

Walls, Keith A.	Widman, Stephen C.	Yungk, George L.	Zebrowski, Jeffrey L.	CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS	
Walsh, Stephen E.	Wiebe, John M.	Zambrano, Steven P.	Zeiders, Michael D.	Ault, Douglas K.	Ludwig, Kurt J.
Walsh, Stephen W.	Wierenga, Michael A.	Zapolski, Edward S.	Zeller, Randel L.	Bertsche, Arnold F.	McAfee, Richard J.
Walter, Ainslie B.	Wiggers, Raymond P., Jr.	Zazworsky, Daniel S.	Zielman, Michael S.	Campbell, Craig M.	McConnell,
Ward, David T.		Zebrowski, Christine A.	Zoepli, Frederick J.	Carver, Gary F.	James A., Jr.
Ward, Larry W.	Wigginton, Ronald L.		Zwingselberg, Keith M.	Curd, Andrew T.	McFarland, Roger L.
Ware, William G.	Wildemann, Leonard W., II	SUPPLY CORPS			
Warmbrunn, Robert J.	Wildfong, Daniel J.	Ansoff, Peter A.	Knorr, Ernest W.	Dove, Stephen M.	Menno, Stephen R.
Warner, John R.	Wilhoit, George Z.	Appelquist, James S.	Kri'l, Rockne E.	Eckhart, Andrew J.	Meyer, Belinda A.
Warren, Darrell W.	Wilken, Dennis R.	Barnet, John A., III	Labarre, Allan K.	Evans, Rodney A.	Oberlin, William L.
Warren, Jay K.	Wilkerson, Lonnie O., III	Beck, Robert K., III	Lewis, James L.	Fortner, Kenneth G.	O'Connor, Michael H.
Warren, Timothy R.		Benson, Nanette E.	Liftman, Michael J.	Fowler, Brad J.	Rudolph,
Warrenfeltz, Larry L.	Willett, Kenneth L.	Bickert, William E., Jr.	Lobasz, Mirosław T.	Frey, Kenneth P.	Thomas C., III
Washington, Leroy L., Jr.	Williams, Charles M.		Louderback, Warren T.	Haines, George F., III	Ross, Steven R.
Washington, Michael B.	Williams, Craig L.	Bland, Paul M.	Lyons, John J., III	Jencks, Randall C.	Saunders, Mark H.
Wassel, Raymond P., Jr.	Williams, Dale J.	Blass, Jeffrey D.	Mackenzie, Robert B.	Knudson, Daniel F., Jr.	Schwind,
Wasson, Warren J.	Williams, Danny B.	Blecharczyk, Ted M.	Manno, Francis A.	Kuenzi, Keith L.	Herbert L., Jr.
Waterfield, Michael G.	Williams, Darrell W.	Boyd, Richard A.	Mattingley, Mark W.	Liedke, Thomas R., Jr.	Sjodin, Kenneth V.
Watkins, Gary N.	Williams, James H.	Boyll, Mark S.	McGavin, Phillip H.	Loose, Michael K.	Vanwyk, Teunis W., II
Watkins, Thomas V., III	Williams, Raymond B.	Breckner, Anthony J.	McLean, Robert M.	MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS	
Watson, Larry J.	Williams, Richard B.	Brown, Gregory A.	McPadden, Russell P.	Armstrong,	Oxford, Lawrence L.
Watson, Michael G.	Williams, Robert P.	Buzzard, Lewis C.	Mikulka, Robert M.	Curtis G., Jr.	Paulson, Larry G.
Watson, Richard N.	Williams, Thomas D., IV	Cade, Adolphe C., IV	Moran, James G.	Bacon, Neil D.	Pierce, Roderick J.
Wawrzyniak, James S.	Williams, William H., Jr.	Carr, Stephen M.	Morgan, Everett M.	Bosshard, Nancy L.	Powers, Pat B., Jr.
Weaver, Brian R.	Willis, Carl J.	Caughman, Clarence E., Jr.	Morrisset, Richard A.	Cain, Russell L.	Silva, William A.
Weber, Bruce A.	Willis, Joseph W., Jr.	Chidichimo, William C.	Moslow, Gene S.	Cawley, Michael	Stringfield, Walter L.
Weber, Frederick W.	Willis, Montgomery P.	Cogswell, Peter R.	Nanney, Robert G.	Chapman, Jack D., II	Swafford, James J., Jr.
Weber, Paul D.	Wilson, Peter C.	Cohe, Shaw H.	Newman, Charles T.	Chumley, Paul A.	Taylor, John P.
Weber, Paul J.	Wilson, Steele D.	Cole, John H.	O'Day, Patrick M.	Cline, Clarence R.	Thibodeau, Ronald E.
Webster, William E., Jr.	Windsor, George B.	Connor, James G., Jr.	Ohms, Bruce G.	Driscoll, Millard J.	Vanze, Stephen P.
Weekbaugh, Larry L.	Winslow, Robert S.	Corbett, John C.	Paskey, Walter J., Jr.	Fish, Stanley L.	Williams,
Wedoff, Steven D.	Winston, Jeffrey N.	Cording, William H., Jr.	Pike, Thomas H.	George, Charles L.	Arthur D., Jr.
Wegner, Brian J.	Wischerath, L. Joseph	Cragie, James R.	Pillmore, Eric M.	Hetsko, John A.	Williams, Peter N.
Weimer, John C.	Wiseman, Fred E., Jr.	Crosby, Thomas W.	Pond, James N.	Hodges, Napoleon	Woche, John C.
Weinhardt, Stephen A.	Wittemberg, Charles F.	Culp, William N., III	Preston, Leonard H., Jr.	Mallea, Richard L.	Wyatt, Edward P.
Weinstein, Frank D.	Woerner, Richard H.	Davis, Donald L.	Price, Stephen R., Jr.	IN THE NAVY	
Wellock, Stephen M.	Wolfe, Christian E.	Day, James W., Jr.	Proctor, John S.	The following-named chief warrant officers, W-1 of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-2, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5787c, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:	
Wells, William A.	Wolff, John C.	Dieterle, Robert S.	Rach, Daniel E.	Anderson, Paul A.	Garland, Fernald T.
Wentzel, Philip E., Jr.	Wolff, William S.	Dixon, Jeffrey A.	Register, Wayne H.	Balinas, Jose C.	Hubner, Jon B.
Wernli, Daniel E.	Wood, Michael P.	English, Raymond P.	Reilly, Robert W.	Bishop, Jeffrey M.	King, John P., Jr.
Wessel, Kirk D.	Woodall, James W.	Ettus, Douglas E.	Scaperotta, Ralph M.	Brasseur, James W.	Raybourn, Stephen A.
West, David D., Jr.	Woodcock, David A.	Evans, Peter M.	Segredo, John M.	Burton, Wilfred R.	Reed, Jerry W.
West, Jeffrey A.	Woods, James A., Jr.	Ferrant, Thomas H. B.	Sheppard, Leslie C.	Cruz, Romeo G.	Royes, Raphael O.
West, Robert T.	Woods, Wayne A.	Freihofer, James T.	Sligh, Albert B., Jr.	Evans, Gary L.	Tucker, Elmo G.
Weyand, William G., II	Woolley, James R.	Gillespie, David W.	Sperry, Charles K.		
Wham, Norman B.	Wooster, Michael H.	Goldberg, Robert J.	Stanton, Marjorie J.		
Whatley, Joseph W.	Wooten, Hubbard S., III	Gruenhagen, Gregory G.	Stensland, John N.		
Wheaton, Richard W.	Work, Edward P.	Guion, Stephen W.	Stephens, Thomas L.		
Wheeler, Daniel A.	Worst, Terry J.	Hall, Thomas F.	Stroupe, John B.		
Wheeler, Dennis R.	Wren, William C.	Haren, Joseph L.	Taylor, Timothy J.		
Wheeler, Steven R.	Wright, Riley L.	Harmer, Frank T.	Telescan, Gary K.		
Whipple, David E.	Wunderlich, Erwin J.	Harp, Timothy J.	Theel, William C.		
White, Gregory J.	Wurst, James P.	Hedges, Michael W.	Thornbury, Joseph S.		
White, James F., III	Wurzel, Donald J.	Hendrickson, Robert C., III	Tomlin, Henry B., III		
White, Jerry S.	Wurzel, James D.	Hess, Donald W.	Torpey, James M.		
White, Norman L.	Wydra, Mark J.	Hill, Edward H.	Trayer, Donald A.		
White, Scott R.	Yandle, Stephen R.	Hirschy, John A.	Turner, Tramble T.		
White, Stephen R.	Yasgar, Richard K.	Hoglund, Michael P.	Uhlendorff, William E.		
White, Stephen F.	Yasment, Frank P.	Hoops, John R.	Volkmar, John A.		
White, Stuart T.	Yates, John M., Jr.	Huff, Kurt R.	Wallace, Brian P.		
Whiteside, Richard E., Jr.	Yates, William R.	Isham, Brian S.	Warren, William H., III		
Whitmer, Lynden D.	Yeung, Bradley W.	Johnson, Michael D.	Waterman, William M.		
Whyms, Michael L.	Yost, Charles P.	Josef, Michael D.	Wight, Terry E.		
Wick, Daniel B.	Yost, Gerald E.	Kent, Rock E.	Williams, Michael G.		
Wicks, James H., Jr.	Young, David R.	Kierner, Frederick A., III	Williams, John A., Jr.		
	Young, Gregory D.	Knaggs, Christopher D.	Winstead, William G.		
	Young, Robert V.		Wiruth, Alvin L.		
	Yumen, David Y.		Zajdel, Daniel J.		
			Zimmerman,		
			Robert G.		

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE TURKISH ARMS EMBARGO DEBATE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an exchange of "Dear Colleague" letters on the issue of whether or not

the arms embargo against Turkey is required as a matter of law.

Following are letters from the proponents of keeping the arms embargo against Turkey in which it is contended that the embargo is required as a matter of law and continues to be required. In a second letter, I have tried to counter this argument and state why the embargo is not required by law, but rather the issue before the Congress is a policy issue, not a legal issue and it is

up to the Congress to decide whether the embargo continues to be appropriate.

The two letters follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July, 1978.

THE EMBARGO AND THE LAW

DEAR COLLEAGUE: You will soon have an opportunity to cast a vote in favor of a foreign policy based on principle and in accord with rule of law.

The Carter Administration's proposal to remove the limited arms embargo now in

effect against Turkey is, in our view an ill-conceived move that violates fundamental legal, moral and security principles of U.S. foreign policy. We ask your help in defeating this effort, and we hope to set forth, in this and subsequent letters, the considerations which have led us to our position on this important matter.

The Turkish arms embargo is required as a matter of law.

It is important to remember that the arms embargo was voted by Congress only after Turkey, in clear violation of American laws and bilateral agreements already in effect, used American weapons for offensive purposes in its second—August, 1974—invasion and occupation of Cyprus.

Unlike Turkey's Cyprus action of the previous month, which was mounted in response to a coup instigated on the island by the Greek junta, this August invasion took place at a time when hostilities had ended, the junta had fallen, a ceasefire was in effect and the interested parties were engaged in peace talks at Geneva. It was at that moment that Turkey employed 40,000 troops, armed with American weapons, to occupy forty percent of Cyprus, and it was in response to this second, clearly offensive, operation, that Congress acted.

Provisions of both the Foreign Assistance Act and the Foreign Military Sales Act required that further military aid to Turkey be terminated. The embargo was voted, therefore, not to enact new law but rather to insure that existing laws were enforced.

Secretary of State Vance has conceded in his recent testimony before the House International Relations Committee that the Turkish occupation of Cyprus was carried out in violation of American laws and bilateral agreements. He has conceded, further, that the imposition of the embargo was the appropriate response to those violations.

Precisely the same considerations which justified imposition of the embargo now require its continued support.

Nearly four years after its invasion of Cyprus, Turkey still occupies forty percent of the island. Nearly 30,000 troops of that occupying army, still equipped with American weapons, remain there. And Turkey has taken no actions to improve the situation substantially.

The continued presence of these Turkish troops of Cyprus, therefore, constitutes nothing less than a continuing violation of American laws. So long as the violations continue, the embargo must remain in force.

It should be noted that the embargo provision itself permits President Carter to end the embargo in a moment, if he is willing to certify to Congress that Turkey is now in compliance with the Foreign Assistance Act, the Foreign Military Sales Act, and its bilateral agreements with the United States, and that substantial progress has been made toward an agreement regarding military forces on Cyprus. We would welcome actions by Turkey substantive enough to permit President Carter to make such certifications to Congress; clearly, however, Turkey has taken no such actions.

In his policy statements on this very issue during his campaign for the Presidency, Jimmy Carter declared that "The United States must pursue a foreign policy based in principle and in accord with the rule of law." We ask that you join us in supporting those sentiments by voting to maintain the arms embargo against Turkey.

Sincerely,

Dante B. Fascell, John Brademas, Norman Y. Mineta, James J. Blanchard, Mario Biaggi, Edward J. Derwinski, Charles Rose, Paul E. Tsongas, Barbara A. Mikulski, George M. O'Brien, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Parren J. Mitchell, Donald M. Fraser, Benjamin A. Gilman, John L. Burton, Robert W.

CXXIV—1465—Part 17

Edgar, Norman E. D'Amours, Wyche Fowler, Jr., Martin A. Russo, James J. Florio, and Charles B. Rangel.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 26, 1978.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: In the last few days, the proponents of keeping an arms embargo on Turkey have circulated letters giving reasons why the embargo against Turkey should be maintained.

In this and subsequent letters I seek to give you another perspective on this issue and to counter arguments made by the proponents of the embargo.

Arguments used by proponents of keeping the arms embargo against Turkey:

1. The Turkish arms embargo is required as a matter of law.

2. Precisely the same considerations which justified imposition of the embargo now require its continued support.

Counter:

1. This issue before Congress is a policy issue, not a legal issue.

Whether the embargo should be required by law is the question at issue. Congress should decide, as a matter of national policy, whether the embargo continues to be appropriate.

Although the embargo is currently required as a matter of law by section 620(x) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Congress is in the process of deciding whether that section should be repealed. Surely, the proponents of the embargo are not arguing that Congress is powerless to lift the embargo. If the Congress enacts legislation repealing section 620(x), the Turkish arms embargo will no longer be required as a matter of law.

2. Other provisions of law do not require the Turkish arms embargo.

Section 3(c) of the Arms Export Control Act and section 505(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to ineligibility for assistance, are general in nature and do not supercede any specific action that the Congress may take with respect to shipments of U.S. arms to Turkey.

To argue that they do is to argue that the partial lifting of the embargo which the Congress enacted in 1975, revised in 1976, and extended in 1977, is illegal.

Those provisions were extensively revised in 1976 and do not apply to violations occurring before then. Moreover, by the terms of those revised sections, a country does not become ineligible to receive U.S. arms and assistance unless and until either (1) the President determines that a substantial violation of the terms of a military assistance or sales agreement has occurred and reports that determination to Congress, or (2) the Congress adopts a joint resolution stating that it finds that a country is ineligible because a substantial violation has occurred. Neither action has occurred in the Turkish case. These provisions of law are not self-enforcing.

3. The principle of law has been upheld.

The enactment of the embargo demonstrated that U.S. arms cannot be used in an unauthorized way. That point will be no clearer if the embargo is left in effect. Our purpose is to get Turkish troops off Cyprus and get a settlement of the Cyprus dispute, but the present approach is not achieving these goals.

4. The principle of law will not be strengthened by leaving the embargo in effect indefinitely.

It defies common sense to contend that laws should remain in force when they harm the national interest. Nothing requires the imposition of an embargo for an indefinite duration as the only permissible response to a violation of the law.

5. Selective enforcement undermines the principle of law.

The proponents of keeping the embargo

have shown no interest in applying the law in other cases where recipients of American arms may have violated agreements with the United States on the prescribed uses of US-supplied equipment. The Library of Congress lists over twenty cases since the 1950s when foreign states may have violated bilateral agreements with the United States. Turkey is the only country against which Congress has applied these sanctions.

6. From its viewpoint, Turkey sees the legal issues differently.

Since Cyprus' independence in 1960, both Turkey and Greece have sent US-origin equipment there illegally. Yet, Turkey was punished in 1974. From its perspective, Turkey felt it had conflicting legal responsibilities. On the one hand Turkey was responsible to our bilateral agreements and, on the other hand, Turkey felt it had a responsibility under the 1960 Accords on Cyprus (Article 4 of the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee) which gave Turkey the right to intervene to restore "the state of affairs" created by the Accords. Some appreciation should be shown for Turkey's legal and policy dilemma.

In sum, the Turkish arms embargo is not required as a matter of law. Whether there is an embargo on arms shipments to Turkey is a matter of policy to be decided by the Congress. In my view, United States interests are suffering in the region, the embargo has become self-defeating and a new approach is needed to try to achieve a Cyprus settlement and accelerate the withdrawals of remaining Turkish troops from the land.

I hope you will agree that it is in our national interest to lift the embargo against Turkey.

Sincerely yours,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Member of Congress. ●

SOVIET TRIALS OF DISSIDENTS

HON. AUSTIN J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the recent trials of dissidents in the Soviet Union has rightfully brought about worldwide criticism. The distinct lack of due process by Soviet courts demonstrates a disregard of basic rights accorded to defendants. The predetermined verdicts in the trials of Anatoly Scharansky, Aleksandr Ginzburg, and Viktoras Petkus are not representative of a freely conducted procedure.

In the Scharansky trial, courtroom observers were handpicked by Soviet officials thereby excluding the defendant's mother, the remainder of his family except her brother, and close friends from the trial. While supporters held vigil outside the building, Soviet officials photographed the crowd. Similar occurrences took place during the May trial of Yuri Orlov and also during the trial of Ginzburg. Actions such as these preclude any hope of a free and open trial.

In the conduct of the trials, basic rules of evidence were violated. In Scharansky's trial, flaws in the Soviet Government's case are readily apparent. For example, although the government charged that Scharansky telephoned Los Angeles Times correspondent Robert Toth to arrange a clandestine meeting, a government witness testified that there was no telephone in Scharansky's

apartment. Such an instance points to a distinct lack of due process as well as a disregard for any rules of evidence.

The sentences given to Scharansky, Ginzburg, and Petkus are harsh by any standard. Ginzburg and Petkus have already spent years in prison because of their political views. For simply observing and acting upon violations of basic human rights, these individuals have had their rights abridged by a regime that seems insensitive to world opinion.

The Soviet Government has violated basic human rights in these cases. Freedom of expression and speech has been denied. Freedom of travel by refusing to allow Scharansky and others to emigrate has also been abridged. Such is the case of Vladimir Slepak who is now sentenced with a crime against the state because he publicly stated his desire to emigrate on a banner hung from his apartment. Throughout the course of these trials and the events surrounding them, the Soviet Government has consistently violated the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the United Nations Charter, and the Final Act of Helsinki accords. Such violations cannot go unnoticed in the court of world opinion. I, therefore, urge the continuance of worldwide focus on violations by the Soviet Union of some of its citizens' human and equal rights.●

ELK HILLS NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, in the next few weeks the Congress will be asked to decide whether or not to reduce the rate of continued production at our Naval petroleum reserves. The principal reserve affected is in my State, Elk Hills NPR No. 1 near Bakersfield, Calif.

While the question that will be before the Congress will be simply stated, the implications of our decision will have a dramatic effect on the independent sector of the California oil industry.

A perceptive and compelling analysis of the reasons why Congress decided initially to develop Elk Hills and our Naval petroleum reserves, why we should continue to do so, and why the California oil industry is unique, might be helpful to my colleagues. I commend to you this analysis by Charles Seeger, an attorney with the Washington office of Nelson, Harding, & Yeutter and former legislative assistant to my friend the late Congressman Charles Teague. The analysis follows:

ELK HILLS NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE: PAST AND FUTURE

(By Charles M. Seeger)

During the House Armed Services Committee hearings on the Naval Petroleum Reserves a few weeks ago, a California Congressman traditionally aligned with Navy

concerns asked the Department of Energy and Navy witnesses, "How much Elk Hills crude does the Navy get?"

"Not a barrel" was the essence of the dramatic reply. Unfortunately, the reply should have also added this fact: crude oil is virtually useless to the military. Refined product—such as Navy Special fuel, diesel fuel, jet fuel (JP-4 and JP-5), gasoline, asphalt—all these refined products are valuable to the military.¹

This colloquy illustrates that one of the few positive government actions resulting from the 1973-74 Arab embargo is now in jeopardy.

In the next few weeks Congress will decide whether or not to reduce the rate of continued production from Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve, and other reserves. This article argues that (1) continued production at the current maximum efficient rate at Elk Hills is the soundest course; (2) government policy is detrimental to the California producers effort to receive the proper value for his crude production; and (3) these two issues are only tangentially related and the oil policy of California requires special federal attention.

WHY ELK HILLS WAS OPENED

The oil embargo of 1973-74 forced the United States to examine its domestic production capability. Part of that examination included a look at Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1, Elk Hills, in Kern County, California 35 miles west of Bakersfield. A reserve established in 1912 because of Teddy Roosevelt's concern for assuring a secure source of oil supply for the Navy. When the oil embargo occurred, Elk Hills had virtually no production only 2,500 barrels per day were being produced for testing and conservation, and this was the average daily production since World War II. Despite TR's hope, Elk Hills then provided the military no cushion of reliance. In December 1973, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Admiral Moorer confirmed this and agreed that Elk Hills should be developed.

ELK HILLS PRODUCTION CAPABILITY

With due Congressional deliberance, and much urging by the local Congressman, the late William Ketchum, the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 was enacted mandating production at the maximum efficient rate for six years.²

This law began considerable development work and Elk Hills production capability is now approximately 128,000 b/d. Elk Hills crude is above 23° API gravity, with the preponderance of the crude being approximately 36° gravity—the combination of Shallow Zone and Stevens Zone production is basically a higher quality crude. In the very near future, the production capability of Elk Hills should be about 140,000 b/d because of additional gas processing capability.

Navy and DOE estimates for ultimate maximum efficient rate are 260,000 b/d.

MILITARY IMPORTANCE OF ELK HILLS CONTINUED PRODUCTION

The Navy's interest is properly keen for historical reasons. But as already noted, the Navy's needs are for refined product and a readily available supply for emergencies. This need is met by continued production from Elk Hills. As noted, seven military bases are now receiving refined product from the independent refiners processing Elk Hills crude. Additionally, the Norwalk Fuel Support point, another recipient of refined product from Elk Hills crude, distributes product to 22 other Navy, Marine Corps, Army, and Air Force installations throughout Cali-

fornia and Arizona. Admiral Moorer's comments favoring the production at Elk Hills since the beginning supports this perspective.

The military need for refined product deserves emphasis. This is so because of the discussion in the Armed Services Committee about the use of Elk Hills as a strategic petroleum reserve.

WHY NOT ELK HILLS AS A STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE?

There is a vast difference between crude oil already extracted from the ground and then placed in storage in a strategic petroleum reserve (SPR), and crude oil remaining to be extracted from a natural reservoir. The ultimate objective of the SPR (i.e., crude stored in salt domes on the Gulf Coast) is a draw down capability of 6 million barrels per day. The draw down can begin within 7 days. This tremendous accessibility is a totally different engineering proposition than extracting crude from a reservoir.

Elk Hills' maximum production level would still be less than one-fifth of the strategic petroleum reserve draw down. That one-fifth (260,000 b/d) could only be achieved through a diligent effort on the part of the Navy and DOE is readying Elk Hills so that it may be at its MER of production as called for under the original NPR Production Act.

If Elk Hills were fully developed, then shut-in as the current amendment of Congressman Bob Wilson (R-San Diego) requires, it would take at least three months to return production to the MER. This assumes that the deterioration of idle equipment does not totally preclude ever again regaining full production.

Unlike oil stored in salt domes, Elk Hills must be a fully-producing reserve if it is to be truly valuable as a reserve.

In short, refined product and the important local refinery capability is an important part of the military aspect of the Elk Hills reserve. Continued production at the MER is the most logical method of meeting our best national interest.

HOW DID THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY SMALL REFINERS OPERATE BEFORE ELK HILLS OPENED UP?

The song refrain, "Got along without ya before I met ya. . . ." raises an issue that must be addressed: Local small refiners, got along without Elk Hills crude three years ago, why do they need it so much now?

Before Elk Hills, local refineries were operating at approximately only 75 percent of capacity. Because of Elk Hills, these refineries are now able to utilize close to 100 percent of their capacity.

Additionally, the situation for small refiners in the San Joaquin Valley has changed since Elk Hills crude has become available.

1. Before, more light low-sulphur crude was produced locally and available. Now, overall, light crude production in the San Joaquin Valley has declined since early 1974, even with significant increases in production at such fields as Yowlumne, which has increased output from 239 b/d to 25,000 b/d in four years time.

2. Before, foreign light crude was trucked from Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors at great expense. Elk Hills eliminates this extraordinary supply method.

3. Before, there was a greater market for the fuel oils refined from the heavier California crudes. Increasingly, more stringent environment regulations in California—the toughest in the nation—have greatly reduced the market for the high sulphur resid, the principal product of heavy California crude. This necessitates refiners running higher quality low-sulphur crude such as imported or Elk Hills.

Footnotes at end of article.

There is absolutely no question that the San Joaquin Valley refiners must have Elk Hills crude in order to run at efficient rates and meet the aforementioned changing supply and environmental concerns.

WHAT ABOUT CALIFORNIA PRODUCERS MARKET- ING PROBLEMS AND SHUT-INS

California crude producers clearly have severe problems with marketing their crude. The problem is marketing a 13° API crude with tar-like viscosity to refiners that, except for specialty refiners, would prefer to run a 36° API crude with a viscosity close to gasoline. This problem is compounded by the federal government. There are prohibitions on the exchange or direct export of heavy crude despite the fact that there is tremendous economic sense in doing this. And despite the fact certain California heavy crudes are shut-in while a ready market exists in Japan.

California producers efforts to receive a greater value for their crude, much of which is now priced considerably below ceiling prices, is further compounded by many DOE and Department of Commerce restraints on the export of heavy refined products from the California crude to potential markets, such as the east coast resid market or Japan.

As if the California producers problems were not complicated enough, there is the entitlements program—easily the most complex cost controlling scheme ever devised. This program was purportedly designed to equalize the cost of oil for all U.S. refineries to prevent companies with ready access to lower tier domestic crude from driving other refineries out of business. The effect of this program in California is to offer virtually no incentive for West Coast refiners to run California heavy crudes when they can purchase higher quality crude from Alaska, Saudi Arabia, or Indonesia and off-set their higher crude costs through checks from other refiners in the entitlements program.

After years of dallying, the administration has within the past few weeks finally announced a program with a sliding scale gravity adjustment for the previously "crude-quality-blind" entitlements program. But, as the producers know, it remains to be seen what benefits they will receive.

Producers are also raising a question about the entitlement treatment Elk Hills crude now receives. Elk Hills crude is treated as uncontrolled oil for purposes of the entitlements program, thus it does not carry the entitlement burden of lower and upper tier crudes. No checks beyond the purchase price flow from the refiner. Arguably this entitlement free status disadvantages the California producer of entitlement burdened crude. But the reason is simple—the Congress wanted the government to receive as much money as possible for the government owned crude. Thus, Elk Hills is bid for on as near as is possible a free market basis. Whether or not this pricing decision for Elk Hills crude is changed should not be a part of the decision on the rate of production.

WEST COAST IS UNIQUE

One lesson from past regulatory tinkering with West Coast supply and demand facts should be to acknowledge that California is different. A program based on national crude acquisition averages is not particularly logical to refiners and producers operating in a petroleum industry with crude supply and product demand patterns quite different from the rest of the country.

In short, the oil policy of California deserves special federal attention. Senator Cranston and Congressman Mark Hannaford have always known this and their efforts in cajoling the administration have been admirable. Additionally, California producers

and refiners alike have repeatedly called for incentives for refinery retro-fitting, to allow the necessary modernization and configuration changes to process heavier domestic crudes. The least incentive being a "stable, rational, and predictable government policy," in the words of California State Controller Ken Cory.

The important point regarding Elk Hills crude is that it is only tangentially related to California producers real problems.

Only tangentially related because "a barrel of crude is not a barrel of crude", that is, crude oil is not a fungible product. A comparison of Elk Hills Stevens zone with California Kern River or even Alaskan Sadlerochit is compelling. The gravity of Stevens zone is well over twice that of Kern River crude, and the sulphur content of the Stevens is only half as much.³

These significant quality differences between Elk Hills crude and the rest of the California production really do diminish the arguments that one crude displaces the other. The natural replacement for Elk Hills crude is like quality crude, and that unfortunately does not mean domestic crude.

WEST COAST GLUT?

The current "crude glut" in California must thus be viewed in quality terms. Further the "glut" also only exists because of California's failure to allow the Sohio project to carry the North Slope crude to the mid-continent, an approval very much wanted by Chairman John Dingell (D-Mich.), of the House Energy and Power Subcommittee. And Dingell wants it before he works to provide the necessary review and alterations of DOE programs to benefit California producers.

Reduced production from Elk Hills would not alleviate the current California crude surplus. As the quality comparison illustrates, such a move would probably simply further increase the demand for foreign sweet crude. And while the surplus is real, it is a surplus of high sulphur crude principally brought on by the availability of Alaskan North Slope Crude. But this Alaskan heavier crude is 1) not accessible to the San Joaquin Valley refiners; 2) cannot be run efficiently in these refineries, and; 3) results in a product yield, which because of the high content of the residual boiler fuel, runs counter to prevailing market and environmental conditions because of state and local air pollution control standards that discourage the burning of residual oil and prohibits the burning of even minimally high sulphur resid.

REVENUE LOSS AND BUDGET IMPACT

No review of the Elk Hills situation is complete without a recognition of its balance of payments benefit and income generating power through the bidding and sale process. Assuming an imported crude price of \$15, oil revenues lost by withholding NPR crude from the commercial market would result in a loss of \$500 million in fiscal year 1979 and each year thereafter through 1982.

CONCLUSION

In short, the reasoning behind getting our Naval Petroleum Reserves in ready production status was sound militarily, strategically, and economically. Elk Hills has benefited the Navy, our balance of payments deficit, the local refiners, and the California consumer. It's continued production is wise, and this is not debated. The rate of that production is now in question in Congress. At the very least no backward steps are warranted and would be disastrous to local small refiners. Producers legitimately raise many questions about their problems and these must be addressed. The full assessment

on these concerns has been diligently sought by the California producers and must continue. The debate on the Wilson amendment to the Elk Hills authorization bill is not the forum for the necessary intricate review.

Six months ago President Carter instructed the Department of Energy to pursue efforts to "expand production of oil at the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve, and maintain production of California crude at a high level."⁴ These two objectives are worthy and should be achieved.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Significantly, California's small refiners now processing Elk Hills crude are providing refined product to seven military facilities: Edwards Air Force Base; China Lake Naval Weapons Center; Point Mugu Naval Air Station; Ontario International Airport (Air Force fuel contract); Long Beach Naval Shipyard; San Pedro Defense Fuel Support Point; and Le Moore Naval Air Station.

² The law also allows three year production extensions if the President so recommends, and neither House of Congress disapproves. P.L. 94-258 April 5, 1976.

³ Approximate gravity and sulphur levels are:

Elk Hills Stevens Zone, 36° API, 4 percent Sulphur.

Alaskan Sadlerochit, 27° API, .8 percent Sulphur.

California Kern River, 13° API, .8-1.0 percent Sulphur.

⁴ Statement by the President, December 21, 1977. Office of the White House Press Secretary. ●

ALASKAN NATURAL GAS: THE SAGA CONTINUES

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, as one of the Members of Congress who vigorously opposed approval of the Trans-Canadian route for transporting Alaskan natural gas to the United States, I was very interested by a recent article outlining problems with getting the gas to the United States.

I hope the pricing problem will soon be solved by Congress, but that will leave the financing issue which was one raised during the debate last year. The article also fails to mention another problem of concern to many of us. Despite the fact this is an American project, the Canadian Government has taken a hard line toward using Canadian products for construction, which could cost Americans jobs and will likely hurt U.S. steel companies.

I would like to insert the news article from the July 24 Washington Star for the information of the Members.

ALASKAN GAS PIPELINE RUNS LATE BEFORE IT EVEN CAN GET STARTED

CALGARY, ALBERTA.—The much-heralded, 4,700-mile pipeline that was supposed to bring trillions of cubic feet of Alaskan natural gas to the rest of the United States by 1983 already is behind schedule.

And in the wake of political and financial problems, and new questions about when the gas actually will be needed, some experts are wondering if the pipeline—the largest

project ever undertaken by private industry—will be ready on time.

If not, years from now, American consumers may find themselves shivering through short supplies of natural gas while huge quantities of the precious fuel are wasted in Alaska.

"There's a question right now as to whether or not a market exists for Alaskan gas," said Jim Kiely, a utilities expert for the U.S. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission who has been following the project since it was proposed several years ago.

Is there a chance that the project, now about six months behind schedule, will not be completed by 1983? "That's a possibility that has to be looked at," Kiely said.

Just last year, Kiely and other government officials were expressing great confidence that the pipeline would be completed in 1983, and the project's sponsors still say it will be. The timing is crucial because if the project is not finished within five years, many oil companies—now reinjecting the gas into oil wells—will be forced to "flare," or burn off, the gas at the wells.

Meanwhile, as delays mount, the project's cost—originally estimated at \$10 billion—grows. Some estimates of the pipeline's final cost now reach \$14 billion.

As designed, the pipeline would extend from Prudhoe Bay in Alaska, along the Alaskan Highway, down through the Yukon and across British Columbia and Alberta. In Alberta, it would be split into two branches—one that would end on the U.S. West Coast and another that would end in the Chicago area.

According to estimates, there may be as much as 26 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in the North Alaskan fields that are now being pumped of oil. A year ago, amid natural-gas shortages that forced school closings and job layoffs in the Midwest, officials considered three plans for transporting that gas to the lower 48 states.

Canadian and U.S. officials finally agreed on the current project, then called the "Alcan" pipeline, now called the Foothills pipeline.

But since that agreement, two large roadblocks have developed. First, President Carter's energy program and its crucial guidelines for natural gas pricing have been blocked in Congress. The project's sponsors—several large Canadian and U.S. pipeline firms—cannot arrange financing until the price at which the gas can be sold is known.

Financing is believed to be the most difficult part. The total equity capital of all U.S. pipeline companies was \$9 billion in 1975, the last year for which figures are available. Thus, the firms must borrow most of the \$100 billion to \$14 billion needed for the new pipeline, and they must borrow the huge amount without disrupting credit markets—a move that would make borrowed money even more expensive.

According to one estimate, each year's delay will add \$1 billion to the project's cost.

"As soon as the gas pricing arrangements get out of Congress, the natural gas producers and buyers of the gas in the United States will sign contracts," said Diane Narvik, an official of Foothills Pipelines (Yukon) Ltd., the consortium that will build the Canadian portion. "Then those U.S. buyers will sign contracts with their local customers and we will have the basis to get into financing."

Narvik maintains that there will be no trouble raising the money. "There's quite a surplus of capital these days and we have a steady stream of people coming into this office wanting a piece of the action," she said.

But many analysts still believe federal loan guarantees will be necessary, although Narvik maintained that financing and construction costs will not rise to that point.

"People just aren't aware that this is relatively easy terrain to build on," she said. "Almost all of the pipeline will be underground. We certainly don't see where there should be any major overruns."

But, as Kiely pointed out, the project faces another large problem: Will Alaskan gas be needed soon enough to justify the enormous outlay of money and effort?

Just 18 months after the Midwest natural gas shortage, there is a "gas glut" in the United States.

A milder winter, conservation and federal restraints on gas usage have accounted for so much excess gas that there have been price decreases in parts of Texas, Louisiana and Oklahoma. One large California utility—Pacific Gas & Electric Co.—is running out of storage tanks for excess gas; after months of refusing to sign up new customers, many utilities around the country once again are soliciting business.

"One of the things the project has to decide is whether the United States will need the gas at the time it's delivered or if they (the pipeline operators) will have to develop another market to handle it for the short term," said Kiely.

If there is no immediate market for the Alaskan gas, a possibility which Kiely says must be considered, financing may be difficult to arrange and the project's completion further delayed. The glut is expected to end in five years—exactly when the gas either must be transported from Alaskan wells or burned uselessly.

That raises the possibility that, if financiers prove shortsighted, the pipeline may not be completed on time.

And even if the gas eventually does arrive in the lower 48 states, it is likely to be quite expensive. U.S. officials estimate its final cost at about \$3-\$4 per thousand cubic feet, compared to \$2-\$2.25 per thousand cubic feet for gas produced closer to market.

Narvik acknowledged that there is some doubt about whether the project will be completed on time, but she insisted that project officials are ready to begin.

"We have over 400 people right here working in the plans and they'd like nothing better than to go out and begin digging a ditch," she said. "If you guys (Americans) would get the energy bill through Congress, maybe we could get started."●

THE NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK COMMITTEE

Hon. Theodore M. (Ted) Risenhoover

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. RISENHOOVER. Mr. Speaker, the National Right to Work Committee which has two problems of its own that I will address, has ordered congressional supporters of education to return our past contributions from schoolteachers.

Again, NRWC—which operates with secret money and from a platform of falsehoods—is trying to confuse the American voter.

A judge ruled that some of the Na-

tional Education Association's political fundraising—a reverse checkoff system used in 16 States—was wrong. Teachers that contributed through reverse checkoff can get their money back—if they want it.

On that basis, NRWC lists about 300 Members of the House and Senate as having received "illegally collected campaign funds."

The NEA never collected any money in Oklahoma with the reverse checkoff system. Yet NRWC says I received "illegally" \$1,300 from the teachers. The contributions were 100 percent legal from Oklahoma schoolteachers. Even money that "may have" been given my colleagues from the reverse checkoff system was received by the candidate's campaign committees in good faith. No Member or candidate should even consider returning the money unless they are requested. No thinking politician, lawmaker, or campaign committee should succumb to the false accusations of the NRWC.

Now, I will address the two problems of the NRWC.

Three years ago, I called upon the NRWC to disclose the source of its funding. It is one of the most powerful, ruthless, untruthful, but well-financed, lobbies in Washington. It has an invisible means of support. I have yet to see its contributor list unveiled. I am sure most of its supporters are not schoolteachers.

Second, NRWC does not—as its name wrongfully implies—have anything to do with a person's right to work. It simply is a secret front for worker-hating people who do not believe in equality among the four factors of production: land, capital, entrepreneurship, and labor. They are lobbying to replace "labor" with "slaves."●

TURKISH ARMS EMBARGO

HON. JOHN L. BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, those of us in Congress who support the Turkish arms embargo have repeatedly called for the administration to use the embargo as a means of encouraging Turkey to take concrete actions to promote a peaceful settlement of the Cyprus tragedy.

We have been deeply dismayed at the administration's unwillingness to act in this matter, and its concentration, instead, on mounting a battle to defeat Congress on this issue.

The futility of this approach is set forth most convincingly by Mary McGrory, political columnist of the Washington Star, in her column of July 17, 1978. Says Ms. McGrory:

"If he would put as much pressure on the Turks as he is putting on Congress, Jimmy

Carter would have his repeal of the Turkish arms embargo handed to him on a silver platter."

Ms. McGrory notes that previous moves taken by Congress to encourage Turkish flexibility have met only continued Turkish intransigence, and she asks, in response to administration's claims about the effects of a total lifting of the embargo, "Why would the Turks be any more willing to bend with U.S. arms than without them?"

As we prepare to consider the Turkish arms question once again, I commend Ms. McGrory's excellent article to the attention of those of my colleagues who have doubts about the Carter administration's handling of important foreign policy matters.

**THE PRESSURE CARTER'S PUTTING ON
HILL MIGHT WORK ON TURKEY**

(By Mary McGrory)

If he would put as much pressure on the Turks as he is putting on Congress, Jimmy Carter would have his repeal of the Turkish arms embargo handed to him on a silver platter.

The president is the chief lobbyist for the dubious cause. He invites groups of members to the White House for urgent briefings attended by the secretary of state, the secretary of defense, superlawyer Clark Clifford and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Republicans receive telephone calls from Supreme NATO Commander Alexander Haig.

Turkey, they are told, has been "punished enough" for using U.S. arms to invade Cyprus in 1974.

The issue has divided Democrats, who have just been through the wringer of the Mideast warplanes sales and are not eager to embark on election-year "kamikaze missions" against their Greek constituencies.

"Why doesn't he put the screws on the Turks?" moaned one liberal who would like to help NATO and oblige his president.

"The problem here," said another, "is Carter's credibility. He just makes one foreign policy mistake after another. He's asking us to trust him to get something out of the Turks."

Turkey has been a sulking member of NATO since the embargo was imposed. What baffles some Democrats is that Carter is asking them to reward the Turks for bad conduct. Administration officials argue that the embargo hasn't worked and that a more indulgent attitude toward the transgressors is the only way.

If that's the case, some of them wonder, why don't we start being nice to Fidel Castro? Surely, our embargo against Cuba has not won hearts and minds in Havana. It has, instead, provoked Castro to such irritating countermeasures as the dispatch of troops to Africa. But any mention of diplomatic recognition as an alternative approach is frowned on by the Carter Establishment.

Turkey's intransigence on Cyprus—it still occupies 40 percent of the island, and, according to one European human rights investigating team, is severely mistreating Greek islanders—is put forward as the clincher for coddling them.

"Turkey and Greece have been at each other's throat for centuries on Cyprus," a White House official explained. "Our national interest is involved in NATO."

Two prominent Senate doves, Frank Church and George McGovern, have been won over to this "realistic" approach, but

others are demanding to see a few cards from the Turks before they throw in their hand.

Why would the Turks be any more willing to bend with U.S. arms than without them? The embargo was never total. We slipped them supplies through the back door of an overseas Pentagon branch office. Last year, Congress tried to bribe them into a show of flexibility by upping their covert allowance from \$125 million to \$175 million. They did not move an inch. Carter's announcement of his intention to resume the full flow inspired them to invite battered Greek refugees back to Famagusta—to live under Turkish occupation.

President Carter "reassured" a large delegation of Greek-American leaders whom he invited to the White House last month that there had been "absolutely no progress on Cyprus"—as if this would dilute their rage over his broken campaign pledge to "couple the improvement in relations with Turkey with increased fair progress on the Cyprus issue."

If the Carter administration has taken any steps to bring about the "coupling," they have been well concealed. Our ambassador to Turkey, Ronald Squires, last January said his "only hope was that the embargo will be removed."

Assent of both houses is required for repeal. The Senate will go first, and the leader of the Greek forces, Sen. Paul Sarbanes, D-Md., is hopeful that logic—and reminders of Jimmy Carter's call for morality in foreign policy—will win the day.

Sarbanes, a freshman, is remembered for his dogged endeavors on the House impeachment committee. He is of Greek origin, but not the wily kind. His friends say that if he had been among the troops outside Troy, he would not have been working on the fateful gift horse; he would have been throwing words over the wall.

"He is leafleting the Senate," says a colleague. "Every time you meet him, he hands you some literature."

Sarbanes goes on the floor armed with reprints of anti-repeal editorials from English and American papers, reprints of pre-reversal statements by Carter and Secretary of State Vance. Lately he has been handing out copies of Laurence Sterne's history of the Turkish invasion, "The Wrong Horse."

Sarbanes says Carter has failed to use international leverage. NATO ambassadors should be routed, not to Capitol Hill, but to Ankara, where the English and the Germans have special influence, to lean on the Turks.

On a more immediate level, he believes that if Carter is willing to write off the Greek vote, his colleagues are not. The administration's high-powered spokesmen say it's "pragmatic" to vote for repeal; but the Greek-American lobby, second only to the Jewish community in activism, is telling them it's not. And it votes. ●

**BISHOP PEDRO CASALDALIGA OF
BRAZIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS**

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, just 2 weeks ago the world was shocked and dismayed as the Soviet Union proceeded to try and convict Anatoly Scharansky,

Yuri Orlov and Aleksandr Ginzburg. These trials have taken on great symbolic value for those of us who are wholeheartedly committed to the cause of worldwide humanitarianism.

Today I wish to share with my colleagues the story of a man whose whole life is a trial in defense of the human rights of impoverished Indians and migrants living in Mato Grosso and Goias, Brazil, Bishop Pedro Casaldaliga. Bishop Casaldaliga, a Claretian missionary priest, has been on "trial" since 1968. His quest for human rights and dignity in Brazil is a living example of the democratic principles which I find most inspiring. Immediately after reading of him I was reminded of a statement made by President Woodrow Wilson,

Liberty does not consist of mere declarations of the rights of men. It consists in the translation of those declarations into definite actions.

With this in mind I commend to the Members the following article by John Kuenster which appeared in the July issue of the U.S. Catholic:

**BISHOP PEDRO CASALDALIGA: PROTECTING
PEOPLE FROM THE POWERS**

(By John Kuenster)

If a man's physical appearance reflected his qualities of courage, integrity, or leadership, it would be extremely difficult to gain an accurate reading of Bishop Pedro Casaldaliga, C.M.F. of Sao Felix, Brazil.

He is a thin, unpretentious-looking man whose personal and spiritual discipline add an unseen dimension of strength to his frail physique. There is a sense of warmth, compassion, and self-effacement about him that stamps him as a particularly magnetic human being.

Casaldaliga has attracted international attention for his defense of the human rights of impoverished Indians and migrants living in Mato Grosso and Goias. As well, his firm stand has attracted considerable hostility among powerful Brazilians.

His diocese covers 57,900 square miles of largely underdeveloped land. When Casaldaliga first arrived there in 1968, there were no modern conveniences such as electricity, telephones, postal services, medical care, and hard-surfaced roads.

At that time, multinational corporations were seizing huge tracts of land. They had only callous disregard for the poor, neglected posseiros (squatters) who had been eking out a living in the sparsely populated Amazon bush country.

Approximately 100,000 people live in Casaldaliga's diocese, an area comparable in size to the state of Michigan. Theoretically, there should be enough land for everyone, and that is one reason why the area has attracted landless people from all parts of Brazil.

In the mid-1960s, national and foreign corporations, with the encouragement of the Brazilian military regime, began grabbing large parcels of land in Mato Grosso and Goias and forced out the squatters. In one case, a worker accepted a small price for his land. When he went back to harvest a few remaining crops, he was shot. The money he had received for his land was used to save his life and nurse him back to health.

When Casaldaliga went to Brazil as a Claretian missionary priest, he often worked side by side with his parishioners, planting and harvesting. He knew his people, understood

their problems, and resolved to stand with them. He once wrote on a banana leaf:

We are the people of the nation.
We are a people of God.
We want a place on earth.
In heaven, we already have one.

In 1970, a year before he was consecrated a bishop, Casaldaliga prepared a report denouncing the conditions of life in his parish and sent it to civilian and church authorities. Almost immediately he was warned that his report was subversive. The state police began to keep him under surveillance. The landowners began systematic harassment of his parishioners.

As he continued his resistance to the injustices in Mato Grosso and Goias, Casaldaliga knew he was inviting his expulsion from Brazil. He had sided with the poor against the rich, a move destined to make him a marked man.

There have been several attempts to kill Casaldaliga. The threats have spurred him to even greater efforts to bring some semblance of human dignity to his people. With the help of his pastoral team of Claretians, diocesan priests, and laity, he has appealed to the government and large corporations to protect the rights of the small landowners in Mato Grosso and Goias. The odds are stacked against him since the state police are at the service of influential power brokers and corporations.

Casaldaliga's appeals have gone unheeded, and there have been incidents of harassment by the police, evictions, imprisonment of parishioners, closing of parochial schools, and the expulsion of priests.

Powerful Brazilians do not look kindly upon Casaldaliga's efforts in social reform based on the gospel message of love. They bristle at his open defiance.

In 1973, his residence in Sao Felix was surrounded and searched. He and his staff—20 or so priests, nuns, and lay people—were questioned, and some were beaten. The nuns' infirmary was declared illegal and replaced by a medical station. Teachers at the diocesan school were threatened.

"How wonderful to be persecuted for the sake of the Gospel!" exclaimed Casaldaliga.

Once, the bishop was arrested in connection with his defense of a French priest of his diocese, Francois Jentel, who earlier had been sentenced to a ten-year term in prison on charges of sedition. Casaldaliga denounced the priest's trial as a "farce," and his cry of protest stirred public opinion in Brazil. The bishop's outcry and pressure from other church leaders brought about a commutation of the priest's sentence, although the clergyman was expelled from the country a year later.

As a bishop, Casaldaliga is completely devoid of ostentation. He is highly visible, traveling constantly within his parish and to other cities. During these visits, he frequently wears a sport shirt, slacks, and sandals. It is hard to distinguish him from the many workers and townspeople he mingles with.

At the time of his consecration, as a bishop, Casaldaliga said he would "use the straw hat of the laborer instead of a miter, the truth of the Gospel for a crozier, the faith of the people as a shield, and the strength of hope and freedom as gloves."

Without the civilized comforts of life and without the accoutrements of title, Casaldaliga has become a symbol of hope for the poor in Mato Grosso and Goias.

The bishop has no intentions of changing the course he has taken. "Our church," he said, "is once again the church of the catacombs."

In 1974 when military personnel again invaded and ransacked Casaldaliga's residence in Sao Felix, they arrested, beat, and

tortured four priests and temporarily held the bishop prisoner.

But the bishop continued his campaign to document and protest injustices in the states of Mato Grosso and Goias.

Large landowners and civil authorities plotted to have him ousted from Brazil. They leveled accusations against the Spanish-born bishop, saying he was subversive, that he was linked to the Communist movement, and that he tried to provoke the rebellion of settlers against the big landowners.

The slanderous attack on Casaldaliga brought a wave of protest from United States and Brazilian bishops. Bishop Ivo Lorscheiter, secretary general of the Brazilian National Bishops Conference, announced there was nothing in the work of Casaldaliga to justify his expulsion. A group of Brazilian bishops, led by Cardinal Paulo Evaristo Arns of Sao Paulo, successfully appealed to Pope Paul to prevent Casaldaliga from being deported on the trumped-up charges.

Threat of death, destruction of homes, and the burning of fields have accompanied eviction of the Indians from their land. In fighting these injustices, Casaldaliga has come close to death himself.

One night in October, 1976, a Jesuit priest, John Bosco Penido Burnier, who worked among the Indians in Mato Grosso, overheard a discussion Casaldaliga was having with a Brazilian youth.

The boy informed the bishop that two local women were being held prisoners at a nearby police station. He said the women were screaming, "Please don't beat us!"

"I felt an obligation to go to the police station to plead in favor of these poor women," Casaldaliga said. "The boy wanted to come with me, but I wouldn't let him. He was very young, and he would be marked for the police. Father John Bosco heard our talk and joined right in to go with me."

Two ranch foremen and two soldiers met Casaldaliga and Bosco. They insulted and threatened the bishop and priest.

Casaldaliga told the men the women's imprisonment was illegal. "You have no reason to torture them," he said.

The police defended their actions, insisting that what they were doing was legal. Bosco calmly challenged them, saying he would report the incident to their superiors when he passed through the town of Cuiaba.

One of the soldiers crossed over to the priest and struck him in the face. Casaldaliga suggested they leave, but the soldier continued to hit the priest below the right eye with his revolver. The gun went off, and the bullet entered the skull of Bosco above the right eye, lodging in the brain.

With the help of friends, Casaldaliga rushed Bosco to a small, local clinic and later accompanied him on a flight to a neurological center in Goiania.

"But it was all futile," the bishop said. "Father died the following day in Goiania. We buried him in Diamantino, beneath the sun of the Mato Grosso, amid songs of the Resurrection of the whole pueblo. The news reporters who were there were impressed. Some of them cried."

Later, Casaldaliga presented a declaration of protest to the federal police in the archbishop's house at Cuiaba.

"Pray that we will be faithful," he wrote to friends outside of Brazil, "that the church remains as witness to the very end. Don't worry about us, but pray that we are not overly preoccupied about ourselves. The Lord is the Resurrection and the life. It is not a sad hour. It is a beautiful hour of the Gospel."

Casaldaliga believes the policeman who attacked Bosco did so thinking the Jesuit priest was the bishop.

"Why was it Father John Bosco and not me?" he has often asked.

Casaldaliga makes a point of being accessible to his flock. He had been in Ribeirao Bonita at the time of Bosco's slaying to be present during the last days of a novena to Our Lady of Apparitions, patroness of the local townspeople.

The members of the mission team in the Sao Felix diocese "give very positive witness to Christian living," says Father Richard Todd, a Chicago Claretian who visited the area recently. "Their poorness, their intimate contact with the people, and their dedication exemplify gospel values."

Under Casaldaliga's direction, the missionaries have not only resisted oppression of the poor people, but also have made efforts to provide medical services and promote hygiene and nutrition in local communities. At the Catholic mission house in each of the towns, a well has been dug for the use of the entire community. Latrine programs have also been encouraged to improve sanitary conditions in the towns.

A few years ago, Casaldaliga established several schools in the area, but they were closed by the government. The government has also tried to curtail the missionaries' medical services by offering a service of its own, but, according to Todd, the government program has been ineffective. "The medical personnel sent into the area by the government do not have a genuine interest in serving the poor people."

"That is one thing that cannot be said of Bishop Casaldaliga. His concern for people is rooted in a deep and abiding faith."

Casaldaliga's spirituality shines through his life, but it does not obscure his humanness. There have been times in the past when he has longed to return to his homeland, times when sporadic desires have arisen in him to flee the misery, poverty, and suffering around him. But Casaldaliga will never voluntarily return to Spain because he knows that if he leaves he may be barred from re-entering Brazil.

The heroic stance of Casaldaliga has put the church in a new perspective in the eyes of the people he serves and has been an example and inspiration to all priests, religious, and laity working in Latin America.

Casaldaliga has clearly defined his position to his parishioners, to fellow church leaders, and to the world at large.

"The church and the prelacy of Sao Felix," he wrote in a pastoral letter, "in communion with the church of the Third World, for reasons of the Gospel and summoned by local reality, chooses the oppressed."

That statement, among others, inspired charges that the Claretian bishop was a Communist.

When a local *campesino* (farmer) was asked what he thought about having his bishop called a Communist, he said, "If being a Communist means being common, there is no doubt about it. Our bishop is a common, unpretentious man. But in another sense, he is a very uncommon man—and for that we are grateful." ●

SENIOR CITIZEN INTERNS IN PRESSLER OFFICE

HON. LARRY PRESSLER

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

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

SENIOR CITIZEN INTERNS

Many thanks to Ruth and Carl Hansen, ages 65 and 70, of Parker, South Dakota who participated in the Congressional Senior In-

ment Program this year. They contributed much to my office during their two-week stay in Washington.

The Hansens spent their time working in my office, and attending special meetings with agencies and private organizations on senior citizen matters.

Many of the interns spent their time in discussions with various Congressional experts, in working sessions with administration officials, in White House briefings, in Congressional committee hearings, or in other functions.

Topics of discussion at the meetings included elderly consumer and transportation problems, Social Security, and Medicare.

South Dakotans who would like to participate in the program next year should write to "Senior Intern Program," 1132 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Any senior citizen group wishing to hear about the Hansens' Washington internship should contact them in Parker, S.D. No. 605-297-3385. The Hansens are available to speak to groups. ●

SPIRIT OF COMPROMISE NEEDED FOR BWCA

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in this House know the extent to which the Boundary Waters Canoe Area has become a highly charged issue in my district and throughout my home State of Minnesota.

The long conflict has exacted a considerable emotional toll from those who care deeply about the BWCA.

The people living in the area, people I represent in this House, have a tremendous stake in the future of an area upon which their way of life and, in many cases their livelihoods, depend so heavily.

While I cannot support a narrow single use concept for the area, I also recognize the tremendous emotional commitment to this issue among many who favor total wilderness.

Throughout the long debate I have hoped the willingness to compromise and the recognition of the variety of conflicting, but nevertheless valid, rights would resolve the controversy.

At this point, we have achieved consensus on the major issues of timber harvesting, mining, and wilderness status. My BWCA proposal, the bill passed by this House last month, and the Anderson-Humphrey bill now being considered in the Senate all would prohibit timber harvesting and mining in the BWCA. These three proposals would reaffirm wilderness designation for the entire 1,030,000 acres now in the Boundary Waters.

Differences now center on the extent to which motorized recreational use of the area will be permitted to continue. This is a people question—the question of who will use the area, and in what manner.

John McMillion, publisher of the Duluth News-Tribune—the largest daily

newspaper in my district—devoted his weekly column, Publisher's Corner, last Sunday to a discussion of the need for compromise in the resolution of the issue.

Mr. McMillion focuses on the essential elements in ending the long controversy—the spirit of compromise and the recognition of the many interests at stake. They include the protection of the environment, the rights of the local people and the rights of all Americans to enjoy the BWCA, either as a canoeist or as a fisherman.

I urge my colleagues to read Mr. McMillion's excellent column.

[From the Duluth News-Tribune, July 23, 1978]

ANIMOSITY NO ANSWER FOR BWCA

(By John McMillion)

There is a message all concerned should listen to in the advice given in the BWCA conflict last week.

U.S. Sen. James Abourezk, D-S.D., head of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, advised those involved to settle the issue among themselves rather than dump it into the lap of Congress. Abourezk points out whatever Congress might come up with could prove unpalatable to both parties.

Nothing could be more dangerous in an issue as emotional and localized as this than litigation conceived in an election year.

Take note of the number of federal, state, and now county candidates who suddenly have become BWCA experts, whereas before they generally ignored the issue.

Beware of politicians bearing gifts in an election year.

Take heed of Abourezk's warning and resolve the thing among yourselves. No doubt Congress will accept anything all parties recommend.

The tricky part, of course, is to get all the parties to agree on something.

It is going to take some understanding and willingness to give, not only from those who favor a general multiple use of the BWCA but also from the environmentalists.

Some will say compromise between these two factions is impossible, but nothing is impossible and I've seen some labor agreements hammered out through the collective bargaining process when at the onset both sides were pretty far apart.

The Boundary Water Conservation Alliance has indicated, through its official, Ed Zabinski, it may be willing to try this approach. Zabinski said the alliance's board of directors will meet Monday to consider appointing a representative to mediate the dispute with the other side, the Friends of the Boundary Waters Wilderness, a group favoring total wilderness.

We hope Zabinski's group does agree to try and mediate. The environmentalist faction has agreed to do so. Neither side has a thing to lose and Abourezk has set it up for a staff member of the Senate subcommittee on parks and recreation. Tom Williams, to act as the mediator.

It won't be easy because the animosity between the two sides is deep.

The key to whether something is resolved is whether the environmentalists are willing to give. The folks who reside in the BWCA have moved quite a ways, not necessarily willingly, if you consider where the bill regulating the BWCA stands as passed by the House of Representatives as compared with the one presented by Rep. James Oberstar, D-Minn., the Congress member representing the district in which the BWCA lies.

The gut issue now is the matter of motorized boating in portions of the BWCA. The lakes and routes approved by the House for such use are too meager in the eyes of those

aligned with the Alliance and if there is room for some give by the environmentalists this is where it is, in my mind.

I certainly cannot pretend to be an expert on the BWCA as my knowledge is pretty well limited to what I have gleaned following the controversy and from a couple of visits to the area, the most recent this past week.

In my opinion, and it is no more than that, there are three considerations.

First the consideration of protecting the environment must be given heavy weight.

Then the rights of the people who live in that area must be a factor, and coupled with this are some of the economic realities involved.

Thirdly the rights of the average resident of this nation, the person who wants some use of the area, who by virtue of being a taxpayer has some rights, cannot be ignored.

I also feel on the basis of my limited exposure that because someone is a canoeist does not guarantee he or she is a purist nor by the same token because someone is a fisherman, or fisherwoman, or fisherperson, does not guarantee he or she is a pig.

In fact the area I fished in this past week was more overrun by canoeists than by those fishing in boats propelled by small motors.

And the lack of expertise or common judgment exercised by some of those canoeing made me wonder if the safety factor cited by the pro-boat advocates might not bear more weight than is being given.

So I think the puzzle has to be put together in a manner where reasonable, and the word reasonable is the key, consideration is given to environmental concerns, the economy of the area and to the average citizen who wants to go fishing or just eye the scenery but with the aid of some motorized propulsion.

The proper mix may be nearer than all concerned feel.

Right now the environmentalists are riding pretty high and don't see the need to do much compromising.

These people must be given credit for awakening the average American to the abuses of the environment prevalent for years from all corners, industry included but perhaps more important from all of us as individuals.

And anyone with a grain of sense does not want the lakes of the BWCA to become the junked-up puddles lined with wall-to-wall cabins as is the case in much of the rest of Minnesota.

And I think the majority of the people of this state would accept extreme limitations on use of the BWCA. For the water skier, the big motor boater and others of this ilk there is plenty of water elsewhere in the state.

But if the environmentalist gets too dogmatic, unyielding, too arrogant from the flush of recent victories, he or she could create a reverse reaction eventually.

THE PUBLIC REJECTS ALL TAX CREDITS AND SUPPORTS STUDENT AID

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Roper Organization, a nationally respected polling company, recently published its second annual study of public attitudes toward the Federal income tax system. Included in their survey were questions relating to tuition tax credits.

When presented with the alternatives

of expanding existing student aid programs or adopting a tuition tax credit as a means to aid families in meeting college costs, the public clearly prefers the student aid option. Only 9 percent of the public supports a tuition tax credit for postsecondary education like the one adopted by the House in H.R. 12050 on June 1. In addition, 64 percent of the respondents opposed a tuition tax credit for elementary and secondary education, and only 28 percent were in favor.

This survey clearly demonstrates that tuition tax credits enjoy the support of only a small minority of Americans.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert the relevant chapter from the Roper study:

CHAPTER V—TAX AID FOR EDUCATION
CHAPTER SUMMARY

A major issue with regard to tax reform during the past year has been that of providing tax aid for education. This study explored public opinion on tax aid for college tuition and for private elementary and secondary school tuition.

Of four plans to provide tax aid for college tuition, the Carter proposal to make more middle income people eligible for government grants or loans by raising income eligibility was the most popular. A relatively small minority approved direct government aid to colleges and universities. But the public turns thumbs down on a flat \$250 personal tax deduction annually when a child is in college—either for everyone regardless of income or for those with less than \$25,000 income.

Furthermore, the public gives a resounding "No" to extending tax aid to private elementary and secondary schools. The idea is equally disapproved when parochial schools are mentioned and when they are not mentioned.

TAX AID FOR COLLEGE TUITION

With college tuition costs rising at a rapid rate, a number of proposals have been made for providing tax aid for college tuition. In this study four plans were put before the public as means of helping people cope with the cost of college. The question explained that all four would mean higher tax rates to bring in the extra billion and a half dollars each plan would cost.

The public turns thumbs down on a flat \$250 annual tax reduction for each year a child is in college—either for everyone regardless of income or for those with less than \$25,000 income. The Carter proposal to make more middle income people eligible for government grants or loans by raising the income eligibility for them was the most popular of the four plans, approved by one-third of the public. Only 1 in 5 approved direct government aid to colleges and universities so they can hold down tuition fees. Only 16 percent favored none of the plans.

All subgroups of the population agreed pretty much along the same lines on the four plans, including those who have children of college age.

Q. 23. There's a good deal of concern about the high cost of college. Here are four approaches that have been suggested for helping people cope with the cost of a college education—all of which would mean higher tax rates to bring in the extra billion and a half dollars that each of these four plans would cost. (Card shown respondent) Which of these plans would you favor, or wouldn't you favor any of them if it meant raising the tax rate?

	Total public	Total tax-payers	Have children 13 to 62
Number of respondents.....	2,007	1,684	189
	Percent		
Plan C: Make more middle income eligible to get Government grants or low cost college loans by raising the income ceiling under which these grants and loans are available.....	34	36	35
Plan D: Provide direct Government aid to colleges and universities so they can hold down tuition fees....	20	20	16
Plan B: A \$250 reduction in taxes for those with less than \$25,000 of income for each year a child is in college.....	14	14	19
Plan A: A \$250 reduction in taxes for everyone regardless of income for each year a child is in college....	9	10	11
None.....	15	16	15
Do not know.....	7	5	4

TAX AID FOR PRIVATE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The public gives a resounding "No" to extending tax aid to private elementary and secondary schools. It was explained that the same four plans for college aid could be used for lower private schools, but that doing so would mean tax rates high enough to bring in four and a half billion dollars rather than one and a half billion dollars. On this basis, the public said it was opposed to extending aid to lower schools by 64 percent to 28 percent. For half the sample, the question asked about private and parochial schools, for the other half the question asked only about private schools, with no mention of parochial. Answers were virtually identical regardless of mention of parochial schools.

A majority of all subgroups are opposed to tax aid for private elementary and secondary schools with the exception of Catholics and even Catholics are more opposed (48 percent) than in favor of it (43 percent).

Q. 24X. These same four plans could be used for children in private elementary and secondary schools as well as for children in colleges. But if they were extended to private schools it would mean tax rates high enough to bring in four and a half billion dollars rather than one and a half billion dollars. Would you be in favor of or opposed to extending tuition aid to private schools?

Q. 24Y. These same four plans could be used for children in private and parochial elementary and secondary schools as well as for children in colleges. But if they were extended to private and parochial schools it would mean tax rates high enough to bring in four and a half billion dollars rather than one and a half billion dollars. Would you be in favor of or opposed to extending tuition aid to private and parochial schools?

	Total public	Parochial schools not mentioned	Parochial schools mentioned	Total tax-payers
Number of respondents.....	2,007	1,004	1,003	1,684
Favor extending tuition aid to private schools (percent).....	28	28	28	28
Opposed to it (percent).....	64	65	63	66
Do not know (percent).....	8	7	9	6

KEY CONGRESSIONAL AID AND THE SUGAR INDUSTRY

HON. RAYMOND F. LEDERER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

Mr. LEDERER. Mr. Speaker, as far back as May 22, 1978, and as late as July 21, 1978, I have conveyed my uneasiness to my colleagues in the House about reports raising serious conflict of

interest charges by former key congressional aides in both the drafting and lobbying efforts behind S. 2990 and its companion bill, H.R. 12486, the Sugar Stabilization Acts of 1978, currently under consideration by both Houses of Congress.

Ethical questions raised by such diverse sources as the Washington Post, the U.S. News & World Report, the New York Times, the Washington Star, and Knight Ritter Newspapers indicate a situation which goes beyond what amounts to a revolving door behind the sugar producing industry and key congressional aides.

Unfortunately, my worst suspicions have been confirmed by a recent Consumer Federation of America investigation, the summary of which I wish to share with my colleagues in the House. Official and quasi-official acts have been attributed to these aides in the drafting and promoting of sugar producing industry legislation while these aides were still in the employ of Congress and yet shortly before they began working for the sugar growers lobby. At the very least, there seems to be a violation of the postemployment lobbying section of the Senate Code of Official Conduct which states "For a 1-year period after leaving, an employee on a Member's personal staff cannot lobby the Member or his other staff members, a committee staff member cannot lobby committee staff or Members, and an S. Res. 60 employee cannot lobby any of the above."

My fears continue that these occurrences may only be one narrow aspect of an entire industrywide lobbying effort by the sugar producers, which is subverting the integrity of the legislative process. It is my belief that these massive efforts by the sugar producers' lobby are attempts to compensate for the fact that H.R. 12486 and S. 2990 sacrifices the interests of the American consumer and this Nation's battle against inflation, for the narrow few who would benefit from such legislation. I sincerely believe that my colleagues in the House will recognize the fact that poor legislation is poor legislation, no matter what efforts are attempted to secure its passage.

The Consumer Federation of America press release follows:

CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA

At a time when consumers can least afford a big boost in sugar prices, why is Congress pushing that hike on behalf of fewer than 1 percent of our nation's farmers?

Consumer Federation of America, the nation's largest consumer organization, today disclosed information which goes far towards explaining the success of one of the most powerful and effective lobbying efforts now on Capitol Hill.

In announcing its findings which developed in light of CFA's own intensive lobbying in opposition to pending sugar legislation, Executive Director Kathleen F. O'Reilly stated, "We are convinced that the door between the halls of Congress and the sugar lobby revolves at a disturbingly fast pace."

According to CFA, the ranks of that lobby are filled with former Congressional aides who worked on sugar legislation. Furthermore, it is immeasurably aided by Senators and Representatives from the sugar-producing states of Louisiana, Texas, Idaho, Hawaii, Utah and Minnesota. Since every legis-

lated price hike for sugar is followed by increased markets for corn sweeteners, additional support comes from Congressional representatives of Western and Midwestern corn-producing states. Many of these members hold key positions on Congressional committees with jurisdiction over sugar legislation.

"This powerful combination of forces is totally ignoring the overwhelming inflationary impact on consumers which passage of the Church/de la Garza bills would produce," commented O'Reilly.

"It is clear that the involvement of former Congressional aides goes well beyond the much publicized gifts of Dwayne Andreas, head of the Archer-Daniels Midland Company, a large corn sweetener manufacturer." O'Reilly was referring to the appointment of David Gartner, former administrative assistant to the late Senator Hubert Humphrey (D-MN), to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, despite Gartner's acceptance of \$72,000 in trust funds from Andreas while working for Humphrey.

CFA found that another former key Humphrey aide, Herbert Waters, has followed the revolving door into the sugar industry. Waters is currently president of Tadco Enterprises, a private lobbying firm hired by Archer Daniels to help ensure passage of the Church/de la Garza bills.

The interplay between the industry and Congressional staff members goes even further, CFA disclosed. Tadco has hired Karth-Best Associates, another lobbying firm, to aid in the sugar legislation campaign. Robert Best, partner of former Representative Joe Karth, was a legislative assistant to Senator Russell Long (D-La.) until 1977. (Long, whose Louisiana constituents include a substantial number of cane sugar growers, is chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. His Subcommittee on Tourism and Sugar, chaired by Senator Spark Matsunaga (D-HI), initiated hearings on the Church bill.)

Best has been implicated, along with Karth and Waters, in writing a letter, dated August 16, 1977, which Gartner sent to the Senate Agriculture Committee under Humphrey's signature making recommendations that could bring a multimillion-dollar bonanza to the corn sweetener industry. According to Knight-Ridder Newspapers, the letter was signed by an office signature machine in Humphrey's absence.

Among the employees at Karth-Best is Will Leonard, another former Long legislative assistant. Leonard was appointed to the International Trade Commission (ITC) in 1968, where he led fights for sugar producers. He resigned from the ITC on June 10, 1977, and immediately became involved with Karth-Best in its sugar lobbying efforts.

A close associate of Senate Agriculture Committee Chairman Herman Talmadge (D-Ga.) is also involved in the pattern. Until March 1978, Michael McLeod was general counsel and staff director of the Senate Agriculture Committee and right-hand assistant to Talmadge. He played a key role in drafting the Church bill. He now lobbies for the Florida Sugar Cane League, despite promises upon leaving the committee that he would not become a lobbyist (Washington Post, March 21, 1978). Coincidentally, McLeod was retained by the League's Horace Godfrey, a USDA official until 1969. Godfrey also represents Texas sugar growers.

Still another player is Dale Sherwin, former minority staff counsel to the Senate Agriculture Committee and assistant to Senator Robert Dole (R-Ka.) until his resignation in March of this year. He is now lobbying for the Church bill on behalf of A. E. Staley, one of the country's leading corn sweetener manufacturers. Sherwin helped draft and develop the bill while on the Committee staff.

Among other corporate food giants the financial success of which is tied to sugar legislation is the Heinz Corporation. Its corn

sweetener interests are represented by the consulting firm of former Nixon White House aide, William Timmons.

"In spite of these overwhelming odds," concluded O'Reilly, "CFA will continue to vigorously voice its opposition on behalf of American consumers and urge the Administration to stand firm in opposing any measure which would raise the price of sugar." ●

THE ROAD TO PROSPERITY— PART XIV—HOW DO PEOPLE AVOID PAYING TAXES?

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Speaker, in the barrage of rhetoric from the administration, the Washington Post and the New York Times against the Investment Incentive Act, there has been one common theme. It is that my proposal is unfair; that it will enable some people to avoid paying taxes. This is the backbone of the arguments against the Steiger amendment. It is time to look at the problem in greater detail.

There are two aspects of the problem. The first is determine what comprises income. Income is the return or reward someone receives in exchange for their labor. Capital is the source of the tools which enables a worker to employ his or her labor. Some economists and some Presidents would tax capital, in the form of capital gains, as ordinary income. This, in effect, turns the income tax into a wealth tax. Not only is it a confusion of objectives, but it taxes away our capital stock which is necessary to expand plant and equipment, produce jobs, and increase economic growth.

Back in 1937, Irving Fisher, hardly a proponent of business or wealthy taxpayers, wrote that any gains in capital value are not properly income. He added,

They (capital gains) are capital; and to tax them as income and later to tax the income flowing from this is a form of double taxation.

Income earned by money—that is, investment—should be taxed in the same manner as income earned by labor. However, we do not tax a laborer who has engaged in work. We tax the results of his labor. In the same light, we should not tax the capital which produces income. I should remind the readers that capital is produced by savings. That savings is acquired from income which is taxed. This is appropriate. But it is not appropriate to tax the capital base itself.

The second problem is how do people avoid paying taxes. Critics contend that the reduction of the capital gains tax only benefits the wealthy thereby creating an inequity in the tax code. This argument conveniently ignores several facts.

First, since 1969, the only individual income tax increase has been on capital gains, but only on gains realized above a certain income tax bracket. It stands to reason that a reduction in the tax will benefit only those who had their taxes

increased. The critics' argument is based on circular, meaningless logic.

All other income taxes since 1969 have decreased. In effect, taxes have been indexed to inflation. The same can be said for salaries and wages—practically everyone now receives cost of living adjustments. The one exception is capital gains. The tax has increased, while inflation has eroded any real gain. It is no wonder that individual investors are dropping out of the stock market, and that those with high incomes are switching to tax-free municipal bonds.

Besides an increase in the tax rate on capital gains, another tax was imposed in the form of the minimum tax. The minimum tax was aimed at those who had high incomes, but were paying little or no income tax. While the number of people in this category declined for several years after the 1969 tax reforms, the number has climbed back up. The minimum tax has not solved this problem. Unfortunately, for many other people, it has become an additional tax. This was not the intended purpose of this tax provision.

The capital gains tax structure is used by many middle and upper income taxpayers to legitimately reduce their tax burden. There is nothing pernicious, immoral, or offensive about their action. But, is the capital gains tax the culprit as far as millionaires who pay no tax is concerned? A recent study by the liberal Brookings Institution analyzed this problem. The higher income taxpayers with the least tax obligations do not rely on capital gains to reduce their taxes. Over half of their tax burden is eliminated by the use of personal deductions, such as contributions to charity. Capital gains account for less than 10 percent of the tax reductions. Yet, capital gains is the major portion of the minimum tax, accounting for 80 percent of the revenue. The personal deductions, the actual culprit, account for less than 10 percent of the minimum tax. Something is obviously wrong. If people are really concerned about tax avoidance, then let's go to the heart of the problem and levy tax on those items responsible for tax avoidance.

I should also remind the readers that unlike other income taxes, the tax on capital gains is completely controlled by the taxpayer. They decide when to realize the gain. Many people remain locked into existing investments because of high taxes. This deprives our economy of recycled investment funds. Others invest in nonproductive, but tax-free, items such as municipal bonds. And, a smart lawyer can always find ways to avoid taxes. The recent Washington Post article on the sale of the Hill 'n Dale estate reveals one device—leasing, rather than selling—to avoid capital gains taxes.

The Post article follows:

WHO DOESN'T BEAR THE TAX BURDEN

The concept of equitable treatment under the tax system has been of considerable public concern in recent years. Tax preferences were an important issue in the 1976 Presidential election, and the winner promised fundamental reform of the income tax.

Many of the most significant contributions to the study of the erosion of the tax base and the popular interest in tax reform have

been made by Joseph A. Pechman.¹ Several of these showed, through a graphical technique, how much the various tax preferences reduced liability in different income classes. This paper will expand upon that analysis by (1) quantifying the average effective tax rates paid at all income levels, according to the tax schedule used and the number of exemptions claimed; (2) searching the population at all incomes for taxpayers with liabilities in different proportions of the average for their income class and household status; and (3) analyzing the effects of tax preferences used by groups of households according to the degree of difference between their taxes and the average. Comparisons can thus be made between groups of tax returns with similar degrees of tax avoidance at different income levels, and between others with different degrees of tax avoidance at the same income levels. This analysis will be based upon the Brookings 1970 MERGE file.²

The first part of this paper will describe the procedures used to group tax returns according to the relationship of their tax liabilities to the average for their type of return and income class. The second part will show the relative importance of tax preference items in reducing tax liabilities, with comparisons among taxpayers grouped by the relationship of their liabilities to the average. A brief conclusion will follow.

DETERMINATION OF AVERAGE EFFECTIVE TAX RATES

Popular interest in tax equity issues typically focuses on tax paid over various levels of income, judged by some subjective standard of vertical equity. For present purposes, however, the major emphasis will be upon tax paid relative to the average effective rate at a given level of income. This standard is chosen because the equal taxation of equals is a more widely endorsed principle than any possible standards for the appropriate treatment of unequals. From a more pragmatic viewpoint, any broadening or narrowing of tax preferences that did not change the distribution of average effective rates would not change total revenue, which is presumably set according to public sector needs rather than distributional preferences; thus this horizontal equity approach can provide insights to the need for and effects of tax reform independent of redistributional questions.

Any measurement of the average effective tax rate must take account of a number of provisions of the tax law that introduce dispersion into tax liabilities at any given income level with no intervention by the taxpayer. Two taxpayers with the same incomes might pay taxes according to different tax rate schedules and claim different standard deductions and personal exemptions; it would be misleading to compare their taxes as though they were identically situated. Therefore several adjustments are made in the analysis described here. First, taxpayers filing each of the four different types of returns (married filing jointly, married filing separately, single, head of household) are analyzed separately. Second, a new income measure called "standard taxable income" (STI) is used to compute average effective tax rates. STI is defined as total income³ less the appropriate standard deduction under the tax law in question, less the total amount of personal exemptions for the taxpayer(s) and dependents. These two adjustments control for the varying sizes and filing statuses of different taxpayers.

One further difficulty, this one computational, is how to categorize each individual return with respect to the average effective tax rate for its income level. The average rate could be computed for a large number of income intervals, and each individual return's effective rate compared with the average for

its class. Such results would be inaccurate, however, because with a progressive tax the average effective rate would be expected to increase from the bottom of each interval to the top. Thus, the average for the entire interval would not be an appropriate standard for the extremes unless the interval were very small. The smaller the income interval, of course, the smaller the sample of tax returns within that interval, and therefore the greater the sampling variation of the mean within each interval.

The alternative chosen here was to estimate the average effective tax rate through a set of four regression equations—one for each type of tax return—relating the effective tax rates to incomes. To determine an individual return's relationship to the average rate, then, the appropriate equation was solved using the precise income level of the return, and the solution value was taken to be the average rate. This technique circumvented the problems of progressivity within income intervals and sampling variation described above.

Of several alternative specifications tried, the best fit of effective tax rates (that is, liabilities as a percentage of STI) to STI was obtained through a simple single logarithmic transformation

$$T/STI = a + b \ln(STI)$$

where T is tax liability and STI is standard taxable income. In order to obtain a satisfactory fit, it was necessary to impose some restrictions on the sample. First, returns with negative standard taxable incomes were omitted from the analysis. Some low income tax returns were eligible for negative taxes under the refundable earned income credit; negative taxes were truncated to zero for the analysis. The regression results are shown in table 1,⁴ and the distribution of tax returns by the relationship of tax liability to the average in each income class is shown in table 2.

TABLE 1.—RESULTS OF REGRESSION ON EFFECTIVE TAX RATES

Type of return	a (stand- error)	b (stand- error)	R ²	F	S.E.E.
Single.....	0.3614 (.0014)	0.0397 (.0002)	0.6546	25,785.60 (1, 13,604)	0.036
Joint.....	.3972 (.0024)	.0543 (.0005)	.2010	11,945.62 (1, 47,491)	.105
Separate.....	.5467 (.0158)	.0831 (.0035)	.6377	569.54 (1, 322)	.069
Head of household..	.3632 (.0035)	.0457 (.0006)	.6129	5,304.64 (1, 3,349)	.042

Source: Brookings 1970 MERGE file, projected to 1977.

TABLE 2.—DISTRIBUTION OF TAX RETURNS BY THE RELATIONSHIP OF TAX LIABILITIES TO THE AVERAGE, 1977

Tax liability as a percent of average	Number of returns (millions)	Percent of all returns
Greater than 100.....	56.8	177.5
100 to 75.....	8.8	12.0
75 to 50.....	2.5	3.4
50 to 25.....	1.4	1.9
25 to 0 ¹7	1.0
0.....	3.1	4.2
All.....	73.2	100.0

¹ The percentage of returns with taxes greater than average is greater than 50 because (a) the distribution of taxes as a percentage of the average is skewed toward zero, as explained in footnote in the text, and (b) the regression equation used to estimate the average effective rate at each income level underestimates the actual mean because it is fit on the basis of the square of the deviation of each observation from the mean, rather than the deviation itself.

² Tax is 25 percent or less of the average effective rate for the income level, but greater than zero.

Source: Brookings 1970 MERGE file, projected to 1977. Data are rounded.

TAX REDUCTION DEVICES

The format for presentation of the results is the graphical technique first used by Pechman.³ This graph shows first the distribution of effective tax rates by income class that would prevail if no deductions or exemptions whatever were permitted; then it shows the change due to reinstating each preferential feature one by one until the final result is tax liability under current law.

Figure 1 shows the effects of the individual tax features for the entire population. The shape of the diagram is much like the earlier computations by Pechman. The personal exemptions and personal credits in the law are found to reduce taxes significantly at the lower income levels, but to become progressively less important in a relative sense as income rises. Personal deductions have a large impact at all levels, including lower incomes where the standard deduction is prevalent. Tax preference items⁶ excluded from the ordinary tax but subject to the minimum tax have a perceptible effect only at upper income levels; the maximum tax on earned income has a similar impact. Income splitting reduces taxes by the largest relative amounts at moderately high income levels, and less at the highest and lowest incomes. The refundable earned income credit reduces taxes at low income levels only.

The most striking feature of the chart, however, is probably the effect of the capital gains preference. While it has no perceptible effect on revenues below about \$25,000 of comprehensive income, the exclusion of one-half of realized long term gains (plus the alternative tax) has a rapidly increasing effect until it is the second most important revenue reducing feature for the highest income returns. This significant role of capital gains preference in reducing taxes at the highest income levels has led many observers to conclude that this preference must play a leading role in cases of highly successful minimization of tax liability by upper income taxpayers.

Figure 2, which is drawn only for returns with tax liabilities within 5 percent of the average for each income level, would probably tend to reinforce this conclusion. It shows that for the average upper income taxpayer, the capital gains preference has a more limited impact than for all of those with high incomes. The other obvious shift at the upper income levels is the greater role for the maximum tax on earnings, indicating that the high income taxpayer with average liability receives a relatively large fraction of his income from labor. Below about \$100,000 of income it is clear that the average taxpayer uses virtually no tax reduction devices beyond deductions and exemptions.

Figures 3 and 4 present taxes for two other subgroups of the population: those whose taxes are between 100 and 75 percent, and 75 and 50 percent of the average, respectively. For upper income returns in these groups, it is clear that the capital gains exclusion and alternative tax are of primary importance. These preferences reduce the effective tax rates of the highest income classes by twenty percentage points in the lower-taxed group—more than all itemized deductions. The maximum tax has less effect as effective tax rates fall, indicating that little of the income at these levels is earned from labor. Income splitting also becomes relatively less important for lower tax rate groups, while tax preference items other than capital gains become more important. The tax reduction devices used at income levels below about \$100,000 are again restricted largely to the various itemized deductions.

Figures 5 and 6 show the tax reducing features used on returns with tax liabilities less than 25 percent of the average but still greater than zero, and on nontaxable returns. The results at upper incomes might

Footnotes at end of article.

come as something of a surprise—the important role of the capital gains preferences is drastically reduced. The overwhelming effect is that of personal deductions, which by themselves reduce effective tax rates by fifty percentage points or more at the highest income levels. The only other appreciable effect is that of capital gains, which is less than 10 percentage points for both groups. The dominance of personal deductions below \$100,000 of income is virtually unchanged.

The foregoing results make it clear that different taxpayer groups with varying effective rates of tax make dramatically different use of different tax reduction devices. A remaining question is the composition of the personal deductions taken at different income and effective tax rate levels. Table 2 shows the percentage breakdown of itemized deductions among five classes: medical, charitable, interest, state and local taxes, and all other. The results indicate that the relative use of different itemized deductions also varies significantly by effective tax rate groupings.⁷

Comparisons among the effective tax rate classes can best be made by broad income groupings. Below about \$20,000 of STI, there is no discernible shift among tax rate classes. Between about \$20,000 and \$200,000, the low effective tax rate group shows a greater relative use of medical, charitable and (with less consistency) miscellaneous deductions than tax returns with higher effective rates. The reliance on interest and state and local tax deductions is lower. Above \$200,000, however, the low tax rate returns show distinctly greater relative use of interest and charitable deductions, and less of medical and state and local tax deductions; miscellaneous deductions are largely unchanged. Interest and charitable deductions are, of course, easily manipulable by the taxpayer to minimize tax liability.

CONCLUSIONS

The computations in this paper indicate that some qualification of earlier notions of the role of tax reduction devices may be in order. A view of the entire population indicates that preferences for realized long term capital gains have an impact second only to personal deductions on tax liabilities at the highest income levels. On tax returns with high incomes and very low tax liabilities, however, personal deductions play a far more important role. Capital gains preferences show up more strongly on returns with liabilities between one-half of the average and the average. For returns with taxes around the average, the maximum tax on earned income reduces liabilities most. At lower income levels, personal deductions are the major tax reduction feature.

An examination of the itemized personal deductions used to reduce taxes shows again that, the use of various devices changes with the degree of tax avoidance. Returns with low tax liability between about \$20,000 and \$200,000 of income make heavier relative use of deductions for medical expenses and charitable contributions than returns with the same incomes and higher taxes; at higher incomes, interest expense and charitable contribution deductions are more heavily used by returns with low effective tax rates.

The major implication of these findings is for tax policy with regard to leakages from the income tax base. If a major concern for policy is the total reduction of tax liabilities at upper income levels, then the capital gains preferences are virtually as important as personal deductions. If, on the other hand, the major concern is extreme cases of tax minimization, then most effort should be concentrated on personal deductions.

FOOTNOTES

¹Notably "Individual Income Tax Provisions of the Revenue Act of 1964," *Journal of Finance*, May, 1965, pp. 247-272; "Individual

Income Tax Erosion by Income Classes" (with Benjamin A. Okner), *The Economics of Federal Subsidy Programs*, U.S. Joint Economic Committee, 92 Cong. 2 sess. (1972), pp. 13-40; *Federal Tax Reform: The Impossible Dream?* (with George F. Break), Brookings, 1976; and *Comprehensive Income Taxation* (editor), Brookings, 1977.

²The MERGE file is a combination of responses to the March 1971 Current Population Survey and tax returns for 1970, on computer-readable magnetic tape. Working papers on the construction of the MERGE file are available from the author.

³"Total income" is defined as adjusted gross income plus excluded sick pay and moving expenses and the excluded half of long term capital gains.

⁴The distribution of effective tax rates is such that there is a maximum value (that which results from taking the standard deduction with no exclusions) but no minimum other than zero. Thus the distribution tends to be truncated at the highest possible tax rate, and the regression curve underestimates the average rate somewhat. The result here is that the group selected as paying approximately the average effective rate includes returns paying somewhat less, and the groups selected as paying less than average in fact pay even somewhat less than stated.

⁵See "Individual Income Tax Provisions of the Revenue Act of 1964," op. cit.

⁶Not including excluded long term capital gains.

⁷It is important to remember two factors in considering table 2: (1) The table shows the percentage breakdown of different types of deductions in total deductions; in the lower effective tax rate groups, however, the absolute amount of deductions is higher in any given income class than in the higher tax groups. (2) The table shows the total amount of each deduction claimed in each income class; certain types of deductions might be claimed in very large amounts but on few returns, leading to a small total.

ARCHBOLD TRACT SET FOR LUXURY PROJECT

(By Jerry Knight and Patricia Camp)

The largest piece of private property in the District of Columbia, the 40-acre John Archbold estate on Reservoir Road NW, will be turned into a multimillion-dollar luxury housing development by C. W. Murchison, Jr., the Texan who owns the Dallas Cowboys.

Officials of a company owned by Murchison said yesterday they have leased the estate, known as Hillandale, from Archbold and his family. The lease calls for payments to the Archbold family in "excess of \$1 million a year" and reportedly includes "cost of living escalators" that will double the annual rental over its 99-year term.

A mixture of at least 300 detached and clustered houses, selling for \$300,000 and up, will probably be built on the land, said John Williams of Hillandale Development Corp.

Murchison formed the company last month to develop the estate, a project that real estate industry sources estimate will cost at least \$75 million and take several years to build.

A housing project that big would bring the city about \$10 million a year in additional real estate and income taxes, said J. Kirkwood White, assistant D.C. planning director.

It would also bring additional traffic, people and controversy to a neighborhood where any proposed development usually produces outcries.

The estate, covering almost 16 blocks on the western edge of Georgetown, is already zoned for housing, so the developer will have few administrative hurdles to clear before beginning work.

Hillandale is a few blocks away from the Foxhall Road estate of Nelson Rockefeller,

where another developer plans to build about 125 houses in the \$300,000 to \$400,000 price range.

D.C. City Council member Polly Shackleton (D-Ward 3), who represents the neighborhood, said yesterday she hopes the development of Hillandale will include "the same kind of regulation that the Rockefeller estate came under."

Rozansky and Kay, developers of the Rockefeller property, agreed to let neighbors participate in planning the project. "I would hope that Murchison would do the same thing and work with the community," added Shackleton.

Williams said the developers already plan to "meet with interested parties, public and private, so we have a project that is economically feasible and solves more problems than it creates."

The Archbold and Rockefeller family fortunes flow from the same oil wells. John D. Archbold was the original partner of John D. Rockefeller in the Standard Oil Company.

Archbold's daughter Anne—who resumed the family name after she was divorced—built Hillandale's eight-bedroom mansion, in the style of a 14th century Italian villa, starting in 1921. She gave away part of the property to form Glover-Archbold Park, which now abuts Hillandale on the north and west sides. On the south, the estate fronts on Reservoir Road for about four blocks. And 39th Street, from Reservoir north past S Street NW forms the eastern edge of the property.

The land now is owned by Archbold Investment Co., a family company headed by John Archbold, the son of Anne, who lives in the house when he is not at his country home in Upperville, Va., at his English estate, or traveling.

Williams said the developers have not decided what to do with the sprawling stucco villa. In addition to leasing the land from the Archbolds, the developers paid \$600,000 for the mansion, outbuildings and a gatehouse now occupied by socialite Page Lee Hufty, a member of the Archbold family.

Under the agreement, Archbold can live in the house for two years, while the developers are planning their project. Hufty can stay in her residence for a year.

The others owners of Archbold Investment Co., who will share in the \$1 million-a-year income from the lease, are John Archbold's four daughters, Anne Archbold Collins, Moira Archbold O'Connor, Lucie Schelling Archbold and Jennifer Archbold.

Richard Mullens, the attorney who represented Archbold in the transaction, said, "The principal factor that prompted him to do something about the property at this time was the District of Columbia property tax."

Mullens said the house was "just too costly." With an assessed value of \$5 million, the highest on the city's tax rolls, the taxes on the property last year were \$65,000.

Taxes were also the reason Archbold decided to lease the estate rather than sell it, Mullens said.

If the property were sold, capital gains taxes almost 50 percent of the money. Income from the lease will be taxed as ordinary income, presumably at lower rates. The \$1 million-a-year rental amounts to an 8.5 percent return on a \$12 million investment, the cash price upon which the sale was reportedly based.

The Archbolds also have an unusual two-year option allowing them, in effect, to force Murchison to buy the property, for as much as \$14 million, depending on when the option is exercised.

Leasing the land creates major legal headaches for the developers, said Washington attorney E. David Harrison, who represents the Murchison interests, because land leases

have never been used for residential developments in the District of Columbia.

Building houses on leased land is common practice in some areas, including Baltimore, but D.C. laws might have to be changed to make the Hillandale project feasible, the attorney said.

In another major development in Northwest Washington, California builder Dwight Mize recently signed a contract to purchase McLean Gardens, a 723-unit apartment complex on Wisconsin Avenue, and convert it to condominiums.

In Northeast, two developers have purchased 25 acres on Michigan Avenue from Trinity College and plan to build 534 town houses there. ●

WEALTH OF A NATION: FOCUSING ON THE FUTURE

HON. JAMES G. MARTIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, this year, for the second consecutive year, my office sponsored an essay contest for juniors and seniors in high schools in North Carolina's Ninth Congressional District.

After preselection by officials at public and private high schools, a panel of independent judges selected a winner and two runners-up from the entries.

The judges were extremely complimentary of the quality of the writing, along with the degree of research and thought which went into the essays.

The winner of this year's essay contest is 17-year-old Paul Madsen, son of Mr. and Mrs. Alan Madsen of Charlotte, N.C.

Paul is a junior at Olympic High School in Mecklenburg County.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, I call to your attention the essay of Paul Madsen and know you join with me in extending congratulations to this leader of the future:

WEALTH OF A NATION: FOCUSING ON THE FUTURE

(By Paul Madsen)

America—it might be considered a relatively insignificant appellation until one considers the enormous impact the United States of America has made on modern civilization. Within this nation lie the roots of democratic capitalism which have such a profound effect upon global society. Never before in the history of mankind has there been so much technological progress than during the relatively short two hundred years America has been in existence. The wealth of the United States is synthesized by its capitalistic way of life; and it is this economic entity, directed by the perpetual influence of human nature, that will determine the ultimate course taken by American society.

How does capitalism function in the economy of the United States? Capitalism can be described as synonymous to the wealth of the United States; and America's wealth, in turn, endures a symbiotic relationship to its economy. So, in essence, it can be safely assumed that capitalism directly supports America's economic system. Without capitalistic drives the economy of the United States would slowly deflate, like a leaky bal-

loon. Capitalism encourages competition and innovative technological development simply because it appeals to an enduring, typically human pursuit—greed. Therefore, capitalism is a predominantly functioning factor in U.S. economic developments.

However, unchecked capitalism has a devastating potential for destruction. As is clearly visible during modern times, America's primary economic influence is getting out of hand. Industrial giants, encouraged by America's democratic, free-enterprise system and spurred by capitalist sentiments, are now largely responsible for the exploitation of human and natural resources which the United States presently encounters. Inflation and unemployment thrive, the stock market falls and pollution contaminates the environment as a result of corporate ventures. Theoretically, America's typical middle-class laborer produces more than he is paid for. Consequently, the United States is transforming into a giant junk yard whose goods eventually end up useless or obsolete from lack of quality and efficiency. Ironically, the United States Government supports such exploitations simply to keep the economy from collapsing. The end results of the process are pollution and similar environmental and economic disasters. A solution is desperately needed to thwart "corporate" capitalism.

The ultimate future of American economy lies then in a form of controlled expansion regulated by the government of the United States. President Carter's energy plan is a prime example of such a system and its complete or even partial adoption will surely open doors. At the same time, however, as governmental influence increases, the creative, technical atmosphere fostered by capitalism could suffer. The strengths of capitalism may, ironically, sustain its partial decomposition. Yet, the benefits of modifying capitalism in its present form considerably outweigh the possible detrimental effects imposed by its control. Therefore, because of present economic tendencies promoted by rampant, "corporate" capitalism, an increase in governmental influence upon United States economy is surely imminent.

America's social behavior is largely influenced by its economy. Social patterns in the U.S. are strongly marked by Marx's theory of Economic Determinism. Thus, by the principle of the syllogism, it can be assumed that capitalism also plays a major role in determining the course of social trend in the United States. In fact, democratic capitalism is fast becoming a way of life for most American citizens. James D. Forman describes the evolution of capitalism:

"Capitalism was born not made. Without benefit of disgruntled intellectuals or revolutionaries, it simply grew as a way of doing business, and ultimately as a way of life."¹

So, early capitalism was nourished by the freedom of a democratic society and it still remains largely unchecked.

What does this economically-centered way of life mean for the average American? It simply means that he will have to endure the effects of present economic tendencies or lower his standard of living. Present sociological trends in the United States indicate sentiments linked to the theory of rising expectations. The United States middle class has been exposed to the highest standard of living it has ever experienced. Yet, this class has such a limited scope that it expects living standards to rise consistently. Of course, they will continue to rise only as long as

¹ James D. Forman, *Capitalism: Economic Individualism to Today's Welfare State*, New York: Franklin Watts, 1972, p. 8.

corporations exploit the economy of the United States. These exploitations also bring the subsequent demise of established society. Today's typical teenager is strong evidence of the influence of present capitalistic trends upon society. Society is disorganized and so he seeks an escape through drugs and alcohol. A solution lies in the enlightenment and intellectual development of America's middle class through improvements in the general quality of education. Therefore, U.S. governmental control is necessary to the stabilization of United States economy, but it is also essential to the creation of the rational social behavior patterns that promote beneficial growth.

Most American citizens would tend to think that an increase in government influence upon their lives implies socialist or communist motives—on the contrary. Controlled expansion will provide for a more efficient capitalistic, social-economic state. Capitalism thrives on the constant threat of communism. Americans feel intimidated and consequently divert their energies toward beneficial development. The United States need fear no interruption by either socialism or communism if it exhibits tendencies toward an increasingly structured capitalist nation. Capitalism must not be totally eradicated because it has more growth prospect than any other economic system.

Common problems such as drug abuse, crime, vandalism and poverty are all typical of the destructive nature which the disorganized, economically dependent society of the U.S. has instilled. Governmental organization will invariably enable these problems to correct themselves. The complete process will take time, perhaps as long as it took capitalism in its present form to develop, but the ultimate rewards will be great.

Politics will naturally have a fundamental influence upon the future of American economic and social trends. Liberalism is essential to the structured capitalism the United States must pursue. The trite advice which proceeds from the expression "nothing ventured—nothing gained" is quite pertinent to America's present situation. United States citizens are already witnessing the downfall of conservative sentiments in the corporately-stressed Republican party. Conservative attitudes provide for no organized development of technical processes. So, in the long run, conservative attitudes cannot survive within the political spectrum of the United States.

The development of American society can be critically employed to evaluate the eventual outcome of the supreme political struggle which the United States presently encounters—The Cold War. The Cold War is constantly nourished by fear and instability. These fears are largely created by the prospect of mutually-assured destruction. Most Americans probably realize that the economic stability enjoyed by Soviet communism is fast leaving the United States behind in the arms race. America's unsteady economy prevents the successful deterrence of Soviet aggression. Thus, controlled capitalistic economic expansion, may put a damper on Soviet hostilities by restoring some confidence in the American people.

The cold war is also rapidly transforming into an economic superiority contest. The conflict is currently based upon the question of economic stability, the victor being the one who can manufacture a surplus of arms and still maintain its composure. Situations in the Middle East are typical of current Cold War strategies. The United States sells Phantom jets to Israel so the Israelis can vanquish the Egyptians in their Russian-built tanks. America will eventually lose such a

TESTIMONY OF THE CAMBODIAN
PEOPLE—PART 2

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am placing in the RECORD, for the Members' information, two more interviews with Cambodian refugees:

INTERVIEW WITH CAMBODIAN REFUGEE IN BURIAM, THAILAND, CONDUCTED BY AMERICAN EMBASSY OFFICER IN JUNE, 1978

ACCOUNT OF SOURCE C*

Source C, a former barber, arrived in Thailand March 1, 1978, from Siem Reap Province. After April 1975, he was ordered to become a farmer like everyone else. Source C is about 28. His account follows:

Conditions of Life in Democratic Kampuchea. "I lived in a village of 550 people in Siem Reap Province. About half of the people were 'Old Cambodians' and half were 'New Cambodians' (not under Khmer Rouge before April 1975). During the rainy season, we worked in the fields and in the dry season, we worked digging canals and building dams. In my village, the rice crop decreased year by year since 1975. I think that inadequate fertilizer was responsible for the decreases.

"We ate twice each day. For a few months in 1975, we had rice each day. After that, we received only porridge, but not enough. We received about the same amounts until I escaped."

System of Administration and Discipline. "We had to attend weekly meetings in the village. In the meetings, the village chief only talked about production and the need to work hard to build dams." The 'Old Cambodians' could give suggestions, but the 'New Cambodians' could not.

"If the 'New People' were late for work, sick or did not have permission to do something, the group chief would tell the village chief, who would call you in and give you a reprimand the first and second time. If you stole a little food from someone, the same thing happened. If a 'New Cambodian' raised a potato near his house and ate it without getting the permission of the group chief, you would be reprimanded the first and second time. The third time you would be 'sent to Angka Leu' (executed).

"If you were a 'New Cambodian' and had problems, too much work, or if someone was taking advantage of you, you had no recourse. 'Old Cambodians' could tell the group chief. If you were beaten up by an 'Old Cambodian', it was too bad. The 'New People' were always wrong and the 'Old' always right. If the group chief hit you, you could not complain to the village chief, because the group chief would tell the village chief that you were a 'New Person', did not like to work, and do not like the new regime."

Executions. "I decided to escape because the Khmer Rouge wanted to kill me. I was assigned to work far from my village. One night eight of us who were 'New Cambodians' were invited to 'attend a meeting'. When we arrived, the Khmer Rouge ordered us to be tied up. The seven others were tied, but I escaped and ran away. Of the seven, three were former soldiers and four were simple farmers. I did not understand precisely why we were called. There were many such meet-

* (The name of the individual refugee who provided this account has been excised to protect the identity of family members or friends still in Cambodia.)

ings, but usually when we attended we were not tied up. I had heard of this happening before—people were called in the night and then executed.

"I learned from neighbors that I was to be killed. I asked, 'Why?' because I had done nothing wrong. The neighbors told me only that people were being killed. Earlier, I was walking around and I overheard the Khmer Rouge tell 'Old Cambodians': 'We do not trust the Lon Nol people and do not like to keep them.'

"I had two brothers and a brother-in-law who were killed. My brothers were 26 and 24 in 1975. They had not been conscripted in the Lon Nol Army, but their names had been registered. The Khmer Rouge found their names on GKR lists and killed them just two months after the takeover in 1975. My brother-in-law was also killed, but he was a former soldier.

"At that time, the Khmer Rouge assembled all the soldiers, telling the soldiers that they would 'be retrained.' But in fact they were executed. Many people saw the execution sites. I myself saw an execution site at Kog Dong. There were only bones, perhaps 400 skeletons there. At the time, I was assigned to work there. The soldiers' wives were not harmed."

INTERVIEW WITH CAMBODIAN REFUGEE IN BURIAM, THAILAND, CONDUCTED BY AMERICAN EMBASSY OFFICER IN JUNE, 1978

ACCOUNT OF YIM SOT RONNACHIT*

Yim Sot Ronnachit, 16, completed six years of schooling in his native Siem Reap before the Khmer Rouge took over. After the takeover, he moved to Pouk District, Siem Reap with his family, his mother, father and six brothers and sisters. He escaped to Thailand in March 1, 1978. His story follows:

"The Khmer Rouge ordered us to work in the rice fields. My father had been a fish-seller in Siem Reap. At first, we lived together, but after ten days in Pouk, my eighteen year old brother and I were sent about ten kilometers away to work. We worked in the rainy season as farmers. In the dry season, we built canals and dug ditches. We worked from 0600 to 1200 and then from 1300 to 1700. During the dry season, we also worked at night from 1900 to 2100.

"During the dry season, we received rice twice a day. This was not enough. In the rainy season, we only received rice porridge twice a day, one tin of rice (250 grams) to make porridge for ten persons. This also was not enough. The rations were about the same from 1975 on.

"People got sick often because of lack of food. The sick went to the hospital where they received medicine made from roots and bark. Most people came back.

"My brother and I stayed in that place to work until 1977, when we were called back to the village where my family lived (to see our father and mother). After a few days with our family, we and 26 other families, 78 persons in all, were told we would move to another place, Kothasuous, also in Pouk District.

"On the way to Kothasuous, we were escorted by eight Khmer Rouge soldiers. After five days of working in Kothasuous, we were ordered to go to another place near the Lake Tonle Sap to plant rice. The Khmer Rouge soldiers said, 'Let's go all together about five kilometers'.

"After we walked about one kilometer to Kan Sang Pi Doeun, the Khmer Rouge said, 'Everybody must stop here. All the men should go ahead to build houses.' After about one hour, the Khmer Rouge took small groups, about ten or fifteen persons, at a time, all in family groups. The Khmer Rouge

* (Refugee agreed to his name being used in public document.)

would say, 'Let's go to a new place. While waiting, the women and children were very frightened and were crying.

"Then my family was ordered to go along with another three families. We were taken by three Khmer Rouge to a place where there were twelve others. The Khmer Rouge pointed guns at us and tied the entire group of us together. There was one old man, one male adult and the rest were women and children. We could see that the others had all been killed. I saw the body of my father in the heap. The Khmer Rouge said, 'You will be killed, because you are wrong.' We were ordered to sit on the ground, then the Khmer Rouge began to hit us with poles and hoes. The Khmer Rouge beat five or six people before me. Then they hit me on the back of my head and on my back. I fainted. They thought I was dead.

"I spent another night in the forest. My head hurt very badly. Even now when it is hot, I have a pain from my neck into my head. After two nights, I saw a man from my village. He told me of another group which was going to be killed. We decided to flee together. I didn't know where we were going. We got a little rice from some 'New Cambodians' we met. After two days of walking, we met two others we knew, both farmers whom the Khmer Rouge had wanted to kill. We walked in the forest for two weeks before arriving in Thailand March 1.

"I cannot imagine any reason the Khmer Rouge wanted to kill 27 families. We were 'New Cambodians' (not under the Khmer Rouge prior to April 1975) from the town and the Khmer Rouge don't like people from the town. When I was working in the rice fields with my brother, I heard the Khmer Rouge say, 'All New People are the enemy.' All 77 who were killed were 'New Cambodians.' Neither I nor my family had ever previously had any trouble with the Khmer Rouge.

"All the members of my family were killed. They were: Yim Khun Nung, 43, my father; Seng Cham, 44, my mother; Yim Sot Noren, 20, my brother; Yim Sot Ronnachat, 13, my brother; Yim Sot Nisay, 10, my brother; Yim Sot Moniki, 9, my brother; and Yim Sot Seihavirak, 6, my brother."●

DEALING WITH THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. RONALD M. MOTT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in today's RECORD a letter I received from the school board in North Royalton, Ohio.

With Congress still wrestling with the energy crisis, it is refreshing to see that some Americans are taking the bull by the horns and coming up with their own solutions.

I think the school board and school officials of North Royalton deserve the thanks of this Congress for their patriotic actions.

The letter follows:

NORTH ROYALTON CITY SCHOOLS,
North Royalton, Ohio, July 25, 1978.

HON. RONALD MOTT,
Congressional District of Ohio,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOTT: As president of the N. Royalton Board of Education I would like to report to you about the small things we are doing in our school district.

1. We have conducted an energy audit of one of our elementary schools and corrected

all and any energy losing equipment and space.

2. The Appalachian Exploration Inc. whom we signed an agreement for an oil and gas lease started to dig today, July 25, 1978 and is expected to hit gas sometime this week. This school system will naturally begin to profit from this lease.

North Royalton City Schools is proud that it is doing the very best possible to make itself self sufficient in this energy age.

We will be honored if you can report our efforts to the Congress, the Departments of Energy and Education as well as the President of the U.S.

Sincerely,

FELINO V. BARNES, M.D.●

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL, PORTLAND OREGONIAN, READING EAGLE OPPOSE FOREIGN AID CUTS

HON. MATTHEW F. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, the foreign assistance appropriations bill will soon come before the House for consideration. As every Member is aware by now, numerous amendments will be offered to reduce funding and to restrict how our assistance may be used in a variety of ways.

I am opposed to these amendments, Mr. Speaker, and I have been encouraged by the fact that so many thoughtful and responsible newspapers across the Nation have indicated their opposition to them as well. For example, the Milwaukee Journal in a recent editorial argued that the United States should not attempt to impose political conditions on our contributions to the international financial institutions since they were never intended to serve as instruments of U.S. short-term foreign policy goals.

The Portland Oregonian elaborated on this point by observing that a substantial reduction in our foreign aid would prove harmful to a system of international agreements that we ourselves originally fostered.

Finally, the Reading, Pa., Eagle made a more direct point in a recent editorial. It pointed out that AID and the IFIs spend much of the foreign aid funds we provide on goods and services in the United States, and suggested that we should not overlook the beneficial domestic consequences of foreign aid.

For the benefit of those Members who may not have seen these editorials, I am including them in the RECORD at this time:

FOREIGN AID'S MISGUIDED CRITICS

Today's great disparities between rich and poor nations are the seeds for tomorrow's global conflicts. Over the years, the US has wisely voiced the need to help lessen those gaps. Now it has a particularly good opportunity to match its words with dollars.

The House soon will take up a \$7.35 billion foreign assistance bill. Of special importance is a \$2.62 billion appropriation within the legislation representing America's promised share of support for the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank and the African Development Fund. These important multi-

national lending institutions play a vital role in providing assistance to solid economic development projects in the poorer countries of the globe.

These institutions' criteria for lending are not based on politics but on the economic viability of the proposed project. Will the benefits outweigh the investment? Will the project pay? This kind of approach not only makes sense financially but it also fosters the right kind of development psychology in an underdeveloped country. There are no political strings attached to these loans. The recipient nation is beholden to no rich, industrialized country in particular.

It is in the best interest of the US to encourage this kind of multinational activity. Regrettably, that view might not prevail in the House. One reason is a stinginess ill befitting a powerful nation. Although the US contributes a smaller fraction of its national wealth to foreign assistance than do many industrialized nations, some House critics still want to slash support for these international banks. Such a step would be tragic since the amount already is a pared down version of the administration's original reasonable request of \$3.5 billion. And Congress already is in arrears in paying to the banks what it promised in past years.

A second problem is the desire to place severe restrictions on how the American money is used. Some critics don't want the banks to grant loans to countries that restrict human rights; others don't want the institutions to support projects that compete with US products; and still others want to bar loans specifically to such countries as Cuba, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Angola, Mozambique and Uganda.

Such restrictions would be quite proper if this were bilateral US foreign aid meant to support specific short term foreign policy goals. But these lending institutions are specifically designed to be free of politics—and for good reason.

The US should not try to impose its narrow desires on these banks any more than should France, England, Japan or Saudi Arabia, who also contribute funds. If every country attempted to have its way, the banks simply could not function—and the world would be a more explosive place.

CASE FOR FOREIGN AID

California's Proposition 13 precedent in tax slashing has had a variety of impacts. One of the first and most serious of these has been congressional whittling on foreign aid legislation. The mood in Congress has been apparently to impress the folks back home by a show of frugality at the expense of the nation's foreign relations.

The foreign aid issue is expected to come to the floor of the House of Representatives after the July 4 recess. The House Appropriations Committee cut more than \$1 billion off the total the Carter administration requested for the Agency for International Development (AID), International Financial Institutions (IFI), including the World Bank, and military credit and sales. There has been some talk in Congress of killing the entire package.

That would be a great disservice, not only to the poor nations of the world, but to the U.S. national interest as well.

This country has been campaigning abroad for an increase in foreign aid on the part of the world's most developed countries, many of them U.S. allies. An abrupt cessation or substantial cut in U.S. foreign aid would be harmful to the system of international agreements fostered by this country for the strengthening of Third World economies, stimulation of trade and alleviation of hunger in the poorest countries.

For example, the United States was instrumental in creating the agencies in the

IFI as a means of encouraging other developed countries to share in assistance to developing nations. A congressional rebuke to foreign aid would hurt that program, perhaps cripple it.

The issues are expected to be debated for several days in the House. Members will probably try to exhibit on the floor their response to Proposition 13 in the form of reductions in foreign aid. Some reductions are tolerable, but the bill should not be gutted to the extent that the product would harm U.S. influence and interests abroad.

AID MONEY SPENT AT HOME

The Senate has just voted a 5 percent across-the-board reduction in "foreign aid," which poses, according to President Carter, a threat to the good reputation that the United States enjoys around the world.

The echoes, moreover, may be heard not just in some far away place, but right here in our own backyard.

In a manner of speaking, "foreign aid" is a misnomer for the federal program under which goods and services are bought in the United States and sent overseas. It is true, of course, that recipient countries are the beneficiaries, but they get the value only. The buck stops at home; we keep the money.

During the past year, for example, the Agency for International Development spent \$17,182 right here in Reading, out of a total of more than \$23.2 million worth of goods and services that it bought in Pennsylvania.

Of the Berks total, \$3,109 went to Carpenter Steel Company; \$7,110 to Kaweeki Berylo Inc.; \$4,456 to Mercator Corp.; and \$2,507 to Rockwell International.

The sums spent here are dwarfed by those in nearby counties: \$8.3 million in Lehigh; \$1.2 million in Montgomery, and \$728,000 in Chester.

AID explains that the commodities and services that it buys are used to help stimulate economic growth in less developed countries, many of which supply raw material for U.S. factories and, also, are export markets for U.S. products.

Of the statewide total of \$23.2 million, more than \$3.6 million to Pennsylvania farmers and food processors for grain and other agricultural commodities for developing countries under the Food for Peace program.

Multinational development institutions supported by the United States, such as the World Bank, also purchase goods and services in the United States, but accurate figures on that are not available.

In addition to humanitarian reasons, the United States supports a foreign aid program to combat problems in less developed countries that do or could influence the peace, security, and well-being of the United States.

Among these Third World problems are massive hunger that causes political upheaval, skyrocketing population growth that nullifies economic gains, lack of job opportunities that triggers migration to affluent countries, depletion of natural resources like fresh water and arable lands, and environmental degradation.

That the effort also bolsters our domestic economy must not be overlooked.●

ELIMINATION OF GLOBAL HUNGER

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, the international community has repeatedly re-

affirmed its commitment to eliminate global hunger and malnutrition. We in the United States strongly subscribe to this action and we have taken affirmative steps to help others who are in need. Not only must we address this accelerating problem through the attention of governmental efforts, but we must enlist the support and assistance of all religious, social, and other private organizations to effectively reduce world hunger.

In furtherance of this policy, I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to the action taken by the Christian Reformed Synod of North America on June 26, 1978.

Their declaration follows:

DECLARATION ON WORLD HUNGER

Recognizing God as the Creator of all things, and man as his steward;

Confessing that God breaks into the lives of his people with his Word and Spirit, training them in patterns of love and justice;

Finding in God's Word his liberality for men and the whole creation, and protective laws for the defenseless and underprivileged;

Remembering the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, who entered poverty so that others might become rich; and

Listening to God's call to his people to disciple all nations and to practice love and justice in the earth;—the synod of the Christian Reformed Church acknowledges that the alleviation of hunger at home and abroad is an integral part of our Christian responsibility, and asks that all members of the Christian Reformed Church devote themselves to gratitude, compassion, repentance, and justice as they respond to world hunger with a ministry of word and deed. ●

SOVIETS SUBJECT PHILADELPHIA SISTER TO OUTRAGEOUS ORDEAL

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to an abhorrent experience endured by Sister Gloria Coleman during her recent trip to the Soviet Union.

Sister Gloria is coordinator of interfaith and ecumenical affairs for the Cardinal's Commission on Human Relations of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. She also serves as chairman of Philadelphia's Interreligious Task Force on Soviet Jewry.

During her visit to the U.S.S.R., Sister Gloria met with both Jewish and non-Jewish activists, to let them know that Christians in the United States are dedicated to the cause of human rights. While she was waiting at the Moscow airport for her airplane to return home, Sister Gloria was forced to undergo a body search by an airport employee in a locked room, after which the notes she had kept of her trip and addresses of Soviet Jews were taken from her. Airport officials refused to provide her with a document stating that the materials had been confiscated.

I would like to commend Sister Gloria for her courageous work on behalf of

Soviet activists. I would also like to share with my colleagues the following article, which describes Sister Gloria's horrifying experience:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, June 30, 1978]

NUN SAYS RUSSIANS SEIZED NOTES, FILM

(By Paula Herbut)

A Roman Catholic nun concerned about the plight of Soviet Jews charged yesterday that notes she kept of a recent 16-day trip to the Soviet Union, including addresses of Soviet Jews, were confiscated at the Moscow Airport before she returned home.

Sister Gloria Coleman of Philadelphia said yesterday that she handed over the material after she was locked in a room at the airport and subjected to a body search Sunday morning before her departure.

Films of the trip taken by another nun, Sister Ann Gillen of Chicago, executive director of the national Interreligious Task Force on Soviet Jewry, also were confiscated, Sister Gloria said.

"I insisted I was a tourist. There was no reason for a body search," she said in a press conference at Jewish Community Relations Council offices at 260 S. 15th st., Philadelphia. "My objection was that I had no one there to witness it (the search)."

"It was obvious we had no rights at the time we were being questioned and being searched. There was a feeling of powerlessness," she said. "All the laws were being made on the spot for their purposes."

Sister Gloria is coordinator of interfaith and ecumenical affairs with the Cardinal's Commission on Human Relations of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Philadelphia and Philadelphia chairman of the Interreligious Task Force on Soviet Jewry.

She said that she and Sister Ann unsuccessfully requested a document stating that the material and films had been confiscated. She said she filed complaints on Monday with the U.S. State Department's Soviet Desk and Office of Human Rights and Human Affairs.

Her luggage was separated and searched, Sister Gloria said, and she was asked into a room where she was to be searched by a woman employe at the airport. After entering, she decided to leave, she said. But when she turned to the door, the woman locked and bolted it, the nun said.

Sister Gloria said she believes she and Sister Ann were singled out because they ignored several of the group tours made to go off by themselves, sometimes to sightsee and sometimes to visit Soviet Jewish activists.

"I wanted to bring some hope to them (the activists)," she said. "I wanted them to know that Christians were interested in human rights being denied . . . Whether it will be for other Christians or Jews, we're all together."

The two visited about 30 activists or the families of activists who are in prison, all but one of them Jewish, Sister Gloria said. Most have been trying to obtain emigration rights.

One was Ida Nudel, whom they visited 10 days before she was convicted of "malicious hooliganism" stemming from her attempts to emigrate to Israel, Sister Gloria said. She said Mrs. Nudel's Moscow apartment was kept under surveillance by agents who followed the trio when they left.

Mrs. Nudel, a 47-year-old economist, is called the "guardian angel" by imprisoned Soviet activists because of her aid to prisoners and their families. She was sentenced on June 21 to four years in a prison camp in Siberia. Convicted the same day on the same charge was Jewish activist Vladimir

Slepek, a 50-year-old electronics engineer who received five years.

"There is obviously a crackdown" by the Soviet government, "an attempt (to break) the back of the (Soviet activist) movement," Sister Gloria said. "The atmosphere was very tight, very tense." ●

AN INADEQUATE DIAGNOSIS

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day in this Nation when a longtime, intimate adviser to the President of the United States has to resign his position of public trust because of a manifest abuse of his professional status as a psychiatrist-physician. The situation created by Dr. Peter Bourne, who falsified a prescription for a mood-altering drug to be used by a member of the White House staff, cries out for attention.

Mr. Charles Seib of the Washington Post relates that there is more to the story in his July 26 article. More questions have been raised than have been answered both by the press and Mr. Jody Powell. We have two examples of abuse. Is there further drug abuse on the White House staff? Why did the Post's executive editor, Ben Bradlee, sit on the story about Peter Bourne snorting cocaine rather than unleashing his ever-so-efficient Watergate bloodhounds? What was the personal lifestyle of the White House staffers that prompted the so-called need for such drugs? What bad dreams was Mr. Bourne trying to assuage for his young White House friend with his quaalude treatment?

Alexandr Solzhenitsyn's reference to Western decadence is all the more poignant now. How is this ugly incident being played by the Soviet controlled press?

At one point in Mr. Carter's 1976 Presidential campaign, a need for some quick "prop-up" money led his campaign staff to seek the fund raising assistance of acid-rock concert, drug culture types. Are the seeds of that peculiar decision coming to fruition?

Mr. Nixon had his flakey staff people. Mr. Carter had his Lance and his Bourne. The American people will not swallow the shallow placebo offered by Mr. Carter's Press Secretary, Jody Powell, nor Ben Bradlee's tranquilizing excuses.

The Charles Seib column follows:

[From The Washington Post, July 26, 1978]

THE COCAINE INCIDENT: THERE'S MORE TO THE STORY

(By Charles B. Seib)

Dr. Peter Bourne left the White House to an old refrain: He was lynched by President Carter's enemies, who were abetted by the press.

Bourne resigned after it was disclosed that he had signed a prescription for a much-abused drug made out to a fictitious person. That surely was an unseemly thing for the president's adviser on drug abuse to do. But Bourne told the president in his letter of resignation that he really was a good fellow and the real villains were "those who seek to hurt you through my disparagement."

"I know clearly recognize" he said, "that I am an instrument through which others attempt to bring disfavor to you."

Such nonsense can be partly excused as the distraught maundering of a man whose world has just crashed. But it has a familiar ring, recalling the less precipitous but no less self-righteous departure of Bert Lance less than a year ago.

If Bourne believed what he said, he was kidding himself. The prescription caper was news. Any newspaper that suppressed it would deserve to have its First Amendment shredded.

It is true the coverage got strident; it always does when the press goes after misbehavior in high places. But once that luckless woman was arrested for trying to pick up the Quaaludes, there was only one way the story could go.

Having retained my membership in the Society of Militant Journalists, I must go on to say that there were several aspects of the story that the press should feel queasy about. To wit:

An important element in Bourne's decision to quit undoubtedly was a sensational follow-up to the prescription story—a report that, at a party thrown last December by a group favoring the legalization of marijuana, Bourne not only smoked marijuana but also used cocaine, a very illegal and very expensive drug. The party was a big one, attended by at least 600 people. It was in an upstairs bedroom off limits to the bulk of the crowd, the story goes, that Bourne used the cocaine.

That bit of news was broken by Jack Anderson on ABC television the morning after The Washington Post's story on the phony prescription.

Bourne resigned later that day, and the next morning The Post gave the cocaine-snorting story prominent front-page display. It said Anderson's report had been substantiated by "a witness interviewed by The Washington Post."

Anderson's report and The Post's confirmation and expansion of it shared a defect: They didn't tell the whole story.

Anderson's broadcast was based on information supplied by one of his reporters, identified in The Post's story as Gary Cohn. Anderson did not tell his viewers that Cohn had been at the party, although not up in the bedroom, and that he had heard about the cocaine incident at that time.

After the prescription story broke, Cohn told Anderson what he knew, and Anderson directed him to get statements from witnesses. When those were obtained, Anderson went on the air with the story.

Now about that "witness interviewed by The Washington Post" on whom The Post's story mainly relied. The witness was, in fact, a Post reporter who had attended the December party and who said he saw Bourne snort cocaine through a rolled piece of currency, as is the fashion. Two other Post people were in the bedroom, which must have been a crowded one, at the historic moment, but apparently they did not supply material for The Post story.

Anderson and Ben Bradlee, executive editor of The Post, have explanations for their failure to reveal their reporters' special connection with the story.

Anderson says that since Cohn wasn't actually in the bedroom there was no need to mention that he was at the party. He says that he felt it was more important, in the two minutes of air time he had, to put the story in balance by noting some of the good things Bourne had done while at the White House.

Had Cohn been upstairs and a witness to

the cocaine incident, Anderson added, he would have mentioned him on the air.

Bradlee says he is not troubled by The Post's failure to tell its readers that the witness it interviewed was one of its own reporters. "He gave us the information under a pledge of confidentiality, as news sources often do," he says. "Since we couldn't use his name, there was no point in identifying him as a Post reporter."

Well, maybe. But by not disclosing that their reporters were aware of the cocaine-sniffing months ago, both Anderson and The Post avoided an awkward news-business question: If the incident is such big news now, why didn't their reporters consider it news last December? Bourne was the president's drug-abuse adviser then, and cocaine was a highly illicit drug.

Although it is water long since over the dam, both Bradlee and Anderson say that if they had known what their reporters knew last December they would have gone after the story.

The cocaine story, like the prescription story, was a legitimate one. It concerned the conduct of a high public official in his special area of responsibility. It would have been a legitimate story seven months ago.

But the fact remains that neither Anderson nor The Post came totally clean with their publics. And a basic truth—that it is the media people who decide what is news and what isn't—was driven home again. ●

AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues an address delivered by Robert H. Stevens, Ph. D., a professor of biology and chairman of the Bureau of Conservation and Environmental Science at Rutgers University.

Dr. Stevens' remarks, entitled "Agriculture, America's Brightest Star, Outshines Its Quibbling Critics," puts into proper perspective the invaluable contribution by those in this country who produce our food and fiber. I fear that sometimes we tend to forget how great that contribution is, and I offer this speech for the careful perusal of the Members of this body.

AGRICULTURE, AMERICA'S BRIGHTEST STAR, OUTSHINES ITS QUIBBLING CRITICS
(By Robert H. Stevens)

The towering structure of America rests primarily on the production of food and fiber. It is the basis of our standard of living and our national prosperity.

Even during the recent recession, with the highest unemployment level since the great depression of the 1930's, America is still the most fortunate land on earth for the vast majority of its citizens.

U.S. industrial equipment and supplies, public services and facilities, housing and furnishings, education and training, medicine and public health, communications and transport and, above all, food and fiber, not only surpass those of any other nation on earth in abundance, quality and availability to the people, but of any nation since history began.

The efficiency of our farms is such that our burgeoning population is more than adequately nourished by the land labor of less than 5 percent of our people. We thereby release 95 percent to advance our industry, our public works, our education, our research and to enrich our culture and to maintain our defense.

The charge by uninformed persons that U.S. agriculture is wasteful of energy is without substance. Agricultural production in 1976 (the last full year of record) consumed only 3 percent of our total national energy budget, and at the same time accounted for exports equivalent to 68 percent of all petroleum imports. As for manual labor taking over energy tasks, a human being laboring 10 hours (at approximately \$26.80 total wages) does work equivalent to that provided by 3 cents worth of electricity. Pesticides, also blamed by some persons as being energy consumptive, actually requires only 2 percent of our agricultural energy budget, the equivalent of .06 of 1 percent of our national energy consumption.

The other great world power, the U.S.S.R., still binds over 50 percent of her people to the toil of the soil and yet is unable to produce the bare necessities of food and fiber for her people with reliability. They have to appeal, periodically, to America to supply the deficiency.

For the first time in the history of man's long and often frustrating struggle against want, America has, in this century, found how to banish hunger, exposure and destitution from the earth.

This is by far the greatest victory that democracy and the political philosophy of freedom of choice and enterprise has won. It constitutes the fundamental fulfillment of our civilization upon which all other national accomplishment necessarily rests.

THE SEED FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

A century ago the Federal Government recognized that America was an agrarian nation, which would have to rely entirely upon its own lands and waters, its own ingenuity and industry to provide not only the bare necessities of life but also the surplus capital, only upon which the future development and prosperity of the country would have to depend.

Thus the state land grant colleges and later the agricultural experiment station systems, both state and federal, were established to educate the young rural people in the constructive use and exploitation of the land and its resources, and to research and resolve the myriad problems involved in food and fiber production.

The total investment over the past century by the taxpayers of the United States in agricultural and industrial research related to food and fiber production, about \$16 billion, is returned every year in the reduced food bill paid by the American consumer.

In 1973, the cost of food to the American consumer dropped below 16 cents of the take home dollar. It has risen slightly since to about 18 cents, where it is still the lowest all time cost for the highest nutritional level of any country in the world.

In the days of the great depression, the food bill in America was over 30% of the take home income, and it lies well above that figure for most of the countries of the world today, including Russia.

Our food supply is also the most nutritious, highest quality, most abundant and it is readily available at virtually all seasons of the year.

BITING THE HAND THAT FEEDS

Yet there are those who complain of its cost, its quality, its composition, its safety and its appearance. They conveniently ignore their own enlarged incomes and the increase

in expenses of the farmer. They contend the quality is inferior to that of former years, although assays reveal that on comparable scales it is actually of substantially superior quality. They say it has been over-processed into convenience foods, but they no longer want to peel potatoes, string beans, shell peas, fillet fish or bake breads and pastries.

They insist that modern U.S. foods are laced with "poisons" to preserve their appearance and to prolong shelf life, without realizing that there are no medically annotated records of any consumer becoming sick, developing cancer or dying from the direct consumption of any foodstuff that has been treated with any registered pesticide, preservative or food additive used in accordance with approved registered label recommendations.

Yet, there are numerous instances, medically recorded every year, of consumers becoming sick and of fatalities from consumption of foods contaminated with natural toxins, most of which could have been prevented by the correct use of registered, approved pesticides and preservatives.

The production, processing, preservation and distribution of food and fiber in America have become incredibly efficient. However, it has depended entirely upon research and development into all its phases, and this progress was the direct output of the land grant college and experiment station system which adapted the solution of farm problems to each area and climatic condition throughout the United States.

TEACHING OTHERS

The same system can be applied all over the world to the relief of misery for tens of millions of mankind. Indeed in a few cases the system, in miniature form, has already been exported to Mexico, to India, to the Philippines and elsewhere.

In these areas, the system has flourished and brought on the "Green Revolution," but much more needs to be done to bring the food and fiber supply up to a subsistence level and to stem the rapid approach of vast famines.

Although much can be done to relieve the misery, hunger and want of the many tens of millions of humans in Africa, in Asia and in South America and to lift them to a subsistence level, it is manifestly impossible to raise the standard of living of all mankind to that currently enjoyed in North America, or even to that of Western Europe or Mediterranean Europe.

The population of the world has already attained a level where there are simply insufficient resources—energy, arable soils, water, metals, transport, education—to raise all the peoples of the earth to the living standards of the western world.

There is no way in which many poor underdeveloped countries can be raised much above a bare subsistence without pulling down the advanced nations to virtual destitution.

We in America simply cannot appreciate the inordinate wealth and luxury that we have come to regard, not only as essential but even as our birth right. Our average income is \$2,800/annum, which compares with from \$334/capita/annum in South America or to \$379 in Central America.

Scandinavia comes closest to the U.S. with \$1,707/capita/annum. Africa is totally destitute, by western standards, ranging from \$77/capita/annum in central countries to a high of \$456 in the southern countries.

THE ENORMOUS TASK AHEAD

These data reveal all too vividly the utter impossibility of spreading the wealth around and the fallibility of so doing.

What needs to be done, and it will take

over a century of intensive and dedicated effort to achieve even a partial success, is to spread education around to bring the findings of the research laboratory and experiment station down to the grass roots on the farm where it can go to work; to develop, introduce and distribute new species, varieties and strains of livestock and domesticated food plants into countries and edaphic areas where they can flourish; to distribute engineering skills and equipment to provide power to produce so that one man can do what it now takes perhaps a hundred or more to do; and to introduce, provide and distribute agricultural chemicals to promote the growth efficiency of favored livestock and domestic crop plants (feedstuffs and fertilizers), and to protect the increased yields produced from the ravage of insects, weeds, disease and vermin (pesticides).

Once these developing countries can learn to feed, clothe and shelter themselves from their own natural resources and labor, they can then accumulate capital through the export of goods and services and can attain the "Take-Off" stage into a semi-industrialized society and can at least reach to well above a bare subsistence existence.●

NEAL REPORTS VOTING RECORD

HON. STEPHEN L. NEAL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with a practice I have observed ever since coming to Congress, I am making public my entire voting record.

I sincerely believe that the citizens of the Fifth District of North Carolina have a right to know how I voted on every issue coming before the House. Further, I believe that record should be compiled in such a way as to free them of the burden of research.

The ensuing compilation is for the months of January, February and March of this year. Each entry includes, in order, the roll number, a description of the question, my individual vote, the vote of the North Carolina delegation (in parentheses), and, finally, the vote of the entire House. The N.C. delegation vote is in the following order: Yes, no, and the number not present or not voting. "DNV" in all instances means "did not vote."

VOTING RECORD—SECOND SESSION, 95TH CONGRESS

(2) Amendment to clarify authority for warrantless search and seizure under Fish and Wildlife Improvement Act, specifying that a federal officer must have reasonable grounds to believe offense has been committed. Yes (4-5-2). Passed, 215-131.

(3) Final passage, Fish and Wildlife Improvement Act, establishing a uniform policy of game law enforcement. Yes (8-1-2). Passed, 292-59.

(5) To authorize State Department to acquire a bust of Gen. George C. Marshall. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 351-22.

(6) To require Civil Service Commission to comply with state court orders or property settlements in connection with divorces or legal separations of civil service employees. Yes (9-1-1). Passed, 369-7.

(7) To give civil service retirement credit to all federal employees of Japanese ancestry for time spent in World War II internment camps. Yes (8-1-2). Passed, 366-12.

(8) To increase federal loan guarantee for fishing vessels from 75 percent to 87.5 percent of actual costs. No (6-3-1). Passed, 309-68.

(10) To permit federal tax court judges to withdraw from tax court pension system any time before benefits begin to accrue. Yes (11-0). Passed, 399-1.

(11) To authorize \$6 million over three years for the Administrative Conference of the U.S. No (6-5). Passed, 292-103.

(12) To make it a federal offense to use children under age 16 for the production of pornographic materials, or to sell or distribute these materials. Yes (11-0). Passed, 401-0.

(13) To consider (adopt rule) Outer Continental Shelf Land Act Amendments. Yes (5-5-1). Passed, 247-158.

(15) Breaux Substitute for Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments. No (6-5). Failed, 187-211.

(16) Minority substitute for Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments. No (3-8). Failed, 143-229.

(18) To authorize \$1 million for the Office of Rail Public Counsel. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 318-44.

(19) To require ConRail to assume the bankrupt railroads' obligations to pay medical and life insurance premiums for 13 employees who retired before ConRail took over assets of the railroads. No (7-3-1). Passed, 314-50.

(20) To allow supplemental or all-cargo air carriers to qualify for new air cargo certificates immediately, rather than wait one year. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 403-0.

(21) To delete Interior Department authority for core and test drilling under Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 328-77.

(22) Continental Shelf: To eliminate lease cancellation compensation for investment of lessee if lease is canceled. Yes. (10-0-1). Passed, 208-194.

(23) Continental Shelf: To limit the use of new bidding systems to at least 10 percent of newly leased areas, but not more than 30 percent. No (8-2-1). Failed, 196-207.

(24) Continental Shelf: To require that new bidding systems be used for at least 20 percent, but not more than 50 percent, of newly leased acreage. No. (7-3-1). Passed, 219-188.

(25) To resolve into Committee of the Whole House to consider Bankruptcy Law Revision. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 405-4.

(26) To strike provision of Bankruptcy Law Revision to establish an independent bankruptcy court and make bankruptcy judges federal lifetime judges. Yes (10-1). Failed, 146-262.

(27) Continental Shelf: To give discretionary authority to Justice Department to review proposed OCS lease sales for possible antitrust implications. Yes (11-0). Passed, 241-162.

(28) Continental Shelf: To strike provisions of the bill requiring random selection of tracts to be used under new bidding systems. Yes. (9-2). Passed, 225-174.

(29) To approve the journal of the last day's proceedings. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 368-21.

(30) Continental Shelf: To strike provisions establishing documentation, registry and manning requirements for vessels and rigs on the OCS. No (0-10-1). Failed, 118-280.

(31) Continental Shelf: To require that all building and rebuilding of vessels, platforms and rigs for the OCS would have to be per-

formed in the U.S. No (0-11). Failed, 201-208.

(33) Continental Shelf: To stipulate that 20% of OCS revenues, up to \$200 million per year, be shared with the coastal states most directly affected by offshore development. Yes (11-0). Passed, 279-120.

(34) Continental Shelf: To exempt states which receive OCS revenue sharing funds from existing requirements that they have federally approved Coastal Zone Management Plans. Yes (11-0). Failed, 159-230.

(35) Continental Shelf: Final passage, to provide specific statutory guidelines, standards and procedures for the development of Outer Continental Shelf oil, gas and other resources. Yes (11-0). Passed, 291-91.

(36) To adjust Medicaid payment rates for Puerto Rico, Guam and the Virgin Islands to conform to those of the 50 states. Yes (8-2-1). Passed, 253-106.

(37) To consider (adopt rule) on H.R. 8336, Chattahoochee River Recreation Area. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 323-41.

(39) Timber Sales: To direct the Secretary of Agriculture to require sealed bids on all sales of publicly owned timber. No. (0-9-2). Failed, 136-239.

(40) Timber Sales: To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to select the bidding method which best insures fair competition, fair value to the government for timber, economic stability for timber-dependent communities, and prevention of collusive practices. Yes (9-0-2). Passed, 295-78.

(42) To authorize 145 new federal judgeships (including three in North Carolina). Yes (11-0). Passed, 319-80.

(43) To consider (adopt rule) on H.R. 6805, Office of Consumer Representation. Yes (6-5). Passed, 271-138.

(44) Glickman Substitute: To establish an Office of Consumer Counsel in each of the 23 departments and major agencies. No. (6-5). Failed, 93-313.

(46) To resolve into Committee of the Whole House to consider Office of Consumer Representation Act. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 377-25.

(47) Consumer: To extend to all agencies the requirement that the President be notified 30 days before the Office of Consumer Representation sought judicial review of an agency action. Yes (9-2). Failed, 195-219.

(48) Consumer: To eliminate provision which exempted labor injunction suits, certain proceedings of the National Labor Relations Board, and activities of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. No (2-9). Failed, 138-274.

(49) Consumer Representation: To strike provision which exempted from the bill proceedings of the Department of Agriculture, Farmers Home Administration and Federal Crop Insurance Corp. No. (0-11). Failed, 105-309.

(50) Consumer Representation: Final passage, to create an independent, nonregulatory Office of Consumer Protection to represent the interests of consumers before federal agencies and the courts. No (1-10). Failed, 189-227.

(52) To recommit with instructions Redwood National Park Amendments. No (2-9). Failed, 116-274.

(53) To expand Redwood National Park in California by 48,000 acres. Yes (10-1). Passed, 328-60.

(54) To adopt conference report on Endangered American Wilderness Act, designating 17 areas, including 1.3 million acres in the western U.S., for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System. Yes (11-0). Passed, 333-44.

(55) To resolve into Committee of the Whole House to consider H.R. 2664, Black Hill Claim. Yes (11-0). Passed, 337-17.

(56) To instruct House conferees on Additional Federal Judgeships to insist on House provision regarding merit selection of federal district court judges. Yes (9-1-1). Passed 321-19.

(57) To resolve into Committee of the Whole House to consider Chattahoochee River Recreational Area. Yes (11-0). Passed, 325-7.

(58) To require State of Georgia to take over ownership and operation of Chattahoochee River National Park in 1980. No (1-9-1). Failed, 119-230.

(59) Final passage, to acquire up to 6,300 acres and develop and operate Chattahoochee River National Park. Yes (8-2-1). Passed, 273-79.

(60) To limit number of commissioned officers in the military and establish uniform standards for appointment, promotion and retirement. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 351-7.

(62) To adopt conference report on black lung benefits. Yes (7-4). Passed, 264-113.

(63) To create National Aquaculture Plan to facilitate development of commercial aquaculture in U.S. Yes (7-4). Passed 234-130.

(65) To authorize \$250 million from Highway Trust Fund to states for repair of potholes and highway damage. No (4-6-1). Passed, 274-137.

(66) To authorize the president to call separate White House conferences on the arts and the humanities. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 341-65.

(67) To extend Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education through FY 1983, and to authorize \$67.6 million for five years for its programs. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 409-0.

(68) To authorize \$5 million for the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 356-53.

(71) To table a motion to recede and concur with a Senate amendment rescinding \$462 million for production of two B-1 bombers. No (6-5). Failed, 172-244.

(72) To concur in a Senate amendment to rescind \$462 million for production of two B-1 bombers. Yes (5-6). Passed, 234-182.

(73) To consider (adopt rule) IMF Supplementary Financing Facility. (Neal bill). Yes (11-0). Passed, 386-15.

(76) IMF: To specify that salary limits would apply only to the Supplementary Financing Facility and not to all IMF representatives. Yes (5-6). Passed, 253-141.

(77) IMF: To authorize the U.S. to invest \$1.8 billion in the Supplementary Financing Facility of the International Monetary Fund. Yes (6-5). Passed, 267-125.

(78) Overseas Private Investment Corp. (OPIC): To prohibit OPIC loans or guarantees to the National Finance Corp. of Panama unless approved by the House of Representatives. DNV (6-4-1). Failed, 166-199.

(79) OPIC: To prohibit OPIC from insuring or financing any project to establish or expand production of palm oil, sugar, or citrus crops for export. Yes (9-2). Passed, 191-167.

(80) OPIC: Final passage, to extend OPIC through FY 1980. Yes (8-3). Passed, 191-165.

(81) To consider (adopt rule) Grazing Fee moratorium. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 302-1.

(82) To consider (adopt rule) Wichita Indian Tribal Lands. Yes (8-1-2). Passed, 295-6.

(83) To place one-year moratorium on increases in public lands grazing fees. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 257-47.

(84) To accept Roncallo substitute to Wichita Indian Tribal Lands, defining affiliated bands, etc. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 293-1.

(85) Final passage, to permit Wichita Indian Tribe to file its land claims against the United States with the Indian Claims Commission, etc. No (8-2-1). Passed, 226-68.

(87) To approve action of District of Columbia Council amending D.C. Home Rule Charter so D.C. voters can initiate laws and disapprove council acts by referendum. Yes (9-1-1). Passed, 321-24.

(88) To approve D.C. Council action permitting D.C. voters to recall elected officials. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 350-4.

(90) To abolish diversity of citizenship as a basis for federal court jurisdiction. No. (7-3-1). Passed, 266-133.

(91) To authorize \$290 million through FY 1981 and make substantive changes in Federal Trade Commission functions. No (0-10-1). Failed, 146-255.

(92) To authorize funds (\$3.18 million for three years) for American Folklife Center of Library of Congress. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 306-80.

(94) To consider (adopt rule) D.C. Representation in Congress. DNV (10-0-1). Passed, 386-21.

(96) To resolve into Committee of the Whole House to consider D.C. Representation in Congress. DNV (9-0-2). Passed, 369-15.

(96) To resolve into Committee of the Whole House to consider D.C. Representation in Congress (day after preceding vote). DNV (10-0-1). Passed, 394-12.

(97) To propose a constitutional amendment to provide the District of Columbia with representation in Congress on the same basis as states. Yes (11-0). Passed, 289-127.

(99) To approve the journal of the previous day's proceedings. Yes (9-1-1). Passed, 304-20.

(100) To provide \$400,000 for Veterans' Affairs Committee investigations and studies. Yes (11-0). Passed, 336-1.

(101) To provide \$275,000 for District of Columbia Committee investigations and studies. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 318-15.

(102) To provide \$49,500 for Rules Committee investigations and studies. Yes (11-0). Passed, 321-13.

(104) To approve journal of previous day's proceedings. Yes (9-0-2). Passed, 331-11.

(105) To designate May 3, 1978, as Sun Day. Yes (9-0-2). Passed, 348-7.

(107) To extend the authority of Commissioner of Education to waive certain requirements regarding the use of grants for 13 school districts, allowing them to continue programs begun under ESEA Title I studies. Yes (11-0). Passed, 404-0.

(108) To consider (adopt rule) on Increasing the Temporary Debt Limit. No (9-2). Passed, 285-115.

(110) To strike provision requiring that subsequent debt ceilings be set in concurrent budget resolutions provided for in the Budget and Impoundment Control Act. No (6-5). Passed, 277-132.

(111) To increase the temporary debt ceiling to \$824 billion. No (2-9). Failed, 165-248.

(112) To authorize Southwestern Power to purchase \$13.1 Million in electric power to fulfill its delivery contracts. Yes (9-2). Passed, 353-50.

(113) To provide \$2 million for Public Works and Transportation Committee studies and investigations. Yes (11-0). Passed, 399-1.

(115) To dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 372-34.

(116) To approve journal of previous day's proceedings. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 377-26.

(117) To table a motion to reconsider the

vote approving journal of the previous day's proceedings. DNV (8-1-2). Passed, 313-91.

(118) To close debate on adoption of the rule on Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act. Yes (9-1-1). Passed, 371-36.

(119) To consider (adopt rule) Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act (Humphrey-Hawkins). Yes (7-2-2). Passed, 349-58.

(120) To table a motion to reconsider vote adopting the rule on Humphrey-Hawkins. Yes (10-1). Passed, 368-29.

(121) To resolve into Committee of the Whole House to consider Humphrey-Hawkins. DNV (8-1-2). Passed, 364-32.

(122) To approve journal of the previous day's proceedings. Yes (11-0). Passed, 386-15.

(125) Humphrey-Hawkins: Anti-inflation substitute to require the president to include in the annual economic report specific price stability goals and policies and programs designed to achieve those goals. Yes (9-2). Passed, 277-143.

(126) Humphrey-Hawkins: To add a specific goal of reducing inflation to 3% by 1983. Yes (5-6). Failed, 198-223.

(127) Humphrey-Hawkins: To require president in the annual economic report to measure all employment, and to count separately public service employees. Yes (9-2). Passed, 239-177.

(128) Humphrey-Hawkins: To add to bill's economic goals a goal of 100% parity of income for farmers at the marketplace by 1983. Yes (11-0). Passed, 264-150.

(129) Budget Recission: To approve recissions of \$40.2 million in appropriations for the military assistance program; \$10.1 million in borrowing authority for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and \$5 million in appropriations for contributions to international peacekeeping efforts. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 318 to 0.

(131) To order a second on motion to suspend the rules and pass Rate of Interest on Individual Retirement Bonds, making their interest yield consistent with Series E savings bonds. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 372-1.

(132) To authorize Civil Service Commission to conduct three-year experiment in the use of compressed and flexible work schedules. $\frac{2}{3}$ required. No (2-8-1). Failed, 242-141.

(133) To establish a uniform federal policy on part-time employment and to require federal agencies to establish part-time career employment programs. No (7-3-1). Passed, 294-84.

(134) To provide Congress opportunity to review proposed changes in the level of nationwide postal services before they take effect. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 371-6.

(135) To recommit with instructions Judiciary Committee Funding. Yes (6-3-2). Failed, 161-216.

(136) To recommit with instructions Select Assassinations Committee Funding. No (5-4-2). Failed, 182-198.

(137) To provide \$2.5 million for investigations and studies of the Select Assassinations Committee. Yes (5-4-2). Passed, 204-175.

(139) To dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House. Yes (10-1). Passed, 331-72.

(140) To read in full the journal of the previous day's proceedings. No (2-9). Failed, 99-301.

(141) To approve journal of the previous day's proceedings. Yes (10-1). Passed, 371-29.

(142) To table a motion to reconsider the vote approving the journal of the previous day's proceedings. Yes (10-1). Passed, 308-91.

(143) To suspend the rules and pass Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness Act. Yes (11-0). Passed, 380-20.

(144) To order second to motion to suspend the rules and pass Travel Expenses of Government Officials Paid by Private Foundations. DNV (10-0-1). Passed, 387-2.

(145) To order a second to motion to suspend the rules and pass Home Production of Beer and Wine. DNV (10-0-1). Passed, 388-3.

(146) To designate 904,500 acres of the Custer and Gallatin National Forests in Montana as the Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness. Yes (11-0). Passed, 405-7.

(147) To broaden the exception to prohibition against private foundation reimbursement of government officials' expenses, permitting reimbursement for foreign and domestic travel. Yes (11-0). Passed, 372-38.

(148) To expand Redwoods National Park by 48,000 acres, etc. Yes (9-1-1). Passed, 317-60.

(150) To approve journal of previous day's proceedings. Yes (11-0). Passed, 387-15.

(151) To resolve into Committee of the Whole House to consider Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act (Humphrey-Hawkins). Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 380-19.

(152) Humphrey-Hawkins: To add the specific economic goal of a balanced budget by 1983 and to mandate the president to pursue policies consistent with that goal. Yes (9-2). Failed, 205-215.

(153) Humphrey-Hawkins: To declare one purpose of the Act to be the achievement of a balanced budget consistent with achievement of the unemployment goals. Yes (11-0). Passed, 411-3.

(154) Humphrey-Hawkins: To end debate on Title I at a specified time. Yes (8-3). Passed, 237-170.

(155) Humphrey-Hawkins: To add goal of a permanent reduction in individual federal income taxes by 10 percent a year for three years, accompanied by a 1 percent reduction in corporate taxes annually for three years and an increase in the corporate surtax exemption to \$100,000. Yes (9-2). Failed, 194-216.

(156) Humphrey-Hawkins: To resolve into Committee of the Whole House to consider the bill. Yes (11-0). Passed, 379-8.

(157) Humphrey-Hawkins: To add to the bill's national priority programs the implementation of programs already established by law as national priorities, such as the removal of architectural barriers to the handicapped. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 398-0.

(158) Humphrey-Hawkins: To omit certain persons from the unemployment statistics used for purposes of the Act, such as those unemployed because of strikes; those unemployed for less than four weeks; those not seeking full-time employment; those who voluntarily left their last jobs; and those who have jobs but for their own convenience are waiting to start work. Yes (9-1-1). Failed, 199-204.

(159) Humphrey-Hawkins: To strike the enacting clause and thus kill the bill. No (2-9). Failed, 106-310.

(160) Humphrey-Hawkins: To require the President, in carrying out the Act, to consider the impact on the national economy of all provisions of the U.S. Code and Federal Code of Regulations. Opponents contended the amendment would require the President, every time he sent Congress recommendations for new programs and policies, to review all federal laws and regulations—a task which would take years. No (0-11). Failed, 114-296.

(161) Humphrey-Hawkins: To strike requirement that Joint Economic Committee to submit its own concurrent resolution to Congress. Yes (9-2). Passed, 259-153.

(162) Humphrey-Hawkins: To terminate the Act on Sept. 30, 1983, unless extended by Congress. Yes (7-4). Failed, 196-216.

(163) Humphrey-Hawkins: To accept Republican substitute prohibiting use of public service jobs to meet unemployment goal. No (2-9). Failed, 137-276.

(164) Humphrey-Hawkins: Final passage, to set 1983 unemployment target of 4 percent of all workers 16 and older and 3 percent for adults age 20 or more; 1983 target of 100 percent parity in farm prices; reduce income taxes 10 percent a year for each of three years; reduce corporate taxes and increase corporate surtax exemption; to achieve a balanced budget consistent with goals of the act; to require the President to include in annual economic report specific price stability goals and policies and programs to achieve anti-inflation goals. Yes (8-3). Passed, 257-152.

(166) To order a second on a motion to suspend the rules and pass Middle Income Student Assistance Act. Yes (5-4-2). Failed, 156-218.

(167) To provide \$375,000 for an investigation and study of Korean-American relations. Yes (9-0-2). Passed, 367-13.

(168) To consider (adopt rule) Postal Service Act Amendments. Yes (9-0-2). Passed, 387-0.

(170) To condemn the March 16 kidnaping of former Italian Premier Aldo Moro. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 390-0.

(171) To consider (adopt rule) Public Debt Limit Extension. Yes (9-1-1). Passed, 314-80.

(172) To extend the existing temporary debt limit to \$752 billion through July 31, 1978. No (6-4-1). Passed, 233-172.

(174) To consider (adopt rule) Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments. Yes (5-5-1). Failed, 198-209.

(175) To abolish compulsory retirement for most federal employees and raise the mandatory retirement age for non-federal workers from 65 to 70. Yes (10-0-1). Passed, 391-6.

(176) To resolve into Committee of the Whole House to consider Postal Service Act Amendments. DNV (9-0-2). Passed, 364-2.

(177) To appropriate \$300 million in FY 1978 for the Federal Disaster Assistance Administration. Yes (9-0-2). Passed, 393-4.

(178) To consider (adopt rule) Shipping Act Amendments of 1978. Yes (9-0-2). Passed, 365-33.

(179) To resolve into Committee of the Whole House to consider Shipping Act Amendments of 1978. Yes (9-0-2). Passed 376-0.

(180) Final passage, Shipping Act Amendments, stiffening penalties for illegal rebates in the shipping industry. Yes (9-0-2). Passed, 390-1.

(181) To disagree with Senate amendments to Raisin Marketing Order Act. The amendments added to House bill provisions which diverted 31 million acres of wheat, corn, soybeans and cotton; increased target prices and prices and loan rates for wheat, corn, and upland cotton. Yes (8-0-3). Passed, 332-63.

(182) Motion to table, and thus kill, a motion to instruct House conferees to support Senate amendments to Raisin Marketing Order Act. Yes (8-1-2). Passed, 224-167. ●

LEGISLATION TO FACILITATE THE COAST GUARD'S SEABORNE DRUG INTERDICTION

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I testified before the Subcommittee on

the Coast Guard and Navigation, which is chaired by my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. BIAGGI), in support of H.R. 10371 and H.R. 10698, respectively measures authored by the gentleman from New York and myself, that would facilitate the enforcement by the Coast Guard of laws relating to the importation of heroin, cocaine, marihuana and other controlled substances. Both proposals are designed to prohibit any individual on board a U.S. vessel on the high seas and any U.S. citizen on board a foreign vessel on the high seas to possess, with the intent to distribute or dispense, any federally controlled substance.

The subcommittee is considering revising these legislative proposals to include, among other things, prohibiting the transfer of a controlled substance from any vessel to a vessel of the United States, or to a vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. This is known as the "mother ship" transfer, whereby the "mother ship" remains outside the U.S. Customs inspection waters and unloads the contraband cargo to a small, inconspicuous vessel that then mingles among the tens of thousands of recreational boats in U.S. waters and eventually unloads the illicit cargo onto the isolated coves scattered throughout this Nation's coastline.

A second major proposed revision to H.R. 10371 is to provide funds for the Coast Guard to purchase additional seaborne drug interdicting equipment.

As a member of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control who has participated in the select committee's recent drug trafficking hearings in Florida, Hawaii, and Guam. I want to assure my colleagues that our drug law enforcement agencies need additional personnel, first-rate equipment and funds to compete against the sophisticated equipment currently used by the international criminal syndicates whose Lear jets and 7-knot corsa boats are no match for our antiquated World War II aircraft, sluggish vessels and other outdated equipment. Our law enforcement agents need assistance in the form of legislation that would provide them with the authority to plug this existing law enforcement loophole and funds to purchase better equipment. The Coast Guard also needs communications equipment, radar equipment and other sophisticated radio gear.

There is also a need for the Coast Guard to emphasize drug law enforcement as one of its missions and to develop a personnel system that emphasizes law enforcement as a career. These dedicated agents who daily risk their lives in interdicting narcotics trafficking and in apprehending drug traffickers are to be commended for their outstanding drug interdicting accomplishments; but they also need our legislative help.

Mr. Speaker, in order to share with my colleagues my thoughts regarding Mr. BIAGGI's bill, H.R. 10371, and my proposal, H.R. 10698, together with my views regarding a suggested revision to these measures, I am inserting the complete text of my statement before the

Subcommittee on the Coast Guard and Navigation at this point in the RECORD. I will welcome the views and support of my colleagues on these legislative proposals which are intended to assist the Coast Guard in interdicting the narcotics trafficking, which has reached catastrophic proportions, and in apprehending the drug traffickers who profit from the human misery of this sordid business.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES' SUBCOMMITTEE ON COAST GUARD AND NAVIGATION ON H.R. 10371 AND H.R. 10698, JULY 26, 1978

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Subcommittee on the Coast Guard and Navigation, I welcome this opportunity to join you in the important proceedings regarding H.R. 10371 and H.R. 10698 respectively, measures that you, Mr. Chairman, and I have authored that would facilitate the enforcement by the Coast Guard of laws relating to the importation of heroin, cocaine, marihuana and other controlled substances. Minor differences between our two measures aside, both proposals are designed to prohibit any individual on board a U.S. vessel on the high seas and any U.S. citizen on board a foreign vessel on the high seas to possess, with the intent to distribute or dispense, heroin, cocaine, marihuana, or any other controlled drugs.

The U.S. Coast Guard's authority to interdict illicit drugs on the high seas is broadly governed by title 14, section 2 of the United States Code, which authorizes the Coast Guard to "enforce or assist in the enforcement of all applicable Federal laws on or under the high seas and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States." Section 89 of that same title permits the Coast Guard to "make inquiries, inspections, searches, seizures, and arrests upon the high seas and waters over which the United States has jurisdiction for the prevention, detection and suppression of violations of laws of the United States." This broad authority (and certain drug-related statutes) does not, however, prohibit a U.S. citizen from possessing Federally controlled drugs while on board a United States or a foreign vessel on the high seas; nor does it prohibit a foreign national on board a United States vessel on the high seas from possessing these Federally controlled drugs.

As a member of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control that held hearings last November at the United States Mission to the United Nations in New York on international narcotics control . . . a hearing that you, Mr. Chairman, participated in in your capacity as ex officio member of the Narcotics Select Committee . . . I was impressed by Rear Admiral Norman C. Venzke, Chief of the Office of Operations and Director of the Enforcement of Laws and Treaties Program of the U.S. Coast Guard, who testified:

"The general revision of drug laws which produced the Comprehensive Drug Abuse and Control Act of 1970 omitted the provision making the possession of quantities of drugs by United States vessels on the high seas a Federal crime. Consequently, Coast Guard drug law enforcement action against U.S. vessels at sea beyond the 12-mile customs zone now requires the proof of conspiracy to import before law enforcement action can be properly undertaken."

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 10371 and H.R. 10698 are designed to help plug that loophole by prohibiting that conduct and by subjecting the convicted violator to an imprisonment

of not more than 15 years and a fine of not more than \$25,000, or both. A subsequent conviction would subject the violator to imprisonment of not more than 30 years, a fine of not more than \$50,000, or both—penalties that are stipulated by the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that you are considering revising your bill, H.R. 10371, that, among other things, would broaden the scope of this measure to include the following: (1) to state as a Congressional finding and declaration that the Coast Guard place increased emphasis on the interdiction of controlled substances on the high seas by vessels bound for the United States and to authorize the purchase of law enforcement equipment necessary to meet the operational requirements of seaborne drug interdiction; (2) to prohibit the attempt or the conspiracy to import or to transport any controlled substance into the United States; (3) to prohibit the transfer of a controlled substance from any vessel to a vessel of the United States; (4) to authorize the President to conclude agreements with foreign nations to seek prior consent of a foreign nation for the Coast Guard to board and seize a vessel violating this legislative proposal and to arrest the individual on board such vessel; and (5) to authorize the appropriation of not more than \$30 million for each of fiscal years 1980-1982 in order to carry out the purposes of this proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I commend you for broadening H.R. 10371, for sharing your thoughts with me and for providing me and my staff the opportunity to make some suggestions to your revised proposal. In my view, two provisions of the revision are particularly critical: (1) prohibiting the transfer of a controlled substance from one vessel to a vessel of the United States, either within the territorial seas of the United States or on the high seas and (2) to authorize the appropriation of funds to permit the Coast Guard to purchase seaborne interdicting equipment.

I encourage you to go forward with the revised version of H.R. 13071, and I will be pleased to join you in this measure as a cosponsor. The revision clearly broadens the very things that your original proposal and my H.R. 10698 would attempt to accomplish, namely: to provide the Coast Guard with the law enforcement tools to conduct effective seaborne interdictions and to minimize the advantage in equipment and smuggling techniques currently used by international criminal syndicates.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, one major seaborne drug smuggling technique used by organized crime and independent narcotics traffickers is the "mother ship" technique popularized during the 1920s and the early 1930s by prohibition rum runners, whereby the "mother ship" remains outside U.S. Customs inspection waters and unloads the contraband cargo to a small, inconspicuous vessel that then mingles among the tens of thousands of recreational boats in U.S. waters. The smaller, "narcotics running" craft eventually unloads its illicit cargo onto the isolated coves scattered throughout this Nation's coastline. From there, these deadly drugs are dispersed by organized crime's intricate operational networks to virtually every city, town and school district in this country, injecting our citizens with narcotic misery and destruction.

Obviously, if the Coast Guard (and other drug law enforcement agencies) are to effectively combat the international criminal syndicates whose Lear jets, 70-knot corsa boats, and other sophisticated equipment outmaneuver the antiquated World War II aircraft, obsolete boats and other vintage

equipment used by this Nation's law enforcement agencies, then these brave and dedicated law enforcement agents, who daily risk their lives in interdicting the narcotics traffic and in apprehending the drug traffickers, must be provided sufficient personnel, first-rate equipment and sufficient funds to perform their difficult and dangerous tasks.

Last month, the Narcotics Select Committee focused its spotlight on drug trafficking in southern Florida—an area that is currently the drug trafficking capital of the Nation. The drug trafficking problem in Florida has reached epidemic proportions . . . it is a tidal wave, a drug crisis of catastrophic dimensions. The problem of interdicting the massive quantities of illicit drugs from polluting our shores and from preventing these deadly drugs from moving inland to every region of our Nation is herculean.

Just last week, on July 12th and July 14th, the U.S. Coast Guard cutter *Durable* seized 82,000 pounds of marijuana worth an estimated \$30 million and arrested 17 drug traffickers. I understand that during the 10 weeks from May 6th, 1978, through July 19th, 1978, the U.S. Coast Guard, combined with the U.S. Customs Service and local law enforcement authorities seized 804,919 pounds of marijuana (or more than 402 tons) worth an estimated street value of \$289,186,497 and arrested 137 traffickers. During the month of June, Customs agents in Florida seized 35 pounds of cocaine worth approximately \$105,000 and 367,655 pounds of marijuana worth approximately \$183,827,500. These seizures represent only the tip of the narcotics iceberg; they do not represent seizures by other Federal, State and local law enforcement agencies, nor do they represent the amount of hallucinogens, stimulants, barbituates or other dangerous drugs that have been seized by law enforcement authorities.

Clearly, if this Nation's law enforcement authorities are to perform effectively and efficiently their dangerous assignments and to place their lives on the line, then they must be provided with personnel, the equipment and the funds to compete against the sophisticated equipment of organized crime whose highly organized international criminal syndicates reach into every region of the world and whose sordid business corrupts the political, economic, social and moral fabric of the international community. Restrictions against the "mother ship" transfer of any controlled substance and the authorization of appropriations for seaborne drug interdicting resources is a step in the right direction to help impede these illicit drug trafficking operations and these provisions will go a long way in plugging certain deficiencies currently hamstringing the Coast Guard.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I commend you and your distinguished colleagues on this subcommittee for focusing attention on H.R. 13071 and on H.R. 10698, and for thinking about ways to broaden these measures. In the event that you and members of this distinguished subcommittee decide to go forward with this proposed revision, I can assure you that you can count on me to co-sponsor this legislative proposal and to support it fully. ●

FAIRNESS IN EXTENDING ERA

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, a majority of the American people are com-

mitted to the principle and the spirit of the equal rights amendment. A majority of the Members of this House share that commitment. I believe full equality for women should be assured in our Constitution.

The amending process insures full public debate of any proposed amendment and contributes to the development of a national consensus. The very requirement that three-fourths of the States must ratify the amendment increases the power of an amendment, and amendments themselves are strengthened by the rigorous procedure of amending the Constitution.

The current debate over the extension of the period for ratification of the equal rights amendments has raised the question of the effect the extension will have on the amendment itself.

The issue which will soon be before us in this House will not be whether one favors the equal rights amendment or not. The debate will not even be limited to the simple question of exemption—yea or nay.

Archie Salyards, the editorial page editor of the Duluth News-Tribune, offered a significant contribution to the debate over extension in his editorial of July 20, 1978.

That editorial argues that the equal rights amendment is so important to the American people that it merits the extension. At the same time, the importance of the amendment cannot override the principle of fairness in the process of considering the amendment.

Extension without providing for reconsideration of previous action on ERA by the States is unfair to those who oppose the amendment, he says.

Salyard's editorial is thought-provoking and I commend it to my colleagues.

I am looking forward to the House debate. I know the equal rights amendment is an issue about which my colleagues feel deeply. The depth of feeling in this House will contribute to the full discussion of the extension which will add to the confidence of the people in this House and in the process by which the Constitution is amended.

FAIR IS FAIR

It's ironic how proponents of the Equal Rights Amendment support a move that is contrary to the very title of the amendment.

The Irony—or insolence, if you prefer—came during congressional maneuvering to extend the deadline for ratification of the amendment by a required 38 states. The original seven-year limitation expires next March 22, and advocates first asked to extend it another seven years.

The House Judiciary Committee Tuesday approved a compromise extension to June 30, 1982. That, in itself, would seem reasonable.

But where the committee, and the proponents, went wrong was in taking away the equal rights of opponents to the amendment. As approved in committee, the pro-amendment forces have until 1982 to convince state legislatures to ratify the amendment, yet the anti-faction is NOT given equal time to convince legislatures which have approved the amendment to rescind what they have done.

Thirty-five states have ratified the amendment, although three later rescinded approval. The legality of the rescission option still has not been settled by Congress.

It has become obvious the nation hasn't

made up its mind yet on the merits of the amendment, at least not in a collective majority strong enough to satisfy 38 state legislatures. A few more years, or even another seven, is a small price to pay to assure the ultimate decision is acceptable to a preponderance of the American people.

Extension of the ratification deadline obviously works to the advantage of those supporting the amendment. Important, naturally, is the additional time given state legislatures to react to the wishes of a changing society—and attitudes are changing on woman's role in that society.

Equally as important, however, is the fact that while the amendment lives, it is being discussed and debated. The amendment's mere presence as a social issue perhaps is doing more to further the rights of women, and change the attitudes of men, than its quick and simple approval ever would have done.

Yes, the Equal Rights Amendment deserves a better, and longer chance. But if Congress doesn't give the amendment opponents the same rights that it gives proponents, then the amendment deserves to die. Fair is fair.

And the fair sex, if anyone, should realize that. ●

NATIONS DO NOT WANT TO BE DOMINATED BY RUSSIA

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, following World War II, we commenced a massive program of economic assistance to our former enemies, Germany and Japan. Our purpose was not only humanitarian; we sought to create strong and friendly allies in our efforts to contain the domination of Soviet Communism over smaller nations.

Over 5 years have now elapsed since American troops were withdrawn from Vietnam, and over 3 years have passed since the North Vietnamese were successful in reuniting their country.

It seems time to resume commercial and diplomatic relations with the Vietnamese.

As in the case of Germany and Japan, and certainly as in the case of Yugoslavia, our national interests are served by strengthening a nation which has no great desire to be dependent on Soviet support.

In this connection, there have been some recent newspaper articles which bear on this point. I enclose them in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, July 24, 1978]

RENEWING TIES WITH VIETNAM

(By Peter Kovler)

WASHINGTON—Now that the United States is out of Vietnam, it is time to get back in. On Sept. 14 the United States trade embargo against that country, issued by executive order in 1975, expires, forcing President Carter either to renew or cancel it. For practical strategic and moral reasons it is an ideal opportunity for the President to break with his predecessors and allow trade. It would be the beginning of a sane and civilized United States-Vietnamese relationship.

Each country would derive important economic benefits. United States self-interest would be served, according to Michael Emmons, president of the American Chamber of

Commerce in Hong Kong, because "we feel that the U.S. trade embargo on Vietnam punishes American business and not Hanol."

And for Vietnam, the new trade would spur post-war reconstruction. Without entering into the question of the United States Government's post-war promises made in Paris three years ago, American firms could aid a poor country that has been at battle for decades. Indeed recent comments by Vietnamese leaders indicate they might like United States economic ties even without direct aid from Washington.

The two countries and several American corporations could particularly benefit from closer links in the agricultural and oil industries. Vietnam now imports approximately one million tons of grain per year. Instead of buying it from the United States, they acquire it from the Soviet Union, Canada, Sweden, the European Economic Community and others. This is especially appalling, as Senator Hubert H. Humphrey pointed out one month before his death, "given our unprecedented trade deficit and our depressed prices caused by overflowing stocks."

Vietnam's oil potential may be as promising as that of any area outside the Middle East. However, according to Maurice Strong, chairman of Petro-Canada and former Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Human Environment, it is the "lack of normal relations with the United States that has constrained the pace of Vietnam's reconstruction, particularly oil exploration and development."

Strategically, it is crucial that the United States consider new East Asian conflicts and consequently become friendlier toward Vietnam. Today the primary clashes are not "yellow versus white" nor "red versus red-white" and Vietnam against Cambodia. A potential threat is that a passive American diplomacy will de facto align us with China against Vietnam; and this will force Vietnam to develop a greater dependency on the Soviet Union. By lifting the embargo, President Carter could decrease Vietnam's reliance on the Soviet Union, and eventually promote the chances for stability and peace in the area.

Morally the United States still has its post-war obligations. Not even the most gifted writer—at this late date—would dare to expound on the atrocities the United States perpetrated against Vietnam: no one wants to be reminded of the horrors. Let it suffice to say that this country acted wrongly. But now, by beginning trade and thereby permitting the Vietnamese to use some of our advanced technology, the United States can, in a small way, atone.

Proponents of a continued embargo are mostly concerned about accounting for the missing in action. The families of these men have unquestionably experienced a terrible sadness and fear; but one must seriously question whether continued strained relations will help to ferret out information about the fates of these men. Recent developments, particularly the current official Vietnamese trip to the Honolulu M.I.A. Center, seem to indicate that closer relations are more likely to bring out the truth, rather than to hide it.

Two years ago there was a consensus that the embargo should be ended. Both the House and the Senate accepted it but it was President Ford's veto that stopped the move. Now, the United States has the chance to push for a totally new sort of "Vietnamization," not based on lies and self-deception, but on an ethical and intelligent approach to Southeast Asia. At least one Congressional advocate of lifting the embargo, Representative Jonathan B. Bingham, a Democrat from New York, has indicated that there could be hearings. One can only hope that renewed Congressional pressure, along with some fresh thinking that recognizes we are no longer

fighting the Vietnam war, will compel President Carter to end this pointless restriction.

TRADE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

Most Asian nations in which American companies have substantial operations, including all members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, are moving rapidly to establish normal diplomatic and trade ties with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

Because of the embargo on U.S. trade with Vietnam, U.S. companies are increasingly finding themselves in anomalous and sometimes embarrassing situations. Two examples can demonstrate this:

(1) A U.S.-controlled company sells spare parts to an indigenous company in an ASEAN country, which then resells them to Vietnam. When the U.S. company discovers the final destination of the parts, it is compelled to refuse further orders, thus souring a long-time relationship and promoting the Asian company to turn to other suppliers, particularly from Japan or Western Europe.

(2) A U.S. bank discovers that its European subsidiary is discussing participation in a syndication to finance exports to Vietnam. The U.S. bank is forced to instruct its subsidiary to withdraw totally.

Vietnam faces severe economic difficulties, primarily resulting from extreme weather conditions and delays in restructuring society after the long war, but it is considered these difficulties will be overcome, creating the probability of Vietnam becoming one of the strongest economic forces in the region during the next decade.

Japan has established itself as Vietnam's leading non-communist trade partner, with two-way trade in 1977 estimated at US\$230 million.

Major commodities include steel, coal and marine products. Japan purchased some US\$60 million worth of Vietnamese coal last year and an agreement has been signed for the Vietnamese purchase of 200,000 tons of Japanese steel annually during 1978-1980.

In addition, Norwegian, Italian and German oil companies have been granted exploration and exploitation rights off the coast of southern Vietnam. These areas are near concessions formerly explored by US companies and in which there were indications of oil in commercially viable quantities. Vietnamese officials would like US participation.

Vietnam has successfully tapped the international financial market, raising a minimum of US\$350 million in commercial loans. This does not include government-government aid or soft loans.

There is a potential market in Vietnam for a range of US exports, including: petroleum equipment and technology; agricultural, forestry and irrigation equipment; mining machinery; fertilizer and fertilizer plants; wheat; cotton; and aircraft spare parts.

The American Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong recommends that all trade restrictions imposed by the United States on trading with Vietnam be suspended. ●

ALTERNATIVES TO ABORTION

HON. MAX BAUCUS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. Speaker, the question of abortion continues to be a hotly debated issue and will be for all times. Philosophers, physicians, lawmakers, and the clergy have for centuries, and will forever argue their positions—all feel-

ing very strongly, and few changing their mind no matter how persuasive the arguments.

Despite all this intense debate, I suspect that all of us can agree on a single basic premise: namely, no one is for abortion. No, abortion is simply a bad alternative to the more basic and infinitely more resolvable problem of pregnancies that, for any variety of reasons, are unwanted.

Abortion is no more a solution to unwanted pregnancies than war is a solution to preventing human rights violations in our world. In both cases, the easy "solution" is just as repugnant as the problem itself.

The real solution, and the challenge that must be faced by Congress—and by both sides in the abortion debate—is how we can best help to keep people from feeling backed into a corner and perceiving abortion as their only way out.

There are, in fact, many alternatives to abortion. And our responsibility in Congress is to take immediate, appropriate, and effective legislative action which will provide access to real abortion alternatives. Unfortunately, the efforts made by Congress in this area, to date, have been inexcusably inadequate.

In fiscal year 1975 the Department of Health, Education and Welfare spent about \$100 million under title X of the Public Health Service Act on family planning services. During the same time period, HEW spent \$50 million, half the amount spent for family planning, to provide payment for medicare abortions. 1976 data provided by the Allen Guttmacher Institute shows that there is one abortion for every 2.8 live births.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, our efforts have not come close to meeting the need.

There are at present several good legislative proposals pending before this Congress which would seek to reduce the incidence of abortion. Unfortunately, pending legislation doesn't do much good. Such legislation must be immediately enacted and put to work if we are seriously committed to resolving the abortion problem.

On April 26, 1978, I introduced H.R. 12400, the Alternatives to Abortion Act. My bill seeks to reduce the incidence of abortion by addressing the following four areas which significantly contribute to the high frequency of abortion in this country.

PREGNANCY DISABILITY

Some women have to work, and unfortunately, under present conditions, economics often force women to seek abortions.

47 percent of the current working force in this country is composed of women. Approximately 70 percent of these working women have to work. Most often they are either the family's sole wage earner or their husbands earn less than \$7,000 per year. When one of these women becomes pregnant, her choice becomes clear: lose several weeks or months of income and maybe her job, or have an abortion. This choice should not have to be made.

Title I of my bill prohibits sex discrim-

ination on the basis of pregnancy. It simply states that "women affected by pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions shall be treated the same for all employment-related purposes, including receipt of benefits under fringe benefit programs, as other persons not so affected but similar in their ability or inability to work." In other words, if a company has a health insurance plan and a sick-leave policy that would permit male employees to take time off for a voluntary operation, then the same alternative should be available to female employees who are pregnant and wish time off to deliver their baby.

TEENAGE PREGNANCY

Here, perhaps, lies our greatest challenge. Not only is the incidence of teenage pregnancy and abortion higher than for other age groups, but so are the risks.

One-third of all abortions in this country are performed on teenagers. Both young girls who have abortions and those who continue their pregnancies face increased health risks. The mortality rate for pregnant teenagers is significantly higher than for older mothers, as is the mortality rate for their babies.

Title II of my bill provides grants for programs which provide prenatal and postnatal health care for both the mother and the infant.

ADOPTIONS

More pregnant women would carry their babies to term if they had assurance that their babies would have secure, happy futures. Title III of my bill enhances the idea of adoption for both the mother and prospective parents.

My bill seeks to remove any financial barriers to prospective parents by calling for an allowance of an income tax deduction for all adoption expenses and providing funds to help alleviate financial obstacles which act as barriers to qualified persons seeking to adopt. In addition, my bill promotes the establishment of uniform adoption regulations and establishes a national office of adoption information and services within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Office of Child Development. H.R. 12400 also seeks to eliminate black-market baby selling.

FAMILY PLANNING

The Federal Government has in fact made some progress in the field of family planning. However, in view of the number of unwanted pregnancies, it is clear that more must be done. Title IV of H.R. 12400 authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for voluntary family planning projects, research and human production, and for community-based informational and educational services about family planning.

Though H.R. 12400, the Alternatives to Abortion Act, only touches the tip of the iceberg in terms of what can and must be done to reduce the incidence of abortion in the country, it will help. And because it will help, this and similar pieces of legislation must be enacted.

I urge my colleagues to remember that we ultimately share the same concern and the same responsibility, and I ask that we all turn seriously to resolving the problem by providing realistic alternatives to abortion. Only then will women not seek abortions.●

PRODUCTIVITY: ONE U.S. COMPANY'S CONTRIBUTION

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. CORCORAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, I was invited to speak in Aurora, Ill., before local 1942 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. This IBEW local consists of employees of Western Electric, a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Bell System. The statement made at the meeting described the record of success enjoyed by the Bell System. I also discussed the importance of labor-management cooperation and productivity in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the crucial importance of productivity to our overall economic position in the world today, I would like to share with my colleagues the bulk of the text of my Aurora statement made before IBEW local 1942:

In preparing for this meeting, I did some research on your industry and found that the Bell System and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers have a record of which you can all be proud. In fact, your very existence as a private enterprise reflects favorably on you because the telecommunications industry of most countries is controlled by the Government. Although the telecommunications industry is part of the private sector in the United States, it is closely regulated by the Government. Prices which are charged, services offered, and profits earned are all regulated by the Government. I am certainly not an advocate of Government regulation and am happy to note the success of your organization despite some such regulation.

Your success is borne out by several impressive statistics:

First. In 1977 the Bell System handled 10 percent more long distance calls than in 1976 and it added more telephones than in any previous year.

Second. The Bell System used 11 percent less energy in 1977 than in 1973, although its volume of business has grown 33 percent. Considering the extent of the energy problem in this country, this is a remarkable achievement.

Third. Ninety-five percent of American households now have telephone service.

Another item worth noting is the awarding of a nearly half-billion dollar contract to Western Electric to furnish and maintain 300 microwave radio relay stations in Saudi Arabia. In view of our

country's poor balance of trade record, such an accomplishment on the part of Western Electric is good news indeed. The Department of Commerce just released figures which show that U.S. imports of oil have now been exceeded by our imports of machinery and transport equipment and manufactured goods. The trend of our increasingly relying on imports is a trend which has complications for all of us, particularly in terms of jobs in America.

Our increasing reliance on imported goods is due in part to bad trade and tax policies in the United States over a long period of time. This must be changed, and soon.

Moreover, the Bell System's productivity record has been a good one—during the period of 1970-76, Bell's productivity rate increased nearly 5 percent each year. One relevant statistic is that in 1967 there were 130 telephones per employee and now there are 167 per employee.

My interest in meaningful labor and management productivity is longstanding. In fact, just a year ago, I sponsored a Labor-Management Seminar on Productivity here in Aurora. We had over 60 leaders of labor and management from throughout the 15th congressional district in attendance. We heard speakers discuss ways in which productivity as well as the quality of working life can be improved—and improved to the benefit of both labor and management. For instance, we heard from representatives of labor and management from a plant in Wisconsin discuss how they contributed to implementation of a profit-sharing plan which has resulted in increased productivity as well as bonuses for the employees. We also heard from a representative of an independent Federal agency—the National Center for Productivity and Quality of Working Life—which is the Federal agency primarily concerned with productivity in the United States today. We also heard from a professor from the Illinois Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations in Champaign. The point of that seminar was to get labor and management together to discuss mutual problems and possible solutions in a way which would supplement collective bargaining agreements. Productivity means "working smarter, not working harder" and it is something in which we all have a stake.●

FROM OLYMPIC DORMITORY TO PRISON: BAD IDEA?

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1977 when we were considering a \$22 million supplemental appropriation for the Bureau of Prisons to build a youth facility at Lake Placid, N.Y. I strongly objected. The Bureau of Prisons was granted these

funds to construct a facility which could be used in the 1980 Olympic games at Lake Placid for athletes' housing and which following the games would be converted to a prison for 500 youth offenders.

I fully appreciated the need for after-use of the facility for athletes housing since the Olympic games represent a substantial investment of taxpayers money. Yet it was and remains of great concern to me that this decision was made without the benefit of full and open discussion. The Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties, and the Administration of Justice, on which I serve has held extensive hearings over the years on both corrections policy and construction.

One major issue which emerges from a discussion of prison construction is the location of facilities. The Director of the Bureau of Prisons told the subcommittee in 1975 that:

Our philosophy is that new institutions should be as close as we can humanly get them to where the offenders are from and where we can find staff and other resources.

The subcommittee was aware of the Bureau's search for a site to house young offenders from the northeast region. Since these offenders would be primarily from metropolitan areas of the northeast it was expected that efforts to find a site would focus on metropolitan areas. It was thus most disturbing to me to learn of the plan for Lake Placid. The inmates for this facility will come from New York City which is 300 miles away as well as Boston, Baltimore, Philadelphia and Washington, D.C. which represent an even greater distance.

It is well recognized and substantiated that in working with youth offenders we should maximize familial and community ties which may constitute the single most important link to a law-abiding life. Along with that consideration, I have concerns about the recruitment of staff for this remote location and access to resources for contractual work and study release programs. None of these concerns were addressed when this decision was made.

I commend to my colleagues the following article of William Raspberry on this matter:

FROM OLYMPIC DORMITORY TO PRISON: BAD IDEA?

They're building dormitory facilities at Lake Placid, N.Y., to house some 1,800 young athletes for the 1980 winter Olympics. That utilization will last for a couple of weeks.

Then the "Olympic Village" will become the newest federal prison.

The idea either makes sense, or it instantly appalls. Argument—of which there is plenty—seems to change no one's mind.

The Olympic people are, of course, pleased. They get a free ride out of the deal, since the U.S. Bureau of Prisons is paying the entire \$22-million cost of the facility, including its post-Olympic conversion from the dormitory to jail.

The people of Lake Placid, according to Rep. Robert C. McEwen (R), who represents that Adirondack district, also are pleased. With the highest unemployment rate in the state of New York, they naturally welcome the prospect of 225 prison jobs at an average pay of \$15,000.

And the Bureau of Prisons, while acknowledging that the site runs counter to the bureau's own guidelines consider the dormitory-turned-prison a pretty good deal.

On the other side are a host of church-related groups, civil-rights organizations, a number of ad hoc bodies and, of course, the National Moratorium on Prison Construction.

Perhaps their most telling argument consists of quotes from the 1967 report of the president's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. For instance: "New institutions should . . . be relatively small, and located as close as possible to the areas from which [they draw their] inmates, probably in or near a city rather than in a remote location."

Or from the United Nations' standards for the treatment of prisoners: "The treatment of prisoners should emphasize not their exclusion from the community but their continuing part in it. . . . Special attention shall be paid to the maintenance and improvement of such relations between a prisoner and his family as are desirable in the best interests of both."

The Lake Placid facility may meet the "relatively small" criterion, with an anticipated 500 inmates, but at a distance of nearly 300 miles from the nearest metropolitan area it will hardly be "as close as possible" to the homes of most of its inmates—most probably New York City.

The fact that almost the entire prison staff will consist of Lake Placid residents hardly emphasizes the inmates' continuing part in their community. Nor will family relations be improved by the fact that the area is served by a single bus a day or that it has hardly any low-cost housing for visitors.

"I agree that this is not the ideal location," says Michael Aun, a spokesman for the Bureau of Prisons. "Our own guidelines say we should build close to where the inmates live, which means the big cities. But every time we try to locate in a big city, we get thrown out—for instance, San Diego, in 1975. Nobody wants us around."

Location aside, said Aun, the Lake Placid facility will come close to being an ideal prison. "It will be modern and unobtrusive, with private rooms rather than concrete and iron cages. It's true that it will be more than 250 miles from New York City but, then, because of the shortage of facilities, we have federal prisoners from the Northeast located as far away as Sandstone, Minn.

"Lake Placid may be inconvenient for families in New York or Boston, but it sure as hell beats Sandstone."

According to Aun, many of the people who are opposing this particular location are in fact opposed to any new prison construction whatever. "Well, the fact is that we have to replace some of the existing facilities. McNeil Island (Washington) is falling apart. We'd like to close Leavenworth. Atlanta needs to be closed or else completely redone. Danbury (Conn.), the only facility in the Northeast, has 767 inmates in space designed for 500."

Aun's explanation won't cut much ice with those who are convinced that the whole proposal is stupid at best, a political boondoggle at worst. From their point of view, the Lake Placid location has less to do with the needs of the Bureau of Prisons than the fact that Lake Placid needs the jobs and income that the prison will provide.

Aun won't deny political influence, principally that of McEwen. But he points out that the rules require that there be a post-Olympic use for any facilities built for the Olympics. "Some of the church groups are

trying to promote the idea of a permanent Olympic training center for Lake Placid," he said, "but so far, there have been no takers."

All that may be true. But for anyone who believes, as the bureau itself ostensibly believes, that prisons shouldn't be isolated, who believes that having a guard force consisting of small-town whites for a population of big-city black inmates was one of the sparks for Attica, it is hard to consider the Lake Placid prison as other than a rotten idea. ●

TITO: DEVISING A FORMULA FOR WORLD PEACE

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, Yugoslavia under Marshal Tito symbolizes the importance of the nonaligned nations to world peace.

The responsible leadership of Marshal Tito has ended the fratricidal civil wars of ethnically diverse Yugoslavia and has brought a degree of stability previously unknown to this region.

In an address to delegates of the non-aligned nations meeting in Belgrade, Tito warned against the dangers of bloc confrontations and involvement of non-aligned nations in these conflicts. Non-alignment is the only possible alternative to confrontations, international tension and ultimately new military conflagrations.

In words which the entire world should heed, Tito stated in unequivocal terms, "Sectarianism of any kind is alien to nonalignment. Divisions based on ideological, religious, and other criteria and motivations are unacceptable, no matter what slogans they hide behind."

These words of reason emanate from a leader who knows too well the horror of ethnic wars in his own country and of major armed conflict.

He was a leader in the fight against Nazi oppression in the greatest military confrontation the world has ever known.

I would like to share with my colleagues in this House a report of Marshal Tito's address which appeared in the New York Times, July 26, 1978.

His speech represents a forceful denunciation of the Soviet-Cuban intervention in Africa. That kind of intervention represents a major threat to the philosophy of nonalignment. At the same time, the Soviet-Cuban offensive threatens to involve the superpowers—the United States and Russia—and their allies in direct conflict.

We have come closer to that confrontation within the past year in Africa than we have at any time since the Cuban missile crisis in 1962.

Marshal Tito's statement comes at a most appropriate time for world peace.

The article follows:

TITO IN WARNING ON ROLE OF CUBA IN
AFRICAN STRIFE

(By Flora Lewis)

BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA, July 25.—President Tito warned countries professing nonalignment today against letting their disputes, especially in Africa, develop into East-West power struggles through involvement of outside forces.

While he named no countries, Marshal Tito's speech, at the opening session of the conference of nonalignment nations, was clearly aimed at Soviet-backed Cuban intervention in Africa.

"There is every indication that we have again arrived at a dangerous cross-roads," he said.

President Tito called on all members of the nonaligned movement, which he helped to establish at the start of the 1960's, to "devise effective means" for settling their disputes "peacefully and democratically." Otherwise, he continued, "new forms of colonial presence, of bloc dependence, foreign influence and domination" may be imposed.

ZAIRE AND ANGOLA REPORT ACCORD

Just after he spoke, Zaire's Foreign Minister, Umba-Di-Lutete, disclosed that his country had reached an agreement with neighboring Angola, which served as the base for an invasion of Zaire's Shaba Province last spring by Katangan rebels. The invasion gave threat briefly of turning into a conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The agreement was reached at a meeting of President Mobutu Sese Seko of Zaire and President Agostinho Neto of Angola, with the help of President Sékou Touré of Guinea. It was drafted last week at the meeting of the Organization of African Unity in Khartoum, the Sudan.

The accord commits each side to prevent the use of its territory for armed attack on the other and for the disarming of rebel groups—such as the Cuban-trained Katangese who invaded Shaba Province.

A commission made up of representatives of Cameroon, Nigeria, the Sudan and Rwanda was established to make sure the accord is carried out, he said.

The Zairian Foreign Minister said the two sides had not discussed the presence of Cuban troops in Angola because "we don't care where they are so long as they don't interfere in our affairs; it would be against the principle of nonalignment for us to say who can be in Angola."

By the same token, he indicated, Zaire made no promises about how long a joint African force, hastily assembled to pacify Shaba, would remain. But the idea of a "pan-African intervention force" has now been abandoned, he said, and it is up to the new commission to make sure that the Zaire-Angola settlement, now "on paper," is put fully into effect.

The reconciliation has already reached a point where the Zairian officials congratulated Foreign Minister Paulo Teixeira Jorge of Angola on his speech today. The address echoed several of President Tito's points, calling for reassertion of nonalignment principles "as an active factor in international détente" and a safeguard for "territorial integrity."

AN EXAMPLE OF TITO'S STRATEGY

The Zaire-Angola agreement was one obvious example of Marshal Tito's strategy favoring negotiated settlements of the many third-world conflicts before they can lead to renewal of the cold war.

Delegations were present from the rebel movements of three countries of southern Africa where white regimes are being challenged by black forces, conflicts that could lead to broad Soviet-supported intervention and Western reaction.

While President Tito said at one point that "it is high time" the "anachronistic situation" of colonialism and racism in Africa be ended, he also seemed to be referring to the explosive situation in southern Africa. He said that "realistic possibilities" for peaceful solutions "represent not interference but offers of good offices."

Marshal Tito's carefully worded but direct statement went considerably beyond what the African countries were able to endorse last week at their Khartoum meeting, after disagreements on the Cuban and Soviet-bloc role prevented denunciation of foreign military intervention in Africa.

COLONIALISM AND HEGEMONY

While he attacked "new forms of colonialism," Marshal Tito also criticized "hegemony," the term the Yugoslavs and Chinese use for Soviet attempts at domination, and insisted that détente was "a universal process that must extend to all areas of the world."

Nonalignment is "the only possible alternative to bloc confrontations, tensions and the dangers of a new military conflagration," President Tito said.

The definition of nonalignment, particularly in the wake of Cuba's intervention in Africa and Vietnam's joining the Communist bloc's economic organization, Comecon, had been expected to be a major controversy of this meeting.

Some countries, led by Cuba, had been asserting that nonalignment must mean adherence to the "progressive" group of countries, in effect those that are Marxist oriented.

TITO SEEKS TO PRE-EMPT THE CUBANS

In several different ways, President Tito sought to pre-empt the Cuban insistence. He said nonalignment was "pledged" to resist imposition of social and political systems or ideologies. "The nonaligned countries must allow no one to jeopardize the solidarity of their movement and blunt the edge of its basic orientation and unity of action," he said. "They must allow no one to dilute the policy of nonalignment."

"Sectorialism of any kind is alien to nonalignment," he continued. "Divisions based on ideological, religious and other criteria and motivations are unacceptable, no matter what slogans they hide behind."

The Yugoslav effort to resist direct or indirect Soviet pressures on the third world was obviously well-prepared.

NORTH KOREAN MORE SPECIFIC

The North Korean Foreign Minister, Ho Dam, read a message from President Kim Il Sung that, surprisingly, was even a little more specific than Marshal Tito in rejecting the Soviet-Cuban stand.

It said that "the nonaligned countries should not classify the member countries into opposed groups arguing which nation is progressive and which is not, and not tolerate any foreign forces to interfere and dominate the nonaligned countries."

If a compromise on the basic issue of Cuba's role has already been reached, which seemed possible, it was reflected in President Tito's explicit reference to Havana as the site of next year's scheduled nonaligned summit meeting. Prospects of a confrontation here would have made that unlikely.

If the 86 year-old Yugoslav leader's efforts to restore a unified overall position among the nonaligned countries are effective, they could bring a subtle but crucial shift in the trend of world politics and a new obstacle to Soviet expansion without direct United States involvement.

NO DRAMA AND LITTLE COLOR

Today's opening session provided no drama and little color. There were no attacks on the United States. Most of the delegates wore Western clothes, and many of them, as dele-

gates to the United Nations, had long since grown accustomed to meeting each other in elaborate conference halls—where speeches are made in public and log-rolling deals are worked out in private.

Marshal Tito, limping on a cane and reading his speech while seated, looked fit otherwise and he spoke in a firm voice. He wore his customary ice-cream linen summer suit.

As he noted, except for the issues of southern Africa and the Middle East, the struggles that brought the original group of 25 nations together 17 years ago had mostly been overcome.

But now, the enlarged group of 87 member countries, 20 observers, including four liberation movements, seven guests and one country with "special status," Belize, is split by a series of rivalries, with several of the countries battling each other. ●

FREEDOM FOR THE INDIVIDUAL

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, appreciation for one's country generally increases with time and experience. Yet at 15 years old, Sara Shulsinger reminds us of a fundamental, and too often forgotten, reason for our Nation's success: America's people are free. They are free in part because America as a country is free from foreign constraints and outside domination.

A first prize winner for the second year in a row of the Palos Verdes Peninsula Independence Day essay contest, 1978, Sara observes in her essay that for an individual to be free, he or she must live in a free land—an appropriate reminder on an Independence Day.

The essay follows:

THE INDIVIDUAL NATION

The United States of America has a long history of successful foreign relations. This was most likely inspired by three documents: the Declaration of Independence, George Washington's Farewell Address, and the Monroe Doctrine. These all discouraged American intervention in international political trials and tribulations. Thus the United States has managed to remain independent of foreign domination, and this status as an individual nation gives its people more choices.

The first step away from outside complications was the Declaration of Independence. America's forefathers foresaw from experience the dangers of involvement with other nations, and so they stated twenty-seven specific reasons why the United States must avoid foreign control. The folly of having another nation ruling the United States becomes clear through these words.

And then in September, 1796, George Washington, with the help of his friend, Alexander Hamilton, compiled his views concerning future foreign policy into his valedictory message. He believed that it would be a wise America that would avoid either patronizing or disfavoring any other country. Unfortunately, Washington's advice has not been followed to perfection, but this nation is still one of the most independent ever.

A third early American document, the Monroe Doctrine, addressed the problem in a different manner. James Monroe neatly slipped into his seventh annual message a few sentences which said that the United States had kept out of European affairs, but

if any European power antagonized an existing country of the Western Hemisphere or tried to colonize this area any further, the United States would take action. He reinforced this statement in his eighth message, proving that no matter how European officials screamed, this statement would have all of America to back it up.

And America has backed it up. And yet it has managed to remain on excellent terms with most nations throughout the world. The United States has mutual tariff agreements with many major countries, including the entire United Kingdom and Japan, thus exposing its people to a wider world. Therefore individuality is encouraged and American residents have greater tolerance and eagerness for what is new and different. Since the United States is an individual, individual rights are protected. ●

COMMEMORATION OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent commemoration of Captive Nations Week, I wish to insert several formal proclamations issued during the past week which display the nationwide interest on behalf of those people held under Red dictatorship. I respectfully direct the attention of the Members to the proclamations issued by Mayor E. Lee Comer, Jr., of the city of Independence, Mo., and by Gov. John D. Rockefeller IV of the State of West Virginia:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the imperialistic politics of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjection and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Byelorussia, Romania, Georgia, North Korea, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, Cambodia, South Vietnam, Laos, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and human rights and to the people of the United States as the leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayer, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of the captive nations.

Now, therefore, I, E. Lee Comer, Jr., Mayor of the City of Independence, do hereby proclaim the week of July 16-22, 1978, as Captive Nations Week in Independence, Missouri, and call upon our citizens to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the City to be affixed this 16th day of July, 1978.

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the imperialistic politics of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of many countries; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and human rights and to the people of the United States as the leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayer, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of the captive nations.

Now, therefore, I, John D. Rockefeller IV, Governor of the State of West Virginia, do hereby proclaim the week of July 16 through July 22, 1978, as Captive Nations Week in West Virginia, and call upon our citizens to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State to be affixed. ●

FDA'S PROPOSED RESTRICTIONS ON ANTIBIOTICS

HON. CHARLES ROSE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, the antibiotics issue arose from an incident in Great Britain 10 years ago where a tolerance problem occurred that resulted in the issuance of the Swann report. This report led to government-restricted use of antibiotics in animal feeds. Since then a recent Braude study from the University of Pennsylvania has examined its effect and concluded there was no converse improvement in human health from the British restrictions as one would expect. An article outlining subsequent British problems is attached for your information.

The Canadian Health Protection Branch, Canada's FDA equivalent, when faced with similar requests for restrictions, has admitted to inconclusive results of research that cannot be objectively measured. I regard these remarks as significant of understanding the ramifications of the proposed restrictions if they remain unsubstantiated by scientific consensus. Part III will present a report by the Watt Publishing Co., "Antibiotic in Animal Feeds: Risk vs. Benefit," outlining the history of the proposed restrictions.

MANY PROBLEMS IN BRITISH ANTIBIOTIC POLICY

(By Rex Wilmore)

The rosy picture painted by British authorities and even British pigmen with regard to experience with very restricted use of drugs

in hog feeds changes a great deal if you really dig into the subject in conversations with pig farmers.

The British experience during the past 4½ years without antibacterial drugs in hog feed is used as an example by those advocating similar regulations in the U.S. Indications are that things are going smoothly in the British pig industry. At least that's what American visitors report and what British authorities say. Even British pigmen claim they've had no problems doing without drugs. Yet when you get out on pig farms, talk with the owners and managers, and really dig into their programs, you find a completely different story. They do have problems with their prescription approach to drug use. And there are indications that U.S. problems would be much worse under the same restrictions.

Even though they voice overwhelming acceptance of drug restrictions and regulations, British producers often use the few drugs available in massive amounts and in combinations U.S. producers would not even consider. They're trying to squeeze every bit of efficiency possible out of their feed, and they're trying to head off, or treat, disease outbreaks.

Use of broad-spectrum drugs in livestock feeds has been under fire in the U.S. for four years—some drugs and combinations have already been taken off the market, and others are under a threat of removal. The British regulations, and results, are held up as strong evidence that you wouldn't suffer if your drugs for growth promotion and disease prevention were put under prescription to "safeguard" man and animals.

Manufacturers are working frantically to provide proof that feeding antibiotics and similar antibacterials doesn't pose a health hazard to humans or animals to head off the threat. The basic concern is that continuous feeding of drugs will result in emergence of bacteria resistant to those drugs—which no one denies. But the possibility of illness in man or animals—illness which couldn't be effectively treated because of the resistance—is the point of contention. FDA and some medical authorities feel it is possible, so FDA has required that companies invest millions in research to prove that it doesn't happen. Other points are involved, but the key question is whether there's a danger to man.

Experience and research to date indicate there isn't, but the research is continuing anyway. No rulings or decisions by FDA are expected in the near future, but that doesn't mean the threat is lessened.

The United Kingdom restricted most effective drugs used for disease prevention and growth promotion 4½ years ago. They're now fed only for treatment, on prescription from a veterinarian. The British pig industry did not suffer a disaster when the switch was made, and seems on first look to have few problems because of drug regulations. But they do have problems. More important, their pig industry is considerably different from our own—and some of those differences make it possible for them to do without broad-spectrum drugs where U.S. producers could not. FDA observers, not familiar with our hog industry, who visited the U.K. seem to have overlooked these differences. When they're taken into account, the idea of restricting drugs here produces a multitude of problems.

There are three differences:

1. The tendency in Britain is to specialization, either producing weaners, or fattening weaners. Farrow-to-finish units are much less common than in the U.S. On top of that, producers concentrate on producing one type of market pig. This specialization produces a high degree of managerial skill, but in a limited scope—a case of doing an excellent job within one segment of the pork industry. The American producer, by contrast, is apt to be working in all phases of production, spreading his management

knowledge and abilities thinner than his British counterpart.

2. Size of unit is a second big difference. U.K. units tend to be smaller than those in the U.S. Yet labor is more available, and labor costs lower, so the U.K. pigman has more manpower available. He lavishes more care, observation and management time on his pigs than the typical American hogman can. At the same time, the British pigman or manager has fewer other enterprises to worry about—those working with pigs generally specialize only in that phase of agriculture, so the manager focuses more management on his pig enterprise.

That means he can, and does shoot for maximum production per unit—sow, pen, whatever—and maximum quality. The American, because he's working in more areas and stretching his management thinner, tends to settle for less than top output. Instead, he boosts the number of units to increase production. The end result is the same—more pigs and more profits. But the manner of getting there is quite different.

3. The U.K. pigman has an effective, low-cost alternate for growth promotion in copper sulfate. U.S. producers have nothing available to replace growth-promoting antibiotics, while the U.K. pigman did. Copper consistently gives between 10 percent and 15 percent improvement in feed efficiency under British conditions. It performs much the same growth promotion function for the British producer that low-level antibiotics fill in the U.S. It has been available since 1958.

Because of the cost differences, British pigmen had already begun switching away from antibiotics for growth promotion before use of drugs was restricted. When they lost most drugs, copper took up much of the slack, making the transition to prescription use of drugs a relatively painless one. "Without copper sulfate, we would have had a much different situation, with more problems," says Dr. Dick Melrose, chief veterinary surgeon of Britain's Meat and Livestock Commission.

Copper sulfate is approved for use in the U.S. at low levels as a trace mineral but is not approved at high levels for growth stimulation or disease prevention, and it is not considered likely that it will become available as a feed additive at high levels.

Companies are not likely to spend the funds which would be necessary to develop the environmental impact data required by the Environmental Protection Agency, especially in view of the EPA's attitude with regard to potential buildup of copper in the soil as a result of spreading manure from copper-fed pigs. Another deterrent is the fact that there would be little opportunity for a company to recover the large expenditures required to clear use of copper sulfate in hog feeds, since no license for exclusive sale of the material could be obtained, and anyone could reap the benefits of the developmental expenditures. Use of copper sulfate in hog feeds was cleared in Britain before the environmental era and the British have taken a much more lenient view of buildup of copper in the soil than has the U.S. EPA.

Better management was supposed to take up some of the slack left when drug use was restricted in Britain. And there's no doubt that successful pig farmers in Britain have intensified their management. "Antibiotics in the past were used to overcome bad management," says Dr. Nick Galbraith, Newbury veterinarian. "General management of pig units now is far superior to that of five years ago, before the restrictions."

Yet better management hasn't solved many of the health problems. "Poorer managers are now on antibiotics at some state of production all the time," says Dick Loane, technical manager of the pig division of BOCM-Silcock, largest feed manufacturer in

the U.K. "The good ones with tighter controls have problems, but nothing that they cannot overcome. But there are very few pig farmers who at some time don't have to bring in medicated feed or medicate through the water."

They've found that management can only do so much. Then the pigman has to have disease prevention and/or treatment available. Even good managers are already frequent users of drugs at therapeutic levels. Larger units are stretching manpower and management thinner, just as in the U.S. The result is a continuing health problem, as visits with farmers demonstrate.

Brian Seife of Aldemoore Farm provides a good example of what can happen. While he's unable to purchase drugs or medicated feed "off the shelf," his problem is such that he's using a routine treatment program. It differs only from that of many American pork producers in that he has to obtain a prescription from his veterinarian and work through red tape to medicate his herd.

He runs a 200-sow herd, farrowing ten sows a week. He's an excellent manager as shown by his records—an average of just under 20 pigs per sow per year, including replacement gilts and open sows. He sold an average 9.48 pigs per litter in the latest six-month period, all sold at 60 lbs. as weaners.

But he has one problem: "We produce a good pig to weaning with no trouble," he explains. "Then all hell breaks loose. I don't know if it's management or what. But until we find what it is, we must have antibiotics in feed to do our job. Antibiotics are our cover."

Seife's problem is the immediate 15 days after weaning. In early 1974, just after he'd doubled herd size to the present 200 sows, his problems began: Pigs were scouring badly, stopped growing and just looked rough. At the time, he was feeding a post-weaning ration containing copper sulfate and virginiamycin. He got a prescription from his vet and had his feed company add 200 gm./ton of Aureomycin to the post-weaning feed. "That was effective for awhile—maybe it was the weather or something, but it quit working."

He muddled along for several months with nothing other than the two growth promoters in the ration, plus injections and water medication as needed. Then he made the decision to pull out virginiamycin from all his rations, which appeared to make no difference in performance, or in his scouring problem. At that point, someone—he doesn't remember who—suggested he try Quixalud, a non-antibiotic effective against E. coli and salmonella, which is cleared for growth promotion at 200 gm./ton and for therapeutic use on prescription at 600 gm.

Seife's veterinarian provided a prescription for the special mix required for a 600 gm. level, his feed company provided the medicated feed, and he's been using it for the 15 days after weaning with every batch of pigs since. It has brought the problem under control, as several other drugs might have done at the therapeutic level.

But the important point is that now, therapeutic treatment is a routine part of Seife's operation. He makes sure not to run out of the special mix, and as added protection, keeps a 5-lb. can of material on hand, just in case.

"This hasn't solved the problem, but it has helped," he says.

Martin Oatley finds himself in much the same situation as Seife. His problem is a combination of gut edema and E. coli scouring, however. "It became a problem last January," he explains. "We had had some problem before, but in January it became serious. We immediately began using Terramycin in water, on prescription, but it did no good. Then we went to furazolidone in the water, then in the feed when we could get it."

"That seemed to help the problem a lot, but after three months the treatment suddenly became ineffective. So we stopped using it. We used Tylan some during this same period. Then the problem cleared up for awhile, only to reappear later. We don't know what's causing it, but now as soon as we see a problem coming on, we begin a treatment program that seems to work."

The current program Oatley is using goes this way: As soon as he sees a scouring or edema problem, every pig in a pen (or all pigs weaned at the same time) gets an injection of ½ cc of Tribriksen (trimethoprim and sulphadiazine) every day for 3 days. In addition, neomycin is added to the feed for that pen or group of pigs for six days. The medicated feed is not premixed, nor is it kept on hand. Instead, Oatley's vet trusts him to keep a supply of neomycin on hand.

Whenever pigs start to break, he mixes up a batch of medicated feed in a 5-gallon bucket. This is a crude and inaccurate procedure, but one that works well for Oatley. Without it, he doubts he would have been able to survive through last year's rough economic situation. And today, it's a treatment he uses on almost every group of pigs.

In this case, because he's unable to pick a ready-mixed feed off the shelf, Oatley is using a program that's both time-consuming and not up to the standards he sets for the rest of his operation. Yet it's the only thing he's found that works, and he plans to stick with it as long as it does work. He guesses that regular feeding of a broad-spectrum antibiotic would solve his problem, but that's illegal.

Oatley also uses a heavily medicated diet from weaning on. His normal ration contains zinc bacitracin, arsenic acid and copper sulfate at maximum levels cleared for growth promotion. But this combination does nothing against his scouring, and other products aren't easily available. So he has to follow his program.

There are other problems with the prescription concept, too. Jeremy Skipper of Pettings Court Farm is one of the sharpest hogmen you'll meet anywhere, and an excellent manager by any standards. Until recently, he was running a 100-sow farrow to finish unit by himself, but has recently added a full-time man. One measure of his ability: Pigs reared per sow per year averages over 20 since he began the unit, and in one year he topped 24. His death loss from farrowing to 60 lbs. runs 0.9 pig per litter, including stillborn pigs. He feeds no drugs normally.

Skipper's problem came on suddenly on a Wednesday. Normally, he has no scouring problem at all in his flat-deck post-weaning pens (weaning is at three weeks). That Wednesday evening, he noticed a bit of scouring, but nothing serious. The next morning, he had dead pigs, so he called the veterinarian. The veterinarian took swabs from the pigs and recommended adding Terramycin to the drinking water, pending culture and sensitivity test results.

Skipper's unit is geared for water medication, with tanks for each bank of nursery pens. So it was no problem to medicate through the water, except for coming back out every four hours to let in more water and add new medication. But Terramycin didn't help at all, and pigs continued to die. Late Friday evening, the vet called back with the test results. The problem was an E. coli that's susceptible to furazolidone, but the vet had none on hand. Even though the next day was Saturday and it's normally impossible to obtain something like this on Saturday, the vet did locate a supply and delivered it Saturday afternoon. It went straight into the drinking water and by Sunday the scouring was under control. But Skipper was still going to the unit every four hours to add new medication.

Net loss to date: 13 pigs in a unit where he'd had no death loss previously.

"That same Saturday, we started working to get our starter-creep ration medicated with furazolidone," Skipper says. "I had a prescription, so that was no problem. But because it is a special mix, it had to be mixed at the BOCM-Silcock plant at Liverpool. I had to order 2½ tons minimum, and then, even though I work very closely with BOCM, it took two weeks for the special mix to arrive. So it cost me 13 dead pigs, plus more feed than I needed, at a higher price than I wanted to pay, to get the problem under control."

Two weeks is a bit longer than normal for obtaining a special feed mix, say feed company officials. But even at best, it takes 5 to 7 days from the time the order is placed. Plus however long it takes the veterinary surgeon to determine what drug to prescribe. The minimum required per order varies with the feed company and the mill at which it is mixed. But the bare minimum seems to be 2½ tons of complete feed. Farmers who mix their own feed don't have this problem of course. They simply obtain the drug from their veterinarian (or a pharmacist), and mix it up themselves.

The British do have some antibacterials readily available in feed—drugs that are classified as unrestricted—but they're used only for growth promotion, providing little if any therapeutic or preventative value.

"The only feed additive drugs we have readily available, we have because they're not very effective," says Dick Loane of BOCM-Silcock. "Only one has any action against gram negative bacteria—which are the ones we need to affect. The others don't do much. Most give only 1 percent or 2 percent in efficiency, which is scarcely worth the cost. But if we could use broad-spectrum antibiotics with copper, we would get twice the response in growth and feed efficiency."

All antibacterials are available for therapeutic use on prescription, of course. But they're available in feed only on special order, in minimum amounts of 2½ tons generally. And obtaining them involves waiting for the order to be made and delivered—a long wait during a serious disease outbreak.

There are other problems with the system, as well. Obtaining a prescription is ordinarily no big problem. But it can mean a veterinary call that would be unnecessary otherwise—just one more added expense. And there's a black market of sorts in some antibiotics. Although it's difficult to learn details, many veterinarians admit to having seen bags of restricted drugs at pig units they visit.

It's obvious to the American observer that the U.K. approach to limiting use of broad-spectrum drugs has created difficulties for producers. While they're not insurmountable problems for the most part, and can be lived with with no great expense, the same would not be the case in the United States.

In the first place, the American hog producer would have no efficient alternative for growth promotion—he has become largely dependent on antibiotics. Copper sulfate allowed the British to go from wide use of drugs to a very limited use without the farmer suffering economically. American producers would suddenly find themselves with no growth promotants, and a subsequent drop in performance, production and profits.

In some respects, converting to prescription on therapeutic and prophylactic drugs such as Aureo-SP-250 and Tylan-Sulfa would be a much harder blow to American producers. While they would be available on prescription, that would mean most producers would not be able to use them until a problem had shown up and could be diagnosed. This would likely mean increased pig mortality, followed by lower rates of

gain and feed efficiency, all piled on top of a more severe disease situation.

Size would also be a problem. Larger British units are having some health problems, in spite of their more intensive management. Most felt the problems were due to management—after they'd supposedly tightened down on management, facilities, and other factors that are supposed to make it easier to do without drugs. So it would seem that the average American producer could look forward to problems, as well, while the large unit would face a great many problems.

There's no doubt that U.S. use of drugs overcomes lack of management time. But as common as scours, pneumonia and other health problems are now, it's almost impossible to visualize what would happen without the products we now depend on to keep these under control. Certainly restrictions on drug use would lead to smaller units, an increase in therapeutic treatment, higher costs of production and less efficient use of feed, higher death loss, and a higher labor requirement.

Given restrictions on drugs such as those in the U.K., American hogmen would find themselves using more feed and capital to produce fewer slaughter hogs in smaller units at a higher cost. Learning to do that would provide very expensive lessons for pork producers.

Dick Loane of BOCM-Silcock says, "I've seen the U.S. situation, and would not swap our setup for yours. You use such massive amounts of antibiotics that if you dropped them, you would have a catastrophe." ●

THE CAREER WOMAN IN GOVERNMENT: WHAT IS HER FUTURE?

HON. GLADYS NOON SPELLMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mrs. SPELLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of interest and emphasis, these days on "upward mobility" for women, both in government and in the private sector. For this reason, I would like to share with my colleagues a recent speech by Alan K. Campbell, Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, before the National Council of Career Women. Mr. Campbell outlined the reform legislation now before the Congress and commented on the measures the Commission was taking or drafting, to make the Federal career service more "hospitable" to the talents of women. The National Council of Career Women is a nonprofit membership organization providing career guidance and development for women in order to make them better prepared for "upward mobility."

The speech follows:

THE CAREER WOMAN IN GOVERNMENT: WHAT IS HER FUTURE?

I very much appreciate the opportunity to talk with you about the future of career women in government.

Any consideration, of course, of women in government must be based on two sides of an equation: the individual initiative required to develop, to learn, to grow, and, the employers' responsibility—in this case, the Federal Government—to supply opportunities, training, and rewards.

Focusing on the employer's part of the equation I will discuss here some programs already underway, and the President's proposals for personnel reform and reorganiza-

tion—what these mean to you as a career woman, and as a concerned citizen.

It is a truism that the government as employer must fulfill special roles which the private-sector employer need not consider. Among these, sometimes acknowledged, sometimes not, is government's role as a model employer. To take just one example, quite clearly, the government has no business prescribing employment standards in the private sector which it flaunts in its own personnel management.

It would appear, however, that government has often failed in the model role. At best, it has been a reflection of its times, and continues to reflect its times.

A special report we just did last month found that women hold 35 percent of all Federal jobs, compared to 36 percent in the nation's total labor force.

Side by side comparisons of salaries for women in public and private industry are hard to come by, but we do know that in both sectors women hold an unsought monopoly on the lower paying, less responsible jobs: Women hold 68 percent of the Federal jobs in grades one through eight.

As we move to the mid and upper levels, we find fewer women at each step along the way—about 22 percent in grades 9 through 12, about 6 percent in grades 13 through 15, and only 3.2 percent in the supergrades 16 through 18; that last total is at least up from the previous year's high of 2.8 percent!

We are especially concerned about the scanty representation of women in grades 13 through 15 since these comprise the "feeder group," the ranks which produce tomorrow's executives.

Since Federal managers tend to fill top jobs almost exclusively from within, the paucity of women in the "feeder" grades makes it extremely unlikely that the supergrade situation for women will improve markedly so long as we hold to present staffing habits. For example, last year 11 times as many employees were promoted to GS-13 as were hired from outside of government. My point is, when we make progress at the feeder level, we can hope for later progress at the top.

I should stress, as well, that reaching the upper ranks through promotion is a long slow process, even in a "growth economy." Today, it represents an even more tortuous, uncertain route, since the Federal work force has seen little expansion since 1972—consequently, there are fewer top jobs to be filled.

In the non-career service, where upper grade people can more readily be hired from outside government, the picture is somewhat brighter for women. Sixteen percent of this administration's non-career executive appointments have been women, and their representation in non-career supergrade jobs has doubled over the past year.

Nevertheless, anyone aspiring to the career service, or anyone interested in the health of the career service, which comprises 92 percent of Federal jobs, should be concerned about these lopsided statistics. Indeed, this is one of the many issues we are tackling as we move forward in personnel reform.

As you know, we began to examine the personnel system a year ago, and reform legislation is now before Congress. Hearings have been completed in both the House and the Senate. With markup now in progress, we have every expectation that we will see a bill reported well before the session ends.

But before I outline that legislation, let me highlight some measures we are already taking, or drafting, to make the Federal career service more hospitable to the talents of able women, to get women and minorities out of the "basement of public service," and increase their numbers at all levels.

The first of these is the Presidential Management Intern Program. Our purpose is to attract outstanding young men and women,

well educated and committed to public management. They bring to government new graduate degrees in public management at a time when creative management is sorely needed.

On completing their two-year internships, they may receive competitive civil service status. They start at GS-9, and are eligible for promotion during their internships. Close to 1,000 highly qualified people were nominated for the first year of the program, and 250 were selected. It is particularly gratifying that 46 percent of the finalists are women.

These interns, I might add, are in great demand, for there are more billets than the 250 who can be hired in a given year.

Another promising new opportunity is a graduate co-op education (or work-study) program extending the existing undergraduate program to graduate and associate degree students. It could provide as many as 10,000 internship-like positions yearly. Students are paid for career-related work assignments in Federal agencies while still in college. If they meet certain requirements, they may enter the career service non-competitively. This program will open still more doors for women in the public service.

We have done extensive work to develop a Special Emphasis Program, in which agencies will be authorized to appoint women and minorities through special procedures in an occupation where they are underrepresented. The program is clearly experimental, and if it does not produce good results it will be abandoned. We feel experimentation is necessary, however, because current procedures have not resulted in a Federal work force that appropriately reflects the nation's diversity.

The plan would permit a variety of selection methods, providing competition on the basis of education, experience, and performance. Those selected would, in effect, be taking a two-year on-the-job performance test. If successful, they will enter the career service.

The plan is positive and innovative. However, there are things it would not do:

It would not create new jobs, or set up parallel systems outside the personnel mainstream . . . rather, candidates will occupy regular positions which are temporarily designated for these so-called Schedule A jobs.

It would not choose candidates on non-merit factors, such as race, color, creed, sex, national origin, or handicap . . . appointments under the excepted authority would be open to all candidates.

I'd like to point out that the Special Emphasis Program is designed for hiring new employees. In no way is it a replacement for upward mobility. Nevertheless, women already in Federal jobs could compete through special methods and be selected for higher grade positions.

Let me briefly mention Upward Mobility, which began to work in a meaningful way with passage of the EEO Act of 1972.

Its basic principle is that some employees in dead-end jobs, GS-9 and below, have the potential for more rewarding positions, but not the qualifications. How do we tap this potential?

Target jobs must be identified, the employee must have counseling, there must be training to get the employee qualified for the better job, and, finally, each participant's progress must be carefully evaluated.

Participants in the Upward Mobility Program are predominantly women since most of the dead-end jobs are held by women, and the program has helped them. From 1972 through 1975, an estimated 60,000 employees moved to career occupations, some reassigned, some promoted. And in 1976 alone, the latest year for which we have solid information, over 70,000 were either promoted or reassigned to new careers.

What about mobility for the mid-level woman?

Just as there is a difficult gap to be bridged at the GS-4 through 9 range, another stopping point for women is at the GS-11 through 13 levels.

Women who reach the "full performance" (formerly journeyman) level of their jobs, and are excellent technicians in their fields, find that they are not being considered for promotion to management jobs. I have just asked the Commission's Federal Women's Program, working with our Bureau of Training and an interagency task force, to map out a meaningful career development ladder for such women.

We expect these positive steps not to undermine merit, but enhance it—a concept that has clearly been violated in a system which has 92 percent white males and 3 percent women at its top levels.

I am pleased to report to you, as well, that plans to move a substantial portion of CSC's responsibilities for EEO and affirmative action to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission are progressing well. Reorganization Plan I, mandating such a transfer, was recently cleared by Congress, and we have worked closely with both the White House and the EEOC to ensure that civil service reform and EEO reorganization are mutually supportive.

Now let me turn to the civil service reform drive, and specific aspects of the legislation.

There are some who maintain that the proposed personnel reform and reorganization is simply another Washington game of musical chairs.

Not true! We are proposing to simplify the complex personnel system, remove the inconsistencies, and speed up the process.

The basic civil service law, written in 1883, is still on the books. Certainly, the system has evolved, with a law here, and an Executive order there.

The tragedy of it all is that the changes have added more and more protections, against abuse and against arbitrariness, but there have been literally no changes designed to make it more possible for a manager to manage! So this reform reflects the first time the system as a whole has been studied, and solutions devised to match the problems.

The two legislative instruments which we're proposing are the Civil Service Reorganization Plan, or Reorganization Plan 2, which went to Congress today, and the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, submitted to Congress on March 2.

The Reorganization Plan would split the Civil Service Commission into three agencies, namely:

The Office of Personnel Management which would help the President manage government's human resources, as does the Office of Management and Budget in managing government's finances.

The Merit Systems Protection Board which would be an independent agency to hear employee appeals, empowered to punish violators or abusers of the system.

The Federal Labor Relations Authority which would pull together several programs, and function for Federal workers much as the National Labor Relations Board does for private sector workers.

Let's get to the heart of these civil service reform proposals. The bill sent to Congress on March 2 contains the changes requiring specific Congressional action. It would:

Put into law the basic principles of the Federal personnel system. With the rules in a single law—rather than a hodgepodge of Executive orders, rules, legal precedents, and diverse statutes—we stand a far better chance of enforcing them. And, we are also providing the means to punish those who violate the rules.

Improve performance evaluation. The present system for appraising employee performance is an exercise in futility. Ninety-nine

percent of all Federal employees receive the same rating—satisfactory. We would require each agency to develop its own performance appraisal system, tailored to its needs.

Allow agencies more authority. This should result in quicker decisions, since agencies won't need to go through the Office of Personnel Management on every personnel decision. That office would, of course, oversee the agency's actions.

Increase the range of choices in hiring decisions. The "rule-of-three" asks for our testing methods to make finer distinctions they now can provide. We therefore are proposing to allow a choice from the top seven candidates, or from an even wider range if circumstances merit. We want to be sure candidates have equal chances.

Provide incentive pay for mid-level managers and supervisors. By tying pay increases to performance—not time in service—for managers and supervisors at the GS-13 through 15 levels, we would be adding greater motivation for those officials who are so crucial to improved government productivity.

Improve employee appeals procedures. This would put teeth in the Merit Systems Protection Board, giving enforcement authority to act against abusers of the system. It would also ensure appeal rights to all Federal employees, and would define circumstances when an agency whose decision was reversed would have to pay the appealing employee's costs.

Better use of the talents of top managers. We propose to create a Senior Executive Service with possibilities of greater pay for superior performance, as well as possibilities of easier removal for marginal performance. SES officials could be placed wherever their talents could be best used—regardless of agency. The greater risks would balance the greater benefits, but there would also be a fallback right to a GS-15 position for any career executive removed from an SES position.

Modify veterans preference to concentrate on those who need and most deserve these benefits, and to alleviate the adverse effects on women's opportunities. I've saved this issue for the last, since I would like to dwell on it.

Up until this administration took office, the topic of veterans preference was pretty much like the weather—everybody talked about it, but no one did much about it.

Such an attitude is unfair on the face of it. It serves no one's cause to leave rumor unchecked, charges unsubstantiated.

The fact that a heated controversy—should I say fight—on veterans preference could put the entire civil service reform package in jeopardy did not contravene, in our view, the need to get this issue out in the open, and to press for change.

Among the many documents and facts, now available, let me refer to just a few.

According to GAO, in a September 1977 report to Congress, because of veterans preference (and the appointment law, now repealed) many highly qualified women can't be certified for employment. Some women, said the report, with perfect or near-perfect scores, currently rank behind veterans with much lower scores. Non-veteran women need substantial extra qualifications to surmount veterans preference barriers.

The conflict, I might note, became more vivid during the 14 public hearings we held last year. One manager in California, for example, reported that his hiring effort for an entire year was wiped out, when, in a reduction in force, the veterans were retained and the women and minorities were "laid off," to use his expression.

The result of veterans preference is that half the Federal work force is veterans, and only 35 percent are women. Looking at grades, 65 percent of the supergrades are veterans, while 3.2 percent are women.

We propose to limit preference for non-disabled veterans to ten years after leaving the service. For retired military personnel, preference would be even more limited. Anyone retiring under the rank of major would receive preference for only three years after separation; those in the ranks of major or above would receive no preference.

During a reduction in force, non-disabled veterans would retain preference over competing employees only during the first three years after their first appointment. After that, non-disabled veterans' only advantage in RIF's would be a five-year credit added to their length of service computation.

I would point out that any contemplated reduction in veterans benefits would apply only to non-disabled vets. The disabled would continue to receive lifetime preference. In fact, we are proposing to make it even easier for disabled veterans to get Federal employment. Moreover, there would be special benefits for Vietnam era veterans.

Some States are already in the forefront of modifying veterans preference. In Oregon, State officials are already seeing more women and minorities on the certificates although the law was just passed in 1977. No doubt, we will find more women on Federal registers too, when the law is changed.

In closing, before I gird myself to answer the questions of this excellent panel assembled here, let me add a personal note.

To women who are building Federal careers, or who, as private citizens, are watching the Federal Government's drive for a more representative civil service, I would say the coming decades will indeed be years of controversy and challenge. Women are on the brink of a new world in Federal employment. Our goal of true equal opportunity will not be achieved next year or the year after. Passing a law or issuing a regulation alone cannot change a tradition quickly. But the path has been cleared; the design completed.

Whatever measures the Congress approves, I can assure you that we will persevere in our drive to rebuild and modernize the civil service system. We count on your support.●

BEEF INDEMNIFICATION ACT OF 1978

HON. EDWARD R. MADIGAN
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce legislation today for the purpose of discouraging the President from further harming the domestic beef industry. My bill would achieve this purpose by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to issue indemnity payments to cattle producers for economic losses incurred whenever the President acts to increase or suspend meat import quotas for any reason other than as part of an international agreement to expand agricultural exports from the United States.

The indemnity payments to the eligible producers would be calculated based on the difference in the price of cattle 120 days immediately preceding the President's announcement of import increases and the price of cattle 120 days immediately following the announcement of import increases.

President Carter's announcement on June 8, 1978, to increase meat imports by 200 million pounds has caused grave concerns among consumers, cattlemen, and corn growers.

The consumers are concerned about the President's decision because, in the future, as foreign supplies of beef tighten and U.S. cattle production decreases, beef prices may rise to a higher level than they are at the present.

The cattlemen are justifiably concerned since the price of fed cattle in feedlots across the country dropped from above \$60 to less than \$50 after the President's announcement. Thus, resulting in disastrous economic losses to the cattle industry who were just beginning to recover from a 5-year cycle of low prices and inflationary costs.

Corn growers will be adversely affected because the President's actions will decrease domestic cattle production, and thus reduce demand for corn and feed-grains.

Furthermore, the President's decision will adversely affect the balance-of-payments situation. The U.S. trade deficit for 1978 is projected to be a record \$40 billion, an increase of \$13 billion from 1977. It is estimated the 200 million pound increased beef imports will add further to that deficit.

In summation, I think the President's decision to increase meat imports by 200 million pounds was wrong because there will be no long term reduction in beef prices or inflation, but rather an increase in both with the undesirable possibility of costly cattle Government price support programs if cattle producers are denied reasonable profits in the marketplace. Therefore, it is my hope that this bill, the Beef Indemnification Act, will discourage the President from increasing meat import quotas in the future. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.●

**MAYOR GEORGE R. MOSCONE OF
SAN FRANCISCO AND AIRPORTS
DIRECTOR HEATH URGE AP-
PROVAL OF THE AIRPORT AND
AIRCRAFT NOISE REDUCTION ACT
AS PRESENTED BY PUBLIC WORKS
AND TRANSPORTATION AND WAYS
AND MEANS COMMITTEES**

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we would like to call to the attention of our colleagues a copy of a mailgram sent to some of us by Mayor George R. Moscone of San Francisco, accompanied by a longer message from Richard R. Heath, director of airports, San Francisco International Airport. Both strongly support the incorporation and approval, as requested by our respective committees, of H.R. 11986, Ways and Means, as title III of H.R. 8729, Public Works and Transportation, the Airport and Aircraft Noise Reduction Act, both of which are now pending before the Rules Committee.

The City of San Francisco badly needs passage of H.R. 11986, formerly H.R. 8729, Congressman Glenn Anderson's Bill. We urge you to prevent its being bottled up in the Rules Committee. I will not repeat the arguments forwarded to you by our Airports Director,

Richard Heath. But I strongly request that you carefully consider his position and do whatever is necessary to permit the Bill to reach the House Floor. It is essential to this City's Airport which serves all of Northern California.

GEORGE R. MOSCONE,
Mayor of San Francisco.

I cannot stress sufficiently the urgency of the need for passage of H.R. 11986, formerly H.R. 8729, Congressman Glenn Anderson's Bill. This Airport, like most other major airports, is faced with massive costs for property acquisition or property easements if the aircraft fleet is not retrofitted or replaced with less noisy aircraft in the reasonably near future. Airport proprietors of this nation have been working diligently with Congress and the FAA for many years to bring about passage of this greatly needed legislation. It would be tragic indeed if these years of work were scuttled by the House Rules Committee through a refusal to allow this Bill to reach the House Floor.

We fully support Title III of this Bill which provides monetary assistance to the Airlines in paying for the conversion of their fleets on an accelerated basis. The funding mechanism provided is totally consistent with the long-established policy that the Air Transport industry should be paid for by the users of that industry. Air passengers and air shippers, and not the general public, pay the charge that creates the Trust Fund. Providing the airlines this financial assistance out of that Trust Fund will assure their compliance with the deadlines provided. Without this assistance you and all other members of Congress will be subjected to intensive pressure by the Airlines to relax the compliance dates so that they may utilize the older, noisier aircraft longer.

HR 11986 constitutes a fragile compromise agreement between all segments of the air transport industry, the traveling public and the airport neighbors who are affected by aircraft noise. If HR 11986 is stalled by the Rules Committee, that compromise will likely disintegrate. The result will unquestionably be a proliferation of legal actions nationwide requiring airports to buy up residential properties near airports. We estimate that the probable total cost to San Francisco Airport alone will exceed the total funding provided in Title III. Let's not kid ourselves that the Aviation Trust Fund will not be tapped for most of this cost. HR 11986 thus makes good sense from the economic standpoint alone. Failure to pass it will result in far higher costs in land acquisitions in the years to come. Failure to pass it will result in a boon to the lawyers bringing and defending those lawsuits, but will be a serious blow to airports, airport neighbors and to the traveling public.

We urge you to take immediate action to refer this Bill to the House Floor before that fragile compromise, painfully constructed over many years, comes apart at the seams.

RICHARD R. HEATH,
Director of Airports,
San Francisco International Airport.●

THE TURKISH ARMS EMBARGO DEBATE, NO. 2

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an exchange of "Dear Colleague" letters on the issue of whether or not the administration has acted in a manner which has undermined the effective-

ness of the embargo and has signaled Turkey that it need not take the embargo seriously.

Following is a letter from the proponents of keeping the arms embargo against Turkey in which it is contended that the administration has been unwilling or unable to make the embargo work. In a second letter, I have tried to counter this argument and state why the embargo has not worked. I mention that there have been many U.S. efforts over the last 3 years to try to achieve progress towards a Cyprus settlement.

The two letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July, 1978.

UNDERMINING THE EMBARGO

DEAR COLLEAGUE: In imposing an embargo on American military aid to Turkey after Turkey's August, 1974, invasion and occupation of Cyprus, Congress had in mind two basic considerations:

The first was the need to enforce American law, which required that further military assistance to Turkey be terminated after American-supplied weapons were used by Turkey for offensive purposes on Cyprus.

The second consideration, and the focus of this letter, was the expectation that the Administration would use the embargo to convince Turkey of the need to take substantive actions to promote a just settlement on Cyprus.

Regrettably, the Administration has failed to do so.

Instead, this Administration, like the one which preceded it, has acted in a manner which has undermined the effectiveness of the embargo and has signaled Turkey that it need not take the embargo seriously.

The following brief summary of Carter Administration actions and statements concerning Cyprus—many of which have received little or no publicity in this country—makes this conclusion obvious. The summary also makes clear that the Administration's request that the embargo be lifted "because it hasn't worked" stands logic on its head: the embargo has not worked because the Administration has been unwilling or unable to make it work.

We think it essential, therefore, that the following facts be kept in mind in considering the Administration's justification for attempting to lift the embargo:

The Administration's first request for arms for Turkey, submitted by the State Department in March of 1977, sought a level of military assistance many times the level supplied by the previous Administration. This request, you may recall, engendered strong opposition and was ultimately substantially reduced. Turkey nonetheless received a forty percent increase in military sales (from \$125 to \$175 million) from 1977 to 1978 although it had taken no positive action whatsoever on Cyprus. The hope that this significant increase would induce such positive action on the part of Turkey proved empty.

The Department of Defense resorted to a little-known agency—the NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA)—located in Luxembourg, to supply Turkey with nearly \$30 million of weapons beyond the restrictions in American law limiting the amount of military sales. Despite the vigorous protests of several Members, including the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the House International Relations Committee, who termed the action "a violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of the law", this circumvention of the military sales limitation continues.

The United States Mission to the United Nations, in an effort to avoid "offending"

Turkey, voted with a very small minority last fall to weaken a General Assembly resolution which simply called for action toward a settlement on Cyprus.

The State Department submitted last February a report on human rights in Turkey and in Cyprus which was a deliberate whitewash of Turkish practices in both those countries. A State Department spokesman was quoted at the time as saying that the Department did not want to report anything which might make it more difficult to get Congress to approve lifting the embargo.

The United States Ambassador to Turkey declared in news interviews in Ankara, during the time when the Administration still claimed to support the embargo, that "the embargo doesn't serve any American interest," that "without changing the law (which prohibits United States arms to aggressor countries) I would like to find some way around it," and that "my only hope is that . . . it (the embargo) will be removed." High-ranking U.S. military officers made similar statements in the past eighteen months and thereby encouraged Turkish intransigence with regard to a just settlement on Cyprus. Obviously, the arms limitation could not be effective when the Turkish government heard high American officials publicly contradict the Administration's own policy on this issue.

The Secretary of State assured Members of Congress several months ago that before the Administration made any decision on whether to reverse its field and ask for a lifting of the embargo, the Administration would carefully study the actions and proposals expected from Turkey to insure that they represented substantive progress toward a Cyprus settlement. But the Administration soon backed down and—before Turkey had taken any action, indeed, before the Turkish proposals had even been submitted, let alone examined—asked for the lifting of the embargo anyway.

Not surprisingly, with all incentive to take actions on a Cyprus settlement having been eliminated, Turkey took no actions at all. Moreover, its proposals were so poor as to be regarded throughout the diplomatic community as virtually meaningless.

This sorry record shows clearly why the embargo "hasn't worked": these—and other—actions of the Administration have undermined it. The Administration has failed abysmally to convince Turkey that greater flexibility on Cyprus is essential to the resumption of a full military relationship with the United States. As a remedy for its own failure, the Administration now asks Congress to abandon principle and to ignore the clear requirements of American law. This we must not do.

We ask you, therefore, to join us in demonstrating that Congress, a co-equal branch of our government, believes in enforcing our laws by supporting the effective use of the arms embargo against Turkey.

Sincerely,

Dante B. Fascell, Edward J. Derwinski, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, John Brademas, Charles Rose, Parren J. Mitchell, Norman Y. Mineta, Paul E. Tsongas, Donald M. Fraser, James J. Blanchard, Barbara A. Mikulski, Benjamin A. Gilman, Mario Biaggi, George M. O'Brien, John L. Burton, Robert W. Edgar, Wyche Fowler, Jr., James J. Florio, Norman E. D'Amours, Martin A. Russo, Charles B. Rangel.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

DEAR COLLEAGUE: This letter is in response to the second letter sent to you by the proponents of keeping the arms embargo against Turkey. Their second letter addresses the issue of whether the Administration undermined the embargo and whether it was unwilling or unable to make the embargo work. Arguments made by the proponents of

keeping the arms embargo against Turkey:

1. This Administration has acted in a manner which has undermined the effectiveness of the embargo and has signaled Turkey that it need not take the embargo seriously.

Counter:

1. The fundamental reason why Turkey has not acted more to promote a Cyprus settlement while the embargo has been in force is because, as a proud and independent nation, Turkey is not going to "buckle" under to American pressure.

Turkey has so stated publicly. The more we exert public pressure, the less likely will Turkey act. Turkey did not refuse to act on Cyprus because the Administration undermined the embargo.

2. If the proponents' argument were true, then continuing the embargo means continuing the status quo, which we all agree is unacceptable.

If it is true that the embargo has not worked because the Administration has been unwilling to make it work (we would acknowledge that neither this Administration nor the preceding one had enthusiasm for the embargo), then we cannot expect that attitude to change if the embargo continues. And if the attitude of the Administration does not change, we cannot hope for improvement in the situation if the embargo remains.

Proponents of the embargo argue that we have not had any progress on Cyprus but that we should continue the same policy.

I conclude the opposite: we have not made progress because we have pursued a policy that has not worked. Therefore, we need to try a new approach.

3. The Administration has complied with the embargo and made many good faith efforts to try to achieve substantial progress towards a Cyprus settlement.

A detailed list is available of over 100 contacts held since July 1974 in which the Administration strenuously urged the Turks of the necessity to be more forthcoming in order to achieve substantial progress toward a Cyprus settlement. There have been some important achievements, including an agreement between the Cypriot communities over the broad outlines of a settlement.

But a Cyprus settlement will require negotiations between the two communities on the island, which have proved very difficult while the embargo has been in effect.

The Administration acknowledges that Turkey was able to make a few purchases while the embargo was in effect from the NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA). Turkish NAMSA purchases have now been stopped and the loophole has been closed except for small purchases involving NATO partnerships over which NAMSA and the U.S. have little control.

The question of how hard the Administration worked to enforce the embargo is not now the relevant question. For whatever reasons, the embargo has not worked and lingering with it longer will only continue the existing, unacceptable situation.

I hope you agree that a new approach should be tried, and that the embargo should be lifted.

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON, M.C. ●

A GOOD INFLATION FIGHTER

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the mark of a truly good elected representative is his ability to recognize and support the

good ideas of others, as well as having good ideas himself.

My colleague and friend from Arizona, Congressman ELDON RUDD, is a man with such ability.

As a first-term Member of Congress, ELDON has introduced and cosponsored many worthwhile pieces of legislation that would benefit the American people. Many of these bills were inspired by his senior colleagues, who are experts on economic, budget, and Government policy, and other important issues facing our Nation.

By supporting and helping to promote these good ideas, so that they gain wider acceptance by the public and his colleagues, ELDON RUDD has proved himself to be a good inflation fighter, through attempts legislatively to balance the Federal budget, stop deficit spending, cut taxes, and reduce overburdensome Federal regulatory control.

It is a tribute to him, and to the people of Arizona's Fourth Congressional District who elected him, that he has achieved such an excellent record of legislative accomplishment, which has been recognized by his peers as well as by citizen and opinion leaders.

I know that I speak for a great many of his senior colleagues in Congress when I say that ELDON RUDD has earned our respect and admiration as a very capable representative.

ELDON's initiative and ability in proposing and supporting good legislation during his first term in Congress has been recognized editorially by the Phoenix Gazette, Arizona's largest statewide afternoon newspaper. I would like to include the Phoenix Gazette editorial in the RECORD to underscore Congressman RUDD's record of legislative accomplishments.

[From the Phoenix Gazette, July 24, 1978]

INFLATION ANTIDOTES

While the Carter administration is casting around for means of controlling the increasing rate of inflation, there are measures sitting in Congress that would provide means to this end.

Rep. Eldon Rudd, R-Ariz., is co-sponsor of many of these bills, and, as he pointed out recently, heavy taxation is only part of the total problem. The federal government uses tax money to build bureaucracies, which, in turn, find regulatory work to do. This adds almost \$100 billion a year to the cost of producing products and services. This cost, of course, is borne by consumers who had the displeasure of financing all the overseeing in the first place.

Rudd is co-sponsoring legislation to cut taxes, require a firm ceiling for federal spending, to prohibit federal deficits and require balanced budgets. A look at taxation at all levels from 1967 to 1977 reveals the crying need for this reform.

State and local income taxes went up 405 percent. Property taxes increased by 132 percent. Sales taxes are up 199 percent, and corporate taxes rose by 112 percent. Social Security taxes jumped by 220 percent, and federal income taxes are up 125 percent.

Whatever the worth of a dollar earned, only 53 percent of it is real. The total tax bite is 47 cents on the dollar—dangerously close to one-half.

Inflation is Washington's chief export, and only at the source can this be stemmed. The means are available. ●

CXXIV—1467—Part 17

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD HONOR THE MEMORY OF DRAJA MIHALOVICH

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of American fighter pilots who were shot down by the Nazis over Yugoslavia during World War II owe their lives and their freedom to a Yugoslav patriot, now dead, by the name of Gen. Draja Mihailovich.

Mihailovich rescued and gave refuge to these American servicemen, and they now seek congressional support to honor his memory.

The problem is that the State Department is lobbying against legislation, sponsored by Senator STROM THURMOND, which has already passed the Senate, because Mihailovich was a political enemy of Yugoslav dictator Tito, who had Mihailovich shot after he came to power.

Senator THURMOND's bill, now bottled up in the House Administration Committee, would require the Secretary of Interior to permit the National Committee of American Airmen Rescued by General Mihailovich to construct and maintain a monument to this valiant Yugoslav patriot.

The Arizona Republic has recently editorialized that Congress should forget about the State Department's unwarranted nervousness about offending dictator Tito, and pass the Mihailovich memorial legislation.

I wholeheartedly agree with that position, and commend that Republic's editorial to all my House colleagues. I would like to insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Arizona Republic, July 24, 1978]

TITO'S TANTRUM

Since the closing days of World War II, the name of Draja Mihailovich has been treated in official American quarters as some despicable family scandal. It simply isn't mentioned if anyone can help it.

But just as assiduously, a small and dwindling group of World War II fliers has been trying to elevate Mihailovich's name to heroic public proportions.

No one denies Mihailovich deserves hero recognition. But international diplomacy has gotten involved, and everyone knows that the politics of diplomacy frequently ignore logic or justice.

Mihailovich was the World War II Yugoslav patriot who took to isolated mountain hideaways, and tied up thousands of Nazi soldiers with guerrilla raids on occupied Axis territory.

While in the mountains, Mihailovich and his Chetnik followers hid more than 500 American fliers who had been shot down behind Nazi lines. Most of them were airlifted to safety by the Chetniks.

But if Mihailovich hated Nazis, he also hated an old Yugoslav political foe worse—Josip Tito.

Unfortunately for Mihailovich, the Allies sided with Tito after the war, and presided over his installation as Yugoslavia's leader.

Mihailovich was arrested by Tito in 1948, tried for treason—a euphemism for opposing Tito—and shot.

Enter the ex-fliers who owe their lives to Mihailovich.

For years, they've been trying to move Congress into approving a monument for the executed Mihailovich.

What has happened every year is precisely what is happening this year, as another bill honoring Mihailovich bogs down in Congress.

Tito objects to the United States honoring the old nemesis whose fame he tried to wipe out with the firing squad.

As Washington columnist Jack Anderson reported recently, American Ambassador Lawrence Eagleburger was ushered to the Yugoslav foreign ministry, and handed an "energetic protest" about Congress creating a posthumous honor to Mihailovich.

The State Department also has joined in the hand-wringing, speculating that a monument to the Chetnik patriot would create "extreme umbrage" on the part of the Tito regime.

Such nonsense.

The United States should tell Tito where to get off.

Congress is not proposing that it honor the politics of Mihailovich. It is honoring the memory of a man, regardless of his Yugoslav politics, who risked his life to save the lives of hundreds of Americans.

The honor should be established, and let Tito vent his rage.

More to the point, there is a dramatic irony involved in this issue.

The American government is cowering in fear over the "extreme umbrage" that might be expressed if it honors a man who defied fear to save others. ●

THE KEMP-ROTH BILL

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to an editorial published in the July 23, 1978, edition of the Arizona Republic, the largest newspaper in my State. The editorial is a ringing and articulate denunciation of the Kemp-Roth tax cut bill. This editorial is significant because for decades, the Republic has been a consistent, aggressive and conscientious champion of conservative politics. Their editorials always have been in the best tradition of American journalism—direct and forthright. Sometimes the Republic and I have been on opposite sides of an issue, and sometimes not. But I think in this instance they have taken a particularly courageous stand, and the newspaper deserves commendation. I recommend the editorial to my colleagues.

INFLATIONARY PROPOSAL

With the echoes of California's tax revolt still reverberating through Capitol Hill, a bill to cut personal income taxes by 33 percent over the next three years, and corporate taxes, as well, is gaining momentum in Congress.

The bill, introduced by Rep. Jack Kemp, R-N.Y., and Sen. William Roth, R-Del., already has won the endorsement of 176 congressmen. Bill Brock, chairman of the Republican National Committee, has called it a top GOP priority.

Since no legislator has ever failed re-election because he voted for a tax cut, there is

a chance that Congress will pass the bill. President Carter has said that, if Congress does, he will veto it.

In this, the president has proved himself a truer conservative than Kemp, Roth, Brock, et al, men who call themselves conservatives. For the bill is Keynesianism run amok.

Kemp and Roth argue that cutting taxes by a third would generate so much new investment and create so many new jobs that, within a year or two, government revenues would rise to a point where the budget would come into balance, even without a cut in the budget.

As evidence, they cite what happened after the Kennedy-Johnson tax cut. The economy did expand, and the increased revenues resulting from that expansion did put the Treasury into the black.

Voila! they say. The same thing would happen again.

The fallacy lies in the fact that 1978 is not 1963. The economy was then in the doldrums, running well below capacity. There was no shortage of skilled labor. And, most important of all, the rate of inflation was a miniscule 1.4 percent.

Today, we are enjoying 40 straight months of economic expansion, the longest such period in the history of the nation. Many industries are running at capacity or very near it. There is a growing shortage of skilled labor.

And inflation, during the second quarter of the year, was running at the horrendous annual rate of 10 percent.

As Walter W. Heller, the architect of the Kennedy-Johnson tax cut, has pointed out, it did not lead to increased capital investment, as Kemp and Roth seem to believe, but to increased consumer demand, which took up the slack in the economy.

There's no slack now. Pouring billions of dollars into the hands of consumers will simply send prices sky high. The nation will start looking back at 10 percent inflation with longing.

There is a need for a tax cut to stimulate capital investment, for that is the weakest spot in the economy. Industry is not spending nearly enough on new plants and equipment.

However, the need is for a tax cut specifically designed for the purpose of encouraging such expenditures—a decrease in the corporate tax and in the capital gains tax, a rise in the investment tax credit, the end of double taxation of dividends, a change in the method of computing depreciation.

Politically, it would be impossible to enact any of these measures without giving individuals tax relief, too, and that should be done, but not in the meat-ax way that Kemp and Roth propose.

A 33 percent cut in the federal income tax could have no other result than runaway inflation.●

VIETNAM VETERANS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1978

● Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the problem of veterans employment is a serious one. As I'm sure you realize, Vietnam veterans are often the last hired and the first fired. Furthermore, the economic recession of 1975 brought veterans' unemployment to an all time high.

Consequently, Congresswoman MARGARET M. HECKLER and myself have produced what we hope will be a fruitful

analysis of the current situation facing the veterans. We hope our recommendations will prove worthwhile and appropriate action will be taken. It is for this reason that we wish to bring the report to the attention of the colleagues.

VETERANS EMPLOYMENT—ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(By LESTER L. WOLFF and MARGARET M. HECKLER)

Veterans' unemployment is primarily counter-cyclical rather than structural. Vietnam veterans' and disabled veterans' underemployment is both structural and counter-cyclical. In 1973 when veterans' unemployment reached its lowest level (4.9 percent), then President Nixon declared that "veterans' unemployment is no longer a national problem." The economic recession of 1975 brought veterans' unemployment to an all-time high (10.5 percent). The average Vietnam veteran is now 31 years old. He has a wife and two children, and a high school education. The veteran is seeking a secure and meaningful career in the private sector commensurate with his peers who did not serve in the military.

Vietnam veterans are often the last hired and first fired. Many lack the training and skills necessary to acquire careers equal to their abilities and aspirations. A viable solution to the unemployment and training of the disabled and Vietnam veterans lies in the private sector, not in subsidized public service employment. Effective private sector career training initiatives and interfaced with Veterans Administration Apprenticeship On-the-Job Training (OJT) and cooperative benefits should be the primary solution to the employment and training needs of the disabled and Vietnam veteran. The substantial potential that lies in the HIRE II program may be lost because there is not sufficient technical assistance, training, and guidance to ensure effective implementation of the program. HIRE II funds can be spent as CETA title I OJT programs.

However, CETA title I training opportunities are far below the employment capabilities and aspirations of the majority of the disabled and Vietnam veterans. To utilize the HIRE II program in the same manner as a CETA title I program would be a tragic disservice to veterans and the future of veterans employment initiatives. To realize the full potential of the HIRE II program, the maximum feasible effort should be made to interface HIRE II with Veterans Administration Apprenticeship, OJT, and cooperation benefits programs. To facilitate this objective, the Veterans Administration (VA) and the Veterans Employment Service (VES) must play an integral role in the development and implementation of the HIRE II training opportunities. It appears that the VA and the VES are being denied the opportunity to utilize their full potential in ensuring the success of the HIRE II program. The Department of Labor (DOL) press release announcing the appointment of Mr. Weatherford as Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Veterans Employment (DASVE) states that, "a number of the Department's programs helping veterans, including the HIRE program, are not under his supervision." CETA prime sponsors have the ability to implement HIRE II as a CETA title I OJT program without the assistance of the Veterans' Administration and the Veterans Employment Service. However, the programs' real potential cannot be realized without the maximum contribution and cooperation of the agencies and organizations concerned with veterans employment. Since the HIRE II program is exclusively a veterans program, the talents and resources of the DOL and the nation's veterans employment specialists must be fully utilized in order to ensure its success.

To this end it is recommended:

1. That the Veterans Employment Service and the Veterans Administration be given a major role in the technical assistance and training program to ensure that CETA prime sponsors, the Veterans Employment Service, veterans service organizations, and other organizations and individuals concerned with the development and implementation of HIRE II are full aware of its provisions and how to effectively implement them;

2. That specific goals be established for the interfacing of HIRE II with Veterans Administration OJT apprenticeship and training programs;

3. That a HIRE II orientation guide be prepared to ensure effective interpretation and implementation of the HIRE II program by all concerned; and

4. That maximum effort be made to ensure the future of the HIRE II initiative once the initial funding is expended.

To improve employment services to veterans within current fiscal and manpower resources there must be a greater emphasis on qualitative services to disabled and Vietnam veterans, rather than a quantitative increase in "compliance indicators" to all veterans. Without additional fiscal and manpower resources, any quantitative increase in the Employment Service indicator requirements would probably result in a qualitative decrease in services to many of the most needy disabled and Vietnam veterans. These veterans require the greatest individual attention in both counseling and job development. Current acquisition of employment through the employment service is often predicated upon the veteran being in the employment service office at the time the job opening is posted. Greater emphasis must be placed on counseling, skills assessment, and meaningful career development and training for disabled and Vietnam veterans. Employment Service offices must have the capability of promptly notifying veterans when an appropriate employment opportunity becomes available, and ensuring that the veteran is qualified, motivated, and prepared when referred to an employment opening. To this end it is recommended:

1. That the Disabled Veterans Outreach Program (DVOP) be continued at current strength (2000) or expanded through a combination of Federal funding and State and local CETA contributions to sustain and expand DVOP initiatives. PSE slots could be allocated by prime sponsors to local employment service offices to fund DVOPs. The role of the DVOP should be expanded to include services not only to disabled veterans, but also to Vietnam and other veterans as deemed necessary and appropriate;

2. That the counseling resources of the Veterans Administration be made available to the Employment Service to assist veterans with benefits, career planning, personal adjustment, and motivational problems, and possible cooperative outreach efforts with the VA; and

3. That greater technical assistance, training, and support be accorded to local employment service offices and DVOPs to ensure that they are fully apprised of the resources available to them and can provide necessary employment services to veterans.

In a letter dated May 4, 1978 to Congressman Lester L. Wolff (D-NY), Secretary of Labor Ray Marshall stated that the "DASVE program plan, or "Veterans Helping Veterans" program, has been carefully reviewed and a decision has been made to provide \$10 million for a new veterans outreach and job development program, concentrating on target cities with high unemployment among veterans, particularly minority veterans. This program is still in the planning stage and will be announced in the near future."

The Department of Labor apparently wishes to reduce that amount to only \$3 million. This amount is insufficient and repre-

sents only the funds necessary to sustain viable existing veterans outreach and supportive service programs. Many of these programs were assured that their funding would be assumed and their programs expanded by the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Veterans Employment, upon notification by Secretary Marshall and Assistant Secretary Green that a \$10 million "Veterans Helping Veterans" program had been approved.

In a June 29 letter to President Carter, Rep. Margaret M. Heckler stated that "full and effective implementation of Vietnam veteran initiatives advanced by both yourself and the Congress must be supported by the Department of Labor's \$10 million 'Veterans Helping Veterans' technical assistance and training programs, and by support for community-based veterans' self-help initiatives." Rep. Heckler noted that such funding will enable development of "workable new veterans job development, outreach, supportive service, and demonstration projects."

Such a community-based effort was mandated by Section 305 of P.L. 95-93 and was an integral element of the nation's readjustment efforts for veterans of World War II. It is recommended:

1. That the "Veterans Helping Veterans" effort be funded on a case by case basis at the announced level of \$10 million;

2. That maximum effort be made to allocate CETA PSE's to viable "Veterans Helping Veterans" projects to fund their staffs;

3. That a concerned technical assistance and training program be initiated as soon as possible to facilitate effective implementation of program initiatives. The success of veterans employment programs is to a far greater extent predicated upon the effective utilization, coordination, and interfacement of existing programs and resources than it is to the allocation of additional fiscal resources. One of the biggest problems facing the veteran is a lack of understanding of his needs, and how to target existing resources to address those needs; and

4. That maximum use of community-based resources, traditional service organizations, and Veterans Administration resources be utilized in the implementation of the "Veterans Helping Veterans" program.

In a letter to Secretary of Labor Ray Marshall, Congressman Wolf expressed concern that the effectiveness of the Deputy Assistant

Secretary of Labor for Veterans Employment was impeded by a lack of operational control over the programs within its jurisdiction as well as the permanent professional staff resources needed to implement those programs. While the Office of the DASVE was established by Congress over 18 months ago, it still has not been allocated professional staff positions by the Civil Service Commission. Currently the Veterans Employment Service is operating with only 10 of its 15 authorized professional staff members, the vacancies occurring at critical senior policy development and implementation levels.

In a June 27 letter to Labor Secretary Ray Marshall, Rep. Heckler called for reestablishment of the position of director of the Veterans' Employment Service. She called for the appointment of a "highly qualified individual who is an aggressive veterans advocate, and one who has the confidence of the veterans community, to this important post. Mrs. Heckler noted that the abolition of the Director position has seriously affected the operation of the 200 VES personnel in the field. Rep. Heckler stated that reestablishing the position of director, and refocusing the strength of the Veterans Employment Service, would bring credibility to the operation of the VES among veterans organizations.

There appears to be an effort to curtail the statutory responsibilities of the DASVE and the Veterans Employment Service. The Department of Labor press release announcing the appointment of Acting Director of the DASVE Lawrence Weatherford states in part: "the Act specifies that the Deputy Assistant Secretary is the principal advisor to the Secretary (on) unemployment and training programs to the extent they affect veterans. A number of the Department's programs helping veterans, including the HIRE program, are not under his supervision."

The law states in fact that the DASVE "shall be the principal advisor to the Secretary of Labor with respect to the formulation and implementation of all policies and procedures . . . of the Department of Labor employment, unemployment, and training programs to the extent they affect veterans." The law further states, "to this end policies shall be promulgated and administered by a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans Employment, through a Veterans Employment Service within the Department of Labor, so as to provide such veterans

and persons the maximum employment and training opportunities through existing programs, coordination and merger of programs and implementation of new programs."

While the DASVE and the Veterans Employment Service should not be a separate employment and training delivery system within the Department of Labor, they must be utilized to their fullest capability to facilitate the effective formulation and implementation of programs administered by existing delivery systems to the extent they affect veterans. This working relationship can be readily established provided that the DASVE and the Veterans Employment Service are accorded their proper role within the Department of Labor. To this end it is recommended:

1. That the Civil Service Commission authorize as soon as possible permanent staff positions for the Office of DASVE, and that highly qualified persons be appointed to such positions on a temporary basis until a new DASVE is chosen;

2. That the position of Director of Veterans Employment Service be restored;

3. That qualified persons from the VES field staff be detailed on a temporary basis to the national office to ensure effective program development and implementation until the professional staff vacancies in VES can be filled permanently;

4. That the veterans employment specialists in the DASVE, VES, and the VA be utilized to their fullest extent to ensure the effective implementation of all DOL employment and training programs affecting veterans; and

5. That a technical assistance and training program be initiated to ensure effective implementation of current and new veterans employment and training program initiatives.

Legislation (H.R. 13373) has been introduced by U.S. Representatives Heckler and Wolf which would extend the 10-year delimiting period for veterans to participate in Veterans Administration OJT, apprenticeship, and cooperative programs. Enactment of this legislation is critical if the Administration initiatives are to effectively address the needs of Vietnam combat veterans. The legislation falls within the parameters of the fiscal resources available to the Veterans Affairs Committee for new initiatives.●

SENATE—Monday, July 31, 1978

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 17, 1978)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

PRAYER

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

The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? the Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?—Psalms 27: 1.

Almighty God, in whom we live and move and have our being, we do not know what the future holds but we know who holds the future. Thou dost hold the world and all things in it now and forever. Thou art above all men, above this Nation and all nations. In our

good deeds and our misdeeds Thou art our refuge and our strength. Once more we ask Thee to enfold our little lives in the vastness of Thy love and wisdom that we may be our best selves. Show us what to do and how to do it. May we go forth into the new week in quest of the true, the beautiful, and the good, following the Lord of our salvation. 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. EASTLAND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., July 31, 1978.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF LEADERSHIP

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting Republican leader (Mr. STEVENS) is recognized.