

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LET US SPEAK OUT ON HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1978

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as you know, this week marks the 20th anniversary of Captive Nations Week. This year these 7 days have a special significance.

The recent mock trials of Scharansky and Ginzburg demonstrate that after two decades, our fight to secure basic human freedoms is not yet won. Captive Nations Week is not, as some claim, an annual banal repetition of tired phrases and jaded slogans. For those nations that remain captive, this week is a yearly renewal of hope, an affirmation to the world and to themselves that America still deeply believes in the principles upon which she was founded.

These basic freedoms—freedom of religion, of speech, and self-determination—which we have celebrated as Americans for over 200 years have won global acceptance through the U.N. Charter, the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, and the Helsinki accords. They belong to all men regardless of where they are born or in what country they live.

It goes almost without saying that the recent actions of the Soviet Government have done more to spotlight the cause of human rights than 435 speeches in the House ever can. The plight of Scharansky and Ginzburg has become the concern of all those who value freedom.

During this Captive Nations Week, let us remind the world that the conviction of these two courageous men is a symbolic rejection by the Soviets of the right of all men to certain freedoms. Only with our vocal support can those who desire freedom attain it.

The Soviet Union and other nations claim that our desire and efforts to see basic human rights affirmed is an encroachment into their domestic affairs. They claim we are foisting our ideals and values upon them.

I can only say that to remain silent would be to condone the repression and the denial of human liberties found in the Soviet Union and other nations. As President Carter said in his inaugural address, "because we are free, we can never be indifferent to the fate of freedom elsewhere."

During this week, let us speak out with more vigor than usual, but let us remember: When basic human rights are violated, words alone are not enough. Let us demonstrate to the world at large, but more importantly to the people of captive nations, that we will work tire-

lessly until the human rights of all are affirmed.●

MRS. WM. T. DELAPLAINE DIES

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor the memory of one of Frederick, Maryland's most outstanding citizens, Mrs. Janie Hendry Quynn Delaplaine.

Born in Ijamsville and a relative of Barbara Fritchie, Mrs. Delaplaine gave much of her time and talents to better the community of Frederick. She maintained one of the most beautiful gardens in the area, while still finding time to be an active member of many civic clubs. She was a supporter of Hood College and a past president of the Hood College alumnae association.

Her passing will be felt by all who knew and loved her and I know you will join me in extending the official sympathies of the House in honor of this patriotic American woman.

Please include the attached article from the Post, Frederick, Md.

[From the Post, Frederick, Md.]

MRS. WM. T. DELAPLAINE DIES—WAS "MISS JANIE"

Mrs. Janie Hendry Quynn Delaplaine, one of Frederick's most prominent women and a relative of Barbara Fritchie, died Tuesday, July 18, at her residence, 273 Dill Avenue. She had been ill for some time.

Mrs. Delaplaine was the wife of the late William Theodore Delaplaine, who was the president and manager of the Frederick News-Post from Aug. 15, 1955, until his death April 18, 1964. Mr. Delaplaine was the third son of the founder of The News, William T. Delaplaine.

(Funeral arrangements, under the direction of Robert E. Dalley & Son Funeral Home, will be announced Wednesday.)

Mrs. Delaplaine was born in Ijamsville, Jan. 9, 1888, a daughter of the late Charles William and Harriete Eleanor Williams Quynn. She was the last of her immediate family.

She was a life-long member of the Evangelical Reformed United Church of Christ. She was graduated from the Woman's College of Frederick, later known as Hood College, in the Class of 1908. She was an ardent supporter of Hood and had remained active in the Hood Alumnae Association.

Mrs. Delaplaine was a founder and charter member of the Frederick Garden Club, a member of the Board of Directors of the Frederick Memorial Hospital, the Historical Society, the Frederick Art Club, the Salvation Army Auxiliary, and a past president of the Hood College Alumnae Association.

Survivors include her daughter, Mrs. Martin L. (Natalie) Bowers Jr. of West Chester, Pa.; two grandchildren, Martin F. Bowers and Miss Jane Elizabeth Bowers, both of West Chester; two nieces, Mrs. Samuel P. (Virginia-Quynn) Grant of North Carolina and Mrs.

Myron W. (Frances Ann Delaplaine) Randall of Braddock Heights, and two nephews, Jack T. Quynn of Frederick and George B. Delaplaine Jr., publisher of the Frederick News-Post.

Mrs. Delaplaine was predeceased by two children—a son, Lt. William T. Delaplaine III, a Navy pilot killed in World War II, and a daughter, Miss Eleanor Frances Delaplaine.

Her son was killed in April 1943 in a plane crash with three other pilots and eight airmen. On May 1, 1949, the Delaplaines dedicated the airport building in Frederick in his name.

Her daughter died suddenly Oct. 22, 1938 and a garden on the Hood campus here bears a memorial plaque in her honor.

Mrs. Delaplaine was an artist, and had studied art under Miss Florence Doub, founder of the Frederick Art Club.

She was also a noted gardener, and maintained at her home one of the outstanding gardens in the city.

Jane Quynn and William Delaplaine were married Nov. 15, 1916, and had taken an anniversary cruise the year before his death.

She dedicated the Physicians Lounge at Frederick Memorial Hospital in her husband's name. She also had established scholarship funds at both Hood College and Washington and Lee University.

She had a life-long association with Hood and had known personally all of its presidents.

It is requested that flowers be omitted and expressions of sympathy be made to the Alumnae Association of Hood College in Memory of Mrs. Delaplaine.●

VIETNAMESE REFUGEES

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times of July 10 expresses a viewpoint which I completely share regarding President Carter's decision to admit additional Vietnamese refugees into this country. The editorial properly commends the President for his decision, and I wish to insert it at this point for the Members' attention:

HELPING THE "BOAT PEOPLE"

The plight of Indochina's "boat people"—refugees from Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia—is cruel enough in that too few countries accept them. Their tragedy has been increased by the incredible sight of military and civilian ships passing them by, leaving them adrift in their often-makeshift vessels.

To his credit, President Carter last week ordered all American ships to pick up these boat people. A State Department spokesman said the refugees may resettle in the United States if they wish.

Not only will the cost of accepting the refugees be minute compared to the billions spent in the Vietnam War, but we also stand to gain in the long run. Most of the escapees are the kind of people who accept the work ethic and whose activities generate new jobs.

For instance, Leo Cherne, chairman of the International Rescue Committee, says that

refugee youngsters already here have proved to be highly motivated students in schools and nearly 92 per cent of the employable adults have found jobs.

Canada has accepted some Indochina refugees, as have Israel and a few other countries. But since Hanoi's victory in Vietnam in 1975, the number of refugees has far exceeded the number accepted. Cherne says churches and individual families can do more to help, too. He's right, and many have.

Carter's decision was a humanitarian one. If other countries follow suit, this modern tragedy can be substantially eased. ●

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. JAMES J. BLANCHARD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1978

● Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, the week of July 16-22 marks the 20th annual observance of Captive Nations Week.

During this week we take note of our commitment to help those who are not free. Yet we do so at a time when the Soviet Union has taken bold and concerted steps to stifle the spirit of freedom in their country. It is indeed frustrating and disgusting to find the Soviet Union actually making a deliberate effort to move against freedom, by further hardening their oppressive policies. Their recent actions in the trials of Anatoly Shcharansky, Alexandr Ginsburg, and Victor Pektus demonstrate a desire to systematically blot out the vestiges of a human rights movement—and they do so by employing their characteristic tool of fear. It is frightening, yet it nevertheless should be said, that the Soviet Union feels it is in a position to ignore worldwide reaction to the trials, in order to better enforce oppressive policies within their own country.

Soviet officials may believe that they can intimidate, through fear of reprisal, the many brave men and women of their own country who have spoken out against the failure of the Soviets to honor international agreements such as the Helsinki accords. Yet we cannot allow them to believe that their cruel and unjust actions will silence the outcry of the free world. We must continue to speak out, but we must also do more.

It is time that we begin to seriously assess what kinds of more substantive actions we can undertake in such areas as economic or technological exchanges. The words of freedom have clearly had a major impact on the Soviet Union. The idea of freedom itself is disturbing to the Soviet Union because it filters even through the barriers of fear and oppression.

Yet we must now back up those words with actions—actions which force them to take seriously the commitments to human rights that they agreed to at Helsinki, actions which they cannot ignore by turning inward and imposing more oppressive sanctions against their own people.

Over the past two decades we have helped contribute to the strength of the

Soviet Union through economic and technological exchanges. Let us reevaluate our policy of cooperation in these areas. For true cooperation is hinged on the premise that each party will honor its end of an agreement. The Soviet Union has not displayed this sense of cooperation because they have blatantly failed to uphold the human rights provisions which they agreed to at Helsinki. How can we continue to cooperate through economic and technological exchanges, with a party that has been as uncooperative and untrustworthy as the Soviet Union? Their recent actions in fact demonstrate how far they are willing to go in scoffing at the very notion of cooperation. We must remain undaunted in this struggle to bring freedom to those who have been denied their most basic rights. Perhaps today, during the observance of Captive Nations Week, more than at any other time in recent years, it is necessary for the people of the free world to stand up and proclaim that we will not retreat from the task before us—that we will not allow the spirit that has been displayed by the people of the captive nations to be lost or spent in vain. In deed, we must reassert with renewed vigor, our commitment to bring freedom and independence to the people of the captive nations. ●

PROHIBITION ON SEX DISCRIMINATION BASED ON PREGNANCY

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1978

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last fall the Senate passed S. 995, legislation to amend the Civil Rights Act to make it unlawful for an employer to deny pregnancy disability benefits to an employee while providing other disability benefits. I am a supporter of this legislation; it guarantees the right of women workers to the disability benefits they have earned.

Nevertheless, on July 18 I voted against H.R. 6075, the House version of the pregnancy disability bill, which was brought up under a suspension of the rules and passed by a vote of 376 to 43.

Only noncontroversial measures are supposed to be brought up under suspension of the rules, a procedure that permits no amendments. However, H.R. 6075 is anything but noncontroversial. For, as reported out of the Education and Labor Committee, the House bill has been amended to permit employers to withhold pregnancy disability benefits from employees seeking to use them for abortion while requiring the same employers to provide benefits in all other pregnancy-related cases.

The right to choose an abortion is every woman's constitutionally protected right as recognized by the Supreme Court in 1973. For the House to abridge a woman's civil rights in a bill intended to protect women's civil rights makes a

mockery of both the pregnancy disability bill and the right to choose.

I want my vote on H.R. 6075 to be understood clearly. It was not a vote against pregnancy disability benefits, which I wholeheartedly support. It was a vote for the House of Representatives to face up to the very real and deep controversy that exists when civil rights legislation is used to authorize discrimination. The bill should have been brought up for full debate and an opportunity should have been afforded to strike the antiabortion amendment from the bill. ●

TWENTIETH OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1978

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in the 20th observance of Captive Nations Week. Having participated in this anniversary since its inception, I believe my basic position is well known on this issue. I would, however, like to make a few brief comments in the light of the current status of East-West relations.

First, let me reemphasize my strong conviction that there is nothing inconsistent about expressing U.S. concern over the denial of civil liberties in much of the world today and attempting to negotiate meaningful agreements with other nations, including those who disagree with us on a variety of issues involving our security and overriding national interest.

As chairman of the Committee on International Relations, I fully support the administration's efforts to conclude a mutually acceptable arms control accord. Such an agreement should, I believe, be judged on its own merits and not be viewed as an expression of approval or disapproval of Soviet actions in other fields or other areas of the world.

By the same token, our commitment to the negotiation process should never be interpreted to mean that we condone Soviet oppression over its own minorities or over the peoples of Eastern Europe. Neither does it mean that we accept Soviet "adventurism" in Africa or Soviet violations of the Helsinki accords. President Carter is, in my judgment, entirely justified in making that distinction clear. He is also right in pointing out that while we have to live in the world as it is, and not as we would like it to be, the United States should not lose sight of the goals and principles upon which the Nation was founded. We should, in fact, "stand for something" and uphold our ideals—even an admittedly imperfect international environment.

Captive Nations Week serves as a reminder to all Americans that as long as the ideological struggle continues, as our adversaries consistently proclaim it will—and must—there is no more compelling human ideal or aspiration than the desire for freedom. ●

PATENT POLICY VERSUS INNOVATION

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the June 30, 1978, issue of *Science* magazine, which is published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Mr. William Carey, publisher, printed an incisive and articulate appraisal of patent policies established by the Federal Government, and the effect these policies may have on innovation and the benefits arising from our investment of billions of Federal dollars in research and development.

Mr. Carey's thoughts merit careful consideration by the Members of Congress who are sincerely concerned with the need for the public to obtain even a reasonable benefit from our Federal research and development programs. Accordingly, I am taking this opportunity to insert the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope that it may stimulate serious thought in the minds of the Members of Congress, the administration, and the general public, to the end that we may consider our patent policies and program requirements associated with research and development funding.

We have waited too long to address this matter realistically. Mr. Carey's editorial makes this plain. It should stimulate us to corrective action.

The editorial is as follows:

PATENT POLICY VERSUS INNOVATION

The United States is engaged in a massive research and development effort which, measured in current dollars, is edging close to the level of \$50 billion annually, counting outlays in both the federal and the private sector. The budget for R & D in government calls for more than \$28 billion in the next fiscal year. There is no doubt that the R & D input is strong. The output side may be a very different story.

We support R & D to learn something that we do not know, and to make use of what we learn. Like any other type of investment, R & D is expected to yield returns. In the case of government-financed R & D the question arises, Are the investors getting full and timely return? Are the results of federally funded R & D finding their way into the market?

The evidence, as usual, seems mixed. About 8000 inventions are said to be generated each year from government-financed R & D, many of which are patentable. Not enough of these apparently reach the market. Some 30,000 government-owned patents are piled up awaiting takers. To that extent, the national economy is not being enriched and utilization is forestalled. It is a baffling situation until one realizes that the blockage occurs largely in the government's patent policy.

The government operates on the proposition that the economic rewards from federally funded R & D should be captured by the government, or shared only grudgingly with others, since public funds were used. The view prevails that if rights to the discovery were released to private developers on an exclusive basis unreasonable private enrichment could occur. There is scant evidence to

support these apprehensions, but the doctrine is riveted into the government's thinking. The effect is that the market incentive to develop government-financed discoveries is circumscribed and inventions are isolated from normal risk-taking and pursuit.

It is not hard to see how this can inhibit the prospects for pass-through of discoveries from biomedical research or energy-related R & D. We see a prodigious R & D enterprise, fueled by tax dollars, constrained from diffusing its results because of a public policy barrier. Throughout the enterprise, discoveries sit stranded and aging. Meanwhile, we search for clues as to what is wrong with U.S. technological innovation, and how it is that foreign industry can undercut American competitiveness and employment.

As usual, public policies are muddled, conflicting more often than complementing one another. In the new study ordered by President Carter of the problems assailing industrial innovation, a fresh opportunity is provided to reexamine both the premises and the consequences of government patent policies. There is ample evidence that the costs of producing and marketing an invention are many times as great as the outlays on the R & D that led to the invention. Not many developers will take these risks with inventions resulting from federal R & D, in the absence of clear ownership.

It begins to appear that we have thought of "science policy" too much in terms of stimulating R & D and too little in terms of liberating its results. The benefits of federally funded R & D are hard enough to realize without the added drag of a dubious policy on patents. A public which is regularly lectured on the promise and performance of science may not be grateful to learn that government's rules are blocking research applications. That could be far more harmful to science than the Golden Fleece awards.

Public policy, if wisely designed, can stimulate economic pursuit of government-financed inventions while at the same time minimizing the risk of abuses. What is clear is that the present patent policies will not get us innovation, nor health and energy benefits, nor economic growth, nor trade competitiveness. We can hardly make the case that R & D contributes significantly to the nation's economy if, at the same time, we isolate its results from utilization. Here is a notable "Catch 22" in federal R & D policy, and it is time to bring it into the open.●

RECOGNITION OF RITA WHITTAKER

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker and distinguished Congressmen, I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of myself and that of my late colleague, the Honorable Bill Ketchum, to recognize the great contributions of his constituent, Mrs. Rita Whittaker, for her 30 years of loyalty, devotion, and dedication as administrative assistant to the superintendent of the Panama Union School District. She is considered by her colleagues as one of the most highly esteemed and universally loved individuals in the field of education in Kern County, Calif. Mrs. Whittaker is not only recognized for her contributions to education but also for unselfish contribution of time and energy to innumerable commu-

nity projects. Currently, a petition is being circulated to name a school in her honor. So I ask my fellow colleagues to help me give thanks to such an outstanding citizen. We wish her a very long, healthy, and relaxful retirement.●

ARE NUCLEAR PLANTS SAFE?

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, time and time again, in my work on the House Interior Subcommittee on Energy and the Environment, I have seen the Nuclear Regulatory Commission provide less than full and candid information to our subcommittee, despite repeated requests to the contrary. The accompanying articles illustrate that they have succeeded in this case. I will not repeat or summarize what the following articles say, for they do a fine job of laying out a picture of what appears to be a serious lack of strict safety regulation by a former Atomic Energy Commission official who is now the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. This type of incident is not new to our subcommittee, and we will be investigating it thoroughly. I hope that by placing these articles in the RECORD, that other Members become aware of one of the main stumbling blocks to the further advancement of nuclear power: The apparent actions to protect the nuclear power industry by an agency charged with the protection of the public health and safety. It is a lack of confidence in the NRC that is a contributing factor in the Congress declining support of nuclear power as an energy option for the future. I hope that this confidence can be restored, and am heartened by the recent appointment of Dr. Ahearn as the fifth NRC Commissioner. This is a step in the right direction.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Star, June 23, 1978]
HE FOUGHT SAFETY PLAN IN '72, NRC HEAD SAYS

(By John J. Flalka)

After prodding from Congress, the head of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has released a document showing he opposed a suggested major change in the design of nuclear power plant safety systems in 1972.

In the memo, released yesterday, the NRC's current chairman, Joseph M. Hendrie, said that although the proposed design change "is an attractive one in some ways," implementing it would conflict with "conventional wisdom" in the nuclear power field.

"Reversal of this hallowed policy, particularly at this time, could well be the end of nuclear power. It would throw into question the continued operation of licensed plants... and would generally create more turmoil than I can stand thinking about," the memo states.

Key portions of the memo and others showing that the NRC's predecessor, the Atomic Energy Commission, may have been pressured not to release information about the design problem, had been withheld from an anti-nuclear group, the Union of Con-

cerned Scientists, on the grounds that if they were released under the Freedom of Information Act they would "inhibit the free exchange of opinion" among the staff of the NRC.

Hendrie, who wrote the memo while he was deputy director of licensing for the AEC, reversed the policy yesterday after Sen. Gary W. Hart, D-Colo., suggested in a letter to Hendrie that public release might "improve the credibility of the commission."

Rep. Morris K. Udall, D-Ariz., chairman of the House Interior Committee, was also reported to be miffed about the matter. "It seems to be a problem that was withheld from public hearings on safety issues," complained Udall aide.

The problem was first raised by Dr. Stephen Hanauer, a technical advisor at the AEC and the NRC, who has the reputation of being a "devil's advocate," a man who often questions accepted engineering practices within the nuclear industry in order to stimulate better safety measures.

In a memo written in November 1971, Hanauer argued that a small leak in pressurized pipes carrying superheated water in the reactors designed by General Electric—of which there are more than 50 in use or under construction in the United States—could bypass a pool of water used as a safety device to condense any steam escaping from the nuclear reactor.

The escaping steam would eventually "overpressurize" the dome surrounding the nuclear plant, causing it to collapse, Hanauer suggested.

He added, "GE wants us and ACRS (an advisory panel of outside scientists and engineers used by the AEC and the NRC) not to mention the problem publicly. They are afraid of delaying hearings in progress."

Hendrie, one of nine AEC officials who were asked to comment on the Hanauer memo, wrote a brief memo to his superior, John F. O'Leary, who has since become deputy secretary of the Department of Energy.

Asked about this controversial response, Hendrie said, "I sort of dashed it off in a hurry. It was meant to be a casual, flippant sort of a note that doesn't attempt to be explicit about the issue."

Hendrie said the problem posed by the possibility of a slow leak was later corrected by procedures and design changes to make sure that "vacuum relief valves" used in the GE pipes do not stick open. There is no ban on the GE design under consideration, Hendrie asserted. "They (GE's plants) present an adequate level of safety," he said.

Robert D. Pollard, a former GE engineer who now works for the Union of Concerned Scientists, has charged that the design feature allows GE to use much cheaper domes over its plants than the heavy steel and concrete ones used by its chief competitor, Westinghouse. The dome is intended to be the last barrier between the radioactive materials in the plant and the outside environment.

Pollard has charged that the withholding of the documents constituted a "cover-up" and possible "illegal activity on the part of former AEC officials, now officials of the NRC."

Hendrie, who yesterday authorized the release of the memo and 153 other documents he signed while he worked for the AEC, asserted that the problem was never covered up and that new refinements of the GE design are being considered.

"My, we had some splendid fights in those days. Everybody in town ought to find something he can be offended at in there," Hendrie said, referring to the documents. With the exception of documents signed by NRC chairmen, Hendrie believes that comments made in the heat of debate over safety designs should be withheld to permit a "frank discussion."

Bertram Wolfe, vice president of GE's nuclear program, said he had "no knowledge" of any attempt by GE to get the AEC to suppress public discussion of the problem.

The GE design, he asserted, "is safer" than its competitors because "it reduces the pressure almost immediately."

[From the New York Times, June 23, 1978]

NUCLEAR OFFICIAL SOUGHT TO SUPPRESS MEMO (By David Burnham)

WASHINGTON, June 22.—The chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission last month sought to suppress a memorandum he wrote in 1972 in which he contended that a plan to solve an important reactor safety problem "could well be the end of nuclear power."

Joseph M. Hendrie, who wrote the memorandum when he was an official of the Atomic Energy Commission, further argued in it that if the plan was adopted it "would generally create more turmoil than I can stand thinking about."

Though the Government took no action in 1972, the commission earlier this year exempted 21 of the 70 reactors operating in the United States from a Government rule requiring a "sufficient margin of safety" because of continuing concern about some of the same problems that had been raised in the original discussion.

Mr. Hendrie, in an interview yesterday, acknowledged that he decided last month to refuse a request for the memorandum by the Union of Concerned Scientists, an anti-nuclear group that had asked for the document under the Freedom of Information Act. Today, after inquiries from Congress, he placed his 1972 memorandum and several other documents into the public record.

WRITTEN IN HASTE

He said in the interview that the 1972 memorandum had been written in great haste and was "smart alecky" and that his decision to attempt to block its release to the public was wrong.

Daniel F. Ford, director of the Union of Concerned Scientists, today voiced criticism of the memorandum and the way it had been handled.

"Dr. Hendrie's memorandum indicates that the nuclear regulatory process has been perverted by officials who are more interested in protecting the nuclear industry from criticism than in protecting the public health and safety," he said.

Mr. Hendrie agreed that his 1972 memorandum could be read as an indication that he was more concerned about the nuclear industry than nuclear safety. But he contended that such an interpretation "does not reflect my views then or now."

When he wrote the memorandum, Mr. Hendrie was the deputy director of licensing for technical review of the Atomic Energy Commission, the predecessor of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The commission is responsible for assuring the safe operation of nuclear reactors.

The memorandum was prompted by a recommendation made by Stephen H. Hanauer, then technical advisor to the director of regulation of the Atomic Energy Commission.

PROBLEMS IN PRESSURE SYSTEM

Dr. Hanauer, on Sept. 20, 1972, said that "recent events have highlighted the safety disadvantages of pressure suppression containment," a technically complex system designed to handle the heat and pressures that would result if a reactor somehow lost its cooling system in a serious accident.

Although Dr. Hanauer said such pressure containment systems had some advantages, he added that "on balance I believe the disadvantages are preponderant. I recommend that the A.E.C. adopt a policy of discouraging further use of pressure-suppression containments, and that such designs not be accepted

for construction permits filed after a date to be decided.

Four days later, Mr. Hendrie wrote his memorandum.

It began by saying that "Steve's idea to ban pressure suppression containment schemes is an attractive one in some ways."

Mr. Hendrie noted, however, that system was widely accepted by all elements of the nuclear field. "Reversal of this hallowed policy, particularly at this time, could well be the end of nuclear power. It would throw into question the continued operation of licensed plant, would make unlicensed the C.E. and Westinghouse ice condensers plants, and would generally create more turmoil than I can stand thinking about."

The pressure suppression containment system was designed by the General Electric Company for its nuclear reactors. The system is an integral part of 21 of the reactors now operating in the United States, including those owned by Consolidated Edison, the Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, the Power Authority of the State of New York, the Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company and Jersey Central Power and Light.

According to a recent report by the N.R.C.'s Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, several of the problems raised by Dr. Hanauer in his 1972 proposal are still considered unresolved questions "important in assuring the health and safety of the public."

Following inquiries from Representative Morris K. Udall, Democrat of Arizona, chairman of the House Interior Committee, and Senator Gary W. Hart, Democrat of Colorado, chairman of the Subcommittee on Nuclear Regulation, Mr. Hendrie requested Dr. Hanauer to give his current opinion about pressure containment systems.

Dr. Hanauer, still a staff member of the N.R.C., replied that despite his 1972 recommendations that the system be abandoned he believed then and believed now that "we have adequate assurance of their safety."

[From the Independent and Gazette,
June 20, 1978]

NUCLEAR OFFICIALS HUSHED WARNING (By David Hoffman)

WASHINGTON.—Six years ago, top U.S. nuclear energy officials were quietly urged to ban new construction of certain nuclear power plants because of safety risks in the containment system designed to absorb the heat of a major nuclear accident.

But a previously undisclosed memo shows that Joseph M. Hendrie, then a high-ranking Atomic Energy Commission official and now the nation's top nuclear regulator, threw out the suggestion because he feared it "could mean the end of nuclear power."

"It would throw into question the continued operation of licensed plants . . . and would generally create more turmoil than I can stand thinking about," said Hendrie, who is now chairman of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Hendrie's conclusions were censored by the NRC when the letter was released recently to the Union of Concerned Scientists, an anti-nuclear activist group. But the full text was obtained by the I-G's Washington bureau.

The disclosure of Hendrie's memo is likely to fuel new controversy on Capitol Hill about what critics view as the protective attitude that the NRC has taken of the nuclear power industry it is charged with regulating.

The original suggestion—to halt the building of so-called "pressure-suppression" containments—was never adopted, and currently about 20 U.S. nuclear power plants are licensed to operate with this containment system. Thirteen were licensed after 1972.

The containment is a doughnut-shaped ring encircling the reactor, holding water

that would be used to condense onrushing steam in the event of a core melt-down.

In September, 1972, Stephen Hanauer, technical advisor to AEC's director of regulation, pulled together a series of safety concerns he had about the pressure-suppression containment system, concluding that there were a "preponderance of disadvantages" with it.

But, Hanauer says today, "I don't think it was taken very seriously."

"The memorandum was exceedingly significant," Daniel Ford, executive director of the Union of Concerned Scientists, testified last week before the House energy and environment subcommittee chaired by Rep. Morris K. Udall, D-Ariz.

"... It refers to the nuclear containment system . . . of the type primarily used on General Electric nuclear plants," he said. "Hanauer's conclusions that the safety disadvantages were such that GE should no longer be permitted to use it had far-reaching implications for public safety."

Bert Sobon, manager of containment licensing for General Electric, defended the safety of the pressure-suppression containment system. He said it had numerous advantages over the "dry" containments that are just concrete shells around the reactor.

At least seven pressure-suppression containment systems had already been licensed and in operation when Hanauer wrote his 1972 memo raising questions about safety risks in the system.

In his letter, Hanauer warned that valves which play a crucial role in the safety of the pressure-suppression system "do not have a very good reliability record." If the valves are not working properly, Hanauer said, the increased hydrogen volume in the chamber could create an "explosive mixture."

Moreover, Hanauer said that 10-year-old test data on safety risks provided by General Electric—and accepted "for many years" by the AEC—had turned out to be "incorrect" because it was "not applicable" to accident conditions.

Taken together, Hanauer said, the "disadvantages are preponderant" in pressure-suppression containment.

"I recommend that the AEC adopt a policy of discouraging further use of pressure-suppression containment and that such designs not be accepted for construction permits filed after a date to be decided."

But Hanauer says that "nothing" happened after his warning was issued. To this day, he says, he has never received a response from those who received it.

Hanauer's letter was sent to several top nuclear safety and licensing officials, including Hendrie, who was at the time deputy director for technical review at the AEC's directorate of licensing. A copy also went to John F. O'Leary, then the AEC's head of licensing and now a top U.S. Energy Department official.

On Sept. 25, Hendrie wrote a two-paragraph memo to O'Leary in which he acknowledged that the idea to "ban pressure-suppression containments is an attractive one . . ."

But Hendrie rejected any shift in federal policy because, he said, acceptance of pressure-suppression "by all elements of the nuclear field . . . is firmly embedded in the conventional wisdom."

"Reversal of this hallowed policy, particularly at this time, could well be the end of nuclear power," he said.

Hendrie has refused all comment on his remarks or why he had them censored before release to the Union of Concerned Scientists. O'Leary could not be reached for comment.

However, it was learned that Hendrie has been asked for an explanation from both sides of Congress. He is scheduled to respond this week to letters from Udall and from Sen.

Gary Hart, D-Colo., who chair the key Senate subcommittee that oversees the NRC.

The censored version of Hendrie's memo surfaced last week during UCS testimony before Udall's subcommittee on the Carter Administration's bill to speed up nuclear licensing procedures. The UCS charged that Hendrie had failed to disclose Hanauer's concerns in official safety reports.

"There is a broad discrepancy between internal federal assessments of nuclear power plant safety and what is reported in official safety evaluation reports," said Ford of UCS.

The disclosure of Hendrie's memo comes on the heels of previous incidents in which Udall and others on Capitol Hill have criticized the NRC's reluctance to disclose information unfavorable to the nuclear power industry.

"Some of the commissioners and staff continued to be imbued with the notion carried over from the AEC era that there exists a duty to protect nuclear power from its critics, rather than lay out all the facts, no matter how unpleasant they may be," Udall charged in a recent report on the NRC.

In another memo recently released to the U.S. Hanauer recounted a meeting of a special AEC task force set up in November 1971 to study the problem of steam leakage in pressure suppression chambers.

In his notes, Hanauer said that General Electric wanted federal regulators "not to mention the problem publicly" because they were "afraid of delaying hearings in progress."

But Hanauer insisted at the time, that a "commitment" should be obtained from General Electric "to study and fix the problem in whatever way is found . . . all safety evaluations reports from now on will have to 'fess up.'"

Solutions were later found to some of the safety concerns raised in Hanauer's original 1972 letter, but questions have persisted about pressure-suppression systems.

New research brought to the NRC's attention in April 1975 by General Electric cast doubt on the safety margins in earlier nuclear plants, and recently 20 boiling water reactors were granted official waivers by the NRC until a long-term program is completed to bring them into compliance with U.S. safety standards. ●

AMBASSADOR ANDREW YOUNG

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, like most Americans, the people of South Dakota are shocked and ashamed at United Nations Ambassador Andrew Young's most recent public utterances.

I have the highest personal regard for our House colleague and the distinguished record which brought him to his present position of world power and influence. Yet, it sometimes seems that Mr. Young does not realize the reverberations of his statements on the conduct of U.S. foreign policy, for which he is supposed to be a defender and spokesman.

The fine art of diplomacy requires far more sensitivity than that imposed upon most of us in public life.

Evidence of widespread dissatisfaction with Mr. Young's performance and pub-

lic statements comes to me daily from constituents in all walks of life and of differing political persuasions.

Although this is not just a partisan issue—it is an American issue that reflects upon all citizens and our very system of government—the South Dakota Republican State Central Committee has asked me to insert in the RECORD the text of a resolution adopted at Pierre, S. Dak., on July 15, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, by his public utterances Ambassador Andrew Young demonstrated a deliberate insensitivity to the desperate condition of Jews and other dissidents in the Soviet Union, and lack of understanding of the outrage of most Americans at the brutal and undeserved punishment of Alexander Ginzburg and Anatoly Scharansky:

And whereas, his false allegations concerning political dissenters in the United States has brought discredit upon our political system and has aided the Soviet Union in its attempts to avoid compliance with the Helsinki accords,

It is therefore resolved, that this South Dakota Republican State Central Committee demands that a new ambassador to the United Nations be appointed who does represent the thinking of the American people. ●

COMMENTS ON ASBESTOS CONTROL

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as many of our colleagues know, I am deeply interested in and concerned with the problems of exposure to asbestos in our general environment, and our workplace. There is much to be done before we solve this problem.

I feel that the commander of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Capt. Ed Kaune, is taking aggressive action to try to solve the problem of asbestos usage and control in his shipyard. This, however, is only going to be part of a solution.

I would like to make sure that there is absolutely no placement of asbestos in new ships for any utilization where there is a functionally acceptable substitute. The letter which I received from the Navy, dated July 14, implied that this might be the case, but seemed to avoid clearly stating this to be so.

The letter did state, and this disturbs me, that asbestos would only be removed during the ordinary course of overhaul, regardless of its condition. Apparently, asbestos could be crumbling before their eyes, and it would not be replaced until the scheduled overhaul.

An employer should act in a more responsible manner when his workers lives are at stake. And, of course in this case, the employer is all of us; the people of the United States.

The people of this country should insist that the health of workers in the private sector is also protected. I have written to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, urging that

much tougher standards be imposed on the use of asbestos in the workplace. The current standard which allows 2.0 asbestos fibers per cubic centimeter is little more than a very sick joke; a deadly joke. Two and a half years ago, ISHA proposed a standard allowing only 0.5 fibers, and this has yet to be approved. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, in 1976, recommended a standard based on 0.1 asbestos fibers per cubic centimeter.

Clearly, Federal health experts feel that the asbestos standards the American worker must live with today could kill him tomorrow.●

THEATER NUCLEAR BALANCE

HON. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, in the first entry in the regional part of my *Balances of Power* series (Book III), NATO's increasing vulnerability to a Warsaw Pact attack was explained in an article by Justice Galen. Today, continuing our look at the region of NATO's center sector, the same author—a pen name—examines the growing imbalance which is the most troublesome, certainly, to the Europeans and most destabilizing in the absence of corrective action by NATO and the United States: the imbalance in tactical nuclear weapons and the doctrines and assumption underlying the different approaches to theater nuclear warfare. This article, taken from the *Armed Forces Journal International*, January 1978, is entitled, "Theater Nuclear Balance (part 2)." The first part of the article follows:

Part one of this series discussed the trends in NATO and Warsaw Pact theater nuclear forces which are giving the Warsaw Pact parity or superiority in theater nuclear strength, which are giving the Warsaw Pact the ability to match NATO at virtually any level of conflict or escalation, and which are sharply increasing the number of warheads the Warsaw Pact can bring to bear against NATO targets. This article concludes the assessment of current trends in the theater nuclear balance by examining:

Comparative capability to initiate and escalate a conflict;

Ability to manage the intensity of a conflict, terminate a conflict on equal or favorable terms, and limit or control a nuclear conflict to a tactically or strategically acceptable degree;

Comparative vulnerability;

Ability to use "conventional" forces effectively in a tactical nuclear war;

Comparative command and control capability; and

The comparative impact of theater employable strategic systems on the theater nuclear balance.

COMPARATIVE CAPABILITY TO INITIATE AND ESCALATE A CONFLICT

Both NATO and the Warsaw Pact have a sufficient variety of nuclear warheads and delivery systems to initiate and escalate a theater nuclear conflict to virtually any level of intensity. The Warsaw Pact is developing a distinct superiority in some areas, such as long range theater surface-to-surface mis-

siles, and is improving its theater nuclear forces more rapidly than NATO. However, the U.S. and U.K. can allocate large numbers of strategic warheads against long range Warsaw Pact theater targets, and the balance of forces in the table below indicates that NATO retains powerful theater nuclear capabilities.

The most critical difference in each side's capability to initiate and escalate theater nuclear war lies in the differences between their political control, ideology, and military doctrine, rather than in their relative force strength and hardware. These differences are "soft"—they cannot be quantified or easily proven—but they are basic to an understanding of the theater nuclear balance.

IDEOLOGICAL CONSTRAINTS ON NATO: THE STRATEGY OF DETERRENCE

NATO is a democratic alliance. Its military and political structure is inherently tied to the traditions of the nations that have created it. It is reactive, defensive, and deliberate in character. Its liberal Western origins inevitably limit its willingness to use nuclear weapons to fight or escalate. NATO concentrates its planning on successful deterrence, and not successful war fighting. Every NATO activity dealing with theater nuclear forces is oriented towards conflict avoidance, control, and termination.

Whatever military prudence may dictate, NATO is run by military, civilian, and political decision makers who are anything but likely to authorize nuclear war until it has been forced on NATO by the Soviet Union. There are very few NATO military officers who would even privately advocate a NATO first strike, a preemptive strike strategy, or escalation to a massive level of theater-wide conflict. NATO's military is no more anxious to engage in general war than its civilians.

In fact, one of the great ironies of NATO theater nuclear planning is that neither NATO's civilian or military planners could seriously come to grips with the concept of actually having to fight a theater nuclear war for the first two decades of NATO's existence.

During the 1950's, NATO used its initial monopoly of theater nuclear systems to create a deterrent strategy based on a nuclear tripwire. This "MC14/2" strategy provided a limited "shield" of conventional forces. If this "shield" was beaten down, NATO planned to launch its "sword" in the form of a massive all-out attack with its nuclear strike fighters. No one really looked beyond this retaliation.

In practical terms, NATO had no real war plan, only a massive deterrent. In spite of occasional rhetoric to the contrary, NATO linked its theater nuclear forces to the U.S. strategic war plan or SIOP. NATO never developed the command control systems, or other basic war fighting tools, that would have allowed it to fight a theater nuclear war after the first massive exchange.¹

This situation did not change when NATO converted to a strategy of "flexible response" in the mid-1960s. Contrary to popular opinion, NATO did not develop meaningful options for fighting nuclear wars at controlled levels of escalation as part of its new "MC 14/3" strategy of "flexible response". It concentrated all its attention on improving its conventional options, and on improving civilian control over NATO's nuclear weapons.

As a result, NATO remained totally reliant on theater nuclear deterrence. There was no "flexible response" beyond the limited demonstrative use of a few nuclear weapons. NATO had a choice of options linked to the SIOP or nothing. It also continued to rely on alert strike fighters—"QRA" or quick reac-

tion alert fighters—long after these and their bases became so vulnerable they made sense only as a "first strike" force.

It was not until 1973 that Secretary of Defense James R. Schlesinger shifted U.S. strategy to an emphasis on realistic options for graduated theater nuclear response. It was only then that NATO began to seriously plan for what might happen if deterrence failed.²

Yet, NATO still focused on what could be done to control wars rather than fight them. NATO sought the means to control or reduce the collateral damage its weapons would do to civil populations. It sought credible battlefield, theater, and regional nuclear options that would cause the Soviet Union to halt a Warsaw Pact attack, rather than to defeat such an attack.

NATO assumed that it must plan as if there were an alternative to theater-wide war. It added conflict control and a wide range of deterrent strike options to its basic deterrent capability, but it did not seriously plan to fight theater nuclear war.

THE COST OF A DETERRENT STRATEGY

This emphasis on deterrence does not mean that NATO is relying on, or ever has relied on, a theater nuclear bluff. Ultimately, if the Warsaw Pact should ever force the issue, NATO would use its nuclear weapons.

NATO might even initiate demonstrative or limited theater nuclear strikes to halt a Soviet attack, if forced to do so by a Soviet defeat of its conventional forces, by desperation, or by Soviet escalation. NATO would certainly match the Warsaw Pact step by step to theater-wide or strategic nuclear conflict.

In short, NATO's moral and ideological constraints are not weaknesses, but they do have major military effects. NATO cannot credibly take advantage of many of the major tactical and strategic options for fighting a theater nuclear war which Warsaw Pact planners have made a basic part of their theater nuclear doctrine:

NATO cannot launch a surprise theater nuclear strike before a conflict starts, regardless of how inevitable war is believed to be, or the risk of a Soviet first strike, NATO is not a first strike alliance.

NATO cannot preempt a Soviet strike or major act of escalation until a war reaches so high a level of conflict that political restraint ended and preemption would have little value. NATO is not a preemptive Alliance.

NATO cannot shift to theater nuclear war—with the possible exception of demonstrative use or very selective strike—until its conventional defenses fail or are on the edge of failure. NATO would initiate even battlefield use of nuclear war only as a last resort.

NATO will always act to seek to control or terminate conflicts, and will take significant military risks in trying to do so. NATO is incapable of letting its commanders fight a purely military battle, or in ways which seek tactical military objectives rather than the political goal of conflict termination.

NATO cannot act as if nuclear weapons were simply an extension of other means of firepower. NATO's political organization and leadership is fundamentally incapable of ceasing to make moral distinctions between conventional and nuclear forces. NATO will concentrate on conventional options for nonmilitary reasons.

These are powerful constraints on NATO's war fighting effectiveness. There is no question that Soviet military doctrine, operations research, and systems analysis is correct in stressing the military value of precisely the opposite approach to initiating and fighting theater nuclear war.

¹ These problems are discussed in depth in Lynn E. Davis' "Limited Nuclear Options," Adelphi Paper 121. I.S.S.S., London, Winter 1975/1976.

² L. E. Davis, op. cit., pp. 2-5.

THE SOVIET APPROACH TO WAR FIGHTING

Soviet planners constantly emphasize the value of a first strike, of preemption; of seizing and maintaining the nuclear initiative; and of totally integrated conventional and theater nuclear tactics and force structures.

Anyone who reads through the discussions of nuclear war in the Soviet Military Thought series—or through the extensive unclassified discussions of Soviet exercises, plans, and military literature in RAND, SRI, BDM, and SPC studies—becomes aware of the fact military leadership does not agonize over theater nuclear war. In contrast to the West, the Soviets write about the "scientific" character of such wars. They write about theater nuclear weapons as simply one more extension of firepower, as an aid to mobility, as a method of ensuring breakthroughs, and as a substitute for shock and surprise.³

The Soviet military have extended Lenin's focus on what Von Clausewitz called "perfect" or "pure" war to virtually all their discussion and practice of theater nuclear war. While the top Soviet political leaders may, and hopefully do, have a more constrained view of the use of theater nuclear war, there is no published Soviet counterpart to the constant Western discussion of control, avoidance, conflict termination, and deterrence.

This basic difference in ideology also affects other aspects of conflict initiation and escalation. Most Soviet writing tends to treat a war in Europe as a decisive struggle that must end in a conclusive victory for Communism.

Although some allowance must be made for rhetoric, this leads Soviet military writers to focus on the probability that any major conflict would inevitably escalate to the point where NATO would be forced to initiate large scale use of nuclear weapons. And, having begun with the assumption that war must be decisive and will almost certainly eventually escalate, they move immediately to discussing the advantages of efficient massive preemption or strikes that achieve a high degree of tactical surprise.

Almost in reverse of Western planners, who focus on controlling or terminating a slow upward process of escalation from conventional to general war, the Soviets focus on fighting nuclear war from the top down. Their doctrine and methods of analysis focus on how massive deep ranging strikes might bring victory, on how they might help Soviet armored forces smash NATO defenses and sweep across NATO's lines of communication through Belgium and the Netherlands and deep into France.

While not totally rejecting conventional or limited nuclear war, Soviet doctrine still regards the feasibility of such limited war as extremely doubtful. The Soviets concentrate on theater nuclear grand strategy. Their primary concern lies in having the kind of capability provided by the SS-20, the Backfire, and new Soviet strike fighter aircraft—on having the option to win on a theater-wide basis.

It is scarcely surprising, given these differences, that the USSR places so much emphasis on improving the number of nuclear weapons it can deliver against any NATO target, and against NATO air bases, facilities in the rear, and nuclear storage sites. It is also not surprising that Soviet force improvement priorities differ so sharply from NATO's attempts to improve control of escalation or collateral damage, such as the "neutron bomb."

NATO and the Warsaw Pact have fundamentally different priorities in improving

their theater nuclear forces. This difference permeates every aspect of NATO and Warsaw Pact force planning, and force structure.

There are some caveats, however, that must be added to any interpretation of Soviet willingness to initiate theater nuclear war:

There are no indications that the Soviets are not deterred by the thought of the damage NATO can inflict, or the risk of strategic escalation. The Soviets very clearly understand the cost of large scale conflict in Europe. There is no indication they would engage in war more readily than NATO, or regard a strategy of trying to win a theater nuclear war as desirable unless their vital interest were threatened. The difference lies fundamentally in what each side would do at the point that a war seems inevitable and not in the caution both sides now show in moving towards any such confrontation.

Recent work by Dr. Joseph Douglas of Systems Planning Corporation strongly indicates that the Soviets do place strong emphasis on damage limitation, and are in no sense cavalier about collateral damage.⁴ Although past U.S. studies have tended to estimate that the Soviets would use the largest possible yield a delivery system could carry, it now seems almost certain that the Soviets would actually use much lower yields tailored to the size of a target attacked. This does not mean that they have NATO's interest in controlling collateral damage "from the bottom up." It does mean the Soviets are efficient military planners. They will not use unnecessary force, or unnecessarily destroy the economic structure of the Europe they intend to win or "liberate."

It is impossible to tell the extent to which present Soviet doctrine is the result of past failures in NATO doctrine. Unfortunately, NATO's unwillingness to think about the unthinkable has led it to adopt deterrent postures that must have seemed extremely threatening or hypocritical to Soviet military planners.

As noted earlier, it was not until Secretary of Defense James R. Schlesinger directed the Joint Chiefs to develop a realistic capability to fight at any level of escalation, in 1973-1974, that the USSR had any reason to regard a graduated nuclear response as credible, and they may well have regarded NATO's previous doctrine of flexible response as little more than a political fraud.

Accordingly, NATO's past emphasis on deterrence, and its political and ideological unwillingness to deal with nuclear weapons in terms of realistic war fighting options may have had an unintended and unmeasurable influence in shaping Soviet doctrine and strategy to focus on the probability of large scale nuclear conflict, and on striking preemptively or first. There are times when being unwilling to face the unthinkable can have potentially disastrous results.

"LIMITED NUCLEAR OPTIONS": COMPARATIVE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE INTENSITY OF A CONFLICT, LIMIT OR CONTROL A CONFLICT, AND TERMINATE IT ON FAVORABLE TERMS

Unfortunately, a well reasoned—but half implemented—strategy can also have disastrous effects. There is no doubt that the new tactical nuclear strategy of "Limited Nuclear Options" or LNOs that Secretary of Defense Schlesinger introduced in NATO was a great improvement over the hollow shell of "flexible response."

By the mid-1970's it gave NATO a wide range of options other than the SIOP if the Warsaw Pact attacked with sufficient constraint to make them meaningful. NATO's deterrence was improved because the Warsaw Pact could not attempt to exploit the chance that NATO might not escalate to nuclear weapons because it had no effective alternatives between conventional and strategic nuclear war.

⁴ Ibid.

LNO'S WITHOUT WARFIGHTING CAPABILITY?

However, improved deterrence is not the same as improved war fighting capability. The ability to actually fight a limited nuclear war is dependent on the ability to actually manage and terminate nuclear war on favorable terms. In order to develop this ability, both NATO and the Warsaw Pact would have had to meet certain basic criteria:

Both NATO and the Warsaw Pact would have had to adopt roughly the same tactics and doctrine. They would have to have a common interest and belief in constraint.

Both sides would have to plan to fight in a highly rational manner, and to escalate slowly and cautiously.

NATO would have to be able to fight more effectively than the Warsaw Pact at some level of conflict that the Warsaw Pact cannot counter by going to higher or different levels of conflict. Sustaining a war, once NATO uses such options, must involve greater damage or risk to the Warsaw Pact than terminating a conflict.

The Warsaw Pact would then have to have initiated a conflict without having anticipated such NATO options, and the risk of escalation to theater-wide nuclear war. Deterrence would have to have failed in the first place because the Warsaw Pact drastically miscalculated the cost of war.

Given the fact that the USSR does not now share common tactics and doctrine with NATO, or share a common interest in slow escalation and constraint, these criteria can only be met by changing Soviet attitudes or plans. This, however, can only be accomplished in one of two ways: Either NATO must develop superior war fighting capability to force a change in Soviet plans and attitudes; or, NATO must develop some superbly inventive tactical plan for which the Warsaw Pact has no counter, and which the Warsaw Pact can be allowed to know about long enough in advance to change its approach to war.

NATO certainly has not developed superior tactical nuclear forces, and it has done a magnificent job of failing to publicize any superiority in tactical planning.

There has, of course, been a great deal of U.S. discussion of different kinds of NATO nuclear strikes that might be tailored to terminate theater nuclear conflicts on favorable terms or to "manage" the level of nuclear conflict in ways favorable to NATO. This discussion, however, never quite seems relatable to any specific practical course of action or to any special NATO military advantage.

It ultimately always seems to boil down to describing a sophisticated game of "chicken": a heads-on race in which the drivers with the blue hats never flinch, but in which the drivers with the red hats obligingly spin around at the crisis point and go back to their starting line.

This, frankly, seems to be a case of applying game theory to wishful thinking. One only starts a game of chicken when one expects the other player to lose, and the Warsaw Pact would not start a conflict without considering such risks. Further, the USSR has shown no apparent interest in "mirror imaging" its war plans to the Pentagon's. It has tended to view NATO's LNO strategy as a mixture of hypocrisy and exportable military weakness. As a result, both NATO and the Warsaw Pact may be postured for the kind of unintentional tragedy that occurred in 1914.

NATO's theater nuclear and conventional forces are highly vulnerable to a Soviet large scale strike. NATO's talk of graduated options and sophisticated games of chicken may encourage Soviet planners to strike before such games can start, particularly if they do not intend to back down in the first place, think theater-wide escalation is inevitable, and feel NATO might be using dis-

³ An excellent overview of Soviet doctrine and tactics can be found in Joseph D. Douglas's "The Theater Nuclear Offensive," Studies in Communist Affairs, Vol. 1, Gov't. Printing Office, 1976.

cussions of LNOs to encourage Soviet restraint and give NATO time enough to launch a first strike.

Ultimately, NATO cannot fight an LNO strategy with sophisticated threats. If it wants to develop an LNO war fighting capability, it is going to have to pay for it, and pay enough to convince Soviet planners that theater-wide nuclear war is the feasible and inevitable result of a breakdown of deterrence.●

STABILIZING MEDICAL COSTS

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting in the RECORD an article entitled, "Fee Freeze By Doctors Spreading," which appeared in the Gloucester County Times on July 10, 1978.

The article describes the voluntary medical cost-containment measure now spreading across the State of New Jersey, a movement started by the Gloucester County Medical Society.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Gloucester County Medical Society and all others in New Jersey that have seen fit to join them in this important effort to help control the ever increasing costs of medical care. Hopefully their effort will serve as a model for other physicians and health care providers across the country as the Nation attempts to control inflation. I am pleased to give the Gloucester County Medical Society the recognition it truly deserves for this fine effort. The text of the article follows:

FEE FREEZE BY DOCTORS SPREADING

The Gloucester County Medical Society's effort to stabilize medical costs through a pledge by member physicians not to increase fees for a six-month period is spreading across the state.

The society's voluntary cost-containment measure, which went into effect early in June, has now been adopted by the seven-county Coalition of Southern New Jersey Medical Societies and is scheduled for discussion by the board of trustees of the statewide Medical Society of New Jersey later this month.

The coalition, a loosely-organized union of the medical societies in Atlantic, Burlington, Camden, Cape May, Cumberland, Gloucester and Salem counties, unanimously adopted a resolution supporting the fee freeze two weeks ago, after Dr. Benjamin Wolfson, the Woodbury psychiatrist who proposed the idea, spoke to the group.

According to Dr. Irving P. Ratner, a Wilkesboro orthopedic surgeon who is chairman of the coalition this year, it is too soon to tell how many of the physicians the unit represents will participate in the voluntary fee limit. But so far, he says, the idea is being received with as much enthusiasm at the regional level as when Wolfson first proposed it to the Gloucester County group in May.

"I anticipate significant cooperation," said Ratner, who is also president of Burlington County's medical society, during a recent interview. "We're hoping that this will catch on throughout the state."

That could happen after the Medical Society of New Jersey's trustee board considers the freeze at its next meeting on July 16.

The board may be reluctant to adopt the plan, preferring to leave that choice to the statewide group's larger House of Delegates

which does not meet until April, society executive director Vincent A. Maressa explained. He expects, however, that the board will at least approve of the measure where it is already in effect, an endorsement that could give it more exposure statewide.

"It seems to have a fair amount of sentiment," Maressa said last week from his Trenton office. "I think by mid-fall (when the county medical societies resume their regular meetings) it probably will be adopted throughout the state."

Wolfson and Ratner are pleased by that possibility because they believe that wide acceptance of the cost-containment plan among all segments of the health care industry will help its chances of continuing beyond the initial six-month period.

Both the Gloucester County society and the seven-county coalition will review the freeze this winter. If the costs affecting physicians' charges—labor, supplies, taxes and insurance—have risen appreciably, the voluntary fee limit will have to be lifted or modified to allow for some increases.

"On the other hand, if this voluntary trend (to keep costs down) should continue and the inflation has slowed or stopped, there will be no reason to raise our fees again," Wolfson says.

There is also some evidence that publicity for the cost-containment program has crossed state lines. Since its inception, Wolfson and Ratner have been interviewed by Philadelphia newspapers and TV stations and by a national financial planning magazine for physicians.

So far, however, the plan has evoked little reaction from two of its main targets, government officials and the nationwide American Medical Association, reports Jeanne Budd, executive director of the Gloucester County Medical Society.●

LOU WOZAR RETIRES FROM STEWARDSHIP OF SISTER CITIES

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House the fact that Mr. Lou Wozar today officially concludes his service as president of Sister Cities International.

Under his direction, that excellent organization has flourished and, in so doing, has advanced immeasurably the cause of international understanding and world peace. The chief executive of a major company in my district and an active leader in many Dayton, Ohio civic undertakings, Lou somehow managed to find the time not merely to be part of Sister Cities activities, but to energize and direct them. The fact that the organization is so well known and growing, is due to his tireless efforts and brilliant leadership.

A self-made man in the classic American tradition, Lou once again has excelled in a difficult assignment. In so doing, he has gained the admiration and respect of the many people he has come to know here in Washington. This group includes high-ranking American officials, as well as many important members of the diplomatic community.

Sister Cities has increased the number of community affiliations with foreign

nations and expanded both the number and variety of the programs in which it engages. These efforts are a vital force for international understanding and tranquility. For these accomplishments Lou Wozar should take great credit.

"Observe good faith and justice toward all nations," said George Washington just before he died. "Cultivate peace and harmony with all * * *." Lou Wozar has done just that to the benefit of us all.●

BETHLEHEM'S MAYOR SHARED HIS VIEWS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on a recent visit to Washington, the mayor of Bethlehem, Mr. Elias Freij, shared his views and his hopes for a Middle East peace with several Members of Congress. For those who did not have the opportunity to meet with him, I am placing in this RECORD a copy of his letter to Secretary of State Vance. The letter outlines some of the principles which Mr. Freij feels are essential to a Middle East peace settlement.

The mayor is regarded as a moderate Palestinian by observers of the Middle East. A Christian, he is a spokesman for both Moslems and Christians in the West Bank. He openly supports the Sadat peace initiative; he also has close ties to Jordan. Mr. Freij hopes to see the creation of a Palestinian homeland that will have close links to Jordan and close contacts with Israel. He knows the present Israeli leadership, often meeting with them in connection with his responsibilities as mayor. He feels that he and they deal with each other well and must continue to make every effort to do so now and during and after a peace settlement.

Mr. Freij has children in the United States and has a close affinity for this country. He sees a U.S. presence in the West Bank similar to our current presence in the Sinai Peninsula as a critical element of a settlement. He also stresses the need for the United States to take a more active interest in the West Bank and the Palestinians living there. This will be an important step toward strengthening the hand of the moderates in that region as opposed to more radical elements. In particular, Mr. Freij expressed his concern that certain states such as Libya are providing municipalities with mayors less responsive to the needs of peace with large sums of aid while the moderates receive little support. This has a definite impact upon the political balance in the West Bank and could be detrimental to the hopes there for peace. The United States, therefore, could play a constructive role by taking into consideration the needs of the Palestinian people, by demonstrating an interest in their well-being, and by developing assistance projects to aid them. This, Mr. Freij strongly feels, would promote peace in the Middle East.

BETHLEHEM MUNICIPALITY,
April 10, 1978.

Hon. CYRUS VANCE,
Secretary of State, U.S. Government,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY OF STATE: As a Palestinian Arab citizen and Mayor of the Holy City of Bethlehem, I wish to stress that the Palestinian Arabs in the occupied West Bank and Gaza areas reject the military occupation which is about to complete its eleventh year.

The so-called "self rule plan", which Mr. Begin presented to the World last December falls in every respect to meet the basic demands of the Palestinian Arabs and in fact, it is a long step backward. The Begin plan deprives us of our right for self-determination and of our right for a homeland or a "house for the Palestinians" in the West Bank and Gaza. The Begin plan will be unanimously rejected by all the Palestinian Arabs.

There are mixed feelings in the occupied areas as to the best course to solve the Arab-Israel conflict. However, there are certain basic demands which do have the full support of the inhabitants in the occupied areas. These points call for:

- (1) Complete Israeli withdrawal from all parts of the West Bank and Gaza in accordance with Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and U.N. Resolution 3236.
- (2) The Arab sector of East Jerusalem is an integral part of the occupied West Bank.
- (3) Right for self-determination.
- (4) Right for a Palestinian Homeland or Independent Palestinian state to be determined by a free plebiscite.
- (5) Right of Palestinian Arabs to return and live in the West Bank and Gaza areas.

A majority of the Arab inhabitants will accept and welcome a transitional period of five years, provided Israeli military forces are completely withdrawn and replaced by other forces. The composition of such forces may be the 'KEY' factor in helping to solve this crisis.

Having given this question deep thought, I would strongly suggest that during the transitional period, forces from the U.S., Jordan and Egypt be invited to take full control of the occupied West Bank and Gaza.

The duties of the newly composed forces will authorize it to:

- (1) Be in charge of internal and external security matters.
- (2) Facilitate the peaceful return of Palestinian Arabs.
- (3) Help the inhabitants to organize and build our "House of Palestine" on free and democratic basis.
- (4) Other duties to be set and defined as necessary.

I believe that such a force will surely help to stabilize the situation and with constructive planning, might achieve the dearest dream for millions in this part of the World—peace and a home for the Palestinian mothers, children and people.

Hoping that you will find the time to study this proposal, I assure you of my best and sincere wishes.

Sincerely yours,

ELIAS M. FREIJ,
Mayor of Bethlehem.●

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1978

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 20th anniversary of "Captive

Nations Week," and I join with my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to the courageous people of the captive nations.

The sentencing of Viktoras Petkus, a member of the Lithuanian public group to promote the implementation of the Helsinki agreements, along with the Alekandr Ginzburg and Anatoly Scharansky trials in the Soviet Union, are further recent examples of the gravest deprivation of human rights and the importance of our commitment as a nation to the basic human rights of all people.

Surely we must wonder about the Soviets ability to comply with any SALT agreement, when they have so blatantly refused to honor their commitment to the Helsinki accords. If the SALT agreements are important to us, they must also be important to the Soviets, and I deeply regret that this administration did not suspend these negotiations taking place during the same week that Scharansky and Ginzburg were so brutally sentenced. Such a suspension would have been a message not only to the U.S.S.R., but to the entire world, that America deplores such totalitarian tyranny. The Russians have, in effect, torn the Helsinki accords to shreds.

There are now 30 countries on the list of captive nations under Communist domination and we may well wonder, particularly in light of Soviet actions in Africa, how long it will be before that list is expanded.

Our concern for the basic human rights—personal, civil, and national—of the people of the captive nations must continue not only because it serves their best interest but, ultimately, because it serves our own if democracy is to survive in the world.

As the leader of the free world, we cannot be complacent. It is our duty to publicly deplore all human rights violations against the people of the captive nations and the people of all countries who live under an oppressive government that denies liberty and justice to its citizens. We must demand complete compliance with the Helsinki agreements by all cosignatories. To do less is to reject all that America stands for.●

IN HONOR OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1978

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 20th observance of Captive Nations Week, a week designated to call attention to the many countries of the world which still do not have the rights of national self-determination of which we of the free world take pride. It points in particular to those proud Baltic nations that once enjoyed freedoms now trampled by Soviet dominations. It serves as a reminder that the struggle for individual liberty continues

and is as much in need of our efforts as ever before.

We in the United States have minimal understanding of the intense suffering which is the inevitable result of being denied the most basic and fundamental human rights. Over the past few weeks, many Americans have come a little closer to understanding what it is really like to be persecuted, harassed, and arrested for believing what one believes and for wanting to live where one chooses. They have learned from the news reports about the plight of Anatoly Scharansky, Maria Slepak, Aleksandr Ginzburg, and the many others the Soviets fear and have persecuted.

As the Nation to which many others look for guidance on human rights, we must constantly strive for the preservation and extension of basic human freedom and rights for all people, regardless of the nation in which they reside.

Captive Nations Week is a time for all Americans to rekindle our hope and renew our intent to see that freedom and independence are achieved for all nations throughout the world.●

PRASE FOR MILWAUKEE'S FIRST HANDICAPPED EAGLE SCOUT

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that scouting, because of the value of the experiences it provides in forming strong leaders and dedicated citizens, deserves our praise and support.

This is especially true of scouting's efforts to assist the handicapped—efforts which are exemplified by the story of a Milwaukee Eagle Scout, Kevin Koehler.

As a commendation for past programs in scouting for handicapped, and as encouragement for future efforts in this important area, I am pleased to share the following article from Scouting magazine about this outstanding young man, his accomplishments in scouting for the handicapped, and the dedicated efforts of Scout leaders who made them possible.

"PERSISTENCE WINS THE GAME"

During the past few months, he has received letters of congratulations from various Scouting executives, the mayor of his city, from both the State's senators as well as the Governor and from the President of the United States. His story has been featured on two local television stations and in the city's major newspaper. The "Today" Show in New York has interviewed him. And with good reason. On June 7, at court of honor ceremonies, Kevin Koehler became the first Eagle Scout in the 35-year history of Milwaukee's Troop 152, a very special outfit.

Of all the boys who join Scouting, only one percent ever attain the rank of Eagle Scout. No one knows what the percentage is among handicapped Scouts. But in Milwaukee, although the percentage isn't known, the number is: one. And the name of that one Eagle Scout is Kevin Koehler.

Sitting on the couch in the living room of

his Milwaukee home, Kevin balances the large, spiral notebook on his lap. Reverently, he turns the plastic sheets that house the letters of commendation. His mother, Mrs. Shirley Koehler, sits nearby, smiling at her son. Kevin stops turning the pages and points down at a handwritten letter. "This one means the most to me." His mother nods her agreement. The letter is signed by Norman Schober, Scoutmaster of Troop 152. "This man has been much more than just a Scoutmaster to me," says Kevin. "He has been a close friend."

"We have approximately 30 boys in our troop," said Norman Schober, "all of whom have problems of one sort or another. We have boys with muscular dystrophy, cerebral palsy and cystic fibrosis. Many of our Scouts have multiple problems. Last year, one had cerebral palsy, epilepsy, a colostomy, no voice box and was mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed. Some of our Scouts have severe orthopedic problems. We had one boy, born with deformed hands, who underwent 58 operations before he could even write. After all those operations, he asked me if he could be the troop scribe. We've had scribes who took better notes but we've never had one who took more pride in his work than that boy."

Closing the spiral notebook, Kevin Koehler pushes his crutches aside as he reaches over and gently lays the book down on a table. "When I joined Troop 152 in 1969," says Kevin, as he sits back on the couch, "I discovered that, even though it had been in existence for over 30 years, the troop had never had an Eagle Scout. I decided right then that I was going to be the first one. Of course, I realize that I was one of the lucky ones in that troop. Cerebral palsy had only affected my legs."

Norman Schober first became involved with Troop 152 through the Kiwanis Club. Since then he has held virtually every Scouting position on the local council and district level. "In 1957, I joined the Kiwanis Club of Milwaukee," said Schober. "The club has about two dozen committees that are involved in community work. I chose the committee that dealt with youth because that was the one that included Scouting activities. You see, I'd already been active in Scouting for the past seven years. I have two boys who became Eagle Scouts. Anyway, after I joined the youth committee, the Kiwanis Club told me the Gaenslen Orthopedic School, a Milwaukee public school, needed help with its Scout troop. The troop was already being sponsored by the Kiwanis Club. All the boys in the troop attend the school, which is totally dedicated to handicapped children."

Every new Cub or Scout unit must have a sponsor to offer initial funding, a place to meet and the needed manpower. Many units, for instances, are sponsored by churches or schools. The amount of money involved in the initial funding is usually minimal. Providing a place for the unit to meet is also normally no problem for the sponsor. Many sponsors, however, according to Norm Schober, find it difficult to provide the unit with a permanent source of manpower. But this has hardly been the case with the Milwaukee Kiwanis Club and its Troop 152.

"We have a committee of 15 men who regularly work with Troop 152," commented Schober. "These men are serious about the work they do in both Kiwanis and Scouting. No one has been on this committee for less than five years. Like myself many of them have been members for over 20 years."

Kevin Koehler sits with a small box in his

hand. "It was plenty tough," he says, "but I made it."

"You weren't the only one who had it rough," his mother says, laughing. "Remember, Kevin, when you had to prepare and cook three meals in one day?"

"Those were three great meals," replies Kevin with mock indignation.

"Oh, sure they were," counters his mother. She laughs again. "I knew that if the two of us could survive that, we could survive anything."

Much of the success of Kevin Koehler and the other Scouts of Milwaukee Troop 152 can be credited to the principal of Gaenslen Orthopedic School, Carl Schmidt, who is a strong enthusiast of Scouting. He has made Troop 152 a regular part of the school's curriculum. Troop meetings are held on Friday afternoons during school hours.

"Every Friday afternoon," said Carl Schmidt, "you can find the men of the Kiwanis Club at our troop meeting. There is usually one adult for every two Scouts. In order for these men to come on Friday afternoons they must, of course, take time off from their work. I am sure they don't realize the tremendous influence they exert on these boys. On Monday morning, I start getting questions from the boys about the troop meeting on Friday afternoon."

"Scouting does so much for these boys," continued Schmidt. "It gives them the feeling that they are part of a group. Wearing the Scout uniform, or even a part of it, embellishes that feeling. These Kiwanis men who work with the troop are truly the leaders of our community. They're all successful businessmen and professionals. How else, but through Scouting, could our students work with and be influenced by men of such caliber?"

Kevin Koehler balances the box on his knee as he talks about the 24 merit badges he had to earn in order to become an Eagle Scout. "I tell you, in my early days of Scouting, sometimes I'd get discouraged. So would some of the other Scouts. But the men who work with the troop have such enthusiasm. You'd push forward despite yourself because you didn't want to let them down. In Scouting, you know, no one is standing over you forcing you to do it. You can quit any time you want. But with the encouragement you got from these men, you just didn't want to quit."

Despite his cerebral palsy, Kevin Koehler not only earned the 24 required merit badges, he also earned the Red Cross 50-Mile Swim award.

"... Swimming those 50 miles was the toughest thing I had to do as a Scout. It took a lot of visits to the pool," says Kevin emphatically, "to get 50 miles."

"One of the major values of Scouting for these boys—for all boys—" said Norman Schober, "is that it gives them something worthwhile to strive for. If you water down the standards, if you make it easy for them, then the goals become meaningless. Believe me, every merit badge in Troop 152 is truly earned."

"You can't feel sorry for these boys," continued Schober. "When I first began working with the troop, one of the boys, hobbled with crutches and braces, fell down on a ramp. I went to help him up. Although he had a severe speech impediment, I still understood the word he said when I reached down to him—'No.' It took him literally 40 minutes to pull himself up, but he made it and when he did he looked back at me and said, 'See?'"

"I worked with six boys for a whole year," said Schober, "on one merit badge. Only two passed. But I think it means more to a boy to fail at a meaningful goal than to achieve one that isn't."

"There was a long list of requirements for the Communications merit badge," says Kevin. "One of them was that I had to act as master of ceremonies for some sort of function. So I held a dance at school and was the disc jockey for it."

"That wasn't too difficult for him," comments his mother, "since Kevin was president of the student council. Scouting has literally changed his life. Before Kevin became a Scout, he was a shy, quiet boy who had no self-confidence and a terrible self-image. But Scouting really got his adrenalin flowing. It showed him that he could do far more than he ever thought possible. His confidence has grown tremendously. He is an achiever," Mrs. Koehler states proudly. "He is a leader."

Kevin blushes at his mother's words as he begins to open the small box. "I do feel, though," he says softly, "that my reaching Eagle Scout has given my fellow handicapped Scouts a goal to aim for. Now that someone from our troop has made it to Eagle, they know that at least it's possible."

"Too bad they don't have awards for Eagle Scouts' mothers," said Norm Schober. "If there was one, Mrs. Koehler would certainly get it. She has always been there to listen to Kevin's problems and to offer him moral support. That kind of parent can make the difference in any young person's life, but especially in the life of a handicapped person."

"Most of the parents of handicapped children, like Mrs. Koehler," continued Schober, "somehow learn to provide the proper mix of love and discipline. But some handicapped Scouts have parents who spoil them rotten. They pamper the boy to the point where real communication is simply impossible. At the other extreme are the parents who don't try at all. They simply tolerate the boy. A child can sense that. Sometimes, the parents just leave. Desertion among parents of handicapped children is high. The parent of a handicapped child has to allow that child to struggle to his full potential but also to be ready to give help when it is needed."

Kevin slowly opens the box then holds it up for inspection. Inside, on a velvet bed, are the Eagle medal, the patch for his uniform, the Eagle tie clasp and the Eagle lapel pin. He returns the open box to his lap and stares down at it. "That's really something isn't it?"

He looks up after a moment. "The night I received this, I was certainly filled with mixed emotions. It had been a lot of hard work and in that sense I was glad it was over. But in a way, the hard work was fun. I got a feeling of self-satisfaction out of it." Kevin takes one more look at the symbols of his being an Eagle Scout before closing the box.

"I've got a good life ahead of me," says Kevin. "The future is filled with plenty of new challenges. Since graduating from high school a few months ago, I've been working at the VA regional office. Weekends I'm working at Major Goolsby's, which is a pub and grill. I also plan on attending Milwaukee Area Technical College because I'd like to get a degree in communications. As far as Scouting is concerned, since I'm not officially out of Troop 152 yet, I'm going to add some palms to my Eagle Scout award. After that, I'd like to become an adult volunteer. Mr. Schober and I have already talked about my becoming his assistant Scoutmaster. I very much want to give to other boys what Scouting has given to me."

"You can't do all of that," injects Mrs. Koehler, "you just won't have the time."

"Anything is possible if you want it badly enough and you put your mind to it," says Kevin confidently. "Scouting has taught me that." ●

EXXON SUIT DRAGS ON

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, again, the example of the regulatory agencies dragging its feet and frustrating law enforcement has been repeated here in Washington.

Attached is an article from the Washington Post which reports that lawyers are celebrating the fifth year of getting nowhere at the Federal Trade Commission in the so-called "Exxon suit."

I want to share with you the clipping from yesterday's paper.

The article follows:

EXXON SUIT DRAGS ON AS LAWYERS CELEBRATE
(By Larry Kramer)

The clinking of champagne glasses could be heard in antitrust law offices all around Washington Tuesday night. There was reason to celebrate.

July 18 was the fifth anniversary of the famed "Exxon suit" filed by the Federal Trade Commission, charging the nation's eight largest oil companies with "anti-competitive practices." It's called the "Exxon suit" because Exxon was listed first on the complaint—it's the biggest.

And after five years, the FTC has gone nowhere—the agency's still in the discovery stage and has not yet received one "substantive" document from any of the oil companies.

Unquestionably, this case has become one of the great legal disasters in history. After the initial filing of the complaint, the case foundered for years in a monotonous filing of papers.

Then, in February 1976, the FTC filed an 1,800-page request for "substantive document discovery," from the oil companies. The defendants said it would be impossible to comply with such a huge request and appealed to the commission.

In November 1976, an FTC administrative law judge agreed with the oil companies, calling the request, and the case that would grow out of it, "unmanageable."

But at least he did order the oil companies to hand over some "non-substantive" materials.

In January 1977, the FTC lawyers appealed to the full commission to overturn the administrative law judge's ruling.

That request sat around until September 1977, when the FTC lawyers filed another pleading with their own commission stating that they had changed their mind, and decided they didn't need all of the documents they asked for in their 1,800-page request.

Instead, they said they would refile a request for documents that would be less burdensome.

Then last Jan. 12, the FTC lawyers filed another request for documents, which the oil companies again challenged.

On May 10, the FTC filed yet another request, this time for information concerning the computer systems used by the oil companies. Again, the oil companies are fighting that request.

Meanwhile, the Department of Energy's Office of Special Counsel, in its investigation of oil company pricing regulations, has already received access to the computers of one oil company—Shell—and has asked for others. And the Office of Special Counsel has only been in existence for about seven months.

The late Sen. Philip A. Hart (D-Mich.), had originally asked the FTC to undertake the investigation in 1970. Elated when the complaint was finally filed, even Hart may have underestimated the length of legal wrangling that would be involved when he said:

"The sad part is that we won't get a verdict—and relief—for 8 to 10 years. The FTC has to prove not just monopoly power, but anticompetitive behavior. This will mean a search of millions of documents to confuse everyone."

Meanwhile, many of the practices alleged in the FTC complaint to be anti-competitive still go on.●

ENERGY IMPACT ASSISTANCE ACT
OF 1978

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works has spent considerable time developing legislation to address one of the most critical aspects of energy resource development—the energy impacted area. We have enacted, or are in the process of enacting, laws to deal with virtually every other aspect of providing energy for the country. Now is the appropriate time to establish a plan for compensating those areas completely altered during the process of supplying the Nation with energy.

I am happy to introduce a bill very similar to the Senate bill, S. 1493, and am anxious to see the legislation considered by the House as soon as possible, so that the people living in resource-abundant areas can plan for the development which will surely come. The legislation provides financial and technical assistance to States, local governments, and Indian tribes suffering economic impact as a result of energy development activities.

The bill sets up a cooperative system whereby the Governor or governing body of an Indian tribe, State officials, and local officials comprise an "energy impact assessment team" which is responsible for assessing, for a particular area, the projected energy development, anticipated growth as a result of such development, anticipated needs for public facilities, and available funding resources to meet those needs. The Governor is given the option of designating a local developing district certified under the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 as the assessment team for a particular area.

To help make this system effective, the Secretaries of departments having knowledge of any planned major development will be required to provide all relevant information to those assessment teams. In addition, the Council on Environmental Quality will be responsible for revising the National Environmental Policy Act to assure that information useful in anticipating the impact of such major development will be made available as

soon as possible for the preparation of an environmental impact statement for the planned development.

The assessment team, in cooperation with designated local officials, will then prepare a mitigation plan which shall identify the projected impact, the resulting needs, proposals for meeting those needs, available resources for meeting those needs, contain an environmental impact statement, and any other information pertinent to the Secretary.

Each State, upon review of individual assessment team mitigation plans, will then be responsible for submitting a "statewide investment strategy" to the Secretary of Commerce, establishing priorities among proposed uses; and, once approved, funds will be made available for implementation of those mitigation plans. The bill also provides funding to meet emergency needs for public facilities or public services in impacted areas following certain requirements.

A total of \$150,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1979-83 is authorized to carry out the provisions of the act, to be allocated on the basis of various factors as identified in the bill.●

IRV SCHWARTZ, ASD CHIEF OF PROTOCOL, TO RETIRE AFTER 38 YEARS OF FEDERAL SERVICE

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to pay tribute to an outstanding member of the Dayton, Ohio community, Irving Schwartz.

A transplanted New Yorker, Irv has earned great respect for his extensive participation in many activities both professional and civic. Next week, he concludes 38 years of service with the Department of the Air Force when he retires as the Chief of Protocol of the Aeronautical Systems Division at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

Irv, a man of boundless energy, enthusiasm, and ability, will not retire in the normal sense. The event merely means that he will have more time to devote to community undertakings in which he has participated in the past.

He has made notable contributions to the city of Dayton as a member of the important plan board and also to Temple Israel. As a qualified and interested individual, Irv doubtless will continue to apply his talents to the area of educating our young people, a task in which he has been engaged in the past.

Irv Schwartz has given the Federal Government his best during a long and distinguished career. The list of generals who could testify to his sagacity is a long one indeed as is that of his many associates at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

For me to praise Irv Schwartz is no idle matter since I count him as one of my oldest friends, back to our student days at the University of Dayton.

He is an outstanding citizen whose departure from Government service only means the gaining of more of his time by the Dayton community.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be able to commend Irv for his many contributions and to wish him well in his future endeavors.●

SUGAR STABILIZATION ACT OF 1978

HON. RAYMOND F. LEDERER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. LEDERER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues in both Houses an article in the July 1978 Consumer Federation of America News warning of the dire consequences which would result from the enactment of S. 2990 and H.R. 12486, the Sugar Stabilization Act of 1978.

Unfortunately, matters affecting the sugar policies of this Nation have been afforded a low visibility, allowing legislation not in the best interests of the consuming public or this country to be enacted into law. Serious questions of ethics have been raised concerning the practices of many of the narrow special interest groups attempting to promote such legislation.

When these practices come fully to light and such legislation is considered with the interests of the consuming public in mind "solutions" as proposed in S. 2990 and H.R. 12486 should be rejected summarily in both Houses of Congress.

The article follows:

SUGAR STABILIZATION ACT OF 1978

In testimony before the Senate Finance Committee on May 11 Legislative Director Kathleen D. Sheekey raised CFA's objections to S. 2990, the Sugar Stabilization Act of 1978.

1. *The cost of sugar to consumers would drastically increase.* Based on estimates of the President's Council of Wage and Price Stability, the restrictions on imports provided by the Sugar Stabilization Act of 1978 would raise the price of raw sugar from its present level of about 14¢/lb. to 17.5¢/lb. This 3.5¢/lb. increase would raise the costs to consumers for sugar subsidies to \$2.4 billion annually and add a full percentage point to the Consumer Price Index for food.

2. *Cost of corn sweeteners would also rise.* Any measure designed to raise the price of sugar above reasonable levels is likely to result in a further increase in the use of sugar substitutes such as corn syrup. In opening the door to this heavy competition, the supporters of S. 2990 could actually push out the sugar farmers they were intending to help.

3. *Costs would be disproportionately borne by low-income consumers.* Studies by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics show that sugar accounts for a larger percentage of the budgets of low-income consumers than other segments of our population. Therefore, those who can least afford it will be hardest hit by rising sugar prices.

4. *The Future of the International Sugar Agreement will be seriously jeopardized.* Although a stated purpose of S. 2990 is to implement the International Sugar Agreement, the objective being to stabilize world prices,

passage of S. 2990 would drastically decrease U.S. sugar imports and thereby seriously compromise the fledgling ISA's intent.

5. *Sugar workers would not benefit from increased sugar prices.* Since workers did not even benefit from the 1974 sugar price explosion, it is highly unlikely that passage of S. 2990 would result in increased wages for sugar workers.

6. *Higher prices will not result in reduced consumption.* Although CFA is firmly committed to measures which will educate consumers in a meaningful way of the health risks associated with sugar (e.g., restricting TV advertising of heavily sugared products to children), we are unconvinced that supporting higher sugar prices will discourage consumption. This was not the case when prices soared in 1974.

Sheekey recommended to the Committee CFA's preference of an interim program which maintains market prices at about 13.5¢/lb. consistent with the minimum ISA price. If cost of production should rise above this market price, then a system of direct payments should be used to compensate efficient producers for the difference.

Mark-up of S. 2990 is not yet scheduled by the Senate Finance Committee. CFA commented on similar measures, H.R. 12486, 12667, and 12804, when they were before the House Committee on Agriculture. They also await markup.

The House bills, as well as an Administration bill submitted on request by Representative Vanik (D-OH), are scheduled for hearings in July before the Subcommittee on Trade, Committee on Ways and Means, to which they were jointly referred.●

URGENT NEED FOR STRONG MEASURES AGAINST TERRORISM

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have become all too familiar with the bombings, kidnappings, assassinations, and hijackings that terrorists wantonly commit. It is not enough to denounce international terrorism after one of these unconscionable acts grabs the headlines. More important, we must develop an effective policy to prevent these heinous crimes, and in those instances where terrorists continue to strike, impose harsh penalties on these international criminals and strong sanctions against those nations and groups which support terrorists.

Testifying on July 19, 1978, before the Public Works and Transportation Committee's Subcommittee on Aviation in support of H.R. 13261 of which I am a cosponsor, introduced by the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California, Mr. ANDERSON, and House Concurrent Resolution 72, a measure I introduced, I joined with several of my colleagues and other concerned individuals in urging the subcommittee to take expeditious action on legislation that would greatly strengthen U.S. efforts to act decisively against terrorists.

To share my findings and recommendations concerning necessary actions to be taken against international ter-

rorism, I submit the full text of my statement before the Subcommittee on Aviation be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

AN ACT TO COMBAT INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Mr. Chairman and other distinguished members of the subcommittee:

It is a privilege for me to appear before the Public Work's Aviation Subcommittee and to join you in these important proceedings. You are to be commended for your efforts to focus attention on the problems of international terrorism and for seeking possible legislative remedies to these problems.

The sad fact is that living with terrorism has become a way of life for many millions of people around the globe. The pattern of terrorism continues to grow and spread throughout the world. As cooperation between terrorists and terrorist organizations increases, so do the bombings, kidnappings, assassinations and hijackings.

These acts of terror have become a popular tool for all those seeking to impose their will on a world community which is unable or unwilling to defend itself. The most frightening aspect of this trend is its arbitrary nature, where innocent victims are gripped by the consequences of terrorist activities often being slaughtered for no apparent reason. As indicated by a PLO terrorist leader in 1970:

"There can be no geographic boundaries or moral limits to the operation of the people's camp. In today's world, no one is innocent, no one is neutral."

As a product of this insanity, over the last ten years, worldwide, there has been nearly 1000 terrorist incidents resulting in the deaths of more than 1300 people and more than 3600 wounded. Unfortunately, under current laws and current levels of international cooperation, more than three-fourths of all terrorists escape punishment for their actions while they are almost certain to achieve their aim of gaining widespread publicity.

The conviction rate for terrorists and the length of actual sentences imposed has been unimpressive. While the FBI has a better than 90 percent capture rate for criminals involved in kidnapping for ransom, a terrorist involved in an international kidnapping has about an 80 percent chance of escaping capture or death. Sadly, the average sentence for those who are caught and brought to trial has been only eighteen months.

At a time when the threats of terrorism are at an all time high, our current domestic and international efforts fall way short of the tasks before them. Earlier this year, FBI Director William Webster testified before the Congress that the bureau's presently strained resources are not adequate to cope with a major terrorist campaign. In fact, he warned that proposed budget cuts this year would threaten already existing investigations of terrorist incidents.

The people of this nation through their government must respond to this attack on the civilized world. We must join together in seeking to mobilize the necessary forces in this and other nations which would be equal to the task of combating the bands of terrorists fanatics and the conditions from which they spring. We must seek to deny a safe haven to terrorists and to establish sanctions against states which aid them, harbor them, or fail to prosecute or extradite them.

We must impress upon each other the collective threat posed by terrorism. As history has shown, terrorism begets other acts of terrorism and violence. Our response can only be to create a dedicated, aggressive, coordinated, multinational effort to apprehend and punish terrorists wherever and whenever they strike. We must meet this

challenge. As pointed out by the Washington Post in its March 17, 1978 editorial:

"The terrorists are pressing the question whether a government actually exists—or is it only the legal shell of a government, with nothing inside? Is it capable of acting, at last, to preserve itself and public order?"

During the past few years in different forums, I have sought to denounce terrorism and to alert those still unmoved to action, that terrorist acts feed on each other. A civilized society cannot for long fail to respond to the threats to its very existence which are posed by the ever increasing incidents of terror. It is impossible to forget that the hateful creed of the terrorist is that there are no innocents; any individual regardless of age or sex, regardless of station is a potential victim.

I have had the privilege in the past and in the present Congress of authoring and cosponsoring much needed legislation to deal with terrorist-related problems. One such resolution, H. Con. Res. 72 which is currently pending before this Committee, deserves your attention. The resolution calls for an international study of the causes of terrorism, urges the President to both take action against nations aiding terrorists, and to seek stronger international sanctions against such countries, and strive for conclusion of an effective international convention against terrorism.

In the specific area of air piracy and hijacking which is currently under study by this Subcommittee, H.R. 13261 will, as stated by its author, Chairman Anderson, "deal in a comprehensive way with the threat terrorism poses to Americans both at home and abroad." This bill and similar legislation now before you can contribute meaningfully by enabling our nation to deal more effectively and promptly with terrorism.

As a compliment to these vital efforts, we must encourage the world community to fully support the existing international treaties dealing with air piracy and hijacking.

The Tokyo Convention of 1963, the Hague Convention of 1970 and the Montreal Convention of 1971 provide for the classification of air piracy as an international crime and provide for the extradition or prosecution of hijackers. Unfortunately, these conventions have not had unanimous acceptance or adherence.

Recently, however, there have been some encouraging signs of an awakening in the world community to threats posed by terrorist hijackings. On November 3, 1977 the United Nations General Assembly, for the first time, adopted a resolution condemning air piracy and called upon all governments to take steps to tighten security and to agree to prosecute or extradite hijackers. In addition, at this week's Bonn Economic Summit Conference, the seven heads of state reached an important agreement on air piracy and terrorism that includes a call for suspension of air flights to and from those countries that provide assistance to hijackers.

I urge the members of this Subcommittee to seize this opportunity to strengthen these efforts through the passage of the legislation before it, thereby strengthening our nation's hand in combating terrorism. The terrorist challenge to the civilized world was summarized recently in a Washington Post editorial of May 16, 1978:

"The breakdown of law enforcement tends, unfortunately, to be circular. One successful crime incites other people with guns to try the same thing. Demoralization among the police spreads. To reverse the deterioration requires vigorous political intervention by the national leadership."

This Subcommittee is playing an important role in providing the needed leadership to combat terrorism. Now the United States as a nation must take the lead to enlist all

nations and peoples that are outraged by the brazen attacks, assassinations, threats, the taking of innocent hostages, and other vile forms in which international terrorism manifests itself.●

SMALL BUSINESS

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions, I have stressed and reiterated the continuing need for more emphasis in the direction of small business development. I would like to briefly address that issue and the need for a stronger approach to its incorporation into the educatory process.

It is my feeling—and I am sure that many of my colleagues in the House will agree—that it is imperative that the Congress and the Nation as a whole recognize the need for the development of new educational and training programs specifically designed to assist prospective and established small business persons with problems they continually encounter in the daily operation of their businesses. Startling reports from the Small Business Administration citing the failure of some 400,000 of the 440,000 small businesses that are initiated annually, are certainly indicative of the dire need for such programs. It is further reported that 50 out of every 100 small businesses starting today will fail in 2 years and approximately 90 out of 100 will fail after 10 years. Sadly enough, these facts disturbingly point out that, after 10 years, only 10 of the original 100 businesses will still be viable.

During the early days of our Nation, the self-employed small business person could survive with little or no training or education and with little knowledge of management techniques, technology, and governmental regulations. However, we must now face the fact that the world of small business is vastly more complex, and there is a need for the small business person to be proficient in these areas. Oftentimes, the small business owner finds him or herself wholly unprepared to meet the challenge of our changing economic picture. This is because, contrary to what is generally believed, many small business people have barely a high school education and lack even the rudimentary educational and business management skills.

It is known that many of the present programs involving business and management educational training are generally geared to the managers of large corporations, and thus have little or no application to the problems encountered in the daily operation of a small business. Consequently, the small business person finds his options for educational training extremely limited.

With the incorporation of simple training programs in the basics of business management and operation into high schools, colleges, adult education,

and night schools, a substantial number of small business persons who have encountered various problems as well as those who are preparing for small business careers, can be greatly helped.

Of course, for prospective small business persons these training programs may be of tremendous value since those persons would be made more aware of potential problem areas and instructed as to how to effectively deal with these problems. In addition, both potential and actual small business owners and managers would be made aware of the additional resources for assistance within the community. Further, these training programs would improve the survival potential of many small businesses, and would thus have a significant positive impact on the small business community.

Let me further emphasize my feeling that the increased survival of small business will have a significant impact on unemployment and on the national economy. The Small Business Administration has cited that small businesses employ 58 percent of the national work force and that 1 out of every 10 new jobs is generated in the area of self-employment. This, of course, would allow for the succession of more businesses as well as the generation of more income, jobs, products, and services for the benefit of the general population.

Presently, many of us are desperately searching for noninflationary solutions to the devastating problem of national unemployment. The wide-scale introduction of training programs in the area of small business development can be a giant step in the direction of alleviating this situation. Hopefully, as we initiate new legislative efforts, we can attempt to formulate policies that will be pertinent to the development of new educational and vocational programs of specific application and benefit to prospective and existing small business owners and managers.●

WARREN, MICH., CHOIR TO TOUR ROMANIA

HON. JAMES J. BLANCHARD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take note of an upcoming tour of Romania by the Warren Woods Concert Choir of Warren, Mich.

The tour is being sponsored by the Friendship Ambassadors, a nonprofit organization which has sponsored many tours of foreign countries by performing American artists.

The Warren Woods Choir will appear in the following Romanian cities: Bucharest, Sibiel, Sibiu, Kluz, Trigu Mures, Poiana Brasob, Piantra Neamt, Galati, and Olimp.

I know that the people of Romania will thoroughly enjoy this fine choir from Warren. I feel that cultural exchanges of this kind are especially

important because they give people an opportunity, at a very human level, to gain valuable insights into differing ways of life.

I am sending a letter to each of those cities and their leaders expressing my appreciation for their hospitality and cooperation in this venture.

At a time when there is great tension between Eastern and Western nations, I believe that this concert tour, which is organized in a spirit of international friendship, will help strengthen the bonds of good will and understanding. ●

PARKS PACKAGE PRAISED

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note the outstanding accomplishments of my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. PHILLIP BURTON). His quiet efforts toward attaining a more perfect degree of environmental quality through an expansion of our national parks and recreation areas will remain a symbol for future generations of what can be done by the collective wisdom of concerned Members of Congress, and their leader.

On this issue, it was Mr. BURTON who provided that leadership.

More than a decade has passed since the last major legislative initiative affecting this Nation's parklands has been considered by the Congress. The National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978, originated by Mr. BURTON, is an accumulation of loose ends and incomplete thoughts that have remained during the past decade of near neglect.

I offer, for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, those comments by four major environmental groups that relate to this legislation and to Mr. BURTON's foresight.

The efforts of the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, the Friends of the Earth, and the American Rivers Conservation Council were impressive in shoring up support for the bill.

We can only hope that the Senate can act judiciously and without haste to pass this bill and to send it on to President Carter for his signature into law.

PARKS PACKAGE PRAISED

The Wilderness Society heaped praise on the National Parks Omnibus Bill passed by the House of Representatives today.

Calling it "the most important parks legislation since the establishment of the National Park System," Celia Hunter, Executive Director of the Wilderness Society, praised its chief sponsor, Rep. Phil Burton, who "deserves tremendous credit for the outstanding job he has done in pulling together this remarkable piece of legislation."

The bill if approved by the Senate will: Designate more national park wilderness than any bill since the 1964 act establishing the National Wilderness Preservation System—almost quadrupling the amount of national parks wilderness.

Provide \$650 million in matching grants to local communities to rehabilitate their parks and recreation systems.

Designate more wild and scenic rivers than any bill since the 1968 Wild and Scenic Rivers Act—seven new rivers and nineteen study rivers.

Add thirteen new areas to the National Park System.

Add four new trails to the National Trail System.

"There are literally dozens of items in this bill that are essential if we are to protect and manage our national parks at all adequately," said Hunter. "It's high time that someone took the initiative and did this job. It should have been done years ago. We'll all benefit from Rep. Burton's good work."

AMERICAN RIVERS

CONSERVATION COUNCIL,

Washington, D.C., July 12, 1978.

The American Rivers Conservation Council hails H.R. 12536, the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978, passed by the House today as a landmark measure in the preservation of our natural heritage. This will be by far the most significant addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System since the original 1968 Act. In addition to the designation of 7 rivers and authorization of 19 studies for potential additions, the bill includes several policy measures which should improve the wild and scenic rivers program and encourage river preservation action by the states.

Chairman Burton and the National Parks Subcommittee are to be praised for the vision they showed in putting this package together. H.R. 12536 will go far towards improving the quality of life for future generations.

The gem of the whole bill though is the wild and scenic designation for the Middle Delaware River. This will help resolve a long standing threat to one of the most outstanding natural areas in the East and allow the recreational use of this marvelous resource within a days drive of one quarter of the U.S. population. Meyner's vote defeating the Thompson amendment was a real high for those who care about our nation's rivers and natural areas. Congratulations to Chairman Burton and Congresspersons Kostmayer, Meyner, Fenwick, McDade, and all the others who attributed to this great victory.

AMERICAN RIVERS

CONSERVATION COUNCIL,

Washington, D.C., July 17, 1978.

HON. PHILLIP BURTON,

Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks and Insular Affairs

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURTON: Congratulations on a job well done on a bill for which you can always be proud. The National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 is the biggest step forward for the National Wild and Scenic River System since its 1968 enactment, and is of similar importance for other aspects of the struggle to insure that future generations will have the opportunity for outdoor recreation and for experience with the natural world.

Together with the Redwoods, Boundary Waters, and Alaska legislation which you and Chairmen Udall and Seiberling have fostered, the 95th Congress is certain to be remembered as a high point in the preservation of our natural environment.

We will do all we can to insure that these bills are passed by the Senate and signed by the President in as strong form as they passed the House. Our press release on H.R. 12536 is enclosed.

Sincerely,

HOWARD BROWN.

Washington, D.C., July 12, 1978.

SIERRA CLUB PRAISES BURTON PARKS AND RECREATION BILL

The Sierra Club today hailed the passage of H.R. 12536, the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978, authored by Rep. Phillip Burton (D., Calif.), as "a milestone in conservation."

Michael McCloskey, Executive Director of the Sierra Club, said in a telegram to Rep. Phillip Burton: "May we offer our hearty congratulations for your superb work in guiding the omnibus parks bill through the House of Representatives. We think this is a milestone in conservation. Your skill and perseverance made it possible. We are immensely grateful. We look forward to carrying the work forward now in the Senate."

After the passage of the bill in the House, Linda M. Billings, a Washington Representative for the Sierra Club, said: "We are elated that this major legislation passed the House with such a large margin of support. Rep. Burton deserves high praise for his vision and courage in crafting the legislation and for his political skill in guiding it to victory. The bill has made great strides towards bringing a number of programs forward which have made very slow progress over the past decade. We are particularly pleased with the provisions for wild and scenic rivers, national trails, national park wilderness, urban parks recovery, and new areas protection such as the Santa Monica Mountains, the Chatahoochee River, and the Pine Barrens. We are also gratified that the bill settles some long-standing controversies such as the lower canyons of the Rio Grande, the middle Delaware River and Tocks Island Dam project, and Mineral King Valley in California. We urge the Senate and the Carter Administration to look favorably upon this legislation and to insure its enactment in this Congress."

JULY 13, 1978.

Representative PHILLIP BURTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

May we offer our hearty congratulations for your superb work in guiding the omnibus parks bill through the House of Representatives. We think this is a milestone in conservation. Your skill and perseverance made it possible.

We are immensely grateful. We look forward to carrying the work forward now in the Senate.

MICHAEL MCCLOSKEY,
Executive Director, Sierra Club.

FRIENDS OF THE EARTH,

San Francisco, Calif., July 18, 1978.

HON. PHILLIP BURTON,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PHIL: Friends of the Earth congratulates you for your leadership and vision in putting together H.R. 12536, the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978, and for so skillfully steering this historic bill through the House of Representatives.

This omnibus bill not only addresses the need of the American people for additional parks, wild rivers, and recreation areas, it recognizes that we must act swiftly to protect our scenic resources from development. Our California office is most familiar with the threats to areas in this state included in your bill, Mineral King, the Santa Monica Mountains, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, etc. . . . Certainly the threats in other parts of the country are no less great.

H.R. 12536 is not only one of the most significant pieces of environmental legislation to come before the Congress, it is one of the most constructive. In recent years, both the Congress and environmental organizations

have had to spend far too much time in fighting off attacks to existing parks—open pit mining in Death Valley, logging outside of Redwood National Park, and the concessionaire scandal in Yosemite, were just three such battles in California. There has been little time left to devote to protecting new areas, as you have done in H.R. 12536.

Many of the proposals in the omnibus bill have been brought up time and time again but have not been acted upon for one reason or another. H.R. 12536 has been accurately characterized as "catch up" legislation. But it took your hard work and dedication to give the Congress the opportunity to catch up on the urgent business of preserving our natural and historic resources.

We hope the Senate will not wait long to follow suit.

Sincerely,

CONNIE PARRISH,
California Representative. ●

TAXING PROBLEMS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Carl Richards, retired editor and publisher of the Palos Regional, a local newspaper serving my district, can best be described as one of the deans of the weekly community newspaper. Carl is a homespun philosopher as well as a discerning journalist.

Therefore, I wish to insert into the RECORD the editor's note and column of the July 6 Palos Regional which I commend to the attention of the Members:

TAXING PROBLEMS

Carl Richards was lucky. His newspaper survived. But countless other publications have not been able to cope with the monumental tax increases incurred by small business owners. This tale, reprinted from his column of April 14, 1977, is of one such unlucky publisher.

This column is especially timely in light of the recent success of California's Proposition 13, dubbed the property taxpayers' revolt.

Richards told this editor that he thinks that politicians across the nation will now have to listen to their constituents who are demanding that taxes be cut.

We stopped at the front door of a small town newspaper plant last Thursday and read a sign which said that the business has been closed by order of the Internal Revenue Service.

That meant only one thing—the publisher had not paid his taxes.

We do not know the name of the present publisher, nor why he didn't (or couldn't) pay his taxes, but we do know the couple who founded the paper 10 years ago, and some of the paper's history.

It was started by a couple with five or six children and everybody in the family worked on the paper. They served their community and most people in town seemed to like them. After five years of hard work they gave up. He told us that he just couldn't make a living with the paper and he got himself a job with some company in Michigan.

We hear that the same pattern existed with the present publisher.

In the past 20 years the federal, state, county and local governments have piled so many taxes on those who operate a business that it is a wonder that there are any small businesses left. Let's see what faced that small publisher.

He had to withhold income taxes for all of his employees, and himself, and send the money to the Internal Revenue Department. He had to withhold and pay the Social Security tax for all of his employees and pay the same amount himself for all of his employees and himself. He had to pay state unemployment tax, tax on all supplies and equipment he purchased and taxes on everything for his own personal use. Also, real estate taxes, personal property taxes and dozens of hidden taxes.

With the amount of reports he had to file he probably paid an accountant \$100 a month or spent nights trying to make out the forms and learn how to be a tax expert. He also had his company and personal income tax returns to make and unless he had professional help he could mess it up and stand the chance of drawing penalties for improper returns. Or, appear before a court which literally says you are guilty before you are tried. If a small businessman would keep a record of the hours he puts in doing book-keeping and collecting for governmental agencies, and would charge them for it, he could ask for one tax-free year.

Let's assume that this publisher had put aside the amount of money necessary to pay his withholding, Social Security, sales tax, real estate tax, income tax and his unemployment tax, and an emergency hits his family—his wife or kids get sick, or in an accident, and he runs up big hospital and medical bills. Or, he gets sick for a long period and cannot make money for the newspaper. A federal or state sticker appears on the door.

An auction of the newspaper plant and equipment was to have been held Tuesday. We couldn't have gone if they had been giving the machinery away. We couldn't stand to see 10 years of hard work crushed and destroyed by a giant federal government that has long forgotten that our flag once flew over "The land of the free." ●

FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS, ALAN GREENSPAN, TESTIFIES IN SUPPORT OF THE KEMP-ROTH TAX RATE REDUCTION ACT AND ANSWERS THE INFLATION QUESTION

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Alan Greenspan, testified last week before the Senate Finance Committee's Subcommittee on Taxation and Debt Management in support of the Kemp-Roth Tax Rate Reduction Act. Dr. Greenspan was Chairman of the Council under President Ford and is now president of Townsend-Greenspan & Co., in New York City.

Dr. Greenspan testified:

I support the Roth-Kemp Tax Reduction Act as a vehicle that will help us break away from an economic policy which looks increasingly unlikely to resolve the problems facing this country.

A new approach must be initiated, one which has a fighting chance of breaking us out of the discouraging cycle and restoring long-term balance to our budget and economy. We need the equivalent of Proposition 13 for the nation as a whole. Roth-Kemp combined with modest restraint in expendi-

ture growth could move us a long way in the right direction.

Then, Dr. Greenspan addressed himself to the recent attacks on Kemp-Roth, attacks that it would be inflationary, by putting it in the context of what our choices are:

It strikes me that those who label Roth-Kemp as inflationary are assuming the same type of federal expenditure growth which has created our current problems. There is no question that should we continue on the current path, we will be running large deficits and highly inflationary fiscal policies. But this would occur with, or without, Roth-Kemp. Our problem is that we tend to spend whatever we have. The great advantage of Roth-Kemp is that it would restore a significant part of the normal increase in tax revenues coming from the growth in the economy to taxpayers, rather than employing them for new expenditure programs. It is not Roth-Kemp that is inflationary, it is the process of federal outlays which Roth-Kemp may succeed in curbing.

Dr. Greenspan's written testimony follows in its entirety:

TESTIMONY OF ALAN GREENSPAN BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TAXATION AND DEBT MANAGEMENT, COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, JULY 14, 1978

I support the Roth-Kemp Tax Reduction Act as a vehicle that will help us break away from an economic policy which looks increasingly unlikely to resolve the problems facing this country.

We are confronted with an insufficiency of investment and a disturbing shortfall of risk-taking. We have observed, as a consequence of growing inflation fears, an increasing unwillingness on the part of the business community to commit to longer-lived assets: That is to the future of this country. The ability of the market economy to address future imbalances has accordingly been weakened and productivity and real income growth have slowed. We have experienced over the years a gradual deterioration in fiscal restraint and allowed budget expenditures to expand in excess of the capacity of our economy to finance them. While our political leaders are rhetorically eloquent on matters of fiscal restraint, their specific decisions based on short-term political pressures seem inexorably to pad federal outlays.

I had hoped that the recent rhetoric for fiscal restraint would lead to a curbing of expenditure growth, thereby gradually reducing the federal deficit and removing the inflationary pressures from our economic system. The recent inflationary upsurge has apparently put some fiscal backbone into the executive branch and, clearly, the prodings from their constituents have produced a number of new converts to fiscal conservatism in the Congress.

However, with increasing pressure on the financial side of our economy, the chances of a recession within the next two years are now better than even. I fear that when confronted with economic weakness and a newly rising unemployment trend, much of the recent fiscal restraint will dissolve. New short-term fiscal stimulus would then throw the prospect of budget balance indefinitely into the future and, presumably, add little to real growth.

A new approach must be initiated, one which has a fighting chance of breaking us out of this discouraging cycle and restoring long-term balance to our budget and economy. We need the equivalent of Proposition 13 for the nation as a whole. Roth-Kemp combined with modest restraint in expenditure growth could move us a long way in the right direction.

Are there risks in the Roth-Kemp proposal? Of course there are. But the level of

risk in initiating such a fiscal policy is less, and the potential rewards significantly greater, than the course which we now appear to be following.

Let us remember that the basic purpose of any tax cut program in today's environment is to reduce the momentum of expenditure growth by restraining the amount of revenues available and trust that there is a political limit to deficit spending. For if expenditures are not curtailed in line with tax reductions, or if tax cuts do not greatly expend taxable incomes, a tax cut is an illusory increase in real purchasing power. Inflation will eat away at whatever increase in nominal incomes is produced.

Hence, any tax program must be associated with programmed curbing of growth in outlays. Fiscal 1978 receipts are currently estimated at \$401 billion. Under current tax law, extended, the January budget projected revenues of \$608 billion for fiscal 1981 and \$686 billion for fiscal 1982. Roth-Kemp would probably reduce 1981 revenues to about \$500 billion, still 25 percent above the current fiscal year, and to approximately \$560 billion for fiscal 1982. Even if Roth-Kemp did nothing to enhance the economic outlook implicit in this January's budget, a balanced budget by fiscal 1982 under Roth-Kemp would still allow a rise of 5½ percent annually in federal outlays during the next four years. The implied level of fiscal 1982 outlays, I might add, would be precisely the amount that President Ford recommended in his January 1977 budget. To the extent that the Roth-Kemp bill enhances the economic outlook beyond that embodied in the January forecast, revenues would be higher and expenditures could grow faster than 5½ percent annually and still reach a balanced budget.

It strikes me that those who label Roth-Kemp as inflationary are assuming the same type of federal expenditure growth which has created our current problems. There is no question that should we continue on the current path, we will be running large deficits and highly inflationary fiscal policies. But this would occur with, or without, Roth-Kemp. Our problem is that we tend to spend whatever we have. The great advantage of Roth-Kemp is that it would restore a significant part of the normal increase in tax revenues coming from the growth in the economy to taxpayers, rather than employing them for new expenditure programs. It is not Roth-Kemp that is inflationary, it is the process of federal outlays which Roth-Kemp may succeed in curbing.

There is some inflationary risk involved in the Roth-Kemp bill. It does, in the very short run, increase the federal deficit. It does create the types of risks we shouldn't have to be taking. But fiscally irresponsible policies have brought us to the point where we are required to use the type of sledge hammer approach embodied in Proposition 13 to break us out of a stagflation oriented policy scenario. We appear to have a potential very substantial backlog of capital investment, which is being stifled by high risk and required rates of return. This backlog could be activated if we can somehow create greater incentives and increase confidence in cash rates of return on future investments. Such an investment boom would generate a broad expansion in economic activity, in productivity and, hence, in standards of living.

The structure of the Roth-Kemp bill is in the right direction. But, I would go further. I would prefer more emphasis on corporate tax cuts and cuts in the upper-middle and upper income brackets. Hence, I am also in favor of the Steiger Amendment which could compliment Roth-Kemp. Such a program would certainly enhance incentives and expand investment and economic activity. Those who would benefit most from such a tax cut are those who exist at the margin of the economy, those who are most vulnerable to unemployment when the economy sags,

and those who are hired or upgraded as the economy expands—namely the middle and middle-lower income earners. To argue that the Roth-Kemp or Steiger initiatives help the rich at the expense of the poor is shortsighted. Everyone should benefit, the poor most of all.

Finally, let me address the issue of the effect on increasing tax rates on the tax base. Unless we initiate a new policy, we will presumably continue to allow inflation to boost effective tax rates, thereby increasing the burden on investment and initiative in this country. We will surely, in the process, give lip service to cutting taxes and will periodically cut rates, but not enough to offset fully the inflation tax. There are those who believe that we have already reached the point where taxation has become counterproductive, that further increases in tax rates will erode the tax base and thereby increase the federal deficit. While evidence is lacking, we know in principle that there is a point where increased tax rates become counterproductive to economic growth.

The problem is that we are unlikely to be aware we have reached such a point until perhaps three or four years after the fact. There is no way analytically to ascertain developing stagnation except in retrospect. Unfortunately, once that stage is reached, as the British have sadly concluded, the pain, economic and social, in reversing it, is close to intolerable. The British have North Sea oil to help them in their transition back to economic sanity. No such bonanza seems pending for the United States. We must avoid, at all costs, slipping into the British disease.

Can we say with a reasonably high degree of assurance that we are not now, nor are we about to, approach a rate of taxation which will engender economic stagnation? While I suspect that we have not as yet reached the danger point, there is surely enough peripheral evidence on investment shortfalls and lagging basic research to give us sufficient concern that we may be entering a level of effective taxation which could cause us trouble.

Since the cost of stagnation politically, socially and economically is so large, we have to lean over backwards to avoid it. A program of well structured tax cuts and expenditure restraint is an insurance policy we badly need. ●

INFLATION CZAR

HON. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● **Mr. GRASSLEY.** Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks we have seen much attention given to the problem of inflation. We even now have an "inflation czar" who is supposed to lead us in our fight against inflation, which is again recognized as our country's No. 1 problem.

Yesterday, July 20, 1978, an article appeared in the Washington Post with the title "Farmers Reap Loss on Inflation." The article accurately points out that farmers have also suffered from the high rate of inflation with which we are now having to live. Farmers have had to endure this high inflation on top of the low commodity prices many of them received last year and the adverse weather conditions which hit some parts of the country.

We all must realize that inflation hits everyone. It is a hidden tax which leaves no one untouched. If we are ever to gain stability in our economy and lower

the rate of inflation, we must halt the proliferation of Government spending. The Government cannot solve all of our problems or provide us with everything.

The article provides an excellent insight to the problems facing farmers and in order to share it with my colleagues the text follows:

FARMERS REAP LOSS ON INFLATION—CONSUMER GOODS GO UP AS CROP PRICES SLIDE

(By Bradley Graham)

NORTH PLATTE, NEBR.—Alice Phelps has the patient, tolerant look that comes from a lifetime of farming. She is generally slow to anger and quite diplomatic about most things. Which is why her friends continue to elect her to head the local Farm Bureau chapter, her protestations to the contrary.

But the other day she was obviously disturbed. Her visitor from the East, simply did not understand the facts of farming. He had suggested that current high food prices meant farmers were getting rich.

"Don't blame us for inflation," she said in her most admonishing way, which is very effective. Whereupon she rose from her kitchen chair, walked to a cupboard and reached for a box of Post Grape Nut flakes.

"This box of cereal costs \$1.04. It weighs 18 ounces. Know what's in it?" She glanced at the side of the box. "Basically, wheat and barley. Know what a bushel of barley is selling for today? About \$1.75. A bushel of wheat goes for about \$2.50. Each bushel weighs 50 or 60 pounds. That's a lot of cereal." She paused.

"No, inflation doesn't make us richer," Alice Phelps said, "only poorer."

After several days in this central Nebraska town, it is readily apparent that the current round of inflation has been more bane than boon to crop farmers. In fact, inflation has struck here with a vengeance. For while the prices of consumer goods have been accelerating upwards, the wholesale prices of grains have slid to hardship lows.

It was only a short while ago that this agricultural community knew very good times. In 1974, thanks to a surge in world demand for American grain, crops here were selling at record highs of \$4 per bushel and more. Now, a bushel of dried corn can't fetch above \$2.

In the meantime, the prices of farm machinery and farmland, sparked by the bumper farm profits and splurge in farm spending of several years ago, have anything but reversed themselves. A 125-horsepower tractor which sold for \$14,000 in 1973 is on the market today for \$31,293. An acre of prime farmland has soared in price from \$800 to more than \$2,000.

It is this disparity between the prices farmers can get for what they sell and the prices they are having to pay for what they need that irks them the most about inflation. It doesn't seem fair to them that some prices should rise while others slip back and they get caught in the squeeze. "If everything fluctuated as grain prices do, we'd do all right," said Glen Phelps who, with Alice, grows corn on several hundred acres north of town. "But they don't. They go up and up and then just stay there."

Farming used to be a lot simpler, and farm life more sheltered from fluctuations in national and world markets. Now, everything seems affected by everything else. The tone and tempo of life on the Plains has changed, and inflation is part of the change.

Glen Phelps recalled that his parents 30 years ago had a dairy farm and would trade milk and cheese with neighbors in return for meat and vegetables. "We didn't deal with money then. We bartered for things. Today, everything is money and inflation. I wouldn't mind going back to trading with the neighbors."

The Phelps are still largely independent of the stores in town. Alice grows just about

everything imaginable in the garden and the family draws its meat from the cattle they raise. But Alice still must shop for staples such as coffee, sugar and flour. Many of her friends, she said, have abandoned their gardens altogether. "We've all become somewhat spoiled, I guess," she noted.

Farmers here stress how little influence they have over the price of food. They say they themselves are at the mercy of uncontrollable forces, including the weather, the demand for grain exports and—something that's currently on everyone's mind in Nebraska—grasshopper plagues. The ones really responsible for inflation, they say, are the groups that can control prices, and do.

A favorite target is labor unions, represented in North Platte by the Union Pacific Railroad. The railroad operates a large roundhouse just west of town and employs about 15 percent of the county's eligible work force. Every farmer interviewed sooner or later mentioned the Union Pacific, claimed its workers were overpaid, and blamed inflation on it—at least in part.

Big business, too, comes in for a scolding in these parts, charged with manipulating supplies to raise prices artificially and fatten profits. "Lots of folks remember how the price of fertilizer nearly doubled in 1974 because of a reported shortage of natural gas," said Ron Sobotka, manager of a local grocery store. "The next year you could get all the fertilizer you wanted. The same thing happened with the supply of baling wire here a short time ago."

As much as farmers talk about the advantage in pricing that comes from being organized, they have stubbornly resisted attempts to create a national coalition. Part of the reason may be found in that traditional sense of righteousness, of rural piety, which still prevails here. Part of the reason may be found in the fierce independence farming seems to breed.

In any case, the American Agricultural Movement, which stirred many to drive their tractors to Washington last fall, fizzled here and elsewhere in the spring when planting time came. "They all went back to their own farms," said Harlon Luttrell, this area's farm extension agent. "No one really believed they would strike like they threatened to, not when it came right down to giving up a year's crops."

The cry of hard times on the farm seems to ring inconsistent with the looks of the expensive rigs standing in the fields here. The tractors and combines are large and powerful and come equipped with air conditioning, stereo speakers and even telephones. But these, farmers say, have simply become the tools of the trade. "It's not a question of how we can afford them," said Luttrell, "but whether we could do without them. Farming isn't a small scale operation anymore. The capital investment necessary in a farm today is enormous. The mowers, the mixers, the sprayers, the loaders, planters, rakes, balers, tractors—the average investment per farmer is somewhere around \$120,000."

This figure, Luttrell said, has increased with inflation, not only because machinery costs more today, but also because the average size a farm must be in order to be economical has increased—and larger farms require larger machinery.

On the other hand—and here is the only benefit higher prices have had on farming—the tremendous appreciation in land values has meant an increase in personal equity for the many farmers who own their own land, allowing them to borrow more to finance more expensive machinery.

"Land is the best thing you have going for you in the credit market," said Lee Harris, a 41-year-old corn farmer from nearby Cozad who bought his 2,500-acre spread in 1971 for about \$800 an acre. Harris estimates his land is now worth at least \$2,000 an acre, and last year he found it easy to borrow the

necessary \$50,000 for a new irrigation system and storage bin.

Though on paper inflation has turned some here into millionaires, farmers say they have had to work harder than before to get their farms to pay. They say they have no fat left to cut. Their only choice is to become more efficient.

Ernie Mehl, a beet farmer, called in a consultant from International Harvester to tell him how to improve his operation. The result: he now grows beets in 30-inch rows instead of in 22-inch ones and uses bigger equipment to harvest them. Gerald Beattie, a grain farmer, also hired a consultant when the cost of pumping water went from \$15 to \$50 an acre.

With farmers investing what money they have back in their farms, towns like North Platte have been seriously affected by a slump in retail sales. Sales here grew only 2 percent last year—"Hardly enough to keep up with inflation," said Gary Toebbin, director of North Platte's Chamber of Commerce. William Dietemeyer, president of the First National Bank of North Platte, spoke of a "new conservative attitude" he has seen among farmers.

Over 80 percent of the farmers in this area participate in some kind of federal agricultural support program, receiving payment from the government either for storing their grain or letting some fields lie fallow. While these programs help pay farm bills, they are hardly enough to keep up with the inflation rate, farmers say.

Alice Phelps said the most she can hope for is that grain prices will not stay at their current depressed level long, but rise as beef prices have recently. It is all a matter of supply and demand she knows and all out of her control.

But she won't leave farming. She likes life in the country she said and the independence of farming. "I also like to watch things grow" she added with a smile. "It gives me satisfaction." ●

1980 OLYMPICS SHOULD NOT BE HELD IN MOSCOW

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the Soviet trials and sentences of Anatoly Shcharansky, Aleksander Ginzburg, and other Soviet Jews and monitors of Soviet compliance with the Helsinki agreement, we must let the Soviets know that we will not tolerate such outrageous abuses of human dignity and blatant disregard for international covenants. There is no alternative except to increase our efforts to seek freedom for these courageous people and to apply more sanctions to the Soviet Union linking human rights violations with technological and cultural exchange programs.

The most effective way to tell the Soviets that we will not acquiesce to their disregard of human rights and the Helsinki agreement is for our Government to support the removal of the 1980 Olympic games from Moscow. Not to take this kind of action, in effect, makes the United States an accomplice to the acts we so strongly deplore. There is no neutral stance that absolves us from the moral responsibility of acting to resist the violation of human rights, for to fail to do so places the human rights of us

all in jeopardy. Unless there is some change in the Soviets' repressive policies and a movement toward the respect of human rights is indicated, the Soviets should not have the privilege of hosting the 1980 games.

The last time a country hosting the Olympic games was involved in a campaign of antisemitism, the world did nothing to respond and, therefore, acted in support of the Nazi propaganda effort. Not only did the United States fail to boycott the 1936 Olympics, but the American team cooperated with the Nazi request to remove two American athletes from competition because they were Jewish. To remove the Olympic games from Moscow would signal our refusal to allow any country to again make such a disgusting display of hypocrisy.

A few weeks ago, I wrote to the president of the International Olympic Committee in Lausanne, Lord Michael Morris Killanin, urging the committee to speak out against the exploitation of these games by the Soviet Union made evident by its campaign to eradicate from its major cities critical elements which may be visible during the Moscow Olympics. I am writing again with my colleagues to urge the removal of the games in Moscow.

I urge my colleagues to join me in co-sponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 1268 calling for the removal of the 1980 Olympic games from Moscow. Let us also ask other countries to join us in this effort and in our forthcoming sanctions against the Soviet Union's continued persecution of Soviet Jews and monitors of the Helsinki agreement. ●

LARGO WORLD BAND OF GOLD

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of July 27, three new gold medals will be arriving in the United States. These medals were won on the playing field, but a musical, not an athletic playing field, and the players who marched off with the gold medals were not discus throwers or skiers, but 210 talented young band members from the Largo Senior High School in my district. They will be bringing their medals with them as they triumphantly return from Europe where over the weekend of July 15-16, they marched away with the World Band Title at the World Olympics of Music in Kerkrade, Netherlands.

Competing against 250 bands representing 26 nations, the Largo Band of Gold, as they are more familiarly known, captured their first gold medal in the concert section, playing a medley including works from Beethoven to the Beatles. They outdistanced all competition in the show section by scoring 175 out of a possible 180 points, to win their second gold. And, in placing third in the march section, garnered sufficient points to win the third gold medal, the one awarded to the all-around winner of the competition.

Winning is nothing new to these youngsters, a class AA show band of world standards, winners of national parade, concert and field championships, and in this very same competition from which they have just emerged as world champions, they were last year winners of two gold medals. Credit must be given to the community which has so loyally supported them, their own mayor, the Honorable Warren Andrews accompanied them to Europe and to their fine musical director, Bob Cotter, whose talent and tireless effort has helped develop and to maintain this musical organization at such a high level of excellence. But for now, I think the spotlight belongs to this very wonderful group of boys and girls who have once more helped to prove that the United States is the very best.

I wish I could introduce my colleagues personally to the members of this band which has so ably represented our country in world competition, but since I cannot, I would at least like to share with you the names of the members of the "Largo World Band of Gold."

Abel, Linda, Allen, Thomas J., Jr., Alvarez, Silvia, Anderson, Calvin, Ansell Karen M., Ansell, Kristine E., Aridizzoni, Tracy Jo, Arvid, David A., Babson, Jane, Babson, John E., Jr., Bailey, Cynthia Ann, Badders, Rebecca S., Bandaret, Lynda Sue, Bechard, Brenda, Bell, Shari Lee, Benedict, Alan J., Berglund, Lori, Berklhiser, Rhonda, and Bernard, Tena. Berry, Marilyn C., Bignotti, Terri Lisa, Bingaman, Kerry, Bobzin, Barbara L., Boelk, Laura Ann, Boelk, Nancy T., Bolinder, Leonard J., Borruso, Melissa, Bouxsein, Tanya L., Brash, Jody, and Brash, Mary.

Brittain, Steven, Brown, Jennifer L., Brown, Lori, Brown, Sharon Rae, Brown, Teresa A., Burrige, Wendy M., Butterworth, Teresa Lee, Butts, Steven J., Cannady, Thomas, Capitanio, Lilliana, Carlson, Carolyn A., Carlson, Catherine A., Carmichael, Crystal Lynn, Chambers, Pamela J., Chambers, Stephanie, and Cody, Nancy.

Collins, Lesley, Crowningshield, Alice E., Davidson, Robert, Demarco, Lori Dana, Diehl, Ronna Jean, Dobson, William A., III, Dominick, Daniel L., Donahey, Sean K., Dort, Glenn K., Drown, James R., Dunbar, Shelley Lyn, Duser, Susan G., Edington, David, Elmore, Gloria P., Engleka, Cynthia M., Estep, Janet, and Flatten, Amy Kathleen.

Flinner, Valerie Ann, Fontain, Troy N., Fuller, David, David, Forde, Steven M., Forde, Theresa Ann, Fuoco, Robert A., Furry, Dora Sue, Furry, Jason, Fussell, Lisa C., Garrett, Dawn M., Garbutt, Robert, Gear, Tamara Rae, and Giesegh, John.

George, John A., Guchemand, Kevin R., Gulliver, Maryfrances C., Gundel, Robert H., Haas, Frank X., IV, Haddle, Brian K., Hall, Cynthia D., Hamilton, Alison P., Hancock, Elisha Ann, Hancock, Kenneth J., Harrison, Andrew T., Hartzell, Todd William, Harrison, Janet A., Harvey, Jeffrey J., Hensel, James E., Hickey, Monica Lee, Hickcox, Mark E., and Higgins, Craig.

Higgins, Judith, Higgins, Joan, Hoffman, Beverly Gale, Holroyd, Donna M., Howard, Neal, Hullett, Bonnie, James, Joni, Jasmer, Daniel P., Jawors, Baron, Jeworski, James L., Jobson, Jennifer C., Jodrey, Donald S., Johnson, Kimberley K., Johnson, Sonia L., Johnson, Susan K., Jones, Patricia A., Kahn, Julie L., Kampka, Tammi, Keller, Elizabeth M., Kennedy, Teresa, Klein, Anna Marie, Klein, Margaret E., and Kleinsorge, Thomas J.

Kleinsorge, William J., Koller, Donna, Kravako, Tammy L., Kroger, Linda M., Kuenn, James, Kuntz, Jeffrey, Lamelle, Karen, Laplante, Christine A., Laplante, Michael A., Lancaster, Timothy D., Larosa,

Michaëlle, Lents, Michelle L., Levesque, Karolina M., Lichter, Linda, Lowery, Tammy, Lundeen, Patricia, McConn, Kevin L., McGinnis, Kathleen M., and McGinnis, Kay A. McClelland, Lisa Ann, McClure, Carolyn M., MacFarlane, Christine, Mack, Lanette, MacMillen, Mary Ann, Mahoney, Linda M., Manion, Robert, Mann, Elaine, Mickel, Linda, Milford, Pamela, Milletto, Bruce J., Miller, Kelly Jo, Morrow, George W., Moston, Jo Anne M., and Moore, Kathy P.

Murphy, Teresa, Muirgrove, Martin H., Navon, Jeffrey, Nelson, Dena, Nelson, Jerome L., Norris, Valerie K., Okerstrom, Valerie K., Patton, Eugene, Patton, Gerald, Pikerill, Lori, Proplesch, Carol E., Proulx, Jeffrey A., Puccinelli, Laura Sue, and Quade, William. Ranson, Bradley, Revere, Karen Anne, Revere, Mary Louise, Revere, Michele Anne, Riedel, Karen Anne, Rinard, Patrick W., Roberts, John C., Roden, Paul J., Saranceni, Michelle, Schloss, Anthony J., Schroeder, Albert W. Jr., Schroeder, Anna L., Schwesky, Steven E., and Seebacher, Allen B.

Seery, Thomas J., Sheffield, Lorna L., Singer, Michel M., Sipek, George C. Jr., Smaridge, Pamela E., Snyder, Gary L. Jr., Stevens, Mark D., Sweetman, Patricia L., Tapia, Paul, Tapia, Richard Jr., Tice, Margorie L., Thomson, Mary Francis, Trippett, John E., Tyrie, Eileen L., and Uden, Kevin A.

Urban, Gail M., Van Peer, Nicole S., Wardell, Wendell G., Warner, Daren J., Watson, Robert F., Wilkowsky, Laurie P., Wilson Jynne J., Wilson, Vickie S., Wise, Craig E., Wise, Dean, Whitmill, Deborah A., Whitmill, Donna M., Whitmill, Roseanna, Wolf, Jami L., Wolf, Katherine E., Woodside, Elizabeth J., Wotring, Deborah L., Wunderlin, Mark W., Wunderlin, Michael E., Yunko, Tamara C., Kubler, Gary L., Erickson, Debra Ann, Hall, Thomas, and Warner, Derek L. ●

APATHY

HON. HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● **Mr. HOLLENBECK.** Mr. Speaker, it is often helpful for Members of Congress to consider actions taken at the State and local level before trying to pass Federal legislation in a particular area. Although the election day voter registration bill, H.R. 5400, did not reach the floor last year, it might be helpful to us in future years to study the effects of similar proposals in individual States.

In that regard, a recent editorial by the Hudson (N.J.) Dispatch vividly illustrates some of the problems inherent in recent State legislation. The editorial takes special note of the real reason for low voter turnouts: apathy. The challenge for us is not mandate automatic or 1-day registration procedures, but to demonstrate to the electorate the continuing strength and vitality of the democratic process.

I insert the Dispatch editorial into the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

EDITORIAL

The instant voter registration bill sounds good on paper. It's the practical effect we have qualms about.

If it becomes law, New Jersey residents could register and vote in general elections on the same day by going to the municipal clerk or the county election office and presenting a driver's license or other "suitable identification" or merely having a registered voter vouch for them.

The bill passed the Senate last February and yesterday the State Government Com-

mittee of the Assembly voted to release the bill without any recommendation pro or con.

An amendment approved by the committee would enable unregistered voters to cast a ballot after bringing proof of residency to the polls. Prospective voters would have to be accompanied by a sponsor registered to vote in that district. A second amendment would provide a 25-day period after the election for officials to verify residency.

Fraudulent registration would be punishable by a fine of up to \$1,000, a three-year prison term, or both.

The theory behind the bill is that the decline in voter participation is due to the inconvenience of the current voter registration process. By allowing registration and voting in one simple process, the theory goes, the state would be opening up the franchise to many people who would otherwise not vote.

Republicans generally oppose the bill because they believe most of the new voters will be potential Democrats.

We oppose the bill the way it now stands for other reasons.

First, it will be an easy avenue for fraud. We have no problem imagining party regulars merrily skipping from municipal clerk to municipal clerk, vouching for each other's residency. There would have to be better safeguards against this easy kind of fraud.

Second, if they wanted to truly open up the franchise, why did legislators limit instant registration just to general elections? In many countries primaries are where the action is. Of course, they are also where organizations have the most control. Maybe party heads are fearful they will lose power if the electorate can register and vote as party members in one day.

Third, the bill doesn't provide additional funds to cover the potentially enormous administrative expense municipalities must bear as a result of instant registration. In Wisconsin, which has a similar statute, 216,000 people registered and voted on Election Day in 1976.

The major defect in the bill, however, can't be addressed by amendments. It is the underlying assumption that democracy will automatically be strengthened by having more voters turn out at the polling booths.

This may have been true 30 years ago, when many states had poll taxes, property requirements, grandfather clauses and other legal barriers to voting for whole groups of people. But these have been eliminated, as have many of the physical impediments to registration.

Today, most people don't vote simply because they feel their vote doesn't make a difference. They feel politics is an irrelevant game participated in by two-bit players concerned only with power or wealth.

California's Proposition 13 and other referenda have hit a responsive chord in voters partially because they permit voters to directly affect the operation of a government that seems to ignore them. Instant voter registration aside, then the message for politicians is that when voters feel they can make a difference, they will go to the polls. ●

A SALUTE TO STEVE ACUNTO

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● **Mr. OTTINGER.** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have as one of my constituents. Steve Acunto—an outstanding citizen who gives tirelessly of himself to people of all ages. Steve is a devoted family man who has helped countless young people in Westchester develop their

sports potential. I am pleased to share with my colleagues an article which appeared in the Westchester Rockland newspapers in honor of Steve:

SALUTING ACUNTO, A VERY SPECIAL DAD
(By Helen Ganz Spiro)

Mention the name Steve Acunto in most any home and chances are one member, or even all members, of the family will connect his name with either boxing, Little League, bicycling, politics, journalism, or radio.

There are few children, teenagers, or adults in Westchester County who have not at some point or other crossed paths with Stephen Acunto II . . . father, teacher, coach, sportsman par excellence, columnist and radio sportscaster, whose high principles have been instilled in many.

And it is for this reason we feel the title of Westchester Father of the Year 1978 should be bestowed on this man whose love for children, devotion to fair play, is undisputed.

There are few children who don't know him from the ballfield, where he has been very much in evidence with Little Leaguers. As an examiner and teacher of safety measures for cyclists his lectures are hard hitting, but with an ulterior motive . . . safety. He is a familiar figure with a pair of boxing gloves on, teaching youngsters self defense, sparring with the older set, or just giving an exhibition.

Acunto is mentor to thousands as well as father to his own four children, now adults—Stephen III, Laura Markevitz, Stephanie, and Donna.

Natives of Staten Island, the Acunto family moved to Westchester in 1935. "My father, the original Stephen, was quite comfortable, and he bought the house we presently live in on Fletcher Avenue. It has always been known as the 'big house' and has been the center of family activities."

Acunto senior was a professor of music, a composer, a music critic and then president of a piano company, the sportsman recalls. "When I was graduated from St. Francis Xavier High School in New York my family wanted me to have a professional career . . . to become a lawyer. But somehow that wasn't what I wanted. Guess I was sort of a maverick."

"I liked to hang out at Stillman's gym and watch the boxing greats train," says the man who presently is director of the Crime Prevention Unit and Youth Activities Unit of the County's Sheriff Department. (Through the years his vocation has been as a salesman, a teacher of physical education, and with a bank.)

But of all his avocational sports, boxing has always been Acunto's favorite and during the years he frequented Stillman's he boxed in exhibition bouts with some of the top notch professionals. "That sport," he says, "helps teach youngsters discipline and confidence," two traits he considers vital.

"Youngsters need and want to be disciplined first at home by their parents, then in school by their teachers and then in sports. Boxing teaches young people to discipline themselves by keeping physically fit, training to participate in the sport and then to respect the ability of their opponent. It's also a way to teach kids self confidence to face life," Acunto says.

He feels children aren't born bad, but they do have to be steered and taught, sternly and lovingly, first by their parents, and then by their teachers. "Young people can go bad at an early age if parents give them too many material things. Giving a child everything is never the substitute for spending time and sharing interests with one's offspring."

Acunto, the man who has been honored by numerous local and national organizations, whose manner is gentle and who radiates kindness, is critical of plea bargaining and of jails that are like country clubs. "If some-

one does something wrong, there should be a mandatory sentence for the wrongdoing. Sometimes young people get into trouble because of the company they keep, or because of peer pressures. But still they have done something wrong and should be punished for what they have done."

What about the upbringing of his own children? "I was a strict father," he says. "Maybe my children resented it, but later on they realized that what my wife and I did in the way of disciplining them, was for their own good."

And how will this Father of the Year spend today? His wife, Mercedes, and their four children and grandchildren will spend the day together, as they have in many years gone by, at the "big house on Fletcher Avenue." ●

IMPACT OF LEGISLATION ON FAMILIES

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman whose major legislative interest lies in the area of children and families, I strongly support efforts to remove antifamily policies from Federal laws. After laboring over foster care and adoption reforms for over 3 years, as well as several other matters, it is evident to me that there do exist many extremely antifamily provisions in Federal laws, many of which we in Congress would be surprised to learn exist.

In particular, I would like once again to point to the financial incentives for the breakup of the family which are contained in the present foster care program. We will continue to pay hundreds, even thousands, of dollars a month to keep a child in foster care (often far longer, or in far more costly a setting than necessary for the benefit of the child), but we will not pay adoption supports to a qualified family willing to give that child a permanent home. We have not developed the necessary, and cost-effective, review procedures to assure that children are removed from the system at an appropriate time.

Thus, the studies all show that as many as two-thirds of the children in foster care are inappropriately placed. A study by the New York Comptroller last year showed that the cost of these inappropriate placements in New York City alone is in excess of a quarter of a billion dollars.

Many of these problems could be remedied with the comprehensive, and widely supported reforms contained in the H.R. 7200, which this House approved over a year ago. Inaction by the other body has not only delayed enactment, but has contributed to the unnecessary costs of foster care, to the very great detriment of thousands of children who have unnecessarily entered, or remained in inappropriate placements. Once again, I call upon the Senate to act expeditiously on the child welfare provisions of H.R. 7200.

But foster care is not the only problem area. As the attached article from the Wall Street Journal notes, the anti-

family aspects of the current welfare program, and even of some of the proposed reforms need further study and improvement. Much of this very essential review is currently being undertaken by the family impact seminar at George Washington University. The FIS, headed by Sid Johnson, an extraordinary talented man, has been engaged in the development of policy analysis techniques so that this Congress will be able to act far more wisely in developing legislation which will benefit, and not interfere with, family life. The second article which I am submitting today describes the very important work of the family impact seminar, which deserves the support and attention of every Member of the Congress concerned with family life.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 11, 1978]

WHEN WELFARE FAMILIES KNOW THEIR RIGHTS

(By Bradley R. Schiller)

In offering his welfare reform proposals last year, President Carter noted that "the welfare system is antiwork and antifamily." It is antiwork because it provides income guarantees to those who don't work, and imposes high taxes on the wages of those who do. It is antifamily because in most cases it disqualifies poor families that remain intact with an unemployed or low-wage father.

There has never been any serious disagreement about the *theoretical* impact of the welfare system on the employment or family stability of poor families: The system is indeed both antiwork and antifamily. What has kept the welfare debate alive for so long is that the *actual* antiwork and antifamily effects of the welfare system have not been that large.

For example, one out of four welfare mothers holds a job at least part of the year, despite the fact that the welfare system may take away as much as 67 cents out of each dollar she earns. Even more remarkable is the fact that one out of 10 welfare mothers works full time, despite the very high tax (as much as 67 percent) imposed on her very low wages (around \$3 an hour).

Such evidence suggests that welfare mothers have a much stronger work ethic than most Americans (as Leonard Goodwin documented in some fascinating Brookings Institution studies) or that they respond "irrationally" to market incentives. The irrationality argument is based on the premise that welfare mothers are not completely informed about the loss of welfare benefits implied by a decision to work, either before or after they take a job.

The same kind of discrepancy between theory and practice is evident with respect to the antifamily provisions of the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program. There is a very strong financial incentive for poor fathers to desert their families, as desertion of the father (in fact or in appearance) makes the mother and children eligible for welfare (AFDC) benefits.

In view of this incentive, it is truly amazing that nearly three million poor families—including over 11 million individuals—continue to be headed by a male, despite the fact that nearly all of these families would be better off financially if they split up. What should one conclude? Do poor people have stronger family ties than the rest of us? Or don't they understand the complexities of the welfare system?

Recent evidence from the continuing welfare experiments in Seattle and Denver provides some answers. The basic intent of the experiments is to test the impact of different welfare-benefit provisions (especially higher guarantees and lower tax rates) on poor families. However, the most "startling"

finding reported to Congress by the Stanford Research Institute economists conducting the study is that the experimental families are splitting up faster than anyone expected. Indeed, the rate of family break-up increased by 61 percent among black families and by 58 percent among white families after they began participating in the experiment.

The initial reaction to this extraordinary increase in the rate of family breakup has been greeted with dismay by welfare officials. HEW has been quick to point out that the Seattle-Denver experiments do not provide the jobs promised by President Carter's welfare reform proposal, and that such jobs might foster greater family stability. But such responses not only obscure the fact that President Carter's proposals also contain antifamily incentives, but miss a more fundamental point: What really distinguishes the welfare experiments from the regular welfare system is the amount of information provided to welfare recipients.

Families in the Seattle-Denver experiments are completely informed about their welfare rights and the consequences of employment and family break-up for their welfare benefits. By contrast, most welfare families are uninformed about welfare regulations and must go to extraordinary lengths to obtain clear, succinct answers about their welfare rights.

In other words, the distinguishing feature of the welfare experiments is that they encourage "rational" behavior. In so doing, they are quickly closing the gap that has long existed between welfare theory and welfare fact.

The current welfare system is in fact both antiwork and antifamily, and we have not yet witnessed the full implications of its perverse incentives; the Seattle-Denver experiments have provided a preview of what lies ahead. The question now is whether Congress will be sufficiently impressed by this glimpse of the future to undertake serious welfare reform before the full burden of the present system is evident.

[From the New York Times, June 24, 1978]
STUDYING GOVERNMENT ROLE IN FAMILY
(By Steven V. Roberts)

WASHINGTON, June 23.—When A. Sidney Johnson's mother took sick recently, he wanted to care for her at home. But since Medicare will pay for a nursing facility and not for home-based care, it would have been more expensive to keep his mother in her own house, surrounded by her own family.

This sort of situation infuriates Mr. Johnson and his colleagues at the Family Impact Seminar. Their purpose is to determine ways that government can help families cope with an age of bewildering change. But all too often, they find, government hurts more than it helps.

Supported by several large foundation grants, the seminar is one of dozens of institutes and agencies that have sprouted around the country in recent years to examine the family and its role in modern America. But unlike some of these researchers, who act more like morticians, the seminar staff believes that the family is in good health. "The family," said Ruth Hubbell, the seminar's research director, "is still the best way to do a lot of things, such as raising children and meeting economic needs."

Theodora Ooms, the deputy director, senses a reaction against "professionalism" and the notion that families do not know what is best for themselves. "We have to change practices to meet family needs," she said, "rather than take over family functions."

CHANGES IN THE SOCIETY

Impetus for the seminar came from several sources, among them the devastating societal changes currently affecting the family. Over half the mothers with school-age children are now in the work force, as are more than

one-third of those with preschoolers. The rising divorce rate, the increase in single-parent households and the growing career aspirations of women are all shaking the foundations of the traditional family structure.

Furthermore, the findings of the well-known Coleman report of the mid-1960's had stressed that family was more important to a child's development than school or other influences. Professionals realized more than ever that they could not study children in isolation, as if they were laboratory animals, but also had to consider social and economic forces.

A third source was political, since Mr. Johnson, the seminar director, had spent six years as staff director of the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth under then Senator Walter Mondale.

The seminar was established in early 1976 with the idea of testing the feasibility of a family impact statement, similar to the environmental impact statements now required for legislation affecting the environment. Some advocates wanted to push the idea through Congress immediately, but Mr. Johnson felt it would be better to study the concept and let it "bubble a bit."

A SENSITIVE ISSUE

Family issues touch on highly emotional and controversial subjects, and there is no one model for a successful, functioning family. The sensitivity of the issue was demonstrated recently when Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Joseph A. Califano Jr. announced a two-year delay in the White House Conference on Families after different groups had started squabbling over the choice of director and the orientation of the conference.

The seminar consists of 22 experts in the field of family study, who meet periodically to guide and review the work of the small professional staff. Right now, the staff is drafting some model impact statements.

The first model concerns the Federal Government as employer and evaluates the experience of about 140,000 employees who have been working on flexible time schedules.

The seminar members believe that the impact of work on family life has long been underestimated. As Halcy Bohen, chief author of the model impact statement put it, "the competition between time for work and time for family has become a growing problem for an increasing number of Americans."

According to an interim report published in April, many workers say that flexible work hours improve their morale and give them more time for such family-related events as doctors' visits and school days.

CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE

The second subject for a model impact statement is the foster care system, which is directly influenced by government policy. Seminar studies show that many foster children are allowed to drift in a sort of limbo, since government regulations make it difficult to reunite them with their biological families or put them up for adoption.

After two years of study, the seminar staff has realized that many of the key decisions affecting families take place on the local level, where services are delivered, rather than at the national level. The hours of a hospital clinic or after school day care center, for instance, can be far more important to a family than a Congressional vote on welfare policy. Accordingly, the seminar is also trying to develop a sort of checklist for consumers, a set of questions that can be asked at city council meetings or in letters to the editor, which would help illuminate a policy's impact on families.

Since the seminar places top priority on the family, it encounters some resistance from groups that have other goals. Some feminists; for example, see the emphasis on

family as a threat to the full independence and liberation of women.

Focusing on the family can also seem threatening to advocates of "self-actualization," and to those who believe that "doing your own thing" precludes compromise within a larger social group. "There's been tremendous interest in self-actualization and self-fulfillment, but I think it's gone too far," Mrs. Ooms asserted. "People need some rootedness, some sense of responsibility."

For all its faults, the seminar seems to be saying, the family will, and should, endure. "I find some family talk nauseatingly sweet," Mrs. Ooms said, "but it is still the most intense way in which we get meaning in our lives."

BALANCE(S) OF POWER SERIES— SOVIET INTENTIONS AND DOCTRINES IV(i)

HON. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, current Soviet military doctrine, adopted by the party in the late 1950's, "requires that the Armed Forces, the country and the whole Soviet people be prepared for the eventuality of a nuclear-rocket war." This doctrinal decision required a new strategy, which was made known to the West in August 1962, through the publication of Marshal Sokolovskiy's Military Strategy. Further explanations of Soviet military doctrine and strategy have been presented since that time in hundreds of Soviet books, pamphlets, and articles. Subsequent events, such as the Cuban missile crisis, the Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty, and SALT negotiations have not altered their basic provisions. Development, production, and deployment of Soviet weapons systems have been in accordance with stated military objectives and principles.

Despite the clarity with which Soviet military doctrine and strategy have been stated, many Western analysts throughout the 1960's misinterpreted or ignored their basic thrust. While seeking to find internal dissension among the Soviet political-military leadership, Western analysts have failed, as a group, to inform the public about the fundamental tenets of military doctrine and strategy upon which Soviet military-political policies are based.

I should like to continue my ongoing Balance(s) of Power series by initiating herewith a Soviet Intentions and Doctrine book in addition to my book I previously printed, and books II and III now appearing regularly in the Record. My first selection is by Dr. William F. Scott, Colonel USAF retired, appearing in the Strategic Review, summer, 1975, and entitled, Soviet Military Doctrine and Strategy: Realities and Misunderstandings. The first part of Dr. Scott's article follows:

I. REALITIES

It has been said that the scholastics of earlier ages spent days in endless discussions considering, for example, how many teeth should be in a horse's mouth. Writings of Plato were examined for views that might shed light on this matter. The size and shape

of a horse's head, as found in paintings of that time, were carefully studied. Finally, after centuries of scholarly analysis, the club rules were broken. Although reportedly later ostracized, one man finally dared to go into a stable and there opened the mouths of a number of horses and counted the teeth that each possessed. Thus the scientific age was introduced.

It is difficult, and often impossible, to obtain first-hand information on the Soviet Union. Of her 400 largest cities over 325 are closed to foreigners. Less than three per cent of the total Soviet land area can be visited by foreign tourists. However, in matters of military doctrine and strategy Soviet writings are remarkable revealing. The Party-military leadership apparently wants the entire nation to understand fully the reasons for the massive defense effort, and what is expected of each individual.

There is no excuse today for mere speculation among Western analysts about the basic content of Soviet military doctrine and strategy. We have readily available a vast amount of Soviet military and political-military writings. To ensure that military doctrine is not misunderstood, Soviet spokesmen are clear and concise. In this period of detente and negotiations, Soviet readers are reminded:

"Placed in a nutshell, the Soviet military doctrine, as Marshal R. Ya. Malinovsky wrote, states that: the next war, if the imperialists manage to unleash it, will be a decisive armed conflict between two opposing social systems; according to the character of the weapons employed, it will inevitably be a thermonuclear war, a war in which nuclear weapons will be the principal means of delivering weapons on target. This war will be characterized by an armed struggle of unprecedented ferocity, dynamic, highly mobile combat operations, the absence of continuous stable front lines or distinction between front and rear, greater opportunities for dealing surprise strikes of great strength against both troops and the deep rear areas of the belligerent countries."

After quoting from this 1962 work by the late Soviet Minister of Defense, the Soviet authors of the SALT era go on to assert:

A future war will inevitably be intercontinental in scope and most destructive in character, resulting in the death of hundreds of millions of people, with whole countries being turned into lifeless deserts. But the struggle to victory cannot be restricted to nuclear strikes, hence the war may drag out and require the protracted straining of all the forces of the Army and the nation practically to the breaking point. Naturally, the ultimate victory can be achieved only as a result of the joint efforts of all the services and arms involving the participation of mass armies millions strong.

The Soviet military doctrine requires that the Armed Forces, the country, the whole Soviet people be prepared for the eventuality of a nuclear rocket war.

The statements above have been the bases of Soviet military doctrine and strategy, as well as the rationale for the development, production and deployments of Soviet weaponry for over a decade. These statements also give the rationale for much of Soviet industrial planning, as well as for the military indoctrination of the entire Soviet population.

It apparently is difficult for most Western analysts—and for most Western political and military leaders as well—to accept the possibility that the Soviet leadership is, in fact, "preparing the Armed Forces, the country and the whole Soviet people for the eventuality of a nuclear war." Such doctrinal statements may sound irrational by Western standards, and generally are dismissed as utterances of a few dissident elements within the Soviet military structure.

Hence, the military doctrine of the Soviet Union, first formulated in the early 1960s, and the strategy which stems from it, often have been misinterpreted or ignored in both the United States and Great Britain.

If we are to negotiate successfully with Soviet political-military representatives, we first must understand their military doctrine and strategy, regardless of how irrational it may appear. Only through this understanding can we appreciate the continued militarization of the Soviet Union, and the nature of its military forces.

A CONCEPT OF DOCTRINE

The first key to understanding Soviet military affairs is to recognize the significance of doctrine. "The nuclear age demands above all a clarification of doctrine." With reference to nuclear weapons, "only a doctrine which defines the purpose of these weapons and the kind of war in which they are to be employed permits a rational choice." Further, "strategic doctrine transcends the problem of selecting weapons systems. It is the mode of survival of a society."

We might reflect on the situation in which we in the United States find ourselves in 1975. "In the absence of a generally understood doctrine, we will of necessity act haphazardly, conflicting proposals will compete with each other without an effective basis for their resolution." We might consider our own military planning and attempts to negotiate in light of this statement: "The quest for numbers is a symptom of the abdication of doctrine."

The above views on the importance of doctrine were expressed by Dr. Henry Kissinger in 1957. His plea for the need of doctrine was never faced, or perhaps never understood, by the political and military leaders in the United States. However, within one year after his book, *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy*, was published, his concepts were being quoted by Soviet theorists. By 1959 his book had been translated by Voenizdat, the publishing house of the Soviet Ministry of Defense, and could be found in military bookstores from Leningrad to Khabarovsk. The Soviet political-military leadership grasped the significance of doctrine, so well expressed by the then-Harvard professor.

According to Soviet theoreticians, the basis of the new Soviet military doctrine was announced by the First Secretary of the Communist Party in his report to the Supreme Soviet on January 14, 1960. (This explanation is given even today, although Nikita Khrushchev, First Secretary at the time, subsequently became a non-person.) A more detailed explanation was given by Marshal Malinovsky when addressing the XXII Party Congress the following year. In December 1962, within weeks of the Cuban Missile Crisis, a further explanation of the new doctrine was given in yet another work by the Minister of Defense, *Vigilantly Stand Guard Over the Peace*. Since that time Soviet military doctrine, with a few modifications, has remained generally unchanged.

A STRATEGY FOR THE NUCLEAR AGE

The new Soviet military doctrine was based on the assumption that a future world war "inevitably will take the form of a nuclear rocket war, that is, such a war where the main means of striking will be the nuclear weapon and the basic means of delivering it to the target will be the rocket." The doctrinal decision, made by the political leadership in 1959, demanded a new strategy. In the summer of 1962, as the Soviet leadership was preparing their Cuban missile adventure, the first edition of Marshal Sokolovskiy's famed *Military Strategy* appeared in bookstores throughout the Soviet Union.

A second edition of this work was published in 1963, little change in substance from the first edition. Five years later a third edition was issued. Again, even after the Brezhnev

regime was firmly established, the content of this work essentially was the same as that of both earlier editions, which had appeared while Khrushchev was in power.

By 1967 the Soviets rapidly were approaching nuclear parity with the United States. Parity provided a nuclear umbrella under which their own conventional forces might be employed, if desired, providing additional options. However, the Soviet leadership was careful to assert that these new possibilities for the use of non-nuclear forces did not lessen the significance of the nuclear weapon. In 1968 Lt. Colonel V. M. Bondarenko, Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, was tasked to explain this modification to Soviet military doctrine:

"In our times conditions may arise when in individual instances combat operations may be carried out using conventional weapons. Under these conditions, the role of conventional means and the traditional services of the armed forces are greatly increased. It becomes necessary to train troops for various kinds of warfare. This circumstance is sometimes interpreted as a negation of the contemporary revolution in military affairs, as its conclusion.

"One cannot agree with this opinion. The point is that the new possibilities of waging armed struggle have arisen not in spite of, but because of the nuclear missile weapons. They do not diminish their combat effectiveness, and the main thing, they do not preclude the possible use of such weapons. All of this forces the conclusion that the present situation is one of the moments in the revolution in military affairs. It flows out of this revolution, continuing it, instead of contradicting it.

"On the basis of this, we are able to define the contemporary revolution in military affairs, as a radical upheaval of its development, which is characterized by new capabilities of attaining political goals in war, resulting from the availability of nuclear missile weapons to the troops."

The continuity of Soviet military strategy can be seen in a book published in mid-1973, *Scientific-Technical Progress and the Revolution in Military Affairs*. Statements in this book can be traced directly to the 1962 writings of Marshal Malinovsky and to all three editions of *Military Strategy*. According to the authors of this post-SALT I work:

"The basic positions (principles) of strategy are based on the conclusions of Soviet military doctrine and at the same time they elaborate and make these conclusions concrete, giving them the character of theoretical and practical rules of solving different tasks of preparation for and waging the armed struggle.

"Soviet military strategy examines and researches world war in contemporary conditions, if the imperialists unleash it, as a decisive clash of two opposed world socioeconomic systems, in which both belligerent sides will pursue decisive political goals. Such a war might be nuclear with the use by the belligerent sides of all the might of the nuclear rocket weapons in their possession. At the same time, in such a war conventional armaments as well might find use. Under certain circumstances, units and subunits will conduct the struggle with only conventional means. War may be unleashed by different methods, including the surprise use of nuclear weapons or conventional means of destruction."

THE REVOLUTION IN MILITARY AFFAIRS

In the early 1960s an expression became popular in the Soviet military lexicon, which continues to his day—"the revolution in military affairs." Such a revolution, according to Soviet political-military spokesmen, was caused by the introduction of nuclear weapons into the Soviet Armed Forces. Throughout the 1960s and into the 1970s, hundreds of books, articles, pamphlets and speeches refer to this revolution. As a conse-

quence of its occurrence, military power has taken a new meaning:

"Today, the military might of a country is determined by the nuclear rocket weapon, the combat qualities of its nuclear charges and strategic rockets, the level of development of its nuclear and rocket industry, the power of its strategic rocket troops, and the nuclear rocket weapons of all other services of the armed forces."

Soviet theorists assert that the revolution in military affairs took place between 1953 and 1960, although certain phases still continue. The expression was popularized about 1962, after the basic tenets of military doctrine and strategy had been expressed. "Revolution" has a much deeper significance in the Soviet Union than in the United States. The revolution in military affairs was to dramatize and to draw attention to the new military changes, both in military thought and in the restructuring of the Soviet Armed Forces.

In the winter of 1965, within months after Brezhnev came to power, a most significant book, *Problems of the Revolution in Military Affairs*, was published by the Ministry of Defense. This work had gone to print only two weeks after the ouster of Khrushchev. Its contents consisted of articles that had appeared in newspapers and journals over the two preceding years. The only editing of the articles was to drop all references to the deposed First Secretary. This was one of the first clear indications that the revolution in military affairs, with the resulting new doctrine and strategy, was to continue.

Since the signing of the SALT I agreement in 1972, analysts throughout the Western world have watched carefully to see what changes would take place in Soviet military thought. The publication of *Scientific-Technical Progress and the Revolution in Military Affairs* in mid-1973, as already noted, strongly suggests that thus far there have been no more changes in Soviet military doctrine and strategy in the aftermath of SALT I than there were after the overthrow of Khrushchev in 1964.

THE TUITION TAX CREDIT ACT OF 1978

HON. MARC L. MARKS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1978

● Mr. MARKS. Mr. Speaker, few issues in the 95th Congress have been more hotly debated than the decision of whether to provide tuition tax credits to offset rising education expenses. As with any highly emotional issue, there were many claims and counterclaims, some valid and some not so valid. I would like to take this opportunity to ferret out the facts in this debate, and explain my reasons for voting for H.R. 12050, the Tuition Tax Credit Act of 1978, as it passed the House of Representatives on June 1.

I. IMPACT ON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The debate largely centered around one issue: Whether passage of tuition tax credits for elementary and secondary schools (which would primarily benefit families with students in private schools) would have adverse effects on the public school system. This was the crucial issue for me, since I myself as well as my children had attended public schools in Pennsylvania and I had enjoyed many years of close association with teachers in the Pennsyl-

vania public school system and with the Pennsylvania State Education Association. Therefore, I had no intention whatsoever of taking any action on this issue which I thought might prove to be harmful to the public school system.

There were a number of reasons I came to the conclusion that H.R. 12050, as passed by the House, would have little if any adverse impact on public schools. First, while total enrollments for all institutions of education have declined following the baby boom after World War II, public education's share of the total pie has actually increased, and private education's share has decreased. To be specific, in 1966, 87 percent of all elementary and secondary school students in the United States attended public schools. Ten years later, 90 percent of all students were enrolled in public schools. During the past decade, the total number of nonpublic schools has fallen from 19,946 to 17,950, representing a loss of 10 percent or nearly 2,000 schools. Looking to the future, the U.S. National Center for Education Statistics predicts a drop of enrollment at nonpublic elementary and secondary schools from 6.3 million in 1965 to 4.2 million in 1984. Proponents of a tax credit were not arguing that enrollment in private schools would increase, but rather that the decline in private enrollment might simply be arrested.

My second reason for concluding that a tuition tax credit bill would not harm public schools was the evidence that support for public schools is strongest in the States and communities where private education is strongest. For example, in the five States where the largest percentage of students were enrolled in private schools, public school expenditures per pupil average \$300 more than in the five States where private schools account for the smallest fraction of total enrollments. In addition, one argument advanced for tuition tax credits was that some relief would be provided for parents now twice billed (paying property taxes for public schools, and tuition costs for private schools), thus perhaps sweetening the mood of local taxpayers, which in many places is very bitter.

Third, the amount of credits contained in the House-passed tuition tax credit bill were insufficient to encourage parents to place their children in private schools if they had not already done so. H.R. 12050 permitted a maximum credit in 1978 of only \$50 for tuition paid at elementary and secondary schools, and a maximum of \$100 for these schools in 1979 and thereafter. Also, the House voted to permit a credit of only 25 percent of the total tuition costs, which meant that many persons would not be able to claim the full \$50 or \$100. An amendment to increase the 25-percent limit to 50 percent was rejected by a vote of 142 to 261; I was among those who voted against increasing the amount of the tuition that could be taken as a credit against income taxes.

If we use as an example a private school which charges \$800 each year in tuition and we apply the maximum limits set in the House-passed bill, we quickly see that the costs remaining after

use of the tax credit are probably still prohibitive to persons considering private schools, if costs were a factor before. The maximum credit that could be claimed under the House bill for an \$800 tuition is only \$50 in 1978 and \$100 in 1979, leaving a balance of at least \$700 to be paid directly out of pocket by the student or the student's family. And with the 25-percent limit, a \$200 tuition expense would be reduced by only \$50 in all years, still leaving \$150 in tuition to be paid and still a prohibitive expense to any applicant unable to afford \$200 in tuition. Again, the provisions of the House-passed bill would be extremely unlikely to influence families to send their children to private schools unless they had already decided to do so in spite of financial reasons.

Fourth, the House bill would not encourage "white flight" into racially segregated schools since the credits could only be used to offset tuition paid to private schools which meet Government requirements that the institutions do not discriminate on the basis of race. In addition, the proportion of minority students attending nonpublic schools is increasing significantly. A survey of Catholic schools in 10 metropolitan areas in the 1975-76 school year showed that out of nearly a quarter million students, 26 percent were black, 17½ percent were Spanish-surnamed, and 2½ percent were other minorities.

Fifth, tuition tax credits would not result in more Federal aid going to private schools than to public schools. A figure frequently cited during congressional debate on this issue was that the Federal Government contributed approximately \$128 per pupil in public schools. The fear was that tuition tax credit legislation would result in much higher expenditures by the Federal Government per private school pupil. However, as passed by the House, H.R. 12050 at best brought the level of "Federal assistance" per private school pupil to \$100, and even this overlooks the fact that in 1978 the Federal Government is estimated to forgo \$4.6 billion in revenues for public education because property taxes are deducted from Federal income taxes. Thus, all State and local support for education derived from local property taxes—not counted in that \$128 figure of direct Federal assistance—is, in fact, deducted from overall Federal revenues and is then indirect assistance from the U.S. Government, which is given to only public schools.

While H.R. 12050 as passed by the House would represent a loss of approximately \$1 billion in revenues to the Government, the Joint Committee on Taxation estimated that if the 7.7 million students now enrolled in private elementary, secondary, or higher education institutions were enrolled in tax-supported schools instead, the education bill to the taxpayer would be an additional \$17 billion every year. In Erie, Mercer, and Crawford Counties, the additional burden would be approximately \$27 million, or roughly the entire operating budget of the city of Erie school district.

Sixth, the argument was also suggested that the existence of tuition tax credits

would drain students from public schools with the development of "fly-by-night" schools which would open to capture the benefits of the tax credit. As indicated before, the amount of the credit in H.R. 12050 is hardly sufficient to encourage a single student to leave the public school system. More importantly, however, for a student to be eligible for a tax credit, the student must be attending a bona fide nonprofit institution approved by the Internal Revenue Service, and which must be accredited or approved under the laws of the State in which the school is located.

It was for these reasons, then, that I felt the tuition tax credit, as contained in the House-passed bill, would not damage our system of public schools. I also felt that our Nation's system of public schools is strong and viable, and a system in which we can take great pride.

Although I considered most important the argument of impact on public schools, there were other arguments raised against the tuition tax credit bill. I would like to address those arguments at this point.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN

One of these arguments was that a system of tuition tax credits would result in a substantial administrative burden. The fact is that such a credit would create no more of a burden to the IRS than a tax credit such as another one also now being considered by Congress for persons who insulate their homes against rising energy costs. And, in comparison, the administrative burden is far less for tax credits than for the two other education aid programs also suggested, which were the administration's Middle-Income Student Assistance Act and Representative Mikva's tax deferral plan. According to the Congressional Budget Office, an expansion of the current grant program (the Middle-Income Student Assistance Act) "would involve a greater administrative burden" than tuition tax credits, which require only a one-line entry on tax returns. Also, unlike grant programs, tuition tax credits do not invade personal privacy, as they do not require an individual to reveal his or her personal finances to a bureaucrat. The tax deferral plan would also mandate greatly increased complexity, since massive forms would be needed to keep track of amounts owed the Treasury by each family over a period of several years, and the IRS could encounter the same default difficulties now being experienced under student loan programs. Also, the tax deferral plan fails to provide any permanent relief to the taxpayer, since the money is simply a loan and must be repaid.

III. INCREASES IN TUITIONS

Another fear expressed about a program of tuition tax credits was that of schools attempting to "capture" the benefits of the credit by raising their tuition rates by amounts equal to those permitted in the legislation. Schools are hardly likely to do this, however, if they do, in fact, hope to attract new students and avoid the risk of losing current students. In addition, competition among schools is keen and schools which did raise their tuitions would lose students to those which did not. In a period when

total enrollments may continue to decline, this competition will be even keener and the effects of a tuition increase that much more acute.

IV. AID TO THOSE IN NEED

Another question asked about tuition tax credits was whether this approach was an effective way to target education funds to those in need of assistance. I had cosponsored legislation early in the 95th Congress which permitted tax credits for higher education tuition costs, but which also gradually reduced benefits for families which had incomes exceeding \$25,000. H.R. 12050 contained no similar ceiling on incomes, so I had hoped to offer an amendment during House debate to impose such a limit. Unfortunately, the rule governing House floor consideration of this legislation permitted only three amendments to be offered to the bill, none of which was a proposal to impose a ceiling on income. For this reason, I voted against the rule on H.R. 12050.

Yet, even with this flaw in the bill, the Joint Committee on Taxation estimated that 85 percent of the total benefits of this bill will accrue to families with adjusted gross incomes below \$30,000. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, only 4 percent of all benefits would go to elementary, secondary, and postsecondary students whose families have incomes over \$50,000.

Finally, one of my reasons for voting for final passage of H.R. 12050 was that this bill may represent the only tax cut legislation the 95th Congress enacts, since the President's personal income tax reduction proposals have floundered, and Republican efforts to reduce income taxes by one-third (the Kemp-Roth bill, which I cosponsored) have been repeatedly defeated by the Democratic majority in Congress. As the Erie Morning News, one 24th District newspaper, observed in January of this year:

President Carter's tax cut program, with its slight to the middle class, makes passage of a tuition tax measure even more important.

V. EFFECTS ON OTHER AID PROGRAMS

Another concern over enactment of tuition tax credits was whether cut-backs might be made in grant programs for college students, since the tax credits would be available for all students. This possibility arose, in fact, when the House on June 8 considered the Labor-HEW appropriations bill for fiscal year 1979, which contains funding for education programs. An amendment was offered to reduce the student grant program by \$233 million, the amount estimated to implement the Middle-Income Student Assistance Act, and that amendment was defeated on a voice vote. Thus, the House of Representatives has indicated its desire to see a strongly supported program of education assistance. In light of past support in the Congress for these grant programs, frequently over Presidential objections, I fully expect this support to continue.

VI. NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Of course, too, the question arose of whether there was any need at all for

any program of assistance, since conflicting data appeared comparing increases in income over a period of years and increases in tuition costs over those same years. While some charts did indicate that before tax incomes had kept pace with rising tuition costs at institutions of higher education, additional data revealed that after tax incomes had fallen behind tuition increases. Between 1970 and 1977, the average cost of attending a public college rose 57 percent, and the cost of attending a private college had climbed 54 percent. But during this same period, the median income of families with college-age dependents increased just 46 percent. This data is particularly relevant for our own State of Pennsylvania since, as another 24th District newspaper, the Titusville Herald, noted on October 5, 1977:

Tuition at Penn State (\$1,263), Pitt (\$1,310), Temple (\$1,450), and Lincoln (\$1,168) already is the highest among all public colleges and universities in the nation. Further tuition increases will price the cost of an education beyond the reach of the average Pennsylvania family.

VII. CONSTITUTIONALITY

Finally, the question of constitutionality was raised. Since the Supreme Court has never ruled on a Federal program of tuition tax credits, and since previous State programs differed significantly in several respects from H.R. 12050, no precedent has been set for this bill. Since the benefits will go to families and not the schools, the bill may very well be constitutional, as many eminent constitutional experts believe. Until a Federal tuition tax credit program is enacted by Congress, the Supreme Court will have no opportunity to review its merits.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

There were several reasons, most commented on earlier in my remarks, that the House of Representatives chose to consider the tuition tax credit bill during this year. It has become increasingly clear, first, that incomes of families who wish to send their children to college are rising above the maximum qualifications for Federal financial aid programs so that more and more middle-income families cannot obtain this assistance. At the same time, however, tuitions are increasing faster than incomes. Thus, middle-income families are caught in a financial squeeze and find it increasingly difficult to obtain a quality education for their children.

Second, the Nation's taxpayers are sending the message loud and clear to their elected representatives that they demand tax relief. One method of providing such relief is the tuition tax credit legislation. The demand for tax relief is entirely legitimate, and the Congress is responding to that need.

Third, with the steady decline in enrollment in private schools, some action is needed to retard that decline and thus maintain a strong and healthy dual education system. Our dual education system has been a part of this Nation since its birth, contributing in countless ways to our society as well as saving on tax dollars going for public education. We should not aid one system over another,

but we must make certain that both survive.

Finally, our Nation was also founded on the principle of freedom of choice, and the belief that a good education is the best possible legacy we can leave our children. We have long believed that the way to break the cycle of poverty and rise to a better life is through education. We have recognized that the way to improved employment is through a good education. To give our children the best education possible, we consider all avail-

able alternatives. Most parents choose the public school system, and public schools do provide excellent educational opportunities. Some parents prefer to send their children to private schools, feeling that a particular private school would better meet their needs. The House of Representatives, in approving the tuition tax credit bill, wished to help assure the freedom to choose the school which best provides the educational needs of all children.

For the first time ever, the House of Representatives voted on legislation providing tuition tax credits for education expenses. Much controversy surrounded the issue, and the debate is not over yet. Knowing the importance of this legislation, I examined it in great detail, analyzing the arguments and finally voting as I determined would best benefit the varied educational needs of the 24th District of Pennsylvania and the rest of the Nation. ●

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, July 24, 1978

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The Lord is near to all who call upon Him, to all who call upon Him in truth.—Psalms 145: 18.

O God, our Father, as we draw near to Thee in prayer do Thou come near to us and stay with us all through the activities of this day. With Thee we can make our decisions wisely; with Thee we can do our work worthily; with Thee we can plan our day wonderfully. So we place our hands in Thine to be led by Thee through the coming hours.

We pray for the people in our districts whom we endeavor to serve faithfully and fully. Make us sensitive to their needs, careful to evaluate their requests, and ready to do all we can to help them.

We pray for our Nation that we may help to so strengthen her foundations that our greatness may be in character, our security in spirit, and our life together in good will.

We pray for all nations that the spirit of fraternity may begin to bind us together and make this planet a fairer place for all to live together in peace.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1420. An act for the relief of Umberto Ruffolo.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 785. An act to declare that all right, title, and interest of the United States in two thousand seven hundred acres, more or less, are hereby held in trust for the Palute and Shoshone Tribes of the Fallon Indian Reservation and Colony, Fallon, Nev.,

to promote the economic self-sufficiency of the Palute and Shoshone Tribes, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House with an amendment to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 920. An act relating to the disposition of certain recreational demonstration project lands by the State of Oklahoma.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8449. An act for the relief of Lourdes Marie Hudson.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 85. An act for the relief of Raul Arriaza, his wife, Maria Marquart Schubert Arriaza, and their children, Andres Arriaza and Daniel Alvouich Arriaza;

S. 140. An act for the relief of Dr. Kok Liong Tan, and his wife, Gloria Siao Tan;

S. 340. An act for the relief of Dr. Belinda A. Aquino;

S. 613. An act for the relief of Kwok Hung Poon and his wife, Sandra Shau Man Lai Poon;

S. 1564. An act for the relief of Tomiko Fukuda Eure;

S. 2061. An act for the relief of Dr. Angelito Dela Cruz;

S. 2067. An act for the relief of Cesar B. Ibañez II, doctor of medicine;

S. 2209. An act for the relief of Munnice Surface;

S. 2243. An act for the relief of Rohini;

S. 2326. An act for the relief of Anupama Alis Chandrakala;

S. 2377. An act for the relief of Muradali P. Gillani;

S. 2509. An act for the relief of Rodolfo N. Arriola; and

S. 2639. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kerry Ann Wilson and Jason John Barba.

CYPRUS AND THE SENATE

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time only to call to the attention of the Members of the House an excellent editorial appearing in the New York Times of Saturday last, July 22, 1978, entitled, "Cyprus and the Senate." The New York Times editorial argues very forcefully, and I think correctly, that it

would be most unwise, for several reasons, for the Senate to vote to repeal the limitations on arms sales to Turkey.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

CYPRUS AND THE SENATE

The Senate is about to vote on whether to continue the limitations on arms sales to Turkey. They were imposed after Ankara used American-supplied weapons to occupy two-fifths of Cyprus in 1974, in violation of a Congressional prohibition. We have argued in the past that the limits should be kept until Turkey indicates it will withdraw its forces. We still think so.

Few controversies are as vexing as the feud between the half million Greek Cypriots and the 120,000 Turkish Cypriots over how they will coexist on their island. Their centuries-old quarrel has reached into American politics. The Turks and Turkish Cypriots and their American sympathizers contend that national pride forbids concessions on Cyprus so long as the "embargo" stands. Directly, they predict that maintaining last year's \$175-million limit on arms sales will drive Turkey out of NATO, perhaps even into Moscow's arms. But it would be no gain for the West to purchase Turkish good will at the price of Greek resentment.

When Jimmy Carter was a candidate for President he held that the restriction on arms sales should stand until Ankara withdrew the force that enables Turkish Cypriots, with 20 percent of the island's population, to occupy roughly 40 percent of its territory. This spring, however, he urged that the embargo be lifted. Administration spokesmen maintain that once it is lifted, Ankara will make generous diplomatic proposals. But the Government of Prime Minister Bulent Ecevit has so far given no sign that it is prepared to risk the domestic consequences of offering the concessions needed to reach an accommodation. The vague proposal put forward by the Turkish Cypriots on Thursday for resettling some Greek refugees is welcome but scarcely sufficient. The Turkish concessions need to be territorial.

Where Greek Cypriots go wrong is in insisting that their preponderance in numbers also entitles them to the kind of predominance they enjoyed under the island's 1960 constitution. If the Turkish Cypriots would yield significantly on territory, they could more credibly insist on a constitution that provides for virtually autonomous states for the two communities, linking them only for a minimum of such "federal" functions as conducting foreign affairs and issuing currency.

Greek Cypriots denounce this idea as a mere division of the island. Even if this were true, there would be no alternative; nothing except good will can force the two communities to work together. Because ending Turkey's occupation remains an essential first step toward creating an atmosphere of trust,