EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NATIONAL HISPANIC HERITAGE WEEK IN CONNECTICUT

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, September 11 through 17 was National Hispanic Heritage Week, an event that recognized the important role of Hispanic-Americans in our Nation's life. Connecticut, where the Hispanic community numbers approximately 300,000, marked the occasion with a legislative proclamation.

Connecticut public television aired a special series of programs during the week, with both the Hispanic and Anglo communities in mind. A recent letter from Frank Marrero of CPTV explains the bilingual series and other Spanish programs produced by public television. I would like to share this letter with my colleagues.

MUNDO REAL,
Hartford, Conn., September 6, 1977.

Hon. WILLIAM R. COTTER
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COTTER: With the advent of the Carter Administration's focus on our relations with the countries of Latin America, there has been a rejuvenation of our awareness of the responsibility we share in meeting the needs of our own 11.7 million Hispanic citizens. Public dialogue is an unquestionable necessity to emphasize not only the richness and value of our cultural differences, but also to stress the overwhelming similarities which tie us together. Obviously, this responsibility is not unidirectional, and the Hispanic community also shares in the responsibility to enlighten the non-Hispanic to its Latin past and present. Any move toward meeting these goals must be a joint effort.

We are fortunate here in Connecticut to have been awarded four consecutive grants from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, under the Emergency School Aid Act, to produce television programming designed to lessen minority group isolation (in our situation relating to Spanish-speakers). This June, "Mundo Real" was one of only two Regional Bilingual Projects to be funded for the 1977–78 fiscal year. The impact of the series can be shown not only in the viewership throughout the Northeastern Region of the country—both Hispanic and Anglo, child and adult—but also in the response from both public and commercial stations throughout the country, who have been or will be in the Fall airing the series. The quality of the series is well-documented in the list of national and international awards it has garnered and is an indication of the level of talent available in our Hispanic citizenry.

With an estimated 300,000 Hispanics in the state of Connecticut, the recent legislative proclamation designating the week of September 11th through the 17th as a National Hispanic Heritage Week is of special import and should be celebrated.

Connecticut Public Television, under the aegis of the "Mundo Real" staff, will be presenting a special selection of programs addressing the Hispanic and Anglo communities (bilingual) during the Hispanic week. This week will represent the beginning of an ongoing monthly program schedule introducing Hispanic artists and covering topics of national interest.

We trust that we can count on your support both at the Capitol and with your constituency here in Connecticut. As a resource, we know your office is invaluable to us; and if we can be of any assistance to you, in terms of disseminating information, please don't hesitate to contact our office.

Sincerely,

FRANK MARRERO,
Executive Producer, Project Officer.

UNITED STATES—MORE OIL AND GAS

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, here is an excellent summary of energy prospects for the United States. It was an Associated Press article quoting the report of Walt Rostow, William Fisher, and Herbert Woodson. The emphatic conclusion was that 50 percent more money must be spent now on domestic exploration and development.

They believe that the drain on the capital of the oil industry will prevent the drilling effort that is required to meet the planned 1985 oil and gas production requirements.

As the Senate continues to debate the energy bill, they must include the essential plowback provision. Then they can continue to improve the bill by eliminating the punitive crude oil equalization tax.

The article follows:

PROFESSORS URGE ALL-OUT ENERGY EFFORT

AUSTIN.—Unless an all-out effort to produce energy is launched in 1977, the United States "will face mortal risk to our economic prosperity," three University of Texas professors predicted last week.

"Every objective assessment," of President Carter's National Energy Policy NEP and the House proposal patterned on the policy indicate they "will fail to meet the 1985 energy consumption, production and balance of payments targets required in the national interest," the professors said.

They said the United States could be importing as much as 15 million barrels of oil a day by 1985, and added:

"Three independent estimates make it clear that a U.S. requirement of this magnitude will create a major international economic crisis."

The report—by Walt Rostow, William Fisher and Herbert Woodson—also concludes that this country has enough oil and gas to return production to the 1976 level—the NEP target, but up to 50 per cent more must be spent on exploration and development than set forth in the House proposal.

"One must conclude," the professors' report said that there exists a reasonable adequate reserve and resource base of oil and gas which is sufficient to support current rates of production for more than 50 years.

"It has been argued," the report added, "that the price structure proposed in the NEP and in HR–8444 is adequate for oil and gas operators to realize a sufficient profit.

"This may well be the case. But what is at stake for the nation is not the adequacy of current profits by business standards—it is rather the rate of drilling and production.

"Even if proposed pricing structures provided for sufficient profit, is the price structure adequate to generate the level of cash flow necessary to mount and sustain the drilling effort required to meet the planned 1985 oil and gas production goals? We conclude . . . that it is not, and that 1985 national oil and gas production will be as much as five million barrels a day below the NEP goal."

They said $699 billion in 1976 prices must be invested to fulfill production and conservation targets of NEP.

OIL AND PANAMA

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the President's proposed Panama Canal Treaty, Mr. Carter and his supporters have constantly told the American people that the canal is a "declining asset" in the world of the future. Because of the canal's declining value to America, the President tells us, we should not hesitate to give the international waterway to the Panamanian dictator, Torrijos.

In its issue of August 5, 1977, one of the largest daily newspapers in my district, the Banner, pointed an important reason why the President is simply wrong about the future value of the Panama Canal to our country. After noting that Mr. Carter had decided against allowing the oil companies to sell Alaskan oil to Japan, the editorialist for the Banner noted that the only way to move Alaskan oil to the east coast is through the canal. Obviously, such a situation can only magnify the strategic and economic importance of the canal to our Nation, which so desperately needs that Alaskan oil. We cannot move the Alaskan production through continental U.S. pipelines and that means we must have an assured canal route.

I commend the Banner's important thoughts on this issue to my colleagues:

OIL AND PANAMA

Bowing to political realities, President Jimmy Carter has backed away from a proposal to sell Alaskan oil to Japan. The oil industry has argued that refineries on the West Coast cannot handle all the oil expected to flow through the Alaska pipeline, and that East and Gulf Coast refineries can be supplied at less cost with oil purchased in the Middle East.

We believe the president has made the correct decision. Americans simply would not accept sale of Alaskan oil to Japan when, in Mr. Carter's own words, the country is engaged in a struggle for energy independence that is "the moral equivalent of war."

The surplus Alaskan oil must be moved east, however. Environmental restrictions in California make it most unlikely that it will move by pipeline. Shipment by large tankers

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

around Cape Horn is not economically feasible. And that brings us to the Panama Canal and a water route that is both practical and cheap.

And there's the rub. A new Panama Canal treaty is in the final stages of negotiation with the leftward-leaning government of Gen. Omar Torrijos, friend and admirer of Cuba's Fidel Castro. The terms of the treaty are expected to call for an immediate weakening and eventual surrender of U.S. control and defense of the canal. There will be a hard fight in the Senate to secure that body's consent to ratification of the new treaty.

How will the Carter Administration square its conception of the Panama Canal as a "declining asset" in the face of new requirements to use the canal for transport of Alaskan oil? Further, how can senators be assured that a canal increasingly under the control of an unstable Panamanian regime is as secure from the threat of sabotage by political terrorists as one manned and defended by the United States? Make no mistake about it—no treaty that the two governments negotiate is going to please extremists in either country.

Much has been made of the canal's vulnerability to "one stick of dynamite" in the hands of a Panamanian nationalist. We are not sure we buy that. We believe the canal is defensible. We are certain the threat to the canal is not going to disappear with the signing of a treaty surrendering to Gen. Torrijos.

SHORTCIRCUITING REFORM

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the actions of the Senate regarding the electric utility section of the National Energy Act have been a major disappointment to those of us committed to the idea of serious rate reform. Indeed, its failure to adopt the provisions contained in the House-passed bill—provisions which would finally send the right economic signals to consumers who conserve—must be seen as a major setback in efforts to create a comprehensive and equitable energy program. I can only hope that the bill ultimately passed by Congress will include the necessary provisions so that real opportunities for rate reform will exist.

In light of this, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to the following editorial from the Boston Globe which excellently describes the reasons why the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee's actions should be reversed:

SHORTCIRCUITING REFORM

The Senate Energy Committee has cut out an important innovation in energy management by excising from the Administration's bill a provision of national guidelines for the regulation of electric utilities. Unless the proposal can be restored by amendment on the floor of the Senate, the House version should prevail when the bill goes to conference.

The main thrust of the Administration proposal was to make electric utilities charge rates that reflect more accurately the actual costs of generating the electricity and getting it to customers. It would have banned automatic reductions in rates for large users except where actual economies of scale could be demonstrated. It would have encouraged higher rates for users during peak hours and peak seasons. And it would have expanded consumer-complaint opportunities and limited the domination by bankers and businessmen of the boards of directors of utilities.

Utilities have fought the proposal with great vigor. Their complaints have centered on the inability of a national regulatory policy to reflect local conditions that are well understood by state regulatory commissions. It is at least refreshing to hear words of support for state commissions—not often voiced in recent years.

But the important principle involved in the bill is one of treating electric-rate reform on a national rather than a state-by-state basis. Last year an attempt was made in Massachusetts to introduce flat rates. The Globe opposed that proposal on the grounds that it would tend to place Massachusetts industry at a disadvantage with industries in neighboring states. The Administration proposal gets around that problem by guaranteeing that no state would gain undue advantage over any other by structuring below-cost rates for business to lure it from other areas.

There are aspects of the bill that could be argued. The provisions for limiting directorships seem overblown, for example. But opposition from the utility industry is also overblown—a reflection of its conservatism and resistance to change. Congress has an opportunity to work real rate reform into the energy bill and it should reverse the Senate Energy Committee's stand as soon as possible.

BETTER IN THAN OUT

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared in the September 19, 1977, issue of Business Week magazine. In early August I signed a letter to the President urging him to consider carefully the consequences of a withdrawal from the ILO and to examine the alternative methods of putting effective pressure on members of that organization. The Business Week editorial, while conceding that the "United States has ample reason to wash its hands of the ILO," shares my conclusion that "walking out now will do little to change (ILO) attitudes or practices." For the benefit of my colleagues I am inserting at this point the full text of the Business Week editorial:

BETTER IN THAN OUT

The International Labor Organization's long record of irresponsible headline-hunting and political posturing forces the Carter Administration to make a hard choice. The U.S. can get out, as it is threatening to do, leaving the ILO without its strongest voice in support of labor and management autonomy. Or it can remain a member in spite of the efforts of the Communist nations and their Third World allies to turn the ILO into a three-ring circus. On the whole, the U.S. would do better to grit its teeth and stay on.

A U.S. pullout would reduce the effectiveness of the ILO in promoting such basic human rights as freedom of association, freedom of workers to organize, abolition of forced labor, and employment without discrimination. These principles and various other ILO conventions on labor relations, health and safety, and social relations are embodied in agreements that are ratified by member nations. The ILO's Committee of Experts, a group of 18 legal specialists, has so far managed to do a capable job of monitoring the extent to which member nations comply with the agreements. There is evidence that the objective reports of the committee do exert a moral force on nations that violate human rights.

The ILO's human rights machinery is by far the most effective in the U.N. system—in spite of the political capering of the Communist bloc. The ILO conventions have become, in effect, part of the Helsinki Agreement, and the Committee of Experts' reports may provide important support for the U.S. when compliance with the Helsinki principles is reviewed at the Belgrade Conference in October.

The U.S. has ample reason to wash its hands of the ILO after the majority's repeated attacks upon it and the calculated insults to Israel. But walking out now will do little to change attitudes or practices, and it might well hasten the movement of the Third World countries toward the totalitarian left.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 8309

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, it is expected that the House will soon consider H.R. 8309, the Navigation Development Act, which would authorize the replacement of lock and dam 26 at Alton, Ill., and which would establish a 6-cent-a-gallon tax on fuel used by commercial barges and tows on the Nation's inland waterway system.

I believe that title II of this bill, which is the fuel tax provision, does not go far enough in making commercial users pay a fair share of the cost of building, operating, and maintaining our inland waterways. It is estimated that the committee provision would recover only about 8 percent of these costs. I think that a much larger percentage recoupment is desirable, fair, and feasible, and that the full House should be afforded an opportunity to consider stronger provisions.

It is important to understand that the users of federally built and maintained inland waterways currently pay nothing for that privilege. In contrast, competing modes of transportation do pay charges for the use of Government-maintained facilities. Trucks pay license and fuel taxes, airplanes pay landing fees, and railroads provide their own roadbeds. Only the barge industry receives a free ride. A recent CBO study showed that Federal subsidies were equal to 42 percent of all barge revenues compared with 3 percent for railroads, 1 percent for trucking, and no subsidy at all for pipelines. Clearly, the time has come for the barge industry to begin paying a fair share of the cost of their facilities.

I am aware of and sensitive to the concern that such a program should be phased in gradually in order to insure that an unreasonable financial burden is not imposed on the barge industry. I also believe that such a program should allow for careful review of the impact and implications of the recovery schedule.

However, I do feel very strongly that the program should mandate a significant and set percentage of recovery because this will cause the users of these facilities to act as watch dogs against unnecessary construction.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, title II of H.R. 8309 falls short of this standard. For that reason, I have proposed that users be required to pay charges which recover 25 percent of operation and maintenance costs and 25 percent of new construction costs.

Both would be phased in over a 5-year period. Such a program would clearly establish the principle that users of our inland waterways should bear a fair share of the cost of their facilities. It would establish the concept of users paying a set percentage of these costs—not just a fuel tax. And, it would provide incentive for the users to make sure that future construction costs are absolutely necessary, since they will be bearing a part of such costs.

Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago, I placed the text of my amendment in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Since that time, it has come to my attention that I have used a different method than the Ways and Means Committee in computing the tax.

In order to avoid any debate over which method to use in figuring the tax, I have asked the Congressional Research Service to recomputate a tax based on the Ways and Means method which would recoup one-half of the 25 percent of operation and new construction costs—the other half to be recouped through other user charges such as licenses, lockage fees, and congestion fees. By using the Ways and Means assumptions, the tax rates in my amendment come out lower than in my original amendment. I am prepared to use these new figures because that way there can be no worry that I have used different data than the committee. For this reason, I would like to revise the tax rates in my amendment as follows:

In fiscal year 1979, the tax on a gallon of fuel would stay at 2 cents.

In fiscal year 1980, the tax on a gallon of fuel would be 4 cents, not 5 cents.

In fiscal year 1981, the tax on a gallon of fuel would be 6 cents, not 8 cents.

In fiscal year 1982, the tax on a gallon of fuel would be 8 cents, not 12 cents.

In fiscal year 1983, the tax on a gallon of fuel would be 10 cents, not 15 cents.

The full text of the amendment with these changes in it follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 8309, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. BEDELL

Page 13, strike out line 1 and all that follows down through line 19 on page 15 and insert:

TITLE II—IMPOSITION OF USER CHARGES FOR USE OF CERTAIN INLAND WATERWAYS

SEC. 201. IMPOSITION OF USER CHARGES.

(a)(1) Not later than the last day of the tenth month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, and after conducting public hearings and permitting not less than forty-five days for public comment, promulgate, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, preliminary regulations establishing a schedule of user charges to recover 25 per centum of the Federal costs of each navigation project constructed, operated, rehabilitated, or maintained by the Secretary on any inland or intracoastal waterway of the United States, and shall publish such preliminary regulations in the Federal Register.

(2) After reviewing any comments on the schedule of user charges set forth in the preliminary regulations promulgated pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary, not later than April 1, 1979, shall, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, promulgate final regulations establishing such schedule of user charges, and shall publish such schedule in the Federal Register. The schedule of user charges set forth in such final regulations shall take effect October 1, 1979.

(b) The schedule of user charges established by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a)—

(1) shall require the payment of user charges pursuant to such schedule by the owner or operator of any shallow-draft cargo vessel for the use by such vessel of any navigation project on any inland or intracostal waterway of the United States;

(2) shall be structured to collect—

(A)(i) in the fifth year beginning after the effective date of such user charges, and in each succeeding year, 25 per centum of the estimated Federal costs of the operation and maintenance of all navigation projects to be operated and maintained in such fifth year by the Secretary on any inland or intracostal waterway of the United States; and

(ii) in the first, second, third, and fourth year beginning after such effective date, 5, 10, 15 and 20 per centum, respectively, of the estimated Federal costs; and

(B)(i) in the fifth year beginning after the effective date of such user charges, and each succeeding year, 25 per centum of the estimated Federal costs of the construction and rehabilitation of all navigation projects to be constructed and rehabilitated in such fifth year by the Secretary on any inland or intracoastal waterway of the United States; and

(ii) in the first, second, third, and fourth year beginning after such effective date, 5, 10, 15, and 20 per centum, respectively, of the estimated Federal costs;

(3) shall be appropriately adjusted for a year to reflect the amounts by which the amounts collected in any previous year were in excess of, or less than, the amounts required to be collected;

(4) shall take into account the volume of traffic and seasonal and other repetitive peak demands for use of the inland and intracoastal waterways of the United States;

(5) shall allow, as an offset or deduction against such user charges, the payment of any Federal tax (including tax imposed by section 4042 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) imposed on any vessel using the inland or intracoastal waterways of the United States enacted on or after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(6) may use, but is not limited to, one or more of the following mechanisms to collect the user charges established pursuant to this section:

(A) License fees.

(B) Congestion charges.

(C) Charges based on ton-miles over a given segment of an inland or intracoastal waterway.

(D) Lockage fees.

(E) Charges based on the capacity of cargo vessels, loaded or unloaded, over various segments of the inland or intracoastal waterways of the United States.

(c) Any owner or operator of a shallow-draft cargo vessel who fails to pay any user charge in accordance with the regulations promulgated pursuant to subsection (a)(2) of this section shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 per day for each day during the period for which such violation continues and, during such period, shall be prohibited from the use of any lock on any inland or intracoastal waterway of the United States.

(d) Not later than three years after the effective date of the schedule of user charges established pursuant to subsection (a)(2) of this section, the Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of Transportation, shall submit to the Congress a report on the implementation of the provisions of this section. Such report shall describe—

(1) the economic impact of user charges on the commercial users of and consumers of goods shipped on the system of inland and intracoastal waterways of the United States;

(2) the economic impact of user charges on a regional and national basis;

(3) the effectiveness of user charges in establishing a more balanced national transportation system;

(4) the effectiveness of user charges in promoting the more efficient use of public investments in the Nation's system of waterborne transportation and reliance on the private sector; and

(5) the effectiveness of user charges in providing for the balanced use of the Nation's water resources.

(e) For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "inland or intracoastal waterway of the United States" means any inland or intracoastal waterway of the United States which is subject to this Act by reason of section 103 of this Act (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act);

(2) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers; and

(3) the term "shallow-draft cargo vessel" means any cargo vessel other than a cargo vessel designed primarily for use on the high seas which has a draft of more than 12 feet.

(f) Section 154 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1976 is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking out "December 31, 1978" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1979"; and

(2) in subsection (d), by—

(A) striking out "and" at the end of clause (E);

(B) striking out the period at the end of clause (F) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(C) adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(G) waterway user charges.".

SEC. 202. IMPOSITION OF TAX

(a) Chapter 31 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special fuels) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 4042. TAX ON FUEL USED IN COMMERCIAL TRANSPORTATION ON INLAND WATERWAYS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby imposed a tax upon any liquid used during any calendar quarter by any person as a fuel in a vessel in commercial water transportation.

"(b) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be—

"(1) in the case of a use after September 30, 1979, and before October 1, 1980, 2 cents a gallon,

"(2) in the case of a use after September 30, 1980, and before October 1, 1981, 4 cents a gallon,

"(3) in the case of a use after September 30, 1981, and before October 1, 1982, 6 cents a gallon,

"(4) in the case of a use after September 30, 1982, and before October 1, 1983, 8 cents a gallon, and

"(5) in the case of a use after September 30, 1983, 10 cents a gallon.

"(c) Exemptions—

"(1) DEEP-DRAFT OCEAN-GOING VESSELS.—The tax imposed by subsection (a) shall not ap-

ply with respect to any vessel designed primarily for use on the high seas which has a draft of more than 12 feet.

"(2) PASSENGER VESSELS.—The tax imposed by subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to any vessel used primarily for the transportation of persons.

"(3) USE BY STATE OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN TRANSPORTING PROPERTY IN A STATE OR LOCAL BUSINESS.—Subparagraph (B) or subsection (d)(1) shall not apply with respect to use by a State or political subdivision thereof.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) COMMERCIAL WATER TRANSPORTATION.—The term 'commercial water transportation' means any use of a vessel an any inland or intracoastal waterway of the United States—

"(A) in the business of transporting property for compensation or hire, or

"(B) in transporting property in the business of the owner, lessee, or operator of the vessel (other than fish or other aquatic animal life caught on the voyage).

"(2) INLAND OR INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY OF THE UNITED STATES.—The term 'inland or intracoastal waterway of the United States' means any inland or intracoastal waterway of the United States which is subject to the Navigation Development Act by reason of section 103 of such Act (as in effect on the date of the enactment of such Act).

"(3) PERSON.—The term 'person' includes the United States, a State, a political subdivision of a State, or any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing.

"(e) DATE FOR FILING RETURN.—The date for filing the return of the tax imposed by this section for any calendar quarter shall be the last day of the first month following such quarter."

(b) Section 4293 of such Code (relating to exemption for United States and possessions) is amended by striking out "chapters 31 and 32" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 4041, chapter 32,".

(c) The table of sections for chapter 31 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"SEC. 4042. Tax on fuel used in commercial transportation on inland waterways."

(d) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1979. The first proposed regulations under section 4042 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall be published in the Federal Register not later than the day which is 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

JOHN "JAKE" HORN HONORED

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend John "Jake" Horn of Winchester, Mass., for his years of service on behalf of veterans. Himself a veteran of World War II, Jake served in the U.S. Navy and was posted in the Pacific theater.

Among other things, Jake has been a town meeting member for over 25 years and has been a member of the personnel board of the American Red Cross. He was also a past commander and quartermaster of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 3719.

John "Jake" Horn suffered a tragedy in November 1974. At that time he fell from a leaf machine and fractured four vertebrae. Despite the necessarily long convalescence period, Jake has continued his fine work. He is presently meeting with the board of selectmen and has been assisting in the acquisition of two new wings for the honor roll to honor those who served in Korea and Vietnam. I thank him for all that he has done through adversity and wish him continued success.

BILL TO DEAL WITH LABOR UNREST IN THE COAL FIELDS

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues a measure being introduced today by Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina and myself, a bill to deal with labor unrest in the coal fields.

THE PROBLEM

Coal is an essential element in the lifeblood of our economic system. Its use will be increased dramatically in the coming years under a national energy policy now being formulated that will require new and existing electric power plants and major fuel-burning installations to use coal as their primary energy source. However, for many years labor unrest among the United Mine Workers has hampered the production of coal, a trend that is likely to worsen unless steps are taken by which the miners will be allowed to return to work.

The labor unrest is influenced by two factors—a strong adherence to union tradition, such as honoring another union's picket line, and roving stranger pickets who threaten to commit, and who do commit, violent acts upon those who would rather work than strike in support of a labor dispute at a distant mine.

THE REMEDY

The remedy we propose is twofold.

Federal courts would be empowered to enjoin sympathy strikes, and violent activity committed at or about a job site would be declared unlawful under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA).

The problem addressed by Section (a) of our bill is best illustrated by *U.S. Steel Corp.* v. *UMW*, 93 LRRM 2945 (1976), in which roving stranger pickets threatened workers with threats of physical bodily harm or personal property damage. Despite efforts of the union leadership, the miners refused to cross the picket lines.

The court declined to order the miners back to work because there was no legal authority for it do so. The court described the situation as "alarming" and said that "under the current conditions legislative action may be necessary." Id. at 2948. Even though the miners themselves wanted to return to work, the court lamented:

> We cannot grant the injunction to help the unions combat the dissident few who apparently are on the threshold of making a mockery of our time-tested system of laws. Id.

The court concluded that it "now appears that the days of eradicating labor strife through peaceful arbitration are close to extinction." Id.

In *Boys Market, Inc.* v. *Retail Clerks Union*, 398 U.S. 235 (1970), the Supreme Court held that section 4 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act does not prohibit a Federal court from enjoining a labor strike if the underlying dispute which gave rise to the strike is subject to a mandatory grievance and arbitration procedure agreed upon by the employer and the striking union. However, in *Buffalo Forge Co.* v. *United Steelworkers*, 428 U.S. 397 (1976), the Court narrowed Boys Market by saying that even though the parties involved in a labor dispute are bound by a collective bargaining contract containing a no-strike/no-lockout provision, the union is still free to engage in a sympathy strike.

Section (a) seeks to reaffirm the more reasonable approach of encouraging, not hindering, the peaceful settlement of contract disputes by resolving differences privately through methods other than work stoppages. This is done by making clear that Federal courts have power to enjoin breach of contract strikes by amending section 10 of the Labor Management Relations Act to provide for specific enforcement of a no-strike/no-lockout clause irrespective of the wording of an arbitration clause that might also be included in the contract.

Although coal production per manday has declined dramatically in the past 10 years, President Carter wants to increase coal production to more than 1.1 billion tons a year by 1985, a level which will be difficult to attain under the most ideal of circumstances. One of the factors that will cause a shortfall is continued labor unrest in the coalfields. Despite the fact that the United Mine Workers (UMW) signed a contract with mine operators that contains a no strike/no-lockout provision, wildcat strikes permeated the coalfields. For example, the wildcat strikes this summer are estimated to have cost 11 million tons of production.

Under the labor contract between the United Mine Workers and the Coal Mine Operators, revenues paid into health and pension funds are based on royalties geared to coal production. A decline in coal production resulting from strikes means less money will be paid into the funds' assets. The loss from January through August of 1977 was $45 million. In June 1977 the decline in coal production due to work stoppages had become so severe that the funds no longer had sufficient income to provide cost-free medical coverage and, thus, benefits were reduced accordingly. The funds' reserves could no longer absorb the losses resulting from decreased revenue.

In July the wildcat strikes were particularly severe. Two hundred seventy-nine thousand man-days were not worked resulting in nearly 2½ million tons of coal not mined, over $17 million in wages not paid and about $5.3 million lost to the UMWA Health and Retirement Funds in just that 1 month.

The existing remedies available to persons harmed by violent activity engaged in during labor disputes are inadequate.

Although violent conduct may result in an unfair labor practice under section 8(a)(1) or 8(b)(1) of the NLRA the only remedy available from the National Labor Relations Board is a cease-and-desist order. The Board will not authorize even backpay for employees unable to work because of violent conduct by others during a labor dispute.

In essence, it is only the on-going continuing acts of violence or coercion for which the act affords any relief, as a cease-and-desist order offers no consolation to a victim injured by a one-time violent occurrence. Further, even in those situations in which there are continuous acts of violence, the Board, the General Counsel, and the courts, have demonstrated great reluctance to take aggressive action to halt such conduct.

Section (b) of our bill would correct this deficiency by making violent conduct an unfair labor practice warranting mandatory injunctive relief and providing the injured party compensation for any loss suffered as a result of such conduct. The amendment does not invade the legitimate rights of labor or management. It does, however, assure that those provisions of the NLRA which were meant to encourage unions and employers to pursue their own interests actively and vigorously do not also immunize the parties in a labor dispute from punishment when the welfare and property of the public are harmed.

It should be emphasized that this section is not intended to preempt State and local law enforcement mechanisms. Rather, it is intended to supplement those agencies.

As a footnote, according to a September 17 news report, a temporary emergency agreement to bridge the trust fund gap has been made between the UMW and the Bituminous Coal Operators Association. This agreement will not work, however, if we have more strikes in the coal fields.

NO. 893

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, as baseball has joined "apple pie" and "Mom" in importance to American life, I think it is significant to note the outstanding record of Lou Brock of the St. Louis Cardinals. Thus, I am anxious to share with my colleagues this article which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on August 8, 1977:

No. 893

Lou Brock, officially, is now the greatest thief baseball has ever seen. And such has been the excitement generated by his quest to overtake Ty Cobb's record that when he reached base in the seventh inning of Monday's game the San Diego fans urged their opponent to go. And Lou went—base 893 was stolen. St. Louis fans can well understand it. They know the excitement Lou Brock generates any time he gets on base. The pitcher begins concentrating more on first base than home plate; the catcher appears poised to throw before he has the ball; the infield seems off balance as each member keeps an eye on the man who may run at any moment.

From the beginning of the season, this was to be the year the record was broken by the man who had made base stealing a science. He began his string of 12 consecutive seasons with more than 50 stolen bases in 1965. And during that season Post-Dispatch artist Amadee prophesied, "The Cardinals have had their share of swifties over the years but Lou Brock is poised to top them all." Top them all he has. Then when he got off to a slow start in 1973, Lou said some bench jockeys were saying "Old Man, you can't do it anymore." But the old man showed them. He stole 70 bases that year and during the next set the single season record of 118 thefts. Now at 38 he has the record and has time yet to run up the tally. How about a thousand, Lou?

RENTERS' TAX EQUITY

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an itemized deduction equal to 75 percent of rent paid for a person's principal residence during the taxable year. This amendment would end the discriminatory treatment of renters in the current tax code.

Interest payments on home mortgages have long been deductible in our Federal income tax. Rent payments, however, are not deductible, which results in discrimination against renters. Two identical people with an equal sum to invest in residences will bear different tax burdens if one buys a house and the other rents a comparable house and invests his money—see table.

Not only is there no rationale for this bias, the unequal burden falls most heavily on low-income people. The majority of low-income housing is rented, houses are not in oversupply, and movement from city residences to suburban homes is not generally desirable.

Under my bill, homeowners will continue to have adequate compensation for the burden of property taxes, for it does not affect homeowners. When property tax rates, mortgage interest deductions, and taxes on alternative forms of investment are evaluated, it is clear that those who invest in homes do not bear an unfair tax burden. The 75-percent deduction figure in my bill amounts to a modest differential in the treatment of homeowners and renters for the purpose of equalizing to some extent the differences in property tax burdens.

Legislation of the kind I am proposing here has been opposed by the Treasury Department in the past on grounds that a rent deduction would cause a decrease in tax revenues. Greater revenues, however, do not justify unfair laws and unequal treatment.

Others in this body have introduced legislation which would provide a credit equal to 5 percent of qualified rent payments. This device would provide relatively more relief to low income than to high income groups. However, it is inconsistent with existing provisions of the tax code. Since mortgage interest payments are deductible and imputed rent is ignored, rent payments should be made deductible.

I urge support for my bill and for the equal tax treatment of renters and homeowners which it will provide. The following table illustrates the inequity of the current definition of taxable income and the effect of the proposed amendment.

(Assumption: each person has $40,000 to invest and wishes to live in a comparable home.)

	Renter	*Equity owner*	*Mortgage-owner*
Imputed rent	0	$2,000	$2,000
Interest paid	0	0	2,000
Dividends	$2,000	0	2,000
Taxable income under current law	2,000	0	0
Taxable income under amendment	0	0	0

ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION'S "DIRTY DOZEN" LIST

HON. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from the friendly, if misinformed, folks at Environmental Action's Dirty Dozen Campaign Committee. These self-styled environmentalists—although who they represent and from whence comes their authority escapes me—were kind enough to include my name on their 1976 "dirty dozen" list.

The communication concerned the upcoming vote on funding the controversial Clinch River breeder reactor. That is OK with me. Many individuals and groups contact me with regard to pending legislation and often are a source of valuable information.

Unfortunately, Environmental Action's latest effort at shaping the course of future events contained a paragraph which is inappropriate. The offending and offensive sentences follow:

From an environmental standpoint, the vote in September will be one of the most important votes you will cast in this session of Congress. I want to be perfectly frank in telling you that the Dirty Dozen Committee will use this vote (along with others) for the purpose of selecting the 1978 Dirty Dozen. I want to make sure that you are aware of this fact when you make your decision on the CRBR program.

The above language is pompous. The tone is self-righteous, all knowing and holier-than-thou. A reasonable person could well construe it as nothing more than a thinly veiled threat.

My vote with regard to the Clinch River breeder reactor will be based upon facts, evidence, and what I perceive to be

the best interests of the United States. Making Environmental Action's hit list for 1978 does not bother me in the least. Certainly I am not going to try and curry favor with this or any other special interest group. Perhaps the dirty dozen campaign ought to put its own house in order before attempting to clean out the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 6693 TO PROHIBIT SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will soon consider H.R. 6693 which will amend and extend the provisions of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act.

At that time, I intend to offer the text of the child exploitation prevention bill, which was introduced by Mr. MURPHY of New York and myself, as an amendment. This amendment would extend the original concept of H.R. 6693 by prohibiting commercial sexual exploitation of children.

Extensive hearings have been held on this legislation which is being sponsored by 126 Members of the House. Hearings were held in Los Angeles and New York in addition to hearings here in Washington. Among those who testified were people from the Justice Department, local law enforcement agencies, prosecutors' offices, treatment facilities, the media, and academic institutions. The final version of the bill incorporates some of the suggestions made by these witnesses.

The testimony demonstrated both the scope of the problem and the serious consequences for those children who are commercially sexually exploited. In the course of these hearings, we have discovered that the sexual abuse of children is a much more prevalent problem than many of us had suspected. I think that we also came to the conclusion that no single faceted approach will be sufficient to deal with this serious problem. Additional attention needs to be given to prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation on both the Federal and State levels. I envision this amendment as the beginning of a process in which we do much more to protect our children from sexual abuse and treat those who are the unfortunate victims.

This amendment will attack one of the most reprehensible aspects of this problem. It will provide punishments for those whose motivation for abusing a child is greed and profit.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, the text of which follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 6693

(Offered by Mr. KILDEE)

Page ___, after line ___, add the following new section:

SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN

SEC. 7. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the use of children as subjects in the production of pornographic materials is very harmful to both the children and to society as a whole;

(2) the production and sale of such pornographic materials represent many millions of dollars in annual revenue, and the sale and distribution of such materials are carried on to a substantial extent through interstate and foreign commerce and through the means and instrumentalities of such commerce; and

(3) existing Federal laws dealing with the interstate distribution of pornographic materials do not protect against the use of children in the production of such materials, and specific legislation in this area is both advisable and needed.

(b) The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (Public Law 93-247; 88 Stat. 4) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN

"SEC. 8. (a) Any person who causes or willfully permits a child to engage in a prohibited sexual act or in the simulation of such an act shall be punished as provided under subsection (c) if such person knows, has reason to know, or intends—

"(1) that such act will be photographed, filmed, or electronically reproduced; and

"(2) that any photograph, printed material containing such photograph, film, or electronic visual image depicting such act will be transported or shipped through interstate commerce or foreign commerce for purposes of sale or resale, will be made available for sale or resale in a manner which will affect interstate commerce or foreign commerce, or will be mailed in connection with the sale or resale of any such materials.

"(b) Any person who photographs, films, or produces an electronic visual image of a child engaging in a prohibited sexual act or in the simulation of such an act shall be punished as provided under subsection (c) if such person knows, has reason to know, or intends that any photograph, printed matter containing such photograph, film, or electronic visual image made by such person depicting such an act will be transported or shipped through interstate commerce or foreign commerce for purposes of sale or resale, will be made available for sale or resale in a manner which will affect interstate commerce or foreign commerce, or will be mailed in connection with the sale or resale of any such materials.

"(c) Any person who violates subsection (a) or (b) shall be fined not less than $5,000 nor more than $50,000, or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

"REPRODUCTION, TRANSPORTATION, AND DISSEMINATION OF CERTAIN PHOTOGRAPHS, FILMS, AND ELECTRONIC VISUAL IMAGES

"SEC. 9. (a) Any person who—

"(1) manufactures, reproduces, or duplicates any photograph, film, or electronic visual image depicting a child engaging in a prohibited sexual act or in the simulation of such an act, and who knows, has reason to know, or intends that the product resulting from such manufacture, reproduction, or duplication will be transported or shipped through interstate commerce or foreign commerce for purposes of sale or resale, will be made available for sale or resale in a manner which will affect interstate commerce or foreign commerce, or will be mailed in connection with the sale or resale of such materials;

"(2) knowingly transports or ships through, or in such manner as to affect, interstate commerce or foreign commerce or knowingly mails any photograph, printed matter containing such photograph, film, or electronic visual image depicting a child engaging in a prohibited sexual act or in the simulation of such an act, for the purpose of sale or resale;

"(3) knowingly receives for the purpose of selling or knowingly sells any photograph, printed matter containing such photograph, film, or electronic visual image which has been shipped or transported through, or in such manner as to affect, interstate commerce or foreign commerce or has been mailed, and which depicts a child engaging in a prohibited sexual act or in the simulation of such an act; or

"(4) uses for profit, or makes available for profit, in any public showing any film or electronic visual image which has been transported or shipped through, in such a manner as to affect, interstate commerce or foreign commerce or which has been mailed, and which depicts a child engaging in a prohibited sexual act or in the simulation of such an act,

shall be punished as provided in subsection (b).

"(b) Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be fined not more than $25,000, or imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.

"ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY

"SEC. 10. Enforcement authority for the provisions of sections 8 and 9 shall be vested in the Attorney General of the United States.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 11. For the purposes of sections 8 and 9—

"(1) the term 'child' means any individual who has not attained age 16;

"(2) the term 'prohibited sexual act' means sexual intercourse, and intercourse, masturbation, fellatio, cunnilingus, sexual oriented sadomasochistic abuse, sexual bestiality, or a lewd exhibition of the genitals in the context of any sexual activity;

"(3) the term 'public showing' means any showing which is accessible to the general public for the payment of any direct or indirect fee or other consideration and includes any membership organization for which the qualifications are established for the primary purpose of making any individual who qualifies as a member eligible to attend such a showing; and

"(4) the term 'simulation' means the depiction of the genitals in explicit sexual activity which gives the appearance of the performance of any prohibited sexual act.".

HELSINKI'S UNFULFILLED PROMISE

HON. MARTY RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having the opportunity to join my distinguished colleague, Representative DRINAN, in a project he initiated entitled "Helsinki's Unfulfilled Promise." As we are all aware, in August of 1975, 35 nations signed the Helsinki Final Act which pledged to facilitate the reunification of families separated by political boundaries. It would appear that the Soviet Union's promise, however, is virtually meaningless as evidenced by the number of families who have been divided because of the U.S.S.R.'s harsh and discriminatory emigration policies.

I am deeply saddened by the need to call your attention, once again, to the case of Celia and Joseph Kats and their young son, Albert. Since 1973, the Kats family has attempted to leave the Soviet Union and join Celia's mother, Mrs. Goldetha Fooxman, who lives alone in Bat Yam, Israel. To date their request

has been refused 34 times under the pretext that Joseph served in the army and, therefore, his emigration would be a threat to State security. Supposedly, Joseph Kats could not leave the country for 5 years after his Army term—it should be noted that this period of time has already expired but no decision has been forthcoming from Soviet officials.

It is commendable that this family and others like them, continue to pursue their dream of being reunited with loved ones despite the overwhelming obstacles posed by their government. That the Soviet Union can continue to forcibly retain those citizens within their borders, however, is certainly a tragedy. I would urge every Member of Congress to look within his or her heart and, by joining this vigil, express concern and compassion for those who must always struggle for freedom.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PENSION TIME BOMB DEMANDS IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a problem of particular concern to the cities of America: The runaway cost of public employee pension plans.

One of the more serious examples of this problem is found there in the District of Columbia.

For the benefit of my colleges—who will soon be voting on a measure to solve the District of Columbia's pension problem—I wish to insert in the RECORD two Washington Post articles.

The first, authored by Neil R. Peirce, outlines the general public pension problem. The second, a letter by David A. Ryan, focuses in on the District's pension problems.

We will have before us, on Monday, September 26, the bill, H.R. 6536, the District of Columbia Pension Reform Act. I am also inserting a fact sheet relating to H.R. 6536.

I helped draft the D.C. Pension Reform Act, I worked on it extensively in the 94th Congress and again, in this Congress.

I believe H.R. 6536 is a good, solid, defensible and prudent bill. I hope all my colleagues will look over these materials closely and support H.R. 6536 when it reaches the floor next Monday, September 26.

SIX STEPS TO PENSION SANITY

(By Neal R. Peirce)

DETROIT.—By the time he'd finished his first term in the Tennessee legislature, says State Rep. John Bragg, he'd learned two things: 1) where the men's room was and 2) that there was something wrong with Tennessee's state and local pension systems.

So, Bragg related at the recent Detroit meeting of the National Conference of State Legislatures, he proposed a study of Tennessee's government pensions. "When the results came out, I wished I hadn't learned what I learned."

Like almost every other state, Tennessee has built up huge unfunded pension liabilities. Politicians were receiving the accolades and votes for approving generous special-interest benefit packages. Fund investment practices were sloppy and "the hired help"—pension-plan trustees and administrators—"were employees who benefitted from the higher benefits and abuse of the systems. They weren't about to tell what was wrong because of their own vested interest.

Tennessee began broadscale reform under Bragg's leadership. Now, as chairman of the NCSL's public-pension task force, Bragg offers a checklist of six basic steps any state legislature can undertake to pull its state and local pension plans out of the trough of poor management, poor funding and political expediency:

1. Appoint a committee or council on pensions, made up of "hard-headed, thick-skinned legislators—preferably from safe districts, so they don't have to play to special interests—who are willing to work and learn about pensions and get some control of these programs." Without that first step, says Bragg, "you're dead—because nobody else cares."

Every proposed pension change must then be forced to run the gauntlet of that committee, Braggs says, so that it can be exposed to full actuarial analysis and the true costs revealed.

2. Eliminate pension hopping. Under this popular loophole, an employee may work years as a ditch digger, then get appointed to a higher-paying job just before he retires and get all his years at ditch digging credited at high salary to give him an inflated pension benefit. The most notorious example is New York's practice of using only an employee's last year of work—including overtime—to determine his pension base.

Now in Tennessee (and a few other states) a worker gets a pension based exclusively on the money he paid into the fund, plus the state or local government's matching contribution to the pension fund.

3. Eliminate double-dipping. The most notorious examples are federal laws that permit a person receiving a full military pension to go back to work for Uncle Sam drawing a full civilian salary at the same time. There are currently 150,000 double-dippers on federal payrolls, drawing $1 billion annually in pensions plus their current salaries.

Double-dipping is also a chronic problem in the states—highway patrolmen, for instance, who retire with pensions at 55 and then get elected local judges.

4. Examine disability procedures and rolls. It's generally much easier to qualify for a disability pension in government than private business, and the area is rife with abuses.

A favorite gambit of government administrators who want to reduce work forces or get rid of an employee they don't like is to discover he or she has some kind of disability and must be pensioned immediately. While drawing government pensions, "disabled" workers often go off and get other jobs, so that society pays for them twice.

Tennessee tackled the problem with a bill requiring examination of disabled government workers every five years by two physicians.

5. Insist on front-end funding. That means that when any new benefit is added, it's funded immediately on an actuarial basis. When Tennessee was asked to institute a 3 per cent annual cost-of-living allowance on its pensions, advocates said it would cost less than $500,000. But Bragg's committee found the cost would escalate to $100 million annually by the year 2000, and insisted it be funded immediately at an actuarily computed level of $20 million annually.

6. Integrate all public-pension funds with Social Security and place a cap on a pensioner's total benefits—Social Security plus his government pension—of about 70 per cent of pre-retirement income. A cap of 70 or at the most 80 per cent lets the average pensioner maintain his standard of living, analysts say, because of sharply reduced costs and taxes in retirement.

Only 30 per cent of state and local workers are now covered by Social Security, but most pension experts agree with Bragg that coverage should be universal and mandatory. It's short-sighted, Bragg says, for any state or local government to withdraw from Social Security—as several have in recent years.

Bragg says his NCSL pensions task force "will try to get these six reform points instituted in every state."

Other reforms, however, are likely to join the list. Minnesota State Rep. Donald Moe would prohibit collective bargaining on public pensions—a source of some of the worst abuses of recent years. Many legislators are interested in reversing the trend toward early retirements, which balloon pension costs at alarming rates.

Others are pushing for consolidation of myriad local pension plans into consolidated state plans, where the legislature and taxpayer groups can monitor them more easily and better management can increase investment yields. Interest is growing in the computerized data bank on all of a state's pension systems pioneered by Massachusetts.

Bragg reserves, however, the most revolutionary idea of all for himself. "Eventually," he says, "all federal, state and local plans will have to be combined in a single national system, on one master computer. You work for the taxpayer, and he's the ultimate employer."

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 27, 1977]

DEFUSING THE PUBLIC-PENSION TIME BOMB

(By Neal R. Peirce)

BOSTON.—Belatedly—and in the nick of time—state and local governments are starting to defuse the time bomb of widespread underfunded public-worker pensions.

The process is not going to be easy—or cheap. There are decades of neglect, of expedient political deals, of poor pension-fund management and unconscionable concessions to privileged classes of government workers to be paid off.

Massachusetts' solution, for instance, is a 40-year plan that will require—after a five-year phase-in to soften the fiscal blow—expending 26 per cent of state and local payrolls each year to cover the Bay State's huge $12.6-billion unfunded pension liability.

Officials of Boston and other hard-pressed localities worry whether they can afford the annual payments. But Carmen W. Elio, chairman of Massachusetts' Retirement Law Commission and chief architect of the reform plan, warns that if the pension plans aren't put on a sound basis, bankruptcy will be inevitable.

The pension commitments many states and cities have made to their workers, especially when an employee can retire with more money than he was making on the job, amount to "capital punishment of the taxpayer," says Tennessee State Rep. John Bragg, chairman of the public-pension task force of the National Conference of State Legislatures.

Bragg reports that in 16 states a school teacher who retires at 65 after 25 years' service will receive—combining pension and Social Security—an actual increase in after-tax disposable income.

A Philadelphia city worker who retires at 65 after 30 years on the job will draw 129 per cent of his final take-home pay through combination of his city pension and Social Security, pension expert Bernard Jump de-

termined. In Detroit the comparable figure is 116 per cent; in New York City 127 per cent.

There are some states and localities where employees are offered far less. But on the average, according to a Twentieth Century Fund report, pensions for state and local government workers are roughly double those the worker in private industry can expect. Many state and local government retirees are protected by automatic cost-of-living adjustments, for instance—features virtually non-existent in private industry pensions.

Sloppy actuarial work and fund management by political cronies have compounded the problem. The net result is that unfunded pension liabilities—obligations beyond accrued retirement funds—are at alarming levels from coast to coast. Examples: California, $13.6 billion; Illinois, $5.7 billion; New Jersey, $5.3 billion; Ohio, $3.5 billion; Florida, $2.8 billion; Maryland, $2.5 billion. Eventually, taxpayers are going to have to pay all those bills—plus the cost of the federal government's Civil Service and military benefits, an unfunded liability estimated as high as $700 billion.

Massachusetts' breakthrough came after Elio's Retirement Law Commission created a computerized data bank of the state's 101 state and local pension systems. The data bank, the first of its kind anywhere, can determine the cost of any proposed retirement-benefit change on short notice. A fiscal note is attached to any pension bill the legislature considers. One result: no pension liberalization since 1973.

"In the past," Elio says, "everyone used to say, 'Yes, pass a pension benefit today and worry about the cost tomorrow.' But tomorrow is today now, the costs are here, and they just can't keep being passed on."

Before the legislature accepted the new 40-year funding plan, Elio campaigned across Massachusetts for a year, persuading taxpayers and public employees that, without reform, the state's fiscal position would be dangerously weakened, with government workers in jeopardy of losing their pension benefits. Government-employee unions, previously hostile, dropped their opposition.

Massachusetts' data bank will now be expanded across New England under a grant from the U.S. Labor Department, permitting instant comparison of all six states' public-pension plans and effects of proposed changes.

At least half the states have started comprehensive pension reviews, moved to set up consolidated statewide retirement systems or begun, for the first time, to apply actuarial studies to proposed pension changes. Governors have started to veto pension "sweeteners" approved by state legislatures.

Delaware's legislature voted to limit new employees' total retirement benefits (including Social Security) to 75 per cent of final pay. New York began a reduced benefit plan for all new state and local government workers, which ties in Social Security benefits and is expected eventually to reduce pension costs by some 20 per cent.

Reduced benefits generally apply only to new employees, not workers already covered, on the legal theory—enforced vigorously by courts—that pension concessions once made are contracts a government can't break. But the Tennessee Supreme Court last year said that, if paying full pensions ever threatened the state's fiscal stability, the state might renege on its commitments.

With the pension debts states and localities must pay off in the next quarter century—in some cases exceeding active payrolls—there's a distinct chance of default in paying pensioners unless early reforms are made.

There have already been sufficient state reforms, however, to take the wind out of the sails of a congressional effort to impose on state and local pension systems many of the reporting, disclosure and fiduciary requirements already applicable to private-sector pension plans.

The House Pension Task Force last year issued a blistering critique of state and local plans, saying they lacked many of the basic safeguards required of private plans, often failed to inform participants of plan operations or the benefits they could expect, and in some cases were so poorly managed they "fairly reeked of culpability." State pension reformers smell gross hypocrisy in the idea of Washington applying private-sector standards to state and local governments while neglecting its own grossly overcommitted pension programs. It would be a classic case, says Elio, of "Don't do as I do; do as I say."

The best approach, Elio suggests, is to expand data banks across the country and foster frequent communication between the states on ways to improve their pension systems. That way, he believes, the states can achieve needed reforms without confusing federal regulations.

"I think we can put our own houses in order," Elio says. And while the states have a long way to go, the evidence suggests they are beginning to do just that.

FIRE FIGHTERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., September 1, 1977.

EDITOR,
Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDITOR: We read with great interest an article "Defusing the Public-Pension Time Bomb", by Neal R. Peirce, in your August 27th edition. There are many points raised by Mr. Peirce that we think need further elaboration as many have a very familiar ring to us. In the whole we agree with Mr. Peirce and it is obvious that many jurisdictions are reviewing their pension liabilities and how they will be met. We find it particularly interesting that this second look by Cities and States seems to have been brought about by the possibility of Congressional intervention. We don't doubt this is true but question whether "the pot is not calling the kettle black."

The District of Columbia firefighters, police officers, and teachers find themselves deeply involved in a pension morass similar to that described by Mr. Peirce. There is one basic difference in that our systems have been the sole responsibility of the Congress since their inception. Until the passage of the Home Rule Act in 1974, Congress alone determined the level of benefits for these District employees and also elected not to provide funds for these benefits so now the unfunded liability is over 2 billion dollars. Congress, being aware of this took action to correct this financial dilemma in 1974 and again in 1975 under the lead of Congressman Thomas Rees. Neither of Mr. Rees's bills were viewed favorably by the Administration and never were brought before the House. In 1976 Congressman Mazzoli took up the cause and his bill was unanimously reported out of Committee at about the same time the present Administration established a Task Force to study D.C.'s financial problems. The pension issue was to be a priority issue for the Task Force.

There have been several meetings of the Task Force and all of the Congressional and City representatives strongly support Mr. Mazzoli's bill. However, there has been no decision on this matter to date and all indications are that the recommendation is going to fall far short of what is needed for an actuarily sound system. The Carter administration has not been applauded for its strong support on behalf of cities and it appears Washington will be no exception. It is extremely disturbing in this instance as Mr. Mazzoli's bill, after much discussion, is supported by the employee groups as well as the Congressional and City representatives.

We can understand local and state officials resenting Congressional mandates affecting local issues, even though these local officials brought the problem upon themselves, but what really must arouse their ire is a look at who is pointing the finger. It appears the White House Task Force on the District of Columbia could easily espouse the quote from Mr. Peirce's article, "Don't do as I do; do as I say."

Sincerely,

DAVID A. RYAN,
President.

FACT SHEET ON H.R. 6536—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RETIREMENT REFORM ACT

Sponsored by Mr. Mazzoli and co-sponsored by Mr. Diggs, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Bauman, Mrs. Holt, Mr. Steers, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Fauntroy, Mr. Marks, Mr. Dellums, Mr. McKinney, Mr. Harris, Mrs. Meyner, Mr. Fisher, Mrs. Spellman, Mr. Whalen, Mr. Stark, Mr. Applegate, Mr. Simon, Mr. Badillo, and Ms. Mikulski.

1. Establishes separate retirement Funds for police and firefighters, teachers, and judges with District Government and employees contributing 80% and the Federal Government, 20%.

2. Establishes an independent Retirement Board to manage the Funds (11 members, 5 appointed by District, 6 elected by active and retired employees). Invests the Board with fiduciary responsibility over the Funds.

3. Requires the Board to comply with reporting and disclosure requirements similar to those imposed by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA).

4. Prohibits investment of funds in D.C., Maryland, and Virginia securities, real estate, and agencies.

5. Provides the following changes in benefits for D.C. police and firefighters:

FOR PRESENT EMPLOYEES

a. Vesting in 5 years with right to deferred annuity at 55;

b. Biannual cost-of-living adjustment similar to current Civil Service system;

c. Eliminate disability retirement for aggravation of off-duty injuries;

d. Increases survivor annuities to conform with current Civil Service and Social Security practices.

FOR NEW HIRES

a. Base annuities on average of three year's pay (as opposed to one year's pay currently);

b. Changes eligibility for normal retirement to age 50 with 25 years service (as opposed to 20 years and out currently);

c. Bases disability annuities on a medically determined percentage of impairment and places a stronger outside earnings limitation on disability retirees;

d. Strengthens medical and income reporting for annuitants.

FOR TEACHERS AND JUDGES

a. Repeals 1% "add-on" provision in cost-of-living adjustments and provides for biannual cost-of-living adjustment described above;

b. If teacher has elected to receive a reduced annuity to provide for a survivor's annuity and spouse predecease annuitant, allows for the restoration of the full annuity.

Authorization.—The bill includes authorizations of $47.7 million in FY 1978 and a total Federal outlay of $768.9 million ending in FY 2003.

COMMUNICATIONS REFORM

HON. SHIRLEY N. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mrs. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues on the Communications Subcommittee are now engaged in the complex and arduous task of overhauling the

Communications Act of 1934 in order to bring it into line with today's technology. This question has sparked a great deal of interest throughout the Nation and we have all received voluminous correspondence on the importance of this legislation. Recently, the Board of Supervisors of San Bernardino County enacted the resolution below and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION No. 77-175

Resolution of the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors Relating to the Consumer Communications Reform Act of 1977

Whereas, the Consumer Communications Reform Act of 1977 has been introduced in the United States Congress to resolve uncertainties and to reaffirm to the intent of Congress with respect to the structure and direction of the common carrier telecommunications industry; and

Whereas, the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors is in support of a telecommunications policy that would allow as many households as possible to have telephone service at affordable rates; and

Whereas, current policies of the Federal Communications Commission will have a tendency to significantly increase rates to private telephone customers.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Bernardino of the State of California, on behalf of the citizens of San Bernardino County, unanimously feels that the Consumer Communications Reform Act of 1977 should be given serious consideration, and that Congress should establish a policy that will give high quality telephone service at reasonable rates to the local telephone users.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the county's Congressional representatives.

THE KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, in May 1940, 15,000 Polish soldiers and officers were murdered and buried secretly in the Katyn Forest. Their mass grave was in Polish territory occupied by Soviet troops. There seems to be little doubt that the massacre was perpetrated by the Soviets, who had just cooperated with Nazi Germany to smash Polish independence.

On June 19, the State of Connecticut remembered the Katyn Forest massacre under a proclamation from our Governor. I would like to share this proclamation with you, along with a similar statement from the mayor of Hartford:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT OFFICIAL STATEMENT

(By Gov. Ella Grasso)

The citizens of Connecticut are proud of the many organizations throughout our state which dedicate themselves to the veterans of foreign wars and their families.

The Polish Army Veterans Post 119 is one of these outstanding associations. The members have risked their lives for freedom and have made significant contributions beyond their service in times of war.

Each year they display their devotion to the Polish Army Veterans through their observance of the anniversary of the Katyn Forest Massacre in Russia.

This year marks the 37th anniversary of this sorrowful event during World War II, when more than 10,000 Polish soldiers and officers were killed.

The graves of the soldiers were discovered three years later. An official investigation following the war placed responsibility in the hands of the Soviet Union's army which had held the victims captive.

War is the ultimate example of man's inhumanity to man. Through cooperation and communication between nations, we continue our struggle to prevent this evil.

The history of conflict is an invaluable lesson in the tragedy of war and personal loss.

I therefore designate June 19, 1977, as a day of remembrance for those who died in the Katyn Forest massacre, in the hope that humanity will not again be grieved by such acts of violence.

PROCLAMATION: KATYN FOREST MASSACRE DAY, JUNE 19, 1977

Whereas, On June 19, 1977, the Polish Army Veterans Post #119 will celebrate Holy Mass to commemorate the 37th anniversary of the massacre of some 15,000 Polish prisoners of War at Katyn Forest, Russia; and

Whereas, Polish people everywhere, especially Polish Army Veterans, cannot forget what happened at Katyn Forest 37 years ago; and

Whereas, The tragedy not only lies in the death of these Polish prisoners, but also in knowing that the guilty were never punished; and

Whereas, The organization of Polish Army Veterans, Post #119, of Hartford, Connecticut have initiated a program to honor the Polish soldiers murdered at Katyn;

Now, therefore, I, George A. Athanson, Mayor of the City of Hartford, do hereby proclaim Sunday, June 19, 1977, as "Katyn Forest Massacre Day in the City of Hartford," and urge people to honor and remember those 15,000 officers, doctors, professors and other intellectuals who gave their lives not only for Poland, but for the cause of freedom.

LAETRILE BANDWAGON DERAILED

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues recent developments in the States indicating the laetrile legalization bandwagon has lost its momentum. During the August work period, I appeared before the health committee of the California assembly to stop an effort to legalize laetrile in my State. Before being elected to Congress, I was chairman of that committee, and I was dismayed by reports that reached me during the summer of high pressure lobbying tactics which could lead to laetrile legalization in California.

California had tremendous symbolic value to the prolaetrile forces. California was the very first State to outlaw laetrile just a few short years ago; California is our largest State by population, and its legislature is considered very sophisticated in health matters. For California to have legalized laetrile would have had a domino effect on legislation in a dozen other States.

I felt that if California and other States legalized laetrile that our food, drug and cosmetic law would be completely undermined, and the marketplace would be flooded with useless nostrums.

The arguments that I and Donald Kennedy, Commissioner of FDA, made were persuasive to the health committee of the California assembly which voted in August against legalization immediately after our presentation. The vote was 6 to 5.

Shortly thereafter, Gov. Hugh Carey, whose wife died of cancer in 1974, vetoed two measures permitting use of laetrile by patients signing a consent form for patients with a terminal condition.

What does this mean? It means that the lobbying effort of laetrile proponents is not invincible. A growing number of States have rejected laetrile: Hawaii, Illinois, Maryland, North Dakota, South Dakota, and West Virginia.

I have always believed that the best offense to high pressure lobbying is information. I have told my constituents not to be taken in by the slogan, "freedom of choice." The only meaningful choices are informed ones; therefore, I close my remarks today with an article appearing in the August issue of Consumer Reports entitled "Laetrile: The Political Success of a Scientific Failure." This article documents, in a format any layman can understand, why laetrile should not be legalized at this time.

LAETRILE THE POLITICAL SUCCESS OF A SCIENTIFIC FAILURE

(Copyright © 1977 by Consumers Union of United States, Inc. All rights reserved under international and Pan-American copyright conventions. Reprints available from Consumers Union of United States, Inc., 256 Washingon Street, Mount Vernon, New York 10550.)

Laetrile was discovered quite by accident in 1920 during an attempt to improve the flavor of bootleg whiskey. Supposedly "purified" in 1952, Laetrile has been struggling for respectability as a cancer remedy ever since.

Scientifically, it hasn't made it. But its political respectability is growing with stunning speed as state after state passes laws legalizing its use. If that trend continues, the Federal Government's 14-year-old ban on the importation and interstate shipment of Laetrile may well become as obsolete as Prohibition. More important, the Government's ability to rid the marketplace of quack remedies of all kinds may be jeopardized.

The power of political pressure is being felt even in the scientific world. Generally, major cancer-research centers consider it unethical to test a drug on humans unless it first shows promise in animals. Laetrile has shown no such promise. Nevertheless, the National Cancer Institute (NCI) and the Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center—two organizations that have conducted extensive animal tests of Laetrile and found it ineffective—say that controlled human tests of Laetrile may now be necessary.

"Laetrile is a highly emotional issue that will not soon go away," says an NCI official. "By conducting very careful human tests, we hope to prove once and for all time that the stuff is useless, and doesn't do anything that it's touted for." The NCI plans to begin tests with humans in a few months.

A bill currently before Congress would make such trials of drug efficacy very much beside the point. Drugs must now be proved safe and effective before they're marketed. But the "Medical Freedom of Choice" bill, which has more than 100 Representatives and Senators as cosponsors, would remove the

necessity for proving a drug effective, requiring only that it be proved safe. An aide to Representative Steven Symms of Idaho, who introduced the bill in the House, said the Laetrile was not a factor in drafting the legislation. But the bill is strongly supported by pro-Laetrile groups. Its passage would immeasurably help their cause—and immeasurably damage consumer-protection safeguards. Because removing the major obstacle to Laetrile marketing, such a law would legitimize countless other ineffective remedies as well.

Laetrile, a trade name coined by its developers, is the spiritual descendant of a long line of unproven cancer remedies, including such old-time favorites as turpentine and green frogs and such 20th-century hoaxes as Krebiozen and Harry Hoxsey's herbal remedy. In 1976, the American Cancer Society published a list of 71 would-be treatments promoted to help cancer sufferers but deemed valueless by the ACS. Those products, or products like them, could flood the market and compete with effective anticancer therapies if the "Medical Freedom of Choice" bill were passed.

LAETRILE, THE DRUG

When Laetrile was first discovered, its future impact could hardly have been foreseen. Derived mainly from crushed apricot pits, which contain traces of cyanide, Laetrile was considered too toxic for human use by its discoverer, Dr. Ernst Krebs, Sr., a California physician. But after his son, Ernst Krebs, Jr., claimed to have "purified" it, both father and son advocated Laetrile as an effective treatment for cancer. Laetrile was off, if not yet running.

The next step was to explain how Laetrile worked. With a little imagination, the younger Krebs came up with a "magic bullet" theory. Cancer cells, he said, contain an abundant amount of an enzyme that releases cyanide from Laetrile. The cyanide, in turn, kills off the tumor cells. Normal cells are low in that enzyme, the Krebs theory went, but rich in another enzyme that detoxifies the cyanide. So normal cells live while cancer cells die.

That's an interesting theory, and potentially life-saving, if right. But it's wrong. The supposedly abundant "releasing" enzyme is scarcer in cancerous tissues than in normal tissues and the "protective" enzyme is found in equal amounts in both tissues. Moreover, cyanide does not have bullet-like precision. Because it diffuses rapidly, any destructive effects would spread to both cancerous and noncancerous cells.

Once that initial theory was discredited, Laetrile proponents shifted ground, suggesting a more complex sequence of biochemical events. Again, the scientific community found that the proposed mechanism had no validity. But the most dramatic and effective change in promotional strategy was yet to come.

LAETRILE, THE VITAMIN

After nearly two decades of unsuccessful attempts to get Laetrile approved as a drug, its promoters embarked on another course. Laetrile, the drug, was suddenly transformed in 1970 into Laetrile, the vitamin.

Cancer, so the newest theory went, was a vitamin-deficiency disease. Laetrile, it went on, was "vitamin B–17," the missing vitamin needed to prevent and treat cancer. As a vitamin and not a drug, Laetrile would be exempt from the stringent drug laws enforced by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA).

Just one catch: Laetrile is not a vitamin. *No disease*, including cancer, has been associated with its lack in any animal; it is not an essential nutritional substance; it does not serve a unique bodily function, or, indeed, any bodily function at all.

The name change did not entice the FDA to look the other way. As CU reported in July 1974, the FDA took legal action against *Apriken and Bee-Seventeen*, two "health-food" products containing amygdalin, the technical name for Laetrile. In 1975, a Federal court in California placed the manufacturer of those products under permanent injunction. The judge found that "vitamin B–17" was not a recognized vitamin in human nutrition, and that both products were adulterated foods. The next year, a Federal court in New Jersey enjoined the distributors of *Bitter Food Tablets* from shipping that amygdalin-containing product across state lines. The court found that the promotion or sale of amygdalin as a food or drug constitutes a fraud on the public.

While the vitamin ploy did not win over Laetrile's opponents, it did place Laetrile in step with the "health-food" and mega-vitamin forces—forces that have already influenced Government policy. In 1976, an active lobbying effort by those groups succeeded in severely curtailing the FDA's regulatory power over vitamin products.

Laetrile advocates no longer push "B–17" as an isolated therapy for treating cancer. Instead, it's part of a "holistic" approach that may include large doses of vitamin C, enzymes, rest, exercise, and even transcendental meditation. The history of Laetrile is a history of change: changing theories, changing therapies, and finally, changing claims. Instead of being touted as a cancer "cure"—a word no longer on the lips of most Laetrile promoters—Laetrile is now being hawked on other grounds. It purportedly "prevents" cancer, "relieves pain," "slows" or "controls" the cancer, promotes "euphoria." But what is the real story?

THE SCIENTIFIC STORY

Despite frequent calls by Laetrile proponents for new tests, Laetrile is already one of the most tested cancer treatments ever. In 1953, the Cancer Commission of the California Medical Association investigated Laetrile and found it ineffective. As part of that study, the commission found that all but one of 44 patients treated with Laetrile were dead or still had an active form of cancer. A decade later, when the Cancer Advisory Council to the California State Department of Public Health reported that Laetrile had no value in treating or curing cancer, California banned the use of Laetrile. In 1965, investigators reporting in the Canadian Medical Association Journal found that two formulations of Laetrile—one manufactured in the United States and one in Canada—were both ineffective in cancer therapy.

All anticancer drugs effective in humans were first shown to be effective in animal experiments. Between 1957 and 1975, the National Cancer Institute tested Laetrile in animals on five different occasions. No evidence emerged that Laetrile was effective against cancer. Four independent cancer-research centers performed additional studies in 1975, with the same results.

The most comprehensive series of tests was recently completed by Sloan-Kettering in New York City. From 1972 to 1976, approximately 37 experiements were conducted using Laetrile on mouse and rat tumors. One researcher found evidence suggesting that Laetrile might inhibit the spread of tumors. But those results were not based on sufficiently sensitive techniques, and the findings could not be replicated by other investigators. In all the other animal trials at the New York cancer center, Laetrile neither prolonged life, nor reduced tumor size, nor checked the spread of cancer.

"Laetrile is not active against cancer," says Dr. C. Chester Stock, head of the laboratory conducting the experiments. "If something is *active we would see* it consistently active, which we have not seen with our Laetrile experiments."

Laetrile's claims have recently been challenged in Mexico, the major source of supply for clandestine traffic of Laetrile in the United States. The Mexican Department of Health banned the drug last October, after Mexican scientists said they found no clinical evidence that the compound works against cancer. One firm that appealed the decision lost, and another firm's appeal was still pending as we went to press.

THE TROUBLE WITH TESTIMONIALS

Scientifically, Laetrile just doesn't score; but emotionally, it's flying high. Men and women tell of miraculous cures with the drug, often crediting it with saving their lives.

Although such testimonials are rich in dramatic impact, they lack scientific validity. Medical records submitted by Laetrile proponents have never substantiated the claims made. Many cancer patients who believe they've been cured by Laetrile find out later that they still have the disease. Others didn't have cancer to begin with. Some cancer patients have temporary remissions—periods when symptoms may actually improve; if Laetrile use coincides with such a remission, the patient may think Laetrile did the job. In other instances, patients have taken Laetrile along with accepted medical treatment and attribute their recovery partially or entirely to Laetrile.

The current hero of the Laetrile movement seems to fall into the last category. Glen Rutherford of Conway Springs, Kansas, won the first court decision allowing a cancer patient to import Laetrile for personal use. (Several similar decisions across the country have followed.) Rutherford was diagnosed as having a form of rectal cancer in 1971. He refused surgery, choosing instead a trip to Mexico for Laetrile therapy. Just 15 days into his treatment there, his rectal polyp was cauterized—burned off—by Mexican surgeons. Rutherford continued to use Laetrile smuggled into the United States for several years after his return home. When his supply dried up during an FDA crackdown, Rutherford brought the suit that won him celebrity.

Rutherford attributes his current good health to Laetrile. But five-year survival rates for patients who have had the same type of polyp removed run as high as 90 percent.

In a search for objective evidence that Laetrile works, the FDA asked Dr. Ernesto Contreras, the head of a major Tijuana Laetrile clinic, to provide his most dramatic examples of success with the compound. He submitted 12 case histories. Of the nine whose records were available for review, six had died of cancer, one still had cancer, one had used conventional cancer therapy, and one had died of another disease after the cancer had been removed surgically.

A QUESTION OF SAFETY

The issue of effectiveness is only one part of the Laetrile controversy. A change in emphasis by Laetrile supporters began in 1972 when Dr. John Richardson, a California physician with a large Laetrile practice, was arrested on charges of violating that state's cancer quackery laws. His first trial resulted in a conviction; that ruling was overturned on appeal, and two subsequent retrials ended in hung juries. But the defendant's legal situation had reverberations beyond the courtroom. Dr. Richardson belonged to the John Birch Society, and many of his fellow members had united in his support. One of them, Robert Bradford, turned the ad hoc defense group into an organization working toward legalizing Laetrile: the Committee for Freedom of Choice in Cancer Therapy. That group, now claiming 450 chapters and 23,000 members, is spearheading the legalization fight.

The major thrust of the group's argument is that the Government should not interfere with an individual's choice of therapy, particularly if that therapy is without toxic side-effects and therefore "safe." Laetrile's purported lack of toxicity is not a point strenuously contested by the Government. The drug seems to be nontoxic in usual doses,

but large doses can cause cyanide poisoning. Accidental ingestion of Laetrile recently caused the death of a 10-month-old child.

Whether toxic or not, Laetrile is unsafe, many medical scientists contend, because it is ineffective. A recent FDA Drug Bulletin commented: "No worthless drug is without harm; a patient's choice of Laetrile, to the extent that such choice delays or interferes with swift diagnosis and prompt effective treatment, is potentially fatal."

Early diagnosis is important in most cancers, and swift treatment with such therapies as radiation, surgery, and drug offers the best hope for improvement and even cure. Since cancer is often a progressive illness, any loss of time can imperil those efforts.

Unfortunately, each of those proven methods of cancer treatment may involve some discomfort or pain. A film by Laetrile supporters takes dramatic license with that fact: "Surgery slashes," "Radiation burns," and "Chemotherapy poisons," the film charges. In comparison, Laetrile is promoted as a pleasant, risk-free way of "treating" cancer, two very appealing selling points.

But if Laetrile is taken instead of proven remedies, it presents the ultimate risk. In a number of cases documented by the American Cancer Society, patients with treatable cancer had abandoned conventional therapy for Laetrile. By the time they realized Laetrile wasn't working, their chances for recovery were poor or lost.

FALSE HOPE FOR THE DYING

A great deal of publicity about Laetrile has centered on "terminal" cases—advanced cancer patients who turn to Laetrile as their last chance for life, or at least as a way to ease the pain. For them, the issue seems to be hope, not safety, and the call for Laetrile legalization the most compelling. But the issue of safety still must be faced. According to Cancer News, a publication for the American Cancer Society, permitting Laetrile's use in patients with advanced cancer might give it an aura of legitimacy. "[Laetrile] supporters would be able to cite the fact that it was given by such-and-such a physician, in such-and-such hospital—and it would be available. This immediately would give it the status or a viable alternative to proved cancer treatments. And the danger is that patients whose cancers are discovered in early stages may think that Laetrile is a legitimate therapeutic opinion." Already, an estimated 50,000 Americans are taking Laetrile.

Laetrile is also being promoted for the relief of cancer pain. Some patients report a feeling of well-being and decrease in pain with Laetrile use. But its action as a pain reliever has never been validated. Patients often feel better if they and their doctors *believe* a particular treatment will be beneficial, regardless of whether the treatment has any genuine effect. That phenomenon, which is known as "the placebo effect," has been shown to occur, on average, in about one-third of patients treated with dummy medication.

But what about the right to hope? Even if a drug has no proved value, might it not have psychological benefit for a terminally ill cancer patient? In the debate over Laetrile, legislators have repeatedly confronted the FDA with that question. In a typical exchange, one New York State legislator put it this way: "When you drive your car out of a car wash, doesn't it seem to run better?"

"Maybe," replied the FDA official, "but my car would really run better if it had an engine job. And if anyone tells you a wash will improve your car's performance, he's committing fraud."

CU agrees. In our opinion, the use of Laetrile as a treatment for the terminally ill cancer patient stands in violation of basic patient rights against being duped and offered a false sense of hope. Some people who realize that Laetrile is worthless nevertheless argue that the terminally ill are in a special category and should have the right to choose whatever therapy they prefer. But those patients also have the right to responsible, honest medical care of high quality for as long as they live. The dying patient rarely, if ever, requires deceptive drug treatment. Rays of hope can be offered through words and attentiveness.

THERE'S MONEY IN LAETRILE

In addition to being deceived, the patients or their families have to pay dearly for the deception. Laetrile therapy is not cheap. The cost of a month's treatment at a Mexican clinic has been estimated at between $1500 and $2500. Laetrile smuggled into the United States is priced as high as $50 for a half-ounce vial for injection, compared with a $9 price tag in Tijuana. Tablets sell for nearly $2 in the U.S., but cost only about three cents to manufacture.

A lot of the money made from Laetrile seems to be concentrated in just a few hands—a fact brought to light last year when eight Americans, one Canadian, seven Mexicans, and three Mexican firms were indicted on 171 counts of smuggling Laetrile into the U.S. The indictment noted that Dr. John Richardson, the California physician whose earlier prosecution aroused the John Birch Society, banked more than $2.5-million for Laetrile treatments given over a 27-month period; Dr. Contreras, the Mexican physician with a Laetrile practice in Tijuana, deposited almost $2-million in bank accounts in San Ysidro, Calif., during that same time span. In addition, the indictment claimed, Robert Bradford, who organized the nationwide Freedom Choice group, had received $1.2-million for 700 shipments of Laetrile. (Four Americans were convicted last April in the smuggling case, including Bradford and Richardson.)

THE FORCES BEHIND IT

While some people are undoubtedly in Laetrile for the money, many proponents are true believers in the drug, and others are believers in the political idea that less government is better government. The Committee for Freedom of Choice in Cancer Therapy, the largest pro-Laetrile organization, emphasizes constitutional rights and freedoms. Headed by Bradford and Frank Salaman, another convicted Laetrile smuggler, the organization denounces the medical establishment and governmental intervention in private affairs.

Other organizations fighting for Laetrile legalization include the International Association of Cancer Victims and Friends, and the Cancer Control Society. The oldest pro-Laetrile group is the National Health Federation, a champion since 1955 of unorthodox or unproved medical treatments. Several of its leaders have been convicted of such offenses as misbranding dietary products, marketing electrical devices with false claims, or practicing medicine without a license.

Laetrile supporters have developed into a highly vocal and extremely effective political force. They sponsor conventions for cancer victims and their families. They distribute literature. They petition the Congress. They lobby for pro-Laetrile legislation. In Indiana, hundreds of Laetrile backers were bused to legislative hearings to argue for their cause. Their efforts paid off. The Indiana legislature overrode a Governor's veto, making that state the first to legalize the manufacture and sale of Laetrile. Ten other states—Alaska, Arizona, Delaware, Florida, Louisiana, Nevada, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Texas, and Washington—have also legalized Laetrile use. As we went to press, similar bills were awaiting the Governor's action in Illinois and New York, and several additional states were considering such legislation.

By approaching the issue state by state, Laetrile proponents hope to bypass Federal food and drug laws prohibiting interstate shipment of the drug. Right now, the FDA has the authority to nullify much of the intent of the state legislation if there is an interstate element in the Laetrile traffic. But that authority may be short-lived if the "Medical Freedom of Choice" bill becomes law, opening the way for national Laetrile legalization.

THE REAL ISSUE: CONSUMER PROTECTION

The emotional push to legalize Laetrile has moved some thoughtful people to believe that little or no harm may come from accepting the pleas of terminally ill patients or their families for a worthless drug. But the issue is not so simple. Over the past seven decades, Congress has passed increasingly tough drug laws to protect consumers from the purveyors of quack remedies. Such laws are now being jeopardized by the pro-Laetrile forces and by the state legislatures that bow to their demands. In our opinion, approval of Laetrile as an anticancer drug would devastate the carefully structured consumer-protection drug laws enacted in modern times and would open the door to the legitimization of quackery. According to the evidence on hand, Laetrile has no place in the medical marketplace.

Even more important, the "Medical Freedom of Choice" bill has no place among the laws of the land. It would turn the clock back to a time when purveyors of worthless nostrums could prey freely on an unprotected public, exploiting the fears of the sick and the desperation of the dying. The fight against charlatans in medicine has been long and hard, and it is far from over. If the political victories of Laetrile turn the battle around, it is indeed a much more dangerous drug than anyone has imagined.

LEVITTOWN'S 30TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a coming anniversary of considerable pride to me, and of considerable significance to the Nation. On October 1, 1977, the community of Levittown, which was developed with more than 17,000 homes on farmland during the years immediately following World War II, begins a month-long celebration of the 30th anniversary of its founding. As the U.S. Representative for the Fourth Congressional District of New York, in which Levittown is located, I believe this is truly an anniversary worthy of recognition.

The community of Levittown was unique at the time it was begun, and it remains so to this day. Those whose memories go back to those early postwar years three decades ago will recall the terrible housing shortage. It was an especially trying time for millions of veterans whose dreams of homes of their own in which to raise their families were beginning to seem unattainable.

Then, like an answer to those dreams, came the vast development at Levittown, Long Island, N.Y. Levittown offered a house and lot that a family could afford, first at rentals of $60 per month, then for purchase at $6,990 and $7,990. Most of the homes were purchased with the help of GI mortgages. When the first 200 houses were offered for sale, long lines of veterans waited patiently at the sales offices. They ignored the seas of mud and

piles of construction material as they rented and bought homes they felt would help their dreams come true.

Almost all of those first residents of Levittown were veterans, most of them in the same age group, almost all of them with young children. No one was rich, no one was poor. Eighty percent of the early settlers commuted to New York City to work. And almost all of them came from crowded apartments or cramped trailer courts, or surplus military housing, and welcomed the sense of freedom and space their own homes, lawns, and gardens gave them.

This is why there was, for the most part, a calm acceptance among those first families of the seas of mud, the unsightly piles of construction materials scattered across the land, and the inconveniences of the lack of stores and lack of public transportation. They were looking into the future, were those first families.

They were confident that Levittown would become what it is today; a 7.3 square mile area of shrubbery-shrouded homes, winding tree-lined lanes, and carefully kept green lawns. It is a proud, vibrant, mature community of more than 65,000 people.

A good many of those first families still live in Levittown, one indication of the strong sense of community which envelopes those who live there. Some of those early settlers became active in government. Among them was Paul Widlitz. He is now Judge Widlitz, of the State supreme court. Judge Widlitz was the 107th person to buy a house in Levittown and still resides there. He was active in forming the first Levittown Civic Association to fight for civic recognition, parks, playgrounds, stop signs and traffic lights. Another early, and active resident of Levittown is county court judge Harold Collins, who worked with Judge Widlitz, and who still resides in Levittown and maintains an active interest in the community.

The first State legislator from Levittown was Assemblyman Francis P. McCloskey, who now lives in nearby Syosset. Frank McCloskey took many of Levittown's battles for State aid to education to the floor of the assembly, where, invariably, he was successful.

Because of the large number of veterans in the community, veterans affairs always were of importance. One of the most active in such work was Major John Kilbride, whose civic work and dedication to the Veterans of Foreign Wars continue to this day. Major Kilbride is chairman of the 30th anniversary celebration, and headed the 10th and 20th anniversary committees as well. Also still in Levittown is the first veteran to buy a home there, Phil Heron. Heron will raise the anniversary flag at the October 1 celebration, a flag flown over the U.S. Capitol; which I will be proud to present to Levittown at the ceremonies.

Newspapers are always important to any community, bringing a focus to community life and activities. This was especially true in Levittown, which had its own newspaper almost from the very beginning. The Levittown Tribune was published under that masthead for the first time in February of 1948. Since then the Levittown Tribune has continued to report the activities of the community and to play a role in its civic programs. Bill Bryson, the Tribune's current editor, has provided valuable assistance in the organization of the celebration.

One of the most important parts of any community is its school system. The Levittown school board was formed shortly after the families began moving in. In 1948, the first officers of the school board were elected, with the late Lyle Smith serving as the first president of the Levittown Board of Education. The Levittown School District has grown to include 15 schools and 11,750 pupils.

The community also moved quickly to organize a library for its citizens. Newman Baum, one of the founding members of the modern Levittown Library and one of its first trustees, still resides in the community and is active in library affairs.

Those are but a few of the many, many residents of Levittown who have helped in the early development and improvement of their community. They ignored the critics who derided the Levittown project as an "instant slum." Just how misguided and wrong those critics were can be understood by anyone who visits the Levittown of today. Almost all of the houses have been expanded with additional rooms and patios. And the individual landscaping and other improvements add to the beauty of the tree-lined prospect as one drives down the winding streets of Levittown.

But the neat, well-kept appearance of Levittown is just one indication of the community pride and community involvement which has been a Levittown tradition for 30 years. The schools, the library, Levittown Hall, the numerous playing fields, and the nine swimming pools which have been included in a unique park district, all represent that community spirit which has helped build Levittown into one of the largest communities in the Fourth Congressional District.

In a larger sense, Levittown today represents the spirit of dedication to community betterment and individual responsibility to community which has built, and continues to strengthen our Nation.

That fine spirit also represents a real promise for the future. So long as our citizens continue to help each other for the good of all, our Nation can face its problems with confidence they can and will be overcome. Levittown is a living example of the spirit of dedication and individual responsibility. It is fitting that we join in saluting Levittown as it marks its 30th anniversary, and looks forward to the future with confidence and expectation.

SOVIET ABUSE OF PSYCHIATRY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that the Soviet Union has massively abused the field of psychiatry. Soviet authorities have turned it into a political weapon against dissidents. Perfectly sane critics of the system are locked away in mental hospitals—all with the cooperation of the Soviet psychiatric profession.

I was pleased to see that the World Psychiatric Association has finally condemned such practices. The association recently censured the Soviet Union for "systematic abuse of psychiatry for political purposes." This is an important step since it focuses worldwide attention on the human rights violations that are occurring in the name of psychiatry inside the U.S.S.R.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to include a review from the Economist, of a book which presents a strong indictment of Soviet psychiatric practices:

THE SANITY OF DISSENT—RUSSIA'S POLITICAL HOSPITALS: THE ABUSE OF PSYCHIATRY IN THE SOVIET UNION

(By Sidney Bloch and Peter Reddaway)

One of the most attractive things about the contemporary Soviet dissident writing is its passion for hard, unadorned facts, coupled with an abhorrence of any kind of extravagance. It is no accident, as communists are fond of saying, that these qualities should be shared by this study, the first of its kind, of the abuse of psychiatry in the Soviet Union. Most of the material on which the authors, an Oxford psychiatrist and a London university specialist in Soviet politics, base their conclusions come from Soviet *samizdat* sources. But the 210 case histories of Soviet citizens who have in the past 15 years been interned in Soviet mental hospitals for reasons connected with their beliefs analysed in this book are only the tip of the iceberg. There have certainly been many more, but the authors did not feel that what they were able to learn about them could meet the rigorous standards they had set themselves. They have supplemented documents and pictures actually smuggled out of the Soviet Union by interviews with scores of witnesses—chiefly Soviet psychiatrists and former victims of psychiatric abuse who have emigrated to the west since 1971. But Mr. Reddaway and Dr Bloch have not neglected to study the official Soviet material on the subject. One of the best-known of the victims, Vladimir Bukovsky, who was exchanged for the Chilean communist Luis Corvalan last Christmas, has written a preface.

The result is a devastating indictment of the barbaric Soviet practice of locking away perfectly sane critics of the system in mental hospitals—an indictment all the more effective for being so calm in its tone and so factual in its presentation. The regime's ideological figleaf for this horrifying practice is the pretence that in a people's state only enemy agents and the insane could be opposed to the system. From the authorities' point of view, incarceration of politically inconvenient critics has a lot to recommend it and is certainly preferable to the politically much more damaging option of putting them on trial. Such trials attract attention both in Russia and abroad. Besides, facts (especially doctored ones) presented at the trial can subsequently be checked and shown to be untrue.

For this form of psychiatric warfare to be effective, however, the full co-operation of the psychiatrists is required and that, as the authors show, the Soviet government has had for years from the Soviet psychiatric profession. But not only the Soviet psychiatrists need feel guilty. Amazingly, the official western psychiatric bodies have over the years continued to ignore reports of ugly goings on

in Soviet mental hospitals and to give the official Soviet version of events the benefit of the doubt. That was the line taken by the World Psychiatric Association at its congress in Mexico in 1971.

The official Soviet version has now, however, been exploded, thanks largely to the efforts of the victims themselves to get the facts about the abuses across to the west. The most notable role here has been played by Vladimir Bukovsky and Semyon Gluzman. But they have had help from certain courageous psychiatrists, such as Dr. Marina Voikhanskaya, who, having once discovered the ugly truth, were not prepared to keep quiet. The scholarly work of Mr. Reddaway and Dr. Bloch crowns their achievements. In Russia, too, the worldwide publicity given to the psychiatric abuses has resulted in the practice being discontinued against well known dissidents. But the authors surmise that it might still be going on against more obscure victims.

Appropriately in his preface Mr. Bukovsky asks who would have guessed when Pinel first removed the chains from the mentally ill and stopped them being treated as criminals that 200 years later prisoners would look with fear at Pinel's successors, preferring chains to their "care".

ARMS REVERSAL PROGRAM

HON. HELEN S. MEYNER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mrs. MEYNER, Mr. Speaker, on September 14, 1977, my good friend and colleague, MICHAEL BLOUIN, addressed a conference on "Arms Control and Reduction: Problems and Prospects." In that address, Mr. BLOUIN suggests that the arms race has left the realm of United States-Soviet relations and that countries that did not previously participate in this deadly game are now competing to become nuclear powers. As Mr. BLOUIN indicates, this potential worldwide use of nuclear arms creates an unprecedented instability in trouble spots throughout the world.

Our future discussions on arms limitations should not focus solely on United States-Soviet relations, but on global disarmament as well. The concerns and interests of the rest of the world, concerns that have been largely ignored, will be addressed at the May 1978 United Nations General Assembly's special session on arms reduction. I share Mr. BLOUIN's belief that this forum can provide an invaluable tool in reducing the global arms race. I commend Mr. BLOUIN for his insights and I am inserting for the benefits of my colleagues, the text of Mr. BLOUIN's statement:

ARMS REVERSAL PROGRAM: "ARMS CONTROL AND REDUCTION—PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS"

There can be little doubt that some kind of universal arms reduction is an idea whose time is long overdue.

For the past 35 years, ever since World War II, the United States and the Soviet Union have been engaged in an on-again, off-again game of armament chess.

First we developed one superweapon and then they come up with some equally deadly counterweapon and on it goes.

Imagine if you will the shape the world would be in today if just half of the money, time and resources this country and the Soviet Union have committed towards the purchase and development of arms had been directed towards solving the problems of poverty, hunger and social injustice.

The two superpowers have been able to avoid nuclear holocaust through various types of diplomatic manuevers such as brinksmanship, détente and bi-lateral treaties.

But those were and are only temporary solutions brought about by mutual states of fear.

The days of two superpowers monopolizing the arms trade and being able to decide things just between themselves are long gone.

We are no longer the only nations that need to and must reduce our armaments.

Expenditures on arms have more than doubled in the developing nations since 1960 and those countries spend as much on military programs as they do on education and health care combined.

It seems as if every country wants to become a nuclear power.

Great Britain, France, the Peoples Republic of China, India, Israel, Pakistan, Taiwan and South Africa are just some of the nations that either already have or reportedly are close to developing nuclear weapons capabilities.

India, for example, recently exploded what they called a peaceful nuclear device . . . whatever that is.

With many of the nations of the world constantly at each other's throats this nuclear proliferation can only increase the very real risk of nuclear mutual destruction.

The Mideast is a perennial tinderbox that could erupt into open warfare at the drop of a hat.

Sino-Soviet relations seem to always be on edge; Greece and Turkey aren't exactly the best of friends; the white-only governments in southern Africa don't make for a peaceful climate there either, and there is always the possibility of an unstable dictator along the lines of Uganda's Idi Amin deciding to get his hands on a nuclear device and then trying to flex his muscles.

If conventional warfare wasn't bad enough, the hot spots of the world carry the added potential for so-called tactical nuclear exchanges especially with the development of the "humane", people destroying, "building-saving", neutron bomb.

Perhaps if we could come up with a bomb that wouldn't hurt people but would only destroy buildings we might actually be making progress.

Ignoring the arms problem won't make it go away. Tragically it may take the first exchange of tactical nuclear weapons or a catastrophic accident before enough people begin to realize that.

Whether by accident or design, the result of such an exchange—the death of millions of people on both sides—would be the same.

I'm not sure we as Members of Congress can advocate that this country unilaterally take its weapons and toss them into the ocean.

Most authorities suggest that such a move probably would not bring the desired reaction by other nations and would not be the best course of action for this nation to follow.

Instead, we should be casting our eyes at the United Nations general assembly's special May 1978 session on arms reduction as a tool to achieve a reduction in armaments on a global basis.

While we have the long standing tendency to observe only Soviet policy in the arms control area, an effort must be made to apprise ourselves on the interests developing within the removed but concerned nations. The United Nations special session, requested by the Third World, provides an opportunity for an open forum by which these countries can take a rightful place in voicing their well founded concerns. Whether or not we and the Soviet Union will listen depends upon our receptivity and preparation for the session.

The Congress, executive branch, and perhaps most importantly the Department of State has the distinct option of leadership at this world conference if the concern and interest necessary is forthcoming. Members of Congress have the opportunity of working closely with the Department of State in developing the United States position. There is responsible leadership within our ranks as demonstrated by past years of foreign policy making and this leadership should and must be applied in this instance. Members may also join in participation at the session as observers which, I feel, would be most supportive of our representation.

This won't be an easy task but this country has a unique opportunity to take a leadership role in this conference.

But only if you and I are willing to help convince the general public of the dangers of the continued arms buildup.

There have been conferences in the past which have resulted in the nations moving closer to agreements because they were in the spotlight of public attention.

With the arms race now consuming more than $300 billion annually we can't afford to delay any longer.

The United Nations special session on disarmament may provide the open door and a fresh, enlightening look at one of the most pressing issues facing our world today.

EILBERG PAYS TRIBUTE TO LEOPOLD STOKOWSKI

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, this past Tuesday the world of art suffered a great loss with the death of Leopold Stokowski.

This remarkable man, who occupied the conductor's platform of the Philadelphia Orchestra from 1912 to 1937, was active and still carrying on his passion with music right up to his death at the age of 95.

Under Mr. Stokowski's direction, the Philadelphia Orchestra achieved unparalleled excellence. It broke new ground in virtually every field related to music, whether it was as the first symphony orchestra to play a radio broadcast under commercial sponsorship, or whether it was engaged in such then-unique projects as the Disney film "Fantasia."

Mr. Speaker, a giant of our century has died, and in tribute I would like to insert these editorial comments on Mr. Stokowski from the September 15 Philadelphia Inquirer and Washington Post:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Sept. 15, 1977]

AN INDOMITABLE GENIUS BOWS

Leopold Stokowski, an ageless genius, is dead at 95. He was a musician of such extraordinary brilliance as to defy comparison. Until he died in his sleep in his house near London Tuesday night, he was a person of such indomitable force as to appear to defy mortality. Still an active and imaginative conductor a quarter century beyond the Biblical three score years and ten, he was scheduled to lead a recording performance today, and would have surprised no one if he had lived to do one on his hundredth birthday.

Biographers and music historians of a generation hence will not lay to rest the controversies in which Mr. Stokowski delighted, sometimes perversely. In Philadelphia, where he raised a miserable symphony orchestra to the pinnacle of professional greatness and international celebrity, there are earnest people who still today will storm out of a dinner party at the praise of Mr. Stokowski—or at the criticism of him—and he left the podium here 36 years ago.

The obituaries and biographies are long and rich. They chronicle a life which leaves deep and indelible marks on the history of serious music and especially on the threatrical effects and public popularity of symphony orchestras. There is no responsible way to distill the lustrous legacies of that life into a succinct inventory of appreciation.

There is no way either to settle the disputes about Mr. Stokowski, as an interpreter of great music, as a flamboyant public figure, as a leader of many of this century's greatest orchestras, and as a man of flaming personal and public passions.

That is as he would want it. As a private person, he was a genius of irony, a man to whom there was in everything humor and the ambiguities and conflicts which are the heart of wit and of truth. To say that he despised orthodoxy, which is inviting, would be to miss the essence of the man: To him, orthodoxy did not exist.

None of the infinite ways in which Leopold Stokowski rejected orthodoxy was more dramatic than his defiance of the very idea of age. Finally, Tuesday night near London, mortality appeared to have won the argument, but if it did, the victory was over only the frailness of the human body. Leopold Stokowski's spirit has never flinched.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 15, 1977]

LEOPOLD STOKOWSKI

When artists talk of productive periods, the idea is that these moments of high inspiration come and go. For Leopold Stokowski, productive periods only came and came and kept on coming. At his death on Tuesday, at age 95, his confidence in his abilities was so strong that he was in the second year of a five-year recording contract. Tireless and seemingly ageless, Mr. Stokowski enlarged the art of symphonic conducting to the point that his interpretations and improvisations of great music achieved a greatness of their own. Part Olympian and part prima donna (he said early in his career that he ought to be paid at least as much as Babe Ruth or Jack Dempsey), Mr. Stokowski became a worldwide figure through the universality of music. From his first time on the podium—while conducting a children's orchestra in London at age 12—till his last, he gave more than 7,000 performances.

Mr. Stokowski's earliest achievement was to bring a burst of culture to Philadelphia. From 1912 to 1937 he led the Philadelphia Orchestra, introducing spectacular premiers. Too proud to repeat the same old numbers and too daring not to be challenged by the opportunity to create masterpieces, Mr. Stokowski drew to the concert hall audiences that previously had paid no attention to, let alone much money for, symphonies. In a newly published book on Mr. Stokowski, Paul Robinson writes: "His concerts were often like dramatic events with musical accompaniment. . . . Stokowski had shown that he could reach people, particularly people who knew nothing about classical music."

Critics said that this reaching instinct got the better of Mr. Stokowski when he went to Hollywood in 1936 to make movies. Although the sight (in "100 Men and a Girl") of the dignified conductor trying to bring out the best in Adolph Menjou in the trombone section was perhaps closer to a comic opera than a symphony, Mr. Stokowski later joined with Walt Disney to produce "Fantasia." It is one of Hollywood's most enduring films, based on music from Beethoven, Bach, Tchaikovsky and Musorgski among others.

Mr. Stokowski's innovations—some of them bold, some of them whimsical—often drew criticism. But throughout his career, his passionate commitment was to elevating music. He not only accomplished that. In the process he also lifted the spirits of millions of listeners.

JUGGLING SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the healthy debate which has ensued since a number of my colleagues and I offered a plan for financial restoration and equity strengthening of the social security system. Our proposal is one of several being considered by the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on social security.

Social security's immediate problem is that it is paying out more than it receives from the payroll tax, and consequently must draw on trust funds to make up the difference. If we continue to draw on social security at the present rate, it is estimated that the trust fund for disability payments will be exhausted by late 1978 or early 1979, and that the fund for old age payments will be exhausted by 1983.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Star on Friday, September 16, 1977, commenting on proposed solutions to the financial crisis faced by the social security system. It is obvious from this and other reports that now is the time to tackle many of the inequities which, coupled with the inadequate financial base already mentioned, have contributed to the ineffectiveness of the social security system.

The article follows:

JUGGLING SOCIAL SECURITY

The greatest vulnerabilities of the Social Security system in recent years have been intellectual poverty and political timidity. Democrats and Republicans alike have addressed the intimidating problems largely by calling for ever higher taxes on an ever rising wage base.

Into the leaking dike of Social Security President Carter has jammed these same two fingers—increasing taxes and wage ceilings—and added a third: Using general revenue to keep the trust funds from going broke. The general-revenue provision is one the President will "insist on," says HEW Secretary Joseph Califano.

That's a desperate lunge. It would require substantial borrowing by the Treasury and a consequent increase in the public debt and additional pressure for higher taxes. The general receptivity of Congress to the use of general revenue was indicated several weeks ago when the Senate Finance Committee by a convincing 11–3 vote rejected such tinkering.

But the most encouraging development on Social Security was the thoughtful reform package offered by six House Republicans, including Minority Leader John Rhodes. It marks a clear GOP alternative to the tattered amalion notions of the Democrats.

Made public just before the Social Security subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee took up the issue this week, the Republican proposal would put the system on a sound financial footing for the next 75 years, its architects contend: It would solve the immediate shortfall in the two major trust funds and strengthen the insurance—as opposed to the welfare character—of Social Security.

Already this week, the subcommittee has approved two of the GOP plan's general provisions—to lift the ceiling on allowable earned income by beneficiaries, and to require federal, state and local municipal employes be in the Social Security system. Inclusion of federal workers would end a conspicuous inequity—the ability of federal workers rather easily through moonlighting or after the earlier retirement allowed by their pension plan to earn the minimum Social Security benefit.

The Republicans would prefer that their reform package be considered in its totality. But, of course, that will not occur. However, the GOP proposal should be, and seems to be, stimulating the members of the House subcommittee as they grapple with the severe deficiencies of the system—the Disability Insurance Fund expected to be exhausted by 1979 and the Old Age and Survivors Insurance Fund by 1983.

A major thrust of the plan would be "decoupling"—eliminating the redundant adjustments for both price and wage inflation in calculating benefits. These two changes, the Republicans say, would reduce the long-range Social Security deficit by "slightly more than half."

Another substantial change would be the gradual advancement, from 65 to 68, of the age for full retirement benefits—the change would not begin until 1990 and not reach maturity until 2001, a phasing that takes into account increasing longevity and health among the population. That seems eminently sensible.

There would be a tax increase under the GOP plan—as its sponsors correctly point out, "There are prices to pay for the problems [the plan] solves." This increase would come, for employes, employers and the self-employed, in three stages; 0.5 per cent in 1982; 0.3 per cent in 1990; and 0.4 per cent in 2000. "This means that tax rates would rise, under this proposal, less than 1¼ per cent over a 75-year span." Among the "obvious alternatives" noted by the Republicans, of course, is the Carter administration's hope of removing all wage ceilings and having taxes paid on total earnings. There may be better ways to discourage personal initiative, but an *ad infinitum* bite like that is a sure one.

There are terrible difficulties in reforming so massive a mechanism as Social Security. The tendency has been merely to shore up an eroding foundation. That is not what is needed, and the GOP proposal seeks to avoid delusory fiddling.

There is no compelling reason that major Social Security legislation be completed in this session of Congress. The very complexity of the issue argues for greater deliberation—to avoid, for a blatant example, the 1972 mistake of double indexing.

The administration calls Social Security action a "must" for this session. It should be no such thing.

Representative James A. Burke, D-Mass., chairman of the subcommittee, the other day doubted that "Solomon with all his wisdom could solve all the problems of Social Security before Congress adjourns this year."

The obvious moral: Don't try.

OUR NUCLEAR-POWERED NAVY

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, last month I received a letter from Admiral Rickover regarding our nuclear-powered Navy. The letter was written at sea during the first trials of the nuclear aircraft carrier *Dwight D. Eisenhower*.

I think Admiral Rickover's letter provides important information and insight into our naval needs and insert it at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of all my colleagues:

NORTH ATLANTIC,
August 1, 1977.

DEAR MR. RHODES: We are returning from the first sea trials of the USS *Dwight D. Eisenhower* (CVN 69), our third nuclear powered aircraft carrier and our tenth nuclear powered surface warship. The purpose of the trials is to demonstrate the performance of her two reactor propulsion plant which produces about as much power as the eight reactor plants in the first nuclear carrier, the USS *Enterprise* (CVN 65). The *Dwight D. Eisenhower* was built by the Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company, Newport News, Virginia. She is a sister ship of the USS *Nimitz* (CVN 68) which was delivered in 1975 and is now assigned to the U.S. Atlantic Fleet. One more ship of this class, the *Carl Vinson* (CVN 70), is also under construction at Newport News.

The *Eisenhower* has a length of 1.092 feet, a flight deck width of over 250 feet, and a combat load displacement of nearly 95,000 tons, and can provide sustained support for a naval air wing of about 100 aircraft. Her initial nuclear cores will provide her with enough fuel to carry out operations for the next 13 years, thus making her truly independent of propulsion fuel logistic support. These cores contain energy equivalent to over two million tons of coal or 11 million barrels of oil, enough oil to fill a train of tank cars stretching from Washington to Boston.

The *Enterprise* was delivered in 1961. She operated three years before her first refueling, including a 30,000 mile cruise around the world in 1964 without logistic support. She was accompanied by the nuclear cruisers *Long Beach* (CGN 9) and *Bainbridge* (CGN 25).

Following her first refueling the *Enterprise* operated four years, including four deployments to Vietnam, before her second refueling and overhaul in 1970. To date, the *Enterprise* has steamed almost one million miles. Her present reactor cores are expected to provide fuel for a total of at least 13 years.

We now have seven nuclear-powered guided-missile ships in operation; the cruisers *Long Beach* (CGN 9), *Bainbridge* (CGN 25), *Truxtun* (CGN 35), *California* (CGN 36), *South Carolina* (CGN 37), *Virginia* (CGN 38), and *Texas* (CGN 39). Two more are under construction; the *Mississippi* (CGN 40) and the as yet unnamed CGN 41. Congress has also authorized advance procurement funds for the first of four nuclear cruisers planned to have the AEGIS anti-air warfare weapons system.

When General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower became our 34th President in January 1953, the only nuclear warship under construction was the submarine *Nautilus*. The second nuclear submarine, the *Seawolf*, had been authorized by Congress a few months previously. Mrs. Eisenhower christened the *Nautilus* on January 21, 1954. President Eisenhower rode the *Seawolf* while submerged during naval exercises in the Atlantic in 1957. This was the first visit of a President to a nuclear-powered warship.

During President Eisenhower's Administration 27 more nuclear attack submarines were authorized for construction, including eight new designs.

The *Polaris* nuclear submarine program, which many believe to be our Nation's greatest deterrent weapon system, was started on a crash basis under him in the 1958 shipbuilding program, and the first 14 *Polaris* submarines were authorized in his Administration. President Eisenhower rode the *Patrick Henry*, the second *Polaris* submarine, in 1960

The nuclear surface Navy was also started while President Eisenhower was in office. The cruiser *Long Beach*, the carrier *Enterprise*, and the cruiser *Bainbridge* were authorized in 1957, 1958, and 1959 respectively.

Nuclear power in surface warships gives them the ability to operate continuously at high speed which affords them protection not available to non-nuclear ships. This could mean the difference between victory and defeat in battle. As the number of foreign bases and the size of our Fleet continue to decline and the availability of foreign oil becomes more tenuous, the need for ships not dependent on a logistic umbilical cord for oil will continue to increase.

Next to providing the major deterrent to all-out nuclear war, I believe that the most important mission of our Navy is to insure that our first line of naval striking forces can carry out their mission against threats developing from potential enemies. A significant portion of our major surface warships must be nuclear powered or we may end up without a credible deterrent to aggressions which do not warrant escalation to a nuclear war.

For the foreseeable future the aircraft carrier will be the principal offensive striking arm of the Navy in a non-nuclear war. No other weapon system under development can replace the long-range, sustained, concentrated fire power of the carrier air wing. Nuclear submarines and nuclear surface ships with anti-air and anti-submarine capabilities are all needed to supplement and augment the capabilities of the nuclear carrier.

Carriers are vulnerable to attack by Soviet sea-based cruise missiles—as are all surface ships. However, the first line of defense surface ships have against missiles and their launching platforms is carrier based aircraft. Without carriers and their aircraft, other surface warships, replenishment ships, and amphibious forces will all be much more vulnerable. The nuclear carrier task force with its capability of unlimited operation at high speed is the most powerful, least vulnerable surface ship force in the history of naval warfare.

Nuclear ships are often compared in cost with cheaper conventional ships of much less military capability, the argument being that we should build more of the cheaper conventional ships rather than fewer of the nuclear ships. Yet study after study has shown that when all costs are considered nuclear warships cost little more than conventional warships having the same weapons systems—the nuclear warships being far superior militarily.

Further, the cost of war itself far exceeds any cost needed to be prepared to prevent it. The best warships and ultimately the cheapest we can build are those which are never used in combat because they are adequate to prevent war.

With the heavy military and non-military demands on our budget, the United States must spend only where it is necessary and where the value received is clear. The true value of the Navy capable of countering the Soviet threat cannot be measured in dollars alone; survival may also depend on it.

The Soviets have recognized the importance of becoming the world's strongest sea power. We have chosen not to challenge them with numbers of ships. For this reason, I believe it essential that the ships we do build be the most powerful and effective weapons we know how to build. This requires nuclear propulsion for major warships. The penalty for any other approach is the steady erosion of our conventional military forces, with consequent reduction in our influence and in our "options" in world affairs. The alternative is to rely for our security solely on nuclear weapons; their use could mark the supreme failure of mankind.

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

"STRAIGHT FROM THE SHOULDER"—VINCENT X. FLAHERTY

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr Speaker, a few years ago, before sports reporting became so technical, with instant replays and expert commentators who analyze the game with the microscopic detail of a scientist reporting on an amoeba, there was a group of sports reporters who had the ability to transform the mortals on the field into legends. Last week, one of those reporters, Vincent X. Flaherty, died in Los Angeles. He was 68.

Vince Flaherty believed that if you "put a ball in a kid's hand, he is not going to have time to pick up a rock." Never mind the million dollar contracts, and the petty disputes; the game was to be played as a romantic adventure that every person could participate in, whether it be on the field or through the imagery of the printed word.

Born in Washington, D.C., Flaherty claimed his father "made more money during his lifetime than any millionaire." His dad worked as a printer for the Bureau of Printing and Engraving where U.S. currency is manufactured.

After writing a popular Washington column, "Straight From the Shoulder," Flaherty came West and joined the sports staff of the Los Angeles Examiner.

In the 1950's, Flaherty wrote a series of articles which claimed that a major league baseball team might be quite successful if a club allowed its eastern roots to be transplanted in southern California soil. Los Angeles Mayor Norris Poulson, and then-City Councilman Kenneth Hahn liked Flaherty's suggestion and traveled down to Florida spring training to visit various teams. Walter O'Malley, owner of the Brooklyn Dodgers thought it was a good idea, too.

Once the Dodgers moved to Los Angeles, Flaherty succeeded in organizing a special exhibition game at the Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum between the Dodgers and New York Yankees. The nighttime contest was played as a tribute to Roy Campanella, the great Dodger catcher who had been paralyzed in an automobile accident. And 100,000 persons, the largest crowd ever to see a baseball game, gave "Campy" the great-

est ovation the Coliseum has seen. Al Brine, now with the California Angels, and a longtime friend of Flaherty said of that evening, "the Dodgers, the Yankees, and Vince Flaherty made that special night possible."

I know my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in expressing our sympathy to his wife, Kitty, his son Vincent, his brothers James and Leo, and his sister Beatrice Dangerfield.

Jim Murray, the noted sports columnists, recently described the career of "The Classy Vincent X." For the benefit of my colleagues, I insert Mr. Murray's article into the RECORD. We could use a few more writers like "The Classy Vincent X."

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 13, 1977]

THE CLASSY VINCENT X

(By Jim Murray)

Vincent X. Flaherty was the first guy I ever saw write with his hat on. I thought that was real class. Here he was in a state where most guys don't even wear hats, and Vincent came and pecked his game story out like a guy who was double-parked.

Vince did everything with a flair. He had one of the earliest post-war cars once Detroit tooled up again, a Chrysler Town and Country, which was kind of a cross between a station wagon and a luxury sedan and there were, like, only three in the whole world at the time—Vincent X. Flaherty's, Louis B. Mayer's and one owned by the president of Chrysler, K. T. Keller.

I never knew a newspaperman who got manicures before. Vince got his shoes shined every hour. He really knew how to act the part out. He took Hollywood by storm. He had friends in high places. Every occupant of the White House from Hoover on down was a pal. John F. Kennedy was a special friend.

His house looked like a museum. He had Eddie Arcaro's Triple Crown saddle, Babe Ruth's bat, and I don't know what else.

He slept late. He was a nightly fixture on the old Sunset Strip at the Mocambo or the Troc. He was a visiting celebrity at the old Toots Shor's or Stork Club in New York.

Vincent came west from Washington in 1945 with the usual baggage of prejudices and misconceptions about Los Angeles. Like most Easterners, he thought it was just one big hotdog stand in the shape of a frog, an orange grove with delusions of grandeur.

But when he looked around he was offended that this metropolis should be scarred with minor league status. He was a whiskey-drinking pal of Bob Cobb, the owner of the old Pacific Coast League Hollywood Stars, but he would never set foot in a minor league park.

He rounded up a fraternity of millionaires like Ben Lindheimer, owner of race tracks in Chicago, and Mickey McBride, taxi tycoon from Cleveland, and he started up a rival professional football league to the NFL, the All-America Conference. It was an idea whose time had not yet come. Had he waited only two or three more years for television to grow up and the coaxial cable to be installed, Vince and his league would be winning Super Bowls by now instead of Lamar Hunt's.

Vince's writing style was like his lifestyle—flamboyant, to the point, purple and mostly unafraid. Physically imposing himself, a man who had once been a sparring partner for Young Stribling, and a tramp athlete who played football at four schools, he would crusade recklessly for what he believed in. He got bloodied up to the ears once defending the jockey, Jackie Westrope, but that didn't deter Vince. Vince went the distance.

I don't think he ever started writing till the deadline was past, and the editor was on the phone screaming for copy. Vince was like a ballplayer who was no good till he has two strikes on him.

He had the old St. Louis Browns signed, sealed, and all but delivered to Los Angeles one time in the mid-50's when the league moguls doublecrossed him at the 11th hour and shifted the franchise to Baltimore, where all it did was undermine Washington.

Vince thought he had Washington set for Los Angeles, too, but the Griffith family tarried. When Flaherty tried to tell baseball what a terrible mistake it was making, only one man was listening—Walter O'Malley.

Flaherty pointed out repeatedly that Los Angeles had supported not one but *two* minor league franchises (Hollywood is only a state of mind) and regularly drew more than a million customers—at a time when only one or two major league franchises could make that statement.

Vince Flaherty died last week, I hope with his hat on, and a story in the mill and the deadline coming up. The only sports figures I saw at his funeral were the O'Malleys—Walter and Peter. But, then, the other owners are very busy these days runnning the most-profitable big league franchises in the history of sports. Vincent X. would understand. He always told them they would be. When he came to the city, it was bush league. When he left it, it was big league.

NATIONAL BARRIER AWARENESS WEEK

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my name to the long list of supporters of the House concurrent resolution to proclaim the third week of July 1978 and 1979 as "National Barrier Awareness Week." The purpose of the resolution is to bring greater public attention to the day-to-day obstacles handicapped persons face in activities most people take for granted. It is also designed to publicize recent congressional actions encouraging private establishments to become as accessible as possible to all citizens.

With the rush of energy, social security, and labor legislation now before Congress, it is certainly easy for a resolution of this sort to become lost in the shuffle. However, by the simple act of obtaining 105 additional signatures in support of the resolution, it automatically can be reported out of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and brought to the floor for approval. Mr. Speaker, I believe the resolution I am reintroducing today is in accord with the policies set forth in recent years by Congress and the administration and thus deserves quick and positive action.

A National Architectural Barrier Awareness Week would encourage organizations and businesses concerned with the public interest to rethink and more carefully plan the construction of new structures as well as the modification of existing ones. Simple and inexpensive ideas, such as lowering control panels in automatic elevators and extending handrails to the bottom and top of stairwells for the blind and elderly, can be easily implemented. Indeed, many progressive establishments have already converted restrooms, set aside special parking areas, and lowered water fountains for the convenience of the handicapped. Other original ideas such as the use of nonslip flooring in lobbies and other public access areas, braille on elevator control panels, and strategically placed rest areas for the elderly could be shared among organizations interested in further serving the public.

I am sure that most of my colleagues have noticed the excellent work being done by the Architect of the Capitol in building ramps at all entrances of the Capitol building, lowering curbs at various crosswalks, and converting public restrooms. Passage of this resolution would further encourage all sectors of the public to formulate and execute similar plans.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I believe the simple act of passing this concurrent resolution as expeditiously as possible would be an act and in the best interest of all people.

I have attached a copy of the resolution for the convenience of the Members wishing either to cosponsor or sign a letter to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of the resolution:

JOINT RESOLUTION

Authorizing the President to proclaim the third week of July of 1977, 1978, and 1979, as "National Architectural Barrier Awareness Week"

Whereas architectural barriers infringe upon the rights of the physically handicapped by impeding their access to buildings and other facilities in the United States; and

Whereas the Congress has enacted legislation requiring the removal of architectural barriers at institutions receiving Federal funds; and

Whereas the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provides deductions of as much as $25,000 per year to taxpayers to encourage the removal of architectural barriers; and

Whereas public commitment is necessary to achieve the goal of removing architectural barriers from buildings and other facilities in the United States; and

Whereas public commitment to solve the problem of architectural barriers is based upon public awareness of such problem and the means to solve such problem; and

Whereas the American National Standards Institute has developed standards which, if implemented, would increase the accessibility of buildings and other facilities in the United States to the physically handicapped: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week of July of 1977, 1978, and 1979, as "National Architectural Barrier Awareness Week", and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate activities.

PROTECTION FOR BATTERED WOMEN AND ABUSED CHILDREN

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, throughout the history of mankind, control of

violence between individuals has been a primary concern among those who create and enforce our laws. Yet, we have consistently failed to extend these legal protections to women and children who are continually subjected to physical and emotional abuses by members of their immediate families.

The problem has not necessarily been with our criminal justice system, but rather with basic cultural and societal attitudes which can be traced to prehistoric times. The concept that wives and offspring are property and therefore subject to the rules and laws dictated by the husband and/or father is as old as man.

Because of such attitudes, our courts and legislatures at all levels of government have been reluctant to intervene in what is perceived as an internal family matter. Indeed, even when legal and financial support is available, the victims' fears, more often than not, prevent them from seeking help.

BATTERED WOMEN

The tragedy of domestic violence, its emotional and legal complexities, is no more apparent than when trying to understand and deal with the problems of the battered wife. Considered by law enforcement officials to be the single most unreported crime in the country, "wife-beating" is almost impossible to document since it is most often listed by police under "assault and battery" or "disputes." Although estimates vary, experts believe that approximately 5 million women suffer brutal assaults by their husbands or mates each year.

It is only within the last few years that the courts, social service agencies and law enforcement officials, and society itself, have taken a new look at the problems of battered women. Traditionally, brutalized women have suffered in silence, fearing the loss of their economic security, the indifference of the criminal justice system, and ridicule by their families and friends.

Largely because of the women's movement, battered wives are beginning to look for help. Unfortunately, because the problem is only just beginning to be recognized and addressed, legal and financial support is virtually nonexistent. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has taken a first step with their recent approval of a $1 million grant for battered women's programs on the State level. Nevertheless, this is only token support considering the critical demand for emergency shelters, trained counselors, and legal advisers.

Even more frustrating is the judicial system, which categorizes wife beating as a low priority crime. State laws vary widely, and women find themselves shunted between civil, criminal, and family court—often advised not to press charges at all. If the case is particularly severe, the court may issue an injunction forbidding the husband to attack his wife for a certain period of time, usually no more than a year. If he violates the order, the woman can start arrest proceedings. However, the husband is customarily released on his own recognizance to return home, even more infuriated and violent.

In my own State of Wisconsin, wife battery is still considered a domestic problem and not as a serious criminal activity. It is only within the last year that the Milwaukee city attorney's office has been keeping records on battered women's cases. From September 1976 through July 1977, 1,321 cases were reported with 162 actually referred for criminal prosecution. Generally, the accused was charged with a misdemeanor, fined, and released.

All cases were scheduled for a hearing before a group of assistant city attorneys and law students from Marquette University. The majority of camplaints were dismissed due to insufficient evidence, because one or both parties failed to appear for the hearing, or because the woman dropped the charges against her husband or mate. The remainder were referred for counseling or resolved by having the couple advised by a legal intern or attorney.

Milwaukee, like many other large cities, is critically in need of facilities to assist battered women in coping with their problems. The Women's Coalition Task Force on Battered Women has been most active in trying to help these desperate women by providing counseling and psychological support and, when available, emergency shelter. Only one facility exists at this time, and it is overcrowded and in need of funds. Consequently, with so many obstacles facing them, most battered wives have little choice but to stay home and bear their husbands' abuse.

It is because of my deep concern for the plight of battered women that I am pleased to join in cosponsoring the Domestic Violence Prevention and Treatment Act of 1977. This long overdue legislation would provide supportive services, in the form of financial and technical assistance, for the creation of domestic violence prevention programs at the grassroots level. The majority of funds would be set aside for demonstration grants designed to provide for family rehabilitation and support, emergency shelter to house victims, and training of both professionals and volunteers who are primarily engaged in areas directly related to domestic violence. The remaining funds would be used to assist private and nonprofit organizations interested in developing a domestic violence prevention program.

This bill would also provide for a study of the effectiveness of present laws and programs relating to domestic violence, as well as for a review and coordination of ongoing Federal, State, and local efforts designed to identify, prevent, and treat the problem. In addition, a national clearinghouse would be established to collect and distribute information on domestic violence.

I am particularly pleased that this bill would allow communities to deal with the problems of battered women, with minimal control or interference from the Federal bureaucracy. The unique and highly sensitive social and emotional complexities involved in domestic violence require special handling, which only those with training and experience are able to provide.

ABUSED CHILDREN

When discussing the issue of family violence, it is important to note that women are not the only victims of abuse. Small children are often the target of their parents' anger and frustration.

Ironically, the lack of effective laws and programs to deal with child abuse may be partially attributed to the abhorrence of the problem. The very idea that a parent, who is supposed to love and protect his or her offspring, could be responsible for a child's physical injury or even death, is so repulsive that many are reluctant to believe it. The problem is compounded by the helplessness of the child who often will not, or cannot, testify against his or her attacker. In addition, the violence usually occurs in the privacy of the home, and even when it is reported, it is difficult to prove in the absence of eyewitnesses.

It was not until the latter part of the 19th century that New York passed this country's first child abuse law. However, the most definitive action in the area did not begin until the 1960s when all 50 States passed some type of child abuse law. These are basically concerned with reporting laws which encourage or require the reporting of suspected child abuse—usually by doctors and other professionals; criminal law provisions to punish those who abuse children; juvenile court acts, and State legislation to establish or authorize protective services for children.

On the Federal level, efforts to control child abuse have concentrated on financial assistance to the States for child welfare and social services and for research grants. Traditionally, the Federal Government has avoided specific legislation regarding child abuse, considering it a State matter. In the last few years, however, perhaps because of increasing awareness of the incidence of child beating and the resulting public outcry, a number of bills were introduced in Congress concerning mandatory reporting requirements and the creation of a National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect.

In 1974, Congress coordinated these measures into one comprehensive law entitled the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act. The program, which is administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, provides financial and technical assistance to the States, public and nonpublic agencies for the development of child abuse prevention and treatment programs. All 50 States receive some funding from this program, and 30 States qualify for State matching funds.

Legislation to extend and reauthorize the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act has passed the Senate and has received the House Education and Labor Committee's approval for full House consideration. Enactment of the legislation is necessary to ensure that States and localities can continue to work for more effective ways of protecting innocent children from parental maltreatment.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

A related, but certainly more depraved form of child abuse, involves the sexual exploitation of young children in pornographic films and publications. Within the last few months national attention has focused on this facet of commercial sex with the introduction of

several bills in Congress prohibiting the interstate sale and transportation of films and photographs which depict children in sexual activities.

While the Federal Government is limited in developing legal prohibitions against child beating, Federal legislation to discourage and prohibit child pornography is not only possible but necessary. Our society has tolerated a great deal from the producers of "smut," but we must draw the line when innocent children become the subject of such depravity.

The bill I am cosponsoring today, the Child Exploitation Prevention Act, prohibits the sexual exploitation of children and the interstate transportation and sale of photographs and films depicting children in sexual activities. Any individual convicted of the crime or crimes would be fined $25,000 or sentenced to 15 years in prison, or both.

The House Education and Labor Committee is currently considering legislation in this area. I hope the committee moves quickly to bring a bill before the full House. Our children deserve the fullest protection of the law from those who would rob them of their innocence in order to gain profit.

It is unfortunate that it has become necessary for us to deal with these problems through legislative action. However, it is unconscionable for us to continue treating abused children and battered women as problems beyond the scope of legal control. Our criminal justice system was designed to protect all individuals from violence, regardless of the source. And we, in turn, have an obligation to see that justice is carried out.

GRASSROOTS SENTIMENT AGAINST CONSUMER AGENCY

HON. ARLAN STANGELAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, in the debate over the creation of a new consumer agency the views of the average citizen and small businessman has been overwhelmed by the highly polished and well financed votes of Ralph Nader and other professional consumers. I feel it is time for the people at the grassroots level to be heard. These are the people who will ultimately bear the burden of a new consumer advocacy agency either through increased taxes or increased regulation and paperwork.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has provided the opportunity for the grassroots to be heard through a recent survey it conducted of its membership regarding the creation of a new consumer agency. The Chamber's membership comprises a broad spectrum of American firms, large and small. To date the Chamber has received letters from 15,000 businesses who oppose any new super agency for consumers. I insert in the RECORD the names of those companies from the Seventh District of Minnesota who have spoken out against this unwarranted growth in a government that is already too big:

Gene L. Goedker, Goedker Realty, Insurance & Constr., Box 664, 514 E. 6th, Brainerd, Minnesota 56401.

D. B. Madison, Pres., Brainerd Recreational Supply, Inc., P.O. Box 311, Brainerd, Minnesota 56401.

Larry G. Mankin, Brainerd Area Chamber of Commerce, 6th & Washington, Brainerd, Minnesota 56401.

T. J. McCollough, Gen. Mgr., The Brainerd Daily Dispatch, 215 S. 6th St., Brainerd, Minnesota 56401.

Harvey Tanner, Pres., Tanner Motors, 217 Washington St., Brainerd, Minnesota 56401.

Leo Fraser, Crosslake Lbr. Co., Crosslake, Minnesota 56442.

Dennis L. Anderson, Pine Manors, Inc., Rt. 2, Nevis, Minnesota 56467.

Dr. Bottemiller, Homecrest Industries, Inc., Wadena, Minnesota 56482.

Don's "Friendly" Red Owl, 10–S. E. Aldrich N. 2022, Wadena, Minnesota 56482.

Leroy E. Anderson, Manufacturers Systems, Inc., Box 703, Detroit Lakes, Minnesota 56501.

Richard C. Dean, Red River Implt. Co., Hwy. 75 S., Breckenridge, Minnesota 56520.

Les G. Grosz, Pres, Farmers & Merchants State Bank of Breckenridge, 225 N. 5th St., Breckenridge, Minnesota 56520.

Clinton Grove, Pres., Cosmos Enterprises, Inc., 1213 Division E. Box 2013, Elbow Lake, Minnesota 56531.

Robert M. Bigwood, Otter Tail Power Co., 215 S. Cascade, Fergus Falls, Minnesota 56537.

Richard L. Erickson, Holiday Inn, Hwy. 210 & I–94, Fergus Falls, Minnesota 56537.

Don Luchman, H. L. OK Hardware, 120 W. Cavour, Fergus Falls, Minnesota 56537.

George C. Milton, Arneson-Larson-Milton, 101 W. Lincoln, Fergus Falls, Minnesota 56537.

Kenneth E. Neumann, Partner, Ness, Neumann, Wallert & Nygaard, 115 N. Court St., Fergus Falls, Minnesota 56537.

Chas. H. Peterson, Western Minn. Savings & Loan Ass'n, 225 W. Cavour, Fergus Falls, Minnesota 5653".

B. K. Soby, Soby Construction, Inc., P.O. Box 635, Fergus Falls, Minnesota 56537.

Donald M. Bishop, Glenwood Super Valu, 211 E. Minn. Ave., Glenwood, Minnesota. 56334.

R. E. Gandrud, Pope County State Bank, 2 S. Franklin, Glenwood, Minnesota 56334.

Grant Hustad, Grant Hustad Co., Hwy. 29 & 55, Glenwood, Minnesota 56334.

Myrl J. Johnson, Glenwood Development Corp., 414 E. Minn. Ave., Glenwood, Minnesota 56334.

Donald L. Miller, City of Glenwood, City Hall, Glenwood, Minnesota 56334.

David A. Tostenson, Agent for State Farm Ins. Cos., 12 S.E. 1st St., Glenwood, Minnesota 56334.

I. J. Arnquist, Arnquist Home Center, Inc., Hoffman, Minnesota 56339.

Verle R. Hammer, Pres., Farmers State Bank of Hoffman, 103 Main St., Hoffman, Minnesota 56339.

Leonard R. Green, Farmers Elevator of Kensington, Minn., Inc., Kensington, Minnesota 56343.

Ray J. Calhoun, Pres., Little Falls Granite Works, Lock Box 240, Little Falls, Minnesota 56345.

Roderick Grell, Sec. & Treas., Central-McGowan, Inc., P.O. Box 272, Little Falls, Minnesota 56345.

Willmar L. Holmquist, Lad 'N' Lassie, 113 E. Broadway, Little Falls, Minnesota 56345.

W. R. Olson, Minn. Power & Light Co., 1201 N.E. 11th St., Little Falls, Minnesota 56345.

T. J. Blais, Blais Motor Co., 114 Central Ave., Long Prairie, Minnesota 56347.

W. L. Peterson, Peterson's Variety, 267 Central Ave., Long Prairie, Minnesota 56347.

Pat Smith, Skogmo Dept. Store, 144 Central Ave., Lone Prairie, Minnesota 56347.

Virgil G. Mitzger, Homer's Lounge, 306 E. Main St., Melrose, Minnesota 56352.

R. C. Coborn, Sr., Coborn's, Inc., 106 S. 1st St., Sauk Rapids, Minnesota 56379.

Marvin R. Campbell, Citizens State Bank, 321 S. 7th St., Brainerd, Minnesota 56401.

M. K. "Dutch" Cragun, Cragun's on Pine Beach, Rt. 6, Box 484, Brainerd, Minnesota 56401.

Arvid P. Benson, Arvid Benson Supply, 900 Maon Ave., Moorhead, Minnesota 56560.

Norman Bertsch, Nelson Window & Glass, 303–N21 St., Moorhead, Minnesota 56560.

Edward A. Gudmunson, Moorhead Drug Co., Moorhead Center Mall, Moorhead, Minnesota 56560.

David J. Hanson, Abbott, Arne, Schwidt, Inc., Business Hwy. #94 S., Moorhead Minnesota 56560.

Marvin L. Lanning, Browser Bookshop, Holiday Mall, Moorhead, Minnesota 56560.

Jacob Sigmund, S & S Construction Co., 2215 12th Ave., S., Moorhead, Minnesota 56560.

James H. Stenerson, Stenerson Lumber, 1702 1st Ave. N., Moorhead, Minnesota 65660.

R. M. Stordahl, Pres., Silverline, Div. of Arctic Entr., Inc., 2300 12th Ave. S., Moorhead Minnesota 56560.

D. E. Carlson, Bemidji Clinic Ltd., 6th & Beltrami Ave., Bemidji, Minnesota 56601.

Donald V. Eng, Dist. Mgr., Otter Tail Power Co., 320 W. 4th St., Bemidji, Minnesota 56601.

C. D. Swedmark, Swedmark's Hardware Hank, 324 Minn., Bemidji, Minnesota 56601.

Sid Swedmark, Exec. V. P., Bemidji Area Chamber of Commerce, Box 806—3rd Bemidji Ave., Bemidji, Minnesota 56601.

James J. Walker, Stewart & Walker, Inc., 15th St. & Bemidji Ave., P. O. Box 634, Bemidji, Minnesota 56601.

Nick A. Welle, Chr., First National Bank, Bemidji, Minnesota 56601.

Harold L. Hanson, The First National Bank of Baudette, Drawer D, Baudette, Minnesota 56623.

Shumway Oil Co., Inc., Oil Jobber, Hwy. 5901 West, Thief River Falls, Minnesota 56701.

Duane Walton, Pres., Mr. Duane's Inc., 214 LaBree Ave., Thief River Falls, Minnesota 56701.

David G. Bang, Crookston Coca-Cola Bottling Co., 609 Martin Ave., Crookston, Minnesota 56716.

Mr Joe French, Poly-Paos Processing 312 N. Broadway, Crookston, Minnesota 56716.

Mrs. Chester E. Ramstad, Ramstad O.K. Hardware, 113 N. Broadwaf, Crookston, Minnesota 56716.

Harold Thomforde, Crookston Chamber of Commerce, Thomforde's Garden Center, 109 S. Main St., Crookston, Minnesota 56716.

Ivan Ferguson, Ivan Ferguson, Public Accountant, P.O. Box 460, East Gran Forks, Minnesota 56721.

Jerry Larson, Pres., Red River Valley Potatoe Growers Ass'n., P.O. Box 301, East Grand Forks, Minnesota 56721.

Marvin O. Mathiason, Farmers Elevator Co., P.O. Box 152, East Grand Forks, Minnesota 56721.

George Wikstrom, Jr., Wikstrom Telephone Co., Inc., 122 S. Main, Karlstad, Minnesota 56732.

Rodney L. Norquist, Prior Electric Inc., 110 2d St. N.W., Roseau, Minnesota 56751.

R. C. Johnson, Pres., Farmers State Bank of Stephens, Stephen, Minnesota 56757.

John R. Heneman, Pres., Security Bank of Warroad, Warroad, Minnesota 56763.

Martin Haar, Pres., Alexandria Bank & Trust Co., Alexandria, Minnesota 56308.

Richard Hagstrom, Hagstrom's, 525 Broadway, Alexandria, Minnesota 56308.

J. W. Juettner, Schwartzwald, 3d & Maple, Alexandria, Minnesota 56308.

James L. Roell, Pease's Champion Auto Stores, Inc., 426 Broadway, Alexandria, Minnesota 56308.

Leland Fashaug, Pres., Viking Office Supply, Inc., 614 Broadway, Alexandria, Minnesota 56308.

COLOR IT GREEN

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Clinch River breeder reactor project has been criticized from every conceivable point of view. The only thing left to criticize is the color we intend to paint it. First it was proliferation, then cost benefit, then location, then design, and then value. I am beginning to believe the argument itself has become the issue—not the substance.

My comments to these arguments are:

A. The opposition argues, a vote against Clinch River was not a vote against the breeder.

First. A vote against Clinch River is a vote against the entire breeder program and is a vote against putting the Nation in a position to have power in the future when there could be no other option.

Second. ERDA's liquid metal breeder program has been carefully scheduled since 1965 to properly integrate component research into subsystem research and finally into a complete system. That system is the Clinch River project. The timing of Clinch River is critical. It makes little sense to say, "We are putting more money into breeder research, even without Clinch River, than any other foreign country." We would be, but that would be wasting money to further perfect individual components before we had the operational data from Clinch River. The evolutionary process of intelligently building, step by step, on experience gained at each level, from the laboratory bench to full scale systems, has successfully been used in aircraft, automotive, space craft, computers and every other modern development. I.B.M. has successfully developed generation after generation of computer systems, but had they continued putting their money into memory research, instead of developing complete systems, I.B.M. would no longer be in the computer business.

B. The opposition contends that R. & D. funds in fiscal year 1978 will insure that work will continue on two important breeder R. & D. projects, the Experimental Breeder Reactor II in Idaho, and the Fast Flux Test Facility in Washington.

First. The Experimental Breeder Reactor II in Idaho is 13 years old. Although it is still being used to perform certain research, it—in itself—is not the item that is being developed. It is a tool to use to develop other parts.

Second. The Fast Test Facility in Washington is not a breeder. It is to be a fuel test facility to develop breeder fuels for the future.

C. Clinch River has been cited as being out of date, expensive and uneconomical.

First. Both Germany and Japan are using the same design concept as Clinch River. The design of Clinch River is one of two most advanced competing liquid metal breeder concepts. If the design is out of date, what newer model is available? Why has not Germany or Japan stopped construction of their Clinch River size plants?

Second. The Clinch River project is expensive, but so is all energy plant development work. Clinch River is estimated at $2.2 billion less anticipated revenues of $700 million. The cost of Clinch River is $4 million per megawatt of installed capacity, compared to the $10 million price tag of the solar electric power tower in California.

Third. As for economics, Clinch River is the only inexhaustible dependable energy source that is ready for development. As expendable supplies; oil, natural gas and uranium are depleted, their price will rise dramatically. The life cycle cost of a breeder compared to the life cycle cost of a coal fired or conventional nuclear plant is extremely favorable. When coal prices rise to $50 per ton and uranium to $70 per pound the breeder wins. From the standpoint of economics, the breeder is far superior to every other option since it produces its own fuel. It is not dependent on mining, or drilling or finding new mineral deposits. It is the stability that the breeder brings to the energy supply stream in comparison to OPEC oil and other unreliable sources that make the breeder economically superior.

D. The opposition has contended that commercial breeder technology will be neither necessary nor economical in this country until after 2000.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with that statement. Commercial breeders cannot be available in any significant number before that time assuming that we go ahead with Clinch River right now. I am glad that the opposition realizes they will be necessary and economical after 2000.

E. Supposedly there will be ample time to build a modern breeder reactor using up-to-date research knowledge.

This position is highly risky and dangerous on two counts. First, there will not be ample time to develop the breeder once we awaken to the seriousness of the energy shortage. It now takes 10 years to license and build a conventional plant of proven design and it will require more than one breeder to contribute to the energy supply stream. By contrast, the OPEC countries can shut the oil off in the time it takes to make one conference phone call.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest, we consider Clinch River for what it is, a vital step in arming this Nation against a potential economic nightmare. If in the year ahead, we find a better option, let us use it. In the meantime, let us authorize $150 million for next year's effort to provide project continuity.

Let us color it green and keep going.

SHORTAGE OF CLEAN WATER

HON. DOUG BARNARD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the many problems of a growing population in the United States, one of the most basic of man's needs appears in danger of short supply. I refer to clean water.

Not only can we see shortages of clean water for drinking and industrial use, but we also are encountering problems in disposing of wastewater products.

Now, research by Dr. Wade Nutter of the University of Georgia has resulted in a new method of purifying wastewater for reuse, which gives us fertilizer as a byproduct.

Ms. Lee Pilgrim has written an interesting account of this process for the university's research publication, Columns, and I insert it to be reprinted in the Extensions of Remarks:

NO REASON FOR WASTING WASTEWATER, SHOWS PROFESSOR

Fitting right into the national mood that nothing should go to waste—not even wastewater—a university forest resources professor has designed a treatment system which uses sewage to irrigate land, naturally fertilizing the soil and flushing out bacteria along the way.

The product is as inoffensive as a mountain stream.

Dr. Wade Nutter is a pioneer in the relatively new technology of wastewater treatment which started about 15 years ago at Penn State University where he was a graduate student. Now Nutter is Georgia's expert in the field.

Municipalities are required by federal law to discharge pollution-free wastewater back into streams and rivers. Some 20 Georgia municipalities are considering or already have a system for treating sewage effluent by land application. Engineers have depended on Nutter's research and experience for help in planning most of the projects.

One method of treatment is an expensive advanced wastewater treatment. The second method is called land treatment because the effluent is applied to the land via irrigation before it runs into the stream.

The purpose of such treatment is to rid the effluent of contaminants like nitrogen and phosphorus which remain in sewage even after it has undergone primary treatment to remove bacteria. Spilling the water over the land allows plants to take up and use the chemicals as fertilizing, one step in a complex combination of natural processes that work together to purify the water before it converges with the stream.

"Water discharged into streams after moving through the soil is equivalent in almost every way to rainwater," Nutter explained. "It requires the same treatment we would give normal streamwater to meet drinking water standards."

Among the recycling benefits, he cited land site improvement and increased growth of crops or forests without the expense of fertilizing.

But public acceptance, he said, "seems to be the biggest stumbling block for land treatment.

"No matter how much people read about it, they really don't believe it is acceptable until they see it in operation. They expect a foul odor and plenty of mosquitoes."

Nutter's first Georgia project, however, has already made a believer out of state officials who are now adopting the system in their municipalities.

Nutter's model system was developed at Unicoi State Park in the north Georgia mountains. It started in 1973 as a research project approved by Gov. Jimmy Carter. Nutter and colleagues from several other fields wanted to investigate the biological and physical impact on the forest land. The study involves local conditions such as climate, vegetation, soil, geology and topography, as well as wastewater constituents.

If the system proved feasible, they planned to develop guidelines for the mountain forest

conditions which could be adapted to other regions of the state. Then they hoped to make the Unicoi system a demonstration project for a yet uncommon practice.

The team especially wanted to impress municipal officers, engineers and state officials. They did.

"The state now recognizes land treatment as a viable alternative and the system is being encouraged whenever it fits the situation," Nutter said.

The state is also making efforts to educate engineers and consultants. Last month Nutter conducted seminars for state engineers to help them evaluate system proposals.

Clayton County will begin construction next year of a system designed by Nutter and a team composed of agronomists, soil scientists, climatologists, geologists, foresters, hydrologists and engineers. The system will be the largest in the country operating year-round.

Nutter is also helping plan a system for Watkinsville, which will be of special interest to him because the effluent will be used to irrigate the university's White Hall Forest near Athens.

FEDERAL NUTRITION PROGRAMS A SHAMBLES

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, human health problems have gained increasing importance in recent years. And as more and more Americans realize the risks of disease, they are demanding information about the food they eat and are beginning to recognize the interrelatedness of good nutrition and good health.

The Federal Government, as a national reservoir of knowledge, should play a vital role in providing the American public with nutrition information. In an effort to evaluate the effectiveness of the Government's nutrition education efforts, I recently requested the Congressional Research Service to investigate the scope and functions of Federal programs.

The final CRS document, "The Role of the Federal Government in Nutrition Education," reports there are at least 30 federally operated nutrition education programs in the United States operated by 11 agencies within two departments. Only 14 of these governmental units can identify the portion of their budget which is actually expended on nutrition education. The report further notes that these programs are largely uncoordinated, underfunded and misdirected, resulting in efforts that lack clear goals, firm resolve, or a workable strategy.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we ask why we cannot create coordinating mechanisms to gather information about our nutrition programs and search for ways to integrate and improve these programs; why we cannot agree on educational objectives and devise means for measuring their implementation; why we cannot use our extensive commercial, technological, and artistic resources in both the public and private sectors to convey concise, practical and memorable nutritional messages; and why "nutritional impact" statements cannot be mandated for all Federal food programs.

As chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations and Nutrition, I have called for extensive hearings to study Federal efforts in nutrition education. Beginning September 27 and 28, my subcommittee will call upon consumer witnesses for their evaluation of national nutrition education efforts. Then, on October 6, representatives of the departments and agencies administering nutrition programs will be called upon to tell us how they think they are meeting the needs of consumers.

As part of our continuing hearings, the subcommittee will call upon representatives of the food industry to evaluate their efforts in providing adequate nutrition information for consumers. The subcommittee will also conduct field hearings to provide us with information about the reach of such programs at the community level.

Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal recently ran a series on food and nutrition. It provides an excellent overview of American eating habits, highlighting many issues that will be raised during our hearings. During the next 4 days, I would like to share this series with my colleagues as we take these initial steps toward providing a reliable foundation of information upon which we can plan, coordinate, and communicate a sound national nutrition policy:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 16, 1977]

THE WAY WE EAT—AMERICAN DIETS TODAY ARE HIGH IN PROTEINS, FATS AND CONTROVERSY

(By Joann S. Lublin)

When it comes to eating, Roy F. Northrop is all-American.

Dining recently at a restaurant near his home in Acton, Mass., the 40-year-old stockbroker skipped the homemade bean soup and salad bar in favor of a draft beer and four pieces of buttered bread. Then he ate a rare, 10-ounce steak and a baked potato sprinkled with salt and topped with whipped butter. For dessert, he had coffee with cream and a large dish of chocolate ice cream.

The slightly overweight Mr. Northrop orders a similar meal whenever he goes out. "I'd be very happy to eat the same things forever," he declares.

So, apparently, would most of us. Since the beginning of this century, American patterns of food consumption have changed radically. But although we are heavier than ever before—at least 20% of us carry more weight than our physiques require—we don't eat any more than we used to. Rather, it's the components of the national dinner plate that are different. The average American today consumes proportionately more meat, dairy products, eggs, salt and sugar than his turn-of-the-century counterpart. And he eats less vegetables, fruits and grain products.

This regimen, high in protein as well as fat and colesterol, is controversial. It has, in the opinion of some authorities, increased our average height and lowered the age at which we reach sexual maturity. Others, however, are alarmed by the contrast between this enriched fare and the sedentary lives we lead these days. "Rather than eating well, most people are eating themselves to ill health," states D. Mark Hegsted, professor of nutrition at Harvard University.

Many physicians and nutritionists, in fact, urge that we change our way of eating. A recent U.S. Senate committee report on the subject went so far as to recommend that every family throw out the salt shaker, give up soft drinks, eschew those steaks and eat more vegetables, skimmed milk and fish.

The booming diet-book business and the "natural foods" movement suggest these warnings are being heard. But how well they are being heeded is another matter. Many of us like some foods too much to give them up. Even gender is involved. One nutritionist observes that women seem to prefer chocolate. Surveys by a chicken-industry trade group show that men don't find eating that bird "manly." And nutritionist Jean Mayer, president of Tufts University, believes that "the more men sit at their desks, the more they need reassurance of their maleness by eating red meat. It is the motorcycle of the middle-aged."

DINING AND DYING

Moreover, despite the concern with the state of the nation's eating habits, experts still can't agree on what kind of diet will permit healthy persons to stay that way, or what normal people should eat to function best at work and play. Only recently, for instance, have medical investigators begun to pin down evidence linking the way we dine with some of the ways we die.

Inquiries into how our personalities and our behavior are affected by food are also just getting underway. This area of research represents one of "the new frontiers of nutrition," says George Briggs, a nutrition scientist at the University of California at Berkeley. "The end result may be a healthier, more productive society."

Technology plays a big role in what we do eat these days. Industry's ability to preserve and transport foods has brought Boston scrod to Dallas and put tomatoes on Chicago tables in midwinter. Mass merchandizing helps too. Consider the taco, which 10 years ago was practically unheard of outside the Southwest. Now that the Mexican border fare has captured the interest of fast-food entrepreneurs, "tacos are standard food across the country," says Helen Ullrich, executive director of the Society for Nutrition Education.

THE PRICE OF PROGRESS

At the same time, regional and cultural differences in our eating habits are beginning to disappear. That may be simply the price of progress. However, Richard de Rochemont, coauthor of "Eating in America," a history of the nation's gastronomy, argues that it also means Americans' tastebuds are "infinitely less varied than they used to be." The problem, he says, is that the widespread use of sugar and salt in prepared and frozen foods "tends to level things out," making people less interested in eating foods with other tastes.

Bland though it might be, our diet today is suspected to be a factor in such illnesses as heart disease, cancer, stroke, diabetes, hardening of the arteries and cirrhosis of the liver. Specifically, scientists believe that meats and dairy products, which are high in both saturated fats and wax-like cholesterol, seem to lead to the buildup of fatty deposits in arteries. When these deposits block a heart artery, a heart attack occurs; a clogged artery to the brain causes a stroke.

Other researchers are trying to determine exactly how eating habits play a role in the nearly 400,000 annual cancer cases suspected to be related to nutrition. One theory: animal-fat-laden foods may trigger release of tiny amounts of cancer-causing substances in the colon as well as upset the delicate balance of hormones in the breast.

Cancers of the colon may also be related to our diet's lack of fibers, the tough structural portion of vegetables that's often lost during processing and cooking. Experts think that these fibers somehow dilute cancer-causing chemicals in the intestine while aiding elimination. But, concedes one food researcher, "we don't even know yet what it is" in fibrous foods that seems to benefit the digestive system.

Little is known about how to treat diseases wrought by overnutrition. However, a recent test conducted by a University of Southern California team indicates for the first time that fatty deposits in arteries can be reduced by restricting diet and providing special medication. Especially intriguing is the work of Procter & Gamble Co. researchers, who may have found a way for people to lower their cholesterol intake without radically changing what they eat.

The key in this instance is sucrose polyester, a noncaloric synthetic with the cooking properties of vegetable oil. For 10 days, the Procter & Gamble researchers fed 13 normal volunteers meals loaded with eggs, butter and other cholesterol-raising foods. The subjects' cholesterol levels should have skyrocketed by the end of the period; instead, they dropped 14%. The reason, the researchers believe, is that their foods were cooked with sucrose polyester.

It's too early to tell if these findings mean we will be able to improve our health by gorging on greasy hamburgers and cheese omlets. Nonetheless, the synthetic is a "potentially remarkable, extraordinary compound," says Dr. Charles J. Glueck, director of the University of Cincinnati's Clinical Research Center and a participant in the Procter & Gamble study.

SKIMPY DIETS BLAMED

Skimpy diets, the bane of Depression-era Americans, still affect some of us. The academic failure of many poor schoolchildren for instance, is partly blamed on a lack of nutritious food. Some say this malnutrition is severe enough to inflict brain damage, but other experts disagree. Made sluggish by iron deficiencies, these children "score poorly on intelligence tests because of low energy rather than because of direct effects on the brain," says Michael C. Latham, a professor at Cornell University's Graduate School of Nutrition.

Scientists have only a glimmer of understanding about how food affects moods. But they are beginning to explore the connection between diet and at least two areas of behavior: hyperactivity in children and emotional and mental disorders in adults.

"Wall climbers," or temperamental children who have trouble sleeping, learning and sitting still, are said to number at least 1.5 million, or 5% of all U.S. schoolchildren. In 1973, a San Francisco allergist, Dr. Benjamin F. Feingold, suggested that this hyperactivity could be due to the artificial dyes and colors found in dozens of foods. He kept his hyperactive patients away from more than 50 items, ranging from bologna to ice cream, and observed that more than half the youngsters began to calm down.

"A JOY TO BE AROUND"

Since then, word of the diet has spread among parents of hyperactive children—there are now 100 "Feingold Associations" in 25 states—and many swear by its effectiveness. One is Eugene Kuehnau of Schaumburg, Ill., who decided to try the regimen on her five-year-old son, Kenny, after medication failed to stop his series of angry fits. Since she removed flavored and dyed foods from Kenny's diet over a year ago, his behavior has been "just unbelievable," Mrs. Kuehnau says. "He listens to directions. He's a joy to be around instead of a pain."

Physician organizations, such as the American Medical Association and the American Academy of Pediatrics, remain skeptical about Dr. Feingold's hypothesis. Several federally funded experiments, under way in Pittsburgh and Madison, Wis., are attempting to compare children on the Feingold diet with those who eat the usual childhood foods. Results so far suggest that at best, artificial food colors can trigger hyperactivity in a small proportion of youngsters for a few hours at a time.

Another popular theory holds that an inadequate supply of vitamins, minerals and nutrients can wreak biochemical havoc in the minds of adults, causing everything from schizophrenia to headaches. The answer, proponents believe, is magavitamin therapy; there are about 800 orthomolecular psychiatrists—physicians who practice the megavitamin discipline—in the U.S. who treat patients with up to 200 times the normal dosages of some vitamins and minerals.

Adherents of the theory are enthusiastic about its potential. Megavitamin therapy "roughly doubles the recovery rate from mental illness in general," claims Dr David Hawkins, medical director of the North Nassau Mental Health Center in Manhasset, N.Y. Such "supernutrition" can help ordinary people "reach their potential in life," adds Dr. H. L. Newbold, a New York psychiatrist.

For instance, Dr. Newbold, who pops 10 grams of vitamin C daily to stay in shape, had one 57-year-old patient who kept losing his memory. The psychiatrist concluded the man wasn't getting enough vitamin B12, so he prescribed large doses of the substance, improving the man's recall. Dr. Hawkins says he treated a schizophrenic who had high levels of copper in her hair and urine by placing the woman on a diet low in copper and high in zinc and vitamins B6 and B7. "She improvel in six weeks and went home," he reports.

Critics charge that the megavitamin advocates have failed to test scientifically the theory's merit. "Unless they have hard evidence, they shouldn't make claims," contends Dr. Morris A. Lipton, psychiatry professor at the University of North Carolina's medical school. Other physicians point out that gulping down large doses of certain vitamins can cause harmful side effects, such as kidney stones.

There appears to be independent support for at least one aspect of the megavitamin theory, however, and that involves the way the brain responds to some foods. Until 1970, scientists believed that the brain was protected from blood-level variations in the intake of amino acids, which make up all protein. Then Massachusetts Institute of Technology investigators discovered that amino acids might indeed affect the output of brain chemicals.

Specifically, they found that when rats were fed a diet containing unusually small amounts of tryptophan, a key amino acid, the animals' brains produced less of one brain chemical, serotonin. As this output fell, the rats began to act meaner and more sensitive to pain. Fluctuations in serotonin also seemed to influence the animals' sleep habits, appetite and sex drive.

The researchers now believe the human brain may react in the same way. Will they come up with diets tailored to specific activities such as sex, sleep and work? "We can't do that now," says Loy Little, associate professor of pharmacology at M.I.T. "Someday we may be able to."

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT MAKES A COMEBACK

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, capital punishment is making a strong comeback in this country. Under pressure from their constituents, legislators in State after State are voting for a return of the death penalty.

This is a sharp reversal of the previous trend. For approximately a decade the death penalty remained unused. The primary obstacle has been the U.S. Supreme Court. States watched helplessly as their death penalty statutes were declared unconstitutional.

Now the tide has turned. Aided by a more favorable court decision, Americans across the Nation are pushing for restoration of the death penalty. And their elected officials are responding.

One of the biggest victories for the proponents of capital punishment recently occurred in the State of California. In August of this year, the legislature overrode Governor Brown's veto and passed a measure restoring the death penalty.

I am encouraged by this trend. I have long supported capital punishment as a legitimate crime control measure. During this session of Congress I am sponsoring House Joint Resolution 30, a constitutional amendment specifically upholding the power of a State or Congress to impose the death penalty for any crime involving the deliberate taking of human life. This would free death penalty statutes from further court challenges.

For the information of my colleagues I am including a story from the San Francisco Chronicle on the restoration of the death penalty in California:

STATE DEATH PENALTY IS LAW—BROWN VETO OVERRIDDEN

(By Larry Liebert)

SACRAMENTO.—Death is again a penalty for murder in California.

At 3:02 p.m. yesterday, the Assembly voted to override Governor Brown's veto of a measure to restore the death penalty.

Like the Senate in June, the Assembly yesterday mustered just the two-thirds margin needed to override a veto. The vote was 54 to 26.

It was the first time one of Brown's vetoes was overridden—and only the third successful override in 31 years.

State officials said any murder committed after the moment of the Assembly's action could be subject to the penalty if it fell within the new law's specified categories of homicides.

The gas chamber at San Quentin prison has not been used since 1967 because past death penalty statutes were ruled unconstitutional by the courts.

Opponents of the death penalty already have vowed to go to court again to prevent the law passed yesterday from reopening the apple-green gas chamber.

The governor learned of the Assembly's action in Los Angeles, at his Space Day symposium. He said: "I'm not surprised. I don't believe in the death penalty, but the Legislature has spoken and now it's up to the courts.

"As long as it is a valid law, I will carry out my responsibilities to uphold it," said Brown, whose opposition to the death penalty may hurt him politically when he runs for re-election next year.

Brown had previously said he would not issue a blanket pardon to void all death sentences under a capital punishment law but has not indicated how he will handle individual cases.

For more than an hour yesterday, Assembly members debated life and death, crime and punishment, invoking the Bible, their own consciences and the will of voters who overwhelmingly favor capital punishment.

When Governor Brown vetoed the death penalty in May, he called his action "a matter of conscience" and said his hope is for "a society where we do not attempt to use death as a punishment."

On the Assembly floor, Assemblyman Alister McAlister (Dem-San Jose), who was

carrying the death penalty override effort, responded: "A civilization that lacks the will to protect itself against the barbarians within its walls is a decadent society."

McAlister insisted the death penalty deters "heinous murders" and "is a just penalty for those persons who show so little regard for their fellow human beings as to commit the atrocious crimes for which the death penalty is provided by this legislation."

California's previous death penalty statute was ruled unconstitutional last year by the state Supreme Court because it failed to give juries leeway to consider mitigating circumstances before handing down a punishment of death.

The law passed yesterday permits juries to weigh mitigating and aggravating circumstances before choosing between death and an alternative punishment of life imprisonment without possibility of parole.

The new law does not apply to all murders, only certain categories. Among the categories subject to death are: torture-murder and murder-for-hire, killing of a policeman or witness to a crime, murder during a rape, robbery or kidnapping; multiple murders; murder by explosive and perjury that results in death of an innocent defendant.

Yesterday's Assembly action was rich in political implications because opinion polls and a ballot initiative have shown voters in the state overwhelmingly favor the death penalty.

Republicans are certain to use the issue next year against those Democrats—including Brown and some legislators—who oppose capital punishment. Few Republican officials oppose the death penalty.

Legislators confirmed that Brown did virtually nothing to lobby against the Assembly's override of his veto. The governor said it would not be appropriate to pressure lawmakers on such an issue, but critics speculated that Brown preferred to have his veto overriden rather than to face a ballot initiative on the death penalty in next year's election.

The prime sponsors of the death penalty measure were two legislators who hope to run for attorney general next year, McAlister and Senator George Deukmejian (Rep-Long Beach.)

Attorney General Evelle Younger, who wants the Republican nomination for governor next year, praised the death penalty's enactment and said, "We now have a law which, if it is carried out, will help save innocent lives."

The Assembly action was also historic because a governor's veto is so rarely overridden, especially by a Legislature controlled by the governor's own party, as is now the case.

(The last two overrides occurred when Governor Earl Warren vetoed an appropriation to local governments in 1946 and when Governor Ronald Reagan vetoed a bill giving the Legislature the final say in the shutting down of state mental hospitals in 1974.)

McAlister told his colleagues: "The Legislature has been unduly deferential to our respective governors . . . Most of us received far more votes in our districts than the governor. Our ultimate responsibility is not to the governor but to the people and to our conscience."

He also attacked the courts for "judicial arrogance" in rejecting past death penalty statutes.

But much of the debate probed a basic philosophical question: Is a legislator's duty to a public that favors capital punishment or to his own conscience, which may be revolted by the idea of official killing?

Assemblyman Stan Statham (Rep.-Chico) said a vote against the death penalty represented "audacity" and "immorality" because "you're going against the will of the people."

Assemblyman Barry Keene (Dem.-Elk) responded, "If there were a majority view in this country to execute as 'animals' gays or hippies or racial minorities who happen not to be in favor . . . Would that too be justified as the will of the people?"

But other legislators debated the justice or effectiveness of the death penalty.

Among opponents, Assemblyman Howard Berman (Dem.-L.A.), said the death penalty creates "a false hope, an illusion that people will somehow be more secure."

And Assemblyman John Vasconcellos (Dem.-San Jose), said the death penalty obscures the real issue. "How in fact do we discover how to create a gentler society?" he asked. "How in fact do we overcome the violence that threatens all of us?"

But McAlister said such hopes to root out the deeper causes of crime may never be realized.

"There are people who for whatever reason do terrible things," he said. "Was it wrong to execute the Nazi war criminals? . . . Would it have been wrong to execute Adolf Hitler? Was there any conceivable hope for rehabilitation of people of that kind?"

HUD PROJECT DEBACLE COSTS TAXPAYER MILLIONS

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House a matter which has cost the American taxpayer millions of dollars in waste and/or fraudulent loss. It concerns the demolition of a HUD-insured housing project, the Rockdale Apartments, in Atlanta, Ga., a mere 6 years after its construction. This affair demonstrates again how the bureaucracy has failed to properly implement important programs and failed to monitor and safeguard properly the taxpayers' investments in these programs.

In August 1976, after seeing newspaper stories on the destruction of the 6-year-old project. I asked the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Carla Hills, to make a thorough investigation of how this could have happened. After several months of delay, the Secretary finally ordered the Inspector General of HUD to make a thorough investigation of the matter. That investigation took over 6 months to complete. After it was completed, the report was sent to the U.S. attorney in Atlanta for review.

Although I have not yet acquired a copy of the Inspector General's report, I have seen an analysis of that report by the U.S. attorney for the northern district of Georgia. Because of the shocking conclusions of the U.S. attorney, I have asked our colleagues, Congressman EDWARD BOLAND, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on HUD and Independent Agencies, and Congressman THOMAS ASHLEY, chairman of the Housing Subcommittee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, to conduct a full congressional investigation into the specific problems in the Atlanta project, and more importantly, into the problems within the Department of Housing and Urban Development which enabled such a debacle to occur. I want to know if such abuse of the public trust and moneys is a common problem in other HUD-insured public housing, and, if so, what can be done to prevent it in the future.

In the Rockdale apartments case, the taxpayers invested $4.3 million in buildings not fit for human habitation. At the time the order was given to demolish—just 6 years after its construction, I want to emphasize—it was estimated that it would take $1.4 million to rehabilitate the units in order for them to meet the Atlanta housing code standards.

The U.S. attorney's letter is a devastating indictment of the practices which brought about this fiasco, pointing out its structural deficiencies, inevitable deterioration and vandal-ridden desolation so utter and complete that its tenants for the most part had long since fled the premises prior to demolition.

Just as serious are the allegations that, had the statute of limitations not expired, there would have been grounds for prosecution. There are also allegations of kickbacks and collusion.

My main concern about this disaster includes an impression that nobody in HUD seemed to be terribly upset about this situation when I first brought it to their attention. The correspondence and contacts seemed to show that this wasteful boondoggle was accepted—albeit regrettably—as the normal, routine way of life and HUD personnel seemed prepared to move on to the next fiasco. I was outraged by this situation, and I thought they should be, too.

Throughout my concern with this matter, I have been encouraged and supported by our colleagues, Congressmen BOLAND and ASHLEY. I have asked each of them to read the letter from the U.S. attorney and to draw their own conclusions. It is clear that a thorough and complete congressional investigation of the entire matter is warranted, with the hope that problems of this sort can be avoided in the future so that the taxpaying American public is not victimized again in this way; so that the people who should benefit from this program by having decent housing will not be victimized; and so that public confidence can be restored.

I would hope that any other of my colleagues who are aware of such problems in their own districts, will make all such information available to the able chairman of the two committees so that a complete review of HUD related problems can be undertaken.

CONTINUING CRISIS IN FOSTER CARE

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, over 3 months ago, the House passed H.R. 7200, the most far-reaching reform of foster care and adoption in the Nation's history. The case for these

reforms was strongly made before the Ways and Means Committee, and the full House, on the basis of several major reports recently completed which document the terrible financial and human expense of the present system.

One of the very best of these studies was prepared by the New York City Comptroller's Office. It showed that the failure to provide appropriate services and periodic reviews of children in foster care frequently led to prolonged and needless placement, to the detriment of the child, his natural family, and the taxpayers who subsidize this system. Comptroller Goldin reported, in fact, that nearly two-thirds of the children in foster care in New York had spent an average of 5½ years too long in placement, at a cost of $23,000,000.

Other studies, by the General Accounting Office, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Regional Institute of Social Welfare Research, as well as the record of hearings before the House and Senate committees, have shown that the conclusions reached in the New York City study accurately represent the foster care crisis across the country. Similarly, demonstration programs in the areas of preventive and reunification services and periodic review of placement have proven their capacities, in a number of cities from New York to Nashville and San Francisco, for dramatically reducing the need for foster care, and its duration.

Soon, the full Senate will consider H.R. 7200, which includes some of the critical incentives for preventive service and accountability contained in the House bill and endorsed by the Carter administration in S. 1928 (Cranston). Passage of these reforms will help to reduce the seriousness of the crisis in foster care and save Federal money, as well as put the Senate in agreement with the scores of organizations and individuals concerned for children's welfare and the needs of troubled families, who have strongly endorsed the foster care and adoption sections of H.R. 7200.

George Strauss, who directed the study of New York City's foster care system, recently summarized his findings and recommendations in an article in Newsday. As the Senate prepares to consider H.R. 7200, I would like to share Mr. Strauss' conclusions with the Congress, for they make a powerful statement in support of a strong foster care and adoption reform bill.

In addition to Mr. Strauss' fine article, I want to share with my colleagues a news article from yesterday's Oakland (Calif.) Tribune. This article describes a report which has recently been completed which documents the severe shortcomings of the foster care system in Alameda county. The charges made about the failure of the program in Alameda County are nearly identical to testimony about the program in that area which was presented to the Select Education Committee over a year ago, and which was found in earlier studies.

By illustrating the continuing problems in Alameda, I do not mean to highlight their shortcomings as unique. The long public discusssion of these issues, in which the House, the Senate, the administration and I have been engaged for several years, have all pointed to the great need for remedial legislation nationwide. H.R. 7200 represents the greatest hope for foster children and their parents in over 40 years. Counties, like Alameda, and States also require the added assistance which the bill would provide in order to expand the preventive service programs and the accountability procedures which will reduce the need for foster care, and reduce its duration.

In the 3 months since House passage, the administration has produced a bill of its own, and the Senate Finance Committee has endorsed similar provisions. The children of this Nation cannot wait long for final passage of this largely noncontroversial bill, which virtually everyone knowledgeable in the field agrees will lead to an improved foster care system, and greater permanency for children in crisis. I call upon the Senate to approve swiftly this legislation, before another year passes, and tens of thousands of additional children needlessly enter, and often become locked into, the foster care system, a tremendous expense to the public treasury, and at tragic costs to themselves and their families.

The articles follow:

[From Newsday magazine, Aug. 9, 1977]

THE FOSTER CARE MESS

(By George H. Strauss)

William was a healthy 7-year-old when he was placed in a foster home in 1971 by a foster care agency in the New York-Long Island area. His parents were separated. His father drank heavily and his mother was on welfare, legally blind and unable to care for him. Five of William's brothers and sisters had spent most of their lives up to age 18 in the agency's care. His parents rarely visited him.

In 1972, William became uncontrollable in school, running wild and attacking other students. Weekends spent at the home of his eldest brother, Charles, seemed to have a calming effect on the boy, but he still had to remain in the custody of his foster parents. In 1973, his foster mother told Charles that William could not be discharged to him because the agency planned to have the boy adopted. The agency in fact had no such plans; presumably she just didn't want to lose William—and the monthly stipend his presence brought her.

Asked for the first time, in 1975, what he wanted to do, William told an agency social worker: "I want to live with Charles, he's my brother . . . and Jennie [Charles' wife] is just like a mother to me."

Later that year William got what he wanted. He was discharged into the care of his brother. Meantime, his four years in foster care had cost more than $18,000 in public funds for basic care alone. Half of that money went for agency administration and social services, the other half for payments to the foster parents, who housed five other foster care children besides William. If he had been discharged in 1973, when his brother first requested it, the public expense would have been only $7,500.

Among the 400,000 children in foster placement throughout the country, 31,200 of them are in foster homes and institutions in the New York-Long Island area—2,600 in foster care provided by Nassau and Suffolk County Departments of Social Services, 28,600 in care of New York City and its voluntary agencies.

Foster care is supposed to be a temporary expedient, designed primarily to reunite children with their biological family. Five years ago a Newsday article on foster care showed that many children remain in foster care homes or institutions for most of their childhood. Little has changed since then. Children remain in foster care for too many years, often moved around like chips on a checkerboard.

Foster children are frequently not visited by their parents, sometimes because agencies place them in distant foster homes. Too often, the agencies responsible for them make weak efforts to work with their parents and return them home or discharge them to interested relatives. For those who have no realistic hope of returning home, the agencies are often slow to free them for adoption or to recruit adoptive parents.

As the case of William illustrates, long-term foster care is frequently harmful to the emotional health of children, who need a feeling of stability and belonging that only a permanent home can provide, whether with their biological or adoptive parents. Foster care is also inordinately costly to the taxpayer. The current national price tag is at the $1 billion level. In Nassau and Suffolk Counties alone, more than $14 million was budgeted on foster care for the current fiscal year. The cost per child averages close to $6,000. In New York City, basic care costs are considerably higher—almost $8,000 per child.

Reuniting a child with his or her family is not only better for the child but also saves taxpayers money. And subsidized adoption by low and middle-income families typically costs less than half of what is annually expended for a child in foster care.

Agency practices differ sharply with respect to foster care versus adoption. Consequently, many Long Islanders are the subjects of discrimination. On the one hand, New York City agencies have more than 1,500 New York children placed in foster homes and institutions in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. But when Long Island families wish to adopt children from these same New York agencies, they are usually told: "You live outside our geographic area for adoption."

The causes of the foster care mess are varied. Public reimbursement systems favoring foster care over preventive services or adoption, organizational survival, interagency squabbling, and bureaucratic convenience are prime reasons why so many children get lost in the limbo of foster care.

As for the social workers involved, they are subject to the same inertia often found in bureaucratic situations; they are comfortable with established "clients" and so are sometimes predisposed not to discharge them and take on new ones. This tendency is reinforced by the disinclination of social workers to make crisp, timely decisions, particularly when they are given little guidance or direction by agency management.

An important secondary cause is lax governmental oversight and review of foster care practices at the local, state and federal levels. Government review and audit capabilities are typically fragmented, superficial and narrow in focus. Basic data about programs and their costs are often not even generated, let alone acted upon in significant ways by responsible public officials.

In New York City, for example, agencies with education, mental health, medical and basic maintenance programs are audited in a fragmented manner by the City Board of Education, State Department of Education, City Department of Mental Health, State Department of Social Services, and City Comptroller's Office. No one looks at the total picture.

Two other phenomena that are less often discussed are simple greed by a minority of operators of private foster care agencies, who skim public funds for the enrichment of

themselves, their friends or relatives; and the political power of private agencies and their federations. The latter is well illustrated by the New York City situation. There, private agencies care for 25,000 of the 29,000 foster children and received about $228 million in public funds for them this year, more than 90 per cent of their income. On the boards of trustees of the agencies and their federations sit influential politicians, lawyers, bankers and corporate executives. Traditionally, city policy toward the agencies has reflected the trustees' important but low-profile membership in New York's permanent government.

If the children and taxpayers are to be better served by foster care, a spectrum of corrective actions must be taken at all levels of government. Although there are partial or local success stories that give one some hope, foster care as both a local and national problem will only be solved when reforms such as these are widely implemented:

Public resources must be allocated to emphasize preventive services, short-term care and adoption. Long term foster care should no longer be funded on a general basis.

Children in care must have independent legal representation. This should not be left to the agencies responsible for their foster placements.

After 18 months of care, payment to an agency for a child should be terminated, unless exceptional circumstances warrant continued care. This would force agencies to find suitable permanent families for children within a reasonable period of time.

Agencies should not be left to evaluate their own performance. Independent audit and review of local foster care practice, with appropriate fiscal sanctions attached, must be instituted. Penalties must be invoked when agencies do not find permanent homes for children on a timely basis, where such actions are clearly called for.

At the national level, the White House should set up a Task Force on Foster Care and Adoption to direct and coordinate the many federal agencies involved with foster care administration and oversight.

More attention should be paid to criminal prosecution of the minority of agency operators who misuse public funds. Concomitantly, public officials should not be allowed to sit on agency or federation boards of trustees.

Finally, social service personnel should be better utilized, directed and trained for developing permanent homes for children in foster care, whether by return home, discharge to caring relatives or adoption.

Children are vulnerable. They must not be sacrificed for the convenience of the system.

[From the Oakland Tribune, Sept. 18, 1977]

FOSTER CARE PROGRAM ASSAILED

(By Ernie Cox)

Alameda County's sprawling foster care program for some 1,800 troubled youngsters, costing more than $7.5 million a year, is coming under attack this week in an investigation ordered by the board of supervisors.

The no-holds-barred report, which may startle some of the supervisors is sharply critical of three county offices dealing with juvenile foster care—the mental health service, probation department and children's protective services. It will be turned over to the supervisors Tuesday by Matt Golden, the board's independent evaluator of county programs.

Golden says he is going to recommend the supervisors establish an interagency committee at once to sit down with County Administrator Loren Enoch and work out a multitude of problems. He said the committee and Enoch should report back to the supervisors as soon as possible with solid information so the board can decide what changes to make in the care of foster children.

The work of the three agencies, said Golden, is so fragmented that he cannot find out much about the youngsters in foster homes, as a group, does not know how successful county programs are, why certain youngsters succeed in foster homes and others fail, and what to do about the situation. But he knows the cost to the taxpayers is mounting every year.

Part of the reason for mounting costs, he thinks, is that too little effort is being directed toward finding adoptive homes or guardianship arrangements for children—many of whom languish "in limbo" in county foster homes for years.

County officials who were targets of Golden's criticisms strongly disputed some of his findings.

The study, headed by Elizabeth Kearns of Golden's office found that while county costs for foster care are growing, "There is little understanding of how much and why they are growing." The 60-page report adds, "We do not know whether placement (in foster care) is a good thing or a bad thing for children and families. We do not know which types of placement have the best chance of success."

There are more than 1,300 children currently in licensed family foster homes and the cost per child ranges from $145 to $210 per month, said Golden. The length of stay runs anywhere from a few months to several years and, Golden adds, there is strong evidence that the countys' own procedures are prolonging the foster home stay for many children.

Moreover, Golden reported, many county social workers feel that few foster parents "possess any knowledge of abnormal behavior or are sensitive to the special problems foster children often bring with them to a new environment." And the county is doing next to nothing about training foster parents to fulfill their role, he adds.

As any parent knows, teenagers are a special problem. And so they are for the foster parents as well. Some 42 percent are "failures" in foster homes, leading Golden to conclude, along with many licensing and placement workers. "The traditional foster home setting may neither be suitable or desirable for many teen-agers."

Foster placement often requires coordination between two or more county agencies, but Golden said he found little evidence of such coordination. This was vigorously disputed by the agencies involved.

These agencies, Golden charged, rarely put forth much effort with the child's natural parents to facilitate the child's early return to his home. As a result, many children remain in foster homes longer than necessary, according to Golden.

Dangerously disturbed juveniles are sometimes placed in foster homes with little security and with free access to the community. This is particularly true in the Probation Department where, Golden says, the question becomes not "what is appropriate" but rather "who will take him?"

One branch of county government handles neglected and abused children, another the delinquent, and still another the mentally disturbed. Many children have overlapping problems in all three areas, yet the county system tends to "label" the child under a single category for purposes of placement. This "arbitrary" labeling, Golden charges, may well result in a youngster being placed in a wrong facility which only makes his problem worse.

He says the dollar costs of such failures on the part of the county "may be unclear, but one thing is certain—costs to children and families are high."

He said county workers assume that black children, the handicapped, and those over 9 years old are not adoptable. But he added, "Workers do not often make use of private adoption referral agencies which specialize in finding parents for this hard-to-adopt group."

County taxpayers, Golden said, are paying a high cost for foster placement failures "encouraged by unclear or nonexistent county policies."

Chief Probation Officer James D. Callahan said it "not true" that there is little coordination between his department and the other two agencies.

Dr. Susan Mandel, director of mental health services, said Golden was wrong on several counts. Her reply prepared to staff members, claimed workers spend much time with parents of foster children, that their services follow children when they get into the juvenile justice system, and that they try hard to restore family relationship to prevent out-of-home placements.

CAMBODIA: THE FORGOTTEN LAND

HON. DAN QUAYLE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when President Carter has made much of the human rights issue, when members of the fourth estate have publicized cases of brutalities in various countries of the world, it is surprising that both the administration and the majority of the media people have been strangely silent about the wave of terrorism that is enveloping Cambodia.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I insert in the RECORD an article written by Nick Thimmesch which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on July 7 of this year. In his article, Mr. Thimmesch briefly touched upon some of the incidents of atrocities described by eye-witnesses who had managed to escape from Cambodia. I strongly recommend that my colleagues read this article and the book that Mr. Thimmesch referred to in his article, "Murder of a Gentle Land" by John Barron and Anthony Paul.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 7, 1977]

THE HUMAN RIGHTS CLAMOR IGNORES CAMBODIA'S HOLOCAUST

(By Nick Thimmesch)

WASHINGTON.—One of history's infamous tyrants is reported to have once said, "One death is a tragedy; a million deaths are a statistic." Perhaps this cynicism also describes the world's attitude toward the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of Cambodians by the Communist Khmer Rouge regime—a story that most people want to ignore.

At a time when Jimmy Carter's shibboleth, "human rights," fills the air, it is incredible that advocates of humane treatment have focused very little attention on Cambodia where one-tenth of the people have perished in a holocaust which makes Hitler look like a piker.

It is also a bit remarkable that neither President Carter nor his appointees at the State Department have made any special effort to deplore the bloodbath which the Communists have systematically inflicted on the Cambodian people. Occasionally, in a congressional hearing, an official from State will mention the slaughter, but it gets scant attention in the public prints or broadcasts.

Now we have an excellent account of this Communist genocide, "Murder of a Gentle Land," by two Reader's Digest editors, John Barron and Anthony Paul, who spent a year interviewing some 300 eyewitnesses to the brutality and killing. Their book is a com-

pacted narrative of this grisly, and unfinished, episode.

Then, using the ruse that American bombers were coming [they never did], the Communists ordered a brutal evacuation of the city, jammed with inhabitants and refugees. Eventually, 3.5 million refugees, half of Cambodia's population, wandered toward the countryside, in pitiful columns of feeble elders, frightened women and children, and trembling men. Some 400,000 of these people are believed to have died.

Some refugees who feigned death escaped to tell of the massacres. One at Mt. Tippadei left hundreds of bodies rotting in the sun for weeks, causing an intimidating stench.

There was also an incident involving 88 Cambodians, mostly Air Force pilots, hailed at a ceremony as repatriates. After Thai photographers filmed this seemingly happy reunion, the 88 were driven to a nearby field, where each was clubbed or bayonetted to death.

When mass killings are the rule, the atrocities and the bodies almost lose identity. But a single wanton murder can still stand out. The book tells of a Communist soldier suddenly thrusting his bayonet into the stomach of a blind beggar, killing him. An onlooker asked, "Why?" The soldier answered: "He could never work in the fields. He was useless to society. It is better for him to die."

It began in April, 1975, with the fall of the besieged capital of Phnom Penh to the Khmer Rouge. The fearful populace waved white flags of greeting to the invaders, hoping for the best. Instead, in the name of "Angka Loeu" [Organization On High], the Khmer Rouge troops, some in their early teens, began killing the sick and wounded even shooting and beating to death hospital patients who had just come out of surgery.

Indeed, this is often the guiding force in regimes dedicated to "purification," whether they be Nazi or Communist. Through "re-education" [concentration] camps, constant indiscriminate killings, and warnings that with so many people dead, the living must work twice as long and hard, the Khmer Rouge rule Cambodia.

The Carter administration, if it is to maintain its credibility on "human rights," must quickly and publicly condemn the Cambodian regime, and detail the atrocity stories for the world to deplore. Moreover, it must be pointed out that the Cambodian Communist regime is Peking-oriented, and that there are at least 1,000 Chinese Communist military advisers in Cambodia. The Soviets were rudely expelled at the time of the takeover.

For all the high sounding talk of an administration wanting to establish diplomatic relations with every last nation on the globe, Cambodia is one which doesn't deserve even the remotest consideration. Finally, it would be good for all those antiwar columnists of yesteryear, Mary McGrory for one, who wrote so much hair raising stuff on the tiger cages of South Viet Nam to break their silence and write about the blood-soaked Communist regime of Cambodia.

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY 29TH NATIONAL CONVENTION MOVES TO HEAL QUARREL WITH ACTIVE TROTSKYITE TERRORISTS

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), the U.S. section of the Fourth International (FI), which serves as the chief international coordinating body for Trotskyite Communist groups and parties, held its 29th annual convention as traditional at Oberlin College, Ohio, from Saturday, August 6 to Saturday, August 13. The main purposes of the convention were to coordinate and consolidate the SWP's penetration of U.S. trade unions, particularly of the steelworkers, and to heal a factional split within the Fourth International over whether to engage in revolutionary terrorism now, or to engage in party-building now and use terror tactics later. The "compromise solution" is to do both.

This year 1,685 persons registered for the SWP national convention, including 176 foreign Trotskyite observers headed by Charles Michaloux, alias "Duret," who was the official representative of the Fourth International's International Executive Committee (IEC), and of its ruling International Majority Tendency (IMT), which is actively engaged in terrorism in a number of countries. (Michaloux formerly used the name Aubin while his comrade Udry from Switzerland was called Duret).

Other foreign Trotskyite leaders attending included Chikara Sasaki, a leader of the Japanese section who under the revolutionary alias "Sakai" is a noted Trotskyite polemicist in favor of terrorism; veteran Trotskyite Harry Wicks, now a leader of the British FI section, the International Marxist Group (IMG), and a one-time member of the SWP, and Bernadette Devlin McAliskey, formerly associated with the leadership of such Irish pro-terrorist Trotskyite groups as People's Democracy and the Irish Republican Socialist Party (IRSP) and who now works with the Movement for a Socialist Republic (MSR), the Irish section of the Fourth International.

Another foreign Trotskyite leader present was Reza Baraheni, now operating as a leader of the Sattar League, the Iranian section of the Fourth International. Baraheni is head of a front group run by the SWP called the Committee for Artistic and Intellectual Freedom in Iran (CAIFI) which conducts a smear campaign against the Government of Iran, an important U.S. ally. The offices for Baraheni's CAIFI operation are in the suite of rooms occupied by the citywide SWP and Young Socialist Alliance at 853 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003. In his testimony before the House Subcommittee on International Organizations in September 1976, Baraheni attacked the Shah of Iran and the Iranian intelligence agency SAVAK as "torturers;" but made no mention of his prominent position in the Trotskyite terrorist Fourth International nor of the writings of his ideological mentor, Leon Trotsky, who organized for Lenin "the state terror of a revolutionary class."

Upon registration in the skating rink, SWP members attending were handed convention packets containing information and orientation sheets and picked up undistributed "members-only" discussion bulletins. It is noted that this year the convention packets were enclosed in red plastic folders marked "Postal Training & Development Institute Technical Center" and that a Postal Workers Fraction meeting took place during the convention.

From 1 to 5 p.m. on August 6, SWP members employed in the steel industry attended a Steelworkers Fraction meeting in room 306 of the King Building. The meeting was opened only to those currently employed in the industry. Thirty-six members attende .. Approximately 15 more could not attend as they were not able to leave their jobs.

Early arrivals who were not steelworkers spent the afternoon in the gymnasium swimming pool awaiting the evening's orientation session for new SWP members, observers from other Trotskyite groups in the United States and abroad hosted by veteran SWP member Evelyn Reed, the wife of George Novack; Hattie McCutcheon, an SWP member who is a leader of the front called the National Student Coalition Against Racism (NSCAR) and is running for the Boston School Committee; and Peter Camejo, of the SWP National Committee and supporter of the future use of terrorism.

On Sunday, August 7, the convention was opened by John Hawkins, who outlined for the delegates the procedures to be followed. He was followed by SWP National Secretary, Jack Barnes, who made the political report to the convention. It was entitled "U.S. Ruling-Class Offensive Abroad and at Home."

The major activity of the afternoon session was a report on SWP penetration of the labor movement given by Joel Britton. From 8:30 to 10:30 that evening the delegates participated in a discussion of SWP finances. The SWP has always demanded much of its members financially. The delegates were advised that this will increase in the future

Most of the session on Monday, August 8, was taken up by the report on women's liberation by Willie Mae Reid and a discussion on the report. From 8 to 10 p.m. that evening fraction meetings and workships were held. Attendance at the fraction meetings was limited to those persons who were actually members of the unions penetrated by the fraction. The fractions and workshops and the names of the leaders follow:

Steelworkers Fraction—led by Joel Britton and Andy Rose;

Public Employees Fraction (AFSCME, SEIU, AFGE)—led by Lynn Henderson;

Electrical Workers Fraction (UE, IBEW, IUEW)—led by Ellard Yow;

Hospital Workers Fraction—led by Jean Savage;

Communications Workers Fraction—led by Chris Hildebrand;

Printing Trades Fraction—led by Sarah Lovell;

Building the National Organization for Women Fraction—led by Marcia Gallo and Cathy Sedwick;

Defense Activities on Behalf of Soviet and Eastern European Dissidents Workshop—led by Peter Seidman;

Winning New Members to the SWP Workshop—led by Rich Finkel;

Building the Movement for Gay Rights Workshop—led by Susan LaMont;

Building the Southern Africa Campaign Workshop—led by Osborne Hart and Omari Musa;

Writing for the *Militant* Workshop—led by Steve Clark;

Standardizing Bookkeeping for the Party, A Workshop for Branch and Local Financial Directors—led by Mary Lou Montauk.

Selling the *Young Socialist* Workshop—led by Holly Harkness;

Election Campaign Workshop—led by Matilde Zimmermann.

The August 9 session opened with a report by Olga Rodriguez on the Chicano movement and the struggle against deportation. The report and the discussion centered around the defense of illegal aliens and support for militant Mexican-American groups.

The main activity of the afternoon session was the black liberation report by Malik Miah. That evening from 8 to 10 there were additional fractions and workshops. These were:

Railroad Workers Fraction—led by Ed Heisler;

Women's Liberation Work in the Trade Unions Workshop—led by Cindy Jaquith;

Postal Workers Fraction—led by Marty Pettit;

Auto Workers Fraction—led by Brian Elam;

Teachers Workshop—led by Lynn Henderson;

Textile Workers Workshop—led by Jim Gotesky;

Struggles of Chinese-, Filipino-, and Japanese-Americans Workshop—led by Diane Wang;

Supporting the Movement Against Nuclear Power Workshop—led by Mike Baumann;

How to Take Better Photos for the *Militant* Workshop—led by Susan Ellis.

Educational Needs of the Party Workshop—led by Fred Feldman and Paul Montauk;

Anti-deportation Campaign Workshop—led by Miguel Pendás and Miguel Zárate;

The Branch Bookstore and Its Relation to Party Activity Workshop—led by Peggy Brundy and George Bouse;

Defense Activities on Behalf of Latin American Political Prisoners Workshop—led by Mike Kelly;

Regional Work and Fall Traveling Teams Workshop—led by Rick Berman;

Campaign Finances and Disclosure Laws Workshop—led by Stacey Seigle;

Defense Activities on Behalf of Iranian Political Prisoners Workshop—led by Doug Jenness;

The YSA and the High Schools Workshop—led by Betsy Farely.

The August 10 session opened with a special report on Canada. The SWP considered it very significant that the two Canadian Trotskyite organizations, the League for Socialist Action and the Revolutionary Marxist Group, were now united. The RMG which has its main base among French speaking Canadians is part of the International Majority Tendency of the Fourth International. It advocates terrorism now. The LSA, like the Socialist Workers Party, adheres to the Leninist-Trotskyist faction of the Fourth International, and also advocates terrorism in the future but not under the present circumstances.

The next report for the morning was by Larry Seigle on the proposal to admit to membership a group called the Revolutionary Marxist Committee. The RMC, which came out of a Trotskyite tendency called the International Socialist opposes the SWP line on the nature of the Soviet Union. The Socialist Workers Party believes that the Soviet Union is a "workers state," although it is deformed. Therefore, revolutionaries must defend the Soviet Union against its enemies. The RMC, on the other hand, believes that the Soviet Union is ruled by a system of "state capitalism." Therefore, revolutionaries should not defend the Soviet Union. While to most people this difference of opinion sounds unimportant to Trotskyites it is vital. The nature of the Soviet Union is an article of faith in Trotskyite ranks. Therefore, the admission of the RMC members indicates how desperate the SWP is for new blood. The RMC consisted of 45 people, led by Bruce Landau and Shelly Kramer. Nineteen of their members belong to trade unions, five of them to the United Auto Workers.

During the afternoon, a series of special classes were held. These were:

A Panel Presentation on the Situation in Mexico Today;

Issues in the Middle East Today—by David Frankel;

The Advancing Revolution in Southern Africa—by Robb Wright;

A Panel Presentation on the Class Struggle in Spain;

How the International Trotskyist Movement Began—by Harry Wicks;

A Panel Presentation on Ireland;

Developments Toward the Political Revolution in Poland—by Gerry Foley;

Puerto Rico's Struggle for Independence—by a representative of the Internationalist Workers League of Puerto Rico;

The Fallacies of the Theory of State Capitalism—by Dick Roberts;

A Panel Presentation on the International Women's Liberation Movement;

Ethiopia and Eritrea: Upheaval in the Horn of Africa—by Ernest Harsch;

The Fight Against the Ultra-right in a Period of Growing Class Polarization: the Skokie Example—by Fred Feldman.

That evening from 8 to 10 the following workshops and fraction meetings were held:

Mineworkers Workshop—led by Ed Heisler;

Transit Workers Fraction—led by Steve Beumer;

Teamsters Fraction—led by Andy Rose;

Black Liberation Work in the Trade Unions Workshop—led by John Hawkins;

Building Trades Fraction—led by Frank Lovell;

NEA Fraction—led by Ed Fruit;

AFT Fraction—led by Jeff Mackler;

Building the Student Coalition Against Racism Workshop—led by Osborne Hart and Cathy Sedwick;

Building the Puerto Rican Movement Today Workshop—led by Catarino Garza;

Growing Feminism Among Women of Oppressed Nationalities, a Panel Discussion by Rashida Abdul-ahad, Magdalena González, and Katherine Pon;

Branch and Local Financial Directors Workshop—led by Dave Prince;

Party Campaigns for the *Militant*, *Perspectiva Mundial* and *Intercontinental Press* Workshop—led by Harvey McArthur;

Organizing the Fall Speaking Tours Workshop—led by Mike Maggi;

Workshop on Producing Better Branch Weekly Forums—led by Wendy Lyons;

Winning Artists to the Revolutionary Party Workshop—led by Thiago;

The Party's Fight for Civil Liberties Workshop—led by Syd Stapleton;

Workshop on YSA Finances—led by Brian Williams.

The August 11 session opened with a report on the Young Socialist Alliance by Cathy Sedwick. The YSA is the youth group of the Socialist Workers Party. The next report was by Nelson Blackstock on the Socialist Workers Party press.

The afternoon session heard the organization report by Mary-Alice Waters. That evening the delegates were entertained with music and poetry "in solidarity with political prisoners." Reza Baraheni played the role of an Iranian poet. For most of the convention, he appeared as a leader of the Iranian section of the Fourth International. The evening featured guitar playing by the Brazilian musician Guadencio Thaigo deMello.

The August 12 session featured a report on the world Trotskyist movement by Barry Sheppard. He pointed to the merger of the two factions in Canada as a good sign for the Fourth International. On behalf of the SWP, Sheppard urged that the two major international factions dissolve. The two factions are the LTF, led by the SWP, and the IMT, headed by Ernest Mandel and the other Fourth International leaders. At the last World Congress of the Fourth International in 1974, the IMT had only a slight majority. Since that time, however, the LTF has lost its largest group, the PST of Argentina, which together with its supporters in other countries has formed a third faction called the Bolshevik Tendency. This left the LTF with only the SWP and a few tiny grouplets in other countries. This of course is the reason for the desire of the SWP to abolish the factions. Nevertheless, Charles Michaloux representing the IMT at the convention stated that his faction also favored the dissolution of factions before the next World Congress of the Fourth International, which is scheduled for 1978.

From 9 to 11 that evening a rally was held within the convention on behalf of the SWP newspaper the Militant. Keynote speaker was Maceo Dixon, SWP leader in Boston. The featured speaker was Bernadette Devlin McAliskey, the Irish revolutionary who has collaborated with the Trotskyite terrorist in Northern Ireland. Other speakers were Shelley Kramer representing the Revolutionary Marxist Committee, which merged with the SWP at this convention; Holly Harkness, member of the National Executive Committee of the Young Socialist Alliance; Diane Sarge, SWP member from Houston, Tex., active in the United Steelworkers; and Manuel Archuleta of La Raza Unida, a Mexican-American group that has collaborated with the Socialist Workers Party for a number of years.

Greetings to the rally came from: Richard Mohawk and Paul Skyhorse, two members of the American Indian Movement on trial in Los Angeles for first degree murder in the stomping death of a taxi driver; Morris Kight, a leader of the homosexual movement in Los Angeles; Harry Edwards, black militant at the University of California, Berkeley; I. F. Stone, veteran journalist and Communist apologist; Emile deAntonio, film maker who produced the propganda film on behalf of the terrorist Weather Underground; Leonard Weinglass, leading National Lawyers Guild attorney who recently defended members of the terror-

ist Symbionese Liberation Army; Robert Meeropol, son of the convicted Soviet atomic spies Julius and Ethel Rosenberg; and Jose Angel Gutierrez, Texas judge founding member of La Raza Unida who is a strong supporter of the Castro dictatorship in Cuba.

This ended the sessions of the convention open to all members of the Socialist Workers Party, but, of course, closed to the public. On August 13, selected members of each SWP branch and foreign Trotskyite officials representing the Fourth International gathered to elect the national committee of the SWP and hear a report on the control commission by Linda Jenness. The control commission is the internal investigating arm of the SWP leadership.

Approximately 100 of the 1,600 members of the Socialist Workers Party did not attend the convention. These had to provide an acceptable excuse such as not being able to leave their jobs. The SWP Control Commission has had its job made easier by the fact that the FBI was forced to advise them that there had been 66 informants in the Socialist Workers Party. The Justice Department then ordered the FBI to terminate the informants and advise them not to attend SWP meetings, or to report anything to the FBI about the SWP.

Most of those in attendance at the convention were barred from the final closed session, which was opened only to "official delegates." These "official delegates" were handpicked by the leadership, each representing 12 members. New York for example, with approximately 300 members had about 25 delegates. Most of these were "leaders" and few rank and filers had the opportunity to be in on the real decisionmaking meeting. Smaller branches had one or two delegates who were almost invariably the top people in the branch closely associated with the national leadership.

Two major problems were raised at the convention. The first was financial, the second organizational. The SWP membership had previously been supplied with information concerning these problems. The financial problem was described in a report made to the SWP national committee by Barbara Matson on April 16, 1977.

Additional funds are necessary to carry out the work of the SWP. Those funds have to come from the membership. At this time, according to Matson, 50 percent of the expenses of the SWP newspaper the Militant have to come from the party. Seventy-five percent of the expenses of Intercontinental Press must also come from the party. Intercontinental Press is a weekly magazine published by the Socialist Workers Party on behalf of the Fourth International. The new Spanish language SWP publication Perspectiva Mundial is subsidized 100 percent. In addition the SWP pays 100 percent of all of the expenses of its members traveling abroad on Fourth International business. They also pay 100 percent of the expenses of the new national field organizers and of the Young Socialist Alliance organizer teams that travel around the campuses each spring and fall. According to Matson, "Even though the teams use the income they receive from sales to cover their expenses, we pay for and furnish the materials to them without charge." [1]

The organizational problem is even more serious. As a result of attempting to expand the SWP by breaking down the citywide locals into a number of smaller branches it was soon found that untrained cadre were not following instructions properly. The national office was not sufficiently informed about the work of some of the branches. Mary-Alice Waters in a report to the National Committee of the SWP on January 8, 1977, said:

> Most of the comrades probably read the article about the party that appeared in the *Nation* this fall, written by Walter and Miriam Schneir. Among other things, they describe how George Novack showed them around the national headquarters at 14 Charles Lane and they quote George as proudly commenting that the SWP has an infrastructure for a party of 100,000. I don't know if George actually said that. But knowing what our problems have been this fall, George's enthusiasm really made me laugh. I wish it were true. In reality, while some departments are ahead of the game, we don't yet have an adequate infrastructure for a party of 2,000. And that's one of the things we are proposing to change in the next months.

The solution was to send out eight national field officers, who could handle local problems in their own geographical area. Those chosen were:

LIST OF FIELD OFFICERS

1. Northeast—Doug Jenness (resident New York)
2. Mid-Atlantic—Andrea Morell (resident Washington)
3. South/Gulf Coast—Pearl Chertov (resident New Orleans)
4. Southwest—Peter Camejo (resident Los Angeles)
5. Pacific Coast—Tony Thomas (resident San Francisco)
6. Rocky Mountains/South Plains—Steve Chainey (resident Denver)
7. Midwest—Wendy Lyons (resident Minneapolis).
8. Great Lakes—Joel Britton (resident Chicago).[2]

The desire to recruit new members is complicated by two factors. One is that previously nonpolitical new members take a long time to learn the line and how to follow orders. The other is that members of rival political groups have their own ideological line and are usually a problem to integrate into the SWP structure. There were some misgivings concerning the plan to recruit the members of the Revolutionary Marxist Committee because they came into the SWP with a coherent political position on a number of questions different from that of traditional Trotskyism. The solution to this was not to allow them to all join the Detroit local but to scatter them around the country.

A group that is closer ideologically to the Socialist Workers Party and which has about 75 members has been rejected for membership for the last 2 years. This group called the Revolutionary Marxist Organizing Committee adheres to the positions of the International Majority Tendency of the Fourth International. This group, which has members in a number of cities, including New York and Baltimore, is centered around the Socialist Union in Los Angeles headed by Milton Zaslow, who in the late 1940's and early 1950's was organizer of the New York local of the Socialist Workers Party under the name Mike Bartell. He left the SWP during the 1953 split and supported entryism into the Soviet controlled Communist movement.

The Baltimore group calls itself the Baltimore Marxist Group. Its members are Rick Ehrmann, John Sinnigen, Lisa Sinnigen, and Star Bowie. The New York group calls itself the Marxist Education Collective and includes Murray Weiss and wife, Myra Tanner Weiss, both of whom were long time leaders of the Socialist Workers Party until the 1960's; as well as Art Felberbaum, and Hazel Daren.

The SWP has refused to admit the members of this group, some of whom had been expelled from the SWP in 1975 as part of the Internationalist Tendency. The leadership of the Fourth International, nevertheless, maintained close relationships with this group and Livo Maitan attended the November, 1975, conference at which the local groups were merged into the ROMC.[3] Due to a series of incidents this relationship has been terminated. As a result approximately 75 supporters of terrorism, many of whom have considerable organizational experience, are now unavailable to the Trotskyite movement.

The incidents that caused this began on July 24, 1975, when Herbert Romerstein, former minority chief investigator for the House Committee on Internal Security, testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security on the Trotskyite Terrorist International. That testimony and hundreds of pages of confidential SWP and Fourth International documents relating to terrorism were released by the committee in March 1976.

On April 6, 1976, Hedda Garza, who was expelled from the SWP in 1975 as a member of the International Tendency, called a press conference to answer the charges. Garza never said that the Fourth International opposed terrorism, instead, she claimed that it was the U.S. Government that engaged in terrorism and subversion, instead of her Marxist-Leninist comrades.

The Socialist Workers Party was furious at its former members purporting to speak on its behalf. An April 6, 1976, release issued by the New York SWP office and signed by Jack Barnes for the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party and Ernest Mandel for the United Secretariat of the Fourth International said:

> At a press conference held April 6 in New York, Hedda Garza purported to speak in defense of the Socialist Workers party and the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, although none of the groups or individual she represents are members of either of these organizations. Consequently neither the Socialist Workers party nor the United Secretariat of the Fourth International take

[1] Socialist Workers Party Discussion Bulletin, No. 3, June 1977, pp. 25 and 26.

[2] Socialist Workers Party Internal Information Bulletin, No. 1, February, 1977, pp. 18–35.

[3] Fourth International Internal Discussion Bulletin, No. 5, November 1976, pg. 7.

any responsibility for her declarations. Both disassociate themselves from them.

The RMOC wrote to the Fourth International leadership complaining about the repudiation. They received an answer which pointed out that the Socialist Workers Party is engaged in a "very delicate and complicated legal undertaking" in its lawsuit against the U.S. Government. The Hedda Garza press conference, "threatened to publicly pose spokespeople for the FI in the USA who were not part of that defense/offense effort, thus denying the SWP the right to maintain strict control of its own defense/offense." The letter went on to say, regarding Ernest Mandel that:

Ernest had agreed only to a general statement saying that nobody is a member of the FI in the USA because of the Voorhis Act, a kind of Orwellian legal formulation. That's not what came out in the wash, and an official statement by Ernest into the minutes of the USec condemning this trickery on the part of the SWP is now in the works; this clarifying statement will include the FI's leading bodies on the general conduct of the law suit.

The RMOC wrote back condemning this and other actions of the SWP. The material sent by RMOC to the International Majority Tendency was marked "This material and the information contained herein, should only be shared with reliable IMT supporters." Nevertheless, in January, 1977, Gus Horowitz, who is an SWP representative at the International Headquarters of the Fourth International in Brussels, Belgium, found this material "by accident" at the FI headquarters. This can be translated as found while rummaging through somebody elses papers.

The SWP responded by demanding that the IMT leadership cease their contacts with the RMOC and the Socialist Union. On March 24, 1977, at a meeting of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, a resolution was passed placing the members of RMOC and SU "outside the framework of sympathizing supporters of the Fourth International" unless they leave their organization.

Barry Sheppard reported in a letter to Jack Barnes, "This motion clearly gets rid of any pretenses by the RMOC-Bartell gang that any of them are a fraternal part of the Fourth International. This should bring an unpleasant chapter of history to an end." [4]

The action by the IMT leaders against their American supporters is part of an attempt to defuse the international faction fight that has gone on since 1969. During the fight the SWP and its supporters in the Leninist-Trotskvist Faction (LTF) repeatedly and accurately accused the Fourth International leadership faction called the International Majority Tendency (IMT) of advocating and carrying out terrorism in Latin America and Western Europe. While the IMT continues to advocate terrorism, they have made some concessions to the LTF. They now agree that terrorism should be combined with "party building." While the LTF had argued that "party building" was impossible combined with terrorism because of the lose of cadre as a result of the violence. LTF, however, was glad to accept the compromise as their largest organization the PST of Argentina has left to organize the Bolshevik Tendency, a third faction in the Fourth International. (See International Internal Discussion Bulletin, No. 1, January 1977 for the Declaration of the Bolshevik Tendency.) [5] The plan is that all factions will be dissolved before the forth-coming 1978 World Congress. The LTF will cease its criticism of the IMT on the terrorism issue. The arguments at the Congress will be concerned mainly with the role of Trotskyites in coalition politics and their analysis of and relationship with the Soviet controlled Communist movement in various countries.

The SWP in trying to build support for its position would like to bring an international group called the Organizing Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International (OCRFI) into the movement. OCRFI has its main base in France in a group called the Internationalist Communist Organization (OCI) lead by Pierre Lambert (aka Bleibtrae). This group goes back to the 1953 international split. It was then allied with the Socialist Workers Party. In 1963, SWP broke with the Lambertists to rejoin the Fourth International. The main rival in France to the OCI is the Ligue Communiste Revolutionnaire (LCR) which is the French section of the Fourth International. The two French groups have been bitter enemies for the past 15 years. They have engaged in acts of violence against each other on numerous occasions. The IMT has used this animosity as an excuse for continuing the split with OCRFI. During a discussion last December, Pierre Lambert admitted to a group of representatives of the Fourth International that OCI had planted spies in the LCR. Those who heard this admission were: Claude Chisserey, Stephane Just, Gus Horowitz, Charles Michaloux, and Olivier. Horowitz is the SWP representative to the Fourth International. This greatly upset the IMT leadership. They demanded that the OCI explain why they had spies in the French section of the Fourth International. F. de Massot answered for the OCRFI that, "given the type of relations that existed between the LCR and the OCI, no other solution was possible." He went on to say that the LCR had also sent spies into the OCI. He named a Comrad Carasso from Clermont-Ferrand. It is interesting to note that the Trotskyites spy on one another while condemning the U.S. Governments "spying" on them while gathering information on international terrorism. Unfortunately, the U.S. Government's surveillance of the SWP was canceled last year. The discussions between the FI and the OCRFI are continuing.[6]

The most significant result of the IMT rapprochement with the LTF has been the merger of the Canadian Trotskyites. The pro-terrorist Revolutionary Marxist Group and Groupe Marxiste Revolutionnaire has fused with the League for Socialist Action/Ligue Socialiste Ouvriere. The RMG and GMR are part of the IMT. LSA/LSO is part of the LTF. (Material on this merger may be found in the confidential International Information Bulletin of the Fourth International Nos. 4 and 5, both dated August 1977.)

One of the main points of differences between the LTF and IMT is on the question of the nature of various Communist regimes. The immediate case in point is the Government of Vietnam. In a draft resolution on the Indochinese Revolution submitted by the IMT for the next World Congress whole-hearted support is given to the Vietnamese regime. The resolution is signed by Aubin (Charles Michaloux) Duret (A Udry of Switzerland) Roman and Walter (Ernest Mandel). It appeared in the confidential International Internal Discussion Bulletin, No. , November 19776. It was answered by Fred Feldman of the SWP in the International Internal Discussion Bulletin, No. 6, July 1977. Feldman argued for critical support for the North Vietnamese and calls for the construction of "revolutionary Marxist parties in Indochina" to fight against the Stalinist regimes.

The IMT grew out of that section of the Fourth International which has advocated close cooperation with the Stalinists. This included the tactic of entryism which was to penetrate the Stalinist movements even if it meant giving up the independent existence of Trotskyite parties. The LTF, or at least most of its members, come out of the section of the Fourth International that opposed this. If the debate on terrorism ends, the debate on relations with the Stalinists will still be a major bone of contention.

The end of the debate on terrorism has great significance, however. As sections of the Fourth International continue to engage in terrorism in Latin America, Western Europe and the Middle East they will no longer be subject to criticism by the SWP. In fact, the SWP will increase the support given to these fraternal parties. The SWP in the past has supported speaking tours for foreign Trotskyite terrorists and fund raisers for the terrorists. This will continue, probably even on a larger scale. At the SWP convention four persons active in terrorism in Northern Ireland were present. These were Bernadette Devlin McAlisky of the Irish Independent Socialist Par-

[4] Fourth International International Internal Information Bulletin, No. 2, July, 1977.

[5] For a discussion of this matter see Fourth International International Internal Discussion Bulletin, No. 8, December, 1976, which contains the Self-Criticism on Latin America by the Steering Committee of the International Majority Tendency and a disagreement with the statement by Livio Maitan. See also the Fourth International International Internal Discussion Bulletin, No. 5, May, 1977 which contains an analysis of the self-criticism by Jack Barnes.

[6] Fourth International International Internal Discussion Bulletin. No. 3, May, 1977. pg. 32-33.

ty (ISP), Fergus O'Hare of the People's Democracy (PD), and Anne Farrelly and James McMahon of the Movement for a Socialist Republic (MSR), Irish section of the Fourth International.

On Friday, September 30, 1977, All Souls' Church in Washington, D.C., will be the scene of a meeting featuring the Peruvian Trotskyite Terrorist Hugo Blanco. The meeting is sponsored by the Socialist Workers Party front, USLA Justice Committee.

Blanco had been previously barred from the United States as a result of his terrorist activity. At the SWP Convention the boast was made that now Blanco would get a visa. Although, the SWP is already distributing leaflets announcing that Blanco will speak in Washington on September 30, the State Department claims that the visa has not yet been given. In light of the fact that the Irish terrorist supporter, Bernadette Devlin McAliskey, was given a visa to attend the SWP Convention, it is likely that other foreign terrorists will soon be in this country under the auspices of the SWP.

The Socialist Workers Party has strongly supported the terrorist activity of the Palestine Liberation Organization. Peter Seidman, an SWP activist in New York, has been assigned to co-ordinate activities with the PLO support apparatus in the United States. The two leaders of this support apparatus are James Zogby and Abdeen Jabara. Zogby has expressed some misgivings about the SWP taking over the PLO support apparatus. The SWP refers to its penetration and/or take-over of a movement as "an intervention." Seidman has tried to convince the PLO activists that the SWP only wants to help, not take over. Jabara and Zogby, however, have been carrying out their propaganda activities through the National Lawyers Guild. The Communist Party, USA recently consolidated its control over the NLG defeating a Maoist faction. The Communist Party does not like to collaborate with rival Marxist-Lenninist groups such as Maoists or Trotskyites.

The Socialist Workers Party is sponsoring a trip to the United States for Lea Tsemel, an attorney in Israel and a member of the Revolutionary Communist League, the Israeli section of the Fourth International. The RCL openly supports terrorism and has collaborated with the Palestine Lizberation Organization. Tsemel devotes her time to defense of Palestinian terrorists captured by Israel. She is scheduled to tour the United States in October under the auspices of Viewpoint Speakers Bureau, a front organization for the SWP. She is scheduled to speak in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, D.C., Atlanta, Detroit, Chicago, Seattle, San Francisco, and Los Angeles.

I will continue to report to my colleagues on the activities of the Socialist Workers Party in support of transnational terrorism. This continuing problem points up once again the need to re-establish the committee on Internal Security to investigate and propose legislation against terrorism.

HUMAN EVENTS EXPOSES ACHILLES HEEL OF PANAMA CANAL NEUTRALITY TREATY

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the administration has been insisting the new treaties with Panama give the United States the right to indefinitely guarantee the Panama Canal's neutrality—that is, to intervene militarily to protect it from an aggressor.

This is not the way I see it.

This is not the way Panama sees it.

Nothing in the treaty texts spell out such a right.

Panama's top negotiator, Romulo Escobar Bethancourt, has said the United States has no such right.

Human Events, the national conservative weekly published in Washington, in its September 17 issue, made a simple, clear analysis of this fact, and quoted Escobar Bethancourt sufficiently to demonstrate that Panama officially denies what President Carter and Ambassadors Bunker and Linowitz would have Congress and the American people believe.

I urge my colleagues to study this excellent Human Events analysis printed below:

DO NEW TREATIES GIVE UNITED STATES RIGHT TO DEFEND CANAL?

With officials from 23 other hemispheric nations assembled at the headquarters of the Organizations of American States, President Carter and Panamanian strongman Gen. Omar Torrijos signed those two historic treaties last week that relinquish U.S. control over the Panama Canal. But the atmospherics and the President's rhetoric about a "new" relationship south of the border concealed a grim aspect about these ceremonies: that they cap a headlong U.S. retreat around the globe—from Asia, Africa and now even Latin America.

Not all the pomp and glitter that filled Washington can cloak the fact that the U.S., primarily because of a lack of will, is surrendering a strategic waterway to an untrustworthy, pro-Marxist government of just 1.8 million people.

A key selling point of the Administration's is that the Canal Zone and the waterway won't really be yielded to Panama until Dec. 31, 1999, and that the U.S., through the second "neutrality" pact, can unilaterally and legally reintervene to protect the canal's neutrality thereafter. But this is an extremely dubious argument, at best.

As the text of the treaties—divulged two days prior to the signing—makes clear, the Torrijos government will exert major control over both the Zone and the canal long before the year 2000. U.S. sovereignty over the Zone, for instance, dissolves upon ratification of the pacts.

The Torrijos government will take over approximately 65 per cent of the Zone immediately after the treaties take effect. Just 30 months from the day they become operative, immigration, customs, schools, courts, prisons and police—now in the hands of the Americans—will be run entirely by Panamanians under Torrijos's direction.

U.S. citizens remaining in what is now called the Zone—many of them ship pilots, engineers and managers absolutely essential to the smooth operation of the canal—will be suddenly subject to Panamanian rule. In short, effective control of the Zone will pass to Torrijos some 20 years before the U.S. is technically scheduled to leave.

A new Panama Canal Commission, comprised of five Americans and four Panamanians, will have the responsibility for canal operations until the year 2000. But the administrator of the canal—the man who will supervise the day-to-day operations—must be a Panamanian beginning Jan. 1, 1990. The Commission, furthermore, is charged with flushing out American workers and replacing them with Panamanians. Within the first five years of the treaties, for instance, the number of U.S. nationals working for the Canal Commission must be reduced by "at least 20 per cent. . . ."

Out of 14 military bases now in the Canal Zone, only four will remain after implementation, and these bases will be under direct Panamanian civil and political jurisdiction. The "implementation" agreements accompanying the treaties suggest that the Republic of Panama will share, with the U.S., "the responsibility for control of entry" to our defense sites.

In other words, there is a great myth in the making when the Administration says that the U.S. will "slowly" turn over the canal to Panama: the U.S., in fact, will surrender its interests quite quickly.

What is even more astonishing, however, is the language contained in the "neutrality" treaty that the White House and the State Department have repeatedly declared permanently gives the U.S. the unilateral right to reintervene to protect the canal and its neutrality after the year 2000. *But no such explicit right exists.*

The only reference to this "right" is contained in a vaguely worded passage. Article IV, which says: "The United States of America and the Republic of Panama agree to maintain the regime of neutrality established in this treaty, which shall be maintained in order that the canal shall remain permanently neutral, notwithstanding the termination of any other treaties entered into by the two contracting parties."

As a Chicago *Tribune* correspondent noted: The wording leaves unclear what action the U.S. could take should the neutrality be threatened—could it use military force? Would it be restricted to using diplomatic persuasion?" Indeed, the wording even suggests the U.S. might not be able to act in any fashion without the cooperation of Panama.

In rebutting such criticism. Administration officials insist there is an understanding" with the Panamanians that Article IV means what U.S. officials say it means. If there is such an "understanding," however, Panama's chief negotiator, Romulo Escobar Bethancourt, is not letting on that he knows about it.

Appearing at an August 24 press conference before the Public Health Ministry in Panama City, Escobar was asked what rights the neutrality pact gave the United States.

"Now," said Escobar, "there is the question of whether this does or does not give the United States rights to intervene in Panama. Now that is the real question. The pact does not establish that the United States has the right to intervene in Panama. This word [intervention] was discussed and eliminated, and what is stated is that Panama and the United States will maintain the neutrality of the canal. . . ."

But the neutrality pact, Escobar continued, "does not provide that the United States will say when neutrality is violated. That is not provided there. There is an article which reads that Panama and the United States will maintain the neutrality pact with the purpose that the canal remain open peacefully for all ships of all flags of the world. That is all it says. It does not say that it falls to the United States

to decide when neutrality is violated or not." Yet if the United States cannot unilaterally decide when neutrality is violated, our "right" to guarantee the canal's neutrality means nothing at all.

In a speech before the National Assembly of Panama on August 19, Escobar went even further in denying U.S. intervention rights. The Americans, said Escobar, "proposed that Panama and the United States declare that the canal was neutral and that the United States would guarantee that neutrality.

"Panama was opposed to this concept, explaining that we did not want that with the excuse of neutrality, the United States would maintain a guarantee over the state of Panama. This was another cause of discussion that kept the negotiations detained *until the United States gave up on the idea of its having a guarantee of neutrality over the canal* [emphasis added]."

Even if the Administration believes it has an "understanding" of some sort with Panama, how good can this be when Panama's chief negotiator is saying something quite different to his own people?

Moreover, Escobar isn't the only one who believes the U.S. has no legal right to reintervene to guarantee the canal's neutrality. Roger Fontaine, director, Latin American Studies, Center for Strategic and International Studies at Georgetown University, told Human Events last week—after the treaties were disclosed—"I see no legal right to intervene unilaterally to guarantee the canal's neutrality. We can do so by force of arms, but on no other basis. Which means we can only do so by going to war."

What is most disturbing about the treaties, however, has nothing to do with their actual wording, but the obvious lack of good faith of Panama's top leaders, including its key negotiator, Escobar. If Panama intends to open up a "new" and more "harmonious" relationship with the U.S. because of these treaties, why is it, then, that Escobar continues to defame the U.S. before his own people at every conceivable opportunity? Why is it that he feels compelled to fuel the volatile student leaders with combustible rhetoric, virtually inciting them to confront the U.S. even after treaties take effect?

Down in Panama, Escobar has yet to be caught flattering the Carter Administration for its munificent present. Instead, Escobar, while repeatedly condemning American "gringos," crows that whatever concessions were forthcoming from the United States were squeezed out of a reluctant and imperialist nation.

In his August 12 address to the Federation of Panamanian Students, as we disclosed last week, Escobar suggested that the students should strike out on their own if they are disenchanted with some of the "ugly" features of the treaties, such as the presence of U.S. military installations in Panama for 23 years.

"In the past," said Escobar in one of his most incendiary speeches, "when we set bombs against our oligarchy, when we challenged the regimes established in our country, we never asked anyone for permission. You have never asked anyone for permission. . . .

"When one wants confrontation, one puts his knapsack on his back, his bomb at the waist and goes to stage the confrontation."

At the Organization of American States' ceremonies last week, Panama's strongman, Gen. Omar Torrijos, decided to imitate his chief negotiator by striking a sour note.

While President Carter was more than gracious, Torrijos stressed that despite the new treaties, the Panamanians would not be especially happy because "the 23 years agreed upon as a transition period means 8,395 days during which time United States military bases will remain, turning my country into a possible strategic target for reprisal." He also stressed he was fearful that the U.S. might try to exploit the neutrality treaty as "an instrument of permanent intervention." By this sort of rhetoric, of course, what Escobar and Torrijos have done is to set the stage for future confrontations and future negotiations.

President Carter, in truth, is asking the U.S. Congress to embrace two highly questionable treaties that will surrender one of the world's most strategic waterways to a nation ruled by dishonorable and disreputable men with mean and thuggish mentalities. The Congress should turn the treaties down flat.

ESCOBAR SAYS TREATIES CURB U.S. WARSHIPS

Romulo Escobar Bethancourt, Panama's chief negotiator, recently told newsmen in Panama that U.S. warships would not have the right to pass through the canal during wartime on a preferential basis. The neutrality treaty says that U.S. warships and auxiliary vessels will be entitled to transit the canal expeditiously." But this does not mean—contrary to interpretations placed on it by Administration sources in Washington—that such vessels would get to transit the canal before vessels from other nations, according to Escobar.

Responding to questions to newsmen in Panama City on August 24, Escobar, employing his customarily discourteous language, said the "gringos" would not have special rights under the "famous 'expeditious' passage."

"The United States," said Escobar, "wanted privileged passage through the canal as a means to seek support from the Pentagon in the negotiations with Panama. This is the truth . . . And when they saw that there was no way we would allow privileged passage, then they told us: We have to seek a formula so that the Pentagon will see that we are somehow taking them into consideration.

"This is how the expeditious passage came about. Now, I do not believe that when they explain the 'expeditious passage' term they will give the same explanation I am giving here. They will explain that this means privileged passage and they are entitled to go through first.

"They have to sell their merchandise. It is the same merchandise, but with different wrappings because they do not think as we do. They have to sell this treaty to their country, and for this reason you see that both of us give different information on the same provision."

HUMAN EVENTS ASKS: "ESCOBAR FUELS STUDENTS . . . IS PANAMA'S CHIEF NEGOTIATOR A COMMUNIST?"

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the weekly Washington publication, Human Events, has devoted much space to United States-Panamanian negotiations and the resulting new treaties signed by President Jimmy Carter and Dictator Omar Torrijos with much fanfare on September 7.

In its September 10 issue, Human Events devoted almost two complete pages to the activities of Torrijos' top adviser and chief negotiator, Romulo Escobar Bethancourt.

The publication details a recent incendiary speech to Panamanian students made by this top official, a speech which bodes little good for United States-Panamanian relations whether or not the treaties should be ratified.

My colleagues should be familiar with this key personality. We owe a debt of gratitude to Human Events for reporting on his thinking and activities. The following articles are from Human Events for September 10, 1977:

ESCOBAR FUELS STUDENTS—PANAMANIANS PLANNING POST-TREATIES VIOLENCE?

The new treaties surrendering the Panama Canal to Gen. Omar Torrijos are supposed to buy the U.S. peace with the Panamanians for at least another 23 years. But this Administration line—all-important in its hard-sell efforts with lawmakers and media apologists—seems to ignore a solid fact: Panamanian students, with obvious encouragement from the chief Panamanian negotiator, Romulo Escobar Bethancourt, are setting the stage for major confrontations with the U.S. following approval of the treaties. The major purpose of the students: to force the U.S. to close out all military installations in Panama long before Dec. 31, 1999, the date when such installations must be withdrawn under the new U.S.-Panama pacts.

While U.S. negotiators Sol Linowitz and Ellsworth Bunker have been diligently avoiding word or deed that could possibly offend the Torrijos government since the treaties in principle were announced, Escobar has been fueling the fiery and powerful Federation of Panamanian Students with high-octane rhetoric against the United States, even hinting that the Torrijos government would not oppose sabotage squads against American military installations after the treaties take effect. The Panamanian students have played an important role in triggering violent clashes against the U.S. and were involved in the famous 1964 riots in which 17 Panamanian students and four American soldiers were killed.

In his August 12 address to the student federation, Escobar issued what Latin American expert Roger Fontaine has termed a "barn burner." While making his pitch for endorsement of the treaties—which will have to be approved through a Panamanian plebiscite—Escobar also hyped his audience with talk of the "heroic and majestic" struggle of the 1964 students who "were massacred by the U.S. Army." He also favorably quoted Gen. Torrijos as saying: "I prefer a nation of Castroite youths to one of castrated youths. . . ."

But what was particularly disturbing to many observers was Escobar's calculated ambiguity involving the use of violence. Panama's chief negotiator stressed that the present treaties could have been obtained through violence, but that the Torrijos policy which secured them was far superior because it didn't involve a costly struggle.

Having said that, however, Escobar strongly suggested that the Torrijos government would not oppose violent actions by the students to correct what he said were some of the "ugly" features of the new treaties, including the stationing of U.S. military forces in Panama until the year 2000.

"There are still theories," Escobar added, "that we can get more, much more, through confrontation. I believe this is true. . . . We are not asking for confrontation, but neither will we give permission to anybody for a confrontation. Whoever wants to start a confrontation can do so himself.

"In the past, when we set bombs against our oligarchy, when we challenged the regimes established in our country, we never asked anyone for permission. . . .

"When one wants confrontation, one puts his knapsack on his back, his bomb at the

waist and goes to stage the confrontation. This is not written in any book. If one triumphs, one wins, and if one does not triumph, he dies." This passage, giving the green light to future violence, was met with a burst of applause.

Moreover, Escobar's "bomb-at-the-waist" speech followed on the heels of a short, volcanic address by Robert Gómez, the secretary-general of the Federation of Panamanian Students, who told his audience that while the treaties "resolve part of the problem . . . much remains to be done to totally eliminate the last symbol of the overwhelming presence of U.S. imperialism. The banners of the FEP [the federation] will not be lowered in the struggle, because this struggle will be continuous and prolonged until the last invading soldier leaves.

"Contrary to what many think, the new agreement will not, and cannot, signal the end of the process or of the struggle for national liberation. . . . Hail the unity of the patriotic forces and support for the liberating process! The struggle against imperialism and its internal allies will be continuous and prolonged. Liberation or death! The FEP is on the move! No one and nothing can stop it!"

While Panamanian officials in Washington dish out a far softer line, they also make it quite plain that they do not view the new treaties as eliminating their differences with the United States. When Human Events asked Panamanian press spokesman George Fisher about the agreements, Fisher stressed that Gen. Torrijos feels the pact guaranteeing a decreasing American presence in Panama until the year 2000 is "like a stone Panama will have to carry in her shoe for 20 years. . . ."

The Panamanian government, he said, "will not exaggerate Panama's gains," and he termed as distinct "disadvantages" the fact that the U.S. will still have military installations in his country and primary responsibility for operating the canal until the year 2000.

Fisher said that Gen. Torrijos has headed off street violence against the United States, but "we're not going to say that this [the treaties] ends all the problems with the United States." Fisher also said that the Panamanians can make "no guarantee" against violence, and that no government can guarantee to eliminate "violence against the U.S. presence either before the treaties or *after*" (emphasis ours).

While the U.S., in short, is peddling the new Panama treaties on the grounds that they will avert violence and harassment and secure a U.S. military presence in Panama until the year 2000, no such guarantees are being offered by the Panamanians. Indeed, the country's chief treaty negotiator seems to be encouraging future confrontations.

In the view of one U.S. Latin expert, in fact, Gen. Torrijos has every intention of removing that "stone" in his shoe before the year 2000.

Roger Fontaine, director, Latin American Studies, Center for Strategic and International Studies at Georgetown University, told Human Events last week that he thinks that when the Panamanian police control the Canal Zone—which will occur within three years after the treaties are ratified—the Panamanians "will encourage us to leave the Zone as soon as possible." Gen. Torrijos, he contends, wants to get the credit for our leaving, and doesn't want to sit around and wait.

IS PANAMA'S CHIEF NEGOTIATOR A COMMUNIST?

"The Panamanian Communist party . . . is firmly in control of Panama. Transformation to a Socialist state is still incomplete. The final steps in the process must await a treaty. The Communists are a little incredulous of their own success. . . .

"In order to make the revolution truly irreversible, they have to stop up some of the leaks in their control of the news, mails, radio and television, phone calls, meetings of people, etc. This requires that they obtain effective sovereignty over the Canal Zone and that they attempt to eliminate U.S. bases. As long as the Zone bases remain it is like a sword which threatens their permanency. It also delays further desired consolidations of power and societal transformation. . . .

"In February 1969, Torrijos managed to get control of the Junta Militar. He exiled Boris Martinez, Federico Boyd and others. He brought the Communists back to the University and turned it over to Dr. Romulo Escobar Bethancourt. Romulo is an avowed 'all-out' Communist. Ché Guevara was his house guest during a Panama visit. Bethancourt is a personal adviser to Torrijos. He is currently the chief treaty negotiator. He has also been made the Information/Newsmedia Czar of Panama."

Is Panama's chief negotiator a Communist? Many long-time observers suspect that he is. The information on Escobar Bethancourt quoted above is taken from an inch-thick document that originated from responsible attorneys in the Zone and is now in the hands of congressional staffers. Much of Escobar's pro-Communist record is bared in the publication, which includes a newspaper report disclosing that Escobar is a great admirer of North Korea's Communist dictator, Kim Il Sung

Indeed, when liberal-leaning columnist Charles Bartlett traveled to Panama in late February, he returned to write that: "Too many of the regime's key figures, including some principal negotiators, are commited to the hard left. . . . Torrijos' chief adviser, Escobar Bethancourt, turns up in such curious roles as head of the Panama-North Korean Association."

Escobar's support of Communist causes is believed to be extensive. Albert S. Adams enlisted in the Army Counter Intelligence Corps in 1955 and was assigned to the Canal Zone from 1956 through 1958. From 1958 through 1972, he worked for the Panama Canal Co. According to Adams, who contacted us earlier, Escobar's files that were kept by the U.S. military showed he was connected with numerous Communist groups and even acknowledged his Communist affiliations during the Remón assassination trial of 1957.

Escobar's left-wing stance is so pronounced that even Panamanian officials in the U.S. admit that he is always being "accused of being a Communist," but say that these charges stem from those who never wanted changes in the country's ruling oligarchy.

On August 9 of this year, the Star & Herald, an English language paper published in Panama, quoted a newspaper reporter asking Gen. Torrijos whether or not he was a Communist. At that point, Escobar cut off Torrijos and answered for the general.

"Look here," said Escobar, "we could answer negatively, but what happens is that we do not like to say no because we do not accept someone to self-appoint himself into an inquisitor into one's personality . . .

"Each individual has the right to choose the political ideology he likes, and to act in politics as he chooses. He also has the right to act and think and acquire the philosophical concepts more consonant with his education and social standing, or with what he thinks should be the relations between human rights.

"That question has been asked of the General and myself for many years. Of course, now that he is a General it becomes more outstanding, but the question has been asked of me ever since I was around 14 years old, when the Americans were beating us because we wanted to free our country; when we were jailed, when we were tortured; when we were hanged; when we were submitted to all kinds of humiliations the first question asked was whether we were Communists. And we never answered that we were not Communists; what we always said was that we wanted to defend our dignity and our motherland.

"We never accepted going to a confessionary to tell anyone whether we are or we are not Communists because we believe that a man's deeds, not what he says, are indicative of what he is."

Escobar, of course, did not answer the question. Clearly, however, the question should be vigorously pursued before the Senate ratifies the canal treaties transferring the canal to the Torrijos/Escobar government. Why don't Thurmond, Helms, et al., fly to Panama and rummage through U.S. intelligence files?

CREATIVE COMMUNITY EFFORTS FOR CONSERVATION

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, we have heard many people predict that the public will not adopt effective energy conservation measures, in spite of the obvious need for the public to do so. We may not know for several years whether energy conservation goals will be met, but we do know that to reach these goals, efforts must begin today.

It is for this reason that I am pleased to note some creative community efforts in my congressional district to get public support for energy conservation. The following article, from a weekly paper in my district, explains the details.

The article follows:

[From the El Chicano, Aug. 4, 1977]

WEATHERIZATION PROGRAM

(By Karen Bailey)

The Community Services Department (CSD) Weatherization Program is at it again. (They are the one's responsible for providing free insulation and weatherstripping services for the homes of those who qualify). In response to President Carter's Energy Saving push, Ms. Dina Hunter, the Weatherization Program Manager, has developed an educational program aimed at teaching San Bernardino County's "little ones" how to conserve energy, and how to get their "moms and dads" involved too.

An outreach team visits approximately one to two elementary schools per day and puts on a live puppet show for the children and teachers. The show is fun-lovingly aimed at arousing enough concern and awareness in the children as to stimulate the development of energy saving habits. In the script "Count Conservation," a character resembling a humorous Count Dracula, illustrates how he saves by proper use of appliances. (You may wish to note the Dracula figure is appropriate since it is common knowledge that all good vampires sleep during the day "giving their appliances the afternoon off" and concentrating energy use during the evening hours). The children really respond well to this and the question and answer periods before and after the puppet show.

The Southern California Edison Co. does their part by contributing a very interesting packet called "Energy Conservation Classroom Kits" for grades 1–3 and 4–6. A teacher

manual is included with a wall chart, booklets in English and Spanish, student certificates to be awarded at the completion of the conservation program and a cardboard attache case saying, "Project Energy." Response from teachers, students and parents has been excellent in accepting this form of training as it has such a positive appeal to viewers.

The goals of any project involving federal spending entails more benefits than the one service offered. Through the mutual cooperation of CSD and the CETA Division of San Bernardino County's Employment Office, the Weatherization Program has found CETA workers a large asset in its tremendous success. What this means is that by creating and implementing new and necessary programs CSD is helping to solve the major problem of unemployment in San Bernardino County by continually providing new jobs.

Another exciting new service you can look forward to from the Weatherization Program is the free installation of a reflective film called Aluma-Kook to mobile homes that qualify. It is a transparent sheet of mylar containing properties that reflect the sun's rays thereby keeping it cool in the summer; at the same time the reflective film is capable of shielding against the cold of winter by acting as insulation.

Social Security recipients and interested parties are encouraged to call 383-3561 or 383-1153 for further information or application for the services offered.

The chairperson of CSD's Administering Commission, Naomi Saylor and Executive Director Rodolfo Castro and all of the Community Services Department staff are hard at work thinking of new and vital ways to meet the needs of you and the communities it serves.

UNITED STATES-LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS BY HON. ROBERT C. HILL

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, during the past few months, much emphasis has been placed on our relationship with Latin America. I believe that it is appropriate to share with you the words of an individual who has had extensive experience in dealing with Latin American nations. The Honorable Robert C. Hill was appointed U.S. Ambassador to Costa Rica and El Salvador and served as Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations under President Eisenhower. Since then he has also served the United States as Assistant Secretary of Defense, and U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, Spain, and finally, Argentina.

Not long ago, Mr. Hill expressed his views on U.S. relations with Argentina and Latin America to a large group at the Graduate School of Banking at the University of Wisconsin. The recent signing of the Panama Canal treaties underlines the need for a careful examination of our relations with all countries in Latin America as well as Central America. Therefore, I bring his perceptive comments to your attention:

REMARKS OF HON. ROBERT C. HILL

Having served the United States Government, as well as traveled on business, in Latin America for over three decades, I welcome the opportunity to meet and speak with those who share an interest in this important hemisphere. The pleasant nature of these university surroundings and the impressive assemblange make tonight's occasion particularly appealing to me.

General comments about any area of the world including Latin America are always dangerous. No matter how carefully stated, they tend to create the false impression of regional identity. They ignore, in the case of Latin America, its incredible diversity and too often reflect or encourage stereotyped thinking.

With this observation stated, I will nonetheless make some remarks about this important area. I think it is necessary to highlight important differences between Latin America and the developed countries. In global terms, Latin nations are not members of the developed countries club, with the exception of Brazil, but neither are they among the poorest of the poor. By any socio-economic criteria that you might choose, Latin American countries are members of the emerging nations, who have potentially great economic strength. We are speaking of countries that have achieved a significant, if uneven, level of industrialization; are fully integrated into the world economy; and look to a future in which their development will be intimately linked to that of the industrialized powers.

Latin America's status has important implications for the region's relations with the United States. It means that in this area of the world the United States can find constructive partners in the effort to solve the complex problems of the North-South relationship.

Many leaders in countries like Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, and Colombia share the perception of global economic arrangements. They see an international economic structure rigged against their interests; one ordered and operating according to rules established at a time the developed countries forced their conception of world order on the less powerful. Nor surprisingly, they no longer want their fate determined in councils where they have no voice. They will use whatever economic clout they can muster to wrest concessions from the developed countries. Frankly, I don't blame them.

At the same time, however, Latin American nations have a major stake in finding pragmatic, reasonable solutions to North-South problems. Their future lies in equitably resolving international differences, not in achieving the psychologically pleasing but ultimately empty rhetorical victories often sought by radical Third World spokesmen.

While the opportunity for cooperation exists, United States' approaches to Latin America should emphasize bilateral rather than multilateral relationships. This ensures a proper framework for productive inter-American dealings. However, the record shows that U.S. attempts to deal with Latin America as a whole usually result in a "we-they" confrontation, with moderate Latin countries following the lead of the most strident U.S. critics in order to preserve Latin solidarity. It is a losing proposition for the United States. Furthermore, many Latin leaders dislike the multilateral setting because it does not permit adequate recognition of the individual interests of their separate states.

For these reasons, I applaud President Carter's statement made during his April 14 address before the Organization of American States:

"A single United States policy toward Latin America and the Caribbean makes little sense. What we need is a wider and more flexible approach. . . . (with) policies more suited to each nation's variety and potential."

Before leaving this question of multilateral relations, I would like to comment on a disturbing tendency among some observers to lump several Latin nations under the heading "Southern Cone" and advocate their treatment in essentially multilateral terms. Instead of being a geographical term, Southern Cone has become synonymous with right-wing, repressive military regimes and human rights violations. This is a dangerous oversimplification. It overlooks important differences among the peoples and governments of the southern South American nations and thus hides more than it illuminates. A "Southern Cone Policy" on the part of the United States would be as illusory and counterproductive as a general "Latin American Policy".

Human rights is the issue that has dominated U.S.-Latin American relations in recent months. I do not dispute the need for a strong moral basis for our foreign policy and I share the hope of all Americans that government leaders the world over will respect the rights of their citizens. As former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger so persuasively argued before the 1976 OAS General Assembly in Santiago:

"No government can ignore terrorism and survive, but it is equally true that a government that tramples on the rights of its citizens denies the purpose of its existence."

My reservations in the human rights area concern the policy instruments through which human rights compliance should be sought. I realize that developing policy strategies to this end is a difficult task, but I do not believe that the answer lies in bilateral economic sanctions. Neither do I believe that applying sanctions through votes in International Financial Institutions is a well advised tactic. The Carter administration has finally realized and wisely tried to discourage congressional efforts to legislate mandatory negative votes in the IFI's against human rights violators. Support from other nations that would be necessary to vote down loan requests would probably no be forthcoming. In the absence of such support, frequent U.S. negative votes would eventually reduce this country to the statute of an international scold and the cause of human rights would not have been advanced significantly.

The United States must also avoid human rights initiatives that imply an effort to export our democratic way of life. Democracy as we know it is a way of life rather than a simple political formula. It must be carefully nutured and developed in accord with the conditions that prevail in any given country. We can set a worthy example and encourage democratic tendencies where they emerge, but we cannot force our system on others.

May I read to you an informative and enlightened letter from a friend in Latin America:

"THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
The White House
Washington, D.C.

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is written to you as an open letter and sent to news media in the United States and elsewhere since I believe the subject to be such importance that the contents warrant the attention, not only of yourself, but of the public in general.

"The human rights problem has never been simplistic. As mankind slowly evolves toward universal justice, it becomes even more complex. As a Quaker I applaud your general direction in this area, but as a World War II Pacific Navy veteran who has been living and working in Latin America for twenty years I urge caution, especially in the manner in which your policy is being applied to the southern part of South America. I emphasize this area as it is my home, although I suspect that caution is warranted elsewhere in this troubled world.

"We have lived in six Latin countries over these years: Mexico, Nicaragua, Colombia,

Uruguay, Argentina, and finally, happily, in Paraguay. Five years ago we were transferred to Asuncion by my then employer, the InterAmerican Development Bank after two years of living in Uruguay during the height of the urban guerrilla Tupamaros crisis.

"The Tupamaros started with apparently legitimate aims: to thwart a corrupt hopelessly bureaucratic, one-party ruled "democratic" government. There is no way to reason with people who have elected to use violence; you cannot convince them by argument or prayer that they should not kidnap or kill. The Tupamaros murdered in cold blood. Nor could they easily be arrested and brought to justice. They hit and disappeared.

"In open rebellion, in which human rights are violated, it is not difficult to identify most of the violaters. But in the clandestine terrorism which pervades in so much of Latin America there is no way for a government to maintain order and preserve human rights for most of its citizens except by the unfortunate abrogation of the human rights of those who control by terror.

"There exists within much of Latin America, as elsewhere, great social inequality. This injustice, aggravated by the western nations desire for cheap raw materials, provides fertile ground for leftist agitation and violence. However, the arms and training which seed terrorist movement have for several decades been supplied mainly by communist sources.

"Military governments have emerged in this southern cone of South America for a variety of reasons: principally because the civilian governments were either too corrupt, too inept, or were trying to turn the countries over to communist control. There have been very few of the Batista or Trujillo ilk who have gained control in this area. The military people who have felt the responsibility to take over their governments have generally been civilized patriots.

"As you surely know, Mr. President, the development and support of terrorist organizations to overthrow existing Latin governments is part of communist strategy: Cuba . . . Castro established; Chile . . . Allende was moving toward complete communist control until the military intervened; Uruguay . . . havoc from Tupamaros terror, communist inspired and financed until the military stepped in; Argentina (a country with tremendous potential consistently frustrated political power seekers) now torn by secret armies which strike, kidnap, kill, and vanish. Argentina is beginning to recover since the military has removed Peron's inept third wife.

"Under its military government Uruguay has again become peaceful, but putting and keeping down a clandestine army requires continuing vigilance. The communists never give up just because they receive reverses.

"Mr. President, it would be helpful if you would give us your guidance. Just how can we protect the human rights of peaceful citizens? How can they be preserved from terrorists without depriving the terrorists of some of their rights? Especially so when the murdering of citizens is by underground sources supported from abroad.

"Certainly it is laudable that the United States should try to regain the moral standard and image it once had. And human rights is an ultimate objective. This is what humble people, wherever, seek. But an impractical and inconsistent application of a policy to implement this noble objective will only create increasing disorder in the western hemisphere, and for that matter, anywhere.

What Communist leaders have wanted since the Revolution after World War I is world domination. They make propaganda that sounds good to the young and innocent; and they abuse the U.S. sometimes with justification, since we have often exploited the powerless in many areas for our own profit over many years.

"The military take-over in Brazil, Uruguay, Chile and Argentina were motivated by extreme leftist action which would have made much of the southern part of the South America communist. The civilian governments of these countries either did not wish to resist these onslaughts: Brazil under Goulart; Chile under Allende; or as in Uruguay and Argentina were incapable of standing up to terrorism. The military had no other option. There is a good possibility that these governments will over the next decade have democratic evolution. Hopefully human rights will be automatic for all those who eschew terrorism.

"These factors lead to the conclusion, Mr. President, that in splite of your admirable and respected idealism for some reason you are attacking a symptom or a symbol, and not a basic human principal in the pursuit of your human rights objective. May I suggest that an ill-advised inconsistent U.S. policy on human rights, too rapidly organized and executed, will create disorder in the western hemisphere and elsewhere, and the result of this pursuit will be disaster.

"Mr. President, I suggest that the military governments of Brazil, Chile, Argentina, and Uruguay are led by persons dedicated to the well-being of the vast majority of the citizens of these countries, and that these governments should be supported by the U.S.A. That these leaders are sometimes harsh there is no question; but what alternative is there when violence is clandestine?"

Military assistance and bilateral armed forces' contacts are also subjects that have aroused some controversy, in connection with both the human rights issue and the administration's policy of diminishing foreign arms sales. All this is doing is driving the Latins to Europe and the Soviet Union for their arms. I believe it is important to maintain our military missions in Latin America. I refer not to military groups on a grandiose scale, but rather to the maintenance of missions of sufficient size to provide an adequate and appropriate liaison with host military services. The contacts afforded U.S. personnel are particularly important in cases where the host military establishment is responsible for governing the country.

It is also important to preserve training programs. They provide an opportunity to assist in upgrading the defense capabilities of the Latin American armed services and open channels through which future Latin leaders are exposed to, and hopefully, influenced by our society.

Along with the frequently cited arguments about the availability of alternate arms supplier and the possibility of Soviet sales as in the case of Peru, it is worth pointing out the impact of diminishing sales on longstanding U.S. efforts to promote regional arms standardization. These efforts will have been wasted if the United States abandons the Latin American market to other suppliers.

Reapproachment with Cuba and negotiation of a new canal treaty with Panama have headlined the list of the Carter administration's bilateral undertakings in Latin America. You must understand that Cuba today is not a friend. We should not delude ourselves on that score. Castro has some objectives which are in direct conflict with our own. At the same time, however, there are a number of issues between the two countries which could be resolved to our mutual advantage. It made sense, for example, to draw a maritime boundary between us in the Florida straits. We would like for Castro to allow American citizens resident in Cuba to be repatriated to the U.S. and bring their families with them. We also want political prisoners released. There are, then, possibilities for trade offs. We should approach any talks with the Cubans with this in mind. We must take a cautious, step-by-step approach, making sure we get something in return for any gesture or concession we make. There are some who wish to give everything away. They would lift the embargo, totally or at least in part without getting anything in return. They would give Castro the U.S. base at Guantanamo without first making sure American citizens have been compensated for the $2 billion dollars in goods and properties Castro confiscated in 1960. This is foolishly naive. There may be some benefits in beginning to talk to the Cubans, but we must be hard and pragmatic bargainers, and we must not forget who our real friends are and that Castro is not one of them.

In recent years, it had become evident that U.S. efforts to isolate Cuba in the inter-American framework were ineffective. It is now public knowledege that preliminary discussions to reverse that policy were initiated with Havana during President Ford's term. Protracted negotiations will be required to reach agreement on these difficult problems, and there is no reason why the United States should be in any great hurry. By all signs, therefore, restoration of full diplomatic relations with Cuba should be a long way off.

With respect to the Panama Canal, long negotiations appear to be nearing submission to the U.S. Senate in the form of a replacement for the 1903 canal treaty. When the draft treaty's contents become known in its entirety, we shall all be in a position to assess its acceptability. One of the most interesting congressional confrontations in years appears imminent as the battle lines are being drawn ever more clearly.

One of the most interesting comments on this issue was President Carter's reference in Mississippi last month to the possibility of constructing a second canal. I supported such an initiative years ago when I was Ambassador to Mexico, and later Assistant Secretary in the Department of Defense, and was gratified to hear the President's suggestion. However by no means should the second canal be constructed in Panama. I realize that extensive studies completed during the Johnson administration concluded that a second canal was not feasible for economic reasons. That was some time ago, however, and it might be wise to re-evaluate the proposition in the light of today's circumstances.

Aside from Panama and Cuba, our relations with Latin America are centering on economic questions. Socio-economic development is the top priority of the region's leaders, and the U.S. is the primary source of trade, financial, and technological opportunities from both the public and private sectors. We do not have time to review the many points at issue. However, I think that particular attention should be drawn to the question of raw materials, trade and the need for stability of both supply and price. Many Latin economies rise and fall with fluctuations in the price of a single export commodity. Chile's experience with copper and Bolivia's with tin are only two examples. Commodity agreements that guarantee to the producer a reasonable price and to the consumer a consistent supply represent a pragmatic and equitable solution to such difficulties. Further efforts should be made to conclude commodity agreements covering export items crucial to Latin American economies.

Another area that needs added attention is U.S.-Latin American cultural relations. I believe in cultural exchanges, a valuable and underutilized vehicle for promoting inter-American understanding and friendship. Increased funding should be supplied for government-sponsored programs run by USIA and other agencies. Whether it be symphony orchestras, dance companies, history lecturers, folk musicians, artists, or whatever, exchanges amount to a two-way street to mutual enjoyment, understanding and a better knowledge of each others cultures.

This has been a review of Latin America as I see it. In closing I would like to make

this observation: the United States, at times, has shown enlightened interest in Latin America in the 20th Century—begun under President Hoover, strengthened by the good neighbor policy of Franklin Roosevelt, and additional efforts of understanding by the Alliance for Progress by President Kennedy.

A new administration is in power today. As Americans we want to see the Carter administration a success. Yet in their desire to change the world, old relationships should not be trampled on. Human rights is a worthy objective, but its orchestration and application have to be accomplished quietly to be effective.

You cannot in the United States legislate reform in Latin America or any other country—yes, you can apply economic sanctions—deny military aid—influence normal banking channels. Will this produce results? No!! It will produce enmity that the United States will spend years recovering from.

In the meantime American business interests in Latin America will suffer. Our markets will dry up—business will move to Japan, to Europe and in some instances the Soviet Union.

Yet Latin America, I hope, will be patient and wait until experience takes over in the administration. Then hopefuly traditional friendships will be renewed. The ingenuity of the United States technicians will return hopefully to help fulfill the dream of a strong and powerful Latin America surging forward as equal partners in the common cause of a better world for all mankind.

CRITERIA FOR ACCREDITED NUTRITION PROGRAMS SHOULD BE EXPANDED

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the criteria for determining an accredited program in public health nutrition (Public Law 94–484, section 792(b)(2)) be expanded.

It has come to my attention that through an omission and terminology, only nutrition programs in schools of public health are to be supported. I believe this is inconsistent with the intent of the law, section 792(a), which states "new and existing programs in dietetics and nutrition are to be supported."

I urge that eligibility for programs in in nutrition and dietetics be determined on the following criteria:

First. That the program in public health nutrition be in an accredited school or university in which the graduate school offers graduate study in nutrition as well as public health nutrition.

Second. That the educational program meets the guidelines for M.S. in public health nutrition published in Personnel in Public Health Nutrition.

Third. That graduates of such programs be expected to meet the qualifications for dietetic registration.

Fourth. That students applying for such graduate work should first, hold a baccalaureate degree in nutrition, dietetics or related field from an accredited university or college, and second, meet admissions standards for the graduate school.

The attached article published by the American Dietetic Association should further explain the criteria I have outlined. I hope my colleagues will read this material thoroughly:

II. GUIDELINES FOR MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM IN PUBLIC HEALTH NUTRITION

GENERAL BASIS

The basis for graduate programs in public health nutrition shall be consistent with the educational qualifications developed over a period of 30 years by The American Dietetic Association, American Home Economics Association, and the American Public Health Association. Published statements are:

(1) "Educational Qualifications of Nutritionists in Health Agencies." *American Journal of Public Health* 52:1, January 1962.

(2) "Objectives for Graduate Preparation of Public Health Nutritionists," *Journal of The American Dietetic Association* 28, April 1960.

(3) "Guidelines—Field Course in Public Health Nutrition," mimeographed, 1966. Available from Chairman, Faculties of Graduate Programs in Public Health Nutrition.

CURRICULUM FOR MASTER'S

Recommendations regarding curricula and standards for schools offering graduate training in general public health nutrition leading to advanced degree have been evaluated and summarized. Graduate programs in *general public health nutrition* should be in a school of public health that is accredited by the American Public Health Association or in an accredited school or university in which the graduate school offers graduate study in nutrition as well as training in public health nutrition. Strong recognized programs have been in existence for 25 years in several institutions other than schools of public health.

1. The graduate program in public health nutrition should be under the direction of a full-time faculty member who has had advanced preparation in the science of nutrition and broad experience in the field of applied human nutrition. This should include knowledge of public health administration and public health practice. Furthermore, the faculty should have members specifically educated in human nutrition at the advanced levels.

2. The graduate training program offered by the school should give evidence of providing and requiring courses in the areas of study conforming in general to those in "Objectives for the Graduate Preparation of Public Health Nutritionists," prepared by a subcommittee of the Joint Committee of the American Home Economics Association and The American Dietetic Association.

3. The courses will be apportioned to the curriculum approved by the Institution and according to its policies. This will allow the strengths of each type of institution to function unhampered by standardization. It is recommended that course content be as follows:

a. Approximately one-third in advanced nutrition, including the science of nutrition, nutritive needs in the life cycle, and special needs in disease and under varying conditions. It is essential that original research literature on nutrition be read and evaluated for basic foundation of knowledge.

b. Approximately one-third in public health areas, such as organization and administration of community health services, including program planning, environmental health, statistics, epidemiology, evaluation of nutritive status of individuals and communities as well as planning and evaluation of nutrition programs.

c. Approximately one-third in related courses in social and behavioral sciences and education.

4. Consideration of international health and nutrition is essential.

5. Learning and experience in clinical nutrition should be provided for those students who have not had such training.

6. Field work is an essential component of a program. It should be under the supervision of a public health nutritionist. The purpose of field work is to provide opportunity through observation, discussion, and participation in ongoing programs:

a. to gain a broad understanding of public health and the role of the public health nutritionist.

b. to provide the opportunity to integrate theory with professional practice.

c. to help students learn the practical aspects of assessing nutrition needs of a community, of planning, evaluating, and implementing programs to meet these needs.

d. to help students develop essential skills.

At least part of field work should be concurrent with academic study to facilitate integration of these two components. Some should be provided in a continuous block. While type and amount of field work will depend upon the total curriculum and student needs as determined by their faculty advisors, most students will probably need the equivalent of approximately two months full-time in the field.

Field experience appropriate to the function of a public health nutritionist should be included. The following are examples only:

1. Provide specific technical consultant services in nutrition to individuals, agency staff, or groups in the community.

2. Participate in a survey to assess nutritional status and to determine knowledge levels in a selected population concerning sound nutrition practices and attitudes or participate in any other survey the agency may be conducting.

3. Design and carry out nutrition education efforts directed to meet specific problems of selected groups such as clinic patients, consumer groups, health and nutrition aides, allied health personnel, elementary and secondary school teachers, nurses.

4. Prepare a program plan which includes a problem with stated objectives, using supporting statistical data, method of providing the service, and evaluating the outcome.

5. Evaluate and select appropriate nutrition education materials, including audiovisual aids for assigned activities.

6. Attend such community meetings as are appropriate to the functions of a public health nutritionist in the agency to which the student is assigned.

7. Participate in planning, functioning, and evaluating interdisciplinary teamwork in health service.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Preparation for nutritionist positions in the field of public health requires academic education at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The primary educational objective is to secure competence in the science of nutrition and to apply it in the lives of people.

The undergraduate educational background leading to a bachelor's degree should include appropriate courses in chemistry (including biological), physiology, and microbiology. The following subjects should also be included in order that there be adequate preparation for graduate education: basic normal nutrition, advanced human nutrition and nutrition in disease, principles of learning, behavorial sciences, food selection and preparation principles, and good service systems management. Undergraduate work in human growth and development and mathematics is highly desirable. It is understood that above-average undergraduate performance is usually prerequisite for admission to graduate education. Furthermore, some students may need to strengthen their background education and some graduate programs may have additional requirements in these and other areas.

Summer work, such as a practicum in hospitals dietetics, and/or work in health departments with nutritionists, would be helpful for students during their undergraduate years. It is suggested that undergraduate curricula include orientation to community and community organization.

CONTINUING EDUCATION

Every effort should be made by universities and agencies to provide refresher work. Much can be done cooperatively by health agencies and higher education in the areas of program planning, management techniques, health date systems and feedback, cost analysis, and budgeting health programs and personnel practices.

CALIFORNIA'S REDWOODS: A NATURAL RESOURCE

HON. DAN QUAYLE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, although California's Redwood National Park is 2,300 miles from my northeastern Indiana district, we all have a stake in the preservation of our natural resources.

Therefore the House is considering legislation which would allow the National Park Service to purchase a portion of the watershed nearest the 2,000-year-old trees while setting aside a portion of land for timbering.

Mr. Lou Wein, an editorial writer for the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette, recently wrote an editorial which warrants the consideration of Members of the House as we discuss this legislation.

The editorial follows:

SAVE THE GIANT REDWOODS

Redwood National Park is 2,300 miles from Indiana on California's north coast, but distance and problems close to home shouldn't deter Hoosiers from safeguarding the park's grand forest of giant trees, a unique part of nature's gift to all Americans.

Right now, the redwoods, some of them among the world's tallest and oldest trees, are in mortal danger from nearby logging that is upsetting soil conditions and drainage inside the park. Right now, Indiana's congressional delegation should lend its full support to bills introduced by Rep. Philip Burton and Sen. Alan Cranston, both from California, to expand the park into a self-sustaining ecological unit. Right now, swift action by the Congress is needed because later could be too late to save the redwoods.

PARK BACKGROUNDS

Congress established the park in 1968 by purchasing 28,000 acres of timber company land in the lower end of Redwood Creek's 60-mile dash to the Pacific Ocean. Congress intended another 30,000 acres of state parks to merge with the federal park, but the Nixon-Ford years of neglecting the National Park System also neglected to negotiate the transfer with California.

As the national park ascends the creek, it narrows into a 2,500 acre corridor called the "worm" that is roughly eight miles long by a half-mile wide. The worm includes several groves of ancient "old growth" redwoods that as long as 2,000 years ago sunk their shallow roots into the special soil of the streamside flats formed by creek-deposited sediments. Located in one of the worm's sharp bends, the Tall Trees Grove contains the first, third and sixth tallest trees on earth.

Almost surrounding the park, up both sides of the creek valley and upstream from the worm, are timber company lands. These areas include select stands of old-growth redwoods principally located along the creek's many tributaries that together make up half of its 280-square-mile watershed.

Obviously the Congress made an ecological mistake in originally creating a park that did not cover both sides of Redwood Creek's watershed to the ridge tops, and that failed to provide a substantial buffer area upstream. The park's boundaries, however, were determined like truce lines in a congressional armistice. Neither the timber interests nor the national interest in the redwoods won a complete victory in the 1960s and the hostilities continue today.

LOGGING SPREE

Here's what the timber companies in the two north coast counties where the park is located are doing in their share of the Redwood Creek watershed.

The timber companies are clipping redwoods faster than they can replenish them, at a rate the United States Forest Service estimates will put the industry out of business by the 1990s. The loggers are in a race with the Congress to capture the valuable old growth trees in the 48,000 acres proposed for addition to the park, and they are exhibiting a gold-rush mentality in harvesting too fast to maintain a renewable resource base.

The redwood companies may deny it, but the industry appears trapped by its past greed. If the industry slows down, it risks having a smaller redwood supply price itself out of the market If timbering continues at its present pace, redwood can compete for another decade and then suddenly vanish from the marketplace.

Either way, the industry appears doomed, but it shouldn't drag the park along with it. The take-it-all approach is inflicting serious damage to the park and the cutover areas, while it also is setting the stage for an economic crisis in the redwood region when there's nothing left—inside or outside the park.

Heavily mechanized, the timbering operations are clearcutting and patchcutting in Redwood Creek's canyoned tributaries, up its old-growth-rich eastern slope and in some spots, like the Tall Trees Grove, right up to the park border. Unstable soils from steep terrain and the debris-strewn carnage from logging combine in a potentially lethal mixture that is carried by watershed streams and landslides into the park.

The buildup in Redwood Creek and the intense run-off from its denuded valley slopes threatened severe flooding that could topple the giant redwoods. On the park's edge, the clearcut view and the noise of logging blight the area's scenic beauty. And silt-filled streams endanger acquatic food chains, fish spawning and, ultimately, terrestrial wildlife in the entire watershed.

THE PARK BILL

Adding more acreage to the park and cushioning the impact from the redwood industry's inevitable decline is a far better alternative than the dangerous status-quo. Here's what the park legislation would accomplish.

The bill would purchase the park's watershed at a reasonable price from ridge to ridge and extend a few miles upstream from the worm's current limits. That would afford the smallest margin of erosion and scenic protection required to save the park and leave the greatest amount of land in the upper watershed for timbering under special federal controls.

The measure also would provide unemployment benefits for woods employes and offer them new jobs in reclaiming spoiled parkland and building improvements. As a strong recreational magnet, the enhanced park would contribute new jobs in the tourist industry and its related enterprises.

So here's the choice the Congress should make on behalf of everyone's redwoods.

Pass a park expansion bill that preserves nature's handiwork of the past two millenia and that encourages human activities in harmony with it—and pass it quickly.

AIRBAG CHEMICAL DANGEROUS—SCIENTISTS FEAR

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, after I testified before the Subcommittee on Consumer Protection last week that sodium azide was a dangerous mutagen, William Haddon, Jr., of the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, a group lobbying in support of the airbag, called my concern a "technological red herring." While such rhetoric makes good copy, it adds nothing constructive to this serious debate.

I insert in the RECORD today a memorandum setting forth the concern of leading scientists from around the country, including organic and nitrogen chemists from major universities. They share the view that a normal airbag inflation would produce residual particles which could, indeed, pose a serious health problem to passengers. As Dr. Peter A. F. Smith of the University of Michigan stated:

It is unavoidable to have residual azide . . . the only question is how much will you have.

Other comments include:

Prof. Michael King, George Washington University:

You're probably going to get residual azide in the car, but we don't know how much or for how long.

Dr. Richard Watson, Bureau of Mines, Explosives Division, U.S. Department of the Interior:

It is distinctly possible to have residue escape into the car. . . .

Dr. A. Kleinhofs, Washington State University:

The residual azide would definitely be harmful, even in very low concentrations where the toxic effects might be negligible.

The scientists cautioned that the amount of residual particles exposed to occupants would depend on the particular factors of the reaction, such as temperature, direction of impact, et cetera. But all agreed that there is a high likelihood of residue which could be harmful.

In view of the potent mutagenic properties of sodium azide, the scientists interviewed were unanimous in urging additional testing before proceeding with a standard which could result in hundreds of millions of pounds of this chemical traveling around our Nation's roadways.

I should also like to point out a danger expressed by Dr. Bruce Ames of the University of California at Berkeley—one of the world's leading geneticists. Dr. Ames called attention to the hazards sodium azide exposure would pose to employees in azide manufacturing plants. He said:

The workers would be exposed to this substance over a prolonged period of time, and we still don't know what the impact will be.

It is a very serious threat which should be addressed immediately.

Although there may be alternatives to sodium azide, it is the chemical referred to by NHTSA in their environmental impact statement and final order. Nevertheless, NHTSA's environmental impact statement completely failed to deal with the mutagenic and possible carcinogenic characteristics of sodium azide. That failure, by itself, is sufficient reason for disapproving the mandate at this time.

Ironically, the earlier statement I made that now appears to be inaccurate is that sodium azide presents no danger to occupants of cars when it inflates the airbag.

MEMORANDUM

To: Congressman Shuster.
From: Ron Ence.
Date: September 16, 1977.
Subject: Allegation by William Haddon, Jr., that sodium azide poses no danger to occupants of airbang-equipped cars.

1. Extensive telephone interviews were conducted with leading organic and nitrogen chemists from major universities to examine the nature of the reaction between sodium azide and other oxidizing agents such as perchlorate. Follow-up interviews were then conducted with Drs. Kleinhofs and Ames to explore the potential hazards to humans from sodium azide exposure in the passenger compartment of the automobile. The following summarize the interviews:

a. Dr. Alfred C. Boyd, Associate Professor Chemistry, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.

Dr. Boyd said, "It is unlikely that any chemical reaction would achieve the degree of completion that would absolutely preclude the emission of any residual reactants."

He said the danger would occur when residual sodium azide would be emitted outside the reaction sphere, i.e., the airbag, either through the pores in the airbag, the valve, or eruption of the bag. The amount of residual material, he said, would depend on the conditions of each individual reaction, such as temperature, direction of impact, etc.

"This is somethng that should definitely be checked," he said, "because sodium azide dust can be very dangerous."

Dr. Boyd explained that the residual azide would be in the form of dust, powder or crystals. It would not be emitted in gaseous form, he said.

b. Professor Michael King, Associate Professor of Chemistry, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Professor King confirmed that the reaction would probably not be complete, but added that the degree of danger would depend on the length of exposure to occupants of the car. "You're probably going to get residual azide in the car," he said, "but we don't know how much or for how long. However, these are things that should definitely be tested and resolved before going ahead with these systems."

Another concern expressed by Professor King is the long range effects of sodium azide in the airbag device. If the azide is never reacted, he felt that over time, it could react with the environment or the container. "This substance could be sitting around in cars for 5 or 10 years," he said. "What will happen down the road, nobody knows." (Note: 1.5 million vehicles are abandoned each year, according to the Government's Environmental Impact Statement, so the size of the problem could be enormous. It is unlikely that the container itself would decompose if made of stainless steel.)

c. Dr. Peter A. F. Smith, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Dr. Smith said, "There is a mechanical problem of getting everything mixed to get everything reacting properly with each other. Even if you have a theoretical complete reaction, you probably will have unreacted starting materials.

"It is unavoidable to have residual azide . . . the only question is how much will you have."

Dr. Smith said that in a closed container over a longer period of time, you probably could get close to a complete reaction. But with the airbag, since the reaction will take place in a fraction of a second, the emission of unreacted materials is unavoidable.

Dr. Smith said that on the basis of his knowledge of the chemical reaction, "There is a significant likelihood that sodium azide plus other unidentifiable byproducts will be inhaled by the occupants (in an airbag inflation.)" He agreed with the other chemists that the reaction would probably not be complete, since ". . . a number of factors, including the direction of impact, will affect the mix of the compounds."

He said that another problem was the potential energy of sodium azide riding around in the car. He equated the situation to ". . . like having a keg of dynamite sitting on your steering wheel," and said everyone should be concerned about the possible consequences. "Even if the chances are 1 in a thousand, what if you are that one," he said. (Note: 1 in a thousand equates to 100,000 in 100 million vehicles on the road. Nevertheless, there is no hard evidence to lead us to this conclusion.)

When informed that the airbag system would contain 1¼ pounds of sodium azide, he said, "Good God! The Post Office wouldn't allow you to mail that."

Dr. Smith feels strongly that the effects of sodium azide should be thoroughly examined before proceeding with the airbag mandate.

d. Dr. Richard Watson, Bureau of Mines, Explosives Division, United States Department of the Interior, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Dr. Watson said that ". . . it goes without saying that if the reaction is not complete, there would be a flow of reactants out of the cannister." He said the amount would depend on the particular configuration of the reaction, which would depend on a number of variables.

He added, "It is distinctly possible to have residue escape into the car . . . it depends on the configuration, but it's entirely possible.

He said the only way to determine the degree of danger is to check it through tests. "Geometry, energy source, strength of initiation . . . all are factors which should be examined carefully before mandating them in every car," he said, referring to the airbag systems.

After being informed of sodium azide's mutagenic properties, he said, "Sodium azide sounds kind of like a bad thing to be using."

e. Dr. A. Kleinhofs, Geneticist, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington.

"Is the residual sodium azide; That's the question that must be answered," Dr. Kleinhofs said. "It is my feeling that no chemical reaction is 100 percent complete; therefore, there would be residual azide which would pose a severe health problem to car occupants.

"The residual azide would definitely be harmful, even in very low concentrations where the toxic effects might be negligible," he added.

Dr. Kleinhofs also expressed serious concern about what happens to the azide when the cars are junked or abandoned. He felt that decomposition was a very real possibility over time, and the azide from decomposed systems could find its way into streams and water supplies and into the soil.

f. Dr. Bruce Ames, Chairman, Department of Genetics, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, California.

Dr. Ames feels that the amount of residual sodium azide should be determined before going ahead with the airbag program. He said that ingested azide would probably be metabolized by the body in a few days, "but some carcinogens can give you cancer in a very short period of time." He said this definitely should be tested.

Dr. Ames suggested that whatever substance is used as the detonator, "there should be enough of it tested on the road before actually settling on that substance for all cars."

Dr. Ames also expressed concern about the dangers to employes in sodium azide manufacturing plants. "The workers would be exposed to this substance over a prolonged period of time, and we still don't know what the impact will be. It is a very serious threat which should be addressed immediately."

DEFUSING THE PUBLIC PENSION TIME BOMB

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the funding problems being encountered by the social security system. These same difficulties are appearing in state and local pension plans and must be examined if any serious effort at pension reform is to be made.

Legislators are caught between the need to assure a decent standard of living for pensioners and the need to maintain the fiscal integrity of the pension programs. There are some hard choices facing us as we decide these issues but these choices require a well researched data base. Planning for pension reform has begun in many States and can provide much needed information. The following article explores this need and is a good discussion of the issue.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 27, 1977]

DEFUSING THE PUBLIC-PENSION TIME BOMB

(By Neal R. Peirce)

BOSTON.—Belatedly—and in the nick of time—state and local governments are starting to defuse the time bomb of widespread underfunded public-worker pensions.

The process is not going to be easy—or cheap. There are decades of neglect, of expedient political deals, of poor pension-fund management and unconscionable concessions to privileged classes of government workers to be paid off.

Massachusetts' solution, for instance, is a 40-year plan that will require—after a five-year phase-in to soften the fiscal blow—expending 26 per cent of state and local payrolls each year to cover the Bay State's huge $12.6-billion unfunded pension liability.

Officials of Boston and other hardpressed localities worry whether they can afford the annual payments. But Carmen W. Ello, chairman of Massachusetts' Retirement Law Commission and chief architect of the reform plan, warns that if the pension plans aren't put on a sound basis, bankruptcy will be inevitable.

The pension commitments many states and cities have made to their workers, especially when an employee can retire with more money than he was making on the job, amounts to "capital punishment of the taxpayer," says Tennessee State Rep. John Bragg, chairman of the public-pension task

force of the National Conference of State Legislatures.

Bragg reports that in 16 states a school teacher who retires at 65 after 25 years' service will receive—combining pension and Social Security—an actual increase in after-tax disposable income.

A Philadelphia city worker who retires at 65 after 30 years on the job will draw 129 percent of his final takehome pay through combination of his city pension and Social Security, pension expert Bernard Jump determined. In Detroit the comparable figure is 116 per cent; in New York City 127 per cent.

There are some states and localities where employees are offered far less. But on the average, according to a Twentieth Century Fund report, pensions for state and local government workers are roughly double those the worker in private industry can expect. Many state and local government retirees are protected by automatic cost-of-living adjustments, for instance—features virtually nonexistent in private industry pensions.

Sloppy actuarial work and fund management by political cronies have compounded the problem. The net result is that unfunded pension liabilities—obligations beyond accrued retirement funds—are at alarming levels from coast to coast. Examples: California, $13.6 billion; Illinois, $5.7 billion; New Jersey, $5.3 billion; Ohio, $3.5 billion; Florida, $2.8 billion Maryland, $2.5 billion.

Eventually, taxpayers are going to have to pay all those bills—plus the cost of the federal government's Civil Service and military benefits, an unfunded liability estimated as high as $700 billion.

Massachusetts' breakthrough came after Elio's Retirement Law Commission created a computerized data bank of the state's 101 state and local pension systems. The data bank, the first of its kind anywhere, can determine the cost of any proposed retirement-benefit changes on short notice. A fiscal note is attached to any pension bill the legislature considers. One result: no pension liberalization since 1973.

"In the past," Elio says, "everyone used to say, 'Yes, pass a pension benefit today and worry about the cost tomorrow.' But tomorrow is today now, the costs are here, and they just can't keep being passed on."

Before the legislature accepted the new 40-year funding plan, Elio campaigned across Massachusetts for a year, persuading taxpayers and public employees that, without reform, the state's fiscal position would be dangerously weakened, with government workers in jeopardy of losing their pension benefits. Government-employee unions, previously hostile, dropped their opposition.

Massachusetts' data bank will now be expanded across New England under a grant from the U.S. Labor Department, permitting instant comparison of all six states' public-pension plans and effects of proposed changes.

At least half the states have started comprehensive pension reviews, moved to set up consolidated statewide retirement systems or begun, for the first time, to apply actuarial studies to proposed pension changes. Governors have started to veto pension "sweeteners" approved by state legislatures.

Delaware's legislature voted to limit new employees' total retirement benefits (including Social Security) to 75 per cent of final pay. New York began a reduced benefit plan for all new state and local government workers, which ties in Social Security benefits and is expected eventually to reduce pension costs by some 20 per cent.

Reduced benefits generally apply only to new employees, not workers already covered, on the legal theory—enforced vigorously by courts—that pension concessions once made are contracts a government can't break. But the Tennessee Supreme Court last year said that, if paying full pensions ever threatened the state's fiscal stability, the state might renege on its commitments.

With the pension debts states and localities must pay off in the next quarter century—in some cases exceeding active payrolls—there's a distinct chance of default in paying pensioners unless early reforms are made.

There have already been sufficient state reforms, however, to take the wind out of the sails of a congressional effort to impose on state and local pension systems many of the reporting, disclosure and fiduciary requirements already applicable to private-sector pension plans.

The House Pension Task Force last year issued a blistering critique of state and local plans, saying they lacked many of the basic safeguards required of private plans, often failed to inform participants of plan operations or the benefits they could expect, and in some cases were so poorly managed they "fairly reeked of culpability." State pension reformers smell gross hypocrisy in the idea of Washington applying private-sector standards to state and local governments while neglecting its own grossly overcommitted pension programs. It would be a classic case, says Elio, of "Don't do as I do; do as I say."

The best approach, Elio suggests, is to expand data banks across the country and foster frequent communication between the states on ways to improve their pension systems. That way, he believes, the states can achieve needed reforms without confusing federal regulations.

"I think we can put our own houses in order," Elio says. And while the states have a long way to go, the evidence suggests they are beginning to do just that.

LET'S KEEP CONGRESS OUT OF WASHINGTON

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 19, 1977

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Walter Wriston which appeared in the September 8, 1977, issue of the Washington Star is an eloquent plea for a return to a Congress responsible to the electorate. His comments demonstrate—with frightening explicitness—how far we have strayed from the intent of our Founding Fathers as the Federal legislative bodies, and the staff that supports them, have grown beyond the limits that permit a government to protect, rather than smother, the interests of its citizens. I fully subscribe to Mr. Wriston's recommendation for shorter sessions, and urge my colleagues to study this insightful column carefully:

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 8, 1977]

BEING SMOTHERED BY LAW

(By Walter B. Wriston)

Our free society is gravely imperiled and individual freedom itself is in danger of being smothered.

The rock on which we stand is voluntarism. Democracy can be based on no other presumption. The framework which supports our unique society is that until fairly recently most of us voluntarily conformed to the law. Today I believe that such voluntary conformity is becoming literally impossible for the majority of the American people.

Now only the very rich or the very poor have any possibility whatsoever of learning what the law is, surely a precondition to voluntary conformity. It is becoming increasingly true that the great bulk of our population has to ignore the law completely in order to survive. There are so many laws and regulations with the force of law that it is a fair bet that everyone is at present in violation of some statute—we just do not know which one.

Not only do we not know what the law is, we cannot afford to find out. The rich may be able to hire enough lawyers to read at least some of the laws and regulations that pour out of government at all levels, but the poor can only find out by being rousted in the street.

The web of laws is now so pervasive that much of it is useless. Since that is true, it puts the power of selective enforcement in the hands of the executive or a politican running for office or an investigative reporter looking for a story. Billy Carter found out that not having his fire extinguisher charged was a violation of law!

A dim bulb in the taillight of your car perhaps fails to pass the legal screen—the list runs on forever. It is so long that no index can be made even listing the subject covered, let alone what the law says.

It would be tragic if what began as the rule of law was in the end brought down through the sheer confusion the mass of law now creates. As more and more laws are put on the books each day. more and more people have to ignore them. We are training up an entire generation, who, with some justification, can have little respect for the law. Our free society, which is rooted in voluntary compliance, stands in danger of strangulation.

Madison warned that the "facility and excess of lawmaking seem to be the diseases to which our governments are most liable."

For all their insight, the framers of our Constitution could not foresee a day when approximately 500 legislators would employ 10,000 people to assist them in their legislative tasks. What they could have told their modern successors was that such a horde would purpose far too much legislation.

Last year there were 20,000 bills introduced in Congress. In a single day not less than 242 committees and subcommittees of the Congress were in session—all, under the rules, "for a legislative purpose." No wonder they produce such an indigestible mass of legislation.

Almost without being aware of it, we have ignored the basic intention of the Founding Fathers that we achieve a fair and equitable government through the separation of powers among the executive, legislative and judicial branches. We have forgotten John Locke's dictum that "the legislative cannot transfer the power of making laws to any other hands."

The executive, in the form of regulatory agencies, now fills the *Federal Register* day after day with explicit evidence that the separation of powers has eroded to an extent that constitutes a clear and present danger. What to do?

It used to be that the Congress was in session about three months each year. The rest of the time members were home listening to the people who elected them. Today Congress meets almost 12 months of the year with a few recesses, leaving a staff of 10,000 to dream up new laws.

Let us have a constitutional amendment that would limit the congressional session to six or seven months. A shorter session, more contact with the electorate, and less with the staff and the Washington press corps, might restore some sense of perspective to our legislative process.

If we continue to force an increasing majority of our population to ignore the law, we shall have neither law nor liberty, but we will run the risk that an authoritarian government will fill the void.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of the Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee of the time, place, and purpose of all meetings when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in meetings as they occur.

As an interim procedure until the computerization of this information becomes operational, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, September 15, 1977, may be found in Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 21

8:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Research and General Legislation Subcommittee
To resume hearings to receive testimony from FDA Commissioner Kennedy on the Federal Government's role in food safety and quality.
Until 10:00 a.m. 322 Russell Building
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on the nominations of John F. O'Leary, to be Deputy Secretary; Dale D. Myers, to be Under Secretary; Alvin L. Alm, to be Assistant Secretary for Policy and Evaluation; and Harry E. Bergold, Jr., to be Assistant Secretary for International Affairs; all of the Department of Energy.
3110 Dirksen Building

8:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To resume hearings on automatic auto crash protection devices.
5110 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.
*Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1893, to establish a commission for the protection of human subjects of biomedical and behavioral research.
Until 12:30 p.m.
2228 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of the Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building
Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1883 and 1855, to strengthen the remedies and expedite the procedures under the National Labor Relations Act.
4322 Dirksen Building
Judiciary
Criminal Laws and Procedures Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the erosion of law enforcement intelligence gathering capabilities.
4200 Dirksen Building
Veterans' Affairs
To resume hearings on S. 364, proposed Veterans' Administration Administrative Procedure and Judicial Review Act.
Until 1 p.m. 6202 Dirksen Building
Special on Aging
To hold hearings to explore alternatives to hospital and nursing home care for older Americans.
1224 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To receive testimony on proposed reprogramming of funds for fiscal year 1977 for the Army, Navy, and Air Force.
1223 Dirksen Building
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1978 for the Departments of Justice and Commerce, and the SBA disaster loan fund.
S-146, Capitol
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To mark up Truth in Lending Simplification legislation, including S. 1312, S. 1501, S. 1653, and S. 1846.
5302 Dirksen Building
Energy and Natural Resources
To continue consideration of Part E—Electric Utility Rate Reform—of S. 1469, the proposed National Energy Policy Act, and other committee business.
3110 Dirksen Building
Finance
To continue mark up of proposed Energy Tax Act of 1977 as embodied in H.R. 8444.
2221 Dirksen Building
Foreign Relations
Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the IMF and the international debt.
4221 Dirksen Building
Governmental Affairs
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on the high cost of energy bills by consumers.
3302 Dirksen Building
Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on the subjects of contributions solicited from or made by members and employees of the Senate, and proper use of staff in political campaigns (in accordance with S. Res. 110).
301 Russell Building
Select Small Business
Government Regulation and Small Business Advocacy Subcommittee
To hold hearings on SBA suggestions for simplification of loan application forms.
424 Russell Building

10:30 a.m.
Human Resources
Education, Arts, and the Humanities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1753, to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
318 Russell Building

11:30 a.m.
Foreign Relations
Foreign Assistance and Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Subcommittees
To hold hearings jointly to receive testimony on the sale of C-130 type aircraft to Egypt.
357 Russell Building

12:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of Labor and Office of Education.
S-146, Capitol

2:30 p.m.
Conference
On H.R. 7797, making appropriations for fiscal year 1978 for foreign assistance programs.
S-126, Capitol

3:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Hud-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1978 for the Environmental Protection Agency.
1318 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 22

8:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Research and General Legislation Subcommittee
To continue hearings to receive testimony from representatives of the drug industry, livestock groups, and public interest groups on the Federal Government's role in food safety and quality.
Until 10:00 a.m.
322 Russell Building
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Conservation and Regulation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2073, Crude Oil Pricing Amendments of 1977.
3110 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of the Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building
Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1883 and 1855, to strengthen the remedies and expedite the procedures under the National Labor Relations Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Financial Institutions Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1460 and 2096, protecting the privacy of public financial records.
5302 Dirksen Building
Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands and Resources Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 473, 553, 624, 688, 824, 917, 920, 1000, 1318, 1403, 1744, 2033, 2034, 2101, H.R. 1403, 2501, 2527, and H.R. 4979; various land conveyance bills.
3110 Dirksen Building
Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Generally Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the proposed increase in the temporary debt limit (as embodied in H.R. 8655).
2221 Dirksen Building
Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings on S. 80, S. 980, and H.R. 10, bills to amend the Hatch Act.
3302 Dirksen Building
Human Resources
Education, Arts, and the Humanities Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1753, to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
5202 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Select Intelligence
Special Investigations Subcommittee
Closed business meeting.
S-407, Capitol

SEPTEMBER 23

9:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Parks and Recreation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1791, to establish the Chattahooche River National Recreation Area; S. 1156, to establish the San Antonio Mission National Historical Park; and S. 1671, to designate the Absaroka-Beartooth as a wilderness area.
3110 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of the Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building

Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1883 and 1855, to strengthen the remedies and expedite the procedures under the National Labor Relations Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

Select Nutrition and Human Needs
To hold hearings on the role that nutrition plays in the needs of the elderly.
Until 12:30 p.m. 457 Russell Building

Select Intelligence
To hold a closed business meeting.
S-407, Capitol

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Financial Institutions Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1460 and 2096 protecting the privacy of public financial records.
5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nomination of James B. King, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the National Transportation Safety Board.
5110 Dirksen Building

Finance
To resume markup of proposed Energy Tax Act of 1977 as embodied in H.R. 8444.
2221 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the IMF and the international debt.
4221 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of Agriculture.
1224 Dirksen Building

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To mark up proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of Labor and the Office of Education.
S-128, Capitol

SEPTEMBER 26

8:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on the proposed Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline route.
3110 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hear testimony on the proposed Panama Canal treaties from Secretary of State Vance, Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker and Sol Linowitz, and Ambassador to Panama William Jorden.
318 Russell Building

Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1833 and 1855, to strengthen the remedies and expedite the procedures under the National Labor Relations Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on bank regulatory issues arising from the Comptroller of the Currency's report on OMB Director Lance.
5302 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Improvements in Judiciary Machinery Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2016, to establish fees for services performed by U.S. marshals, and S. 2049, to allow per diem and mileage expenses for witnesses before U.S. courts.
2228 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nomination of Charles D. Ferris, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission.
5110 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 27

8:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To continue hearings on the proposed Alaska Natural Gas pipeline route.
3110 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on transportation problems affecting agriculture, forestry, and rural development.
322 Russell Building

Human Resources
Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 533, Human Resources Development Act of 1977.
Until 1:00 p.m.
1224 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1845, the Polygraph Control and Civil Liberties Protection Act of 1977.
2228 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2008, to provide a three-year period for the U.S. to reach a permanent solution of the rebating and other malpractices in our foreign ocean trades.
5110 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
To hear Secretary of Defense Harold Brown and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General George S. Brown on the proposed Panama Canal treaties.
318 Russell Building

Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1883 and 1855, to strengthen the remedies and expedite the procedures under the National Labor Relations Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the implementation of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.
1318 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs
To continue oversight hearings on bank regulatory issues arising from the Comptroller of the Currency's Report on OMB Director Lance.
5302 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Reports, Accounting, and Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1847, 1838, 1329, and 2088, to improve the operation and extend the scope of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.
6202 Dirksen Building

Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1753, to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
318 Russell Building

Select Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1633, to provide for the extension of certain Federal benefits, services, and assistance to the Pascua Yaqui Indians of Arizona, and S. 661, to restore Federal recognition of certain Indian tribes.
Room to be announced

SEPTEMBER 28

8:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To continue hearings on the proposed Alaska natural gas pipeline route.
3110 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on transportation problems affecting agriculture, forestry, and rural development.
322 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the activities of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.
5110 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1845, the Polygraph Control and Civil Liberties Protection Act of 1977.
2228 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on S. 2 and S. 1244, to require periodic reauthorization of Government programs.
301 Russell Building

Select Nutrition and Human Needs
To hold oversight hearings on food quality in the Federal food program.
Until Noon
6202 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 2008, to provide a three-year period for the U.S. to reach a permanent solution of the rebating and other malpractices in our foreign ocean trades.
224 Russell Building

Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1883 and 1855, to strengthen the remedies and expedite the procedures under the National Labor Relations Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the implementation of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.
1318 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue oversight hearings on bank regulatory issues arising from the Comptroller of the Currency's report on OMB Director Lance.
5302 Dirksen Building

Veterans' Affairs
To receive legislative recommendations from representatives of the American Legion.
412 Russell Building

Select Indian Affairs
To mark up S. 1509, to provide for the return to the United States of title to certain lands conveyed to certain Indian Pueblos of New Mexico; S. 1582, Ak-Chin Indian community water bill; and S. 1214, to establish standards for the placement of Indian children in foster or adoptive homes.
457 Russell Building

SEPTEMBER 29

8:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To continue hearings on the proposed Alaska natural gas pipeline route.
3110 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on transportation problems affecting agriculture, forestry, and rural development.
322 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hear Attorney General Griffin Bell and others on the proposed Panama Canal treaties.
318 Russell Building

Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1883 and 1855, to strengthen the remedies and expedite the procedures under the National Labor Relations Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee
To hold hearings jointly with the Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee of Human Resources Committee on the regulatory and competitive aspects of the health care industry.
457 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Reports, Accounting, and Management Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1847, 1838, 1329, and 2088, to improve the operation and extend the scope of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.
6202 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Improvements in Judicial Machinery Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1430, to improve the judicial machinery in customs courts.
2228 Dirksen Building

Select Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1920, relating to the Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes; S. 2046, to enable Alaska Natives to maintain and consolidate tribal governing bodies; and S. 1789, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservatory District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands.
1202 Dirksen Building

Conference
On S. 1019, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1978 and 1979 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.
S-126, Capitol

SEPTEMBER 30

8:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To continue hearings on the proposed Alaska natural gas pipeline route.
3110 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.
Select Nutrition and Human Needs
To resume oversight hearings on food quality in the Federal food program.
Until 1:00 p.m. 6202 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To receive testimony on economic considerations from executive branch officials on the proposed Panama Canal treaties.
318 Russell Building

Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1883 and 1855, to strengthen the remedies and expedite the procedures under the National Labor Relations Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee
To continue hearings jointly with the Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee of Human Resources Committee on the regulatory and competitive aspects of the health care industry.
1202 Dirksen Building

OCTOBER 3

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Administrative practice and Procedure Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1720 and 1721, to provide for improved administrative procedures.
2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2065, to provide consumer rights and remedies in electronic fund transfer systems.
5302 Dirksen Building

* Select Small Business
To hold hearings on S. 1815, Small Business Venture Capital Act of 1977.
424 Russell Building

OCTOBER 4

9:30 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To receive testimony from Members of Congress on the proposed Panama Canal treaties.
318 Russell Building

Human Resources
Aging Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1282, to provide assistance for legal services projects for the elderly.
1224 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the implementation of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.
2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Nutrition Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the role of the USDA in nutrition research.
322 Russell Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Rural Housing Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1150, Rural Housing Act of 1977.
Room to be announced

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 2065, to provide consumer rights and remedies in electronic fund transfer systems.
5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To resume hearings jointly with the Public Lands and Resources Subcommittee of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on S. 2053, proposed deep seabed mining legislation.
3110 Dirksen Building

Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1753, to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
4232 Dirksen Building

Select Indian Affairs
To resume hearings on Federal Indian Domestic Assistance programs.
1202 Dirksen Building

OCTOBER 5

9:30 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To continue to receive testimony from Members of Congress on the proposed Panama Canal treaties.
318 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 2065, to provide consumer rights and remedies in electronic fund transfer systems.
5302 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Rural Housing Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1150, Rural Housing Act of 1977.
Room to be announced

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To continue hearings on S. 61, requiring that a certain percentage of U.S. oil imports be carried on U.S. flag vessels.
5110 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Parks and Recreation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1976, to add certain lands to the Redwood National Park, California.
3110 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on S. Res. 166, to create a coordinated administrative management system for the Senate.
301 Russell Building

OCTOBER 6

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Financial Institutions Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on variable rate mortgages and on alternative mortgage instruments.
5302 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Rural Housing Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1150, Rural Housing Act of 1977.
Room to be announced

Judiciary
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on the Freedom of Information Act.
1202 Dirksen Building

Select Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on the concept of creating an independent Indian agency.
Room to be announced

Select Small Business
To receive testimony on the implementation of that part of P.L. 95–89 which established priorities for the awarding of contracts to firms located in labor surplus areas.
424 Russell Building

OCTOBER 7

9:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
International Finance Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the activities of the Exchange Stabilization Fund.
6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Financial Institutions Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on variable rate mortgages and on alternative mortgage instruments.
5302 Dirksen Building

OCTOBER 11

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the implementation of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.
2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the pricing of Federal Reserve services.
5302 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on H.R. 7819, S. 1256, and S. 1257, to amend the laws relating to diplomatic immunity.
4221 Dirksen Building

OCTOBER 12

9:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Civil Rights Commission.
2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue oversight hearings on the pricing of Federal Reserve services.
5302 Dirksen Building

Human Resources
Education, Arts, and the Humanities Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1753, to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
4232 Dirksen Building

OCTOBER 13

9:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on activities of the Civil Rights Commission.
2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on issues facing HUD concerning operating costs on distressed FHA multi-family housing projects.
5302 Dirksen Building

Human Resources
Education, Arts, and the Humanities Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1753, to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
4232 Dirksen Building

OCTOBER 14

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue oversight hearings on issues facing HUD concerning operating costs on distressed FHA multi-family housing projects.
5302 Dirksen Building

OCTOBER 19

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation dealing with the Department of Agriculture's policies, practices, and procedures regarding family farmers.
2228 Dirksen Building

OCTOBER 20

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed legislation dealing with the Department of Agriculture's policies, practices, and procedures regarding family farmers.
2228 Dirksen Building

OCTOBER 26

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the role of the FHA in home financing.
5302 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 35, proposed Civil Rights Improvements Act of 1977.
2228 Dirksen Building

OCTOBER 27

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue oversight hearings on the role of the FHA in home financing.
5302 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 35, proposed Civil Rights Improvements Act of 1977.
2228 Dirksen Building

OCTOBER 28

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue oversight hearings on the role of the FHA in home financing.
5302 Dirksen Building

NOVEMBER 9

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To resume oversight hearings on U.S. monetary policy.
5302 Dirksen Building

NOVEMBER 10

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue oversight hearings on U.S. monetary policy.
5302 Dirksen Building

DECEMBER 13

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S.J. Res. 67, proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the proposal and the enactment of laws by popular vote of the people of the United States.
2228 Dirksen Building

DECEMBER 14

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S.J. Res. 67, proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the proposal and the enactment of laws by popular vote of the people of the United States.
2228 Dirksen Building

CANCELLATIONS

SEPTEMBER 21

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on H.R. 7792, to establish certain limitations on the use of franking privileges, and on simplifying mailing procedures.
154 Russell Building

OCTOBER 25

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on drug enforcement policies.
2228 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 28

10:00 a.m.
Human Resources
Education, Arts, and the Humanities Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1753, to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
318 Russell Building

SEPTEMBER 29

9:30 a.m.
Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings jointly with Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee on antitrust policies in the medical profession.
Until 12:30 p.m.
457 Russell Building

SEPTEMBER 30

9:30 a.m.
Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings jointly with Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee on antitrust policies in the medical profession.
Until 12:30 p.m. 1202 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Human Resources
Education, Arts, and the Humanities Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1753, to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
318 Russell Building

OCTOBER 31

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on drug enforcement policies.
2228 Dirksen Building