made—and are still being made—by conference spokesmen about an alleged right-wing assault on the conference.

The constituent organizations of the coalition for the White House conference would do well to pay attention to what has been happening, as profamily people are shunted out of the action. Some groups comprising the coalition may want to reassess their membership after discovering how the conference leaders are trying to rig the outcome of what was supposed to be a democratic selection process for delegates to the conferences to be held this summer in Baltimore, Minneapolis, and Los Angeles.

I submit, Mr. President, for inclusion in the RECORD at this point, the following material concerning the problems profamily people have experienced at the State conferences and in the selection of delegates to the White House conference.

First, relevant articles from two recent issues of the Family Protection Report, by Connaught Coyne Marshner, who has been a candid critic of the White House Conference.

Second, detailed material from a recent issue of the Right Woman, by Jo Ann Gaspar, an excellent source of data about the conference process.

Third, a thoughtful letter concerning the problems profamily Virginians have encountered with their State's official conference organizers.

Fourth, two articles from the National Catholic Register of March 30, 1980. The first is an interview with Nancy Roach, who overwhelmingly won election to chair the White House Conference on Families in the tricity region of Washington State.

But conference officials just refused to accept her election and replaced her with an unelected appointee. This was Washington State, remember, not Afghanistan. The second article presents an overview of the White House conference. It is all informative, but hardly cheerful reading.

Fifth, an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of November 29, 1979, shortly after profamily delegates won resounding victories in Virginia's State conference. An editorial makes clear, those victories were for the American family, not for any political faction.

Sixth, a forceful letter, printed in the Chattanooga News-Free Press of March 12, 1980, from Mrs. Anita Holcomb, revealing the shocking outcome of the

Georgia State Conference on Families, along with an article from the Atlanta Journal of March 12, 1980, headlined "State Conference Says Homosexual Family Can Be Healthy Environment." Where, I might ask, is the Environmental Protection Agency when we need it.

Eighth, an article from the Idaho Statesman of March 21, 1980 announcing that the Idaho House of Representatives has passed a resolution calling for "the free and open election" of delegates to the White House conference, something which conference officials are opposing.

Ninth, an article from the Christian Citizen of March 7, 1980, asking "White House Conference—Is it going to be IWY revisited?" I think the answer to that is pretty clear by now.

Tenth, and to this article I want to draw special attention, an item from the White Plains, N.Y., Reporter Dispatch of February 22, 1980, in which Mario Cuomo declared that, because of the profamily victories in Virginia and Oklahoma State conferences, "The New York delegation must carry much of the load on issues such as abortion, day care, and homosexuality."

Who is Mario Cuomo? He is Lieutenant Governor of the State of New York. He is also a Carter-Tucker appointee as one of the deputy chairpersons of the White House Conference on Families. He is, moreover, in charge of the Carter Presidential campaign in New York State. Mr. Cuomo declares that "I want a continuing, persistent commitment to all kinds of families." I admire his candor.

Eleventh, an article from the Houston Post of February 23, 1980, along with the report to John Carr from George Willeford, State coordinator of the Texas State conference, which makes clear that the families of Texas do not share the viewpoint of the White House, Mr. Tucker, Mr. Carr, the National Advisory Committee, or the coalition.

Twelfth, a letter from Betty Jean Perry, a profamily woman in Arizona, outlining some of the difficulties which arose when citizens attempted to participate in their State's conference.

Finally, with special admiration and respect, I submit a copy of the letter sent to Jim Guy Tucker by Mrs. Fob James, wife of the Governor of Alabama. Bobbie James is a perceptive and eloquent woman, and her note needs no commentary from me.

There is more documentation that could be submitted; but this sampling will suffice, at least for today.

The material follows:

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON FAMILIES ENDORSES EXCLUSIONARY TACTICS FOR DELEGATE SELECTION

(By Connaught Coyne Marshner)

Jim Guy Tucker and the National Advisory Committee on the White House Conference on Families have given approval to delegate selection tactics which make it increasingly difficult for issue-focus groups to participate in the White House Conference.

"Discrimination . . . has no place in the WHCF," Chairman Tucker has proclaimed. "On the contrary, we have specifically designed unique and innovative process precisely to promote broad participation."

This "unique and innovative process" includes the requirement that each state plan has to be submitted to Washington 20 days prior to publicizing the plan within the state. This is to ensure that state plans "adhere" to WHCF guidelines. One such guideline reads:

"Each state plan should reflect a combination of gubernatorial appointment and peer election, with a minimum of 30% of the delegates being identified by each method."

Activists involved with family issues had taken comfort in this guidance, since it promises that at least one-third of all delegates will be elected. That meant that there would be discussion of issues, airing of differences, and that the will of the population of the state might somehow be expressed. However, by the end of 1979 it was evident that states were looking for ways to avoid having actual peer elections, in response to the much-publicized Virginia family conference "takeover" which the WHCF leadership indicated was the sort of thing that should be avoided in the future.

At the January meeting of the National Advisory Committee (NAC) tacit approval was given to a common method of circumventing the requirement for peer election as part of the "unique and innovative process." "RANDOM SELECTION": "YOU CAN ALWAYS SCREW THE RESULTS"

The NAC approved using various systems of "random selection" as alternatives to peer election. Jim Guy Tucker subsequently confirmed this interpretation in conversation with FPR. "Random selection" works like this "nomination forms" are distributed throughout a state by whatever means the state coordinator chooses. The forms may require the following information: age, sex, religion, ethnic group, family size, family form, income, occupation, organizational affiliation. The forms are returned to the state coordinator, state planning committee, or similar address.

It so happens that other WHCF guidelines include detailed provision for affirmative action requirements in the composition of state delegations. At the NAC meeting, one NAC member was confused by this discussion of random selection. "How can we be assured of diversity in random selection processes?" he asked. The answer was, "It won't be random—the applications will be scrutinized."

In other words, the applicants for "random selection" will be screened by the state planners to make sure that the result of the selection process will eventually include the desired proportions of men, women, blacks, whites, orientals, married, divorced, single homosexual, non-homosexual non-poor, poor, employed, unemployed, and so forth. Critics charge that ideological orientation will also be screened to eliminate those whose opinions are considered too "controversial."

In some states, the result of the screening and "random selection" process is the actual delegation to Minneapolis, Baltimore, or Los Angeles. In other states, the result of the process is merely an invitation to the state conference, which in turn will elect a part of the delegation. Wisconsin, for example, has sent out 20,000 "invitation forms" for a conference which will hold 1200 maximum. Unless a citizen happens to be a friend of someone distributing "invitation forms," that citizen would have no opportunity to attend the conference which will proclaim Wisconsin's policy for children and families, and also elect 45 percent of the state's delegation to the WHCF.

FPR asked Jim Guy Tucker whether the fairness of this "random selection" process did not depend on the goodwill of the state planners. Well, Tucker admitted, "you can always screw the results around. And that kind of situation would be subject to challenge just like some of the elections are."

The public's lack of knowledge of unethical manipulations by state planners was mentioned to Tucker as a reason why such results would be unlikely to be challenged. "The first place to be concerned is the Governor's office, in that case," was Tucker's response.

CHANGED PROPORTIONS ALSO AFFECT PARTICIPATION

In Virginia, the first state to hold a state conference, the delegate selection plan was 30 percent gubernatorial appointment and 70 percent peer election, a 30-70 plan. By 1980, most of the state plans being approved were 30-30-40 plans of some sort: 30 percent gubernatorial appointment, 30 percent peer election ("random selection" in some cases) and 40 percent state planning committee appointment. Since some pro-family activists contend that the "random selection" is merely a thin disguise for planning committee appointment, this amounts to 100 percent appointed delegations.

Even these formulas are subject to change, however, which provokes considerable confusion among the public. In Maryland, for example, state coordinator Sally Michel originally announced on several public occasions that the Governor would appoint one-third of the delegates and that the people of the state would elect two-thirds. After a State Advisory Committee was established, the selection plan was changed so that the Committee would appoint two-thirds, and only one-third would be elected. Significantly, this change occurred after the Virginia conference.

A frequent complaint from pro-family activists is that they cannot find out what actually is happening in their states. One woman in New Hampshire wanted to find out when her state planning committee was meeting. "The Status of Women Commission were the only ones who seemed to know where it was," she told FPR. "Imagine that, even the Governor's Citizens' Service office didn't know!"

Some states won't even conform to the existing guidelines: California insists on having 100 percent outright appointment. NAC concedes that this formula does not meet its guidelines.

AT-LARGE DELEGATES

Other decisions regarding the final composition of the three White House Conferences were reached at the January NAC meeting. It was agreed that the state coordinator from each state will be an automatic at-large delegate, as will NAC members. There will be 244 other at-large delegates, selected by the NAC. The at-large slots are stated to be intended to "fill gaps in representation according to non-discrimination and affirmative action requirements." National organizations are permitted to make two nominations each for the vacancies, as are NAC members, state coordinators, and "other interested individuals."

Regarding alternate delegates, it was decided that alternates must be accredited before the Conference convenes, and no "shuttling alternates and delegates back and forth" will be allowed.

BOYCOTTS AND LAWSUITS PLAGUE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON FAMILIES

(By C. Coyne Marshner)

The aura of consensus which the White House Conference on Families was trying to develop for itself is rapidly evaporating. Two governors have pulled their states out of the Conference entirely, and others are being pressured to do the same. Citizen-filed lawsuits have sought injunctions against state planning committees and against delegates selection plans; other lawsuits are likely to follow. Dissatisfaction stems from insistence by officials of the WHCF on giving quota recognition to non-traditional lifestyles,

from exclusionary methods of delegate selection, and from secretive planning processes at some state levels. Rumors staunchly denied by the WHCF suggest the possible cancellation of the Conference altogether.

**ALABAMA AND INDIANA BOYCOTT**

Governors Forrest (Fob) James of Alabama and Otis R. Bowen of Indiana have decided that their states will not officially participate in the conference in any way. The question of whether any delegates from those states will be accepted by the White House Conference is unsettled. Sources indicate the WHCF will probably appoint at large delegates from Alabama and Indiana, if not full delegations; however, a policy decision will be made by the National Advisory Committee at its April 10-12 meeting.

Mrs. Fob James, representing her husband, sent a letter to Jim Guy Tucker, WHCF Chairman, on February 10. She stated her objection that the NAC "leaves the conference to chance that traditional Judeo-Christian values would be the consensus." (Emphasis in original.) "As a sacred trust to the people of Alabama, we respectfully regret that our state will not participate in this or other such conferences which do not establish traditional Judeo-Christian values concerning the family, the foundation of our nation under God."

The James letter was followed by a more detailed statement to the press outlining three levels of problems with the Conference: "philosophical, political, and substantive." The substantive problems referred to the delegate selection process: "We understand that in some states private citizens were deliberately excluded because they espoused the traditional values." The possibility that human services professionals and academics might dominate the Conference was another concern, which conflicts with the view that "private citizens concerned with public policy and taxpayers should have a prominent voice." In fairness to the WHCF, it should be noted that a guideline for delegate selection stipulates that no more than 50 percent of any state's delegation may be family service professionals.

The political objection cited by Mrs. James was that "Governors are not in charge of their state activities. Yet complaints, which the citizens will have, will be directed to the Governors."

Governor Bowen sounded a related theme in his letter to Tucker: "... since many interest groups have exerted unrealistic demands and pressures regarding an Indiana conference and the delegate selection process, we believe that pursuit of the recommended guidelines would result in divisiveness." After Bowen's withdrawal, there were reports of a staffer's citing "far right groups" as ones which had exerted demands. Governor Bowen subsequently denied that he or his staff said or would say such a thing.

Both Indiana and Alabama mentioned some very successful state programs inaugurated in conjunction with the International Year of the Child as obviating the need for state WHCF activities.

**IDAHO LEADERS CALL FOR BOYCOTT**

In Idaho, a lottery selection of delegates had been decided upon by the state coordinator. To define issues, an eight-page questionnaire was mailed around the state, with complicated instructions for completion. One line was left blank for a respondent to indicate whether he or she was interested in being a delegate.

A group of pastors around the state, of all denominations, became concerned about this method of delegate selection. They sought an appointment with Governor John Evans to ask for open elections, and were told the Governor could not see them for at least two weeks. Meanwhile, State Representative Wendy Ungricht of Boise intro-

duced a concurrent resolution, HCR 50, asking the Governor for the same thing. On the day the Ungricht resolution went to the State Affairs Committee for action, Ungricht was able to obtain an appointment for herself, another legislator, and the pastors.

After hearing their case, the Governor said, "We need a study of this." Ungricht said that there was no time for a study. The Governor responded by stating that there was no time for elections, and no money for them, either. Ungricht responded by saying that there would be enough people in the state so grateful for the chance to elect delegates that volunteers would handle procedure. At that point, according to Ungricht the Governor simply refused. Ungricht asked him whether he would boycott the White House Conference, as have other Governors. He refused. (HCR 50, if passed would instruct the Governor to boycott the Conference if he does not obtain free elections.)

Some pastors asked the Governor whether he would give consideration to the moral view of individuals whom he selects as his appointments to the state's WHCF delegation. Evans stated that guidelines allowed him to consider only demographic characteristics: age, sex, income level, race, and so on. The pastors insisted that the Governor ask them how they feel about values, at least. The Governor said he could not. Further questioning produced the same result. Even if 15,000 questionnaires were returned, asking for one individual to be appointed delegate, the Governor maintained he "could not do it," indicating that WHCF guidelines were higher authority than he.

**THE COURTS OF LAST RESORT**

The WHCF also has been the target of several lawsuits recently. Citizens of traditional moral orientation are turning to the courts as a last resort, to try to protest what they see as denial of their right to vote. Pennsylvania and New Hampshire are two such states.

In Pennsylvania, the state coordinator, Helen O'Bannon, who is also a member of the National Organization for Women (NOW), is being "frugal" and did not spend much money on publicity, according to Sherry Bodie, one of the citizens instigating the suit. "In Johnstown, for example, the only place to get even the primary brochure was the Planned Parenthood office." The delegate selection process in Pennsylvania is weighted 3-to-2 in favor of those who have participated in a regional family forum. However, the guidelines for holding regional or local forums were not released to the public until February 11, Bodie told FPR, "and the deadline by which you had to return your delegate questionnaire, all completed, was March 12. But that wasn't printed on the primary brochure. And to get that delegate questionnaire you first had to write away for it. It wasn't released to the public until the last week of February. So we're talking about a schedule which required interested citizens to find out about it, send away for another form, fill out that form, and return it—all within two weeks." The returned questionnaires will be given numbers, and numbers will be selected by computer in a random fashion. The forms will then be matched by Planning Committee members with the criteria and affirmative action guidelines.

A group of private citizens in Pennsylvania is preparing a suit seeking an injunction against the Pennsylvania Forum on Families on the grounds that the Forum (the state's association to promote the WHCF) failed to publicize adequately the regional hearings or the delegate selection deadlines. This suit is to be filed imminently.

In New Hampshire, the State Superior Court denied that it had jurisdiction in a case seeking a cease and desist order against

the entire delegate selection process in that state. The five citizens, three of them ministers, who initiated that suit, told FPR that they intend to take the case to federal district court if no relief is granted to what they maintain are the majority views of the citizens of New Hampshire.

**THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON FAMILIES**

Virginia has become the Boston Tea Party of the Pro-Family Movement. People from across the country have become aware and are getting first hand experience with governmental bureaucrats and their handling of the White House Conference on Families. The pattern of exclusion of pro-family and pro-life people has emerged. The family people of America are not able to get information out of the State Coordinator's offices, the organization of the State Steering Committees is stacked with governmental employees and other persons with vested interest in seeing the role of government in the family expanded or the radical restructuring of the American family. The "issue development" process within the state organizations has become window dressing for a preplanned agenda from the White House Conference on Families.

In short, the pattern in the other states has followed what happened in Virginia and led up to the "Fredericksburg Massacre".

**THE BIG LIE**

In response to the overwhelming cry of the people in Virginia that "we want the government out of our families—we want our tax burden reduced—we want our mothers to have the freedom to stay with their children—we want to control our own lives," the White House Conference on Families has generated the "big lie". They have used it to change the rules in other states, to deprive people of their right in accordance with the official WHCF guidelines to have a fair, open, and democratic election of delegates. The big lie is that the Virginia delegation is "non-representative, predominantly white, a middle-class delegation with only one or two major interests." John Carr, executive director of the White House Conference on Families, has refused to put this allegation to rest. In fact, it has been perpetuated by members of the WHCF staff. Frank Fuentes, Western Regional Director of the WHCF, has used the big lie to force Washington state to change the number of delegates elected from the maximum to the minimum. The same lie has been used to change the rules in other states, to deprive people of their rights to a democratic process.

**THE FACTS—HOMOSEXUALS ARE NOT REPRESENTED**

The elected delegates for Virginia are representative of the people of Virginia except for homosexuals. The racial mix of the elected delegates reflects extremely well the population of the Commonwealth:

<b>Population</b>		
[In percent]		
White	-----	80.5
Black	-----	18.7
Other	-----	.8
<b>Delegates</b>		
[In percent]		
White	-----	83.3
Black	-----	16.6
Other	-----	.0

The elections in Virginia resulted in a more racially balanced delegation than either in the House of Delegates or the U.S. Congress. The election process produced a more sexually balanced delegation than did the appointment of members to the task forces by the State Coordinator, Dr. Jessica Cohen. The task forces were 25 percent male and the elected delegation is comprised of 33 percent male. (Editor's note: the calculation of

the ratio of men to women was determined by counting the names listed on the program as members of the Task Forces. As a member of the Task Force on Families and the Work World, the male listed on the program never attended any of the announced task force meetings).

The elected delegates include persons who are: handicapped, disabled, married, widowed, divorced. They have been active in working with children with chronic and disabling health problems, sponsored Vietnamese families, helped pre-teens with social problems, supported and opposed ratification of the ERA, and active with migrants. They have been members and active in such organizations as the PTA (Parents Teacher Association), La Leche League, AAUW (American Association of University Women), CAUSE for Positive Education, NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People), and the Virginia Right to Live.

#### VARIOUS RELIGIOUS AND ETHNIC BACKGROUNDS ARE REPRESENTED

The Pro-Family delegates are of one mind when it comes to recognition of the value and importance of the traditional American family and its importance as the primary unit of society—but, isn't that what the White House Conference was supposed to be about?

#### THE AFTERMATH

Let me share some of the happenings and comments in the various states which have followed as a result of the "Fredericksburg Massacre" and the "big lie".

Oklahoma: Anna Mayer of Hooker, Oklahoma called the State Coordinator approximately two weeks before delegates were to be elected. The State Coordinator would not even let her know the names of the members of the state steering committee. Publicity was handled by the Oklahoma Education Association, government agencies, the PTA, and the media. The media indicated that they had a hard time getting information. The PTA did not distribute the information because "it was too controversial". This left the publicity of the meeting in the hands of the professional educators and the governmental agencies. It took complaints to Washington, D.C. and threats of legal action regarding the exclusion of the pro-family people to force the steering committee into permitting any pro-family representation. The reports coming out of the workshops were inaccurate. The final "Overview" session included a skit presenting a light treatment of abortion, jeering at patriotism, and ridiculing of religion.

New York: Pro-lifers were advised not to attend the Albany meeting because the registration was limited to 1,000 and 1,000 had pre-registered; therefore, they need not come. When the ballots were counted there were only approximately 650 cast. At the Stonybrook conference an unannounced fourth ballot box was used, balloting into the box was permitted before the announced opening of the polls. The box was not checked by a credentialed pro-family poll watcher. At Stonybrook there was at least one instance of a woman being given a second ballot. 97 pro-life ballots were invalidated, not on the day of the election, but the day after the election.

Washington: The State Steering Committee is stacked with people who hold radical views regarding the role of women in society. One member, Dr. Beverly Gabron, had been active in Planned Parenthood and has stated "American women are being conned into motherhood." When the people have attempted to elect members to the steering committees, they have been refused by the state organizers.

Pennsylvania: At one workshop a young lady caused quite a stir when she remarked "If we're supposed to be dealing with fami-

lies, we ought to be discussing married people." People protested that "You can't do that. You're disruptive." Workshops conducted by professional educators decried the effect which parents have on their children. These same professionals thought that children should have educational toys which they (the professionals) think the children should have; that there are not enough toys in many homes and homes are overcrowded; that children did not have enough space to spread out with "creative toys and activities". Residents of Pennsylvania did not get to elect their delegates. Instead, Pennsylvania devised an elaborate quota system using a computer, which Marian Bass, Special Assistant to Pennsylvania WHCF, stated was to "prevent what happened in Virginia", where "extremists" took over.

Maryland: Pro-family people won the election in Baltimore and so they are going to have "supplemental elections", i.e., "We will keep the polls open until our guys win". Maybe Maryland should have a "supplemental election" for governor.

Delaware: Pat Fell was accused of "stacking" pro-family people as nominees for delegates. What did she do? She put the application form on the bulletin board in the community post office.

NOVEMBER 27, 1979.

Ms. BRENDA JOHNSON,  
Donaldson Brown Center for Continuing  
Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute,  
Blacksburg, Va.

DEAR BRENDA: When we spoke in Fredericksburg, you asked that I put down for you exactly what our complaints were about the conduct of the Virginia Conference on Families, and why we felt excluded. A number of others expressed the same wish. In an effort to comply, I write the following letter which, if you have no objection, I will send copies of to some others, and which I may use as the basis of a short article, if there is sufficient interest.

I got involved in the VCF fairly late, but it seems to me that there were three distinct phases of it: (1) Task Force formation, meetings, and reports; (2) the "public" conference itself, where the reports were presented and delegates to the White House Conference on Families elected; (3) the formation, meeting, and reports of Family Action Groups, which began about the same time as the task force phase, but continued through the conference, and will continue in a series of public hearings throughout the State; and (4) preparation of the Conference Report.

As the week of the conference began, it is fair to say that many of us who belong to or represent what we think of as "traditional families" felt excluded from the proceedings, and threatened by coercive governmental action. Let me explain in detail why that was so, treating each of the four phases of the VCF.

#### I. TASK FORCES

We all understand that the organization of any public conference must be done by those with some resources and time. It may be inevitable that the "organizing committee" be made up heavily of State employees, though there is no theoretical reason why an independent commission on which non-professionals were represented could not have been created to do this organizing.

The history of the Virginia Conference on Families may be instructive here. I understand, and on this point I would appreciate correction or clarification, that Virginia Polytechnic Institute had already scheduled, some time ago, a conference on the modern family, and that that planned conference was successively adapted to the needs of the Virginia Commission on the Family, and then the White House Conference on Families, without ever losing its original professional makeup.

At any rate, the task forces can only be described as heavily professional. I don't mean that in any pejorative sense, merely descriptive. For instance, the TF on Families and Stress had 25 members, and while the conference material in Fredericksburg did not provide professional affiliations, other printed material from the conference confirms that at most seven of its members do not have an interest in preserving (and expanding) the present system of government-supplied services to individuals and families. And that seven includes the Reverend Rowles (at his request as much as anything) although most clergy called themselves professionals (for instance in the nominating process).

As another example, the TF on Families in the Work World had 20 members. Of these, the most generous count of private individuals yields a total of five. I haven't completed an analysis of the other task forces, but I don't anticipate radically different results. And of course, the White House guidelines on the State conferences emphasize that they are to be lay conferences.

None of this is meant to denigrate the effort of the members of the task forces, or to suggest that professionals are not honest in their work and thinking. But their thinking is limited to a particular way of accomplishing goals, a way involving government to a degree which we find unacceptable.

The professional attitude is clearly indicated by the "Ballot on Issues and Needs," which I understand came from the WHCF, and which was designed to elicit from participants in State conferences their views of the ten issues of most concern to families. These "topics" and the "issues" listed under them reflect an overwhelming bias towards government action. "In what way could flextime . . . be mandated." "In what ways should government encourage . . ." "What can government do . . ." "What role can government play . . ." And so on. Obviously, I have quoted here those issues where government involvement is explicit, but even where it is not, the inference is unavoidable.

For instance, under the topic of "Community/Continuing Education; Family Life Enrichment," one issue is, "How can marriages be enriched?" That is a question that is not susceptible to answer, but worse than that, it implies the creation of a Department of Family Enrichment, and the monitoring of our Enrichment Quotas, to make certain that all families have the minimum daily requirement of enrichment. We resent that implication; we feel that just asking the question treats marriage as something one can lay out on the table for analysis, as one would analyze a diseased frog. My recollection of Biology I is that the frog always died. In short, we feel that these things are no one's business. Least of all our civil servants'.

I have similar criticisms of the demographic sheet included in the packet, but I submitted mine, so I cannot dissect it in the same way now. Suffice it to say that I read ominous implications into it, and I am not normally thought to be very paranoid about these things.

But it is results that count. So let's look at the results produced by the task forces, to see if the overrepresentation of the professional mindset on them justifies my criticisms of their makeup. In one (which blew up at the conference) we know they did: abortion funding. Any task force which reports as the consensus of its members that "medicaid funds should be reinstated for abortions" reveals itself as unrepresentative of Virginians, without further evidence.

But there is more evidence. Throughout the recommendations of the task forces, the operative words are "expand, provide, require, improve, encourage, utilize, offer," etc. These verbs are directed at existing and

contemplated programs (programs, incidentally, which will provide long and assured employment to those drawing up the recommendations). These recommendations contrast sharply with our perception of the actual needs of families, which are really quite simple. We need to be left alone, and we need to have removed from us the burdens imposed by government: taxation, regulation, inflation. That's not what is recommended.

On the contrary, of the specific recommendations that can be mined out of the task force language, 102 constitute a call for new or expanded programs which would cost the citizen money, either in higher direct taxes, lower tax revenues because of a new loophole, or higher prices because of an additional burden placed on private enterprise. Just 11 of those recommendations can be read as providing any form of economic relief. Of course there is a great deal of overlap and duplication in the recommendations, but the trend is clear.

And yet the Task Force on Stress found (quite accurately) that "economic pressure is a significant cause of stress in the family." Not that the TF proposes to do much about it. In fact, 13 of its recommendations would make the problem worse. It is true that the TF talks about "providing equal job opportunities" and "programs which establish jobs . . . for those unable to work." But these jobs are, by definition, non-productive, and by supporting them we shift resources away from productive work somewhere else. The result is the destruction of the productive base on which the CETA employee (not to mention his administrator, and you, and me) depends. And unemployment increases; it doesn't decline. Those of us in the Pro-Family Coalition recognize that truth instinctively, though not all of us can articulate it.

Another thing we recognize is that the burden of taxation and inflation is now unbearable. As individuals, families, and churches, we can find ways to overcome our personal problems, even our spouse and child abuse (not to mention high heating bills). What we can't figure out is a legal way to elude the tax man. And if we do manage to save a dime or two, inflation will get us. Inflation is the cruelest tax, hitting hardest those who are the object of concern of the professionals gathered at Fredericksburg. But their solution, as embodied in those 102 calls for expanded government, will make taxation and inflation worse, and even if the programs work, the poor and elderly will be worse off than before.

Which brings us to another important point: there is no evidence that these government programs work. We have had almost forty years now of welfare and transfer payments. Yet the goal is never reached. Wives are now being beaten in greater numbers than ever; more teenage girls than ever before are getting pregnant; abortions are on the rise; venereal disease is rampant; old people are neglected and abandoned, and can't pay their heating bills.

And what is the solution offered by the social worker? More public service litigation to assert the rights of women against their husbands; more sex education for teenagers; provision of contraceptives to teens and pre-teens; government-funded abortions; government programs to fulfill the roles children once played towards their aged parents; well-intentioned regulation, whose effect is to curtail the supply of fuel and to increase inflation (and thus the cost of fuel). In every case, the failure of government is seen as an argument for more of it. We see it differently: government has failed and its failure is excuse enough to cut it off.

To some extent that attitude is conditioned by our recognition that many of the problems that face humanity are not sus-

ceptible of solution. As an example, let me use the paper from the Task Force on Development Change.

"We must develop a system which 'plans for change,'" we are told. But only private, coerced decision-making can do that. No governmental program or institution has ever been able to, and we don't see that one ever could. There is something to be said for a "family impact statement" to accompany proposed legislation, but not much. Preparation of such a statement would be considerably more difficult and speculative than the preparation of environmental impact statements, which have not been without controversy themselves.

Unless a proposal deals directly with the structure of the family ("any woman giving birth to more than two children shall be shot by the Department of Population Control") its impact is liable to be economic. "This legislation proposes to impose a quota on sugar imports. The impact of this legislation on families will be to raise the price of the sweetener the kids sprinkle on their oatmeal; or maybe it won't. It might keep sugar prices down by weakening the international sugar cartel." I have no trouble deciding what the impact will be, but I doubt that my opinion is unanimous.

To continue: "How can people be better prepared for living in today's society as singles and as marriage partners?" I don't know, and neither does anyone else. No doubt we are born knowing too little, and what little we do learn we learn too slowly to do us much good, either as dating teenagers or as parents. But what can be done about it? Nothing, by government. There may be some utility in writing letters to Ann Landers, or in rap sessions with other parents at Sunday School. But as soon as government enters the picture, the negative becomes cloudy. The equation is changed (along with the metaphor) and now the teacher has a set of answers against which we are all to be graded. I don't like that, and I don't know anyone who does, other than the one with the answers.

So it is not surprising that the recommended solution for the problem outlined at the beginning of the last paragraph is "that the State Department of Education develop and provide minimum or low cost public education which includes family communications, financial management, credit, responsibilities for own actions, abuses-alcohol, drug abuse, courses in parenting." No, thank you. The State Department of Education ought to develop and provide public education that teaches children to read, write, and figure. Until it has done that, it is ill-advised to tackle the most intimate of social relations.

And what of non-public education? Totally absent from the entire document is any indication that private schools can or ought to have any role in providing "life management skills." And yet if I accepted the idea that the schools should teach my children how to "be responsible in their decisions regarding drugs, alcohol and sexuality," I would certainly not choose a public school.

What does the TF recommend in this area? "Mental Health Agencies need to develop outreach services on a regular basis. They also need to train local volunteers."

This TF does raise the issue of the "marriage tax," as did others, and recommends that "taxes be equitable and not penalize anyone because of marital status." Easily said; not so easily done, or it would have been, long ago. We are the ones who are supposed to offer the simplistic solutions around here.

## II. THE PUBLIC CONFERENCE

Our expectations for the public conference were heavily shaped by our experiences with the International Women's Year, by what we hear is happening with the WHCF

in other States, and by our inability to get information about the VCF and the rules by which it was going to be run. Though it is evident, in retrospect, that no effort was made by radical feminists and homosexuals to "pack" the VCF, I don't think our fears were unreasonable.

Nor were the delegates elected at Fredericksburg unrepresentative. On the contrary, they are far more representative of the average Virginian than the membership of the task forces, and more representative than the delegation that would have been elected if we had not made a concerted effort to get our people to attend the conference.

The elected delegates are not a homogeneous group. They are the delegates elected by a coalition, and like any coalition, this one had component parts, each of which gave something to achieve a common goal. The actions and attitudes of some of the delegates would not be my actions and attitudes; not everything that is in the statement of principles aligned by a majority of the conference participants is wholly acceptable to me; and there were things left out that I would have liked to see included. What is important is that a majority of the elected delegates reject the idea that family life can only be protected, promoted, and nurtured by government. That is, I think the view of a majority of Virginians, and it is not obviously the view of the majority of federal and State bureaucrats who have such impact on our lives.

There is something else that has to be said about the conference. That is that no provision was made to permit active participation by the registrants in the development or discussion of issues and answers. Granted that the logistics of such give and take are tough to orchestrate, it is done all the time at political conventions, at labor and professional gatherings, and has been done historically at women and family forums. The failure to adopt (and publicize) rules for conducting the business of the convention added to our suspicions about the conference, and in the end provoked the confrontation that effectively ended it. It is inexcusable, in my mind, to have a public meeting and not permit public participation, unless the proceedings are explicitly labelled "lecture," or something similar. Even lecturers offer the public an opportunity for questions and answers.

It was also unclear (and still is) what impact the conference itself would have on the official report of the VCF to the WHCF. We saw no way to have any impact on that report, and so adopted the expedient of drafting our own set of Principles, with which any such report should be consistent. The result was to accentuate the conflict. We would not have had to do that if we had been offered an opportunity to influence task force findings and final recommendations of the conference.

The afternoon discussion groups suffered from the same kind of structural bias that pervaded the TF operations, only more so. All "facilitators" were State employees, and no changes were permitted in the findings discussed. Again, there were no rules under which discussion could be carried on, or recommendations adopted. Consequently, some of the groups broke down into more confrontation than was necessary. The discussion groups may have been useful, however, in communicating to some State employees (who are too often insulated from this kind of feedback) just how much latent resentment there is towards them out in the community at large.

## III. FAMILY ACTION GROUPS

Since the discussants at the afternoon rap sessions are also the "facilitators" of the FAGs (I'm sorry) back in the local communities, and are responsible for the "hearings"

that are to be held around the State in the future, the same criticisms apply. I have no direct experience with any of the FAGs, and what knowledge I have comes from friends who are either on them or would like to be. On the basis of their testimony, it appears that the FAGs are already at work, are overloaded with friends of extension agents, meet without notice to task force members and elected delegates, and are orchestrating events which are less "hearings" than showcases for expanded governmental programs. No doubt we will know more as time goes on, and I will try to keep you informed of my reaction to these developments.

#### IV. THE CONFERENCE REPORT

The writing of an official report of the VCF has to stand as the least representative phase of the entire conference. As I understand it (and again, I would be happy to have further or different information), Dr. Cohen will take the results of the TF operations, take whatever she wants from the public conference, and take whatever she wants from the activities of the FAGs, and will write the official Report of the conference. Since the activities to date have produced a mass of findings, replete with duplication, overlap, and vagueness, Dr. Cohen will have an essentially free hand. That is unfortunate. In my opinion, the elected delegates from the conference should be the ones to write the official report, perhaps operating on the same mass of material. At the least, they should have the opportunity to see the report in draft, and approve its tone and specific recommendations.

This has gone on much longer than I intended, but one thing has led to another. I hope this critique will be taken in the spirit in which it is given. I have no desire for confrontation, do not enjoy conflict, and hope that all men and women of good will can work together for the good of the family. But I feel strongly enough about the principle that the family is an autonomous, organic unit, not really susceptible to nurture from outside, that I am willing to make the kind of effort we made in Fredericksburg. If this letter can contribute to making such efforts unnecessary, so much the better.

I do emphasize that, although I have said "we" throughout this letter, I speak only for myself. I had not official position in the Pro-Family Coalition, and none in any of its constituent elements. I am just an interested citizen.

I would appreciate any additional information on the history and structure of the VCF, and especially on what the plans are for the future. And I will be happy to be of what service I can to you, now or in the future.

Sincerely,

GORDON S. JONES.

[From the National Catholic Register,  
Mar. 30, 1980]

#### DIALOGUE

(Nancy Roach, age twenty-nine, took a joint degree in political science and history from the University of Montana, then worked as a legislative aide to a United States Congressman in the nation's capital. While her physician-husband completed his medical training in the Southwest, Mrs. Roach chaired a pro-life political action committee in Arizona.)

(The couple currently lives in the city of Pasco in Washington State's "Tri-Cities" area and has three children, ranging in age from eleven months to four-and-a-half years.)

(Mrs. Roach recently won two overwhelming votes to chair her area's White House Conference on Families, but officials running the conference refused to recognize her election and replaced her with their own unelected appointee.)

REGISTER. How did you get involved in the White House Family Conference in your area?

ROACH. I was asked by a woman here who has been involved in pro-family efforts for many years. She wanted to have my name placed in nomination at the first planning meeting, Jan. 15, to be the local chairman.

REGISTER. Why did you agree to be nominated?

ROACH. I felt that it was important to have someone in a leadership position who had experience in dealing with pro-family issues and who had experience dealing with the press. And I'm committed to limiting governmental influence in the family. At the first meeting the vote was in my favor, about one-hundred second meeting, about one-hundred-thirty to twenty. At a second meeting, about five-hundred-fifty people supported me, out of about six hundred who were present.

REGISTER. The pro-family people have been described in the national press as right-wing archconservatives, bigots and racists, to mention a few of the accusations by their opponents, such as the pro-abortion Boston Globe columnist Ellen Goodman.

ROACH. The majority of the people at our local conference and throughout the state of Washington sent the word to Washington, D.C. that we want a reduction in governmental programs and we want control returned to the people. Rights that were originally granted to the people have been limited and in some cases eliminated by the judiciary and the federal bureaucracy. This concern was the bond that united us more than any other issue. This couldn't be characterized as an extremist position, by any means.

REGISTER. Jim Guy Tucker, the man appointed by President Carter to be national chairman of the family conference, has been quoted in the press that "right wing" groups want to "blitzkrieg," "steamroller" and "poison" the family conferences. He has also been quoted as being "alarmed" at "the racists" and "bigots"—apparently references to people like yourself.

ROACH. That's so ironic. In our state, control of the delegate selection process comes from the governor, Dixy Lee Ray, and her appointees. The people haven't even been allowed to select the majority of delegates. I understand this is also true nationally. What our detractors are actually disturbed about is that at the local conferences we stayed involved, we worked within the system, we turned out in large numbers and we beat them. We still managed to pass our most important pro-family resolutions. We didn't boycott the local conferences or stay away to plan our own. To think that the supposedly impartial national head of this, Mr. Tucker, would be so willing to attribute base motives to people against the massive federal bureaucracy—I have to say that's really unfortunate for him to behave that way.

REGISTER. You mentioned bureaucrats limiting or eliminating rights a moment ago.

ROACH. Such as the rights of parents to educate their children according to their own values and their religious beliefs. We've seen the Department of HEW—or now it would be the federal Department of Education—promoting what it calls "values clarification" and sex education programs that are nothing but the repetition of Planned Parenthood's attacks on the family and all traditional values. And in the area of parental consent, the judiciary says that parents don't even have to be informed that Planned Parenthood and similar groups are engaged in giving their children contraceptives and abortions.

In addition, looking to the future, we're concerned about the position promoted by the federal Government during the International Year of the Child that would elevate children's rights to the status of rights traditionally granted only to adults.

REGISTER. Are you saying that children have the right to life and shouldn't be aborted, but they don't have any other rights?

ROACH. I'm saying that in a healthy family setting, parents know better about their children's welfare than the children do. The parents' rights to guidance of their children work to the benefit of the children in character formation. If the family setting is unhealthy, there are better ways to help the children than to create a set of rights for them traditionally available only to adults. The tone of the "child's rights" advocates is that in the rearing of children, they should somehow be kept free from any instruction from parents so they can be completely free of any outside influence in making choices. The implication is that parental influence is somehow bad, that children should be raised in a vacuum.

REGISTER. You mean, a vacuum away from the parents?

ROACH. That's right, then the Government can step into the vacuum and provide its own form of guidance. Perhaps the clearest example of this is the idea being established by the U.S. Supreme Court, dealing with the [1979] Massachusetts case, that a judge can decide better than the parents about whether a minor daughter can have an abortion.

REGISTER. Name another family problem.

ROACH. The size of the tax burden that parents currently face, that oftentimes requires mothers to take a job away from the home, and this has an adverse effect on the family. A big issue that was addressed locally in our conference was inflation and the tax burden and there was a resolution calling for a balanced budget.

REGISTER. Most of what you've been saying doesn't seem to have been any concern at all of officials charged with running the conferences, or with some official-sounding voices in the press on what the conference goals should be. I saw one bureaucrat in your area expressing the hope that you'd deal with consumer affairs. The pro-abortion feminists say you have no business talking about abortion or the Equal Rights Amendment.

And John Carr, a conference official and former U.S. Catholic Conference staffer, was just paraphrased in The National Catholic Reporter as saying that you could do little about abortion or the ERA, but could better focus on such matters as "flexible working hours."

ROACH. You have to ask what is more vital than the integrity of the family, which is under such attack today by the pro-abortion-on-demand militants and other anti-family advocates. Failure to have flexible working hours is certainly not the most direct cause of the threats to the family today, and I think Mr. Carr knows that as well as anyone else. It's true, all indicators of the happiness or harmony of a people must be studied, but consumer affairs is hardly the key to the condition of the family today.

You have to ask what is more pertinent to families than the protection of children, or than the relationship of children to their parents. A good number of the problems currently facing families are related to the moral fiber of our nation as a whole. When we talk about increases in the divorce rate, increase in teen-age pregnancy, in sexual activity among teen-agers—I just heard there's a one-hundred-seventeen per cent increase in couples living together outside marriage since 1970. I think that's the figure—all of these things in turn generate serious problems within the family. They directly affect the heart of the family.

Suicide is on the increase, child abuse is climbing dramatically. Our mental health hospitals are filled to overflowing. All this tells us that the family unit is falling because of the pressure of outside challenges, and it needs help. And Mr. Carr thinks it's more appropriate to talk about flexible working hours and overlook a judicial system

creating a structure whereby judges control sixteen-year-olds' abortions, with the parents left out in the cold?

REGISTER. An editorial in *The Seattle Times* commented that Jimmy Carter hardly had to go to the trouble of having all these conferences in order to learn what's troubling the family, and that social-work professionals essentially just talking to each other only give the illusion that something important is being done.

ROACH. That was first-rate.

#### FAMILY VALUES (By Dexter Duggan)

WASHINGTON.—The White House Conference on Families, conceived four years ago to try to deflect the heat of the abortion issue from Presidential hopeful Jimmy Carter, is currently arousing considerable resentment toward the resident of the White House, Jimmy Carter.

Across the nation, pro-family activists complain there is a conscious campaign of suppression directed at them by appointed officials and bureaucrats from the White House level on down.

The situation appears quite different from some portrayals in major news media: that an unscrupulous force of arch-conservatives would steal the White House Conference on Families away from the American people.

Instead, the story is repeatedly told that officials—often government employees—who were appointed to run states' family conferences, have been engaging in undemocratic tactics to insure that pro-family adherents don't win the representation justified by their numbers and participation.

Traditionalists complain of arbitrary, elaborate and frequently-changing rules established by White House conference officials to undercut a pro-family majority in state after state.

One pro-family activist resentfully compared these tactics to a hypothetical situation to which the Republican Party would bar New York City Jewish voters from the polls on election day simply because they traditionally have high political participation and tend to vote for liberal Democrats.

Four years ago, trying to escape criticism over his stand that the U.S. Supreme Court's abortion-on-demand rulings shouldn't be changed, Jimmy Carter proposed an intensive effort to determine what troubles the American family, so families could be helped.

After various controversies the heralded family conference finally got underway in the states in recent months, to culminate in three regional conferences this summer in Baltimore, Minneapolis and Los Angeles.

But many people soon began complaining that officials directing local conferences appeared to be less concerned with discovering what troubled families than they were with promoting a predetermined viewpoint shared by many government careerists.

In Washington state, pro-family leader Nancy Roach said a state bureaucrat told reporters that the early successes of pro-family people in states like Virginia made the bureaucrats decide they had to take away from the people's control the selection of the majority of delegates for the three regional conferences.

(Washington's *Tri-City Herald* reported that family conference official Dick Westgard said that after the results in other state conferences like Virginia's, where pro-family people scored heavy successes, officials decided that having "a particular group so heavily represented does not provide for diversity and does not meet national guidelines . . .")

Mary Driggs, of Baltimore, secretary of United Families of America, told *The Register* in a telephone interview: "All over the country, governors have appointed someone

like a social worker with a liberal point of view to control everything" in preparations for states' conferences.

In Maryland, she said, it was originally announced that twenty delegates would be elected and ten appointed to attend their regional conference, but the number of delegates to be chosen by the people was later cut in half, to ten, while ten were added to the selection-by-appointment column.

Mrs. Driggs said that after pro-family people won all ten of the elected delegate spots in Maryland, it was announced there would be "supplemental" elections. "I've never heard of it in a free country, to reopen the polls when you don't like the results," she said.

A worker with a pro-family lobby in Washington, D.C., referring to the national situation, told *The Register*: "The conference is not running anything at all as smoothly as they (appointed officials and planners) wanted it to. There seems to be a good deal of resistance from people who feel traditional family views are being short-changed . . . In several states the conferences are being sued . . . The suits go right to the heart of what's happening."

In Arizona, pro-family leader Shirley Whitlock said in a telephone interview that pro-family people elected delegates favorable to their view at all six of the Arizona meetings. She said the local National Organization for Women was asking the governor, "to throw out all the delegates we've elected" because they didn't represent homosexual and other types of groupings favored by NOW.

Mrs. Whitlock said that at family conferences around the nation, activists for NOW and similar anti-tradition groups, with the support of government planners and bureaucrats, were pushing to redefine the concept of "family" to include homosexual, bisexual and unmarried heterosexual partners. The anti-traditionalists were claiming the day of the Judeo-Christian family pattern is over, she said.

Once again, complaints are being made—as they were during the preparations for, and staging of, the National Women's Conference in 1977—that militant feminists can't win unless the rules are especially rewritten to give them preference.

Militant feminists are saying that a complete restructuring of the concept of "family" is an important goal. Betty Friedman recently wrote that the "second feminist agenda, the agenda for the Eighties, must call for the restructuring of the institution of home and work." She approvingly quoted the head of NOW's Legal Defense and Education Fund on "the inevitability of continuing future change in the relationships and roles of men, women and children within families."

NOW president Eleanor Smeal wrote last fall that her group, in fighting for homosexuals, "cannot and will not stand by while others try to deny lesbians and gay men their rights or exploit and persecute them for their own fascist ends."

Pro-family activists who thought the government wanted to learn their views said they were especially chagrined that family conference officials seemed not only to want to rebuff their views, but also to impose the very views the pro-family people say are destroying the family—such as the legitimization of permissive abortion and elimination of parental consent.

It appeared that through bureaucratic fiat, only about one-third of family conference delegates from various states would be elected, while the other two-thirds would be appointed through one procedure or another.

One pro-family suggested that since the final recommendations of the conferences would probably be filed away and forgotten any-

way, it would seem smarter politically for the White House to allow the pro-family people to win whatever they fairly could so they'd be content and believe the President really desired their input.

But the way things are working out, he continued, the White House actually seemed to want to build up substantial resentments among pro-family activists convinced they'd been suppressed by Carter-guided elitists—a resentment more than likely to be vented this fall at the polls.

[From the *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, Nov. 29, 1979]

#### FAMILY AFFAIR

For the second time in recent years, government officialdom across the country is cranking up a major series of conferences challenging traditional mores in the private lives of families. In November 1977, a loud majority of delegates to the National Women's Conference gave booming endorsements to liberal policies on abortion, the notion of "homosexual rights," the proposed Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution, and to many new proposals for government intervention into domestic life, including federal programs for battered wives and tax-subsidized day care centers for children. Miffed by this outcome, the minority of social conservatives at that gathering protested that the structure and rules of the conference had been arranged so as to provide for dominance by feminists.

Another organized national discourse on family life began this month in Fredericksburg, where Virginians assembled for the nation's first statewide assembly preliminary to next summer's White House Conference on Families, called by President Carter. Professionals from the social-service bureaucracies had dominated the "task forces" that had been meeting for several months to prepare for the Fredericksburg gathering. Yet when the Virginia conference was over, the elite of the social-work establishment found itself stung by a strong and unexpected demonstration of dissent. Supporters of the more traditional notions of family life attended the conference in the greatest numbers and succeeded in electing from their group 22 of the 24 delegates chosen to represent the commonwealth at the national conference.

Governor Dalton will complete the delegation by appointing another dozen members. The conservatives meanwhile are celebrating only a partial victory, because they say the Virginia conference's report to state and federal officials will be controlled not by the elected delegates but by the conference's organizers.

The primary matter of contention at this stage of the White House Conference on Families is the very definition of "family." The traditionalists insist that a family "consists of persons who are related by blood, marriage or adoption." Others are pressing to have "family" status acknowledged as applying to men and women joined outside of wedlock in "living together relationships," to "gay couples," to "lesbian and other shared households," to avant-garde communes, and so forth.

Apace with the gollop of social change and concomitant habits of tolerance during recent years, such unconventional living arrangements have become more commonplace. But their mere proliferation does not make them authentic "families." Through the eyes of commonsense, a pair of lesbians living together can be seen as no more a true example of a family than a threesome of college students sharing an apartment or a brigade of soldiers billeted together. The traditionalists correctly insist on their definition as the first bulwark in protecting the integrity and primacy of the family as a

social unit. That insistence no more tends to deny "rights" to homosexuals than it does to college roommates or to soldiers.

The second major controversy is over the role of government in family life. The conference organizers tend to have a vested interest in government intervention into domestic matters, and no doubt most of them are convinced that such intervention is nearly always benign. The conservative forces are expressing a sensible skepticism about suggestions that Uncle Sam don the nanny's apron.

As further hearings and meetings leading up to next summer's White House conference take place, they will be worthy of careful attention by heads of families. For the conference represents a considerable movement to put more responsibility for "human services" in the hands of government, a movement that could weaken the social bonds of the family even as it professes to be the family's great protector."

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press, Mar. 12, 1980]

#### GEORGIA FAMILY MEET DESCRIBED AS "FARCE"

To the families of Georgia:

Saturday, March 8, the devil rode rampant in Georgia, striking down traditional family lifestyles.

I was a delegate on the ballot for the Georgia White House Conference on families. Here are some resolutions that are final and they will be sent to Washington, D.C. as representing the families of Georgia:

- (1) Homosexuals are a family!
- (2) Homosexuals are a minority family—so they will get extra funding and priorities as a minority group, which means if this is passed in Washington you will be seeing homosexuals teaching our children in school and expressing their lifestyles. This will be mandatory.
- (3) More liberal abortions law with greatly increased funding for free abortions.
- (4) More funding of family planning programs. As you already know, any girl 11 and older can have an abortion or receive contraceptives at our health clinics without parental consent. They want the law changed so that any 8-year-old can receive family planning, most probably in our public elementary schools.
- (5) More funding and greatly enlarged day-care center programs to get more mothers out of the home.
- (6) A mandatory four-day work week, another ploy to get more mothers out of the home and into the workforce. A husband cannot support a family on four days of work.

This conference was a farce staged and manipulated by federal bureaucrats, there were huge voting blocs from NASW, NEA, NAACP, EOA, HUD and many other social workers. The pro-family people were outnumbered.

There were 10 workshops. You were allowed to go to only one workshop of your choice. I went to the "Family Value System," which had a majority of Christian pro-family people. When asked to have the term family defined, the Episcopal minister that was in charge of this workshop said that it was against parliamentary proceedings and that we could not define what a family was.

The other traditional nominated delegate from Northwest Georgia, a man, went to the workshop "Community Support for the Family." They had a majority of Lesbians, social workers, homosexuals, etc. and only nine pro-family people.

They were allowed to define family, and they defined it to include homosexuals.

So 40-plus people in Georgia decided homosexuals were a family, for the whole state of Georgia.

This was a ramrod job, and it was spearheaded by President Carter, Gov. Busbee, and C. Randy Humphreys.

I congratulate Gov. Fob James in Alabama for not having this farce of a conference happen there.

Out of 10 delegates only two traditional delegates were picked; the other eight were liberal radicals. Gov. Busbee still has to pick 26 more delegates.

I implore all the Christian traditional families to write Gov. Busbee, Mr. Humphreys, an your local state and federal representatives telling your opposition to these resolutions, and asking him to pick pro-family delegates to represent the good Christian people of Georgia.

Mr. Humphreys can be reached at the office of the governor, Georgia State Capitol, Atlanta, Ga. 20334.

For your families, please stop this onslaught against Christian values.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal, Mar. 12, 1980]

#### STATE CONFERENCE SAYS HOMOSEXUAL FAMILY CAN BE HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT

(By Susan Wells)

ATHENS.—A statewide conference that has spawned some controversy has voted to tell the White House that the homosexual family pattern is a viable lifestyle.

Meeting in Athens last weekend, the Georgia White House Conference on Families voted on a wide-ranging list of priorities for President Carter to consider in policies on families.

Among them was a resolution to encourage community support for the family and to enhance healthy family living.

The conference encouraged federal, state and local governments to "develop mechanisms to enhance community understanding of and appreciation for the variety of family patterns possible. Among these are the nuclear family, the adoptive family, the foster family and the single-parent family."

The conference then passed a special resolution to include homosexual families in that list of diverse family patterns.

"I think this will be the most controversial issue dealt with by the conference. I have already started receiving telegrams on that one from the people who are upset," said Randy Humphrey, state coordinator of the conference.

But, he said, the action of the conference is binding, and the resolution on homosexual families would be sent to Washington no matter what the reaction.

The conference also passed resolutions favoring daycare for children of working mothers and for mothers on welfare, increased aid for the elderly, emphasis on the family in education, more consideration for families in the legal system, support for crisis centers for battered wives and children and suggestions for families on how to use the media to enhance their families.

The conference was marred by a hot controversy between the organizers of the conference, feminists and other liberal groups and a group of conservative women.

The conservative women, representing such groups as the Eagle Forum, Mothers on the March and Stop-ERA, complained that they were shut out of the voting for delegates to attend the Washington family conference in June and shut out of discussions on the various issues at the Georgia conference.

"I am appalled that this country is succumbing to pressure from these radical groups," said Sue Deadwiler, state coordinator for the Eagle Forum, a group of anti-feminists headed by Phyllis Schlafly of Illinois.

"The pro-family groups were squelched. The conference was so controlled by the

radicals that it could not be representative of the thinking statewide," she said.

Polly Williams, another conservative participant, said, "The conference was so mixed up. If you were a feminist, everything was fine. But we weren't given anything in advance. We didn't know who to vote for or what issues would be discussed.

"I was disillusioned. The views that came out of this thing were not representative of pro-family people," Mrs. Williams said. She said she and some of her colleagues were not allowed to leave their workshop to vote for delegates, and when they tried to turn their ballots in late, they were not accepted.

But Ruth Lee, chair of the elections committee and director of the County Welfare Association, said every effort was made to include everyone's point of view in the Athens conference.

"If their feeling (the conservatives) had been the feeling of the conference, you would have seen their delegates elected," Mrs. Lee said. Several of the alternates, but none of the delegates, represented the conservative position.

Feminist Action Alliance President Kay Kornmeier said she was pleased with the way the conference came out and the fact that the conservative women were not able to control it. "Their agenda was to get the conference shut down," Ms. Kornmeier said.

"We certainly think their point of view should be included. They were not shut out. If anything, they seemed more organized than us (feminists)," she said.

The feminists and the conservatives did agree on one thing—that the conference was poorly organized.

MARCH 21, 1980.

DEAR GOVERNOR DREYFUS: I am writing to you in regards to the Wis. Gov's Conference on Children and Families. You were not there as I was and so I request that you take the time to give consideration to what I have to say. I do not intend to advocate for one side or the other as far as the decisions that came out of the conference, my concern is in regards as to how the conference was conducted.

Individuals were initially grouped into small groups and they were led in these groups by trained Facilitators, individuals who had received intensive training at workshops prior to the Conference. The Institute of Cultural Affairs, 1016 North 9th Street, Milwaukee, was the group that trained the facilitators for the role they played in the Gov's Conference. (Documentation available)

A key word in the role of the facilitator was to bring the group they were in charge of to a consensus. It should be noted that when my husband, an educated adult, a physician, suggested that his group resolve issues by voting he was reprimanded as though he were a child by the facilitator. This effectively isolated him from his group as this was done with great emotion deterring anyone else from putting themselves in a position to be the object of such disciplinary action by their facilitator. Question? What is wrong with voting? The facilitator took this opportunity to make it clear that they were hunting for a consensus and that was not to be mistaken for the will of the majority, this was repeated often. I was in a position to visit many different groups and observed the same tactic being used consistently. Question? Other states allowed their delegates to discuss the issue of how they would define family, this freedom was denied Wis. delegates, why?

You addressed the Conference and asked us to respect diversity. In the Conference diversity was not permitted, delegates were at all times directed by facilitators to dismiss

diversity and come to a level where they could agree not to disagree.

Sir, when we agree not to disagree on issues that deal with opposite views on moral issues: affecting our families we have had our freedom of expression taken away from us, this is exactly what happened to both sides on all issues at the Gov's conference.

There is no doubt in my mind that had controlling tactics not been used to orchestrate the convention it would have been possible for both sides to have issued position papers that reflected their views. These papers may have not agreed but they would have been honest and you would have seen the diverse views you asked us to respect.

How long would you have tolerated this system? I saw businessmen cry out in frustration not over the results but the method. Many had become to accept that the results were pre determined and all that was sought was their support. I saw grandmothers who were delegates, come close to tears as they expressed they had come to have in put but slowly had realized it was not possible or wanted.

The frustrations with the dis-organization and manipulative system became so intense that in the general sessions individuals violated the format and rose to their feet to protest. They were told at one of these outbursts that their role was to be an effective listener—'s that what you call having an input.

Individual sections made reports that were distorted in the final printed form. One group wished to stress worship as the key word so they said stressing spiritual strengths, it came out through the bureaucracy as weekly family discussions. Another group wanted to resist government interference and control and their statement was printed up as more Government Involvement!

As far as government involvement with the children is concerned you should have seen what happened at your conference with the children. By Tuesday morning the expert facilitator in charge of the children was reduced to an emotional display of tears after she apologized for yelling and shoving the children around. She had admitted earlier that they had lost control of the children. This is how the Gov't can take over the role of the family and lose control in just 3 days!

I am not blaming the individuals involved with the children for what happened, it seemed inevitable considering the lack of organization and cooperation they got. For two days the children hung on to this process in anticipation of the lunch they were to have with you on Tuesday when many planned to tell you something and some even had some questions for you. The lunch for the children, like the press conference for the media following your speech just never took place.

In brief, disorganization and manipulation was the theme of this conference as far as implementation was concerned. A respect for diversity of views was impossible as an outcome because individuals were coached to set aside their differences and work from that point.

Yes, I have a position, as article 10 of the Constitution reads these powers (dealing with families) should be left to the people and the states not a federal conference, however, that is not the point of this letter, my concern here is that both sides were had!

It was my privilege to also attend an advance national planning meeting on this conference and I would be glad to share with you how specific discussion at that meeting also centered on how to control this conference. I ask you to seriously consider my comments and challenge them if you wish, I stand prepared to document my position as I see it.

Respectfully,

JIL WILSON.

CXXVI—676—Part 9

[From the Idaho Statesman, Mar. 21, 1980]  
FAMILY DELEGATE RESOLUTION OK'D

The House narrowly passed a resolution Thursday calling for "the free and open election" of delegates to the 1980 White House Conference on Families.

The vote on House Concurrent Resolution 50, which now goes to the Senate was 37 to 30. The measure is sponsored by Rep. Wendy Ungricht, R-Boise.

HCR50 also says that people should have equal opportunity to become delegate to the conferences "whatever their race, sex, religion, political affiliation, age, ideological orientation or economic group."

The measure criticized "random selection of delegates" as a thin disguise for planning Committee appointment amounting to a 100 percent-appointed delegation by disallowing individual participation through peer election."

Ungricht said free and open election of delegates was the only way to ensure that Idaho's delegates support what she called the traditional concept of the family as a unit related by blood, through marriage or adoption.

She said the Carter administration's rules for the family conferences, which will be held across the nation this summer, call for inclusion of delegates representing "diverse family forms." She indicated that could include delegates who are homosexuals.

Ungricht said she has never said Gov. John Evans would appoint homosexual delegates, as reports earlier this week implied.

"I have no personal quarrel with the integrity of the governor," she said. "My quarrel is with the system itself. Statements suggesting that I believe the governor would appoint a homosexual delegate to the White House Conference are an obvious attempt to sensationalize the issue."

She also said HCR50's "free and open election" of delegates need not cause the state extra expense.

Other states have held conventions for selection of delegates, with persons attending paying a fee that covers expenses of the meeting, she said.

[From the Christian Citizen, Mar. 7, 1980]  
WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE—IS IT GOING TO BE IWY REVISITED?

(By Laura Canning)

It looks like President Carter's White House Conference on the Family (WHCF) is shaping into an "IWY revisited" in the words of Rosemary Thompson, of Illinois, a former International Women's Year Delegate (1977) and opponent of the WHCF's pro-abortion feminist and libertine leanings.

"At IWY in the name of women's rights, they called for ERA, abortion, gay rights, federal day care . . . to name a few. Now comes the White House Conference on Families and at the regional hearings around the country, in the name of strengthening the family, we are told that we need ERA, National Health Insurance, the whole ball of wax. So it appears that the WHCF is intending to implement the resolutions that came out of IWY," said Thompson.

Not only are the anti-life, anti-traditional-family factions again represented and in charge, there is also a concentrated attempt on the part of Conference planners from the National Advisory Committee, right on down to the state planners, to exclude pro-family organizations and individuals from participation.

The National Advisory Committee, composed of 41 Carter appointees, is predominantly anti-family in outlook. Pro-life, pro-family delegates nationwide are angered that the NAC's membership is not representative of grassroots American families, but are drawn from feminists groups and government bureaucrats with interest in

greater government spending and intervention into family life. Only one of the 41 conservative on family-related issues. Backing up the NAC and in close contact with it is the Coalition for the White House Conference on the Family, which includes the following organizations: Zero Population Growth, Planned Parenthood, National Gay Task Force, the YWCA, American Association of Sex Educators, and the National Alliance for Optional Parenthood.

#### DELEGATE SELECTION RIGGED

A large part of the problem seems to be the plain for delegate selection. Originally, the idea was that each state would elect at least 30 percent of its delegates, called "peer election"; 30 percent was to be governor-appointed, and the remaining 40 percent was to be chosen as the individual states so chose. However, when Virginia adopted a plan of 70 percent peer election in the interest of democracy, and 30 percent appointment by the governor, and elected 22 out of 24 from the pro-life, pro-family contingency, WHCF decided it was time to employ "New Speak". Peer election was changed to read and mean "random selection". "Nomination forms" were to be completed and returned to the state coordinator (appointed by the federal government's NAC) who would then screen them to insure balance among delegates as to race, sex, marital status, geographic background, and economic status. Critics naturally have charged that ideological orientation would also be screened and pro-life and pro-family candidates could neatly be excluded. Conservatives have run into constant stumbling blocks with state planners.

In Illinois, just as with the IWY, deliberately poor publicity to pro-family groups regarding date, time, place and eligibility of delegates was common. In fact, a letter answering inquiries dated February 1 announced that deadlines for delegate registration was January 31.

In New York, one pro-life coordinator from Brooklyn, Evelyn Aquila said that at her regional meeting in Fordham, pro-life persons tried to register, but were turned down. Mrs. Aquila charged bias both in selection of delegates by the nominating committee and in who was allowed to register. Anyone who indicated a religious preference on his or her resume was turned down. When the state coordinator, Eileen Margolin, an aide to Governor Carey, was asked if even one of the 24 elected delegates espoused the belief that abortion is a sin against God and man, she replied "Nobody like that got elected."

Senator John Marchi (Rep. Staten Island), who chairs the Senate Finance Committee has said that unless Governor Hugh Carey appoints more traditional pro-family people to the state delegation, he will urge rejection of the state's \$200,000 budget for the state convention.

In Pennsylvania, some pro-family groups took the position of protesting the state conference, while others decided to actively participate in it and try to change it from within. State planners in Pennsylvania said that applicants won't be asked about political affiliation or ideology and that nothing would prevent a single person, a homosexual, or a member of an unmarried couple or communal family from becoming a delegate. State planner Marian Bass said Pennsylvania is looking for a "balanced delegation" representative of the "diversity of families in the state."

Maryland's pro-family group, called Families Associated in Maryland (FAM), ran candidates in all five regional conferences held in Maryland, with pro-life, pro-family voters turning out statewide to elect 8 out of 10 FAM delegates. The other two delegates made pro-life statements also, but were not associated with FAM. Mrs. Mimi Szep, coordinator of FAM, said Gov. Harry Hughes should recognize the will of the majority and appoint

the other 20 delegates to represent Maryland at the WHFC.

The White House Conference on the Family will culminate all of its state meetings at three national sessions in Baltimore, Minnesota, and Los Angeles in June and July. Even if pro-life forces do manage a majority of persons representing traditional family values as delegates, the risk remains that the outcome in pro-family representation is still dependent upon governors' appointments and the benevolence or antagonism of state planners in the "random selection" process. And even if pro-family, pro-life won out there, the fact remains that it is still the bureaucrats, and feminists, the population planners' conference. The opposition can pull the IWY stunt at the last minute and elect enough "at large" delegates to tip the scale back their way again. The liberals may be in control of the microphones when the Big Three meetings occur this summer, and have proven in Houston at IWY to be master manipulators of twisting parliamentary procedure, thus effectively muffling pro-lifers even if some by chance do get delegates to speak. The test is whether pro-family learned its lesson well enough in Houston to beat the enemy at its own game.

[From the White Plains (N.Y.) Reporter  
Dispatcher, Feb. 22, 1980]

**WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON FAMILIES**  
(By Barbara Woller Lowrie)

The needs of families in the 1980s, including what will happen if women are drafted and tax breaks for families who care for the handicapped or disabled in their homes, will be among the topics discussed at the Governor's Conference on Families, from Saturday, Feb. 23, through Monday, Feb. 25.

The meeting will take place at the Convention Center in Albany and is a prelude to the White House Conference on Families which will be held in June and July in Baltimore, Minneapolis and Los Angeles.

At the Albany gathering, the 123-member New York State delegation (56 delegates elected; 67 appointed by Gov. Hugh Carey) will also focus on single parents, easing in federal policies to allow lower and middle income families to buy single-family homes, flexible working hours ("flextime") to allow parents to meet family as well as job demands, and child care services as more and more middle class women after the work force.

President Jimmy Carter said he called for the national forum "to examine the difficulties they face and the ways in which family life is affected by public policies." White House figures, which he cited to back up the need for the conference, show that two out of five marriages end in divorce and that nearly every other child born today can expect to spend a large part of his life before age 18 in a one-parent family.

From the beginning, however, the White House Conference on Families has run into opposition from conservative organizations, groups opposed to abortion and the Equal Rights Amendment, and fundamental religious bodies who fear it will create too much government interference in family life. Carter had earlier named Patsy Fleming, a divorced mother, to head the conference, but opposition from right-wing factions forced her to resign. The current head of the conference is Jim Guy Tucker, a married man, a lawyer and a former Arkansas Congressman.

But the opposition continues. Last week, Gov. Forrest H. James Jr., of Alabama, decided that his state will not take part in the national forum. He said he made the recommendation after discussion with his wife, Bobbie James, who felt the convention is not operating under traditional religious values regarding family life.

In some other states, such as Virginia and Oklahoma, conservative forces have taken over most or all of the delegate spots. Ilene Margolin, coordinator of the New York State conference, said there was no takeover by any one interest group in New York and that "my impression is that it is an incredible cross-section of people with large numbers of minorities and every kind of family imaginable (as well as) all ethnic and religious groups. It looks balanced. I'm very pleased."

Ms. Margolin, who is also executive director of the state's Council on Children and Families, said that some 5,500 persons attended five conferences throughout New York State in January and February. She said that she prevented a takeover of the delegation by any one interest group by closely following the White House Conference affirmative action guidelines and advertising and using mailing lists and church bulletins from throughout the state. As a result, she said, "we made it impossible for any one extremist group to take over the rights of all."

Mario Cuomo, New York State's lieutenant governor, is also a deputy chairperson of the White House conference. Because of situations in states such as Virginia and Oklahoma, Cuomo said, "The New York delegation must carry much of the load on issues such as abortion, day care and homosexuality. Unless the New York delegation does this, (these issues) might not be brought up. We are unique. Many topics can be discussed here."

Cuomo said that both the traditional and the "modern family," including those with one parent or no children, are in trouble. He added that from the White House conference "I want a continuing, persistent commitment by government to all kinds of families."

The regional meeting at Fordham University at Lincoln Center was one of five meetings held throughout the state. Persons at the event ranged from members of organizations as diverse as the Conservative Caucus and the Coalition of Grass Roots Women and included leaders of these organizations, leaders in area agencies and "interested citizens." Workshops attended by some 1,500 people focused on health care, education and after-school services, problems of immigrant families, divorce and custody law, alcoholism, maternity-paternity leave and domestic violence.

One of the luminaries at the Fordham conference was Betty Friedan, author of "The Feminine Mystique," who took part in a workshop on "Growing Up in the '80s."

"I want to talk of today's family mystique," said Ms. Friedan. "It's American nostalgia . . . the man as bread-winner, mother as housewife and two children who always seem to be under 6. There's a hypocritical use of the word 'family' today."

She added that this type of "traditional" family represents only seven percent of families today. Ms. Friedan also said "everybody has a right to a family" and the first priority of the conference should be passage of the Equal Rights Amendment. In addition, she called for changes in maternity-paternity leave and for flextime to allow parents to bring children "responsibly and joyously" into the world.

Ms. Margolin posed a thought which was expressed by many people in various ways at Fordham: "From this conference will there be tangible results or just another pretty report that goes on a shelf? The answer rests with us all."

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 23, 1980]

**FEDERAL FAMILY INTERVENTION SLAMMED**  
(By Barbara McIntosh)

Anti-abortion, anti-feminist, fundamentalist church and other conservative groups came out in force Friday to support their vision of the "traditional family" and to lam-

bast the federal government for intervention in family matters at the first of several Texas forums designed to help determine the agenda for the upcoming White House Conference on Families.

More than 100 people expressed their views to members of the Texas Advisory Committee at First Presbyterian Church, Friday. The majority insisted that a family should be defined as "a mother, father and their natural or adopted children." Judeo-Christian ethics were emphasized; humanism, homosexuality, and the drafting of women decried and parental rights defended.

A smaller number spoke in support of federal funding of day care, the Equal Rights Amendment, a more liberal definition of family, greater recognition of the needs of single parents and more government services to support and sustain families.

Almost every speaker agreed that the American family was in trouble and was facing increasingly complex problems and pressures. A troubled economy was seen as one of the gravest threats.

The information resulting from the forums in Texas and other states will help develop topics and recommendations for the White House conference to be conducted this summer. This already controversial national conference stems from a 1976 campaign pledge by President Carter. Its proposed purpose is "to determine the strengths of American families, the difficulties they face and the ways in which family life is affected by public policies."

Testimony at the Texas hearings is especially important since the state advisory committee will determine from it whether or not there is a consensus viewpoint. If they decide there is, then they will ask delegates to the national convention to vote in accordance with it. Rita Clements, wife of governor Bill Clements, who attended part of the hearing, said she "was sure Texas delegates will articulate that viewpoint" even though they cannot actually be required to.

After listening to testimony Friday, Judge Carol Higley Lane, an advisory committee member, observed that locally "there does seem to be an attempt to overload the forum with the conservative viewpoint." Jim Guy Tucker, national chairman of the conference, has expressed concern that a "pro-family" coalition will dominate the national conference. Three states besides Texas have had hearings so far and two of them—Virginia and Oklahoma—have been dominated by "pro-family" forces.

Several conservative speakers, however, openly criticized the idea they are "taking over."

"Tucker is saying that we are out of the mainstream," Patti Johnson objected. "We are the mainstream and we are sick and tired of sitting back." Johnson, and a few other speakers, favored Texas withdrawing from the national conference, as Alabama has. They fear it will be "rigged" at the national level by pro-ERA, pro-abortion liberals "like International Year of the Child and International Woman's Year was." Some feel it is an intrusion for the government to even conduct a conference on family life.

Former Houston Woman's Advocate Nikki Van Hightower partially attributes the conservative showing in the family forums thus far as "a backlash to International Woman's year." She says one reason more feminists haven't come out "is they are disillusioned with the good of such conventions. We made many suggestions at International Women's Year and nothing much has come of it."

Advisory committee member Marie Oser emphasizes that Texans still have time to testify and possibly be chosen as delegates to the segment of the national convention to be conducted in July in Los Angeles.

Texas will send 78 delegates to the conference. The governor will appoint 53 dele-

gates and the remainder will be chosen by a drawing to be held by March 31. Any Texan who wishes to nominate himself or herself as a delegate is eligible. Forms for nominating delegates are available at forums.

The Houston forum continues Saturday, 10 a.m.-2 p.m. at the First Presbyterian Church. Forums will also be conducted Feb. 26 at San Marcos Academy in San Marcos; March 1 at the Skyline High School in Dallas; March 4 at Texas A&M Experimental Station Auditorium in Weslaco and March 8 at the Civic Center in Lubbock. All these forums will be 8:30 a.m.-9:30 p.m.

Texans with ideas and suggestions may write to Clements at White House Conference on Families, Office of the Governor, State Capitol, Austin, Texas, 78711. There will also be a telephone hotline to the governor's office Feb. 22-March 7, except on the weekend. Anyone may offer suggestions on family life by calling 1-800-252-9600. Area residents may also call Family Service Center's hotline at 524-3881.

#### WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON FAMILIES

To John Carr, Director, White House Conference.

From George Willeford, M.D., State Coordinator.

Texans were requested in various ways to participate in state activities to work on the White House Conference on Families Goals and Objectives. The Governor asked me to be his State Coordinator and designated Jonathan Hole as director. After that he appointed a 26 member advisory committee to assist in the project. Guadalupe Gibson, your Deputy Chairperson also served as an ex-officio member. Committee members not only helped directly with organizing the regional forums but used their own communication channels and networks to inform the public.

Our office communicated in the following ways: (1) contacted 900 organizations, (2) communicated to members of the Texas Conference of Churches, (3) special notices sent to all Texas newspaper editors, (4) TV slides/spots and radio spots to all stations, (5) advertised in 45 major newspapers, (6) informed county judges and city officials through the Texas Municipal League, (7) asked all state legislators and the Texas delegation to inform their constituents and requested their participation as hearing officers, (8) the Texas Research League contacted 1500 of the top business executives in their memberships, (9) family service agencies conducted surveys and operated hotlines, (10) contacted State agency heads whose agencies have an impact on families.

The Texas Department of Human Resources provided the funds and staff persons for the effort with staff assistance from the Texas Department of Community Affairs, Texas Department of Labor and Standards and volunteers. Polly Sowell, the Director of the Governor's Office of Volunteer Services provided excellent support and assistance.

Texas chose to use a random drawing for the selection of 25 of the delegates. The Texas Bank agreed to pick the delegates from 5 geographical areas represented by the 5 regional forums. Out of 2552 names submitted, 4 were black, 5 were Mexican American and 1 native American. This corresponds to the ethnic breakdown of the Texas population. The ballots which appeared in Texas newspapers were also available at the forums.

The following topics and issues were forwarded by the 3415 Texans who responded to the request to describe their feelings regarding the Texas family. Most, 1701, sent letters indicating their concerns, 1370 provided oral testimony at one of the five open forums held across the state, the remaining 344 made use of one of the 6 hotlines, including 1 which was statewide. All of the information received by the 14th of March was utilized in developing the report. The public was asked to submit material by March 7.

Each issue referenced (sex education in school, anti-ERA, government intrusion into education, etc.) was recorded and tallied. The final summation of references was utilized to develop the topic areas and the issues found within them. There was a total of 10,567 references to approximately 168 individual issues. On the average, participants referred to 3.1 separate issues in the course of their testimony, call, or correspondence. Total issues referenced in the report were 8,557. This represents 81.9 percent of all references.

By number of references the ten top issues in Texas were: (1) Traditional family definition (707); (2) Pro-life—anti-abortion (698); (3) Government intrusion into family life (642); (4) Inflation (637); (5) Anti-ERA (572); (6) Anti-sex information in public schools system (516); (7) Government intrusion into education (497); (8) Anti-federal day care (482); (9) Anti-teaching of secular humanism (440); and (10) Concerns about the declining morality (427).

In the top 30 issues referenced in Texas, we included all but three in its top ten topics. The three not included were: Women's issues: rank order No. 15, 196 references to various issues such as anti-drafting of women, pro-equal wages, and health and child care concerns. These could not fit together into other specific code areas and its breadth made it impossible to use. Definition of family: rank order No. 29, 75 references was also to broad to be a real use in providing a definition. The pro-feminist (ERA): rank order No. 24, 89 references, did not appear to warrant inclusion because of its low response value as compared with the anti-ERA references.

We did include some issues below the rank order No. 30. These were: homemaker benefits: rank order No. 33, 55 references in financial concerns; availability of child care: rank order No. 35, 54 references; family violence: rank order No. 36, references 50; marriage penalty: rank order No. 46, references 34, under taxes in financial concerns; flex-time: rank order No. 50, 28 references; spouse abuse: rank order No. 51, references 27, was put under family crisis in the issue on divorce. Substance abuse by youth: rank order No. 73 with 15 references was placed under family crisis under substance abuse.

We chose to put some of these issues together under broader topics. Pro-life (No. 2), anti-ERA (No. 5) and pro-family protection act (Laxalt Bill) (No. 18) came together to form a topic called Government Legislation, which by tallying the references became the number one topic in the state report.

No guidelines or procedures were given for states to respond in the area of Family Strengths. Therefore we offer the following assessment from the Texas responses. Of those replying to the question, "What makes your family strong?"

Fifty two percent said strong religious commitment and practices.

Fourteen percent said mutual love and respect.

Thirteen percent said good communications.

Eleven percent said commitment to the family unit.

Five percent said maintain discipline.

Five percent said outside activities.

The democratic process has been overriden and nullified by a select group of special interests. The candidates elected by thousands of Arizona residents to represent them at the National White House Conference on Families (WHCF) to be held this July in Los Angeles were not given primary consideration by the Delegate Selection Committee (DSC).

The result of a meeting of the DSC on March 20 was a list of six primary and six secondary candidates, from which the Steering Committee will choose six delegates and six alternates. Only one of the primary six

and two of the secondary six were elected at the hearings. Originally, the DSC were to draw up a list of 18 candidates to submit to the Steering Committee. The six elected delegates were to assist in this process. They were not notified of the meeting until the day before it took place, and only one was able to attend on such short notice. She was not given a vote. It is difficult to understand how she could "assist", since all the criteria were pre-determined, and no outside evidence of the qualifications of people was considered. It was, of course, well-known that all six elected delegates represented a pro-family point of view. Furthermore, out of 18 members of the DSC, three were known to have supported pro-family attitudes, and they alone did not receive notification of the meeting at all, while all others did. It is hard to draw from this any other conclusion than that there was a deliberate attempt to exclude them.

According to the official rules, the DSC was to "give priority to names of those receiving the second, third, fourth and fifth number of votes. . . ." At the meeting the majority of the DSC decided to override that directive, and give priority to the demographic distribution. This meant that they did not even consider any duly-elected nominees from any counties other than Maricopa and Pima. If the demographic criterion was so important, it is difficult to understand why it was not considered more carefully when planning the divisions of the hearings. This is a clear instance of the rules being changed in the middle of the game, in the favor of people who were not elected by the populace.

While the original plan was that the DSC choose 18, from which the Steering Committee was to choose six delegates and six alternates, at the meeting it was decided to only choose 12, and these were placed in two groups of six, one to be given priority. There is no evidence that the DSC was to make further recommendations to the Steering Committee other than a simple list of 18, but they have in essence done the job of the Steering Committee. Of the six people on the primary list, only one received enough votes to warrant consideration.

Several other irregularities occurred in the meeting itself. During a discussion of Frank Williams, his income, which he had claimed as \$10,000-\$19,000 was questioned. Someone said he must not have included his wife's income, as was required. No one seemed to know about his personal finances, however, so the issue was dropped. Some members of the Committee felt that he was more qualified than another candidate because, while most of their credentials were similar, Mr. Williams had been divorced, and thus supposedly could identify better with the divorced community than the other candidate, who has stayed happily married to one wife.

Pro-family people brought in two additional tables from a nearby church, thereby allowing those who wished to browse through literature, but not hold up those who wanted to vote. The line immediately reduced to reasonable proportions. WHCF leaders at the Tucson hearing continually asked pro-family people how many people were coming, because more people came than they had ballots for. There was obviously no way of knowing, but it seemed strange to be "blamed" for high citizen participation.

The day after the meeting, over 25 members of the Arizona Pro-Family Coalition assembled at the governor's office in Phoenix to complain about the deceit and political tricks being employed by his WHCF Delegate Selection Committee. Governor Babbitt refused to meet with them, but said through a spokesman that the governor would not interfere with the committee's work. He also refused to meet with the pro-family representatives at any time in the future.

The Pro-Family Coalition is considering legal action in an attempt to block the DCS's nominations. If Governor Babbitt won't stop this patently unfair and undemocratic procedure, perhaps the courts will.

THE EXECUTIVE MANSION,

Montgomery, Ala., February 10, 1980.

MR. JIM GUY TUCKER,  
Chairperson, White House Conference on Families, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TUCKER: We have decided not to participate in the White House Conference on Families, but rather to continue emphasis on the family and children begun in 1979 by the Commission for the Year of the Child in our state.

A needs assessment has been made and now that data is near completion, we have chosen to build on this information to provide positive leadership and programs for the families of Alabama.

As we discussed by phone, there is no definitive definition of "what is a family", no absolute standards emanating from the White House Conference on Families' Advisory Committee which leaves the conference to chance that traditional Judeo-Christian family values would be the consensus. Terminology used in White House guidelines such as "family stereotypes", differences in structure and lifestyle", along with mandated instructions that state delegations be selected without regard to "sexual orientation", very frankly, are offensive to my husband and me, and in no way reflect either the law of the land, or the kind of conference that would reflect the basic concepts of most Alabamians.

As a sacred trust to the people of Alabama, we respectfully regret that our state will not participate in this or other such conferences which do not establish traditional Judeo-Christian values concerning the family, the foundation of our nation under God.

It has been suggested by one unsung heroine, that "the White House is the defender of the Word of God for all nations".

May it become so.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. Fob James, Jr.

WE HAVE SEEN ALL THIS BEFORE: THE INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S YEAR

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is little in the White House Conference on Families that we did not see foreshadowed a few years ago in the National Women's Conference, convened in Houston in November 1977. That federally funded enterprise set the pattern for Carter conferences and commissions. It established the antifamily credentials of the administration, and its details are worth remembering as a prelude to the upcoming family conference.

The State IWY conferences leading up to the convention in Houston were run by the same kinds of people whom Jim Guy Tucker is trying to keep in charge of the State family conferences this year: an interlocked elite of professionals, leftist activists, and Government employees and appointees. They included such Carter appointees as Bella Abzug, Gloria Steinem, Eleanor Smeal, and Jean O'Leary. When challenged or questioned they used a range of dirty tricks that could have outdone Gordon Liddy.

In State after State, the Carterite feminists pushed aside profamily women. In North Carolina, sincere offers of assistance in organizing and planning were stalled and rejected because they came from profamily women. When the North Carolina conference met to vote on resolutions and delegates to the Houston meeting, the organizers decided, after

midnight Saturday, that a revote was necessary. This they scheduled for Sunday, which happened to be Father's Day. Profamily delegates were thus surprised by a revote, which many of them never knew was underway.

In California, the State conference was a travesty. Prominent church women's groups were not invited to attend. There was personal harassment and intimidation of those who did not agree with the militant feminist viewpoint. A literature table offering prolife material was stormed by a large group of lesbians.

Registration packets were often incomplete. Workshops were moved from place to place, confusing delegates. During the voting on resolutions, delegates having grievances with the procedures were told by the chairman to go to another part of the building to register their complaints. While they did, the voting continued nonetheless. When points of order were raised against this procedure, they were ruled out of order.

One workshop on "health care for all" was at the last minute changed into the "self-help clinic." In order to vote on that workshop's resolutions, delegates had to sit through lesbian propaganda films.

Floor nominations for delegates were abruptly closed. Microphones were unplugged. The organizing feminists directed their agents by means of monitors and beepers so that they could secure a majority in any workshop where their plans were threatened. Voting boxes were left unattended. One wonders how much of this will be repeated in the State conferences on families.

In Georgia, conference organizers refused to present a balanced program of speakers in the workshops. Members of the press were upbraided because they dared to cover the press conferences held by critics of the gathering.

In Idaho, anti-ERA women were excluded from direct IWY communication. The highly structured workshops offered little chance for grassroots participants to decide anything, especially when they were asked to vote on prewritten summaries of recommendations already drafted in Washington.

In Illinois, times and methods for registration fluctuated at the whim of conference organizers. Microphones were unplugged or covered to silence dissenters, a film produced by the Socialist Party was shown, and literature was sold or distributed, with IWY approval, that included "Growing Up Gay," and sexually explicit material.

In Michigan, advance notice was given to the supporters of ERA so that three of them were able to control the mikes for 50 minutes, leaving only 10 minutes for the opposition to make its nominating speeches.

In New York, pro-life women were stalled and lied to when they tried to get information from the official IWY office, one of whose employees shouted at the women, "Get your funds and have your own conference." Remember, all this was done with taxpayers' money. Pro-ERA delegates were bused to the Albany meeting from New York City by conference organizers. Information about the loca-

tion of various workshops was withheld from pro-family delegates. Irregular and slow voting procedures, along with falsified staff badges, made a mockery of the voting.

In Ohio, pro-family literature tables were placed out of the way so that they were hard to find. The official slate of delegates was given preferential treatment on the printed ballots. Voting was slapdash. And critics were denied a chance to have observers present when the ballots were counted.

In Utah, there was secret registration of IWY committee members, in advance of the opening of public registration. Inadequate time was allowed for floor nominations to the national conference. Even newspapers found it difficult to get advance notice of what was scheduled.

In Virginia, the omission of pro-family women resulted in the holding with public funds—of a workshop on witchcraft. When the final voting was held, only 200 of the approximately 1,200 participants were present.

In Wisconsin, registration was lax; no identification was required. Five buses of pro-ERA women were trucked in from Milwaukee. Book displays by lesbians and the Socialist feminists shocked delegates. Pro-family women were required to re-submit already submitted nomination forms. National Organization of Women "facilitators" controlled the microphones. Official speakers were pro-ERA. Voting procedures were irregular. And by the time of the final plenary session, only 300 people were left to vote.

If Jim Guy Tucker will read over this list of horrors from the National Women's Conference of 1977, both on the State level and in Houston, he will better understand the reaction of pro-family citizens, this year, to the White House Conference on Families.

Mr. President, I also submit the following newspaper columns and editorials regarding the National Women's Conference from the Washington Post, Washington Star, Tulsa Tribune, Boston Herald-American, Chicago Tribune, and Human Events for the RECORD at this point.

The material follows:

#### WOMEN'S VOICES

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 18, 1977]

The National Women's Conference, which opens in Houston today, was a poor idea from the start. Such federally financed conferences, whether on women's issues or children and youth or urban policy generally give a public-relations push to ideas that don't need it and generate so much controversy over other issues that they create a public impression of even more discord than actually exists. Beyond these general liabilities, the women's conference has had special problems. Its charter, pushed through Congress by women's-rights advocates during International Women's Year (1975), directs the delegates to "identify the barriers that prevent women from participating fully and equally in all aspects of national life" and to send recommendations to the President. The trouble with that is that American men and women have so many different ideas about equality, participation and what family and cultural life should be like—as well as whether various laws defining the status of women are really barriers or shields.

The planning for Houston has not emphasized accommodation of these varying

views. The conference's organizers, headed by former Rep. Bella Abzug, have advanced a "plan for action" that touches every inflammatory base. Among other things, it supports medic aid-funded abortions, freedom in sexual matters, and federal aid for "voluntary, flexible-hour, bias-free, non-sexist, quality child care and development programs." This platform is, we believe, overloaded and doctrinaire.

In addition, the organizers have been trying to paint their opposition—including the stop-ERA forces and Mormon groups—as right-wing radicals whose views are somehow illegitimate or even dictated by men. However shrill some opposition groups may be, the drive to discredit them may wind up discrediting the meeting's sponsors and alienating some of their less ideological friends.

Why worry about any of this? The problem is that many political leaders and citizens may just sit back to watch a brawl. Some of the public's most harmful stereotypes of women in politics could thus be confirmed. That could hurt the Equal Rights Amendment and other important measures—such as reform or rape laws—whose progress depends on being generally perceived as reasonable and fair.

Moreover, such an outcome would misrepresent the real social and political changes that have occurred in the past several years. The more flagrant kinds of sex discrimination are gradually being dealt with by Congress, the courts and many states. The volatility of other issues, notably those bearing directly on the family, has been generally recognized. More and more women (and men) realize they can back the Equal Rights Amendment or the general concept of broader opportunity without endorsing all feminist rhetoric. And countless women, however diverse and sometimes tentative in their thinking, have become increasingly active and effective—not only on "women's issues" but across the spectrum of public concerns. We hope these quieter messages come through from Houston. It may take hard listening to hear them in the din.

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 18, 1977]  
 HOW SOMETHING USEFUL COULD HAVE GONE ON IN HOUSTON

(By Michael Novak)

Believe me, I have been trying to avoid writing on the government-subsidized meeting of 2,000 women in Houston. Right-to-Life groups have brought 20 times this many women to Washington for two days (and they paid their own way), but the media did not notice. Let the subject of a meeting be a cause the elite classes in this nation cherish with their hearts and the cameras will grind on and on. It's a national disgrace.

Five million dollars yet. Two thousand women in the pay of Daddy Government did not even invite a single leader of their opposition to speak; ran a disciplined meeting that put Richard Nixon's second nominating convention to shame; pulverized their internal opposition—and boasted to the world how liberal they are, how moral, and how beautiful.

Across town, five times as many women, not subsidized by the government, represented the counterculture. Almost unnoticed.

What is most curious about the elite conference in Houston is the dependence on government the new women insist upon. They say they are liberated. They say they are independent. But they want the federal government to pay for their meetings; to pay them \$50 a day just to come; to pay for their child care; and to pay for abortions. Where would a modern woman be without Daddy?

Indeed, the real political meaning of the Equal Rights Amendment is not the sym-

bolic emotional reinforcement it will give to those who desire redundant notice. The real political meaning is the interference it will warrant in state and local affairs by federal agencies.

Daddy is highly arbitrary, he has a temper, and he owns lots and lots of power and money. Nobody knows what Daddy will do with ERA. But those who love Daddy want him to show off in front of the others.

There are a number of urgent and practical questions that a women's congress could have looked into:

Thousands of American couples want babies. There are today far more "wanting" mothers and fathers than "unwanted" children. The thriving black market in babies is a scandal upon the women of this generation. In New York, the list of black parents who desire to adopt children is longer than the list of black babies up for adoption. Could not the woman's movement encourage some abortion prone who would so choose, to bear at least some babies for adoption? Many are "wanted" by loving parents.

Abortions are outrageously high priced. Conditions in some abortion mills are a scandal. Could not the women's movement see to it that the price is brought down (rather than ask Daddy to subsidize inflated prices)? Could not women protest against "windfall profits" in abortions? Must this grisly business be so shabbily conducted? It is, of course, as Time Magazine pointed out, something of a scandal for this generation of women that its liberty should be won through the death of the living. Could not the movement at least have the guts to depict honestly what happens in an abortion, and what it is like, instead of using surgical euphemisms?

The sexual aggressiveness of men constitutes a major difference between the sexes. As Bella Abzug said in Houston, she never saw a hotel full of women send out for call boys. What sort of social sexual code for men ought this society to develop now? Young women are under tremendous and unfair pressures. Our sexual mores are generalizing millions of personal disasters, whose effects will be felt in our children and our children's children for generations: fickleness, inconsistency, betrayal, infidelity, abandonment. Sexual confusion in our society is enormous. To those recently "liberated" from a stricter ethic, the sheer excitement of libertinism is blinding. But the fading will soon become hard to bear. Have liberated women nothing to say about sexual morals, except that lesbianism is a "sexual preference"?

Lesbians at Houston said, with pride, "we are all around you." Of course they are. In an age of sexual confusion, we may expect their numbers to increase. But the self-hatred involved in looking into the Narcissus-mirror of one's own sex will also, in time, deepen and grow. The fullness of human development lies in learning from the opposite sex. Of course, women from time immemorial have been known for being compassionate and forgiving; we did not really expect Houston to speak a word of judgment upon lesbianism. But to have said nothing at all about public sexual morality in which women and men can find a moral integrity and common understanding is a very bad omen.

Estimates for the costs of the child care desired by Houston—subsidized by Daddy—run to \$25 billion a year. Are there to be no rewards from feminism, for those women who give their full time to their children, at least in the first three years of life? Is that choice, that precious service, to be treated with disdain—to be ignored? What shocking indifference to the priceless gift so many millions of women have given to their children.

Believe me, I tried not to write about Houston.

[From the Tulsa Tribune, Nov. 19, 1977]

THE COSTLY CHARADE IN HOUSTON

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The International Women's Year conference, in progress this weekend in Houston, may be a very good thing for America.

Reform usually follows a reductio ad absurdum and this rigged and stocked pow-wow, purporting to represent a cross-section of all American female opinions, is not only morally fraudulent but probably illegal as well.

The case for illegality comes about because Congress last winter appropriated \$5 million out of the public treasury to fund the conference. The Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 specifies that memberships in committees and meetings held by federally funded assemblies "must be fairly balanced in terms of the points of view represented" and not be "inappropriately influenced by the appointing authority or by special interest."

Indeed, last Dec. 10, Bella Abzug swore on a stack of something or other that "this is not a bill which requires the conference to project a particular point of view."

Rep. Shirley Chisholm promised that "any kind of lobbying activities would be negated," and Rep. Patsy Mink stated plausibly, "In the committee we were careful in accepting an amendment which restricted altogether any activities whatsoever that could in any manner, form or shape be called lobbying."

So what happened?

The International Women's Year Commission was already on record with a 35-0 vote in favor of pushing the Equal Rights Amendment. Thus the machinery got underway to fix the state caucuses so that those delegates would be elected who would insure a thunderous ERA vote in Houston.

The first move was to get ultraleftist former Rep. Bella Abzug appointed to head the conference which President Jimmy Carter duly did. How well Bella Abzug represents the views of the majority of American women has never been tested at the polls, but this summer she ran fourth in the Democratic mayoralty primary in her native New York City.

Soon complaints of railroading, vote-packing and undemocratic procedures began pouring in from the state conferences. These didn't bother Bella. She stated, curtly, that such problems are "inevitable for such an ambitious enterprise" and that "all challenges have been denied."

But cats kept escaping from the bag. In New York State a complaint of bias against anti-ERA women was answered with "Get your own funds and have your own conference."

The Baltimore Sun quoted a member of the Maryland state commission as saying, "I perceive the Houston meeting as a political convention, and it has to be run like one. If we lose there we are finished."

Alas, these loaded conclaves weren't even run like political conventions. Some state convocations, ostensibly called to draw in women of all opinions, were almost secret.

In testimony last month before an ad hoc Senate committee, a Wisconsin woman said the publicity for the meeting in that state was "practically nonexistent."

A Missouri woman complained that she had to call a senator to get the time and place of the Missouri meeting.

A California witness said that not even the media had been notified. A Vermont woman described the Montpelier meeting as "the best-kept secret since Pearl Harbor," while another, in Mississippi, charged conflicting information as to time and place.

Nevertheless, opposition rose. Anti-ERA forces stormed into the Ohio, Missouri, Oklahoma and Utah meetings and took over.

This triggered a unique defense. The pro-ERA forces in Arizona created a flying squad, identified with special ribbons, to hurry from workshop to workshop, wherever a vote opposing ERA or federally financed abortion was threatened.

The National Women's Political Caucus liked this tactic so much that it recommended it nationwide. Bella Abzug is on the NWPC advisory board.

The lesbians, of course, were out in force, and one shocked spectator at the Hawaiian meeting described a pornographic skit. A "spirituality" workshop in Virginia was even run by self-proclaimed witches.

Ms. Abzug has made sure that results in Houston will be satisfactory by giving herself the power to appoint 400 delegates "at large." But it should also destroy any credibility which this charade may have enjoyed with those American women who thought it really would be an honest attempt at consensus.

It isn't the principle of the thing.  
It's our 5 million bucks.

[From the Boston Herald-American,  
Nov. 27, 1977]

**IWY RESOLVES SHOULD BE SHELVED**  
(By Patrick J. Buchanan)

One day soon Ms. Bella Abzug and other grizzled, battle-weary veterans of the National Women's Conference will be arriving at the White House to present Jimmy Carter with their "National Plan of Action."

If Mr. Carter is thinking of a second term, he will thank them for their work, promise to study the agenda, give the girls some milk and cookies, and send them on their way. Then he will call in Hamilton Jordan and tell him to file that 25-point "Womandate" on the same shelf where the Scranton Commission Report and the Kerner Commission Report are gathering dust.

Why? Because the National Plan of Action, adopted in Houston, points Mr. Carter in precisely the opposite direction from where the national majority is headed.

Some weeks ago, Newsweek magazine ran a cover story on the "New Conservatism" that appears to be sweeping the country. Yet, what the Houston confab produced was a warmed-over hash of the radical liberalism that generally stunk up the '60s.

Item: The Houston delegates voted almost 4 to 1 for the Equal Rights Amendment. Yet, when put to the vote in New York State, ERA was crushed by a margin of 400,000 votes.

Item: The Houston Convention endorsed abortion-on-demand. Not only does that contradict the President's commitment and convictions, it runs against the trend of court and congressional opinion.

Item: The Houston conclave approved that same sort of "gay rights" provision that Dade County rejected 2 to 1 only weeks ago.

Here is how one Florida delegate, Virginia Harland, described the "sickening . . . nauseous" scene at the Sam Houston Coliseum when the "sexual preference" plank was adopted:

"The demonstration after the vote was disgusting. Most of the pro-family delegation got up and walked out. Other delegations stood with their backs to the chair in protest. The lesbian element here was unbelievable—they were hugging and kissing each other, running through the aisles with their fists raised in a sign of militancy."

And the New York Times would have us believe those 2,000 delegates to Houston "fairly accurately reflect the general female population" in the United States.

Some of the proposals adopted, such as enforcement of the Federal Equal Credit Opportunity Act of 1974, were non-controversial. On balance, however, the National Plan of Actions reads like a political script written by Ms. Bella Abzug, ring mistress

who cracked the whip at the Houston circus.

Yet we know from the returns in the New York mayoralty contest that the politics of Bella Abzug are on the wane in even the most retarded of political precincts. Though she started the race with almost 40 per cent of the vote, Bella ended out of the money in the Democratic primary, running a poor fourth. The winner: An apostate liberal named Ed Koch who captured the fancy of the Big Apple with the enthusiasm with which he discussed the societal benefits of rewiring the electric chair.

On the final day of the Houston Conference, the conservatives walked. The breaking point: the convention's demand that the American taxpayer fund yet another of these feminist pep rallies in the future.

Well, on this one, once is more than enough. The National Women's Conference came about through the good offices, if you will, of Gerald R. Ford in 1975 who asked \$5 million to underwrite this nonsense. Next time ignorance and inexperience will be no excuse. Any congressman who votes another dollar of tax dollars to further this kookery should be retired—without regard to race, creed, color, sex or national origin.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Nov. 28, 1977]

**TAX MONEY USED FOR RIGGED CONVENTION**  
(By Nick Thimmesch)

The federally funded National Women's Conference was no place for a man. Nor for any poor soul who yearns for fairness in this vale of tears or for democratic procedures.

Rather, it is a classic case of a militant minority imposing its will on the majority—the American public, in this instance—and making it pay money for the experience.

It isn't so important that the Houston delegates rubber-stamped an action plan for ERA, abortion-on-demand, lesbian rights and government-controlled child-care centers. It is important that these highly debatable questions were endorsed under the rigged auspices of the federal government at a cost of more than \$5 million to taxpayers.

While it is doubtful that the Houston proclamations truly represent the national will at this time, that argument can be put aside for a more important matter: Namely, the need for taxpayers to raise hell with those glib congressmen who fund this kind of authoritarianism.

As one who once served on a presidential commission, I know how single-minded staffers devise "action plans," arrange for witnesses sympathetic to those plans to appear before the hapless commission and try to ram through their viewpoint.

It doesn't always work, but it eventually did in this episode. Militant feminists bamboozled Presidents Ford and Carter, and Congress as well, to back "women's rights" (motherhood and the flag are now obsolete shibboleths), though their real purpose was to win government blessings for controversial, partisan and minority views.

In July 1976, eight months before the first state conference on women was held, a national commission published the manual that yet-to-be-elected delegates were to follow—or else. It was titled "To Form a More Perfect Union" and included arguments for virtually all the controversial issues ultimately rubber-stamped in Houston.

In early 1977, President Carter, probably to salve an old political enemy, appointed Bella Abzug to head the commission running the Houston show. That act was a green light for militants across the land to stampe the state conferences, using muscle tactics to reduce so-called traditional women to minimal or no-representation status on state delegations.

The militants used dirty tricks that would have made Watergate villains blush. In Florida they cut off nominations of traditionalist women. In Michigan they used question-

able floor maneuvers to do the same. In Kansas militant bosses of the conference shut the doors to a crowd of opponents, claiming erroneously that their presence would violate fire ordinances.

In North Carolina women voted for delegates on a Saturday afternoon only to be informed by militants late that night that the election would have to be held again because one name was missing from the ballot. By then many traditionalist women had either left or were leaving for home to be with their families the next day—Father's Day. Naturally, in the election rerun, the militants won it all.

Just as revolutionaries use the shock of political theater to intimidate moderate sorts, so militant feminists did in Hawaii and California to show and frighten off "nice" ladies. In Honolulu feminists staged a program in which women in leotards performed simulated lesbian sexual acts in a pay toilet.

At the California conference dildoes, vibrators, mini-abortion kits and books on the joys of masturbation were exhibited to attendees—all to show how women could become sexually independent of men.

Well, if Bella Abzug wants to use her own plentiful supply of money to pay for this exhibitionism, that's all right. But why should taxpayers be stuck for it?

To make sure the rubber stamp couldn't be vanquished, Abzug and her fellow commission members, including Jean O'Leary, co-chief of the National Gay Task Force, were careful in their mandated selection of 400 at-large delegates to pick an overwhelming majority sharing their views. For tokenism they also chose a black, Dr. Mildred Jefferson, chairman of the National Right-to-Life Committee and a distinguished professor of medicine.

Finally, in the best sharp-politics fashion, the militants trotted out the wives of Presidents Johnson, Ford and Carter—an unwitting array of dupes—to bless their conference, Middle America style.

Here's some scolding for the press. Why did editors send mostly feminists to cover Houston when the editorial requirement surely called for the dispatch of some H. L. Mencken types? Sending feminist journalists to Houston only padded the cheering section, and most of the coverage showed it.

No matter. I don't care whether ERA is ratified or not. The issue here is whether federal money should be used to support a partisan cause. Such misuse leads to what federally funded (\$56,000 per year) White House assistant Midge Constanza did in Houston—calling for the defeat of political opponents. Will we next be paying taxes to fund political vendettas?

[From Human Events, Dec. 3, 1977]

**WOMEN'S CONFERENCE (FAR) OUTSIDE U.S. MAINSTREAM**

(By John D. Lofton, Jr.)

HOUSTON.—Since the IWY sprang full-blown from the brow of Bella Abzug over two years ago, Sen. Jesse Helms (R.-N.C.) has been a man ahead of his time vigorously opposing the idea of a federally funded International Women's Year conference. After investigating just exactly how the delegates to this get-together were selected, and just who the people were running this show, Sen. Helms told the Senate this past July:

"Of the 42 members of the International Women's Year Commission appointed by President Carter on March 29 of this year, there is only one who opposes the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. There is not a single member who belongs to such groups as STOP ERA, Eagle Forum, or a Right to Life chapter. Not one state coordinating committee is chaired by a member of one of these anti-ERA pro-life groups who speak for a large number of women across this country."

Because this was so, Sen. Helms predicted that the meeting being held here would be "a rubberstamp, unrepresentative debacle" which would be used "to promote the goals of a militant feminist minority."

Well, as one who has closely watched this freakshow for the past three and a half days, I hereby give Sen. Helms the 1977 First Annual Jeane Dixon Gift of Prophecy Award.

During the time I've been here I have, not surprisingly, been in many arguments with many women about many subjects. But the one assertion I am absolutely unable to challenge is spelled out on a large sign stapled to the wall of the National Gay Task Force (NGTF) booth in the IWY exhibit hall. It reads, "We Are Everywhere!" Indeed, they are.

This conference is loaded with lesbians. It is wall-to-wall weirdos. If it is true, as the conference sponsors allege, that this Valley of the Dykes is representative of the female population at large, then 150 percent of American women are homosexuals.

Like they say, they are everywhere. How many? When I ask, a woman (?) in the NGTF booth says, with a laugh, "thousands." Perhaps as many as 500 lesbians are delegates, she (?) says.

Another booth in the IWY exhibit hall, operated by a group pushing the idea that homemakers should be salaried, bears a huge banner reading: "Lesbians for Wages for Housework." I buy a booklet titled "Lesbians Organize: Wages Due Lesbians—Wages for Housework Campaign." Its cover has a Peanuts-style drawing on the cover showing Lucy and another female holding hands. The caption: "Who Needs Charlie Brown?" Another book being offered: "The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community."

When I ask a Ms. Marshall of Black Women for Wages for Housework just how much she thinks housewives should be paid, she says \$20,000 a year. When I note that 40 million women are housewives, which means that her proposal would cost a mere \$800 billion annually, and ask who will pay these salaries, she is obviously bored with such details, replying:

"When you bog yourself down with petty points of an issue, you don't move, okay? The thing is when there's an issue and you have clout behind it, they find a way to do it, okay?" Right on, I say, but who are "they"? Who will pay these salaries? Well, there are "profits from corporations and money within the government," she says. Like where, I say, pointing out that the federal government is running a \$50-billion deficit. Does she know this, I ask?

"Okay, that's fine," she says. "But, you look at Watergate, at the senators running the country, those corporations with profits. The money's going somewhere. I don't know where. They're saying there's a deficit but I do know there's red tape, redundancy, and people taking it off the top."

When, in a parting observation, I explain that if business is saddled with an additional expense of \$800 billion annually, they'll most likely pass along this increased cost of doing business to those who buy their products, people like Lesbian houseworkers, she says: "This is okay, they'd probably do it anyway." Hmmm. Never thought of that.

On my way over to the San Francisco Bisexual Center (SFBC) booth, I am handed a copy of the current issue of "Defending Women's Rights Newsletter." The back-page article is headlined: "Defend Lesbian Rights." Its author, Cheryl Adams, a New York delegate to the IWY convention, who is also the Lesbian Rights Coordinator for the Empire State's National Organization for Women (NOW).

When I reach the SFBC booth, I am handed a flyer by bisexual author Ruth Falk, promoting her book, "Women Loving".

The flyer bears an interesting promo blurb: "... an honest, snewy book; its pace is electric; its shock enduring." To ignore this book, says the promo author, "would be to block out an important part of women's lives as well as our own." The promoter? Les Whitten, co-author of Jack Anderson's syndicated column.

They are everywhere. But not everything they do can be shown in a family newspaper.

The night after the IWY convention approves a lesbian rights resolution, hundreds of lesbians and their sympathizers rally outside the convention hall. A downcast Houston Chronicle photographer shows me "a great" photo he took of two women kissing. But, he says, his paper didn't run it. Oh, well, I console him, what can you expect from a publication run by white, uptight, probably straight men.

They are everywhere. When at one of the so-called "Briefings from the Top," presidential aide Midge Costanza finishes her talk and asks for questions, the first one—a statement actually—is from a woman (?) who identifies herself as a member of the Socialist Workers party and a lesbian who "refuses to compromise my rights." Costanza empathizes. She notes that in a Father's Day interview with the AP President Carter, saying "more than any President ever said before," had declared that he knew people who were taught by homosexuals and "they were never negatively affected by that." Says Midge:

"I get very emotional about this issue because I feel very strongly that you should have the right to love whomever you want. I do." Applause.

Watching Costanza's fist-waving, head-shaking, loose-mouthed macho performance, one realizes why she stays in hot water. At one point, she brags that her first act as a member of the Rochester, N.Y., City Council was to appropriate some money to clean up Susan B. Anthony's grave-site. She says that in her first life as Susan things were much more difficult. Laughter. "Yep, Jimmy and I believe in that stuff," she says. "His (the President's) error was that he made the mistake of coming back as himself." More laughter, applause.

Later, she is asked if Mr. Carter will campaign actively for ERA. Yes, he will, says Midge, and she doesn't mean just make phone calls, which she admits has not been successful. She tells how the phone call strategy backfired because those state lawmakers who were called promptly held news conferences announcing that the President could not intimidate them. Costanza refers to these legislators as "nincompoops." Laughter.

They are everywhere. But not everyone is eager to take up their cause. IWY Big Wig, actress Jean Stapleton, who plays Archie Bunker's wife Edith on "All in the Family," is asked how "Edith" would handle the lesbian rights issue. She ducks this one, telling a Houston Chronicle reporter: "I believe that we'd have a number of story conferences to resolve that issue." Too bad the convention didn't approach the subject this thoughtfully.

A footnote: In fairness to the other far-out crazies working this confab, it ought to be noted that lesbians and their supporters weren't the only weirdos working this gathering. Also in the IWY exhibit hall was the extreme left-wing Pathfinder Press booth which was selling a wide variety of Communist and Socialist literature including the Guardian newspaper. Outside the convention hall, free sample copies of the Communist Daily World were being given away.

Also being handed out free of charge were copies of a newspaper published by the ultra-left Prairie Fire Organizing Group of San Francisco. Last but not least, prowling the halls and holding press conferences here was Margo St. James, the head of what she calls "a loose organization," COYOTE—Call Off

Your Old Tired Ethics. Pushing her favorite cause, the legalization of prostitution, St. James was passing out the program from her group's 4th Annual Hookers Masquerade Ball, held last February in—where else?—San Francisco.

It's 9:15 a.m., Sunday morning. I am about to listen to a panel of women discuss "peace and disarmament." The literature on the table is a sign of what is to come. All the material is pro-unilateral disarmament stuff. There's a press release from the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; a "Bread—Not Bombers!" handout from the Women Strike for Peace; and a pamphlet from the Institute for World Order telling how reduced defense spending is good for the economy.

The meeting comes to order. "The reason we scheduled this thing," says Rep. Pat Schroeder (D-Colo.), "is because women are no longer going to be observers in the area of peace, disarmament and all that. We're no longer going to be a passive rubber stamp. Arms control is not just men's work." She says something about trying to grope with the issue of why certain countries, headed by men, need certain "technological things" to parade through the streets, but don't have good health care, education, etc. Nuclear weapons are sexist.

Randall Forsberg, an "arms control specialist" from Harvard, endorses a "safe" defense policy and a "wide margin" of arms reduction (ours). She says "almost none of our defense budget goes for defense." I don't understand her explanation. But, she's from Harvard. It must be me. I never went to college.

Forsberg talks about the U.S. and the USSR having almost the same number of delivery vehicles. But she doesn't mention the tremendous Soviet advantage in so-called throw-weight, which is very important. She talks about our bombers as if all of them would be able to deliver their bombs in an attack on Russia. But she never mentions Soviet air defenses, which we lack. She talks about our general purpose forces as existing to defend Western Europe. She sounds like this isn't important. Forsberg is opposed to a "militarized foreign policy." Suddenly, I'm glad I never went to college.

The next speaker is a Dr. Helen Caldicott, introduced as a specialist in cystic fibrosis who also was very active in opposing the French nuclear tests near Australia. Or the Australian nuclear tests near France. Whatever. Sounds like the plot for a Woody Allen movie. I'll stay a while longer.

Dr. Caldicott is on the program to talk about the horrible physical effects of atomic radiation, a subject about which I was unaware there was any debate among either men or women.

Nuclear weapons are "hideous," a "diabolical force" which she has fretted about since she was 17. They are the "ultimate insanity" causing "a lot of vomiting and diarrhea," as they did in Japan. Surveys have shown Japanese women whose babies, damaged in utero, were born with tiny brains caused by radiation. The audience is silent. This pro-abortion crowd isn't too big on the problems of the unborn.

There is "no way" to survive an atomic war, says the doctor. Only cockroaches would survive. Such a war would cause "severe psychiatric consequences" for the survivors of a nuclear war, "if there were survivors." The neutron bomb is also a "diabolical" weapon, a terrible way to "kill your fellow brothers." Nixon had the Black Box taken away from him because he was "unstable" the last few weeks of his presidency. The doctors ask:

"Have any of the world's male politicians ever seen a 12-year-old die of leukemia? Obviously not. We must eliminate all nuclear weapons. Women are the civilizers of the human race. We carry life in our bellies.

The ultimate in preventive medicine is to abolish all atomic weapons." Standing ovation.

Margaret Mead is in the audience sitting in an aisle seat. I ask her if the whole IWY thing is worth \$5 million? She looks at me with disdain. "Certainly," she says. "How much of a bomber can you buy for \$5 million? I suggest you study how much is spent on instruments of death."

As an expert on culture, I say, do you think the IWY convention is representative of the American female population at large? She taps her walking stick on the floor a couple of times. She's thinking. She replies: "Nothing in this country ever reflects anything at large." I wonder: Does a wet bird fly at night?

It is late Sunday evening, very late. As I lie on the floor of the convention hall's Music Center watching a seven-foot clown woman on stilts playing "As the Saints Go Marching In" on a kazoo, I think of that memorable moment in the main convention hall when a delegate from Guam, speaking Guam talk, is told by the Chairthing that she was not being understood because she was, well, speaking Guam talk and there was no one to interpret.

I know of nothing I've ever agreed with Betty Friedan on. But when she says of this convention: "I have never seen anything like this," I agree. And I hope I never do again. But, if I do, I at least hope I'm not helping pay for it.

So, enough of the feel, the flavor of this phantasmagoria of nuttiness. Now to the hard facts and demographic data as regards this orgy of sexism.

Is this conference affording, as Bella Abzug predicted it would two years ago, "an opportunity for every kind of woman, representing every viewpoint, in statement of her concern"? Does this carnival of kookiness represent the kind of women who are potential recruits for the Republican party, as has been stated by former GOP National Chairman Mary Louise Smith, and former RNC Co-Chairman Elly Peterson?

Mrs. Smith is quoted by the Washington Post as saying here that GOP women "have the responsibility to show that Phyllis Schlafly is not a role model for Republican women." Well, maybe Phyllis should or should not be. That's obviously debatable. But one thing is for sure and it is this: Phyllis Schlafly is much more in the mainstream of female American thought than are the women delegates to this get-together.

If Mrs. Smith had bothered to stop by the Houston Astrodome to attend the so-called Pro-Family, Anti-IWY rally, which attracted between 15,000 and 20,000 grassroots Americans of all sexes and ages, she would have seen this. This gathering was, in many ways, the real story happening in this city. All of the people in this group paid their own way, unlike the IWY delegates who had their expenses completely financed by federal tax dollars.

How do the women IWY delegates compare and contrast with American women in the U.S. population? The following is extracted from data released by the IWY Commission itself and from information based on statistics provided the Commission by the Department of Labor, the Census Bureau, the National Opinion Research Center in Chicago, and a 1975 poll of American women taken by the Detroit-based organization, Market Opinion Research (MOR).

First, some attitudinal questions. Do you agree that "it is much better for everyone involved if the man is the achiever outside the home and the woman takes care of the home and family?" This question, which is literally the do-you-believe-a-woman's-place-is-in-the-home-question, was put to a representative sample of American women by Market Opinion Research. Over half, 52%, of all women agreed. Most of the females at

this conference would punch your face in if you even asked them this question.

Next: Do you agree "it is more important for a wife to help her husband than to have a career of her own?" Fifty-five percent of all American women told MOR that they agreed. Most women here would look at you like you were crazy if you asked them this question.

Finally: Do you agree "if a wife earns more than her husband, the marriage is headed for trouble?" Fifty-two per cent of all American black women agreed; 50% of all Spanish-American women agreed. One would be taking one's life in one's hand to ask such a question of the black and Hispanic women at this conference.

According to the MOR poll, the magazines most read by all American women are, in ranking order, the Reader's Digest, Ladies' Home Journal and Good Housekeeping. It is inconceivable that most of the women here read these publications with any degree of frequency. This is a Rolling Stone crowd all the way.

Now, the demographics of this convention. First, I will give the category, then the percentage of all women in this category, and then the percentage of the women delegates in this category here at the IWY conference. What the following figures show is that this convention was in dire need of one of those affirmative action-quota plans that it so enthusiastically endorsed.

Age: 16-25, in the population, this group is 22%; in this convention, 7.5%. Ages 26-55, population, 49%; convention delegates, 77.8%. Ages 56 and over, population, 29%; convention, 14.8%. Thus, younger IWY delegates, who tend to be more liberal, are significantly over-represented, while the older delegates, who would tend to be more conservative, are under-represented.

Race: in the population, 84.4% are white; this convention, 64.5%. Blacks, population, 10.4%; convention, 17.4%. Hispanic, population, 4.3%; convention, 8.3%. Asian-Americans, population, 6%; convention, 2.7%. American Indians, population, .6%; convention, 3.4%. Clearly, despite the claim of representatives of the U.S. female population at large, here racial minorities are over-represented and the majority is under-represented.

Income: Under \$7,000 a year, population, 78%; convention, 23.1%. Women who make \$15,000 or more annually comprise less than 3% of the population. But at this convention, 14.1% of the delegates make over \$20,000 a year. This is, relatively speaking, a rich woman's conference with poorer women drastically under-represented.

Religion: Protestant, population, 65.8%; convention, 46.5%. Catholics, population, 25.6%; convention 24.2% (finally, an approximation); Jewish, population, 2.8%; convention, 8.9%.

At the beginning of its poll report for IWY Commission, "American Women Today and Tomorrow," Market Opinion Research inserts a disclaimer reading: "The views expressed in this report reflect public opinion and do not necessarily represent views of the National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year or any other federal agency."

I'll say. Any agreement between the opinions of American women at large in this country and the opinions of those gathered here is strictly coincidental.

#### BACKGROUND: "INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF THE CHILD" UPDATE

##### BACKGROUND

Please refer to our prior publication, RSC Background II-1, International Year of the Child, February 9, 1979, for background information.

##### DETROIT HEARINGS

At the December meeting of the International Year of the Child Commission in Washington, D.C., it was suggested that they

hold their public hearings in Detroit, Michigan. The site was suggested by Dr. Robert Green because he felt that they would be able to attract the minority and union voices. He stated:

"I would like to put in a plug for Detroit. We can attract testimony from sympathetic members of poor groups, union leaders and labor. We can not afford to go to a city where we do not have a great deal of support."

Please note that there was no mention at the meeting that they wanted to attract testimony from a wider cross section of America besides the poor and labor. The commission is made up of liberals who desire the testimony at Detroit to be presented to President Carter as the wants and needs of the majority of Americans, which is just not true!

Very few people were even cognizant that there were hearings on the International Year of the Child. The group giving testimony was obviously carefully selected. Dr. Robert Billings of the National Christian Action Coalition, representing over 200,000 evangelical Christians across the country, heard about the hearings. His organization speaks for over 10,000 Christian schools made up of the very children I.Y.C. states they want to support. Yet this is the account that Dr. Billings gives us of his attempt to testify in Detroit:

"I called Mrs. Carlene Bonner at Wayne State University in Detroit where the hearings were to be held. She referred me to Beulah Stewart. I called twice asking permission to give testimony at the I.Y.C. hearings. I was definitely given the run-around the first time I called. She said that they would call me back. When I wasn't contacted I called them back only to be hassled and told that I would only be allowed to talk for three minutes at the most, and there was a chance I wouldn't be allowed to give any testimony at all. Mrs. Stewart said she would call me back. She never did. I called back twice but no one was willing to give me any information. I then asked if the proponents of I.Y.C. would only be given three minutes apiece to give testimony. I was met with dead silence."

Dr. Billings went to Detroit for the hearings but was not allowed to testify even though his request was submitted several weeks in advance and there were over 180 "slots" for witnesses. Also, a pro-family group from Maryland sought to testify, but was denied permission.

#### LABOR/HEW APPROPRIATIONS HEARINGS

On Friday March 9, 1979, Commission Chairman Jean Young (Mrs. Andy Young) and Barbara Pomeroy (Executive Director of the I.Y.C.) testified before the Labor/HEW Appropriations Subcommittee, requesting additional funds for I.Y.C. This request was for approximately \$685,000.

Mrs. Young stated that they needed this amount because, "citizen involvement is crucial to the success of I.Y.C. Thus, much effort is being spent on fully responding to the many inquiries. The original budget projections for the commission did not fully anticipate this present degree of public interest."

Please note that Mrs. Young said that there was "much effort" to "fully respond" to the inquiries made to the commission. Yet, the Republican Study Committee has made numerous inquiries as to the exact expenditures of the various agencies to the I.Y.C. Commission and has never received answers.

Congressman Natcher (Chairman of the Subcommittee) asked Mrs. Young why a commission such as I.Y.C. should not be funded from private funds instead of public money. Mrs. Young's answer was, "The government should make a commitment to its children and thus fully sponsor the International Year of the Child. We anticipate being able to concentrate entirely on the program rather than fundraising."

As was true with the International Women's Year program, we again find federal funds are being given to support the efforts of those who favor very liberal, anti-family concepts, while the advocates of traditional family values and integrity are systematically excluded from the process.

#### POLITICAL ACTIVITY

During the question period at the appropriations subcommittee meeting, Mrs. Young was anything but candid about the future political activity of the I.Y.C. commission. At first she stated, "We have no plans to engage in political activity." When questioned further, she hedged and changed her statement by saying, "The Commission will not lobby until the end of the year." Meanwhile they will make recommendations to the President on national policies.

Congressman Michel questioned Mrs. Young concerning the Commission's goals on national policy. He stated:

"I can understand that you make recommendations on national policy, but then there will be those who would argue that an issue of national policy today is national health insurance. Because I have to go through these figures that you [Mrs. Young] cite, if I took them carte blanche and said because so many kids are denied medical care today, the only way you get at it is through a program of national health insurance. If you do that, boy, you are going to turn all kinds of people off.

"I don't know exactly what you have in mind here, but maybe I should warn you to stay away from specific issues. You can make recommendations in general terms that you think this is where we ought to go or where we conceive that there is a problem here, but when you get to nailing down specific issues, you are going to run into a buzzsaw."

Mrs. Young answered: "I don't know where we are going to wind up."

To give the commission credibility, Mrs. Young said that the recommendations on national policy would not be because the commission has sat down and determined it. It would be because "we have traveled throughout the country listening to the people all over the country." If this is the case, why wouldn't the commission even allow testimony from the conservative groups at the Detroit hearings? And why were they so intent on going only to a city where they have a great deal of support and could get minority and union testimony only? The answer is very clear; the commission is biased and determined to present their liberal ideology in the form of national recommendations and make them appear to be representative of the desires and goals of all Americans.

To gain control on the local level of the I.Y.C., commissioners have contacted all of the state governors asking them to issue a proclamation declaring the observance of the I.Y.C. in their state. Many governors have done this. According to Mrs. Young the city and county officials also have responded to the request of the National Commission by issuing proclamations and establishing I.Y.C. task forces in their localities. Mrs. Young said, "We are working closely with these official state organizations." We certainly can believe that statement! For example, in North Carolina the state legislature is pushing the following bill:

#### NORTH CAROLINA: A CHILD HEALTH PLAN

The State Senate Bill 389 is basically a socialistic bill which would establish a "health care home." The principal goal of the bill is to improve and maintain the health of North Carolina's children and young people. The word "health" is used in the broadest sense; that is, it means not merely the absence of illness but the highest

possible level of function and development. There will be a promotion of more comprehensive, higher quality, and more accessible health services to children. A principal goal is to make available to all children a continuum of primary care designed to prevent illness and promote normal development. A key concept is that of a "health care home" that provides access to all needed services.

If this bill is passed, it will also promote counseling in "parenting" and will aid parents in determining if they want a child. The proponents of the bill state that unplanned pregnancies are nothing less than tragic. The bill also would make contraceptives available to all sexually active persons, regardless of age.

The bill states, "The family alone cannot meet all of the essential needs of each new generation of children, particularly in the areas of health care and education." Thus, the government once again thinks that it can do a better job of meeting these essential needs!

On the front cover of the report accompanying the bill is the I.Y.C. logo! It is obvious that what Mrs. Young said is true in one aspect—the I.Y.C. commission is very busy on the local level!

#### MENTAL HEALTH OF CHILDREN

Mrs. Young made an incredible statement during her Appropriations Committee testimony. She states that 90% of the children who need mental health services do not have it available to them. She said this data was taken from the HEW publication entitled *The Status of Children*. In reviewing the section on mental health (pp. 102-105) there is no such documentation. What it does state is, "Precise estimates of the number of children and youth with mental health problems do not exist, in part because of varied reporting procedures and lack of uniformity and consistency in classification schemes." The National Association of Mental Health estimates that 3% of the children and youth under 18 suffer from severe emotional problems. Children with mental health problems can have services rendered to them through their school system, special child care programs, hospitals, community mental health centers or other outpatient facilities. If children do not receive these services it is generally not because it is not available to them but rather that for other reasons they do not take advantage of the services.

#### I.Y.C. REGIONAL CONFERENCE

The Southwest Conference on Opportunities for Children and Youth is to be held in the Astrodome Complex in Houston on September 16-18, 1979. This conference is a major government-sponsored I.Y.C. conference. The goal of the conference is to "celebrate" I.Y.C. with special focus on multiethnic cultural experiences and concerns. The conference will involve workshops and a wide variety of activities for children including foreign children who have been invited to the conference under State Department auspices. Objectives include information sharing by and with children; the generating of commitment for expanded opportunities for children, and developing recommendations for improved social policy to benefit children.

#### CHILDREN'S ADVISORY PANEL

According to the "Family Protection Report" the Children's Advisory Panel is working around a budget of \$89,000, and is seeking donations of both money and services from corporations and other entities. Regarding the composition of the panel: about 400 applications were mailed out, and about 200 were returned. The 25 children to be on the Panel will be selected on the basis of their written responses, and according to the 10 HEW geographical regions, and on the basis

of other criteria such as age, sex, special needs and experiences such as incarceration, ethnic background, socio-economic level, different family lifestyles, and different types or nominating agencies. The first meeting of this composite Advisory Panel will be May 22-24. The first meeting will not be open to the public.

At the Appropriations hearings it was stated that over 300 applications were sent to youth-serving organizations asking them to make these applications available to the young people they wished to nominate. It was also stated by Mrs. Young that applications were sent to any young person requesting one. It is questionable if this is totally correct. When a staff person from the Republican Study Committee called the I.Y.C. Commission at the first of the year, she was told that she could not secure an application for her child but rather had to get the application from an agency that would be nominating.

#### I.Y.C. REPORT

The I.Y.C. newsletter is a publication of the Secretariat of the International Year of the Child. The material encompasses activities from all of the countries participating in the I.Y.C. It is interesting to note the subtle biased reporting contained in these newsletters. For example, the front page has an article about the urgent need for reform within the U.S. on various issues pertaining to children. It has never been noticed that any such derogatory remark has been made towards a communist country, or even that they have any need of reform. The I.Y.C. newsletter states that in Russia, the children are the "privileged class." The following is an excerpt:

"Society's attitude to children is a yardstick for its character, humanism and observance of human rights, which begin with the rights of the child. Westerners coming to the Soviet Union frequently refer to children as the only "privileged class" in the country. The Soviet children enjoy in full the rights stipulated in the Declaration of the Rights of the Child, proclaimed by the UN General Assembly.

"Western visitors sometimes look for the reasons of Soviet concern for children in the peculiarities of the "Russian character" and in the depths of the "Russian soul" because many of them could not admit that the decisive factor is the socialist nature of Soviet society, with its motto, 'Everything for man', that is, above all, for those who make a start in life."

What unbelievable propaganda! The Soviets are saying that they have a nearly perfect environment for their children and this should be a yardstick for measuring its character and observance of human rights! It's incredible that a country with such a poor reputation for human rights could have the audacity to make such a statement, and it's just as incredible that the I.Y.C. Secretariat would print it in their newsletter.

#### OPPOSITION TESTIMONY FOR I.Y.C. FUNDING

On April 23rd the Labor/HEW Subcommittee on Appropriations had their public hearing concerning the International Year of the Child. At this time pro-family people were able to express their disapproval of Congressional funding of the I.Y.C. commission. There are twelve congressional Members of the Subcommittee. Congressman Natcher (chairman) was present to hear the testimonies.

Three people were allowed to testify, each representing various organizations. They included: Mrs. Barbara Pagan (representing such groups as Kentucky Pro-Family Council, Concerned Citizens of Louisville, Right to Life, Stop ERA); Liz Sadowski, State Director of New Jersey Majority Women; and Marjorie Garvey, United Nations/NGO Representative, United States Coalition for Life.

Their main concerns were that the govern-

ment, through the I.Y.C., was trying to usurp the role of the family in meeting the needs of their children and to impose liberal ideology in the form of legislation that would affect everyone. They also noted that the Commission had not addressed the preamble to the U.N. Declaration of the Rights of the Child concerning legal protection before and after birth.

When Mrs. Young was questioned about the preamble, which states:

"... the child, by reason of its physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection, before as well as after birth."

Mrs. Young simply said that the commission has not interpreted the preamble and therefore cannot make a statement on it!

[Fiscal years]

	1978 (from April 1978)	1979 (1st quarter)	1979 (2d quarter)	1979 (3d quarter)
Funding for I.Y.C.:				
Department of Justice.....	\$118,000			
Department of State.....	111,000			
Department of Health, Education and Welfare.....	250,000	\$100,000	\$209,000	\$237,000
				1979/1980 (19 mo.; including appropriation request)
	1979 (4th quarter)	1980 (to Apr. 30)		
Supplemental appropriation request.....	\$208,000	\$477,000		\$2,057,000

Congressman Eldon Rudd (R-AZ) asked to have documentation on how many federal employees were working for the I.Y.C. through federal agencies and the amount paid in salaries. Mrs. Young was unable to provide the information.

Salaries of the top seven staff positions funded by the Commission:

Barbara Pomeroy.....	\$47,500
Diana Michaelis.....	38,160
Helen Schnierbeck.....	34,604
Lenora Taitt.....	32,442
Brian Anderson.....	32,442
Carole Kauffman.....	32,442
John Jones.....	32,442

The size of the staff and the dollars available were determined by the Office of Management and Budget.

Personnel loaned by other agencies to the National Commission for the International Year of the Child:

#### EARNINGS, FUNCTION, AND AGENCY

\$47,500, Deputy Director, AID (Agency for International Development).
\$26,500, Executive Assistant, AID.
\$31,113, Visual Information Specialist, EEOC (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission).
\$35,685, Administrative Office, HEW.
\$27,453, Education Coordinator, HEW.
\$13,013, Writer/Editor, DOA.
\$47,500, Deputy Director, Department of State.

#### LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

April 14, 1978, President issues Executive Order 12053 establishing National Commission.

May 1, 1978, Justice Department transfers \$118,000 to Commission for FY 1978 as authorized in Executive Order 12053.

May 11, 1978, a bill establishing Commission and Presidential transmittal letters delivered to OMB for Presidential signature and transmittal to Congress.

May 18, 1978, State Department transfers \$111,000 to Commission for FY 1978 as authorized in Executive Order 12053.

May 24, 1978, President transmits proposed legislation to Congress authorizing Commission and an FY 1979 appropriation of \$1.36 million for life of Commission. (NOTE: May 15, 1978, was Congressional deadline for introduction of authorization bills with specific appropriations.)

May 25, 1978, Sen. Sparkman, "by request", introduces President's transmittal to Senate

#### I.Y.C. IN SWEDEN

In Sweden, in this Year of the Child, children's liberation has won a victory by a vote of 259-6 in the Swedish Parliament. The new law states that parents may not strike their children or treat them in any humiliating way. Spanking is against the law, even a whack or slap. So, too, is sending the child to bed without supper or confining the child to the bedroom for disciplinary reasons. The law prescribes no specific penalties for parents caught spanking their child, but complaints will be handled by police and social workers with referrals to family court.

The Ministry of Justice is planning a big public relations campaign that will include videotapes for children, informing them of their legal rights.

mation, advice, services, and funds as may be useful to the Commission for the fulfillment of its functions under this Act and (2) to detail personnel to the Commission."

September 27, 1978, Sen. Bartlett, for Sen. Helms, offered floor amendment to HEW FY 1979 Appropriation bill which would prohibit any money appropriated under that bill from being re-programmed to the National Commission on I.Y.C. This amendment was accepted in the Senate on a voice vote. In subsequent House/Senate conferences on HEW/Labor appropriations, the Senate receded to the House version, thus delisting Helms amendment.

November 24, 1978, HEW requested of, and received approval from, House and Senate Appropriations Committee Chairman to transfer \$100,000 to Commission for the first quarter FY 1979.

December 15, 1978, HEW requested of, and received approval from, House and Senate Appropriations Committee Chairmen to transfer \$209,000 to the Commission for the 2nd quarter FY 1979.

January 1979, President transmits to Congress request for National Commission funding vis-a-vis FY 1979 Supplemental Appropriation (for 4th quarter FY 1979) and FY 1980.

March 9, 1979, Commission Chairperson testifies before House Appropriations Subcommittee on HEW/Labor regarding Supplemental request.

March 20, 1979, Commission Chairperson testifies before Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on HEW/Labor regarding Supplemental request.

March 28, 1979, HEW requested and received approval from House and Senate Appropriations Committee Chairmen to transfer \$235,000 to Commission for FY 1979, 3rd quarter.

March 29, 1979, Special hearing called by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations to review AID detail of two employees to Commission. Sen. DeConcini demanded that AID cancel these details. Alluding to July 28, 1978, Appropriations Committee deletion of Commission appropriation, he told AID that any action in support of the Commission contradicted the "wish of Congress" that the Commission receive no funds or assistance from governmental agencies. Sen. Inouye stated his "distress" in this matter.

April 23, 1979, House HEW/Labor hearings on the I.Y.C. Three people testified against Supplemental Appropriations request of \$685,000.

May 10, 1979, Markup of HEW/Labor Appropriations request.

#### CONCLUSION

Many concerned citizens will be watching the outcome of this International Year of the Child. Taxpayer's money is being spent to support this questionable "celebration". There are many outcries from the public protesting the use of funds for the I.Y.C. As one Congressman said recently, "I hope that this does not cause us embarrassment like the 'International Women's Year'." The I.Y.C. could cause more than embarrassment for the American public. It could bring about socialistic legislation that could damage the lives of our children and the integrity of family units for years to come.

#### NEWSLETTER

Peter Bourne was an adviser to Carter at a time when, out of the national limelight, the Georgia Governor was showing his disregard for the family by approving legislation to give contraceptives to minors without parental consent. (See Family Planning/Population Reporter, June 1973). Bourne was also one of the figures behind the abortion cases which provided the Supreme Court with the occasion to establish abortion on demand in January, 1973.

"Lifeletter" (August 15, 1978) includes more about the Jimmy Carter, Peter Bourne, and friends:

"Bourne Again." This newsletter rarely pays attention to stories not directly connected to the abortion issue (which is our beat)—so we really have little interest in the sudden departure of Good Old Boy Dr. Peter Bourne (nor even in his parting innuendoes of a High Again White House). But Bourne is not only a charter member of what Columnist William Safire has dubbed Carter's "Magnolia Mafia," he is/was also the Kingfish of the pro-abortion clique that has surrounded Jimmy from his Georgia days. Among the other members: Dr. Robert A. Hatcher of Atlanta's Emory Univ., that veritable epicenter of pro-abortion outpourings—Bourne went to Emory, and his first wife, Judith Bourne Rooks, is still there, in the Family Planning Evaluation Division of the notorious (to anti-abortionists) HEW-financed and Emory-connected Center for Disease Control, bossed by Wild Willard Cates (who calls pregnancy a "venereal disease").

Hatcher co-authored the 1972 book, "Women in Need," a heavy-handed pro-abortion tract that carried a laudatory Foreword by then-Gov. Carter; Hatcher also ran last June's Atlanta "What's Happening" conference which pushed abortion for teenagers (some of them at least as teeny as eleven—see the full report in "Lifeletter" No. 10). And first-wife Judy was one of the chief pushers, as the tape of her June 20 "conference" with the (thankfully) few kids attending confirms (titled "Pregnancy: A Time of Decision," it "counselled" such unbiased wisdom as "Imagine what it would be like for you to go on with your pregnancy . . . picture yourself . . . being its mother and raising it and being responsible for providing for its needs . . . Ask yourself questions like 'How could I finish school?'; and then the helpful hints: "If you have an abortion when you're eight weeks pregnant the fetus is very, very small and is not yet much like a baby . . . If you wait [until five months] . . . you deliver a fetus which looks very much like a baby"!)

Hatcher is also one of the listed "Contributors" to the HEW "Practical Suggestions for Family Planning" publication that publicized "Abortion Eve" (see "Lifeletter" No. 9)—the connections go on and on, e.g., Bourne's current wife, Mary King (No. 2 Person at ACTION—again, see "Lifeletter" No. 9) was labeled by the New York Times (way back on July 8, '76) as "A Key Carter 'Brain Truster' From the Beginning" (she is quoted in the splashy article as saying she "believes she has brought Mr. Carter around on abortion. 'I helped him understand abortion as an alternative to failed contraception,' she said, 'He had only looked at it before as an ethical issue.'").

That isn't all the Bourne-Hatcher team has done. Back in '71-'72, when the original *Roe v. Wade* (Texas) and *Doe v. Bolton* (Georgia) cases were being argued before the Supreme Court—and which provided the basis for the Court's original (in more ways than one, since the Mr. Justices discovered a "right" to abortion that has escaped the notice of every state and court for 200 years!) 1973 Abortion Cases—amicus briefs were filed with the High Court from both states. The list of "Appellants" from Georgia begins: "Mary Doe; Peter G. Bourne; Robert Hatcher"—and goes on to include, among others, Judith Bourne and Planned Parenthood Association of Atlanta. Would you believe that the Texas list starts off exactly the same way (i.e., Bourne, Hatcher, then later Judy, PP of Atlanta and—for good measure evidently—"Georgia Citizens for Hospital Abortion, Inc.")? Obviously, Jimmy Carter's "Abortion Connection" goes way back to the very beginnings of the current battle—and there is nobody in the Carter crowd who has any such public record on the other side.

Arguing that case before the Supreme Court in 1973 was a young Texan woman by the name of Sarah Weddington. Allied with a powerful Texas Democrat, John White, Ms. Weddington moved up quickly in Washington. White became Carter's Deputy Secretary of Agriculture; Weddington became General Counsel to the Department. White became—and still is—Chairman of the Democratic National Committee; Weddington became President Carter's special advisor on women's issues. In that role, the Sarah Weddington of the 1973 abortion victory continues to shape public policy regarding the family.

While Carter claims to oppose Federal funding of abortion, for example, his Administration wholeheartedly supports it. When the Supreme Court recently allowed the order of a single Federal judge to illegally command the expenditure of unappropriated funds for Medicaid abortions, the usually sluggish and unresponsive bureaucracy under Patricia Harris at H&R, within hours, dispatched obviously pre-prepared eight-page telegrams to regional offices around the country, as if they could not wait to start the abortion mills up again.

While Carter proposes to assist families with new health programs, his H&R spokespersons are publicly opposing amendments to the Child Health Assurance Bill that would keep that program from providing abortions under the guise of assuring the health of babies.

Carter's Solicitor General, Wade McCree betrayed the Congress only days ago in his arguments before the Supreme Court concerning the Hyde Amendment. When asked by one of the Justices whether he agreed with the argument being presented, to the effect that no Federal judge can command the expenditure of unappropriated moneys, Solicitor McCree said he did not agree. He was acting, of course, as attorney for the Administration, not the Congress. Even so, he demonstrated his disregard for both the Congress and the Constitution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In one of the crudest political payoffs of our time, Carter repaid the National Education Association for its first Presidential endorsement by leading their campaign for a Department of Education. In opposition to that special interest boondoggle, liberals and conservatives alike protested the creation of a Cabinet Department made to order for the NEA, which shows utterly no respect for family authority in education.

While Carter pushed for the Department, he brutally broke a 1976 campaign promise to assist parents who choose private schools for their children. Four years ago, candidate Carter needed the votes of Evangelicals and Catholics to win the White House. So he misled them, as simple as that. Once in office, he killed tuition tax credits with threats of a veto.

At the same time, he unleashed a totalitarian assault through the Internal Revenue Service against the Christian schools, and all other independent educational institutions. His appointees in the IRS tried to take over those schools through regulation, contemptuous of religious freedom and usurping the law-making role of the Congress. That is why we in the Congress had to trim the wings of Commissioner Kurtz at the IRS last year and why, in the Treasury appropriations for this year, we will do so again.

The sadness that drug and alcohol abuse can bring on a family is well-known. Yet, since the Georgia days, one of President Carter's closest advisors was Dr. Peter Bourne, an open advocate of

the decriminalization of marijuana. It will be remembered that Dr. Bourne resigned from the President's staff, where he was Carter's adviser on drugs and narcotics, when it was revealed that he had written out a prescription of a powerful sedative for a fictitious person. This secretive prescription led to the arrest of a friend of Bourne's administrative assistant. When arrested, the friend was attempting to have the prescription filled for Bourne's assistant. When he resigned, Dr. Bourne was quoted as saying that the incidence of marijuana used by the White House staff itself was "high" and that cocaine use by the White House staff was "occasional."

#### CARTER AND THE FAMILY

If the President hopes his White House Conference will establish his credentials as a pro-family candidate, he should take a closer look at the previous years of his administration. In one area after another, he and his appointees have launched an assault on the family. That attack cannot now be covered up with sociological jargon and promising platitudes.

There is no more serious problem facing the families of America than inflation. The family savings accounts of this country have been plundered by officially stimulated inflation in order to feed the Federal flock. Year after year, the President has had a chance to choose between the family savers, family taxpayers, family consumers of this country on the one hand and, on the other, the special interest constituencies of his bloated budgets. Year after year, he has made his choice. This year, the families of America can make theirs.

Taxes on the American family are downright oppressive. Along with inflation, they have caught families in an economic squeeze that is forcing millions of mothers back into the work force. The Carter administration, seemingly blind to the plight of the family, has imposed more taxes than any other in our history. The President does not seem to realize that few families in this country can run to the National Bank of Georgia for a low-interest loan. He seems not to understand that his high-tax mania makes it impossible for families to save for their children's education or for parental retirement. He still adamantly resists tax rate reduction.

It has been more important to this President to have a monstrous Department of Energy, a Department of Education, and business as usual in Washington, a city which one reporter aptly calls "Fat City."

In education, Carter has been an unequivocal enemy of parental rights and educational freedom. One of his top appointees, Mary Berry, toured Communist China a few years ago and announced that its educational system in which the state is the dominant force—was a model for America. As a reward for that insight, Mary Berry has recently been nominated to the Civil Rights Commission, where she may want to launch a study of civil rights in Red China.

We can expect much more of that from some of Carter's judicial appointments. I have already said my piece about Patricia

Wald, and I will not reiterate it here. Suffice it to say that the nomination of Ruth Bader Ginsburg, another abortion-on-demand feminist, to the district court of appeals is in the Wald tradition. But where are Carter's profamily judicial appointments? There have been recurrent rumors that prolife judicial candidates, for example, are being systematically excluded in the selection process. Even in the absence of proof, the ideological uniformity of Carter's appointments to the Federal bench sustains, if not confirms, those suspicions.

Even in the Department of Defense, Carter appointees have revealed their antifamily bias. As Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, Carter appointed Dr. John B. Moxley, dean of the School of Medicine at the University of California at San Diego, at which institution Moxley was notorious for his discrimination against medical applicants who refused to perform abortions. In apparent violation of California law, he administered, and boldly defended, a vicious admissions scheme designed to keep prolife students from becoming doctors.

In his nomination hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Dr. Moxley promised not to do it again. He agreed to abide by the Dornan amendment to the DOD appropriations bill, prohibiting most abortions in military facilities. But the March 15, 1980, issue of U.S. Medicine reports, "DOD Warily Eyes Moves on Abortion." One of Moxley's subordinates, Dr. Peter Flynn, MC, USN, explains that the Carter Defense Department would prefer to fund abortions. "We've been pushing for a change already, but it's made no difference," he said, because the Congress keeps adding the Dornan amendment to the DOD appropriations:

If registering and drafting women for military service were to come about, there would be more of a demand and need for abortion services, Dr. Flynn predicted.

"The more dependent we become on (military) women, the more we need to ensure that the services they provide will not be interrupted," Dr. Flynn said. But he said the need for abortion services in the military has to be weighed against moral and economic arguments opposing the provision of those services. "It's a very difficult question."

"I would have to guess that the economic issue is not important when the debate is emotional in Congress. It's ironic that (Congress) is using an economic tool to accomplish what couldn't be accomplished in the courts, Dr. Flynn related.

Business as usual in the DOD health affairs bureaucracy.

Dr. Flynn's astoundingly crude assessment of military women, the draft, and abortion is appropriate in the administration of a man who, as Governor of Georgia, authored the preface of a book, "Women in Need," advocating abortion as a necessary part of equal rights for women.

In short, Jimmy Carter plus Dr. Peter Flynn equals disaster: To be equal, women must be drafted; and having been drafted, they must be kept on active duty through abortion. I wonder what Jim Guy Tucker thinks of that schema for the future of military families.

Paralleling its assault on the American family, the Carter administration has launched the first official campaign against religious institutions in our country's history. One instance could be a bizarre blunder. One instance after another is a pattern of mean determination.

Under Carter, the Department of Labor has illegally attempted to transform church schools into nonreligious institutions by compelling them to place their employees under State unemployment compensation systems. Secretary Marshall contends that he, not pastors, will decide which workers are performing religious duties, and which are performing secular work.

The National Labor Relations Board has attempted to classify church-related schools as nonreligious institutions, so that their teachers can be brought under the coverage of national labor laws. These schools are the same ones which Carter insists are agents of religion, when he opposes tuition tax credits as a possible form of "aid" to those schools.

The Carter administration has launched a vendetta against Judge Marion Gallister, a Federal judge in Idaho whom the Attorney General has sought to disqualify from a case involving the equal rights amendment on the sole ground of his religion. He happens to be a Mormon. Therefore, for the first time in the annals of American jurisprudence, the Department of Justice has used a judge's denominational affiliation as a basis for seeking his removal from a case. Which denomination, we may ask, is next in line for disqualification by this administration.

The President is a praying man; he has made that all too publicly plain. That is why his extremist position against voluntary school prayer came as such a surprise. He has threatened to use the full force of his Presidential veto against any congressional action overturning the Supreme Court's decision in *Engle v. Vitale*, outlawing school prayer. Earlier this year, a delegation of religious leaders met with the President in the White House and came away with the impression that the President shares their views on this matter. No sooner was the door closed on them, however, than a Presidential spokesman was setting the record straight: the Carter administration remains unalterably opposed even to voluntary devotions in the public schools.

Now we can understand why a House-passed amendment to the bill creating Carter's Department of Education, an amendment which mentioned school prayer as one goal of the Department, was killed in conference before the legislation was sent to the President for his signature.

Carter's Department of Health and Human Resources is unmercifully badgering Grove City College, a Christian college in Pennsylvania, insisting that it abide by all Federal education regulations or lose its Federal funds. But Grove City does not accept any Federal funds. It also, by the way, does not discriminate, as even the functionaries at HHR admit.

It simply insists upon its total independence, as a Christian institution, from the power of the Government. Carter's appointees cannot abide that, and they have dragged the Christians of Grove City College off to the judicial arena for combat.

Perhaps the greatest insensitivity the President has shown toward the values and traditions which underlie and sustain the American family was his appointment, in 1977, of Jean O'Leary as a member of the National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year and his appointment of her, in 1978, as a member of the National Advisory Committee for Women, to counsel the President on Government policies affecting women.

At the time of her first appointment, Jean O'Leary was coexecutive director of the National Gay Task Force. By her own admission, she is a militant lesbian. What she was doing advising a President of the United States on the problems of American women I will never know. But we do know the kind of advice Ms. O'Leary has put in print. Her name appears on the cover of "A Lesbian Guide," prepared by the National Gay Task Force and, be it noted, "officially approved by the National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year." In other words, President Carter's Commission gave governmental sanction to this discussion of, among other things, "Why lesbianism is a woman's issue."

In another forum, Ms. O'Leary (and a coauthor, Ginny Vida) discussed "Lesbians and the Schools." I reluctantly submit their article for the RECORD, regretting that this is the only way we can document just how shocking are the views of one of Mr. Carter's top advisers on American women:

#### LESBIANS AND THE SCHOOLS

(By Jean O'Leary and Ginny Vida)

The sex role stereotyping promoted in all areas of our educational system is doubly oppressive to the lesbian. Not only does she learn that she is inferior because she is a woman; she also sees that as a woman who loves other women, she is labeled "sick" in psychology texts and is encouraged by school counselors to direct her love energies toward men.

In adolescence, she finds no outlet for her emotional and sexual feelings. She is told in sex education course that she is going through a stage she will outgrow. Young women have virtually no visible role models to counterbalance the heterosexual programming in our schools and are constantly subjected to stories of Dick and Jane in every form. Since all women are conditioned in this manner, it is no wonder that they find it difficult to think in any terms other than heterosexual marriage. The struggle for equality of women must be extended particularly within the system to include control over our entire lives, especially our sexuality.

There are many lesbians in our schools, too many for us to ignore any longer the problems which the educational system poses for them. The schools must no longer deny students and faculty the right to acknowledge their lesbian identities openly and seek out intelligent information about themselves.

Specifically, there is an urgent need for changes in the following areas:

**Counseling:** School counselors should be required to take courses in human sexuality in which a comprehensive and positive view of lesbianism is presented.<sup>1</sup> (Colleges which do not offer such courses ought to design and provide them.) Lesbians as well as heterosexual counselors should be represented on the guidance staff.

In addition, the names and phone numbers of gay counseling services<sup>2</sup> should be made available to all students and school psychologists. Students should be given the opportunity, if they so desire, to contact these agencies.

No school counselor should ever refer a student to a psychotherapist for the purpose of changing her/his sexual preference from gay to straight. Such conditioning conveys to the student that her/his feelings of love are unworthy and unacceptable; it causes immeasurable conflict and ego damage, and can never be done in the name of mental health.

**Sex Education:** Courses in sex education should be taught by persons who have taken the human sexuality courses already mentioned. Students will thus be encouraged to explore alternate life styles, including lesbianism. Speakers from local lesbian organizations should be invited to these classes so that students can have their questions answered firsthand.

Textbooks which do not mention lesbianism or which refer to it as a mental disorder should not be used in sex education courses. At the very least, teachers should expose the misinformation in these texts and provide additional reading material which includes a fair and positive view of lesbianism.

**Lesbian Studies:** Schools should set up lesbian studies programs in connection with women's studies programs to foster pride in the adolescent lesbian and to show heterosexual students that lesbians have made significant contributions to society. Learning about these contributions would foster positive feelings on the part of all students.

**Libraries:** School libraries should be supplied with bibliographies of lesbian literature and urged to purchase novels, stories, poetry, and nonfiction books that portray the joy of women loving women. The use of these books should be encouraged in literature and history classes.

**Lesbian Clubs:** Lesbian clubs should be established in the schools. These clubs would foster a community spirit among lesbians, who up until this time have been isolated due to the pressures of society. Such organizations would help lesbians to develop pride in their life styles, and to help overcome the prejudice of heterosexual students and faculty.

**Recommended Nonfiction Books:**  
*Lesbian Nation.* Jill Johnston, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1973.

*Lesbian Women.* Del Martin & Phyllis Lyons, Glide, San Francisco, 1972.

*Sappho Was a Right-On Woman.* Sidney Abbot & Barbara Love, Stein & Day, New York, 1972.

No wonder, then, that the National Plan of Action adopted at the National Women's Conference in Houston in 1977—and completely underwritten with public revenues—called for:

#### SEXUAL PREFERENCE

Congress, State, and local legislatures should enact legislation to eliminate discrimination on the basis of sexual and affectional preference in areas including, but not limited to, employment, housing, public accommodations, credit, public facilities, government funding, and the military.

<sup>1</sup> Homosexual Community Counseling Center (Workshops) 921 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

State legislatures should reform their penal codes or repeal State laws that restrict private sexual behavior between consenting adults.

State legislatures should enact legislation that would prohibit consideration of sexual or affectional orientation as a factor in any judicial determination of child custody or visitation rights. Rather, child custody cases should be evaluated solely on the merits of which party is the better parent, without regard to that person's sexual and affectional orientation.

In the context of the abominable record of the Carter White House during International Women's Year, is it any wonder that millions of Americans dread the outcome of the upcoming Family Conference?

#### THE BIG LIE: BLAME EVERYTHING ON "THE RIGHT WINGERS"

True to the pattern of the last 3 years, the Carter administration has found someone else to blame when things go wrong. This time, the scapegoat is "The Right Wing," which seems to mean anyone who is pro-life, anti-ERA, opposed to legalized privileges for homosexuals, skeptical about Government meddling in the family, and suspicious of politicians who want to take over child-rearing and spouse counseling. In other words, most Americans. Welcome, everybody, to "The Right Wing."

An example of this scare tactic is a memo to executives of the Family Service Association of America in Ohio. It was written by Robert M. Rice, Ph.D., Director of Policy Analysis and Development of that Association and a Carter appointee to the White House Advisory Committee.

In fact, Dr. Rice is even more than that. According to the White House Conference on Families' own description, he is "the founding Chairperson of the Coalition for the White House Conference on Families." In the business world, such arrangements would give the appearance of an interlocking directorate.

According to Mr. Rice:

The attached material on the New Right should be of particular interest to Ohio [Family Service] agencies. In the week of January 20, 1980, Ohio plans 88 county meetings on families. These county meetings will strongly influence the statewide conference scheduled for March 15th. Moreover, Ohio is unusual in electing 50 of its 75 delegates to the White House Conference. This combination of factors—a large state, a high proportion of elected delegates, an early schedule—may be particularly attractive to New Right mobilization.

Who is plotting now?

Further along in his memo, Mr. Rice warns:

The New Right has demonstrated its ability to capture public attention. When this occurs, the more experienced views that family service agencies and others represent will have difficulty being heard.

What an admission. When profamily people get the public to pay attention to what they have to say, Mr. Rice and his colleagues cannot be heard. I wonder why. Perhaps it is because their own views cannot stand public inspection.

Nonetheless, Mr. Rice continues:

The general direction of the Pro-Family Coalition is negative to services which offer supports to families.

In short, those folks disapprove of the Government programs which keep social service professionals in business.

There is, in fact, considerable skepticism about the efficacy of some of the social services provided in federally funded programs. And that wariness is not dissipated by such overt hostility as shown by Dr. Rice's memo or, for that matter, by his inclusion among "the ground rules for policy development" concerning the family this recommendation:

That policies should support satisfaction in marriage, and termination of marriage when personal satisfaction is unavailable. ("Exploring American Family Policy," *Marriage and Family Review*, II, 3, 1979)

"Personal satisfaction." That just about sums up the value system of many professional social service activists these days. And it is another reason why profamily Americans are mobilizing to protect their homes against the conference.

#### WHAT CAN WE EXPECT FROM THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON FAMILIES

From past experience with Carter conferences, we can make the following predictions about the White House Conference on Families:

When delegates arrive at the conferences, professional managers, trained by the Coalition for the White House Conference, will already be in place, acting with authority.

Pro-family delegates will be split up, assigned to different workshops, given scattered seats, in order to keep them from acting together.

Conference officials will repeatedly use technical points, obscure rules, unilateral command decisions, in order to prevent pro-family delegates from raising their questions and making their proposals.

In the weeks immediately preceding the conferences, there will be a last-minute media blitz by Jim Guy Tucker accusing—who else?—"The Right Wing" of trying to wreck the Conference.

There will be pre-arranged resolutions and draft statements, prepared by personnel of the National Advisory Committee, the Coalition for the White House Conference, and their trained State coordinators. These will, in effect, lay down the parameters within which the delegates will have to work.

When it is time for the delegates to vote, their ballots will not be counted in a normal democratic procedure. Instead, those in charge of the conferences will improve a voting scheme that only an IBM computer could understand. Votes will be "weighted," to indicate not just numbers but the importance or intensity of the issue.

The resolutions of the conferences, presented to the Nation by the National Advisory Committee, will call for more Federal programs, more spending, more agencies. They will not endorse tax cuts, school prayer, an end to forced school busing, a human life amendment, a crackdown on crime and drug abuse, deregulation of the economy, educational freedom, parental rights protection in Federal programs, or other concerns of the majority of American families.

Nothing decided by the conference will in any way exclude homosexual couples, temporary roommates and com-

mune dwellers from Federal programs and benefits for families.

Jimmy Carter will use the recommendations of the White House Conference on Families as an endorsement of his administration and will turn the Conference report into a reelection gimmick.

**CAN THIS CONFERENCE BE SAVED?**

There is only one way to salvage the White House Conference on Families. That is to immediately stop the exclusions, stop the rule rigging, stop the wild accusations. Let the people of the States elect the delegates to the conference. Reject those delegations that have been handpicked by State Governors to give topheavy representation to social service professionals, to the exclusion of honest-to-goodness family folks.

I failed to mention earlier that, in one of its first sessions, the National Advisory Committee on the White House Conference on Families exercised a different kind of exclusion. The committee decided which cities should host the three summer conferences: Baltimore, Minneapolis, and Los Angeles. Fine. Good cities all.

But why not a southern city? Why not, as Coretta King proposed, Atlanta? Or as she did not propose, Miami, Raleigh, New Orleans, or Mobile? As was pointed out to Mrs. King, Georgia has not ratified the equal rights amendment. Of course, it was unacceptable for a White House Conference on Families.

That incident early on revealed the predestined course of the White House Conference on Families. The President's National Advisory Committee showed its antipathy for those States which refuse to assent to ERA. Who inhabits States like Georgia? American families, that is who; and it is a pity that the President's Advisory Committee could not treat them with respect, regardless of their views on ERA.

If the President wants to save his conference, at this late date, he should use his authority to add another city to the list of conference sites, a city in a non-ERA State.

If the President wants to save his Conference, he should give Jim Guy Tucker a little help by appointing a cochairman, a woman, a pro-family leader.

Many names come to mind. State Senator Eva Scott of Virginia, State Senator Donna Carlson of Arizona, State Senator Anne Bagnal of North Carolina, State Representative Mary Pegg of North Carolina, Dr. Carolyn Gerster, president of the National Right to Life Committee, Dr. Mildred Jefferson, past-president of the National Right to Life Committee, Connie Marshner, editor of the Family Protection Report, Jo Ann Gaspar, editor of the Right Woman, Phyllis Schlafly, founder of Eagle Forum, Kathleen Teague, executive director of the American Legislative Exchange Council, Beverly LaHaye, nationally known pro-family activist, Dr. Jacquelin Kasun of Humboldt State University of California, whose scholarly exposé of the decadence of contemporary sex education courses has sparked a national movement to clean up the classroom.

Any of these ladies, given a role in this federally funded program commensurate with the public approval of the views they represent, would provide a badly needed administrative balance to this now lopsided affair.

As things now stand, the proceedings are to be thoroughly rigged. With Federal funds this White House project is constituted in such a way as to enable those running the show to claim that the conferences represent the views of delegates selected by a process in which all Americans were free to participate. In reality, the national conferences appear certain to be procedural monstrosities, just as so many of the State conferences were. The invited speakers will win national headlines for their paens to ever bigger Government bureaucracies meddling in the lives of American families. The elected delegates will have no role in determining the rules of procedure or who will be invited to address the conferences. The official reports of the conferences will be written long after the delegates have returned to their homes. And through the entire process, the main decisions about rules, agenda, invited speakers and conference staff will be made by a centralized bureaucracy led by executive director John Carr, a board member of the Americans for Democratic Action. What a travesty.

I would like to close this rather lengthy discussion with one more article, this time from the Washington Star of April 27, 1980. It is a rather flattering portrayal of Jim Guy Tucker. In fairness to him, I think it should be included.

And in fairness to the families of America, too. For this article makes clear that Mr. Tucker has a rather peculiar view of our tax system. More than that, it is, as far as I know, the first public admission by Mr. Tucker that he deliberately changed the conference rules to thwart the growing participation by pro-family citizens. According to the article:

As soon as the selection of its delegates started, the anti-abortion and anti-ERA forces threatened to turn it into an election-year hazard. (Remember, please, my earlier comments about the Conference being a reelection gimmick.) But Tucker and the conference staff devised a way to at least partially counteract the conservative forces—by allowing at-large delegates to be selected by governors.

**DOES JIM GUY TUCKER'S FUTURE PIVOT ON SUCCESS OF WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON FAMILIES?**

(By Pat Lewis)

He has the Kennedy charisma, Robert Redford's good looks, Lyndon Johnson's "let us reason together" political manner and Richard Nixon's ambition.

Some say he's too good looking, too ambitious, too slick to be trusted.

Others say he's too good to be true. They are the ones who, aware of diehard mistrust of politicians, emphasize that he is smart and "substantive."

But no one denies that Jim Guy Tucker, chairperson of the White House Conference on Families, is a political animal from a political family. (His sister, Carol Tucker Foreman, is assistant secretary of agriculture for food and consumer services.)

His father was Arkansas state auditor and later state director of the Social Security Administration. One grandfather was state

commissioner of mines and agriculture. The other was a county judge who lost his post in the '30s to Wilbur Mills.

When he was 8, Jim Guy Tucker distributed campaign brochures on election day in front of the firehouse in Little Rock. When he was 16, he campaigned in Florida and Texas and got himself elected international vice president of the Key Club. At 28, after graduating from Harvard and freelancing as a correspondent from Vietnam to Arkansas newspapers, he couldn't decide whether to go back to law school and study tax or go into politics.

He took a stab at politics and was elected district attorney. In 1973, at 33, he recovered a little familial honor and won Wilbur Mills' seat in Congress. He also managed to get a seat on the Ways and Means Committee, which is unusual for a freshman.

Then he made a mistake in strategy. After one term in Congress, he decided to run for the Senate. He lost in a primary run-off to David Pryor, who accused him of being too liberal and pro-labor.

The governor's chair was won by another young Democrat, Bill Clinton, who is expected to remain there several more terms. In the meantime, Tucker started his own law practice in Little Rock and accepted a partnership in the Washington firm of Lobel, Novins and Lamont.

This year he could have tried to win back his old congressional seat, now held by a Republican. Instead, he accepted the chairmanship of the White House Conference on Families. The part-time job has filled his career gap nicely—and exposed him to a new realm: the nation.

Grass-roots hearings on the family were held in seven states, and this summer the conference on the family will be held in three cities—fulfilling one of Jimmy Carter's campaign promises in the old Carter campaign style of taking it to the people.

Jim Guy Tucker chaired all but one of the regional hearings—meeting thousands of "real voters." He acknowledges that the exposure could benefit him politically, but says he has not capitalized on it.

At first, observers were puzzled at his appointment. He admittedly is not an expert on the family and many people have had more administrative and political experience.

His congressional work and legal practice have included work on social security, taxes and utility companies. He says he has dealt with legislation that affects the family—but then, so has every member of Congress and most for a longer period of time.

No, it was clearly his charisma, his political tact, that made him a prime candidate for the job, which at that time was a simmering political disaster.

Patsy Fleming, who was the first conference chairperson, resigned after conservative groups screamed about a divorcee heading the family conference. That was only the beginning.

When Wilbur Cohen, the second chairman, resigned because of ill health, Sargeant Shriver was offered the job. But after several weeks of deliberation, he turned it down, saying he couldn't devote full time to it. Jim Guy Tucker accepted the job within 10 days, says Stuart Eisenstat, presidential domestic adviser.

Upon taking it, Tucker sarcastically remarked that he was the wrong guy because "I don't have a dog or a station wagon." But he does represent the changed American family. Five years ago, he married a divorced mother of two, and now he and his wife have a 4-year-old daughter.

According to his mother, Willie Maude Tucker, Tucker is a strict disciplinarian. "The 16-year-old rebels sometimes, but once she says she's going to do something," Mrs. Tucker says, "Jimmy won't let her change her mind."

Grandmother Tucker does maintain, however, that their youngest offspring, Anna, is spoiled. "While they were in Washington, Jimmy worked from 7 a.m. to 9 p.m.," she says. "When he got home, they'd wake up Anna, play with her and put her back to bed."

In Little Rock, where Betty and Jim Guy Tucker are restoring an old house, Betty, once the wife of San Diego Charger wide receiver Lance Alworth, is studying law full-time. Anna spends part of the time in a child-care facility at the University of Arkansas and with her teen-age sister and a college student who lives with the Tuckers.

Jim Guy Tucker has long been familiar with the child-care problems of working couples.

His mother owned three Merle Norman Cosmetic studios while Jim Guy and his two sisters were growing up. The only way to take care of her children was to take them to work with her. When 5-year-old Jim Guy balked, she promised him apple cobbler and that he could cross the street by himself to get it. So he packed up his metal soldiers and went off to work with his mother.

When he was a little older, his mother took him on the Little Rock city bus and showed him how to get from home to the library and back. He and his sister Carol spent a lot of time in that library, each reading 25 books per summer.

Later he spent the summer at camp and when he was old enough, became a camp counselor. (He was hired by camp director Jack Watson who has since become secretary to the Cabinet and assistant to the president for intergovernmental affairs.)

The Tucker children all turned out political. "When they were growing up, we talked politics and little else," says Jim Guy's mother. "And we still do."

Jim Guy's sister, Frances Tucker Kemp, was the first woman elected to her local school board and was part of a small group of people who set out to destroy Arkansas governor Orval Faubus. That was the first and last time a Tucker voted Republican—for Winthrop Rockefeller—says Carol Tucker Foreman.

"I get a lot of yak around there about Jim being a liberal and Carol running the giveaway program," says Willie Maude Tucker. "But around our house we always taught them to live and let live and that I am my brother's keeper."

Tucker says he is morally opposed to abortion, but he did vote for government funding of abortions for poor women where there is a threat to life or health of the mother. He supports ERA but voted against the deadline extension.

He sees abortion as only one of several problems that face the family.

For instance, he points out part of the tax code that provides a \$1,000 deduction for each dependent. "I'm in the 50 percent tax bracket; that means each one of my kids is worth \$500 on my tax return. The family down the street is probably in the 20 percent bracket and only gets \$200 for each child they have."

"It's one thing to look statistically at how taxes work out," says Tucker, "but it's another when you sit there and realize you are living next door to someone, and the United States government has adopted a policy that tells me my kids are worth more to me than his kids are to him. I can't see justification for the government telling one man his children are worth more than another's. But that's not been something we've heard a lot of testimony about."

What will become of Jim Guy Tucker? His mother wants him to continue to practice law in Little Rock: "He knows I think a political job is insecure. And a politician has to cater to special interest groups. I think I'm just as important to think about as the util-

ity companies, the milk companies, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. My experience up there tells me there are more lobbyists in the halls of Congress than congressmen."

But keeping Jim Guy Tucker in Little Rock would be like keeping Phyllis Schlafly at home.

He says he likes politics and that he'll run for office again. One of his supporters speculates that if the family conference comes off without too much confusion and with something concrete to recommend, and if President Carter wins reelection, Tucker could make Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

His immediate future certainly pivots on the success of the conference. As soon as the selection of its delegates started, the anti-abortion and anti-ERA forces threatened to turn it into an election-year hazard. But Tucker and the conference staff devised a way to at least partially counteract the conservative forces—by allowing at-large delegates to be selected by governors.

And in true LBJ style, Tucker went to work trying to get opposing sides to agree on something about the family.

There has been a lot of talk about how he has brought opposing forces together to testify shoulder-to-shoulder, how he has shown them that they can agree on some issues even though they have violent disagreements about others.

Whether or not the divisive forces will come together to work on the things they can agree on, which is Tucker's hope for the conference, remains to be seen.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hoped that every journalist, every religious leader, every civic leader, every academician in the country takes a good look at that favorable summary of Mr. Tucker's handiwork. This is how far we have come with the Carter administration: its appointees boast about how they keep the people from interfering with the President's plans.

In just a few more months, however, the families of America will have an opportunity to pass final judgment on the plans of President Carter, Mr. Tucker, and the administration which has turned public policy over to the likes of Bella Abzug, Jean O'Leary, Mrs. Andrew Young, Dr. Peter Bourne, Jerome Kurtz, Sarah Weddington, Drs. Moxley and Flynn, and John Carr.

#### CONCLUSION

Growing numbers of Americans are outraged by the series of Carter White House projects on topics related to the American family. Taxpayers in large numbers have written me to ask why they should be forced to provide a platform for the social service bureaucrats and assorted counterculture zealots. I am asked why taxes pressed from the flesh of our Nation's families should be put at the disposal of Bella Abzug and her successors who have run the bizarre series of White House "commissions" relating to the family.

The White House Conference on Families will spend at least \$3,050,000 from the U.S. Treasury. Why this Federal expenditure? The social service bureaucrats and leftist pressure groups who have such influence on the Carter administration would have been perfectly free to hold as many privately funded gatherings as they wished. But they wanted official status, and they wanted taxpayer funds.

The track record is plain for all to see.

The aim of those who have control of these White House projects has been to increase Government involvement in family matters which traditionally have been outside the scope of Government. Gay rights, kiddie rights, abortion on demand, Government child care centers, and ever larger numbers of Government bureaucrats purportedly "helping" people by taxing away the resources of families: these are all part of the pattern.

If these White House gatherings were entirely composed of appointed leftists, the political value would be much less. Then Mr. Carter would certainly be blamed for all the wacky, counterculture goings-on at the "conferences." Thus, for political reasons, it was desirable to give the appearance that these meetings were grassroots gatherings. No doubt the theory was that leftist agitation at a grassroots gathering, in which all Americans were free to participate, would not be blamed on Jimmy Carter.

So the leftist pressure groups and the social service bureaucrats obtained Federal funds and the prestige of the White House affiliation. They also obtained operational control of the procedures at the gatherings. For his efforts, Jimmy Carter obtained the gratitude of the leftist activists whose pet causes are advanced at the conferences.

What did the American family obtain? Antifamily propaganda and the bills for the cost of these extravaganzas. In addition, scores of thousands of Americans who strongly support limited government and traditional precepts felt obliged to take time away from their families and to travel to these rigged conferences. Rather than let the boosters of bigger government claim that freely elected delegates from their States support vast new Government social programs, hard-working middle-class Americans spent their own time and money for the privilege of sitting through hours of mostly one-sided speeches by antifamily propagandists. For their pains, these participants—who oppose the Government programs that Bella Abzug, Jean O'Leary, the National Gay Task Force and the Americans for Democratic Action are trying to foist on the American people—are accused of being interlopers and of trying to "take over" the gatherings.

I firmly believe that these White House programs will prove to be a political boomerang to Mr. Carter and those who hope to push America toward more government involvement in the family.

The biased issue content of these gatherings and the undemocratic procedures by which these State and national conferences have been run have offended and activated hundreds of thousands of Americans. Voters are having their eyes opened by these highly publicized excesses. We did not need these conferences. The counterculture activists and the social program bureaucrats thought they did. For Mr. Carter, the infuriating results for taxpayers and families are proving to be a political disaster.

As to the upcoming White House Conference on Families, there is no need for it. The problems and burdens of the

American family are painfully obvious: Searing inflation, punitive taxation, breath-taking interest rates, declining quality of public education, and the encouragement of decadence by governmental institutions. The last thing the American family needs now is more meddling from President Carter and his legion of social engineers. Let the Government attend to getting its own house in order, so that families can have some chance of economic survival. Most American families ask no more and want no more.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session for not to exceed 2 minutes to consider certain nominations on the Executive Calendar, which I will enumerate after going into executive session.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. As in executive session,

I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the Food Aid Convention, 1980 (Executive G, 96th Congress, 2d session), and the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material (Executive H, 96th Congress, 2d session), both of which were transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States, and ask that they be considered as having been read the first time, that they be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed, and that the President's messages be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The messages of the President are as follows:

#### *To the Senate of the United States:*

I transmit herewith, for Senate advice and consent to ratification, the Food Aid Convention, 1980, adopted by a conference of Governments at London on March 6, 1980, and open for signature in Washington from March 11 through April 30, 1980. The report of the Department of State is enclosed for the information of the Senate in connection with its consideration of the Convention.

The Convention replaces the Food Aid Convention, 1971, and together with the Wheat Trade Convention, 1971, constitutes the International Wheat Agreement.

The new Convention commits an increased number of members to provide greater minimum annual quantities of food aid to developing countries. The United States commitment is 4,470,000 metric tons, as compared with a commitment of 1,890,000 metric tons under the 1971 Convention. Either amount is well within the limits provided for by the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, P.L. 480, at least

through FY 1980. Implementing legislation is therefore unnecessary unless the FY 1981 P.L. 480 budget proves insufficient. The Convention also provides for the consideration of increased food aid during a period of production shortfall in developing countries. However, increased food aid contributions by members would be voluntary, not mandatory.

The Convention will enter into force on July 1, 1980, if by June 30, 1980, the 11 members referred to in Article III have accepted it in accordance with its terms. It will remain in force for one year, provided that the Wheat Trade Convention, 1971, or a new convention replacing it, remains in force for that period. If the Wheat Trade Convention is extended, this Convention may be similarly extended.

I hope that the Senate will give early and favorable consideration to the Food Aid Convention, 1980, so that ratification by the United States can be effected at an early date. Doing so will demonstrate our continued commitment to providing food aid to needy developing nations.

JIMMY CARTER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 9, 1980.

#### *To the Senate of the United States:*

I submit herewith, for Senate advice and consent to ratification, the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material. This Convention was adopted at a Vienna meeting of government representatives on October 26, 1979, and was signed by the United States on March 3, 1980. The Convention establishes an international framework for improving the physical protection of nuclear material during international transport as well as for international cooperation in recovering stolen nuclear material and in responding to serious offenses involving nuclear material.

The United States has been a leader in the international campaign to prevent the proliferation of nuclear explosive devices. The Congress and I have cooperated in enacting the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 to strengthen this critically important effort.

The Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material was a United States initiative called for by that Act. It complements our non-proliferation efforts by dealing with threats to nuclear material that may arise from terrorist groups. This is a gap in the current international structure, and I urge the Senate to act expeditiously in giving its advice and consent to ratification. I also transmit herewith, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State concerning the Convention.

JIMMY CARTER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 9, 1980.

#### NOMINATIONS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations on the Executive Calendar beginning with the Judiciary

on page 2, continuing through the Department of Justice and the Department of Commerce on page 3, but omitting the Federal Reserve System on page 3, resuming again with new reports on page 4, and continuing through page 5, page 6, page 7, page 8, and all the nominations on the Secretary's desk on page 8 and page 9.

Mr. BAKER. Reserving the right to object, I will not object, the purpose of the reservation is to provide an opportunity to advise the distinguished majority leader that all the items on the Executive Calendar identified by him just now are cleared on our calendar, as well, and we have no objection to their consideration and confirmation.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. President, I overlooked three others cleared on this side, they being shown on page 2 under National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, reserving once again, those three items also are cleared on our calendar.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the minority leader.

#### NOMINATIONS OF ODELL HORTON AND JOHN T. NIXON

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, it is an honor for me to recommend the Senate's confirmation of two outstanding jurists to serve on the Federal bench in Tennessee.

Odell Horton has been nominated as U.S. district judge for the western district of Tennessee, and John T. Nixon has been nominated for the U.S. district judgeship for the middle district of Tennessee.

Mr. Horton has been an active member of the Tennessee bar for more than 20 years, engaged first in private practice, and later serving in the U.S. attorney's office for the western district of Tennessee, as judge of the criminal court of Shelby County, and as a U.S. bankruptcy judge.

Mr. Nixon also began his legal career in the private practice of law, and later served as an attorney with the U.S. Department of Justice, as staff counsel to the comptroller of the treasury for the State of Tennessee, and as judge of the general sessions and circuit courts of Davidson County, Tenn.

Both of these gentlemen have prepared well for the responsibilities of the Federal bench. It is with genuine respect for their records of service and enthusiasm for their future service as Federal jurists that I urge my colleagues' approval of their nominations.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, today, the Senate voted unanimously to confirm the nominations to the Federal bench of two distinguished jurists with superb credentials. Judge Odell Horton Jr. and Judge John Nixon are men whose character, integrity and ethical standards are beyond question. They are a credit to the merit selection system by which they were chosen.

Judge Nixon and Judge Horton will serve with great distinction in the Federal judiciary. Judge Nixon will serve on the U.S. district court for the middle dis-

trict of Tennessee, and Judge Horton will serve on the U.S. district court for the western district of Tennessee. The courts for both districts will be enhanced by their service.

It was a pleasure to recommend both men for these judgeships some months ago to the President of the United States with the concurrence of my distinguished senior colleague, Senator BAKER. Their abilities as jurists have earned the high esteem of their colleagues in the legal community.

Judge Horton's work as a bankruptcy judge in the western district of Tennessee has earned the praise and respect of his superiors in the U.S. district court and the lawyers who practice before him. Prior to his appointment to the bankruptcy court, he served as criminal court judge and director of community health services of the Mid-South Health Center.

He has also served as president of Lemoine-Owen College in Memphis and has served as an assistant U.S. Attorney.

The legal experience of Judge Horton is varied and rich. I think it will stand him in good stead as he undertakes the task as a Federal district judge. Throughout his career, Judge Horton has demonstrated not only outstanding legal ability but dedication to improving the life of his fellow man. His support came from all segments of the district that he has been nominated to serve—rural and urban, professional and nonprofessional, black and white.

Judge Nixon has established an equally outstanding reputation in his law practice and judicial duties in Nashville. He currently serves as general sessions judge in Nashville and he served from 1975 until 1978 as Davidson County circuit court judge.

He graduated from Harvard College and Vanderbilt University School of Law. He served as city attorney for Anniston, Ala., and as an attorney for the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice.

I have known Judge Nixon for many years, both as a friend, a colleague at Vanderbilt School of Law, an able and competent practitioner at the Nashville Bar, and one of the most distinguished circuit court judges to have ever served in the courts of Davidson County. I can personally attest to the strength of his legal ability, as well as to his genuine concern for the community and his devotion to the law.

Judge Nixon has gained widespread respect in middle Tennessee as an even-tempered and fair jurist. There is no doubt that he will be a credit to the Federal judiciary.

I congratulate both these men on their past achievements and wish them well as they begin their service as U.S. district judges.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the nominees indicated be considered en bloc, confirmed en bloc, that the motions to reconsider en bloc be laid on the table, and that the President of the United States be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominees.

CXXVI—677—Part 9

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION  
M. Athalle Range, of Florida, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

James R. Mills, of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

Frank H. Neel, of Georgia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

#### THE JUDICIARY

Odell Horton, of Tennessee, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Tennessee.

John T. Nixon, of Tennessee, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Tennessee.

Norma Holloway Johnson, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia.

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Henry S. Dogin, of New York, to be Director of the Office of Justice Assistance, Research.

Homer F. Broome, Jr., of California, to be Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

Raymond L. Acosta, of Puerto Rico, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Puerto Rico.

John Saul Edwards, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Virginia.

Thomas Edward Delahanty II, of Maine, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Maine.

John S. Martin, Jr., of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York.

James R. Laffoon, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of California.

John W. Spurrier, of Maryland, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Maryland.

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Margaret Muth Laurence, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks.

#### IN THE AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Howard M. Lane, to be lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Charles C. Blanton, to be lieutenant general.

Lt. Gen. Abbott C. Greenleaf, to be lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Howard W. Leaf, to be lieutenant general.

Lt. Gen. Richard L. Lawson, to be lieutenant general.

#### IN THE ARMY

Brig. Gen. Floyd Wilmer, to be major general.

Brig. Gen. Bernhard Theodore Mittemeyer, to be major general.

Brig. Gen. Quinn Henderson Becker, to be major general.

Col. Robert Thomas Cutting, to be major general.

Col. Guthrie Lewis Turner, Jr., to be brigadier general.

Col. Chester Lawrence Ward, to be brigadier general.

Brig. Gen. Floyd Wilmer Baker, to be brigadier general.

Maj. Gen. Paul Francis Gorman, to be lieutenant general.

Gen. William Allen Knowlton, to be general.

Lt. Gen. John Quint Henlon, to be lieutenant general.

Lt. Gen. Robert Carter McAllister, to be lieutenant general.

Lt. Gen. John Woodland Morris, to be lieutenant general.

#### IN THE NAVY

Adm. Harold E. Shear, to be admiral.  
Rear Adm. James R. Sanderson, to be vice admiral.

#### LINE

John G. Wissler, to be rear admiral.  
Glenwood Clark, Jr., to be rear admiral.  
William E. McGarrah, Jr., to be rear admiral.

Richard A. Miller, to be rear admiral.  
Milton J. Schultz, Jr., to be rear admiral.  
Louis R. Sarosdy, to be rear admiral.  
Robert B. Fuller, to be rear admiral.  
Joseph B. Wilkinson, Jr., to be rear admiral.

Charles E. Gurney, III, to be rear admiral.  
Richard K. Fontaine, to be rear admiral.  
Frank C. Collins, Jr., to be rear admiral.  
James E. Service, to be rear admiral.  
Frederick W. Kelley, to be rear admiral.  
Peter C. Conrad, to be rear admiral.  
Dempster M. Jackson, to be rear admiral.  
James A. Lyons, Jr., to be rear admiral.  
John B. Mooney, Jr., to be rear admiral.  
James B. Bussey IV, to be rear admiral.  
Lawrence Burkhardt III, to be rear admiral.  
William C. Neel, to be rear admiral.  
Walter M. Locke, to be rear admiral.  
Donald S. Jones, to be rear admiral.  
Joseph F. Frick, to be rear admiral.  
Louis A. Williams, to be rear admiral.  
Richard A. Martini, to be rear admiral.  
Powell F. Carter, Jr., to be rear admiral.  
Harry C. Schrader, Jr., to be rear admiral.  
Wayne D. Bodensteiner, to be rear admiral.  
Joseph J. Bath, Jr., to be rear admiral.  
Stanley G. Catola, to be rear admiral.  
Richard T. Gaskill, to be rear admiral.

#### MEDICAL CORPS

Roger F. Milnes to be rear admiral.  
George E. Gorsuch to be rear admiral.  
Eustine P. Rucci to be rear admiral.

#### SUPPLY CORPS

Duncan P. McGillivray to be rear admiral.  
Richard E. Curtis to be rear admiral.

#### CHAPLAIN CORPS

Nell M. Stevenson to be rear admiral.

#### CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Paul R. Gates to be rear admiral.

#### DENTAL CORPS

James D. Enoch to be rear admiral.

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Thomas George Allison, of Washington, to be General Counsel of the Department of Transportation, vice Linda Kamm, resigned.

#### IN THE COAST GUARD

Frederick P. Schubert to be rear admiral.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK IN THE AIR FORCE, ARMY, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Air Force nominations beginning Joseph A. Accardo, Jr., to be second lieutenant, and ending Waldemar Zukauskas, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 26, 1980.

Air Force nominations beginning Ralph E. Bradford, Jr., to be colonel, and ending William E. Riecken, Jr., to be colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate on April 8, 1980, and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 15, 1980.

Air Force nominations beginning Robert F. Aaron, Jr., to be first lieutenant, and ending Robert J. Zettel, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate on April 14, 1980, and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 15, 1980.

Air Force nominations beginning Kenneth A. Murdock, to be colonel, and ending Eugene A. Blitch, Jr., to be lieutenant colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 23, 1980.

Army nominations beginning James R.

Golden, to be permanent professor, U.S. Military Academy, and ending Carol M. Wright, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 26, 1980.

Army nominations beginning Brian J. Adams, to be second lieutenant, and ending John T. Zoccola, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate on April 3, 1980, and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 15, 1980.

Navy nominations beginning Dean S. Nakayama, to be lieutenant commander, and ending Kenneth D. Brown, to be ensign, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 26, 1980.

Navy nominations beginning Josef W. Christ, to be ensign, and ending George J. Tyson, Jr., to be commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 28, 1980.

Navy nominations beginning Timothy James Allega, to be lieutenant commander, and ending Patricia Ellard Wilhelm, to be lieutenant commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 2, 1980.

Navy nominations beginning William Broughton, to be commander, and ending Linda E. Wargo, to be lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate on April 14, 1980, and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 15, 1980.

Navy nominations beginning Jeffrey R. Abel, to be ensign, and ending Charles A. Wilson, to be commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 21, 1980.

Marine Corps nominations beginning Terry L. Armstrong, to be first lieutenant, and ending Raymond R. Yinger III, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 2, 1980.

Marine Corps nominations beginning John B. Airola, to be colonel, and ending Gail M. Reals, to be colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate on April 8, 1980, and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 15, 1980.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, is the Senate back in legislative session now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is back in legislative session now.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

#### NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 730.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2320) to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the programs of the National Bureau of Standards, including certain special statutory programs,

and for other purposes, reported with amendments.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with amendments, as follows:

On page 2, line 9, after "\$87,733,000" insert "for fiscal year 1981, and \$119,706,000 for fiscal year 1982";

On page 2, beginning with line 13, strike "for fiscal year 1981, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1982";

On page 2, line 20, after "\$1,253,000" insert "for fiscal year 1981, and \$1,378,000 for fiscal year 1982";

On page 2, beginning with line 24, strike "for fiscal year 1981, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1982";

On page 3, line 10, after "\$15,390,000" insert "for fiscal year 1981, and \$16,930,000 for fiscal year 1982";

On page 3, beginning with line 14, strike "for fiscal year 1981, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1982";

On page 4, beginning with line 10, insert "for fiscal year 1981, and \$270,000 for fiscal year 1982";

On page 4, line 14, beginning with "for" strike all through and including line 15;

On page 4, line 18, strike "such sums as may be necessary and insert the following: \$4,073,000 for fiscal year 1982, together with such sums as may be necessary for increases resulting from adjustments in salary, pay, retirement, other employee benefits required by law, and for nondiscretionary costs.

On page 5, line 22, after "Department of" strike "the";

On page 6, line 13, strike "subsection" and insert "section";

On page 6, line 18, strike "subsection" and insert "section";

On page 7, beginning with line 1, strike all through and including line 20;

So as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Bureau of Standards Authorizations of Appropriations Act for Fiscal Years 1981 and 1982".*

#### AUTHORIZATIONS FOR ACTIVITIES UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1901

SEC. 2 (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce to carry out activities performed by the Bureau under the Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (15 U.S.C. 271-278h), except section 16 thereof (15 U.S.C. 278f), \$87,733,000 for fiscal year 1981, and \$119,706,000 for fiscal year 1982, together with such sums as may be necessary for increases resulting from adjustments in salary, pay, retirement, other employee benefits required by law, and for other nondiscretionary costs.

(b) Section 16 of the Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (15 U.S.C. 278f), is further amended by adding at the end thereof a subsection (c) to read as follows: "(c) For the purposes of this section, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce \$1,253,000 for fiscal year 1981, and \$1,378,000 for fiscal year 1982, together with such sums as may be necessary for increases resulting from adjustments in salary, pay, retirement, other employee benefits required by law, and for other nondiscretionary costs

(c) Section 18 of the Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (15 U.S.C. 278h), is further amended by: (1) repealing subsection (b); and (2) removing the designation "(a)" from the remaining paragraph.

#### AUTHORIZATIONS FOR ACTIVITIES UNDER OTHER STATUTES

SEC. 3. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce \$15,390,000 for fiscal year 1981, and \$16,930,-

000 for fiscal year 1982, together with such sums as may be necessary for increases resulting from adjustments in salary, pay, retirement, other employee benefits required by law, and for other nondiscretionary costs to carry out the activities specified for performance by the Secretary or the Bureau in:

(1) section 111(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 759(f));

(2) sections 5 (d) and (e), 8 and 9(a) of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act (15 U.S.C. 1454 (d) and (e), 1457 and 1458(a));

(3) section 383(c) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6363(c));

(4) section 5002 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6952);

(5) section 5(d) of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7704 (d)); and

(6) title IV of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2531-2573).

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce to carry out research by the Bureau in the area of environmental measurement sciences \$245,000 for fiscal year 1981, and \$270,000 for fiscal year 1982, together with such sums as may be necessary for increases resulting from adjustments in salary, pay, retirement, other employee benefits required by law, and for other nondiscretionary costs.

(c) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce to carry out the purposes of the Standard Reference Data Act (15 U.S.C. 290-290f) \$4,073,000 for fiscal year 1982, together with such sums as may be necessary for increases resulting from adjustments in salary, pay, retirement, other employee benefits required by law, and for nondiscretionary costs.

#### FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 4. The Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (15 U.S.C. 271-278h), is further amended by striking the figure "\$75,000" in section 14 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 278d) and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "\$250,000"

#### INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

SEC. 5. In order to develop and strengthen the Department of Commerce's expertise in science and engineering, to enhance the Secretary's ability to maintain the Department's programs at the forefront of worldwide developments in science and engineering, and to cooperate in international scientific activities, the Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (15 U.S.C. 271-278h), is further amended by adding immediately after section 16 (15 U.S.C. 278f) a new section 17 to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. (a) The Secretary is authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to expend such sums, within the limit of appropriated funds, as the Secretary may deem desirable, through the grant of fellowships or any other form of financial assistance, to defray the expenses of foreign nationals not in service to the Government of the United States while they are performing scientific or engineering work at agencies of the Department of Commerce or participating in the exchange of scientific or technical information at agencies of the Department of Commerce.

"(b) The Congress consents to the acceptance by an employee of the Department of Commerce of fellowships, lectureships, or other positions for the performance of scientific or engineering activities or for the exchange of scientific or technical information, offered by a foreign government, and to the acceptance and retention by an employee of the Department of Commerce of any form of financial or other assistance provided by a foreign government as compensation for and/or to defray the expenses associated with performing scientific or engineering activities or exchanging scientific or technical information, when the acceptance of such fel-

lowship, lectureship, or position or the acceptance and retention by an employee of such assistance is determined by the Secretary to be appropriate and consistent with the interests of the United States. For the purposes of this subsection, the definitions appearing in section 7342(a) of title 5 of the United States Code apply. Civil actions may be brought and penalties assessed against any employee who knowingly accepts and retains assistance from a foreign government not consented to by this subsection in the same manner as prescribed by section 7342(h) of title 5 of the United States Code.

"(c) Provisions of law prohibiting the use of any part of any appropriation for the payment of compensation to any employee or officer of the Government of the United States who is not a citizen of the United States, shall not apply to the payment of compensation to scientific or engineering personnel of the Department of Commerce."

● Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, today the Senate considers S. 2320, a bill to reauthorize the activities of the National Bureau of Standards (NBS) for fiscal years 1981 and 1982. I urge its adoption.

The NBS is the Nation's oldest research laboratory and lead agency responsible for measurement sciences and standards. The NBS' mission is vital to progress in industrial innovation, technological development and to the achievement of the responsibilities of many agencies.

Until 1978 the NBS had a continuing authorization. In 1978 the Subcommittee on Science, Technology and Space of the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation began oversight hearings on the status of the NBS. They were the first general oversight hearings in the Senate since the establishment of NBS in 1901.

Our hearings indicated a general erosion in the health and technical excellence of NBS. Congressional neglect was cited as one of the contributing factors. As a result, we proposed that NBS be placed on a periodic authorization, and this was done.

S. 2320 would extend authorization of appropriations for NBS through fiscal year 1982. In March we reviewed progress achieved at NBS since our 1978 hearings, along with their budget request. I am pleased to note that a number of positive things have happened in the past 2 years. The administration and Congress provided overall increases in the budget; a multi-year commitment was made to restore and increase NBS scientific and technical competence; a permanent director and deputy director are in place; the first reorganization of NBS in a decade is complete; a planning office was established; the average age of NBS personnel has gone down for the first time in a decade and younger scientists are being recruited; and the General Accounting Office reports that "the majority of users of the Bureau's four major services expressed highly favorable opinions on those services."

Continued improvement in the NBS will depend on maintaining these efforts. The scientific and engineering expertise at NBS is a vital national resource. I believe adoption of S. 2320 will contribute to the maintenance of a strong and effective NBS. ●

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendments were agreed to, en bloc.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BAKER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill (S. 1144) to authorize appropriations for the Quiet Communities Act for the fiscal years 1980 and 1981, agrees to the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. SANTINI, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. LEVITAS, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. MADIGAN, and Mr. SNYDER were appointed as managers of the conference on the part of the House.

#### HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following concurrent resolution was read by title and placed on the calendar:

H. Con. Res. 307. A concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1981, 1982, and 1983 and revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1980.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-3763. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the requests for supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1980 in the amount of \$6,000,000 for the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DECONCINI, from the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2508. A bill to provide for the disposition of the Gila River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community judgment funds awarded in dockets 236-A, 236-B, and 236-E before the Indian Claims Commission and the U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 96-690).

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 2687. An original bill to amend the National Ocean Pollution Research and Development and Monitoring Planning Act of 1978, as amended, to extend the appropriations authorizations to carry out the provisions of such act for fiscal years 1981, 1982, and 1983, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 96-691).

S. 2688. An original bill to amend the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 to authorize appropriations for title II of such act for fiscal year 1981 (Rept. No. 96-692).

Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 2271. A bill to amend the Bretton Woods Agreement Act to authorize consent to the increase in the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund (Rept. No. 96-693). Referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BUMPERS (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. TSONGAS, and Mr. WEICKER):

S. 2686. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the protection of the Barrier Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Environment and Public Works, jointly, provided, if ordered reported by one committee, the other be granted 30 days to report, or be discharged.

By Mr. CANNON (from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation):

S. 2687. A bill to amend the National Ocean Pollution Research and Development and Monitoring Planning Act of 1978, as amended, to extend the appropriations authorizations to carry out the provisions of such act for fiscal years 1981, 1982, and 1983, and for other purposes. Original bill reported and placed on the calendar.

S. 2688. A bill to amend the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 to authorize appropriations for title II of such act for fiscal year 1981. Original bill reported and placed on the calendar.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BUMPERS (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. TSONGAS, and Mr. WEICKER):

S. 2686. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the protection of the Barrier Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Environment and Public Works, jointly, provided, if ordered reported by one committee, the other be granted 30 days to report, or be discharged.

● Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I am introducing today for myself and several of my colleagues, a bill to limit the wasteful Federal spending which encourages inappropriate development on certain portions of the barrier islands.

Briefly, the barrier islands consist of unconsolidated sand which migrates toward the shoreline, as a result of wave action and the rising sea level. The deflection of the waves by barrier islands protects the mainland behind them. In fact, many coastal communities and harbors owe their very existence to the protection provided by the barrier islands. Creating building sites destroys these natural vital processes. Bulldozing dunes to provide for oceanfront development diminishes island stability. Diking and filling wetlands and marshes often destroy critical wildlife habitat as well as nutrients critical to healthy fish populations. Groins and jetties are built to enhance one beach, but rob sand from another island thus greatly accelerating island retreat. In a related problem, access to these islands is usually by ferry or two-lane roads which are often inadequate to evacuate people quickly in cases of impending hurricanes or other disasters. In this regard, the development man places on these islands is extremely vulnerable to the violent storms and hurricanes which frequently strike the barrier islands with the full brunt of their force.

There are over 300 barrier islands, barrier spits, and bay barriers located off the Atlantic and gulf coasts. Many of these islands are already developed and would not be affected by this legislation. However, I believe we have an opportunity to protect undeveloped islands and portions of barrier islands, with substantial savings to the Federal Treasury, through my legislation.

It is estimated that more than \$500 million in Federal funds has been spent over the last 3 years on barrier islands, and much of it was spent to encourage and subsidize development. It is a tremendous waste of Federal funds to encourage new development by providing beach stabilization, bridge construction, wastewater treatment facilities and flood insurance assistance in the first instance, and then paying for reconstruction, often in the same place, following a major storm. I am, therefore, calling for a limitation and redirection of Federal development subsidies in areas which are now undeveloped.

In recent years, increased attention has been focused on the hazards asso-

ciated with developing the barrier islands. In 1977, President Carter's environmental message called for a comprehensive study of the islands. This study, which was recently released, stresses the hazards involved in developing residences and businesses on barrier islands, and the damage to the ecosystem that results from such development. A draft environmental impact statement was then prepared in response to the study which presents three levels of protective options—maintaining the status quo, making administrative changes only, or legislative action. The final environmental impact statement to be released this summer is expected to make final recommendations for Presidential action.

I have reviewed the draft environmental impact statement and am convinced that administrative actions alone will not adequately address the problems associated with barrier island development. Legislative action is necessary. Congressman PHILLIP BURTON introduced H.R. 5981 on November 28, 1979, with 23 cosponsors, which authorizes acquisition of many of these islands. I cannot support the expensive proposition of buying undeveloped islands or portions of islands as proposed in that bill. More importantly, I do not believe that such a course of action is necessary to provide an adequate level of protection for the islands. In my view, it is crucial that we make basic changes in Federal policy to stop the waste of billions of dollars, rather than acquiring these areas.

Mr. President, as I have stated, the bill I am introducing today would only limit Federal actions, assistance, or permits for certain islands or portions of islands. Expenditures for public recreation, navigational safety, energy development and other crucial projects will not be affected at all. But right now there are over 30 Federal programs administered by 20 different Federal agencies which impact the barrier islands. My bill would not affect the already developed areas of the barrier islands, but would aim at limiting the subsidies and permits, including flood insurance, to those islands and portions of islands not already developed.

The primary need for this legislation is threefold. First, as I have only briefly outlined, development on these "sand castles" represents a policy that is unwise and detrimental to important natural processes of these islands. Second, a serious public safety hazard is posed to the residents of the islands from inadequate evacuation routes which might be needed in cases of major hurricanes. Third, and most importantly, it is a tremendous waste of Federal funds to encourage development on these islands.

There have been numerous articles on the problems associated with unwise development on barrier islands, and I ask unanimous consent that two of these articles from the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal be printed in the RECORD at this point. 1980 has been proclaimed the "Year of the Coast." My colleagues cosponsoring this bill and I feel

that the Congress must respond to one of the major issues associated with the Year of the Coast—the protection of the Barrier Islands. I hope that the Senate will be able to move forward expeditiously in passing this very necessary and fiscally responsible proposal. I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the legislation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 23, 1979]

## CRITICS QUESTION COST OF MAINTAINING COASTS IN STORM-PRONE AREAS

(By Janet Guyon)

DAUPHIN ISLAND, ALA.—Solitary pillings line the beach front of this resort island. The houses they once supported are piles of rubble scattered inland among broken pine trees. No roads are visible from the air, only trails of tangled power lines.

"Some people can't even find their lots," says E. Bruce Trickey, executive director of Alabama's Coastal Area Board. A growing number of federal officials and coastal planners are beginning to believe that the displaced Dauphin Island homeowners, as well as storm victims elsewhere on the coast, shouldn't be encouraged to rebuild even when they do find their property.

The devastation here is just a slice of an estimated \$2 billion in damage left behind by September's Hurricane Frederic, the most financially crippling hurricane since Agnes, which flooded Northeastern states in 1972. But it is at the heart of a strong new debate over the wisdom, affordability—and the quality—of recent pell-mell coastal development in the U.S. While the traditional concern for fragile coastal environments remains, the new debate is economic.

## THE FEDERAL TROUGH

Federal tax money not only encourages initial coastal development, critics say, but also pays for rebuilding what gets wiped out each year by storms. And some maintain that because of poor construction standards and practices, tax money in effect subsidizes development that has little chance of surviving a major storm.

Simply put, the issue is, "What does it really cost to keep a person on a beach?" asks John Sheaffer, president of Chicago environmental and engineering firm that is conducting a study for the Federal Insurance Administration. His conclusion: "It's pretty evident that it costs a lot."

"Can we forever afford to support this unwise development?" asks Gloria M. Jimenez, administrator of the Federal Insurance Administration—which last year paid out more than \$135 million flood claims. "It simply doesn't make sense to develop in these very dangerous areas," she contends.

Yet counties along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts are developing at twice the national rate, according to the Interior Department. Between 1960 and 1970, for instance, population in five south Florida counties more than doubled, while population in the U.S. as a whole increased by 13.4 percent. Population density per square mile on U.S. barrier islands is more than four times the national average.

## THE MONEY IS THERE

While federal tax money long has subsidized this development, it also has paid for a sizable part of redevelopment of the same hazardous area. To rebuild a bridge to Dauphin Island for 1,600 permanent residents and an unknown number of tourists will cost \$30 million to \$40 million in federal highway funds, and, critics say, will reopen the island to development that shouldn't have been there in the first place.

In the 1975-77 fiscal years, a dozen federal agencies committed about \$500 million in tax money to aid development of barrier islands like Dauphin. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers currently is rebuilding the beach at Miami Beach for about \$65 million in local and federal funds, although many experts believe the new beach will just wash away in the first big storm.

"How do you hold back development when roads and sewer systems are put in," asks Mrs. Jimenez. "I don't think you can."

Although this unprecedented rush to the beach is costing taxpayers millions of dollars, it also is giving land speculators and coastal developers fat sources of income. In Key Biscayne, Fla., for example, homes and condominiums are selling for 25 percent to 30 percent more than they were last year. In the 1960s, homes there appreciated by only 3 percent to 5 percent a year.

The rush itself has greatly increased the potential bill for federal disaster aid and insurance claims. But many, including federal insurance officials, believe that the problem is compounded by tax local building codes that are loosely enforced and that allow flimsy construction.

#### NO SURGE PROTECTION

"We're more vulnerable today to the hurricane than we ever have been in the history of the nation," says Neil L. Frank, director of the National Hurricane Center in Miami. "The building codes that we have in the U.S. are only designed to give you protection against wind. I don't know of a code in the nation that gives you protection against storm surge." (These are the walls of water 10 to 20 feet high that thunder ashore before the eye of a hurricane.)

Along the beach at Gulf Shores, Ala., just east of Dauphin Island, Mr. Trickey pulls his car over near a two-tone green cottage that still is standing. Pilings with nails sticking from their tops lean crazily in the lots next door. Mr. Trickey walks under the green house, pointing to pilings that are cross-braced and bolted to the floor. "This is good," he says, eyeing half-inch bolts and the system of braces. "There's a real difference between the ones that survived the hurricane and those that didn't."

In surveying the wreckage at Dauphin Island and Gulf Shores, engineers from the Federal Emergency Management Agency found that although most buildings elevations were high enough to meet federal flood insurance requirements many buildings had pilings that weren't driven deep enough or weren't attached strongly enough to prevent them from being washed away. "When you lose five feet of sand, that piling gets pretty fragile," says Robert Cassell, an engineer in the agency's Atlanta office. Federal flood insurance requirements set buildings' elevations above mean sea level, but they don't say how buildings are to be attached to the pilings.

Mrs. Jimenez of the Federal Insurance Administration says, however, that the problem goes far beyond carpentry standards. She thinks that perhaps flood insurance ought to be denied to new construction on barrier islands. She also is considering remapping the entire coastal flood plain. By December, her agency will be able to incorporate wave heights into its methods for setting safe flood elevations. "It's going to cause a big political uproar," she says, "because it's going to cause elevations in some areas to be half again as much—in- stead of 12 feet. It'll have to be 18 feet."

Flood elevation requirements already are causing an uproar in Cape Coral, Fla., a growing community of single-family homes at the mouth of the Caloosahatchee River on the Gulf Coast. City officials there contend that the proposed flood elevations for the community are too high. The Insurance Administration hasn't allowed for factors that

would mitigate the effect of a big storm surge, such as the barrier islands around the mouth of the river, they say. Two local contractors have taken the agency to court.

#### ONE-LEVEL LIFE

The increased elevation standards, the contractors say, will add \$6,000 to \$8,000 to the price of a standard three-bedroom home, an increase of about 15 percent. In addition, many new residents are elderly, says the city attorney, Richard Roosa, and they don't like or aren't able to walk up stairs to an elevated house. "One of the reasons elderly retirees come to Florida is because they can have a single-level home," he says. "We could lose our competitive edge as a single-family community in favor of other areas in Florida with high rises and elevators."

Cape Coral could withdraw from the federal flood insurance program and thus be exempt from its regulations. But then the housing market probably would dry up, says Mr. Roosa, because without federal flood insurance, mortgages are nearly impossible to get. Communities that don't participate in the insurance program are cut off from other federal aid, including federally backed mortgages. To get the insurance, communities must adopt federal elevation standards and a flood-control program approved by the Insurance Administration.

But some communities don't participate in the insurance program, and their residents are glad. "I live in the flood plain and I just want them (federal insurers) to keep their hands off my land," says Terry Keeling, a Houston real-estate broker who lives in Fort Bend County. "I've never found enough intelligence in the federal government to regulate a parking place for bicycles."

Mr. Keeling heads the Texas Landowners Rights Association, which wants to get the federal government out of regulating local building practices. The group figures it is futile to try to abolish the federal insurance program. So it wants the government to allow any type of construction in the flood plain and to charge flood-insurance premiums according to the risk of damage to each individual building.

#### SHORTAGE OF INSPECTORS

The Insurance Administration, however, has enough problems enforcing its already-existing building standards. The agency relies mainly on local building inspectors who often aren't adequately trained or can't thoroughly inspect all coastal construction. Baldwin County, Ala., for instance, (where Gulf Shores is located) has only one building inspector. "There's no way he can cover the territory he's got to cover without inconveniencing the contractor," says Stephen A. McMillan, a Mobile real-estate broker. "A lot of your coastal areas are rural areas, which means they don't have a large tax base to train their building inspectors."

For now, the hurricane season is over, and many coastal areas have averted disaster for another year. But what worries officials and planners like Mrs. Jimenez and Mr. Sheaffer is the chance of a really big storm hitting a highly developed area like south Florida. One major hurricane there could cause \$1.5 billion of damage, the total amount of damage caused by hurricanes in Florida between 1960 and 1975, the Interior Department says. On the average, two hurricanes strike the U.S. coast each year and cause more combined property damage than any other type of natural disaster, to say nothing of the loss of human life.

"What you have is people who don't want to elevate because it costs more to build," says John Scheibel, an attorney for the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Mrs. Jimenez adds: "It may cost more to build, but we're really tired of paying out disaster assistance. Even the most conservative people

can see it makes fiscal good sense to control development in the hazardous areas."

#### CURBS ON DEVELOPMENT OF BARRIER ISLANDS PROPOSED

(By Senis King)

WASHINGTON.—The Carter Administration is moving toward protecting the barrier islands along the Atlantic Coast and the Gulf of Mexico by inhibiting their development and discouraging redevelopment after storms and flooding.

In the last three years, Federal agencies have spent nearly \$500 million in largely futile efforts to stabilize barrier islands and rehabilitate private beachfront property built in parts of them that are vulnerable to flooding from the sea.

Robert L. Herbst, an Assistant Secretary of the Interior, said of the proposed new policy: "What we have in mind is to clean up our act—to set some new policies that will save heartaches and financial ruin for the misguided purchasers of such foolish developments, and to save the taxpayers a bundle in the process."

He noted that since 1972 more than 1,900 communities, many of them on barrier islands, had been declared flood disaster areas two or more times and had received Federal disaster aid that was often used to rebuild them in the same locations.

Such familiar, highly developed localities as New York State's Fire Island; Nahant, Mass.; Atlantic City, N.J.; Cape Hatteras, N.C.; and Miami Beach and Sanibel Island in Florida are barrier islands.

The Interior Department's Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service has prepared for distribution an elaborate environmental impact statement that includes proposals for Federal action to inhibit new development in the most fragile areas of the islands.

Also contained in the statement are proposals for limitations on Federal disaster aid and Federal flood insurance to discourage rebuilding of areas on the islands that have repeatedly been destroyed by hurricanes or major storms.

#### CURB ON ENGINEERS' PROGRAMS

The Corps of Engineers could be "turned away" from its vast and costly beach restoration and protection projects and the Federal Government could acquire undeveloped barrier islands that now provide both sanctuary for wildlife and protection from sea storm flooding of the mainland, the statement suggests.

Policy recommendations, based on these proposals, are expected to be sent to President Carter by mid-February, Mr. Herbst said.

The statement, with supporting letters to the heads of the 20 Federal agencies whose programs or policies affect the barrier islands, will be circulated within the next two weeks, Mr. Herbst said.

This will come in advance of hearings on barrier island legislation introduced recently by Representative Phillip Burton, Democrat of California, chairman of the House subcommittee on national parks.

His bill would establish a program under which the Federal Government would buy or acquire many of the 100 or more barrier islands still undeveloped. It would also authorize the Government to acquire uninhabited portions of developed islands. And it would bar spending any more Federal money on the uninhabited islands until they have been remapped and identified.

Over the centuries, barrier islands were formed as wild Atlantic storms piled up coastal dunes and then forced surf through their weak points, separating coastal strips from the mainland and forming narrow bays behind them.

An Interior Department study, prepared

last March for President Carter as the basis for Federal action that was originally expected to begin in mid-May, emphasized that all barrier islands are unstable.

Their sandy shorelines constantly move under the force of storms and currents, the study found. It also declared that man's efforts to stabilize barrier island shorelines usually caused even more damage to the islands.

As an example of barrier island problems and wasted funds, Mr. Herbst cited the communities off the coast from Mobile, Ala., that were ravaged by Hurricane Frederic this fall.

"State and local governing bodies there are already proposing to rebuild essentially the same communities, in the same vulnerable spots, in the path of the next inevitable hurricane, and, naturally, with huge infusions of Federal dollars," he said.

The environmental report suggests that the Government could insist that all Federal disaster aid and recovery programs be turned away from flood-prone areas on the barrier islands so that past mistakes would not be perpetuated by subsidizing their restoration.

The statement also suggests that new private development on barrier islands could be influenced by limited Federal grants for water and sewer lines to areas where building would be least detrimental.

Proposals for new protection of the Fire Island National Seashore also included restoring the island's natural sand movement; building of sand bypass structures around inlets, thus preventing entrapment of sand that would naturally replenish the beaches; stopping the building of beach stabilization on structures and discontinuing antimosquito ditching in the marshes.

S. 2686

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

#### FINDINGS AND STATEMENTS OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) there are resources of extraordinary scenic, scientific recreational, natural, historic, archeological, and cultural value present on the barrier islands which are being irretrievably damaged and lost;

(2) the barrier islands are generally unsuitable for development because of erosion and sand migratory patterns that undermine permanent man-made structures;

(3) certain development on barrier islands severely restricts the natural processes on which the islands are dependent; and

(4) critical to more effective use and conservation of the unique values of barrier islands is a program of coordinated action by Federal, State, and local governments to protect the islands for natural, scenic, ecological, scientific, cultural, historic, conservation and recreation opportunities.

#### BARRIER ISLANDS ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 2. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established the Barrier Islands Advisory Council (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Council").

(b) CHAIRMAN.—The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall serve as Chairman of the Council.

(c) MEMBERS.—In addition to the Chairman, the Council shall consist of representatives of the following departments or agencies: the Department of Transportation; Housing and Urban Development; Commerce; Energy; Agriculture; Defense; Small Business Administration; Federal Emergency Management Agency; Environmental Protection Agency; General Services Administration; Council on Environmental Quality; National Park Service; Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, Fish and Wildlife Service; and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

(d) MEETINGS.—The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman, but not less than six times each year. All Council meetings shall be open to the public, and at least fifteen days prior to the date when any meeting of the Council is to take place the Chairman shall publish public notice of such meeting in the Federal Register.

(e) FUNCTIONS.—It shall be the function of the Council to—

(1) conduct studies and advise the Chairman with respect to ongoing, planned, and proposed Federal actions affecting the barrier islands, barrier spits, and bay barriers located along the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts (hereinafter referred to as the "barrier islands") including preservation of natural, cultural, and historic resources, transportation planning, acquisition priorities, economic development, beach restoration and preservation, flood insurance, disaster relief, and such other matters as may be submitted for advise by the members.

(2) make recommendations with respect to proposed regulations or management plans promulgated by any Federal agency which may adversely affect barrier islands; and

(3) make recommendations with respect to ways to improve coordination and consultation between Federal agencies and between such agencies and the several States before actions are taken which may adversely affect the barrier islands.

#### CONSERVATION OF BARRIER ISLAND RESOURCES

SEC. 3. (a) The provisions of this section shall apply to those undeveloped barrier islands and undeveloped portions of barrier islands identified and generally depicted on maps appropriately referenced and dated, which taken together comprise the "Barrier Islands Protection System." Such maps shall be available for public inspection in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, in Washington, D.C.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal expenditures or financial assistance may be made available under any authority of Federal law, and no Federal license, permit or other form of approval may be issued by any Federal agency for—

(1) the construction of any structure, facility, road or related infrastructure;

(2) any road, bridge, airport, boat landing facility, or other facility to be used for providing access to any area in the Barrier Islands Protection System;

(3) flood insurance policies under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. 1441, as amended, for structures in which construction had not commenced prior to May 8, 1980;

(4) any project to prevent the erosion of, or to otherwise stabilize, any shoreline or in-shore area of such a barrier island: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to activities related to energy development, navigational safety, public recreation, and protection of the barrier island ecosystem.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to make minor boundary revisions in the areas included as part of the Barrier Islands Protection System.●

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a bill for the protection of the barrier islands introduced by the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS) be jointly referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Environment and Public Works, and that when ordered reported by one of these committees, the other committee have 30 days to report the bill or be discharged.

This request has been approved by MESSRS. JACKSON, RANDOLPH, HATFIELD, and STAFFORD—the chairmen and rank-

ing minority members of the committees involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 2169

At the request of Mr. SCHWEIKER, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. HEINZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2169, a bill for the relief of William Kubrick.

S. 2417

At the request of Mr. BENTSEN, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HEFLIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2417, a bill entitled the "Productivity Improvement Act of 1980."

S. 2463

At the request of Mr. HUMPHREY, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2463, a bill to amend the Survivor Benefit Plan provided for in chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, to permit a person who has elected to participate in such plan to suspend that election when such person has been rated as totally disabled for a specified period of time, and for other purposes.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1742

At the request of Mr. SCHWEIKER, the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HEFLIN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE), and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ARMSTRONG) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1742 proposed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, a concurrent resolution setting forth the recommended congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1981, 1982, and 1983 and revising the second concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1980.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 425—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION TO DISAPPROVE PROPOSED EXEMPTION FROM INCREMENTAL PRICING

Mr. JACKSON submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. RES. 425

*Resolved*, That the Senate does not approve the proposed rule under section 206(d) of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 (relating to incremental pricing of natural gas) a copy of which was transmitted to the Congress on May 7, 1980.

● Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 requires the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to develop an incremental pricing scheme for industrial users of natural gas. Incremental pricing for boiler fuel users of natural gas is mandatory under the NGPA; expansion of incremental pricing for other industrial uses is presently under review by the Congress.

Incremental pricing as applied to boiler fuel users is the subject of the resolution I am submitting today. At present, the incremental pricing rule passes on a specified portion of the acquisition

costs of natural gas through a surcharge mechanism. The mechanism operates to increase the boiler fuel users' natural gas prices until the price equates with the cost of the users' alternate fuel.

Last fall, on October 15, FERC submitted a proposal to Congress for review establishing the alternate fuel price at the cost of No. 6 high-sulphur fuel. An explanation of that proposal appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 15, 1979, on pages 28319-28320. The Commission has just submitted a continuation of the program establishing the No. 6 high-sulphur fuel price as the alternate fuel price. I ask unanimous consent that the explanation of the proposal be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The proposal is subject to congressional review. Either the House or the Senate could preclude the proposal from going into effect by adopting a simple resolution of disapproval. As has been my practice in the past, I am submitting a pro forma resolution of disapproval of the proposed incremental pricing action.

Questions or comments concerning this matter should be directed to Elizabeth A. Moler, staff counsel, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, (202) 224-0611.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL ENERGY  
REGULATORY COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., May 7, 1980.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
President of the Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) herewith submits regulations which would exempt industrial users subject to Phase I of the incremental pricing program required by section 201 of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 (NGPA) from the upper two tiers of the three-tier price ceiling mechanism contained in the regulations implementing Phase I. This exemption is submitted under the exemption authority contained in section 206(d) of the NGPA.

The NGPA provides for phased deregulation of most newly discovered natural gas by 1985. The incremental pricing provision, a program to transfer a larger proportion of the higher costs of new gas to industrial users, were included to partially shield residential and other high priority users from the full immediate impact of higher gas costs and to provide order in the natural gas market following deregulation.

The statute requires that incremental pricing be implemented in two phases. Phase I applies to large industrial facilities using more than 300 thousand cubic feet of natural gas per day as a boiler fuel (to generate steam or electricity). The Commission implemented Phase I on November 9, 1979.

The portion of new gas costs assigned to industrial users under incremental pricing is to be limited by a ceiling price tied to the price of alternative fuels. An industrial user subject to incremental pricing is intended, under the statute, to pay up to the price of No. 2 distillate fuel oil. However, the Commission is given discretion to reduce the price ceiling to the price of No. 6 residual fuel oil in order to prevent industrial facilities from switching off of natural gas. Industrial load loss of significant magnitude would lessen the protection from higher gas prices provided to high priority users, one

of the two stated objectives of the incremental pricing program.

Under this authority, the Commission has adopted a three-tier system of price ceilings based on the regional prices of No. 2, No. 6 low-sulphur, and No. 6 high-sulphur fuel oil. The price to an individual facility is tied to the alternative fuel that the facility is actually equipped and authorized to burn.

The average price per million Btu's for No. 2 distillate fuel oil is now approximately \$5.50, No. 6 low-sulphur sells for \$4.00 to \$4.50, and No. 6 high-sulphur is in the range of \$3.00 to \$3.25.

In October of 1979, the Commission submitted to the Congress an exemption under the authority provided in section 206(d) of the NGPA suspending the upper two tiers of the three-tier system for one year. The exemption was proposed to prevent industrial facilities from switching to fuel oil at the beginning of the winter heating season which might jeopardize supplies of home heating oil and to give the Energy Information Administration adequate time to develop a data collection program to determine the appropriate prices of all three grades of fuel oil. The Congress did not disapprove this partial exemption rule; it will remain in effect until November 1, 1980.

The Commission is now proposing to extend this exemption from the upper two tiers of the three-tier system in Phase I for an additional year, until November 1, 1981.

With this letter, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission respectfully submits for Congressional review this exemption under section 206(d) of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978.

Sincerely,

CHARLES B. CURTIS,  
Chairman.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED FOR  
PRINTING

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION  
86—FIRST CONGRESSIONAL  
BUDGET RESOLUTION, 1981

AMENDMENT NO. 1755

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. GLENN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, a concurrent resolution setting forth the recommended congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1981, 1982, and 1983 and revising the second concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year 1980.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL  
RELATIONS

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations will hold a markup on Wednesday, May 14, 1980, at 11:15 a.m., in room S-146, to consider S. 878, the Federal Assistance Reform Act.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY CONSERVATION AND  
SUPPLY

● Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Energy Conservation and Supply of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources will hold a hearing on Friday, May 23, 1980, on S. 1519, "to authorize

and direct the Secretary of Energy to defer repayment of certain reimbursable costs incurred by the Southwestern Power Administration, to waive certain interest costs, and to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944."

The hearing will begin at 10 a.m. in room 3110 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The subcommittee would be pleased to receive written testimony from those persons or organizations who wish to submit statements for the record. Statements submitted for inclusion in the record should be typewritten, not more than 25 double-spaced pages in length and mailed with five copies by June 6, 1980, to Veronica Kun, Subcommittee on Energy Conservation and Supply, room 3106, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY REGULATION

● Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on Thursday, June 5, 1980, the Subcommittee on Energy Regulation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources will hold a hearing on the Department of Energy's Building Energy Performance Standards (BEPS) program. This hearing will begin at 10 a.m. in room 3110 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. Questions about this hearing should be directed to Benjamin S. Cooper or James T. Bruce of the subcommittee staff at 224-9894.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY REGULATION

● Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on Monday, June 2, 1980, the Subcommittee on Energy Regulation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources will hold a hearing on emergency motor fuel demand restraint mechanisms. On April 16, 1980, I introduced the Emergency Motor Fuel Demand Rationing Act of 1980, S. 2570, which proposes one such mechanism. Because this bill involves the use of an emergency tax, it was quite properly referred to the Senate Finance Committee. Another mechanism is coupon rationing which is currently under consideration by the administration for submittal to Congress under the provisions of title I of the Emergency Energy Conservation Act of 1979 (Public Law 96-102).

The purpose of our subcommittee hearing is to examine the energy policy issues associated with these and other methods of dealing with episodic, severe shortages in transportation fuel.

This hearing will begin at 10 a.m. in room 3110 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. Questions about the hearing should be directed to Benjamin S. Cooper or James T. Bruce of the subcommittee staff at 224-9894.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

AMERICAN BUSINESS CAN DO  
THE JOB

● Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, David T. Kearns, president and chief operating officer of the Xerox Corp., has written a striking column for the "My Turn" feature in the May 5 Newsweek magazine. I ask that this article, "Let's Take Risks

Again," be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Kearns has laid down the challenge that American business can succeed in advancing innovation and productivity in spite of big government. He has addressed what I have long felt are the most serious problems facing our economy, and our foreign policy as we compete with other nations around the globe.

I agree with Mr. Kearns that American business can do the job, but Government must not stand in the way. Unnecessary and burdensome Government regulations and paperwork must be eliminated.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I believe that Congress must not only continue to strive to reduce big government, but also incentives must be established for business innovation and expanded productivity. The 1978 reductions in capital gains taxes and employee stock ownership plans are milestones in this course, but, as I have urged President Carter, more must be done.

Xerox is big business. It is also one of the leading innovators among all American industries. Mr. Kearns' candid and challenging article should be food for every American's thought.

The article follows:

#### LET'S TAKE RISKS AGAIN

(By David T. Kearns)

Almost all of us in business have complained at one time or another about the cost—and the reach—of government regulation. It now seems to me our complaints have become self-defeating excuses.

American businessmen, in fact, are hiding behind government regulations. They're using the excesses and inefficiencies of Big Government to excuse lackluster management, poor technology and deteriorating productivity.

I don't mean the complaints aren't valid, just that we've heard enough of them. Government isn't the whole problem, no matter how big and how intrusive it is or may become. Getting rid of government—and government's regulations—wouldn't be the whole solution, either. This isn't to say that government and its regulations are a good thing, only that they aren't as good an excuse as some of us think.

If we could claim that government's growth over the last 50 years has come at the expense of business, or the average family's standard of living, it would be a different matter. We can't, because it hasn't.

While government has grown into the half-trillion-dollar leviathan it has become, the economy, by and large, has prospered, and our standard of living soared. In that same period of enormous governmental growth, business has expanded, the number of jobs has doubled and the quality of the average worker's life in America has bested that of any other society in history.

The growth of government didn't cause that success—but it didn't prevent it, either, and that's an important distinction.

Let's stop telling ourselves how easily we could solve our economic problems if only we could change the policies—or the politicians—in Washington. What about the policies in corporate boardrooms?

#### HELP

We like to preach the virtues of a free society, but at the first signs of trouble, the air lanes to Washington are filled with businessmen looking for help. George P. Shultz, former Secretary of the Treasury, said that one of his biggest disappointments was in 1971,

when parades of businessmen arrived in Washington, pleading for wage-and-price controls.

The point is, we can't have it both ways. American businessmen have to square their practices with their principles, because the American people won't tolerate anything less. They will never accept a system that allows us to keep our profits, while our losses are subsidized with their tax dollars.

It's time we set aside Big Government as the Big Excuse and get to work on a more serious problem—our vanishing productivity. Since 1966, and particularly since 1970, while the United States progressed slowly—when it progressed at all—our economic competitors have thrived.

Washington is part of the productivity problem, but so is business management. A recent management survey found that U.S. workers are only two-thirds as productive as their grandfathers were—but the survey blamed management, not the workers. Fully 30 per cent of a workday is lost, the survey concluded, through scheduling problems, unclear communication of assignments, improper staffing and poor discipline.

Lay the blame on management, as well, for providing workers with old and outmoded production equipment that might have served their grandfathers well, but can't do the job today. American industry no longer seems willing to risk its resources on capital investments for the future. British essayist Henry Fairlie says of us: "The once rambunctious American spirit of innovation and adventurousness is today being paralyzed by the desire to build a risk-free society." Indeed, America's dismal economic record during the last decade reflects, more than anything else, an astonishing decline in research and development, innovation and productive risk-taking.

Through it all, the American economy has proven to be unusually strong and resilient, and depending on how you look at it—either because of American industry, or in spite of it—it's likely to remain so.

The one great lie in this country—and it has to be exposed—is that it's all over for us, that the age of innovation has ended. We are prosperous, it is said, because we have an abundance of natural resources. We had the good fortune to find ourselves in a place with most of the world's coal, much of its oil and a lot of its gas, ores, minerals and farmland. The corollary to that myth is that, as those resources run out, or seem to, so does our luck run out.

I don't agree, not just because I find it totally unacceptable, but because I believe it's totally avoidable. The wealth, at least of this nation, is not in the ground. It's in our minds—and that is a renewable resource. We can create new wealth, and we have.

Cost: We have entered a new, electronic age that we created and where we clearly excel. Electronic circuits have become the bargain of the century. The cost of a high-quality transistor in an integrated circuit has dropped in twenty years from \$20 to one-fiftieth of a cent. Computers, which have become indispensable to our way of life, operate at 7 cents per million calculations today, when twenty years ago, those same calculations cost \$1.26. In my business, we've lowered the cost of making a copy from 8.5 cents on the Xerox 914, which revolutionized the copier industry twenty years ago, to just over a penny today—and our most advanced copier-duplicators will give you those copies at the rate of two a second.

Over the past decade, the compound annual rate of productivity growth for the U.S. semiconductor industry has been a spectacular 22.5 per cent. In the next twenty years, our knowledge of electronics—and our ability to apply it intelligently—will have a profound effect on how we live and work, but more to the point, on how well we do each.

Ahead are new generations of microcircuits that will spawn a multi-billion-dollar market for electronic sensors, controls, machines and computers of all sizes and types for consumer and industrial applications of every description.

With the technology we've developed, we can revitalize our tired industrial machine and restore it to its rightful place among our competitors. I mean that both as a statement of fact and a challenge.●

#### WITHOUT TAXFLATION, TAX FREEDOM DAY WOULD COME MUCH SOONER

● Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, Sunday, May 11, has been designated as Tax Freedom Day. This is the day when most taxpayers will have earned enough to cover their tax liabilities for 1980. The significance of this date is that, from this point forward, our taxpaying citizens will be working for themselves: What they earn for the rest of the year is theirs to save, invest, or dispose of as they choose.

We cannot allow this day to keep falling later and later in the year. When that happens, we know that the overall tax burden is still rising. That should not be allowed to happen. The fewer days a taxpayer is working for his or her own benefit, or for a family in need of support, the less incentive there is to increase productivity and efficiency. We are just beginning to become aware of the impact of marginally higher levels of taxation on our rates of productivity and economic growth. It should, however, be self-evident that our citizens are most highly motivated when they can gain maximum benefit from the fruits of their own labor.

Mr. President, one obvious and simple way to help Tax Freedom Day fall earlier in the year would be to index the Federal income tax for inflation. By indexing I mean stabilizing effective tax rates relative to real income, so that the interaction inflation and the progressive income tax will not shunt people into higher rate brackets. This change can be effected simply by requiring annual adjustments in the rate brackets, zero bracket amount, and personal exemption to reflect the most recent annual rise in the price index. It can be accomplished by passing the Tax Equalization Act, (S. 12), which I introduced last year.

It is not fair for the Government to continue to absorb automatically an even larger share of the earnings of our citizens, without even having to cast a vote. Tax equalization would not only help move Tax Freedom Day earlier in the year, it would make the Congress more honest and responsive in setting tax policy. I would urge my colleagues to reflect on this matter in observance of Tax Freedom Day.●

#### THE INSUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR AGRICULTURAL PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAMS IN SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 86

● Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, a balanced budget in fiscal year 1981 is a desirable goal, and I support efforts to

achieve it. Fiscal restraint is needed and necessary during this time of high inflation rates and low productivity.

I do have great concern, however, about the types of programs that are cut back in the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1981, as opposed to those that are increased. Extreme austerity, for example, is evident in agriculture function 350, especially for agricultural price supports. The agriculture function 350 total for fiscal year 1981 is \$2.3 billion. But \$1.5 billion of this is for agricultural research and services, leaving only \$.8 billion for agricultural price supports.

Therefore, Mr. President, I fear that the first concurrent resolution, as reported by the Committee on the Budget, shortchanges farmers and rural America, and consequently the economic health of most rural areas and communities. It is my understanding, with some slightly different but quite reasonable assumptions about commodity prices—especially in light of the recently announced USDA report on planting intentions—that the maintenance of current price supports would require another \$2 to \$3 billion.

Thus, the chances are that the function 350 total for agriculture is \$2 to \$3 billion less than that required at current price-support rates—price-support rates that are not even high enough to keep net-farm incomes from plummeting to around \$25 billion in 1980. This is close to \$10 billion less in net-farm income than in 1979. And since the inflation rate is running at 18 percent, \$25 billion in net-farm income for fiscal year 1980 represents \$20 billion in 1979 dollars.

Senators from States where agriculture is not a major activity may not realize that farmers in my State and other farm States are suffering the worst economic conditions since the Great Depression.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I am disturbed by the Senate Budget Committee's report language for agriculture function 350. The report suggests that current farm price supports through fiscal year 1985 would result in stable or increasing per capita net-farm incomes. I quote from page 97 of the report:

Assuming that the current declining trend in farm population continues over the next 5 years, per capita real net-farm income would increase by about 5 percent.

In other words, the Senate Budget Committee is saying that current price supports through 1985 will give stable or slightly increasing per capita real net-farm incomes only if the number of family farms drops significantly.

Well, in my view, with the amounts budgeted for agriculture, this will be a self-fulfilling prophecy. The report language seems to imply that this is a good policy to follow for consumers and farmers. Even though there will only be a handful of farmers left, the report is saying that their net-farm incomes will be stable. How meaningful is this?

I am raising these points today because, with such a low agriculture function 350 total, there is no room for S. 2639, the Agricultural Trade Suspension Adjustment Act of 1980. The provi-

sions of S. 2639 are designed to mitigate the adverse effects on U.S. farmers resulting from the suspension of trade with the Soviet Union. Among other things, the bill would make modest increases in the loan rates for wheat and feed grains going directly into the farmer-held grain reserve.

If the Senate agrees with me and the other members of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry that—due to the grain embargo, bumper crops, and large carryover stocks—S. 2639 is needed legislation, the budget totals for agriculture must be raised in the second concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1981.

I am not going to offer an amendment to raise the total for function 350 at this time. I do want to warn the Senate, however, that the current function 350 total is unbelievably insufficient. I certainly hope that the Senate Budget Committee will treat function 350 differently during its consideration of the second concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1981—whether S. 2639 eventually passes or not. So many seem to forget, Mr. President, that our food is not manufactured at the supermarket. How much is it worth, I ask, to have a stable farm economy and a dependable food supply? It seems obvious that, without them, we would not survive as a strong and free nation.●

#### MINNEAPOLIS VA HOSPITAL

● Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Mr. President, I was very pleased to hear the news last week that the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee has taken action to recommend that \$15 million be appropriated in fiscal year 1981 to begin the design, architectural and engineering plans for the replacement of the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Minneapolis, Minn.

The Minneapolis Veterans' Administration Hospital, which was originally built back in 1927, serves 72 counties in the Midwest region and approximately 547,117 veterans. It is also a valuable teaching facility which has had a long and profitable academic relationship with the University of Minnesota Hospital in Minneapolis. The VA medical center has one of the largest education and training programs in the Veterans' Administration, ranking in the top 1 percent of all VA medical facilities.

However, despite the large number of veterans dependent on the hospital and the valuable contribution it has made in the field of medical education and training, all who have personally toured the hospital agree that it is operating in an antiquated medical facility and is in desperate need of replacement. The Metropolitan Health Board in Minneapolis, which examined the current structure and the replacement plans, declared the existing 738-bed facility as "sorely inadequate" because of age and design.

Most of the facility is made up of buildings that have long past code compliance and present significant fire and safety hazards. There is also a problem with narrow corridors, inadequate space, fans for ventilation, barriers for the handicapped, and patient privacy is almost nonexistent. The building is clearly

outdated, and in its present state seriously impairs the efficiency and the cost-effectiveness of its operation.

Without a modern facility, the Veterans' Administration is not able to deliver the quality medical care that we have promised to our country's veterans. We have made a commitment to serve our veterans and we must now live up to that commitment. Furthermore, if we renege on our obligations to our vets, we will jeopardize our chances of attracting the talented young into the services. We must demonstrate to our young people that we treat our veterans with dignity and deserved gratitude. The armed services today are seriously lacking in prestige, and this is, in large part, due to the unwillingness to make veterans programs—education, health, and other programs—a national priority. It is a small price to pay for the service our country receives in return.

In closing, I would like to thank the Veterans' Affairs Committee again for their vote of approval and to urge the Senate Appropriations Committee to act favorably and appropriate the funds for the hospital as recommended by both the House and Senate Veterans' Affairs Committees.●

#### THE NORTHEAST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROJECT—S. 2156

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to congratulate Senator CANNON and the members of the Commerce Committee for their efforts to insure uninterrupted funding for completion of the Northeast corridor improvement project. S. 2156 is a prime example of continuing congressional commitment to an efficient and balanced transportation system in this Nation.

Our country is increasingly compelled to rely upon mass transportation systems. The railroads will continue to be a critical component of such systems. They were our first efficient form of mass transportation in America. Even today they move over 37 percent of intercity freight and 33 percent of intercity and commuter passenger traffic. Fuel to run our automobiles has become increasingly expensive and scarce. These same fuel costs have produced marked increases in air transportation rates. Improved rail transportation throughout the Nation can provide an important alternative, one that will alleviate congestion at our airports and on our highways, cut travel costs, save fuel, and protect our environment.

Rehabilitation of the northeast rail corridor is a long term investment for our entire Nation. It is one of the few intercity passenger rail routes capable of operating without subsidy. Increased ridership in this corridor will reduce long term Federal costs needed for support of the national Amtrak system, and the results of planning and experience in this corridor will be used as a pattern for emerging corridors throughout the Nation.

Many benefits for the Northeast region will accrue as a result of this project. Reduced fuel usage, and reduced pollution, both noise and air, will result

from the use of electric instead of diesel engines. Up to 120,000 barrels of oil could be saved in this manner.

New England is in the process of shifting its electricity generation capability from petroleum to nonpetroleum fuels; thus use of electrical engines will reduce our dependence on petroleum fuels. By 1990, 85 percent of the electricity south of New York and 50 percent of the electricity north of New York will be generated from nonpetroleum sources. A 3.7 percent reduction in total pollution is estimated for 1990. Noise levels of train operations in the Northeast corridor can be expected to decrease by 28 percent.

We must make a commitment now to finish this project. There is little benefit to a 1-year authorization. Materials which could be purchased now will have to be purchased later at higher prices; equipment that will be needed 2 years from now cannot be ordered now. Without a long-term funding commitment, the project will be a haphazard, piecemeal effort. Project objectives and values have been geared toward and fixed by the total authorization—not a single year's appropriation. Most of the various operations of the project extend over a period of 2 or more years and are closely interrelated. In 1975 the Congress made a commitment to the Northeast corridor improvement project. We must not now leave the project stranded, without adequate funding for completion, and thus waste funds already committed or spent.

I encourage my colleagues to consider very carefully the need to complete the Northeast corridor project. It is the most economically viable part of Amtrak's system. If the Northeast corridor project fails, the chance for developing corridors in other parts of the country will be sorely jeopardized.

I am hopeful that Congress will act quickly to assure continued funding for this vital transportation project. Its importance to the future of rail passenger transportation in this Nation cannot be overstated.●

#### THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I have recently made a series of statements in connection with the United States Senate, as we look forward to the 200th anniversary of the United States Senate, which will occur in 1989.

On last Friday, I spoke of the positions of majority leader and minority leader and indicated that I would be speaking later with further reference to the whip system in the United States Senate. It is to that subject that I turn my attention today.

The office of whip is a purely British institution. It is found in what was formerly Ceylon, and Ireland, and I suppose is also found in all the other Commonwealth countries which have based their parliaments on that of the United Kingdom.

The term "whip" has two distinct parliamentary meanings in England. The whip refers not only to the party officials, like those in the Senate, but also to a

written document. As a matter of fact, the term "whip" was applied to the written document itself much earlier than the term was applied to the officials who were, and those who today are, responsible for the distribution of the whip letters or whip notices.

Under the British system, the government and the opposition have whips who send to their respective party members a document—or notice—called a "whip." This notice informs members of the legislative activities for the ensuing days. Members are informed of the priority or the urgency of matters by a system of underlining.

Each legislative matter in the "whip" notice is underlined in accordance with its importance. A one-line "whip" may indicate that there will not be a vote on the matter. A two-line notice may indicate that the matter is important and that a vote may occur. A three-line "whip" would indicate that every Member is expected to be on the floor and that a vote is scheduled.

It is recorded that "whips" underscored by as many as six lines were used in the House of Commons as early as 1621. Whips that were underlined in red ink for divisions of extreme importance were introduced during the late 1800's.

I spoke with someone at the British Law Library today who indicated that "whips" were first used in 1621, when notices were sent to the king's friends in the House of Commons. A royal "whip" issued on September 21, 1675, read as follows:

Sir J. Williamson to a Member of Parliament. The King being firmly resolved that Parliament shall meet 13 Oct., that you may not be surprised with any contrary reports, nor be detained by the business of the sessions, which unhappily is near that time, has commanded me to give you this notice, and to desire you will not fail to be here at or before the time appointed, and I desire you will let me know as soon as you come to town, that I may acquaint the King how his commands to me have been executed.

As I indicated in an earlier discussion, the "whips" in the 17th and 18th centuries were known as "circular letters." They were also known as "treasury notes" or "treasury letters." In early days they were secret letters.

By 1763 the procedure of the "circular letter" was firmly established, and the withholding of a "whip" was considered a slight.

Edmund Burke, as I stated earlier, referred to the person who dispatched the "circular letter" as being the equivalent of the "whipper-in," the whipper-in being the huntsman assigned to the task of keeping the hounds from straying from the field during the fox hunt.

In May 1769, there was a great debate in the House of Commons on the petition against the return of Colonel Luttrell for Westminster in the place of Alderman Wilkes, who had been expelled from the House by its order. The King's Ministers made great efforts to get all of their supporters together from all quarters for the debate. Edmund Burke, who took part in the debate, referred to these efforts and described how Ministers had sent for their friends to the

north and as far away as Paris, "whipping them in, than, which," he said, "there could not be a better phrase."

I am told that since that time, since Burke made that reference, the members responsible for the marshaling of the forces and for giving out information have been themselves called "whips" and they occupy an important position in both the government and the opposition parties.

A common expression from England about the chief function of a whip is as follows: The whip's job is, "to make a House, to keep a House, and cheer the Minister."

Of course, the meaning of the last phrase is obvious, while the first two phrases refer to the whip's job, first, to insure that sufficient Members of his party are present to constitute a quorum and second, to guarantee that his party can outvote the opposition.

It is especially important, in the British system, for government whips to insure that their party receive a majority vote and as large a majority as possible on every issue because a "snap-vote" that is lost by the government damages their prestige within the chamber and without the chamber. A division loss by the majority party would also create the impression that Government supporters are not very keen in their support or are failing in their parliamentary duties, and it encourages the opposition, both inside and outside the House.

So the job of the Government whip or the chief whip and the deputy whips on the chief whip's side is to prevent such losses while the opposition's whip's task is to inflict as many defeats or narrow majorities as possible on the majority party.

So, to avoid such parliamentary defeats and embarrassments, the chief whip and his assistants see that all party Members are informed of the current legislative business and, as I said the other day, to see that the right Member is in the right place at the right time. If a Member wishes to be absent, his respective party whip will try to arrange pairs.

From 1789, when the Senate first was organized, until 1913 the Senate party whips did not exist, as far as I know, even though our national legislature is patterned in many respects after the English Parliament and legislative procedural practices. It is likely that certain legislators may have performed tasks roughly similar to those of contemporary whips, but there was no institutionalization of the office apparently until the 20th century.

A probable explanation for this is that strong political parties evolved in the United States Senate only after decades of development.

In the early years of the 19th century, political parties on the Hill were largely unorganized groups. In 1874, Senator Justin Morrill, Republican of Vermont, noted this lack of party organization when he said, "I do not propose to act as 'the whip' of the Senate. I think Senators are quite competent to express their own judgment without any whip."

We have never had what is called a whip in the American Senate."

In 1913 the first Democratic Party whip was appointed. He was J. Hamilton Lewis, of Illinois. And he himself indicated that, as far as he could learn, he was the first Democratic whip appointed in the history of the United States Senate, and that was during the first Wilson administration.

Here is what the May 29, 1913, New York Times had to say about Mr. Lewis' appointment:

As a further precaution against a snap division in the Senate by which the Democrats might find themselves in the minority, the caucus elected Senator J. Hamilton Lewis of Illinois today to serve as "whip," although designated as assistant to Majority Leader Kern in the capacity of floor leader. Mr. Lewis's chief duty will be to see that Democrats are present or paired at every rollcall.

The appointment of an assistant to Senator Kern, though brought about in a way to avoid wounding the majority leader's pride, is in fact partly explained by general dissatisfaction with Mr. Kern's leadership.

That closes the quote from the New York Times story.

Others have said that poor attendance at some of the party caucuses angered the majority leader, Mr. Kern, and that, as a result, a party whip was appointed.

In this regard I quote from Claude G. Bowers' *The Life of John Worth Kern*, 1918, page 351:

At times when the regular Democratic attendance had dwindled to a corporal's guard, his impatience manifested itself in caucus, where on one occasion he supplemented his appeal with sarcastic protests, and a "party whip" was selected to assist him.

So two factors may have produced conditions which led to the creation of a party whip post: one, the dissatisfaction of the Democrats in the Senate with their party leader; and, two, the need of their party floor leader in the Senate for an assistant to assure attendance at the party caucuses and on the Senate floor.

Well, having observed that Democratic innovation, the Republicans in 1915 appointed as their first party whip, Senator James Wadsworth of New York, who served but 1 week until Senator Charles Curtis of Kansas was named as his successor.

As in the case of other party leadership positions, that of party whip is not provided for in the Standing Rules of the Senate. Beginning in 1955, the legislative branch appropriations bill contained funds for two clerical assistants, one for the majority whip and one for the minority whip.

As I stated earlier, the whips are chosen in the secret caucus or conference of each party at the beginning of each new Congress.

The party whips are often referred to as the "assistant leaders." On October 7, 1969, the Republican Conference met and unanimously adopted a motion to change in the conference rules the title of "whip" to that of "assistant leader."

Former majority leader Mansfield changed Senator EDWARD KENNEDY's title as well, for a 1970 Congressional Directory identified Mr. KENNEDY as the "assistant majority leader."

When I became whip I asked that the title of "Majority Whip" be reinstated because I preferred that title. I preferred it because of its parliamentary and congressional history. As I have already indicated, the history of the whip institution under the British parliamentary system goes back to the 1600's, and I felt that, with those deep institutionalized roots, the title of whip should continue to be carried by the person in the Democratic Party structure who fulfilled that traditional role in the legislative process.

In the United States Senate, the whips have in recent years sent to their colleagues "whip" notices as the British whips do under the British system. As an example of one of those whip notices, I ask unanimous consent that a whip notice dated June 30, 1972, which was distributed to my colleagues when I was majority whip, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the whip notice was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SENATE DEMOCRATIC WHIP NOTICE

JUNE 30, 1972

The Program for today is as follows:

Senate convenes at 8:15 a.m.

Fifteen minute orders as follows:

Mr. Tunney.

Mr. Harry F. Byrd, Jr.

Mr. Proxmire.

Mr. Moss.

Mr. Robert C. Byrd.

#### DEBT LIMIT BILL

9:30 a.m.—rollcall vote on Bennett amendment (10 percent social security increase).

9:45 a.m.—rollcall vote on Church amendment (20 percent social security increase).

Resumption of debate and amendment to Debt Limit Bill (no time limitation).

Rollcall vote on final passage of Debt Limit Bill is sure.

#### PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL

Senate will take up Public Works Appropriation Bill under a time limitation (2 hours, 30 minutes on any amendment, etc.).

Rollcall vote sure on final passage of Public Works Appropriation Bill.

#### CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Senate will next resume consideration of Continuing Resolution under a time limitation (1 hour for debate, 1 hour on Proxmire amendment, ½ hour on any other amendment, etc.).

Rollcall vote on Proxmire amendment. There will also be a rollcall vote on passage of Continuing Resolution.

#### GENERAL INFORMATION

(1) Conference reports will also be called up during the day.

(2) Foreign Assistance Act remains the unfinished business and action thereon will be resumed when Senate returns July 17.

(3) Minimum Wage Bill will be second track item when Senate returns on July 17.

#### REMINDER

At least 6 rollcall votes today, the first to occur at 9:30 a.m.

#### POST-DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION INFORMATION

The leadership urges all Senators to plan on lengthy sessions daily, six days each week, following Senate's return July 17. A very heavy tough and controversial work load confronts the Senate at that time. For example, the following measures speak for themselves:

- (1) Foreign Assistance Act.
- (2) Minimum Wage Bill.
- (3) Welfare Bill.
- (4) No-Fault Insurance.
- (5) Maritime Bill.

(6) Marine Mammals.

(7) Military Construction Appropriation Bill.

(8) Agriculture Appropriation Bill.

(9) Supplemental Appropriation Bill.

(10) Foreign Aid Appropriation Bill.

(11) Defense Appropriation Bill.

(12) Plus others.

The political radar shows stormy weather ahead; much turbulence; fasten your seat belts—but in the meantime, try to get some relaxation and rest.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also that the "whip" notice of Friday, June 23, 1978, distributed to his Democratic colleagues in the Senate by Mr. ALAN CRANSTON, the able whip who now serves, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the whip notice was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,  
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY WHIP,  
Washington, D.C., June 23, 1978.

DEAR COLLEAGUE,

MONDAY, JUNE 26

Senate convenes: 9 a.m.

Following the usual preliminary activities, the Senate will take up S. 2579 (Calendar Order 783), establishing the Presidential Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, which is under a time agreement. When work on S. 2579 is completed, we will turn to S. 2450 (C.O. 769), extending assistance programs for community mental health centers and for biomedical research and then to S. 2486 (C.O. 770), establishing the National Institutes of Health Care Research, etc. There are time agreements also on these bills. The leadership hopes that it will be possible to complete work on the above measures on Monday. If not, we will return to them after the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill is disposed of on Tuesday.

Roll Calls: Can be expected, but no roll call votes before 4 p.m. Monday.

TUESDAY, JUNE 27

Senate convenes: 9:00 a.m. or earlier.

After the preliminary activities and special orders, the Senate will begin work on H.R. 12930, FY 79 Treasury-Postal Service appropriations.

At 10 a.m., the Senate will interrupt its work on H.R. 12930 for a vote on the resolution of ratification of the U.S.-U.K. tax treaty which includes the Church reservation.

Following the vote on the Treaty, the Senate will resume its consideration of the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill. When this item is disposed of, we will either return to work on the health bills listed above (if they haven't been disposed of) or will then take up S. 419 (C.O. 733), the oil shale bill.

#### THE WEEK

Convening times for the remainder of the week are as follows:

Wednesday, June 28—9:00 a.m. or earlier.  
Thursday and Friday, June 29-30—9:00 a.m. or earlier.

Other measures which the leadership expects to take up next week include the following (but not necessarily in this order):  
Calendar Order 782, S. 2549, NSF authorization bill.

Calendar Order 771, S. 3074, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act to authorize development assistance programs.

Calendar Order 773, S. 3076, Department of State, ICA and Board for International Broadcasting authorization bill.

New York City aid bill H.R. 12426 after June 28.

The leadership wishes to emphasize that there will likely be some night sessions next week (before leaving for the July recess) and roll call votes will occur daily.

ALAN CRANSTON.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. In Mr. CRANSTON's whip notice he indicated to his colleagues the events scheduled for Monday, June 26. He called to their attention the measures that would be taken up during that day, and he indicated that there would be no rollcall votes before 4 p.m. on that Monday.

For the business on Tuesday, June 27, he indicated the measures that would be called up, one of which would be a tax treaty between the United States and the United Kingdom, and another of which was an appropriation bill making appropriations for the Treasury and the Postal Service. Then he gave a wrapup of the remainder of the week in which he stated the convening times and the measures that were likely to be called up, and he emphasized that there would likely be night meetings during the week before leaving for the July recess, and he stated that rollcall votes would occur daily.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a whip notice dated May 17, 1979, distributed to his colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle by the distinguished Senator from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS, the Republican Party whip, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the whip notice was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE REPUBLICAN WHIP NOTICE

MAY 17, 1979

DEAR COLLEAGUE:

MONDAY, MAY 21

11:15 a.m.

Senate will convene.

Following the usual preliminary activities, the Senate will take up S. 241, the Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration bill. Final action is expected today.

It is possible that the Senate might consider S. 756, authorizing appropriations for the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, assuming action on S. 241 is completed.

Rollcall votes expected.

TUESDAY, MAY 22

Time for convening uncertain.

The majority leader has unanimous consent to call up S. 584, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act, and it is expected that he will do so.

Rollcall votes expected.

It is also anticipated that at sometime during the week, the conference report on the First Concurrent Budget Resolution will be available for action.

The program for the balance of the week has not yet been determined. Please contact 4-8601 for details on the daily schedule. My office at 4-2708 is available to answer questions.

NOTE: The Memorial Day recess will begin when the Senate has concluded its legislative business for the week. The Senate will then reconvene on Monday, June 4th.

(Mr. RIEGLE assumed the chair.)

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. The whip system has continued to develop with the

passage of time in this body. For example, Mr. CRANSTON conducts weekly whip meetings, in which I sit and which are also attended by Miss Mary Jane Checchi, the chief counsel and staff director of the Senate Democratic Policy Committee. Mr. CRANSTON, in those meetings, outlines to the deputy Democratic whips the business that is expected to be taken up during the week. Those whip meetings usually are scheduled for Mondays. Mr. CRANSTON also indicates the work that he feels the deputy whips should assist him and the majority leader in carrying out.

Mr. CRANSTON has developed that aspect of the whip system during his tenure and I commend him on having done this.

The minority whip, Mr. STEVENS, replaced the regional GOP whip system with a new assistant whip structure to make certain that the rights of GOP members are protected during Senate floor actions. All first year GOP Senators, along with several of their more experienced colleagues, are afforded the opportunity to become assistant whips. Mr. STEVENS, the minority whip, introduced the practice of "double-teaming" the floor; in other words, a Republican whip will also be present to assist the party's floor manager during Senate debate on legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the names of the assistant Republican whips for the 96th Congress.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

William Armstrong (Colorado).  
Rudy Boschwitz (Minnesota).  
John Chafee (Rhode Island).  
John Danforth (Missouri).  
Thad Cochran (Mississippi).  
William S. Cohen (Maine).  
Orrin Hatch (Utah).  
Gordon J. Humphrey (New Hampshire).  
Larry Pressler (South Dakota).  
Jesse Helms (North Carolina).  
John Warner (Virginia).  
Richard Lugar (Indiana).  
James McClure (Idaho).  
Harrison Schmitt (New Mexico).  
Malcolm Wallop (Wyoming).  
David Durenberger (Minnesota).

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Incidentally, Mr. President, last week when I inserted in the RECORD the names of the Democratic deputy whips, I inadvertently overlooked the name of the able Senator from Nebraska (Mr. EXON). I make amends for that inadvertence today by giving his name special attention.

So, Mr. President, these two distinguished whips, Mr. CRANSTON and Mr. STEVENS, have brought forth to the respective whip systems in the Senate innovations that serve to improve the effective functioning of the whip systems and certainly make the development of those whip systems more and more in conformity with the whip system in the House of Representatives—which is more highly structured, more developed

than is our own here in the Senate and which, more and more, take on the role and functions of the British whip system. And these changes have been meaningful.

When I was Senate majority whip, I did not have meetings with deputy whips. As a matter of fact, the deputy whips in those days were not as numerous as they are today. I feel that the institutionalizing of the whips' meetings, the meetings of the deputy whips on a weekly basis and the enlargement of the number of deputy whips, are progressive innovations for which Mr. CRANSTON should be commended.

The number of Democrats appointed as deputy whips have been increased from four in 1975 to ten as of now. The increase serves to strengthen the majority's capacity to process the Senate's workload and to monitor sentiment for and against legislation.

Mr. President, there have been 15 Democratic whips since 1913. I ask unanimous consent that a table entitled "Party Whips in the U.S. Senate, 1913 through 1980" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—PARTY WHIPS IN THE U.S. SENATE, 1913-80

Name, State, years as whip	Years of whip service	Years in Senate before election	Advancement to party leader	Age at election as whip
DEMOCRATS				
J. Hamilton Lewis (Illinois 1913-19, 1933-39)	12.0	0		51,69
Peter G. Gerry (Rhode Island, 1919-29)	10.0	2.0		39
Morris Sheppard (Texas, 1929-33)	4.0	16.0		53
Sherman Minton (Indiana, 1939-41)	2.0	4.0		48
Lister Hill (Alabama, 1941-47)	6.0	3.0		46
Scott Lucas (Illinois, 1947-49)	2.0	8.0	1949-50	55
Francis Myers (Pennsylvania, 1949-51)	2.0	4.0		48
Lyndon Johnson (Texas, 1951-53)	2.0	2.0	1953-60	42
Earle Clements (Kentucky, 1953-57)	4.0	2.0		56
Mike Mansfield (Montana, 1957-61)	4.0	4.0	1961-77	53
Hubert Humphrey (Minnesota, 1961-65)	4.0	12.0		49
Russell Long (Louisiana, 1965-69)	4.0	16.0		47
Edward Kennedy (Massachusetts, 1969-71)	2.0	6.0		36
Robert C. Byrd (West Virginia, 1971-77)	6.0	12.0	1977-	53
Alan Cranston (California, 1977- )		8.0		62
Average.....	4.6	6.6		50.4

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table which includes the names of Republican Party whips in the U.S. Senate from 1913 through 1980 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—PARTY WHIPS IN THE U.S. SENATE, 1913-80

Name, State, years as whip	Years of whip service	Years in Senate before election	Ad- vance- ment to party leader	Age at election as whip
<b>REPUBLICANS</b>				
James Wadsworth (New York, Dec. 6, to Dec. 13, 1915)	(1)	1.0		38
Charles Curtis (Kansas, 1915-24)	10.0	6.0	1925-29	54
Wesley L. Jones (Washington, 1924-29)	4.0	16.0		60
Simeon Fess (Ohio, 1929-33)	4.0	6.0		67
Felix Hebert (Rhode Island, 1933-35)	2.0	4.0		58
Kenneth Wherry (Nebraska, 1944-49)	5.0	1.0	1949-51	51
Leverett Saltonstall (Massachusetts, 1949-57)	8.0	4.0		56
Everett Dirksen (Illinois, 1957-59)	2.0	6.0	1959-69	60
Thomas Kuchel (California, 1959-69)	10.0	6.0		48
Hugh Scott (Pennsylvania, 1969)	1.0	10.0	1969-77	68
Robert Griffin (Michigan, 1969-77)	8.0	3.0		46
Ted Stevens (Alaska, 1977- )		8.0		53
Average	5.4	5.9		54.9

<sup>1</sup> 1 week.

Note: The Republicans elected no whip from 1935 to 1944; the chairman of the Republican Conference appointed Senators to assist him.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. An examination of this table will show that during the years 1935 to 1944, no Republican served as party whip. The reason that no Republican was appointed during those years to serve as whip arises from the fact that only 17 Republicans were in the Senate following the landslide election of President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1936.

Of the Democratic whips, an examination of the table will show that J. Hamilton Lewis served longer in that office than any other Democratic whip. He served a total of 12 years.

The Republicans who served longest as Republican whips is shown as Charles Curtis, of Kansas, who served from 1915 to 1924, and Thomas Kuchel, of California, who served from 1959 to 1969. It would appear from the table that Mr. Kuchel served the longest in that position among the Republicans.

The whip appears to be next in line to succeed the leadership of his party, but it should be stressed that this is a matter of probability and not of certainty. No fixed or formalized system of party advancement can be discerned from a study of the tables which I have inserted in the RECORD, or from a study of the political history of the whip institution in the Senate.

Republican whip Leverett Saltonstall, with whom I served when I first came to the Senate, for example, was bypassed for the leadership position in 1952, and Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, the then majority leader, appointed Senator William Knowland, of California, to be acting majority leader in his absence.

Some of the political observers of the time felt that the reason Mr. Saltonstall was not elevated to the office of acting majority leader was because many conservative Republican leaders opposed the elevation of a liberal like Mr. Saltonstall to that position.

The whip's job, like the majority leader's job, is, in countless ways, virtually a thankless task, although the whips are given additional staff and office space; they receive many invitations to social, diplomatic and political functions; and they achieve increased public visibility because of the mass media coverage that accrues as a result of the position which they have attained.

They act in the absence of their respective leaders and, as acting floor leaders, during those occasions they perform, of course, the same duties and responsibilities that are incumbent upon their party leaders.

The whips also arrange pairs for Senators who are absent, but that task in more recent years has been more or less delegated to the Secretary to the Majority and the Secretary to the minority. The whips' duties are determined largely by the relations existing between the whips and the party floor leaders and involve their discussions of the legislation and the program from day to day and week to week. Of course, there are variations which develop in the interpretations of the whip's role by those whips who have held the position over the years.

Mr. J. Hamilton Lewis, who was the first Democratic whip, indicated his views concerning the work of a whip. They were as follows, in part:

The duties of the Senate whip demand his presence on the floor as constantly as possible. Sometimes the long hours test his physical capacity, but generally he is devoted to "watchful waiting." He is ex-officio assistant floor leader, and in the absence of the floor leader, and other assistants, may be called upon to represent his party. At rollcalls he reports absentees and pairs which have been brought to his attention. He is not supposed to introduce bills lest they may divert his attention from his floor duties. While the parliamentary whip is not supposed to engage in debate, there is no such restriction on the congressional whips. In fact, as assistant floor leader it often becomes necessary for them to do so.

The chief whips and deputy whips of the Democratic and Republican parties today, of course, no longer are expected not to introduce bills. They introduce bills and resolutions just as do others of their colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

There no longer is a parliamentary whip, as distinguished from the congressional whip. As to how the Republican party whip from 1944 to 1949, Senator Kenneth S. Wherry, viewed his responsibilities, his biographer may be quoted in part as follows:

Senator Kenneth S. Wherry saw himself as an official who was chosen by his party to assist in maintaining party discipline and

united action in the day-to-day deliberations of the U.S. Senate. He viewed his position as being responsible for the attendance of party members and for the arranging and controlling of the "pairing" process. He reported the absentees, pairs, and voting attitudes of the members on rollcalls. He consulted with and worked under the party floor leader in arranging the order of business of the Senate; and he handled the details of the weekly and day-to-day legislative programs, consulting with the floor secretary of his own party and with the whip of the Democratic party.

Mr. Saltonstall, the Republican whip from 1949 to 1957, said that the whip's chief responsibility was to do the "dirty work" as assistant floor leader; in other words, being on the Senate floor or insuring that, in the whip's absence, someone designated by him would be there to protect the party and the national interest.

In addition to his Senate leadership functions, a party whip may, from time to time, serve as the Senate spokesman for major White House policies when his party controls the Presidency. He especially does this in the absence of the majority floor leader. However, the majority leader, when his party controls the White House, does not at all times necessarily reflect the views of the President and his administration.

(Mr. DeCONCINI assumed the chair.)

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. From time to time, the views of the majority leader and the President will differ, as they have in my own case.

The relationship between the floor leader and the whip parallels, in some ways, the relationship that exists between the President and the Vice President of the United States. Both the whip and the Vice President depend, to a great extent—though not completely, of course—upon the directions and duties given them by their party leader—the Floor Leader and the President, respectively. Both have ill-defined responsibilities.

This is not to say that the whip and the majority leader or, in the case of the minority, that the whip and the minority leader always agree.

In my own case, when I was majority whip, serving with Majority Leader Mansfield, there was never any friction, but we had an understanding that, from time to time, of course, we would have to differ in our votes and that that would be mutually understood and expected—each of us, it having been recognized, owing a responsibility to his own constituents, who sent us to the U.S. Senate to reflect their views rather than simply vote the same way on every issue that came before the Senate. So, from time to time, I had to vote differently. Mr. Mansfield understood that. He was the first to recognize that my own West Virginia constituents were responsible for my election to the Senate and that I, from time to time, would have to differ with him as to voting, but never with any personal feelings involved. Most usu-

ally, it was possible for us to vote together in support of or in opposition to measures that were before the Senate.

That same good, warm relationship exists presently between myself and Mr. CRANSTON, the current majority whip.

From time to time, just as Vice Presidents have been selected more for political balance than for ideological compatibility, so the same has been true, perhaps, in connection with the selection of party whips in the Senate.

May I say for the record that not only do I have a splendid working relationship with my own Democratic whip (Mr. CRANSTON), but also with the Republican leader (Mr. BAKER) and the Republican whip (Mr. STEVENS).

Mr. CRANSTON has earned an excellent reputation as a "nose-counter" in the Senate. I think I, myself, have given him the nod as being the "best nose-counter in the Senate." He is really superb when it comes to anticipating how the votes will fall in place on a given issue. I commend Mr. CRANSTON and the deputy whips on this side of the aisle for the cooperation and fine support that they have given me as leader. They work together and with the majority leader diligently and well.

Mr. President, may I also say that the election to the office of party whip or, for that matter, floor leader, does not rest on the custom of seniority. It differs from time to time based on many factors. For example, the selection by the party leader, Mr. Lyndon Johnson, of Senator Mike Mansfield to become his assistant in 1957 was an instance in which the majority leader, himself, made the selection of the party whip.

The factor of ideological balance may have been the major factor in the selection of Senator Saltonstall as minority whip in 1949, because he was a spokesman for liberal elements in his party.

In the case of the selection of Senator Hubert Humphrey for majority whip in 1961, President John F. Kennedy gave his support from the White House.

Incidentally, I do not think it is a good idea for the White House to attempt to influence the selection of any Senate party official. It could very well be counterproductive from the White House viewpoint.

Other factors that have influenced the selection of the respective party whips over the years are those of legislative skill, persuasiveness, energy, political instincts, knowledge of the rules, ability to get along well with colleagues, knowledge of colleagues' interests and political viewpoints, and so on.

Finally, and in conclusion, in the case of our two current whips, Mr. CRANSTON and Mr. STEVENS, I would say that they have recognized competency in legislative procedure, they have organizational ability, they have energy, they have political instincts that are accurate, and they enjoy the respect among their colleagues as men who do their homework well, and they are both good vote counters.

In recent years, the position of whip in both parties has gained considerable importance, and I believe, with good rea-

son, that such will continue to be the case.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, on Monday, the Senate will convene at 9 a.m. It will resume consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, the first concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 1981.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement that was entered into shortly before 2 a.m., this morning only the following amendments will be in order, except for second degree amendments to those amendments, on which second degree amendments the time will be limited to 30 minutes.

The following amendments will be called up in the sequence specified—which may be changed by unanimous consent—and with the limitations of debate indicated:

Three amendments by Mr. WEICKER on which there will be 30 minutes each;

An amendment by Mr. HEFLIN, 40 minutes;

The Levin amendment, 30 minutes;  
The Durkin amendment, 30 minutes;  
The Stevens amendment, 20 minutes;  
The Metzbaum-Dole amendment, 30 minutes;

The Domenici amendment, 30 minutes;  
The Jepsen amendment, 30 minutes;  
The Glenn amendment, 10 minutes;

A Glenn amendment, 90 minutes—that is a second Glenn amendment, 90 minutes;

The Pryor amendment to the Glenn amendment, 20 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. THURMOND on which there will be 20 minutes, with 15 minutes controlled by Mr. THURMOND, and with the right to modify his amendment;

Twenty minutes on a Cranston amendment to the amendment by Mr. THURMOND, if offered; and

Two amendments by Mr. HELMS on which there will be 30 minutes each, with the right to modify.

So, certain amendments in the second degree have been specified, but amendments in the second degree, though unspecified, will be in order to amendments in the first degree.

Any rollcall vote ordered in respect of amendments prior to 3 p.m. will begin at 3 p.m. and will occur consecutively in the sequence proposed, and the rollcall votes will last 10 minutes each.

I emphasize, however, that rollcall votes may occur prior to 3 p.m. on motions, points of order—if such are submitted to the Senate—and appeals, if such are taken.

By so indicating, I am not implying that such rollcalls are likely, but they could occur—such rollcall votes could occur.

If other of the amendments enumerated have not yet been reached by the hour of 3 o'clock, such amendments will continue to be called up with the time specified to be allowed thereon, following the sequence of rollcall votes which will begin to occur at 3 p.m.

It would appear from the listing of the amendments that there would be, easily, 15 rollcall votes on Monday.

If all the time is consumed as allowed by the agreement, then it would appear that there would be, roughly, 8 hours taken for debate and with an additional 2½ to 3 hours for rollcall votes.

I would imagine the session could last from 9 a.m. until 9 p.m., give or take, on Monday evening.

Mr. President, that is the program for Monday.

If the distinguished Republican leader wishes to speak, I will yield the floor.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. I will not detain the Senate further this afternoon.

I simply say that the program outlined by the majority leader is, indeed, a demanding and ambitious program for Monday. I know many Members had plans for the early part of that day based on our usual practice so far this year of not having votes except for emergency situations prior to some time in the late afternoon.

But I urge Members on this side of the aisle to take account of this description of the program for Monday.

I have canceled my plans for Monday to be out of the city for part of the day. I urge Members on this side of the aisle to do the same, unless it is absolutely essential because, as the majority leader points out, we may have 15 or more votes.

It will easily be the most active day of this session, with respect to rollcall votes, I suspect.

I thank the majority leader for outlining the program as he sees it at this time, and I wish him a pleasant weekend preparing for a difficult week ahead.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, as always, the minority leader is most considerate and thoughtful. I reciprocate his expressions of good wishes and hope that he will have a good weekend and that the assistant minority leader (Mr. STEVENS) who is in the Chamber, will have a good weekend as well; that my colleague in the chair (Mr. DECONCINI) and our other colleagues will all be prepared for a very busy Monday and a busy week.

#### ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF THE TWO LEADERS ON MONDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, the two leaders or their designees have not to exceed 5 minutes each at the

beginning of the day and following the prayer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. ON MONDAY NEXT**

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until 9 a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and, at 3:52 p.m., the Senate recessed until Monday, May 12, 1980, at 9 a.m.

**NOMINATIONS**

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 9, 1980:

**U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY**

George William Ashworth, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, vice Barry M. Blechman, resigned.

**COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORPORATION**

Joan F. Tobin, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation until the date of the annual meeting of the Corporation in 1983 (reappointment).

**THE JUDICIARY**

Judith Nelsen Keep, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of California, vice a new position created by Public Law 95-486, approved October 20, 1978.

Marilyn Hall Patel, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of California to fill an additional position created September 18, 1979, pursuant to the provisions of section 372(b) of title 28 of the United States Code.

Thelton Eugene Henderson, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of California, vice Cecil F. Poole, elevated.

A. Wallace Tashima, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the central district of California, vice Warren J. Ferguson, elevated.

Justin L. Quackenbush, of Washington, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Washington, vice Marshall A. Neill, deceased.

Helen Wilson Nies, of Maryland, to be an Associate Judge of the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, vice Donald E. Lane, deceased.

**DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

The following-named person for appointment as Foreign-Service information officer of class 2, a consular officer, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Robert James Korengold, of Maryland.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consular officers, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Frances D. Cook, of Florida.

John K. Ivie, of New Mexico.

Raymond Gordon Robinson, of New York.

For appointment as Foreign Service information officers of class 4, consular officers, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

James Michael Haley, of Washington.

Jonathan Palmer Owen, of Maryland.

Paul Richard Smith, of Maryland.

For promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 6 to class 5:

Bernard Alter, of Colorado.  
 Vincent M. Battle, of New York.  
 Anita Shashy Booth, of Florida.  
 William J. Brencick, of Missouri.  
 Martin G. Brennan, of California.  
 Harold Toney Angelea Burgess, of Connecticut.

James J. Carragher, of California.  
 J. Michael Cleverley, of Maryland.  
 Robert B. Courtney, of West Virginia.  
 Thomas E. Crocker, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

Nancy M. DeGumbia, of Connecticut.  
 Lynwood M. Dent, Jr., of Virginia.  
 William J. Duffy, of Michigan.  
 Alan W. Eastham, Jr., of Arkansas.  
 Stephen E. Eisenbraun, of Florida.  
 Andrea Morel Farsakh, of Virginia.  
 John J. Feeney, of New York.  
 Donald E. Grabenstetter, of Florida.

Marc I. Grossman, of California.  
 Anne M. Hackett, of California.  
 Susan Angela Haggerty, of Virginia.  
 Roger L. Hart, of Tennessee.  
 Kevin F. Herbert, of New York.  
 Imogene Gibson Karawa, of Massachusetts.  
 Gregory B. Kenny, of Florida.

Michael Klosson, of Maryland.  
 Ann Kelly Korky, of New Jersey.  
 Eric A. Kunsman, of Pennsylvania.  
 Julien LeBourgeois, of New Hampshire.  
 William F. Loskot, of Washington.  
 Gerald Richard Lueders, of Nebraska.  
 Stuart Richard Lynn, of Virginia.

Michael E. Malinowski, of Illinois.  
 Reginald James McHugh, of Wyoming.  
 James M. McGilinchey, of New Jersey.  
 Edward McKeon, of the District of Columbia.

Michael E. McNaull, of Washington.  
 John Medeiros, of Florida.  
 George Innes Middleton, of California.  
 Jerry K. Mitchell, of Illinois.  
 Michael C. Mozur, of Virginia.  
 Andrea J. Nelson, of New York.  
 Robert J. Nemeth, of California.

Steven Rolf Ordal, of California.  
 Jack P. Orlando, of New York.  
 Robert G. Paiva, of Connecticut.  
 Mildred Anne Patterson, of Missouri.  
 Nancy Leslie Pelletreau, of New York.  
 Mary Ann Peters, of Florida.  
 William E. Primosch, of the District of Columbia.

Douglas K. Rasmussen, of California.  
 Edna M. Read, of Florida.  
 Joseph P. Richardson, of South Carolina.  
 Nicholas H. Riegg, of California.  
 Josiah Blumenthal Rosenblatt, of Pennsylvania.

Vladimir Peter Sambalew, of Texas.  
 Stephen A. Schlaikjer, of Connecticut.  
 Charles R. Schwarck, of Pennsylvania.  
 K. Dunlop Scott, of Pennsylvania.  
 John Michael Shelton, of California.  
 Raymond R. Snider, of California.  
 Donald E. Stader, Jr., of Pennsylvania.

Donald K. Steinberg, of California.  
 Barbara J. Tobias, of New Jersey.  
 Annette L. Veler, of Wisconsin.  
 Alexander Russell Vershbow, of Massachusetts.

Marc M. Wall, of Virginia.  
 Richard H. Wallen, of Colorado.  
 Carman C. Williams, of California.  
 Thomas Kenneth Wukitsch, of Illinois.  
 For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consular officers, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Michael Joseph Hinton, of California.  
 Larry G. Millsbaugh, of California.  
 For promotion from Foreign Service information officers of class 7 to class 6:  
 Wendy C. Forward, of California.  
 Mary Jo Furgal, of Illinois.

Stephen James La Rocque, of Massachusetts.  
 Richard C. Lundberg, of New York.  
 Howard Stephen Shapiro, of Texas.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a consular officer, and a sec-

retary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Rosil A. Nesberg, of Washington.

For appointment as a Foreign Service information officer of class 6, a consular officer, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Anne Holmberg, of Wyoming.

For appointment as Foreign Service information officers of class 7, consular officers, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

William B. Bell, of Connecticut.

Andrew F. Key, of California.

Robert L. Koenig, of Missouri.

Bruce McGowan, of Michigan.

William F. Melvin, of Massachusetts.

Antonia Maureen Moras, of Ohio.

Michael H. Morgan, of the District of Columbia.

Jeffrey C. Murray, of Maryland.

Margaret C. Pearson, of California.

Edward H. Platte, of the District of Columbia.

Margarete Schmidt, of the District of Columbia.

Richard J. Schmierer, of Connecticut.

Janet Elaine Wilgus, of Wisconsin.

For appointment as Foreign Service information officers of class 8, consular officers, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Arthur N. Buck, of California.

Eliot Jay Cohen, of New York.

Mary Deane Connors, of Pennsylvania.

Patricia McMahon-Game, of Pennsylvania.

Anne H. O'Leary, of California.

Foreign Service reserve officers to be consular officers of the United States of America:

George B. Fitch, of Virginia.

David A. Lambert, of Ohio.

Randall G. Upton, of Virginia.

Phillip H. Wold, of Florida.

Foreign Service reserve officers to the consular officers and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Clyde P. Berryman, of New York.

William L. Brooks, of Virginia.

Frederick A. Brugger, of Virginia.

Robert B. Crawford, of Maryland.

Michael I. Dane, of Maryland.

R. Bruce Ebersole, of Virginia.

Phillip C. Essman, of Virginia.

Michael J. Farmer, of Virginia.

Melvin L. Gamble, of Virginia.

Maureen D. Geisler, of Virginia.

Douglas R. Hokenson, of Rhode Island.

John Anthony Jordan, of Virginia.

Thomas F. Kady, of Maryland.

John F. Keefe, Jr., of Connecticut.

John L. Kelly, Jr., of Virginia.

Kenneth D. Moorefield, of North Carolina.

Robert A. Phillips, of the District of Columbia.

Hugh E. Price, of Maryland.

Roger P. Sherman, of Connecticut.

Eloise K. Shouse, of Indiana.

Robert D. Steele, of New York.

Lanier B. Yarbrough, Jr., of Virginia.

Foreign Service reserve officers who are candidates for appointment as Junior Foreign Service officers to be consular officers and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

William M. Bartlett, of Kentucky.

Roy Elias Chavera, Jr., of Texas.

Rhonda LaVerne Crawford, of North Carolina.

Ronald Ashley Dwight, of Rhode Island.

Janice Lee Jacobs Fichte, of Virginia.

Gretchen Anne Gerwe, of California.

Edward Herman Goff, of Virginia.

Martha E. Goff, of California.

Charles Daniel Herrington, of Idaho.

David Milton Hess, of Texas.

Pamela Ann Hughes Hurst, of Arizona.

Robert Lawrence Lane, of Virginia.

Robert Paul Ludan, of California.

Gienda Gaye Maris, of Texas.

Jane Leahy Miller, of Washington.

Jackson C. McDonald, of Florida.

Jane Leahy Miller, of Washington.  
Josephine P. Patterson, of Colorado.  
Horace W. Pitkin, of the District of Columbia.

Patti Post, of California.  
Roy C. Rajan, of California.  
Richard Joseph Rodriguez, of California.  
G. Manfred Schweitzer, of New York.  
Thomas A. Steele, of Georgia.  
William Ross Tagliani, of Virginia.  
Francisca Thomas, of Virginia.  
Stephen J. Tomchik, of Pennsylvania.  
Vicente Valle, Jr., of Massachusetts.  
Moosa Abraham Valli, of California.

Foreign Service reserve officers to be secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

John M. Hall, of Virginia.  
David N. Merrill, of Maryland.  
Foreign Service staff officers to be consular officers of the United States of America:

Georgia H. Alexander, of the District of Columbia.  
Joan K. Campbell, of the District of Columbia.

Louise M. Jones, of California.  
Elizabeth A. Montagne, of Illinois.  
Lorraine M. Moreau, of Rhode Island.  
Donna M. Wright, of Washington.

Fernando Sanchez, of California, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consular officer, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America, effective November 30, 1979.

#### IN THE NAVY

The following-named commanders of the Reserve of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the line and staff corps, as indicated, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, sections 5910 and 5912, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

#### LINE

Aanstoos, Edward R.  
Abeyta, Alfredo L.  
Adams, Stanford M.  
Ammerman,  
Hugh T., Jr.  
Arrigo, Anthony D.  
Asbury, Charles E.  
Avila, Philip F.  
Backer, John M.  
Baker, James W., Jr.  
Banks, Otis G.  
Barrett, Curtis L., Jr.  
Barrett,  
Stephen P., Jr.  
Barsanti, Adolph J.  
Barton, Alexander J.  
Baxter, Donald J.  
Baynes, Gerald T.  
Bechtold,  
Joseph A., Jr.  
Bednarek, Norbert H.  
Bell, Norris H.  
Berg, Peter E.  
Best, John W., Jr.  
Bingham, Tad H.  
Birkner, Robert O.  
Bishop, John R.  
Blanchard, John N.  
Bobrick, Edward A.  
Bolwerk, James M.  
Boughton, Harold G.  
Boyle, Thomas J.  
Braun, John C., Jr.  
Braverman, Allen S.  
Brenner, Marc A.  
Brewer, James J.  
Brinn, Ronald C.  
Brooke, James F., III  
Brooks, Andrew D., Jr.  
Brown, Richard A.  
Browne, Henry W., Jr.  
Bruce, Marian L.  
Bullock, William G.  
Burger, Francis J., III

Burridge, George D.  
Burroughs, Robert P.  
Busch, Kenneth L.  
Callan, James R.  
Camp, Carl R., Jr.  
Carlisle,  
Sanford K., Jr.  
Carlo, James N.  
Carter, Jere S.  
Carter, Malcolm K., Jr.  
Castor, John R.  
Catriz, Albert G.  
Chisum, William R.  
Chrisman, Virgil E.  
Churchill, William B.  
Clark, George G.  
Clarke, Charles E., Jr.  
Coffey, John J.  
Combs, Charles E.  
Conklin, Dwight E.  
Cox, Jerry G.  
Coyle, Francis X.  
Crawford, Forrest S.  
Curry, Robert J.  
Curtis, Wendell J., III  
Cushing, Robert P.  
Damm, Bruce A.  
Davies, William  
De Castro,  
Julian E., Jr.  
Dee, David B.  
Dewep, John N.  
Derr, John F.  
Dethomas Joseph. III  
Devincenzi,  
Ronald D.  
Dolbear, Robert L.  
Donnell, Robert F.  
Doollittle, John B.  
Douglas, James G.  
Dutton, William M.  
Dykema, Owen W.  
Elliott, Norman S., Jr.  
Erickson, Charles A.

Fidler, Paul P.  
Finley, Robert H.  
Fitzgerald, Richard S.  
Florio, Anthony W.  
Forsythe, William D., Jr.

Francis, Perry G.  
Fuller, Gran F.  
Gallagher, Edward J., III

GARD, Robert L., Jr.  
Geier, Edward A.  
Gillespie, Richard I.  
Glatzer, Maurice  
Gordon, James A., Jr.  
Green, Clyde L., Jr.  
Grocki, Chester J.  
Guedalia, Jack I.  
Hackenberg, Richard B.

Hager, Robert M.  
Hall, Vaughn E.  
Hamilton, John E.  
Hardin, James T.  
Hargadon, Edward W.  
Harris, Henry E., Jr.  
Hawkinson, Arthur A.  
Haynes, Terry K.  
Heinz, John A.  
Hensey, Charles M.  
Duxbury, Richard B.  
Eade, Robert M.  
Ellis, Howard B., III  
Ferris, Edward  
Finerty, Gary T.  
Flinney, Robert G.  
Flohr, Robert B.  
Foley, Robert J.  
Fort, Thomas H.  
Freeley, Edward D.  
Gallagher, Robert J.  
Gallaudet, John C.  
Garrido, Donald P.  
Gilles, Robert J.  
Gillis, Dana G.  
Goldstein, Robert M.  
Gore, Alfred M.  
Greer, Charles R.  
Guderian, William, Jr.  
Hacala, Martin J.  
Hackett, Vincent T.  
Hair, Max A.  
Hamilt, Arthur  
Handler, Bruce H.  
Hardy, Edward W., III  
Harmon, George P. W.  
Harwell, Layne H.  
Hayes, Robert T.  
Hazley, George J.  
Helweg, Otto J.  
Hensley, George L., Jr.  
Herbert, Frank R.  
Heyck, Joseph G., Jr.  
Hinson, Bruce H.  
Hobokan, Andrew  
Hobson, Robert L.  
Hodge, Don W.  
Hogan, William P.  
Hohman, Glenn W.  
Hooper, John R.  
Hughes, Bruce N.  
Hunt, Alan G.  
Hutchinson, Samuel F.  
Hutchko, Alvan J.  
Isquith, David A.  
Jacksonis, Michael J.  
Jaeger, Bol J.  
Jarema, Frank E.  
Jenkins, Wallace T.  
Johnson, Douglas A.  
Johnson, Edward L.  
Joslin, Ivan L.  
Justin, Norman E.  
Karlson, Edward S.  
Kashmanian, Gregory  
Keleher, Peter D.  
Kelly, William C.  
Kerby, Douglas G.  
Kerrebrock, Robert A.

Keske, Carl D.  
Kimball, Warren F.  
King, Michael J.  
Kitts, Earle L., Jr.  
Kunst, Arthur F.  
Lackey, Marvin L., Jr.  
Lagueux, Paul B.  
Lamb, William M.  
Lambden, Jerry D.  
Lamer, Wayne L.  
Landers, John D.  
Larson, Lawrence P.  
Larson, Reuben R.  
Learson, Harold W.  
Lee, Martin K.  
Lee, Richard M.  
Leinwohl, Arthur  
Leo, Paul F.  
Leslie, William H.  
Lester, John W.  
Levit, Bernard E.  
Lisle, Paul C.  
London, "J" Phillip  
Loughridge, Everett A.  
Lowell, William A., II  
Lukens, Reeves A.  
Lyons, Richard B.  
Maher, James J.  
Malcolm, Lawrence D.  
Malone, Jack H.  
Marler, Marvin R.  
Martel, Leon C., Jr.  
Martella, Alex A., Jr.  
Martin, Michael J.  
Martin, Ronald C.  
Mason, John A., III  
Maughlin, Richard K.  
May, David T.  
McLoskey, Robert D.  
McMillan, Joseph C.  
McNergney, Robert P.  
Merritt, Ernest A.  
Merritt, William A., Jr.  
Meyers, "L" "J"

Louis J., Jr.  
Mihaly, Donald G.  
Miller, Gardner H.  
Mills, Michael T.  
Mills, Stuart K., Jr.  
Moore, Edward R.  
Moriarty, Brian M.  
Morrow, Frank S., Jr.  
Moyses, James E.  
Murdock, Robert V.  
Myers, George D., II  
Neal, Rodney D.  
Nicholas, Jack R., Jr.  
North, John H., III  
O'Connell, John R., Jr.  
Oechslein, Peter E.  
Osborn, Jerry C.  
Owen, John F.  
Pappalardo,  
Salvatore J.  
Partlow, James G.  
Pepka, Ronald F.  
Peters, William J., III  
Peterson, Albert E.  
Pfozter, William  
Pitney, James F.  
Polutnik, Francis L.  
Popp, Joseph M.  
Poulin, Francis A.  
Powell, Hurley J. T.  
Quackenbush,  
Gilbert W.  
Rausch, Harry A., Jr.  
Ray, Edward J.  
Redmond,  
James W., Jr.  
Regan, James D.  
Reinke, Henry S.  
Reutter, Walter E.  
Rich, James H., Jr.  
Richards, James H.  
Richards, Richard L.  
Ricker, Charles T., Jr.  
Ricketts, Donald B.  
Rieger, Jon H.  
Riggins, William S.

Rigone, John L.  
Riley, James C., Jr.  
Rimbach, David G.  
Robbins, Clyde D.  
Roberts, Michael M.  
Robinson, William A.  
Rossi, Robert J.  
Roudebush, Daniel L.  
Rufe, Robert W.  
Sallade, Frederick E.  
Samuelson, Ronald A.  
Sanchez, William A.  
Sass, Arthur H.  
Sax, Samuel W.  
Schaefer, Dale G.  
Schick, Philip F.  
Schrader, William H.  
Schwob, Thomas N.  
Scichilli, Carl J.  
Scott, Wayne E., Jr.  
Shanahan, Vincent J.  
Sharp, George K.  
Sharp, Stanley E.  
Shifflet, Edward E.  
Shimkus, John J.  
Shows, Ned H.  
Sindelar, James H.  
Skaggs, Glenn E.  
Sloan, Robert L.  
Smith, Canie B.  
Smith, Ralph W., Jr.  
Snipes, Stephen G.  
Snyder, Daniel R.  
Specht, Malcolm R.  
Spence, Stuart B.  
Stapleford, Thomas C.  
Stein, Earl A., Jr.  
Stephen, Earl M., Jr.  
Stephenson, Graves B.  
Storey, Douglas H.  
Stromberg, Jack W.  
Stroud, Lisle A., Jr.  
Stuart, Douglas A.

Talley, Alfred F., Jr.  
Tanner, John W.  
Tate, John T.  
Taylor, Charles A.  
Taylor, Donald S.  
Thompson, Bobby C.  
Tiedemann, John G.  
Todd, Frank P.  
Turgeon, Charles F.  
Twist, Gerald A.  
Veal, John S.  
Sanchez, William A.  
Sass, Arthur H.  
Sax, Samuel W.  
Schaefer, Dale G.  
Schick, Philip F.  
Schrader, William H.  
Schwob, Thomas N.  
Scichilli, Carl J.  
Scott, Wayne E., Jr.  
Shanahan, Vincent J.  
Sharp, George K.  
Sharp, Stanley E.  
Shifflet, Edward E.  
Shimkus, John J.  
Shows, Ned H.  
Sindelar, James H.  
Skaggs, Glenn E.  
Sloan, Robert L.  
Smith, Canie B.  
Smith, Ralph W., Jr.  
Snipes, Stephen G.  
Snyder, Daniel R.  
Specht, Malcolm R.  
Spence, Stuart B.  
Stapleford, Thomas C.  
Stein, Earl A., Jr.  
Stephen, Earl M., Jr.  
Stephenson, Graves B.  
Storey, Douglas H.  
Stromberg, Jack W.  
Stroud, Lisle A., Jr.  
Stuart, Douglas A.

Walker, David R.  
Walker, Norman L.  
Waller, James W.  
Walls, Hollis W.  
Webster, Richard G.  
Wed, John J.  
Welch, Kenneth J.  
White, James F.  
White, Robert F.  
Whittington, Frederick B., Jr.  
Wilkins, John M.  
Wilner Arthur I.  
Wilson, James S., Jr.  
Wolf, Lee E.  
Womble, Robert W.  
Wynn, Earl B., Jr.  
Yarber, William J.  
Yatsko, George J.  
Yorio, Beniamino  
Young, Larry R.  
Young, Stephen G.  
Yusem, Stephen G.  
Zanin, Norman R.  
Zeman, Irving M.  
Zickrick, Jerome L.

#### MEDICAL CORPS

Bell, Donald D.  
Boles, Lawrence R., Jr.  
Boyd, Gerald E.  
Brennan, Thomas V.  
Cabell, Benjamin B.  
Carlson, Richard E.  
Casey, John M.  
Charles, Clive R.  
Christensen, Gerald R.  
Crutchfield, James D.  
Dodge, Herbert S.  
Downing, John E.  
Ende, Norman  
Evans, Earl F., Jr.  
Eyerly, Robert C.  
Fargason, Crayton A.  
Faust, Robert B.  
Felsoory, Attila  
France, Thomas D.  
Fulton, Lyman A.  
Garrett, Henry F. M.  
Gondring, William H., III  
Grumbling, Hudson V., Jr.  
Hendrix, James Z.  
Howery, Stephen E.  
Janssen, Erwin T.  
Jochimsen, Peter R.  
Kardinal, Carl G.  
Kayye, Paul T.  
Kessler, David B.  
Kirchner, Peter T.  
Klenk, Eugene L.  
Klibanoff, Edward

Marnell, Daniel J.  
McDonald, Kenneth M.  
Melton, Russell W.  
Miranda, Mario C.  
Monell, William C.  
Nelson, Norman D.  
Olson, Theodore G., Jr.  
Ostroski, Joseph T.  
Patriquin, David A.  
Pettengill, Howard W., Jr.  
Pillapil, Virgilio D.  
Price, Albert C.  
Proskay, Aloysius J.  
Rasco, Jerry L.  
Reed, Ralph E.  
Richmond, Thomas F.  
Rigor, Benjamin M., Sr.  
Riordan, Robert H.  
Schibly, William J.  
Sedlack, Richard E.  
Stewart, Edgar B.  
Thomas, Jerry L.  
Thomas, William J.  
Tucker, Samuel H.  
Vavrin, Charles R.  
Walklett, William D.  
Wanger, William H.  
Worsham, Bertrand R.

#### SUPPLY CORPS

Bernhardt, Paul A.  
Birnbaum, Leonard G.  
Bowne, Charles J., Jr.  
Campbell, Carroll J.  
Collins, Francis A.

Donohue, Patrick T.  
Eilberg, James S.  
Felton, Thomas O.  
Giles, Frederic P.  
Graeff, Paul A.  
Grip, Herman W.  
Haggard, Howard F.

Harvey, Thomas G., Jr.  
 Head, Clarence M., Jr.  
 Hickey, John P.  
 Jaminet, John A.  
 Jones, William J.  
 Kaufman, John R.  
 Kitts, Willis M.  
 Knight, Curtis D.  
 Lacey, Howard W.  
 Lunan, Ralph G.  
 Maguire, James A.  
 McFall, Tommy K.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Adams, Edgar G.  
 Allen, Donald R., Jr.  
 Butenshon, Donald E.  
 Crosland, William A. Jr.  
 Duke, Harvey L.  
 Edwards, Ted E.  
 Gordon, Kenneth R.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Araneo, Peter J., Jr.  
 Bamburg, Marvin A.  
 Bruen, Walter P., Jr.  
 Caswell, Richard F.  
 Cawley, Martin L.  
 Denny, Thomas P.  
 Gaal, Phillip L.  
 Gallagher, James R.  
 Gibson, William R.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

Aires, Randolph H.  
 Barber, Michael E.  
 Brodsky, Ronald D.  
 Caine, Patrick  
 Chapman, Henry S.  
 Clark, James F.  
 Dietrich, Donald P.  
 Ekenazi, Jacob V.  
 Falbo, Gerald A.

DENTAL CORPS

Albright, Jimmy E.  
 Belinski, Edward J.  
 Bradley, Bruce E.  
 Buckis, David C.  
 Burk, Jimmie L., Jr.  
 Carroll, Lon D.  
 Custer, Frederic  
 Dupuy, Robert W.  
 Eng, Wellington R. L.  
 Girolami, John J., Jr.  
 Hall, Lawrence B.  
 Hallman, Robert R.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Boyle, Robert E.  
 Knisely, Ralph F.  
 Landers, Judson W., Jr.

NURSE CORPS

Dinardo, Mary T.

The following named lieutenant commanders of the Reserve of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, sections 5910 and 5912, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abbot, James L., III  
 Abel, Joseph A.  
 Abel, Robert L.  
 Abele, Robert T.  
 Adams, David J., Jr.  
 Adkins, Howard E., Jr.  
 Albi, Lynn J.  
 Allen, Clayton T.  
 Allen, George M.  
 Allman, Stephen B.  
 Alost, James C., III  
 Alvarez, David C.  
 Andersen, Stanley G.  
 Anderson, Howard B.  
 Anderson, Lawrence R.

Mohr, Robert B.  
 Palmer, John D.  
 Palmer, William J., Jr.  
 Pyron, Edwyn B.  
 Russell, Sanford H.  
 Schildwachter, Stephen J.  
 Sklar, Fred H.  
 Soine, Jon C.  
 Sturms, Herschel T., Jr.  
 Taylor, Norman H.  
 Wilmoth, James P., III  
 Wyant, Frederick E.

Attaway, Barr H., Jr.  
 Azzil, Paul A.  
 Bachmeyer, Gervase R.  
 Badolato, Peter T.  
 Baer, Thomas S.  
 Bagemihl, Craig R.  
 Bagshaw, Charles R.  
 Baier, Robert E.  
 Bailey, Douglas L.  
 Bailey, Harry E.  
 Bailey, Patrick A.  
 Bain, Jerry W.  
 Baird, James G., Jr.  
 Ball, Joseph E.  
 Bankerd, John P.  
 Banner, Glen E.  
 Baraldi, William J.  
 Barnes, Dewey  
 Barnett, Larry D.  
 Barnette, Richard T.  
 Barrow, Edward M., Jr.  
 Barry, Andrew M.  
 Bartolini, Bruce F.  
 Barton, Jon H.  
 Bartrum, David E.  
 Bastien, Gilbert J.  
 Batwinis, James E.  
 Bauer, Russell C.  
 Baumer, Edward K.  
 Baumgardner, Walter L.  
 Beal, James A.  
 Beaty, Robert A., Jr.  
 Beck, Robert L.  
 Becker, Richard L.  
 Becknel, Gerald P.  
 Beeby, Gered H.  
 Beguin, Steven G.  
 Behnke, Richard W.  
 Benator, Barry I.  
 Benn, James J., III  
 Benner, William B.  
 Bennett, Bobby E.  
 Bennett, Leroy E.  
 Bergstrom, Arthur E.  
 Berkeley, Joseph B., Jr.  
 Benard, Gilbert C., Jr.  
 Berry, Robert W.  
 Best, Conrad C.  
 Best, William E.  
 Betzold, John N.  
 Bevacqua, Dominick R.  
 Bialecki, Lawrence A.  
 Bitten, Ernest J.  
 Black, Hugh, Jr.  
 Black, William H.  
 Blackard, William R., Jr.  
 Blackburn, Lewis B.  
 Blake, Robert D., III  
 Blake, Robert D.  
 Blansit, Griffin C., Jr.  
 Blanton, James H.  
 Block, Charles E., Jr.  
 Bockelmann, Peter E.  
 Bodanske, John W.  
 Bohlman, Ronald A.  
 Bolain, Gerald A.  
 Bolena, Dennis W.  
 Bomgaars, David A.  
 Booker, John W.  
 Boothe, Paul N.  
 Boots, Thomas K.  
 Borden, Richard C.  
 Borders, Donald E.  
 Borsum, Robert B.  
 Bouchard, Robert M.  
 Boucher, Paul R.  
 Bounds, Billy A.  
 Bourke, Michael G.  
 Bourret, William L.  
 Bowman, Bruce R.  
 Boyce, Allen W.  
 Boyd, Cecil A. K., II  
 Boyd, Larry R.  
 Bradford, William E.  
 Brady, Joseph F.  
 Bray, Stephen R. W.  
 Breen, Edward J., Jr.  
 Breen, Peter L.

Brennan, James P., Jr.  
 Bridges, Robert D.  
 Bried, Robert A.  
 Bright, Richard G., Jr.  
 Brinkley, Marland D.  
 Brinks, Lawrence H.  
 Brittenham, John C.  
 Brown, Carl T.  
 Browning, James W., II

Brumfield, Robert D.  
 Brunelli, John F.  
 Bruno, Francis A.  
 Bruno, George I., Jr.  
 Bryan, John R. G., Jr.  
 Bryan, John H.  
 Bryant, Lee W.  
 Bucciarelli, Eugene J.  
 Buckley, James K.  
 Budryk, Raymond J.  
 Bultas, William A.  
 Burke, Francis A.  
 Burneski, James S.  
 Burnett, Michael J.  
 Burr, David S.  
 Burner, Simeon J.  
 Butler, Edward F.  
 Butterbrodt, Robert D.  
 Button, John E.  
 Caldwell, Frank S.  
 Calhoun, William H., Jr.  
 Callahan, Jeffrey E.  
 Cambre, Kendall M.  
 Campbell, Oscar H.  
 Campbell, Robert R.  
 Canavan, Kenneth  
 Canavit, Frank H.  
 Canby, John C.  
 Caraway, John B., III  
 Carey, Jefferson, Jr.  
 Carberg, Richard F.  
 Carlmody, Joseph P., Jr.  
 Carpentier, Peter F.  
 Carvell, Albert B., Jr.  
 Caskey, Maurice R.  
 Caswell, Jerry W.  
 Catlin, Carl V.  
 Catone, Robert A.  
 Cederholm, Walter T.  
 Chapman, Eugene N.  
 Chapman, Peter K.  
 Cherin, Antony C.  
 Cherry, Robert M., Jr.  
 Chessman, Gary A.  
 Chrurg, James T., Jr.  
 Chronic, Joseph A.  
 Chubb, Stephen D.  
 Chuss, Thomas G.  
 Clecone, Ronald J.  
 Clagett, John B.  
 Clark, Harry B.  
 Clark, Thomas F., Jr.  
 Clarke, Jon B.  
 Claude, David L.  
 Cleary, Edward J.  
 Clodig, John B.  
 Closson, Spencer W.  
 Clough, Geoffrey A.  
 Collier, James C.  
 Collins, Arthur W.  
 Collins, Robert J.  
 Collins, Roy B.  
 Conerty, Michael J.  
 Conroy, John P.  
 Cooley, Jack E.  
 Coonen, Robert H.  
 Copenbarger, Paul D.  
 Cost, Richard W.  
 Coveney, Edward M.  
 Cowardin, James H.  
 Cowart, Joel D.  
 Cowen, Joseph H.  
 Cowgill, Curtis J., III  
 Cox, John A.  
 Cozad, Jerry E.  
 Craver, Charles R., Jr.  
 Cressman, Stephen D.  
 Crosswell, Mitchell M.

Crowe, Loyd A., Jr.  
 Crull, Thomas W.  
 Cuddington, Michael E.  
 Cunningham, Melvin D.  
 Curland, James W.  
 Curran, John P.  
 Curtiss, Edward B.  
 Custodi, George L.  
 Czech, Theodore T.  
 Czekanski, John J.  
 Czerwonky, Arthur H.  
 Dadd, Alan C.  
 Dansker, Alfred S.  
 Danskin, George A.  
 Dashiell, Charles M., Jr.

Daunis, Alexander B.  
 Dauwalder, Robert H.  
 Davis, Clay S., Jr.  
 Davis, John D.  
 Davis, Lorenzo D., IV  
 Davis, Norman L.  
 Davis, Robert W.  
 Davis, Thomas K., Jr.  
 Davy, Ronald K.  
 Dayley, Alan J.  
 Dean, Kenneth H.  
 Debrun, John B., Jr.  
 Decker, Christian F., III  
 Deemer, Leonard H.  
 DeFazio, Salvatore, III  
 DeGiorgio, Jerry R.  
 Dell, Robert E.  
 Delpizzo, Charles W., Jr.  
 Dempsey, Broadus A.  
 Dempsey, Edward J.  
 Denardo, Leonard F.  
 Denninghoff, James P.  
 Dennis, Gary P.  
 DePompei, Daniel A.  
 Devilbiss, John M.  
 Dickson, Guy T., Jr.  
 Dickson, James R., II  
 Diers, James F.  
 DiFilippo, William J.  
 Dillon, Lucius P., III  
 Dillon, Miles C.  
 Dillow, Richard M.  
 DiLorenzo, Leonard A.  
 DiLullo, Louis J.  
 Ditzler, Kirk J.  
 Dizon, Donald L.  
 Dobbstein, Dennis A.  
 Docekal, William L.  
 Dodson, Max H.  
 Dolan, Joseph P.  
 Donahue, Dennis M.  
 Dorsett, Ralph A.  
 Dostal, Donald L.  
 Dostal, Raymond F.  
 Dovener, Joseph J.  
 Dowd, Richard B.  
 Dowd, Sidney E., Jr.  
 Dowdy, William L., III

Downton, Chaales E., III  
 Dozler, Frank S.  
 Driver, Donn R., Jr.  
 Drozd, Theodore V.  
 Druist, George F.  
 Drummer, Jesse F.  
 Dubas, Lawrence T.  
 Dube, George  
 Dude, Robert J.  
 Dudley, Richard M.  
 Duffy, Charles G.  
 Dulin, Leon  
 Duncan, Lloyd L.  
 Duncan, William F., Jr.  
 Dunlap, Steven J.  
 Dunn, Paul H.  
 Dunn, Phillip C.

Dunning, John L., Jr.  
 Dunphy, Aedan B.  
 Durham, John L., III  
 Durrance, Frank M., Jr.  
 Dyer, Bruce P.  
 Dyer, Howard R.  
 Dyer, Hugh N., III  
 Eanes, James M.  
 Eaton, David M.  
 Eck, Michael A.  
 Edwards, James T., Jr.  
 Edwards, Robert S.  
 Eiserman, Joel T.  
 Eliason, Whyynn S.  
 Elliott, Paul B.  
 Elliott, William D.  
 Eness, Curt R.  
 Engman, David E.  
 Engstrom, John T.  
 Eoill, John G.  
 Epstein, David M.  
 Erickson, Clifford M.  
 Erickson, Gaylord L.  
 Ernst, Ronald P.  
 Eubank, Paul J.  
 Eutsler, Ronald B., Jr.  
 Euvrard, Leroy E., Jr.  
 Evans, Frank E.  
 Evans, Richard H.  
 Evtlsizer, James C.  
 Ewing, William D.  
 Faber, Brian R.  
 Fahs, Philip J.  
 Fairchild, Carl G.  
 Fairley, George M.  
 Falbe, John J., Jr.  
 Falcone, Harold J.  
 Falk, David G.  
 Fanning, Timothy O., Jr.  
 Farkas, Daniel P.  
 Farmer, Claude S., Jr.  
 Feaster, Horace W., III  
 Fehrenbacher, Michael R.  
 Felock, Dennis E.  
 Felger, Thomas R.  
 Feller, Rainer  
 Feltham, Francis M.  
 Fennell, Gerald F.  
 Ferguson, James T., III

Ferguson, Lawrence A.  
 Field, Lawrence H.  
 Findelsen, Kurt D.  
 Fischley, James H.  
 Fisher, Ronald E.  
 Fissel, Jack E.  
 Fitzgerald, Edward W.  
 Fitzgerald, John W.  
 Flagg, James C.  
 Fleming, Richard L.  
 Fleming, William H., III  
 Fletcher, Frederick F.  
 Flor, Frederick H., Jr.  
 Flora, Brian G.  
 Florence, Richard A.  
 Flynn, Ernest A.  
 Flynn, Michael M.  
 Fobes, Walter S.  
 Foland, Richard P.  
 Foigate, Julius M.  
 Forbes, Jon E.  
 Fortune, James B.  
 Foss, George E., III  
 Foster, Francis K.  
 Fournier, Richard L.  
 Fowler, Howard D.  
 Fowlkes, Meade A., Jr.  
 Fox, David C.  
 Foy, Clarence A., Jr.  
 Francis, John W.  
 Frank, Richard A.  
 Frankel, Stanton N.  
 Franz, Dale C.  
 Fraser, John H., III  
 Freeman, William I.  
 Freitas, John N.  
 Frick, Dennis D.

- Frikker, Peter M.  
 ruicelli, Robert A.  
 Fuller, Philip B.  
 Fuller, William G.  
 Funchess, Dennis V.  
 Fusko, George M.  
 Gabberry, Raymond E., Jr.  
 Gaffney, William T.  
 Gale, Edwin J.  
 Gall, Robert A.  
 Gallagher, William J., Jr.  
 Ganner, Herbert E.  
 Garcia, Isaac, Jr.  
 Garcia, Ramon  
 Garman, James E.  
 Garmon, Gerald S.  
 Garst, Paul H.  
 Geiger, Clayton P.  
 General, John A.  
 Gerard, Maurice W.  
 Germann, Larry F.  
 Gervais, Kenneth A.  
 Gibbons, Joseph M.  
 Gibbs, Steven K.  
 Gibson, Richard A.  
 Giefer, Herbert G.  
 Gifford, John M.  
 Gilbert, Harris R., Jr.  
 Gilbertson, Jan C.  
 Giles, Grover S.  
 Gilreath, John P.  
 Glover, Samuel E.  
 Glynn, Michael K.  
 Godley, John B.  
 Goff, Robert A.  
 Golden, "I" "L"  
 Goldsmith, Wynn A.  
 Goniou, Gordon E.  
 Goodgion, Gilbert  
 Goodroe, Howard W.  
 Goodsell, Kenneth R.  
 Gordon, James W.  
 Gordon, Michael D.  
 Goshorn, Edward S.  
 Graham, David C.  
 Gralla, Arthur E., Jr.  
 Gray, Douglas C.  
 Greathouse, Robert R.  
 Green, James P.  
 Green, Thomas R.  
 Green, William L.  
 Greene, Raymond A.  
 Greenfield, Gordon A., Jr.  
 Greenway, William J.  
 Gregg, Frederick M., III  
 Griffith, Jesse  
 Grigsby, Gilbert R., Jr.  
 Grimm, Robert S.  
 Groebner, Jerome A.  
 Grothbo, Roger P.  
 Groth, John C.  
 Grube, Kenneth R.  
 Grunert, John L.  
 Guerin, Charles L., III  
 Gullfooy, James E.  
 Gum, Charles L.  
 Gustavson, Michael A.  
 Haase, Richard C.  
 Haberzette, James D.  
 Hadden, Eddie R.  
 Hall, Cecil M., Jr.  
 Hall, Clarence C., Jr.  
 Hallissey, Ronald J.  
 Halverson, Gerald B.  
 Hamilton, Wilfred A., Jr.  
 Hamilton, Wallace O.  
 Hammond, Weldon W., Jr.  
 Hand, Thomas E., Jr.  
 Hanley, Gerald S.  
 Hansen, Thomas C.  
 Hanson, Erik A.  
 Harbrecht, Daniel F.  
 Hardee, Robert M.  
 Harkin, Thomas R.  
 Harris, Joseph W.  
 Harris, Richard N. N.  
 Hart, Gordon P.  
 Hart, Thomas L.  
 Harte, Charles R., III  
 Hartnett, Timothy J.  
 Haskell, Edwin R.  
 Hatton, Bruce N.  
 Hawes, Stephen P.  
 Hegele, Thomas R.  
 Hegland, Robert R.  
 Heil, Herbert M.  
 Heller, Thomas W.  
 Henderson, Charles H.  
 Hennenhoefler, James A.  
 Herder, Dale M.  
 Herman, Gene D.  
 Herrmann, Dan R.  
 Herrmann, Robert W.  
 Hibbard, Lowell  
 Hickman, Jerry T.  
 Hickok, Robert W.  
 Higgins, Robert W.  
 Higgins, Walter M., III  
 Hilger, John G.  
 Hill, Joseph B.  
 Hill, Leo B.  
 Hill, Russell G.  
 Hillegas, Wayne F.  
 Hilton, Jackson M.  
 Himchak, David P.  
 Hindman, Marlon D.  
 Hirsch, Robert B.  
 Hitchcock, John W.  
 Hobbs, Richard R.  
 Hodge, Walter O.  
 Hoeman, Richard D.  
 Hoffer, Henry W., III  
 Hogan, Edward P.  
 Holden, Robert L.  
 Holland, William M.  
 Holler, Eugene J., Jr.  
 Hollerbach, Robert R.  
 Holloway, Dennis, Jr.  
 Holloway, Donald L.  
 Holloway, Richard L., Jr.  
 Holt, Michael S.  
 Holt, William G., Jr.  
 Holtcamp, Jimmie D.  
 Holty, Robert M.  
 Hooks, Jonathan T., Jr.  
 Hopkins, John D.  
 Horst, Julian L., Jr.  
 House, Arthur L.  
 House, Gary W.  
 Houseknecht, Peter S.  
 Hovany, Steven J.  
 Howie, Bruce C.  
 Huber, Gerald P.  
 Huber, Mark C.  
 Hudson, Michael A.  
 Huff, James D.  
 Huggard, Stephen F.  
 Hughes, Frank C.  
 Huie, Charles A.  
 Humphrey, Keith D.  
 Hundt, David W.  
 Hunt, Claude D., III  
 Hunt, Peter C.  
 Hunter, Ralph C., Jr.  
 Hurrelbrink, Kenneth H.  
 Husband, Willard R.  
 Husbands, Robert A.  
 Hyland, Patrick M.  
 Ingersoll, John A.  
 Ingram, Culpepper F.  
 Inman, Rex W.  
 Irland, Richard L.  
 Ives, Charles L., III  
 Jackson, Carlton A. B.  
 Jackson, Donald L.  
 Jackson, Gerald W.  
 Jackson, George W.  
 Jackson, Joe L.  
 James, Thornell H.  
 Jamieson, Jerry G.  
 Janssen, William F.  
 Jenikovsky, Richard E.  
 Jennings, Donald R.  
 Jensen, Jimmy F.  
 Jessell, Charles T., Jr.  
 Jewell, Richard F.  
 John, David F.  
 Johnson, Charles E.  
 Johnson, Curtiss D.  
 Johnson, David E.  
 Johnson, Don A.  
 Johnson, Donald W.  
 Johnson, Jaurvon W.  
 Johnson, James F.  
 Johnson, Stephen R.  
 Johnson, William R., III  
 Johnston, Joseph B.  
 Johnston, Robert M.  
 Jones, Donald L.  
 Jones, Douglas W.  
 Jones, Earl F., Jr.  
 Jones, Richard D.  
 Jorgensen, William F.  
 Jorges, David A.  
 Joyce, John C.  
 Junge, William P.  
 Kaiser, Dennis R.  
 Kaiser, Kenneth O.  
 Kammer, William N.  
 Kane, Joseph E., II  
 Karalekas, "S" Steven  
 Kary, James A.  
 Kasperski, Daniel C.  
 Kass, Frederick J., Jr.  
 Kautz, Norman N.  
 Kazlauskas, Walter V.  
 Kearley, Richard C.  
 Keller, Paul L.  
 Kelley, Donald A.  
 Kelley, Paul W.  
 Kent, John O.  
 Kepler, Donald A., Jr.  
 Kersensbrock, Allan J., Jr.  
 Keyser, Allan L.  
 Killam, Glenn R.  
 Kinder, Thomas H.  
 King, Richard H.  
 Kinney, Brian V.  
 Kiral, Robert H.  
 Kirkbride, Richard J.  
 Kirkland, Brent L.  
 Kish, John D.  
 Kishiyama, David N.  
 Kittell, John F.  
 Klaviter, Elroy C.  
 Klebba, John T.  
 Kletke, Dale B.  
 Knippel, George F.  
 Kokoruda, David J.  
 Kolassa, Stanley A. Jr.  
 Koral, Eugene A.  
 Koster, William H.  
 Kratt, John M.  
 Krause, John K.  
 Krauss, Theodore A.  
 Krewson, Gary L.  
 Krigbaum, Joseph  
 Krilla, Ronald A.  
 Krippes, Donald E.  
 Kross, James M.  
 Kuhn, Rik D.  
 Kulper, Raymond V., Jr.  
 Kuser, William R.  
 Lackey, Robert C., Jr.  
 Lah, Raymond G.  
 Lahiguera, Charles E.  
 Laird, Thomas F.  
 Lamb, Charles H.  
 Lamb, George E.  
 Lamoreaux, Charles W., Jr.  
 Lanctot, Roy C., Jr.  
 Lane, Joseph E., III  
 Lang, James R.  
 Lappan, George J.  
 Larsen, Thomas W.  
 Larue, Christopher J.  
 Lattimore, Bertram G., Jr.  
 Lawrence, Anndrew H.  
 Lawrence, Walter B.  
 Lazenby, Maurice, III  
 Leboeuf, Myron J.  
 LeCours, Thomas E.  
 Leder, John E.  
 Lee, James A.  
 Leffingwell, Shelly L.  
 Legatt, Walter S.  
 Leite, Michael J.  
 Leonard, Thomas F.  
 Leroy, Dennis K.  
 Lewallen, Richard A.  
 Lieberman, Jack P.  
 Lindell, John E.  
 Linderman, Ralph D., Jr.  
 Lindsay, Ronald L.  
 Lindsey, William E.  
 Linscheid, Wilbert W.  
 Liscum, Garrie V.  
 Liska, Robert B.  
 Lister, John A.  
 Lomacchio, Thomas D., Jr.  
 Long, Charles E.  
 Long, James F.  
 Lovasz, Daniel J., Jr.  
 Loy, David A.  
 Ludeman, Stephen P.  
 Ludwig, John E., III  
 Lukowski, Thomas G.  
 Lumianski, Peter J.  
 Lumpkin, Claude C., III  
 Lundblad, Kurt D.  
 Lundgaard, Stanley H.  
 Lundy, Richard J., II  
 Lynch, John D.  
 Lyons, Kenneth G.  
 MacDonald, Dennis A.  
 Mac Fawn, Edward T.  
 Mach, Ludwig F.  
 Maddox, John D.  
 Madley, Peter M.  
 Madsen, Dennis R.  
 Magee, Marshall  
 Magee, Thomas H.  
 Maguin, James J.  
 Maguire, Edward S.  
 Maher, Jay A.  
 Mahoney, Richard P.  
 Maki, Kenneth H.  
 Mallen, Eugene B.  
 Mallini, Joseph J., Jr.  
 Mancias, Joe, Jr.  
 Mandich, Joseph  
 Manglapane, Joseph S.  
 Mannion, Timothy J.  
 Mannor, Richard L.  
 Mapes, John L.  
 Mapes, Kenneth W.  
 Margeson, Walter L., Jr.  
 Marks, Earl M.  
 Marler, Carl M.  
 Marshall, Robert W.  
 Marsyla, Edward G.  
 Martin, Jack E.  
 Maryan, Norman E., Jr.  
 Mason, David O.  
 Mason, Lawrence J.  
 Mathews, Thomas D.  
 Matson, Thomas W.  
 Matt, Harold A., Jr.  
 Mathews, Thomas F.  
 Mattson, Donald R.  
 Matzke, Regis A.  
 Maultsby, James A.  
 Mauro, Robert D.  
 Mayall, James F.  
 Mayer, Conrad J.  
 McAtee, Jerry L.  
 McCamish, Mickey L.  
 McCarthy, Patrick T.  
 McClain, Charles M.  
 McClanahan, Lowell F.  
 McCleary, Raymond E.  
 McClure, James A.  
 McComb, Dennis N.  
 McConnell, James J.  
 McConnell, Robert P.  
 McCracken, Donald H.  
 McCrea, John H., Jr.  
 McCroskey, David H.  
 McDermid, Roy A.  
 McDonald, John B., Jr.  
 McGee, Terry R.  
 McGinty, Leo P., Jr.  
 McGrath, Martin E., Jr.  
 McGrath, Ronald O.  
 McGuinness, Brian M.  
 McHargue, Gary R.  
 McKallagat, Peter B.  
 McKenna, Nicholas V.  
 McKenna, Patrick J.  
 McMichael, William A., Jr.  
 McMurray, Vernon F., Jr.  
 McNeill, Michael F.  
 McNicholas, William E.  
 McVay, Peter O.  
 McWhite, Peter B.  
 Meader, Ronald N.  
 Meador, Malvin E.  
 Medlock, Robert T., Jr.  
 Meldahl, Craig D.  
 Melnyk, George R.  
 Mendralski, Frank T.  
 Mercer, William E.  
 Merkel, Daniel G.  
 Merrill, George D., Jr.  
 Merriman, Edwin L.  
 Merriner, Charles M.  
 Messerly, Edward J.  
 Meyer, James E.  
 Michaels, Oliver H.  
 Middour, Dean L.  
 Mikrut, Fred R.  
 Milam, Benjamin T.  
 Milanette, Ro T.  
 Milas, John F.  
 Mildfelt, William J.  
 Milks, Robert D.  
 Miller, Dennis P.  
 Miller, Walter M., III  
 Millikin, Charles W., III  
 Millikin, Raymond W., Jr.  
 Mills, Albin D.  
 Minkowski, Andrew J.  
 Mintz, Robert B.  
 Mitchell, Gordon L.  
 Mizeras, Vincent F.  
 Molnar, Daniel O.  
 Monahan, Charles O., Jr.  
 Monahan, Thomas P., Jr.  
 Monkres, Ronald G.  
 Monroe, Alexander G.  
 Monroe, Michael C.  
 Montgomery, George C.  
 Montgomery, Michael F.  
 Moore, Merlyn D.  
 Moore, Michael K.  
 Moore, William H.  
 Morel, David W.  
 Morrill, Philip J.  
 Morris, Jeremy G.  
 Morris, Mark H.  
 Morris, Thomas E.  
 Mortimer, Louis R.  
 Moser, Walter J.  
 Mosier, David W., Jr.  
 Mountz, Charles I.  
 Moyer, John J.  
 Moylan, Daniel E.  
 Mozeleski, Jan  
 Murashie, Joseph R.  
 Myers, Paul  
 Nasn, Peter G.  
 Neal, Joseph F.  
 Nelson, Gene E.  
 Nelson, Harold E., Jr.  
 Nelson, Harvey G.  
 Nelson, John A.  
 Nelson, Terence K.  
 Nerrie, George K.  
 Neuman, Carl F.  
 Neve, James K.  
 New, Howard S.  
 Newcomb, Jesse M.  
 Newell, Thomas L.  
 Newton, Otto A.  
 Nichols, Peter D.  
 Nielsen, Charles A.  
 Nielsen, Danny A.  
 Nolan, Patrick H.  
 Nolan, Richard T.  
 Nordquist, Thomas G.  
 Norman, Herman H.  
 Norrholm, Lelf J.  
 Norris, Clarence D.  
 Northcutt, William R.  
 Null, Donald M.  
 Oakwood, John P.  
 Obert, Francis X., Jr.  
 O'Brien, Stephen P.  
 O'Connor, Jeremiah P.  
 Odekerk, Donald E.  
 O'Donnell, John F., Jr.  
 Olsen, Jack A.  
 Olson, Donald G.  
 Olson, James D., II  
 Olson, James R.  
 Oman, Ralph  
 O'Neil, Haines A.  
 O'Neill, James G., III  
 O'Neill, Warren H.  
 Orefice, Gary J.  
 O'Reilly, James A., Jr.  
 O'Rourke, James F. X., Jr.  
 Orr, Thomas H.  
 Osinski, Lawrence  
 Ota, Roy T.  
 Overland, John P.  
 Owens, James T., III  
 Pacheco, Ronald E.  
 Pachuta, Roger J.  
 Page, Arnold S.  
 Palm, Daniel J.  
 Palm, Steven B.  
 Palmer, Burton L.  
 Palmer, Gerald K.  
 Pananen, Lauren W.  
 Parker, Henry S., III  
 Parrent, Larry E.  
 Parrott, Sidney J., Jr.  
 Parry, John C., Jr.  
 Parry, William E.  
 Parsons, Milton L.  
 Patterson, Donald J.  
 Patterson, William J.  
 Paulson, Duane L.  
 Payne, John T.  
 Pearce, Robert W.  
 Peay, Carl H., Jr.  
 Penfield, Scott R., Jr.  
 Persson, Nils R., Jr.  
 Peterman, Roy J., Jr.  
 Peters, Geoffrey W.  
 Peterson, Donald O.  
 Peterson, Vernett R.  
 Peterson, Walter G.  
 Petrich, Martin A., III  
 Petrie, Harry D., Jr.  
 Pharis, Roy L.  
 Philipp, James E.  
 Piazza, Robert W.  
 Piche, James R.  
 Pickett, Robert D., Jr.  
 Pierce, Jerry S.  
 Pitzer, Everett S.  
 Pletz, Thomas G.

Pool, Robert A. F.  
 Poole, Bobby J.  
 Poole, Bradley C.  
 Poole, Jeffrey C.  
 Porter, David K.  
 Pounder, John J. Jr.  
 Pounds, David S.  
 Powers, Michael E.  
 Pratt, James L.  
 Prejean, Gerard A., Jr.  
 Prettyman, George D.  
 Price, Laurence A.  
 Price, Milton S.  
 Prickett, Jerry L.  
 Prince, Andrew S.  
 Proven, Thomas R., II  
 Puckett, Lanny J.  
 Purnell, Louis S.  
 Putt, Kenneth F.  
 Pyecha, Timothy D.  
 Quattlebaum, Richard M., Jr.  
 Quinn, James P., Jr.  
 Quinn, Joseph F., Jr.  
 Rafferty, Dennis M.  
 Ralston, Norman J.  
 Rambo, Robert P.  
 Randall, Jeffrey W.  
 Ray, Raymond B.  
 Redmon, Howard G.  
 Reeve, Harold R.  
 Reeve, Wayne G.  
 Regan, Robert T.  
 Reichenbach, Donald D.  
 Reid, Edward O.  
 Reid, Owen P., Jr.  
 Remus, Thomas A.  
 Renshaw, George S.  
 Reschenberg, James R.  
 Reyff, Paul A.  
 Rhine, James W.  
 Rice, Bart F.  
 Rice, Charles D.  
 Rice, Charles W., III  
 Rice, William N.  
 Richards, Charles L.  
 Richards, James W., Jr.  
 Richardson, Willard D.  
 Richardson, Frank F., II  
 Richardson, Patrick J.  
 Richardson, Roger A.  
 Rieder, Terry A.  
 Rieser, Frank L.  
 Riley, James B.  
 Roberts, Alfred E., Jr.  
 Roberts, Cary L.  
 Roberts, Stephen S.  
 Robinson, Michael F.  
 Rocker, James T.  
 Rodriguez, Antonio J.  
 Rogers, Paul F.  
 Rogers, William W.  
 Rohr, John A.  
 Roller, Charles L.  
 Ronchetto, John R., Jr.  
 Rood, Edson J.  
 Rooney, Daniel J.  
 Rosen, Robert A.  
 Roskens, Thomas L.  
 Rousselto, Gary J.  
 Rovner, Irwin  
 Rowley, Charles W.  
 Ruehl, Victor E., III  
 Ruhe, William J., Jr.  
 Rumbaugh, Richard L.  
 Rumfelt, Charles H., Jr.  
 Rupp, Earl W.  
 Ruseling, Gary L.  
 Russ, Steven K.

Russell, David G.  
 Russell, Robert J.  
 Ryan, Michael J.  
 Sager, Harlan R.  
 Sand, Lawrence S.  
 Sand, Wayne R.  
 Sandquist, Fred C.  
 Sanford, William H.  
 Sanguinetti, Alfred J.  
 Sargeant, William H.  
 Saunders, Jerry W.  
 Scee, Joseph E.  
 Schaefer, William A., Jr.  
 Schar, Thomas T.  
 Scheider, Charles A.  
 Scheiner, Robert  
 Schloz, John M.  
 Schmidt, Richard J.  
 Schofield, Paul L.  
 Scholl, John P.  
 Schwabe, William L.  
 Schweizer, Edward S.  
 Scott, David T.  
 Scott, Lewis E.  
 Scott, Michael R.  
 Scott, Patrick R.  
 Scott, Robert G.  
 Scott, Stephen K.  
 Scott, Thomas B., III  
 Seamons, Dwight C.  
 Seffel, Joel S.  
 Seibert, Peter K.  
 Seidel, David W.  
 Seiple, Ronald L.  
 Self, John C.  
 Self, John F.  
 Seward, Lachlan W.  
 Sexton, Michael R.  
 Shaffer, Jesse S.  
 Shaw, Joseph W., Jr.  
 Shaw, Robert J.  
 Shay, Peter D.  
 Sheffield, Brian E.  
 Shelar, Eugene, Jr.  
 Sheinut, Charles A.  
 Shenk, Robert E.  
 Shields, James C.  
 Shingler, John J.  
 Shingler, Ronald L.  
 Shorr, Harold  
 Shortt, John B.  
 Shuler, James M.  
 Shultz, Robert A.  
 Sibley, Robert E., Jr.  
 Sibold, Brian B.  
 Sieberns, David O.  
 Siebert, Douglas A.  
 Sigg, Joseph A.  
 Silk, Brian A.  
 Simmons, Guy J.  
 Simonic, Frank J., Jr.  
 Simonson, Merlin D.  
 Simpson, Douglas K.  
 Sinutko, Michael, Jr.  
 Skillman, Don K.  
 Skokan, Bryan A.  
 Slaughter, William L.  
 Sledd, Melvin F.  
 Slezak, David R.  
 Smisek, Thomas J.  
 Smith, Charles R.  
 Smith, Dennis S.  
 Smith, Donald H.  
 Smith, Franklin P.  
 Smith, George E.  
 Smith, Kenneth C., Jr.  
 Smith, Lloyd L.  
 Smith, Robert V.  
 Smith, Stephen R.  
 Smyth, Denis C.  
 Sneath, William E.  
 Soltas, Gerald J.  
 Sonksen, John R.  
 Soraghan, Thomas C.  
 Spangler, Henry J., Jr.  
 Spangler, Richard L., Jr.  
 Spicer, Kenneth J.  
 Spiegelberg, Harrison  
 Spurck, Danial N.

Staab, Manfred A.  
 Stanfield, Robert A.  
 Starnes, Jimmy  
 Stecher, Joseph D., Jr.  
 Stein, David A.  
 Stella, Joseph W., Jr.  
 Stephens, Charles D.  
 Steube, Paul M.  
 Stevens, Kent  
 Stewart, Richard W.  
 Stewart, William F., III  
 Stillwell, Paul L.  
 Stokes, Floyd T.  
 Stone, Gary N.  
 Stoughton, Robert A.  
 Stradauskas, Joseph A.  
 Strebel, John P.  
 Strehle, Hugh A.  
 Strohmann, William C.  
 Strouse, James L.  
 Sturgeon, Lanny D.  
 Sudikatus, George H., Jr.  
 Sulk, John F.  
 Sullivan, John J., Jr.  
 Sullivan, James E., Jr.  
 Sullivan, Timothy B.  
 Summers, Charles R.  
 Sund, Werner  
 Susta, Stephen J., Jr.  
 Suydam, Schuyler C.  
 Svalya, Phillip G.  
 Swafford, David E.  
 Swall, Don T.  
 Swanson, David M.  
 Swink, Harley H.  
 Tamney, Peter D.  
 Taper, William D.  
 Tarr, Edwin A.  
 Taubitz, Stewart F.  
 Taylor, Anthony R.  
 Taylor, Royce D.  
 Taylor, William L.  
 Temple, Paul H.  
 Tennes, Richard M.  
 Theriot, Glenn J.  
 Thiel, James S.  
 Thomason, George W.  
 Thompson, Cliff L.  
 Thompson, Joseph R.  
 Thorp, Michael J.  
 Thronson, David L.  
 Tiger, Mark L.  
 Timmons, Thaddeus A., Jr.  
 Tirado, William  
 Titus, Dale N.  
 Torok, Helmut A.  
 Torsiello, John B.  
 Tourigny, Clement G.  
 Trainor, Edmund W.  
 Traub, Carl F.  
 Trautwein, Tom A.  
 Traw, David M.  
 Treter, Douglas E.  
 Trione, William R.  
 Twombly, James R.  
 Urban, Jack  
 Urban, Victor A.  
 Urquhart, Charles F., III  
 Utley, Wallace R.  
 Valetich, Frederick F.  
 Valtchka, Joseph J.  
 Vallee, Ronald A.  
 Valli, Allen A., Jr.  
 Vanderwoude, Thomas F.  
 Vanderwoude, Thomas S.  
 Vandriel, James L.  
 Vanhoosier, Michael E.  
 Vandhoven, David N.  
 Vannata, Michael R.  
 Vannerson, Robert J.  
 Vannice, Robert L., Jr.  
 Vaughn, William C., III  
 Velle, Gary W.

Vera, Albert J.  
 Verzino, William J., Jr.  
 Villanueva, Quintin L. J.  
 Vinton, Carl P., Jr.  
 Wachtel, Leo M., III  
 Waldron, James F.  
 Walker, Jerrel E.  
 Walker, Theodore C.  
 Walker, Thomas H., Jr.  
 Wallis, Wilber B., Jr.  
 Wallschlaeger, Michael J.  
 Walsh, Bartholomew J., Jr.  
 Walsh, Michael G.  
 Walsh, Victor T. C.  
 Ward, Edward W.  
 Warner, Joseph S., IV  
 Warnken, Wayne L.  
 Waters, Marshal P., III  
 Watkins, Prince L.  
 Watson, Malcolm M.  
 Waylett, William J., Jr.  
 Weber, Jerry A.  
 Weddington, Michael E.  
 Weible, Robert D.  
 Weiler, George W.  
 Wendt, Donald E.  
 Wentland, Norman H.  
 Westerman, Charles E., Jr.  
 Westfall, Alan R.  
 Whisenhunt, Thomas R.  
 White, George E.  
 White, James W.  
 White, Michael C.  
 White, Ronald Y.  
 Whiting, William A.  
 Whitman, Riley H., II  
 Whittaker, Ronald G.  
 Wiebelhaus, Raymond J.  
 Wiest, James H.  
 Wiggins, Edwin G.  
 Wilta, Marlin D.  
 Wilkes, Jerry W.  
 Willard, David A.  
 Wille, Franklin O.  
 Williams, John T.  
 Williams, Richard S.  
 Williams, Wade S.  
 Williams, William F., Jr.  
 Willis, Clifton F.  
 Willis, Henry T., II  
 Wilson, Charlie K.  
 Wilson, Earl R., Jr.  
 Wilson, James H.  
 Wilson, James M., Jr.  
 Wilton, Julian D.  
 Wimmer, Ronald W.  
 Winfree, James R.  
 Winnard, David E.  
 Winsko, Stanley J., Jr.  
 Winslow, Donald R.  
 Winters, Doyle E.  
 Wisner, Gary A.  
 Wolfe, Donald A.  
 Wood, John M.  
 Wood, Robert M., Jr.  
 Wood, Robert C.  
 Woodruff, Barry H.  
 Wodrum, Thomas R.  
 Woodward, George P., Jr.  
 Worthley, John A.  
 Wyvill, Samuel A., II  
 York, Samuel A.  
 Young, Donald M.  
 Young, John C.  
 Young, Kenneth L., Jr.  
 Young, Thomas F.  
 Yoviene, Ronald J.  
 Zacharias, John V.  
 Zajkowski, Stanley J.  
 Zaras, Artie  
 Zotter, James A.

Zvonek, Frank B., Jr.  
 Andrus, Peter L.  
 Barvick, Edward J.  
 Bove, Alfred A.  
 Bowden, Robert H., Jr.  
 Brophy, James J.  
 Brown, Douglas E.  
 Byrd, John W.  
 Cahill, Thomas G.  
 Christen, Samuel E.  
 Dansak, Daniel A.  
 Davis, Barney M., Jr.  
 Derhagopian, Robert P.  
 Dillard, Robert P.  
 Drago, Robert A.  
 Florio, Richard L.  
 Hannigan, Edward V.  
 Harley, Earl H.  
 Hendricks, John L.  
 House, Charles M.  
 Huddle, Luther G., Jr.  
 Judman, Allen H.  
 Kidd, Charles E., Jr.  
 Augonis, Frank E.  
 Babb, Robert M., Jr.  
 Block, Edgar D., Jr.  
 Bollam, Kenneth A.  
 Borst, Richard E.  
 Bradford, Charles E.  
 Brainerd, Robert P., Jr.  
 Briggs, Robert J.  
 Brush, William E.  
 Bunten, David R.  
 Burris, Gary M.  
 Claar, Robert C.  
 Dahm, John H., Jr.  
 Davies, Christopher R.  
 DeAngelis, Joseph T., Jr.  
 Deder, Robert E.  
 Delong, David L.  
 Donahue, John R.  
 Dore, David A.  
 Dowley, Peter W.  
 Duff, Donald D.  
 Fox, James F.  
 Foy, Norman F.  
 Francis, Paul J.  
 Grant, Francis B.  
 Gregory, Douglas P.  
 Grumme, Ronald W.  
 Hall, Robert G.  
 Harless, Wayne H.  
 Hollowell, Walter E.  
 Holshey, Michael L.  
 Huff, Howard W.  
 Hull, Lawrence G.  
 Jackson, Thomas A., Jr.  
 Johnston, Richard M.  
 Johnston, William C., Jr.  
 Jordan, Joseph J.  
 Keller, Leslie R.  
 Kennedy, Robert C.  
 King, James M.  
 Maitland, James R.  
 Mangin, Garrett N., II  
 Marshall, Paul G.  
 Mather, Samuel S., II  
 McCameron, James D.  
 Bonn, Burton L.  
 Bradshaw, Jack R.  
 Brock, Jerome W.  
 Bullock, James M.  
 Burbank, John R.  
 Clark, Robert E.  
 Connelly, Albert P., III  
 Eittrheim, Kinley O.  
 Elliott, Charles K.  
 Evans, Edward E.  
 Hankins, Charles G.

MEDICAL CORPS  
 Konerding, Karsten F.  
 Kuk, Dennis S.  
 Levy, Leonard R.  
 Mabry, Nicholas R.  
 Mader, Jon T.  
 Malcolm, Robert J., Jr.  
 Martin, John S., Jr.  
 Massey, Edward W.  
 McCarren, Peter  
 Miller, Lawrence H.  
 Morant, Victor A.  
 Nyboer, Jan H.  
 Posner, Geoggrey M.  
 Pulliam, Morris W.  
 Quinn, Paul V.  
 Russo, Raymond M.  
 Siegel, John E.  
 Vandenberg, David L.  
 Ward, James S.  
 Washburn, Michael D.  
 Wilson, Walter R., Jr.  
 Zaleski, Henry I.  
 Zirkle, John W.  
 McClintock, William R., Jr.  
 McDaniel, Hugh H., II  
 McDonnell, Brian L.  
 McTavish, Thomas H.  
 Meyer, Robert L.  
 Mortsoif, Larry A.  
 Nelson, Gregg C.  
 Oberacker, Martin F.  
 Paddock, Glenn D.  
 Patterson, Paul R.  
 Pitman, John J.  
 Prawl, Phillip W.  
 Price, John W.  
 Pulliam, Nelson B.  
 Puzzo, Dominic E.  
 Rahn, Stanley A.  
 Reis, Peter S.  
 Reynolds, Roger W.  
 Rice, Richard G.  
 Richardson, Daniel G.  
 Rieper, Alan G.  
 Running, Richard B.  
 Schamp, Roger G.  
 Schwartz, Robert G., Jr.  
 Semet, Robert J.  
 Sherrill, Robert M.  
 Shirley, Joseph G.  
 Siegel, Gary  
 Stack, Robert C.  
 Stalker, Donald J.  
 Stiles, Edwin P.  
 Stohimann, John C.  
 Stolark, Edward J.  
 Strack, Beetem H., Jr.  
 Sutherland, Michael T.  
 Sutton, Richard A.  
 Switzer, Harry A.  
 Tarella, Raymond F.  
 Turczyn, Thomas J.  
 Walker, Paul E.  
 Watts, James T.  
 Welch, Donald S.  
 Whan, Geoffrey B.  
 Winter, Wilburn J., Jr.  
 Wood, Daniel A.  
 Hinton, Von J.  
 Jones, Thomas L.  
 Koch, Walter P.  
 Letzke, Walter E., Jr.  
 Markert, Leo F.  
 May, William R.  
 McClure, Phillip W.  
 McConnell, Larry A.  
 McCraven, Franklin M.  
 McPherson, Raymond G.  
 Oyler, George F.

SUPPLY CORPS  
 Babb, Robert M., Jr.  
 Block, Edgar D., Jr.  
 Bollam, Kenneth A.  
 Borst, Richard E.  
 Bradford, Charles E.  
 Brainerd, Robert P., Jr.  
 Briggs, Robert J.  
 Brush, William E.  
 Bunten, David R.  
 Burris, Gary M.  
 Claar, Robert C.  
 Dahm, John H., Jr.  
 Davies, Christopher R.  
 DeAngelis, Joseph T., Jr.  
 Deder, Robert E.  
 Delong, David L.  
 Donahue, John R.  
 Dore, David A.  
 Dowley, Peter W.  
 Duff, Donald D.  
 Fox, James F.  
 Foy, Norman F.  
 Francis, Paul J.  
 Grant, Francis B.  
 Gregory, Douglas P.  
 Grumme, Ronald W.  
 Hall, Robert G.  
 Harless, Wayne H.  
 Hollowell, Walter E.  
 Holshey, Michael L.  
 Huff, Howard W.  
 Hull, Lawrence G.  
 Jackson, Thomas A., Jr.  
 Johnston, Richard M.  
 Johnston, William C., Jr.  
 Jordan, Joseph J.  
 Keller, Leslie R.  
 Kennedy, Robert C.  
 King, James M.  
 Maitland, James R.  
 Mangin, Garrett N., II  
 Marshall, Paul G.  
 Mather, Samuel S., II  
 McCameron, James D.  
 McClintock, William R., Jr.  
 McDaniel, Hugh H., II  
 McDonnell, Brian L.  
 McTavish, Thomas H.  
 Meyer, Robert L.  
 Mortsoif, Larry A.  
 Nelson, Gregg C.  
 Oberacker, Martin F.  
 Paddock, Glenn D.  
 Patterson, Paul R.  
 Pitman, John J.  
 Prawl, Phillip W.  
 Price, John W.  
 Pulliam, Nelson B.  
 Puzzo, Dominic E.  
 Rahn, Stanley A.  
 Reis, Peter S.  
 Reynolds, Roger W.  
 Rice, Richard G.  
 Richardson, Daniel G.  
 Rieper, Alan G.  
 Running, Richard B.  
 Schamp, Roger G.  
 Schwartz, Robert G., Jr.  
 Semet, Robert J.  
 Sherrill, Robert M.  
 Shirley, Joseph G.  
 Siegel, Gary  
 Stack, Robert C.  
 Stalker, Donald J.  
 Stiles, Edwin P.  
 Stohimann, John C.  
 Stolark, Edward J.  
 Strack, Beetem H., Jr.  
 Sutherland, Michael T.  
 Sutton, Richard A.  
 Switzer, Harry A.  
 Tarella, Raymond F.  
 Turczyn, Thomas J.  
 Walker, Paul E.  
 Watts, James T.  
 Welch, Donald S.  
 Whan, Geoffrey B.  
 Winter, Wilburn J., Jr.  
 Wood, Daniel A.  
 Hinton, Von J.  
 Jones, Thomas L.  
 Koch, Walter P.  
 Letzke, Walter E., Jr.  
 Markert, Leo F.  
 May, William R.  
 McClure, Phillip W.  
 McConnell, Larry A.  
 McCraven, Franklin M.  
 McPherson, Raymond G.  
 Oyler, George F.

CHAPLAIN CORPS  
 Bonn, Burton L.  
 Bradshaw, Jack R.  
 Brock, Jerome W.  
 Bullock, James M.  
 Burbank, John R.  
 Clark, Robert E.  
 Connelly, Albert P., III  
 Eittrheim, Kinley O.  
 Elliott, Charles K.  
 Evans, Edward E.  
 Hankins, Charles G.

Pauling, Randall D.  
Rock, Stanley A.  
Spellman, John P.  
Turnbow, Howard R.

## CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Anderson, Henry R.  
Bailey, Robert N.  
Bevilacqua, Albert E.  
Biggers, Ralph L., Jr.  
Branch, Thomas L.  
Christian, Paul J.  
Daniels, Terry P.  
Dutsch, Thomas W.  
Eddins, Rufus O., Jr.  
Evans, Frank C.  
Ewers, James J.  
Gross, Thomas J.  
Haefner, James A.  
Hanf, William F.  
Harman, Joe H.  
Hedley, John R.  
Hennings, Louis W., III  
Heron, Daniel J.

## JUDGE ADVOCATES GENERAL'S CORPS

Albrecht, William E.  
Arbuckle, David L.  
Barr, William S.  
Bell, Robert L.  
Bigler, John E., Jr.  
Bleveans, John A.  
Burson, John H.  
Callahan, James B.  
Campbell, Lawrence W.  
Carter, Norman M., Jr.  
Cerrone, George J., Jr.  
Cherry, Donald G.  
Cuneo, James B.  
Currie, Laurin C.  
Cusick, Robert I., Jr.  
Custis, Douglass L.  
Dickinson, Ronald C.  
Dupuis, Charles T.  
Ennis, Charles W.  
Ewan, William K.  
Farmer, Michael K.  
Flood, Kevin P.  
Foote, Douglas D.  
Frank, Peter M.  
Friedeberg, William H.  
Fuller, Robert A.  
Fuller, Robert G., Jr.  
George, Thomas W.  
Gerard, Kenneth J.  
Glassman, Stephen C.  
Golub, Howard V.  
Haberlach, William P.  
Hagemeister, Daniel R.  
Hammer, Robert S.  
Henning, John F., Jr.  
Hess, John L.  
Hutto, Robert E.  
Igo, Louis D.  
Infante, Edward A.  
Irvin, Alexander M.  
Jaudes, Richard E.  
Kanninen, Michael L.  
Ludwick, Steven W.  
Mallett, Donald A.

## DENTAL CORPS

Ahlin, Jeffrey H.  
Antolini, Anthony P.  
Arguelles, John C.  
Bokmeyer, Timothy J.  
Brumfiel, Robert W., Jr.  
Chrispens, John B.  
Clausen, Donald J.  
Colbert, Earl J.  
Deshazo, John W.  
Dibona, Lawrence B.  
Forgeng, Thomas J.  
Fulp, James F., Jr.  
Galliana, Robert E.

Underhill, Douglas V.  
Waterson, Allan F.  
Whitesides, James D.  
Will, William A., Jr.

Kluck, Robert A.  
Kommer, Dennis D.  
Larson, Jeffrey F.  
Lebold, Robert C.  
Maddox, Don C.  
Manthei, Barnard M.  
Maris, Alan H.  
Maurovich, Thomas J.  
Meyer, Kenneth T.  
Miller, Steven D.  
Musser, James R.  
Neal, John C., Jr.

## MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Bourne, John R.  
Brabant, Peter J.  
Haberhorn, Susan B.  
Ivory, Thomas M., III  
Johnson, Ralph R., Jr.  
Lyon, James P.  
Mast, Harold J.  
McFadden, Glennon K.  
Miles, Donald O.  
Mullin, Michael D.

## NURSE CORPS

Arends, Bernadette R.  
Brown, Mary J.  
Caruso, Mary E.  
Cosgrove, Rosemary F.  
Cummins, Joan  
Grady, Elizabeth M.  
Hodges, Elizabeth C.  
Hornsby, Eva M.  
Judas, Janet I.  
Klose, Frieda V.

The following-named women commanders of the Reserve of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of captain in the line, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, sections 5911 and 5912, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Bonwell, Walterine B.  
Gregory, Martha J.

The following-named women lieutenant commanders of the Reserve of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the line, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, sections 5911 and 5912, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Gibfried, Carolyn J.  
Jenkins, Alyce M.  
Jones, Jeanne R.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 9, 1980:

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION  
M. Athalie Range, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for a term expiring July 18, 1981.

The following-named persons to be Members of the Board of Directors of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for terms expiring July 18, 1982:

James R. Mills, of California.  
Frank H. Neel, of Georgia.

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Henry S. Dogin, of New York, to be Director of the Office of Justice Assistance, Research, and Statistics.

Homer F. Broome, Jr., of California, to be Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

Raymond L. Acosta, of Puerto Rico, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Puerto Rico for the term of 4 years.

John Saul Edwards, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Virginia for the term of 4 years.

Thomas Edward Delahanty II, of Maine, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Maine for the term of 4 years.

Nelson, Stephen L.  
Palus, Donald A.  
Pralle, Patrick M.  
Reynolds, Gerald M.  
Scott, Herman D.  
Soteres, James S.  
Steiner, Joseph  
Strohmyer, Harry A.  
Stutz, Andrew C.  
Wohlwend, James H.  
Word, Leonidas D., Jr.  
Zeno, Allan S.

John S. Martin, Jr., of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York for the term of 4 years.

James R. Laffoon, of California, to be U.S. Marshal for the southern district of California for the term of 4 years.

John W. Spurrier, of Maryland, to be U.S. Marshal for the district of Maryland for the term of 4 years.

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Margaret Muth Laurence, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks.

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Thomas George Allison, of Washington, to be General Counsel of the Department of Transportation.

## IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officer of the U.S. Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

Frederick P. Schubert.

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

## THE JUDICIARY

Odell Horton, of Tennessee, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Tennessee.

John T. Nixon, of Tennessee, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Tennessee.

Norma Holloway Johnson, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia.

## IN THE AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Howard M. Lane, U.S. Air Force (age 56), for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8962.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 8066, in the grade as follows:

## To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Charles C. Blanton, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Abbott C. Greenleaf, U.S. Air Force (age 53), for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8962.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 8066, in grade as follows:

## To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Howard W. Leaf, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 8066, in grade as follows:

## To be general

Lt. Gen. Richard L. Lawson, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, U.S. Air Force.

## IN THE ARMY

The following-named Army Medical Department officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

## MEDICAL CORPS

## To be major general

Brig. Gen. Floyd Wilmer Baker, xxx-xx-xx Medical Corps, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Bernhard Theodore Mittermeyer, **xxx-xx-xxxx** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Quinn Henderson Becker, **xxx-xx-xx** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be brigadier general

Col. Robert Thomas Cutting, **xxx-xx-xxxx** Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Guthrie Lewis Turner, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx** Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Chester Lawrence Ward, **xxx-xx-xxxx** Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named Army Medical Department officer for appointment in the Regular Army to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3306:

MEDICAL CORPS

To be brigadier general

Brig. Gen. Floyd Wilmer Baker, **xxx-xx-xx** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Paul Francis Gorman, **xxx-xx-xx** U.S. Army.

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired lists in grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Gen. William Allen Knowlton, **xxx-xx-xxxx** (age 59), Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. John Quint Henion, **xxx-xx-xxxx** (age 57), Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Robert Carter McAlister, **xxx-xx-xx** (age 56), Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. John Woodland Morris, **xxx-xx-xx** (age 56), Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

IN THE NAVY

Adm. Harold E. Shear, U.S. Navy (age 61), for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

The following-named officer having been designated for command and other duties of great importance and responsibility in the grade of vice admiral within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section

5231, for appointment while so serving as follows:

To be Vice Admiral

Rear Admiral James R. Sanderson, U.S. Navy

The following temporary flag officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, sections 5780, 5781 and 5791:

LINE

John G. Wissler	John B. Mooney, Jr.
Glenwood Clark, Jr.	James B. Busey IV
William E. McGarran,	Lawrence Burkhardt
Jr.	III
Richard A. Miller	William C. Neel
Milton J. Schultz, Jr.	Walter M. Locke
Louis R. Sarosdy	Donald S. Jones
Robert B. Fuller	Joseph F. Frick
Joseph B. Wilkinson,	Louis A. Williams
Jr.	Richard A. Martini
Charles E. Gurney III	Powell F. Carter, Jr.
Richard K. Fontaine	Harry C. Schrader, Jr.
Frank C. Collins, Jr.	Wayne D. Boden-
James E. Service	steiner
Frederick W. Kelley	Joseph J. Barth, Jr.
Peter C. Conrad	Stanley G. Catola
Dempster M. Jackson	Richard T. Gaskill
James A. Lyons, Jr.	

MEDICAL CORPS

Roger F. Milnes  
George E. Gorsuch  
Eustine P. Rucci

SUPPLY CORPS

Duncan P. McGillivray  
Richard E. Curtis

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Neil M. Stevenson

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Paul R. Gates

DENTAL CORPS

James D. Enoch

IN THE AIR FORCE

Air Force nominations beginning Joseph A. Accardo, Jr., to be second lieutenant, and ending Waldemar Zukauskas, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 26, 1980.

Air Force nominations beginning Ralph E. Bradford, Jr., to be colonel, and ending William E. Riecken, Jr., to be colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate on April 8, 1980, and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 15, 1980.

Air Force nominations beginning Robert F. Aaron, Jr., to be first lieutenant, and ending Robert J. Zettel, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate on April 14, 1980, and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 15, 1980.

Air Force nominations beginning Kenneth

A. Murdock, to be colonel, and ending Eugene A. Blitch, Jr., to be lieutenant colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 23, 1980.

IN THE ARMY

Army nominations beginning James R. Golden, to be permanent professor, U.S. Military Academy, and ending Carol M. Wright, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 26, 1980.

Army nominations beginning Brian J. Adams, to be second lieutenant, and ending John T. Zoccola, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate on April 3, 1980, and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 15, 1980.

IN THE NAVY

Navy nominations beginning Dean S. Nakayama, to be lieutenant commander, and ending Kenneth D. Brown, to be ensign, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 26, 1980.

Navy nominations beginning Josef W. Christ, to be ensign, and ending George J. Tyson, Jr., to be commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 28, 1980.

Navy nominations beginning Timothy James Allega, to be lieutenant commander, and ending Patricia Ellard Willhelm, to be lieutenant commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 15, 1980.

Navy nominations beginning William Broughton, to be commander, and ending Linda E. Wargo, to be lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate on April 14, 1980, and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 15, 1980.

Navy nominations beginning Jeffrey R. Abel, to be ensign, and ending Charles A. Wilson, to be commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 21, 1980.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps nominations beginning Terry L. Armstrong, to be first lieutenant, and ending Raymond R. Yinger III, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 2, 1980.

Marine Corps nominations beginning John B. Airola, to be colonel, and ending Gail M. Reals, to be colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate on April 8, 1980, and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 15, 1980.