

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RHODES TAVERN AND WASHINGTON'S LOCAL ROOTS

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK
OF CALIFORNIAIN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the Rhodes Tavern, at 15th and F Streets NW., is the last visible heritage of Washington's early history as a city and capital. It is the only surviving commercial building, in the original city of Washington, whose construction parallels the occupancy of the White House and the first meeting of Congress in the Capitol in 1800. All contemporary taverns and hotels of 19th century Washington have been demolished, the last in 1932.

While the national historic significance of Rhodes Tavern, beginning with President John Adams, has been recognized, the place of the building in the local history of the Nation's Capital is equally impressive.

Its central location in the new capital made the Rhodes City Tavern & Hotel, as it was known, a center of Washington's early civic, political, and social activity.

A survey of local newspapers from 1799 to 1809 reveals that Rhodes Tavern was the seat of much local civic endeavor. For example, Washington's first neighborhood civic group, the F Street Inhabitants and Proprietors Association, met there in 1801 to organize and discuss how paved sidewalks and related street improvements might be financed.

Another local group, the Washington Theatre Co., met at the tavern to make plans for raising money to build the new Capital's first theater which would open in 1805. The city's first mayor, Robert Brent, was very active in this early community cultural enterprise.

Citizens met at Rhodes Tavern to organize the first city council elections in 1802 and the tavern was one of three polling places in the first four city elections. The other polling places, also taverns, have long since been demolished.

Washingtonians concerned about property taxes met at Rhodes Tavern to discuss property assessments and to petition the local government to establish a board of assessment appeals.

Rhodes Tavern was also the site of numerous early citizens' meetings called to draft petitions to Congress regarding the political status of Washington. The agendas of these meetings covered the entire spectrum of this continuing debate and are best summarized in the observation made during one meeting: Congress must be petitioned until "equal rights have been secured for all the inhabitants" of the District of Columbia.

Newspaper accounts reveal that Robert Brent, Washington's first mayor (1802-1812), and members of the city council attended many of these meetings.

The tavern, along with serving as a kind of "town meeting," was the unofficial city hall during the early years as well. Advertisements informed residents that the tax collector, certain court officials, and the board of property assessment appeals had regular hours of business on the premises.

If Rhodes Tavern is not preserved as a functioning tavern, part of a city museum, or some other civic or appropriate commercial purpose, this generation of Washingtonians will be giving some measure of credibility to those who maintain that Washington, since its founding, has been a city of transients with political ties and roots elsewhere. Rhodes Tavern can become a living monument to the proposition that Washington has local roots—deep local roots—apart from its Federal functions.

Mr. Speaker, the civic events associated with Rhodes Tavern document conclusively that Washington, from its earliest days, has been a community of neighborhoods constituting a citizenry that never evaded the responsibilities of citizenship, while continuing to seek political parity with their fellow citizens in the States.

It would be foolish to let the expanding web of Washington's commercial development destroy this most valuable historic structure. There is legislation pending in the Interior Committee to extend the boundaries of the Pennsylvania Avenue National Historic District to include the Rhodes Tavern and its adjoining historic buildings. I would urge prompt action on this measure to permanently save the Rhodes Tavern for not only the Nation but for the District of Columbia, part of whose history was first written under its roof.●

BRUCE I. HOCHMAN

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, attorney Bruce I. Hochman will be honored at the Israel Dinner of State of the Bench and Bar Division of Israel bonds on Thursday, June 21, 1979. He will be presented with the coveted Lion of Judah Award for a lifetime of service to his profession, his community, his fellow Jews, and the State of Israel.

Born in Toronto, Canada, Bruce was educated at the University of Toronto and holds an A.B. honors degree and a

J.D. degree from UCLA. He served on active duty with the U.S. Air Force during the Korean war. Early in his career Hochman was an assistant U.S. attorney in the tax division. He is a lecturer and author in the field of taxation. Bruce and his wife Harriet have four children: Nathan, David, Nancy, and Jennifer.

A longtime supporter of the Israel bond campaign and the United Way, Bruce Hochman is vice chairman of the United Jewish Welfare Fund and past chairman of its attorneys division; national vice chairman of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and former president of its regional advisory board; and a member of the guardians of the home for the aged as well as a member of Leo Baeck Temple.

It is a special pleasure to recognize one who has labored long and faithfully for his people and his community: Bruce I. Hochman.●

PEACE TREATY HAILED

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit to the RECORD a copy of an article written by my friend Jimmy Wisch that was recently published in his column "Jess Jawin" in the Texas Jewish Post. I think Mr. Wisch's words capture the renewed sense of optimism this country is feeling over the prospect of peace in the Middle East and I want to take this opportunity to share his thoughtful words with my colleagues:

WASHINGTON.—The long hard days of fighting between Egypt and Israel are now officially ended.

With three swift strokes of peace pens an attempt to forge a better world has emerged.

President Sadat took a final and brave step to commit himself and his nation to progress and construction. Though the odds to disrupt peace by Arab terrorists will be great, we must remember in this great beginning that a choice to continue the stalemate and fall into retrograde would even have dire consequences.

Israel's position for peace—shalom—goes back more than the thirty one years of current statehood. It is well reflected in Isaiah's command, his injunction to all peoples to beat their swords into plowshares, their spears into pruning hooks.

Added to that are the prayers and codicils Jews intone daily for Shalom. Read the litanies. What is our most precious possession? Peace!

Golda Meir once said, "I mourn the loss of Arab dead just as I mourn the loss of Jewish dead. It is so unnecessary."

We learned that during the Sinal Campaign in 1956. The shifting desert sands which uncovered intact remains of parts of Arab youth clutching for life was stark testimony of the futility of war.

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

Man still has not learned how to practice his greatest capacity: morality.

This great, courageous episode toward lasting peace in the Middle East is a milestone on Humanity's Road. That will help man play his moral role.

The heroes have played their parts excellently.

President Carter is to be applauded for his resoluteness, his undiminished desire not to miss the opportunity.

President Sadat deserves accolades for his great courage. Though the price on his head has risen he has not flinched.

Prime Minister Begin could do no less. Isalah had issued him his injunction as a Jew thousands of years ago. He could not falter, he could not escape his task. It is part of the Jewish ethic.

There will be pitfalls to be faced during the coming months. New differences will arise possibly additional interpretations and agreements will be needed.

One thing has been proven: The initiative has been harvested into reality.

It can be done.

Peace can be achieved.

We must not falter in making certain that it is perpetuated into its highest fulfillment.

When all men will walk as brothers under the Fatherhood of God and war shall fall into oblivion.●

ROBERTS AMENDMENT TO HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 107

HON. BILL NELSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, an amendment to House Concurrent Resolution 107 was offered and was passed on the floor of the House by Representative RAY ROBERTS to restore most of the reductions in the veterans hospital system and in the medical care program for the fiscal year 1980 budget. Mr. ROBERTS proposed, and I heartily endorse, an amendment to increase budget authority and outlays by \$265 million to assure that Veterans' Administration (VA) hospitals will not have to reduce the number of personnel and beds as had been proposed by the President. This amendment will allow us to continue to maintain acceptable levels of health care and benefits for our sick and disabled veterans. The approval of these funds will also enable the Congress to act upon a bill soon to be reported by the Veterans' Affairs Committee that will provide an 8.3-percent cost-of-living increase in compensation and in dependence and indemnity compensation (DIC) rates for service-connected disabled veterans and eligible dependents. In addition to the reinstatement of those positions lost in fiscal year 1979, it will provide funds necessary to restore some of the health care personnel reductions targeted for fiscal year 1980.

In the markup of the first concurrent resolution for fiscal year 1979 last year, the House Committee on the Budget accepted the President's proposal to reduce the VA medical program by 3,132 beds and 1,500 full-time permanent personnel. The House overwhelmingly chose to restore these necessary funds by the adoption of an amendment to the resolution

to prevent the cut of 3,132 beds from occurring. I commend the wisdom of the Congress in this action. As a consequence of this action, these funds were included in fiscal year 1979 appropriation bill.

In spite of the clear intent of the Congress, however, the Office of Management and Budget directed to the Veterans' Administration to use these funds, that had been specifically appropriated for VA medical personnel and research, to absorb the Federal pay raise that became effective October 1, 1978. Thus, by the end of fiscal year 1979, the VA would have been forced to close out 3,132 beds and to reduce the personnel level by 1,500 as originally proposed.

At the end of January of this year, the chief medical director informed all VA hospital directors that they must cut back an additional 3,581 full-time permanent personnel positions by September 30 of this year as a result of a reduction in the medical care ceiling imposed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Therefore, the total loss of full-time permanent personnel in existing facilities during fiscal year 1979 will be more than 5,000. The situation has now become critical and we must not allow these deep cuts to occur in such a short span of time to the veterans of our Nation.

The President's fiscal year 1980 budget calls for a reduction of 1,600 beds and 1,884 full-time permanent personnel in medical facilities throughout the country. This comes on top of those major cutbacks scheduled during fiscal year 1979. I feel that this is more than our veterans should be required to bear even in this time of fiscal restraint. My State of Florida is losing a total of 33 beds and 113 full-time permanent positions during fiscal year 1979.

Mr. ROBERTS' amendment would restore most of the 5,000 personnel reductions for fiscal year 1979 and would provide an adequate level of funds so that the more than 1,800 personnel reductions targeted for fiscal year 1980 will not have to occur. I realize that at this time, all sectors of our economy are experiencing belt-tightening, but in light of the reductions to veterans' medical care in the last year, I feel that our veterans have done their share. We can support this amendment in good conscience, because it is a modest amendment and proposes only to provide an adequate level in current medical services. The approved funds are not for new or expanded programs. I believe that we owe this to our veterans.●

HELPING THE DEAF HEAR AND BE HEARD

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide an income tax credit to deaf individuals and others who require the use of a typewriter for telephone communica-

tion. Called a TTY, this device is similar to a small typewriter and when attached to a telephone, is capable of transmitting a message via phone lines to any other teletypewriter in the country.

One of the unique problems faced by hearing-impaired individuals is their inability to use a conventional telephone. As everyone knows, the telephone serves as a means of communicating with the outside world, and is used in virtually every aspect of daily life. Yet, nearly 12 million deaf and hearing-impaired Americans experience varying degrees of difficulty using the telephone. Their inability to use the phone hinders communication with friends, family, neighbors, and emergency services.

The cost to the deaf of using a TTY to make long-distance calls can be as much as four times higher than the charge paid by people with normal hearing. The reason is the vastly longer time required for the deaf to communicate by phone using a TTY.

It is a discouraging irony that the device which Alexander Graham Bell developed first as a means of communicating with his deaf wife has evolved so as to be virtually unusable by many deaf people without the aid and expense of a TTY. Passage of this legislation will help to serve as a first step in alleviating this problem for the deaf and hearing-impaired.●

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL A. diNUNZIO

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and sorrow that I learned of the death of Michael A. diNunzio in Denver, Colo., May 10, 1979.

Mike diNunzio was one of the true leaders in American municipal government. I had the privilege and pleasure of working with him when I served as mayor of my city of San Jose. Since I have been in the House of Representatives, Mr. diNunzio was general counsel of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, senior program manager of the technical assistance programs, and director of the mayors' Leadership Institute.

Prior to his service with the conference, he served both the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors as manager of the Office of Urban Services. He was a distinguished lawyer and public servant, having served in public office as deputy director of personnel for the city and county of Denver, as Civil Service Commissioner for the State of Colorado, and as the first director of the Denver model cities program.

Mr. diNunzio's service to local government received special recognition when the Conference of Mayors adopted a resolution in June of 1976 commending his work in initiating the Mayors Leadership Institute, a school for Mayors to encourage model executive leadership in our cities. The conference resolution

commended him for his initiative in bringing the innovative Mayors Leadership Institute into the program of the conference.

Mr. diNunzio is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph diNunzio of Woonsocket, R.I.; his wife, Maureen Starbuck diNunzio; two brothers, Mario of North Smithfield, R.I., and Charles of Lee, Massachusetts; a daughter, Mrs. Frank Donlan of Denver; and three grandchildren, Kelly, Nicole and Bridget, all of Denver. ●

NATIONAL ABORTION RIGHTS ACTION LEAGUE (NARAL) INCREASES EFFORTS FOR PRO-CHOICE

HON. S. WILLIAM GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, the latest national public opinion poll on the issue of abortion was taken by ABC news-Harris survey and released on March 7. By a 60 to 37 percent majority, the American people have once again reiterated their support for the Supreme Court decision affirming the rights of women to decide whether to have an abortion.

This poll reinforces what other polls in recent years have shown; namely, a majority of the American public supports the decision which made pro-choice the law of the land. It also shows that this support is getting stronger. In 1977, when the Harris survey undertook a similar poll the results were 53 to 40 percent in favor of pro-choice.

In spite of this obvious public sentiment for a woman's right to choose, an emotional battle is being waged throughout the country over the issue of abortion. There are marches and demonstrations, information campaigns, and misinformation campaigns. As Members of Congress we are too often unnecessarily called upon to vote on this issue in bills as diverse as HEW appropriations, Defense Department and Peace Corps authorizations, and the Civil Rights Commission. We are also well aware that the issue of abortion has been thrust into the grassroots level in political campaigns as well.

Women and men who support the pro-choice view, as I do, have become increasingly concerned over the misinformation made available on this issue, and the need to spread more forcefully the message that the majority of the people in this Nation favor pro-choice. At the end of April, the National Rights Abortion Rights Action League, NARAL, which has lobbied for pro-choice for the past 10 years, held a national convention in Washington attended by over 700 supporters from across the country. Because of the invaluable work which NARAL is doing, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article on this convention which appeared in the May 1 issue of the New York Times. I hope this article will be in-

structive to my colleagues as they consider the information they receive from NARAL, and from those on the other side of this issue, as this year's round of votes on abortion begin to come up.

FOR PRO-ABORTION GROUP, AN 'AGGRESSIVE NEW CAMPAIGN'

(By Leslie Bennetts)

WASHINGTON, April 30.—As hundreds of women sporting big yellow "Choice" buttons streamed through the halls of Congressional office buildings today, the National Abortion Rights Action League wound up a four-day national convention by lobbying legislators and filing six complaints with the Federal Election Commission, alleging violations of Federal election laws by a number of anti-abortion groups.

The conference, which drew more than 700 pro-abortion representatives from around the country to celebrate the organization's 10th anniversary, marked the beginning of "an aggressive new campaign to let legislators know that compulsory pregnancy is not the will of the people," said Karen Mulhauser, executive director of the organization.

'I HEAR FROM THE OTHER SIDE'

Several Congressmen who addressed the convention this morning at its final breakfast said such a campaign is necessary to counteract the vigorous efforts of anti-abortion groups.

"I almost never hear from this side," said Representative Michael Barnes, Democrat of Maryland. "But I hear from the other side all the time—every day. I know that is not because there are more of them than there are of us, but they are organized, active and working."

Accordingly, the organization is now beginning a major effort, directed toward the 1980 campaigns, which will range from intensive lobbying and public information drives to bumper stickers like the current one that reads: "I am Pro-Choice—and I vote."

Such votes will be vital in neutralizing the impact of anti-abortion activists, Senator Robert W. Packwood, Republican of Oregon, told the group's members, "Abortion ought to be the No. 1 issue for women all over the country in 1980," he maintained.

'HIT LIST' TARGETS

Senator Packwood, a longtime advocate of women's right to abortion, said that he and his colleague, Senator Birch Bayh, Democrat of Indiana, are among the leading targets of an anti-abortion "hit list" aimed at defeating pro-abortion legislators. "I'm going to beat the bejabbars out of that group in 1980, with your help," declared Senator Packwood.

In addition to supporting pro-abortion candidates, the abortion rights organization will start combating its opponents on the abortion issue with such other strategies as filing the complaints with the Federal Election Commission.

"We've been very reactive in the past," explained Jackie Dumont, chairman of Freedom of Choice-Ohio, a statewide coalition of pro-abortion groups. "The new tactic is to be more aggressive. We're doing a lot more grassroots organizing, and we're going to be a lot more political."

The membership of the National Abortion Rights Action League has grown from 8,500 to over 65,000 in the last two years, according to Mrs. Mulhauser, who announced the filing of the complaints against anti-abortion groups with the election commission at a final news conference.

The complaints allege violations of Federal election laws in 1978 by two national anti-abortion groups, the Life Amendment Political Action Committee and the National Right to Life Committee, and also by four state organizations in South Dakota, Massachusetts, Indiana and New Mexico.

NARAL has accused the life amendment

group of illegally soliciting funds from the general public even though, they say, it is connected with the National Right to Life Committee; Federal election laws state that an affiliated organization may only solicit contributions from its parent organization's membership, and not from the general public. Paul Brown, director of Life Amendment Political Action Committee, termed the complaint "nonsense," and denied that his group was in any way affiliated with N.R.L.C.

Another charge is that the National Right to Life Committee's Voter Identification Project constitutes unlawful corporate contributions to anti-abortion candidates, and NARAL is requesting that the election commission prohibit the project.

In response to the charges, Ann McDonnell, executive vice president of the right-to-life organization, said, "N.R.L.C. welcomes the investigation. We have not broken the law. NARAL's reaction to our successes indicates the desperate situation the anti-life forces find themselves in today."

ASK FOR INVESTIGATION

The individual state suits allege unreported and illegal election activity on the part of groups in each of the four states. Penalties for all the alleged violations, if substantiated, could total in excess of \$100,000, according to the pro-abortion group, and if the violations were found to be "knowing and willful," the fines could be double that amount.

"What we're claiming is the tip of the iceberg," added Miss Dumont. "We have information that this is happening in other states, and we're asking the election commission to investigate how extensive it is."

Nevertheless, said Mrs. Mulhauser, despite the well-organized efforts of anti-abortionists, "There has been enormous success since NARAL was founded 10 years ago," she said. "Its name at the time was the National Association for the Repeal of Abortion Laws, since abortion was illegal in most states then."

"Back then," she continued, "it was estimated there were 1,200,000 illegal abortions each year; abortion was the third largest crime in the country. In 1978 there were an estimated 1,300,000 abortions. So the issue is not whether or not there will be abortions, but whether or not they are legal, where and how they are performed, and who performs them."

According to Mrs. Mulhauser, the latest figures from a Harris poll in March show that 60 percent of Americans now support the Supreme Court decision on abortion, up from 53 percent in 1977. "So we are confident that as the issue gets a fuller airing, even more people are acknowledging their support for legal abortions," she said.

"But we're doing this with a sense of urgency about the 1980 elections," she continued, "because some politicians have been persuaded by the anti-abortionists that they are strong enough to make a difference in their campaigns." ●

DANCE-A-THONS RAISE FUNDS FOR MENTALLY RETARDED

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House the outstanding success of dance-a-thons conducted by St. Francis De Sales High School in Chicago.

The students at St. Francis have sponsored dances to raise money for the mentally retarded in 1977, 1978, and 1979. These dances have generated more than \$64,000 in gross pledges and contributions. Most of the proceeds of the dances are presented to a community work activity center for retarded children.

These dances have been successful because of the dedication of the students and faculty at St. Francis. Months of planning and hard work have made each dance-a-thon a major success. The Illinois Association for Retarded Children has designated St. Francis De Sales as the top high school fundraiser in the country.

The dances have also been successful because of the tremendous support they have received from the community. Local businesses, community organizations, and elected officials have all made generous contributions of time and money.

I am proud to represent the congressional district in which St. Francis De Sales High School is located. It is a pleasure to see high school students and faculty members working this closely with the community on such an important matter. I would like to commend everyone who has associated the St. Francis De Sales dance-a-thons.●

HANDGUN TRAGEDY OF THE MONTH

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues to take note of the following account, particularly those Members who remain committed to the spread of firearms in this Nation as propagated by the National Rifle Association.

The incident is not uncommon as children are involved in innocent—but fatal—handgun accidents at an alarmingly increasing rate. In light of these statistics, ownership of such weapons by individuals cheapens human life while simultaneously elevating the handgun to a notoriously exalted position.

The material follows:

HE THOUGHT IT WAS A TOY

On April 5, 1979 a young boy—only four years old—fell victim to a handgun blast. The incident occurred in the family's apartment located in West Chester, Pennsylvania. It involved two brothers, twins, Brian and Steven Green.

As recounted by the twins' sister, Charmaine, the brothers used a broomstick to knock a .22 caliber pistol from a box on a bedroom closet shelf. The children had toy guns which looked exactly like the real handgun.

Steven came downstairs and told the mother that Brian had a gun. But when the mother came upstairs, Brian turned and ran back upstairs in front of her. As Steven ran to take the handgun, Brian playfully pulled the trigger and shot his brother in the chest. The horrified mother ran next door to a neighbor to call an ambulance. Steven died of a bullet wound at a local hospital a few hours later.

A neighbor in response to a reporter's question said, "He fired the gun at his brother

thinking it was a toy . . . The child has no idea of what he's done."

And the gun lobby says, "Guns don't kill, people kill."

Steven Green will be counted in the handgun body count for April. The national handgun body count for March 1979 was 729—dead because of handgun murders, suicides and accidents. Among the dead for March were 16 children age 12 or under. Their names are: Danyella Harp, 4, Little Rock, Ark., Arnulfo Escobedo, 5, Fresno, Ca., Shannon Spear, 8, Santa Barbara, Ca., Camilla Jones, 10, Atlanta, Georgia, Scotty Musselman, 2, Chicago, Ill., Joseph Sprauer, 12, Louisville, Ky., Jennifer Spillman, 12, Minneapolis, Minn., Myrick Clark, 5, Wolf Point, Mont., Edward Grudzinski, 12, N.Y., N.Y., Delvin Bryant, 20 Mo., Washington, North Carolina, Francine Burt, 11, Cincinnati, Ohio, Tracey Owens, 5, Columbus, SC, Tommy Hinson, 7, Memphis, Tenn., Serenity Rousseau, 4, Austin, Tx., Shemerin Rousseau, 2, Austin, Tx., unidentified girl, 9, Lomira, Wisc.●

A BETTER CLASS OF MAIL

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Tom CORCORAN has been an active member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee since he came to Congress in 1977. In yesterday's Washington Post, Tom summed up well the feelings of many Americans regarding the present problems facing the United States Postal Service—that is, continuing rate increases and service cutbacks. At this time, I would like to insert this column in the RECORD for the benefit of all our colleagues:

A BETTER CLASS OF MAIL

(By TOM CORCORAN)

Several years ago Congress attempted to remove itself and the president of the United States from mail problems. After a debate, which included Democratic and Republican administrations, the Congress passed the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970, which was designed to make the new U.S. Postal Service independent. The thought was that by removing it from politics and running it "like a business," mail costs would go down and services would go up.

Just the opposite has happened, and that's why the House of Representatives last year, and again this year, is raising the question of another postal reorganization. While I realize some people think we want this for reasons of patronage, or to satisfy the postal unions, I think the concern goes deeper.

Since 1971, first-class rates have risen 150 percent, compared with an 87.5 percent rise in the Consumer Price Index. The Postal "Service" no longer extends door-to-door delivery to new neighborhoods, many small post offices have been closed, hours have been shortened, the Postal Service has been toying with the idea of eliminating the six-day delivery, and we all have horror stories about the type of service we get.

Had I been a congressman in 1970, my vote would have been cast for reorganization. It was worth a try, and much good has come from it. For one thing, the labor force has been reduced through attrition by 10 percent. Considering that labor costs are 85 percent of the postal budget, this is commendable. Second, taking politics out of the rate-making process and giving that responsibility to an independent Postal Rate Commission continues to make good sense.

However, the issue now is: What kind of postal service do we want next year and beyond? First, what about rates for letter mail? If first-class stamps (15¢) keep rising at the present rate, another eight years like the last eight years will lead to a 38¢ first-class stamp. However, unless Congress changes the law beginning in FY '80, the subsidy starts dropping 10 percent a year, thus leading more likely to a 50¢ stamp by 1987.

Second, how will postal services to the public fare? As I mentioned, USPS is a labor-intensive industry, with 85 percent of its costs attributed to personnel. Having eliminated 10 percent of the jobs during the last eight years, can USPS cut costs further without more and more cuts in service? Unless we get machines that go door-to-door, I do not believe USPS can absorb more personnel losses without reducing services further.

In testimony before Congress, Postmaster General William Bolger stated that there are three ways to finance USPS: 1) raise rates; 2) cut services; 3) increase government subsidies. He's right, and Congress must make the choice by our action or inaction this year, because, as indicated earlier, existing subsidies are reduced next year.

These choices get to basic decisions about the mails because raising rates along the lines of the past eight years will drive many people to other forms of communication, especially business, which accounts for 80 percent of first-class mail volume. Without further subsidies, this would lead to ever higher rates for individuals. Reducing services would continue the current trend of volume losses, especially from a market share standpoint. Considering the alternative choices, and where each would lead USPS, I think now is the time to raise the question of whether we really need good universal mail service for every American at reasonable rates. I think the issue should be decided now—not when it's too late to recover without tremendous start-up or, at best, renewal costs.

It was with these thoughts in mind that I authored amendments in the pending legislation that abolish the Board of Governors, require presidential appointment of the postmaster general, eliminate the present automatic billion-dollar subsidy in favor of subsidies based on justified need, and dedicate any increases in the current subsidy level to holding down first-class rates.

The legislation, which will soon be considered by the full House, is not a return to postal politics as usual. We keep many of the good features of the 1970 Postal Act. It was not a bad experiment; we can keep its strong features, but we've learned some lessons, too.

Since 1970, ever-increasing rates and reduced services have hurt USPS and clouded its future. This has occurred despite billion-dollar subsidies every year. Thus, I think subsidies need to be continued, although this time there should be strings attached and realistic goals.

The 96th Congress should recognize that postal independence is a political pipe dream incompatible with good postal service for every American.●

ASA PHILIP RANDOLPH

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1979

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the death of Asa Philip Randolph truly marks a watershed in American history.

Although the great work he started is not yet fully completed, he lived long enough to see that it would surely come to fruition.

Mr. Randolph's role in the unending fight for justice spanned more than half a century. As early as 1917, his writings had begun to awaken black and white Americans to the evils of segregation and bigotry.

When he organized the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters in 1925, he opened the door to a powerfully ally—organized labor. The alliance did not come easily or quickly, but come it did. The porters were the first black union granted a charter by the American Federation of Labor, and in 1957 Mr. Randolph became a national vice president of the AFL-CIO.

Mr. Randolph was criticized and ostracized in his early activities, but his innate decency and dignity soon won him the respect and admiration of both black and white Americans. His technique of nonviolent militancy and his unique organizing ability enabled him to make dramatic gains in the fight against discrimination in all walks of life.

This truly outstanding American leader, with his vision, his courage, and his dedication, has left us a remarkable legacy. His deeds stand as a permanent monument to him, and an eternal reminder to all Americans of what one man can accomplish if he sets his sights on a worthwhile goal, and works unswervingly toward that goal.

The American dream will never die so long as we have people like him.●

DISCLOSURE ETHICS

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we hear so much about financial disclosure revealing the basis for the Congressmen's votes. It has been my experience on the Hill that Congressmen vote based on their convictions and representation of their local communities.

As I read the headlines this week, it said that 28 Congressmen owned stocks in oil and gas companies. Fifteen of these were Democrats and 13 of them were Republicans.

So I went back to check the key vote that would measure how responsive they were to the oil and gas industry. On October 13, 1978, the House had a vote on combining five oil bills together. The liberals opposed to the gas legislation wanted to combine all five bills. The oil and gas interests wanted each bill considered on its separate merit. This was a crucial votes 207 to 206 and the liberal group opposed to the oil and gas industry won. Now let us review the Members that were listed. Two were not Members of the House last year. Two of the Republicans did not vote on this issue.

On this breakdown, Republicans were opposed and most Democrats favored it.

It was interesting to see that among the Democrats the vote was 10 to 5 against the oil companies. Among those five Democrats voting with the oil companies, three were Members from New Mexico, Texas, and Louisiana in whose districts oil production was the biggest industry.

On the Republican side, they voted 8 to 1 for a separate hearing on each bill. One who voted against the gas position was from New York City. And New York City always votes against the gas position.

So among this group who own oil or gas stocks or had any type of what might be considered a vested interest in oil and gas business, there was a 11-to-13 vote. It was just about as close as the final vote itself. I reviewed these individuals one by one and I can find no relationship to their vote and the fact that they own oil or gas properties.

The votes show that my colleagues vote with their conscience.●

W. AVERELL HARRIMAN RECEIVES HARRY S TRUMAN AWARD FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, recently, the former Governor from New York, W. Averell Harriman, received the sixth annual Harry S Truman Award for Public Service. Mayor Lee Comer, of Independence, Mo., in his welcoming remarks at the ceremony on May 4, succinctly summarized the many contributions that Averell Harriman has made to our country. I would like to share Mayor Comer's remarks with my colleagues in Congress:

MAYOR COMER'S REMARKS

Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen: It is my pleasure to warmly welcome you to the 6th annual Harry S Truman Award for Public Service.

This time of year is very exciting for all of us who are citizens of Independence. The many activities that transpire this week and next focus the attention of the entire nation on our city. We are delighted to be a part of this historic time.

On January 8, 1973, the Independence City Council passed a resolution creating the Harry S. Truman Award for Public Service. One person from the entire nation is chosen who best typifies and possesses the qualities of dedication, industry, ability, honesty and integrity that distinguished Harry S Truman in his years of public service.

Tonight we honor Mr. Truman in remembrance, not only for his greatness as President of the United States of America, but because we still think of him as our leading citizen and hold him close in respect and admiration for what he has meant to the city of Independence.

In the light of the ever increasing activities of this world we humans seem capable of involving ourselves in, it is worthwhile for us to pause now for some thoughtful reflection upon the past and its meaning in relation to where we are today, and where we will be heading in the future. Our purpose then is two-fold: to reflect on the greatness of

Harry S Truman, and honor another public service who fulfills the criteria as set forth by our 1973 resolution.

Mr. Truman was a man of intellect who brought to bear on the problems of his time a knowledge of history and literature, and a world of day-to-day living experiences that helped him shape the decisions he was required to make. When we think of Mr. Truman we are reminded of those traits of his character that were so strong: honesty, openness, candor and a sense of duty. We associate the words "integrity" and "respect" with him and recall that when agonizing decisions were required that he was always courageous in doing what he deemed necessary and correct. He was a man of great personal warmth and charm; one who loved people and evidenced compassion and concern for them.

When we recall that each of us who enjoy the blessings and freedoms of this democracy that seems so easeful and so handily come by we remember that we are only the heirs of the giants who have preceded us and brought us to this time. Harry S Truman ranks with anyone you would care to mention, from the discoverers of our great country, those who settled and pioneered it, the framers of our Constitution, those untold thousands who spilled their blood to preserve the republic, and all of the great heroes of our Nation. Our best to them and to Harry S Truman is perpetual and lays on each of us the burden to maintain the republic and insure its continued freedom. Tonight as we honor Mr. Truman we do so by honoring another great American who is a man of Mr. Truman's time. A man so distinguished and so involved in the recent historic construction of our country that one is almost overwhelmed when we consider that he has consented to come to our city and accept the humble admiration and tremendous respect that we offer to him as the 6th honoree of the Harry S Truman Award for Public Service.

The sixth Harry S Truman Award for Public Service goes to the Honorable W. Averell Harriman.

Our honoree was born November 15, 1891, in New York City. He attended Groton and graduated from Yale University in 1913. Just prior to the entry of the United States into World War I, Mr. Harriman bought a shipyard in Chester, Pennsylvania, where he built the first partially fabricated ship in the country. He was chairman of the Merchants Shipping Corporation from 1917 to 1925. Among his financial pursuits were the establishment of the W. A. Harriman and Company private bank. In 1932 he became chairman of the Board of the Union Pacific Railroad. In 1934 he was appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt as Administrator of the NRA.

Mr. Harriman's entry into the field of the Federal Government was a significant act that would come to affect the lives of millions of people throughout the entire world. For in 1941 he became the defense expeditor in London prior to the passage of the lend lease act in 1941. He was given the rank of Minister. While serving the interests of his country and aiding our soon-to-be allies, he was a part of a joint Anglo-American mission to Russia to discuss lendlease aid to the Soviet Union in 1941. He was one of the first to be involved, along with Prime Minister Churchill, in discussions with Premier Stalin of Russia in regard to a second front. His untiring capacity for hard work also permitted him to serve as representative in London of the combined shipping adjustment board, and he, at the same time, was a member of the London combined production and resources board.

Outstanding honor was conferred on Mr. Harriman when he was appointed ambassador

to Russia October 1, 1943. In 1945 he was sent to Moscow to confer with a committee of Polish factions regarding the Liberation of Poland.

Mr. Harriman was appointed ambassador to England in March, 1946. In September of that year he came home to enter President Truman's cabinet as Secretary of Commerce.

In 1946 he served as United States representative in Paris at the Peace Conference. In June of 1950 he was appointed Special Assistant to President Truman on Foreign Affairs, serving as Special Assistant to Mr. Truman until 1951.

After other services to the Federal Government taking him up to January, 1953, he became a candidate for and was elected Governor of the State of New York in 1954. In 1956 he was an active candidate for the presidential nomination. Mr. Harriman has served his country under every President since Woodrow Wilson, and has been an active contributor to those presidents from the time of Mr. Roosevelt down to and including our present president, Mr. Carter. The relatively dry recitation of the achievements of this man are marvelous to behold and well documented. But they pale somewhat when we consider the moral fiber and those traits of character that bring him to us this evening as our honoree for this award. Let me share with you quotes that come to us from articles and biographies of Mr. Harriman.

I was personally impressed when I read that Mr. Harriman had been born and raised a Republican, and in 1928, under what Mr. Truman and I would probably attribute to divine intervention, he decided to become a Democrat. That year he voted for Al Smith. He knew Franklin Roosevelt as a young man and supported him in his candidacy for President and, as we have noted, became an active part of the New Deal Administration. Of his diplomatic days he has said, and those of us in the field of government can agree with his quotation, "You can't satisfy everyone. You needn't go around with a chip on your shoulder, of course. You must try to get along with as many people as you can. If you find something irreconcilable, you must have a combination of understanding and determination."

He has said "Nations are like human beings. No nation can be respected unless it stands on its moral principles. The principles on which our country is based are respected all over the world. When we live up to them we are respected. When we don't, we lose respect."

Winston Churchill has said of him, "The British trusted him because he was honest with them. There was an enormous sense of purpose among people of all walks of life." Another quote from Mr. Harriman: He was asked which President he felt closest to—"Truman," he said, "because he gave loyalty, and loyalty begets loyalty."

Mr. Harriman has authored several books, among which are "Peace With Russia?", "America and Russia in a Changing World," and, with L. E. Abel, "Special Envoy to Churchill and Stalin, 1941-1946," which I personally recommend to those who have an interest in, or lived through, that period of time. As late as December, 1987, it was necessary for our country to call once more on this great American diplomat, Averell Harriman. He was needed to confer with General Alexander Haig, Jr., Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe. He went to Belgium at the request of President Carter, and while there was recognized by the Belgians for his diplomatic achievements.

From Belgium he returned to the scene of many of his triumphs in Moscow to meet with Soviet leader, Leonid Brezhnev—at the age of 87 still actively serving his country.

It is impossible to recount in the space of time available to us the totality of the achievements of this remarkable man.

Suffice it for me to say then, that stepping

out of the pages of history, Mr. Harriman honors us by receiving the Harry S. Truman Award for Public Service, and we are proud to present to him this statue of Mr. Truman, which symbolizes so much to the citizens of our city, and trust that he understands the great respect and admiration that goes to him along with this award. ●

CONGRESSMAN TONY P. HALL SPEAKS ON NATIONAL MANAGEMENT WEEK

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the National Management Association will be observing "National Management Week in America" during the week of June 3 through June 9.

The National Management Association, which has its headquarters in Dayton, Ohio, is a professional, nonprofit association dedicated to improve the quality and promote unity in management by education and fellowship of more than 58,000 members throughout the United States. Management Week in America is the National Management Association's effort to gain national recognition of management as a profession and to promote the American enterprise system.

I salute the National Management Association on the occasion of National Management Week in America, and wish them well in their activities to promote public awareness of the professional role of management.

This year's national theme is "Opportunity 79." The selection of this theme by the National Management Association is intended to project the positive prospects for continued personal, professional, and association growth. The theme is typical of NMA's dynamic approach to managerial and personal improvement.

During National Management Week, Governors and local officials will issue proclamations to urge concerned citizens, industries, businesses, and professional bodies to actively participate in observing this occasion. I join with the National Management Association in urging the President also to proclaim the week of June 3 as "National Management Week in America."

For the benefit of my colleagues, the proclamation of Management Week in the State of Ohio follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the National Management Association is a professional, non-profit association dedicated to improve the quality and promote unity in management by education and fellowship of more than 58,000 members; and

Whereas, the members of this association in the state of Ohio desire to perform a public service by officially recognizing management as a profession; and

Whereas, during the week of June 3, 1979, these members will join management men and women nationwide to emphasize the role of management in our society, and to

encourage the promotion of our American Enterprise System.

Now, therefore, I James Rhodes, Governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby proclaim June 3-9, 1979 as Management Week in Ohio, and urge all concerned citizens, industries, businesses and professional bodies to actively and appropriately participate in its observance. ●

OMNIBUS SMALL BUSINESS BILL OVERWHELMINGLY APPROVED

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleagues for their overwhelming support for H.R. 4011, the omnibus small business legislation, which passed this House by a vote of 380 to 7 on May 22, 1979.

H.R. 4011 extends several important small business loans programs through fiscal year 1982 and increases Federal subsidies for SBA disaster loans by lowering the interest rates. In addition, one of the successful new SBA programs, the small business development center program, which provides management, technical, and technological assistance to small businesses, is also extended by H.R. 4011 through the end of the 1980 fiscal year.

As a member of the Small Business Committee, which approved this bill by the impressive margin of 25 to 2 on March 1 of this year, it gives me the greatest of pleasure to know that our hard work has resulted in this impressive demonstration of support for this legislation.

H.R. 4011 is similar to the omnibus small business bill that was approved by the House last year by a vote of 310 to 72, was amended by the Senate, and later pocket-vetoed by the President.

In its final version, H.R. 4011 authorizes a total of \$1.6 billion in additional funding for various programs, including primary loan guarantees, natural disaster loans, nonphysical disaster loans, and surety bond guarantees. For fiscal years 1981 and 1982, the additional funding increases to \$1.8 billion and \$1.9 billion respectively. Overall, the 1980 authorization for SBA programs is 10 percent higher than in fiscal year 1979.

Unquestionably, the most important provisions of H.R. 4011 relate to disaster loans for homeowners and small business owners.

For natural disasters occurring between October 1, 1978, and October 1, 1979, the disaster loan interest rates will be lowered from the current cost-of-money rate to 3 percent for homeowners on the first \$55,000 borrowed.

For SBA and Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) business disaster loans, the bill establishes a two-tier system of loans:

Borrowers who are unable to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere could receive a 5-percent interest loan.

Borrowers who are able to obtain credit elsewhere could obtain an SBA or

FmHA loan at a higher interest rate reflecting the cost of money, plus up to 1 percent.

The limit on all such SBA and FmHA business loans would be \$500,000, and the lower interest rates would apply retroactively to disaster loans issued on or before October 1, 1978.

Mr. Speaker, as H.R. 4011 moves on to what I trust will be prompt and favorable conference action, we can all take pride in having demonstrated our overwhelming support for these much-needed funding authorizations and program extensions.●

FEDERAL VALIDATION AND COLLECTION OF ENERGY INFORMATION

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I am today submitting a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Department of Energy must expedite and strengthen its efforts to verify the information it receives, and, if need be, further develop its program so that it may be fully independent of industry statistics.

At this time, the general public does not trust the oil and natural gas producing industry, nor any aspect of the industry including refiners, marketers, and dealers. Much of this distrust may be the result of a lack of understanding of Federal regulations and the industry itself. Many are simply reacting to a painful situation in which long gas lines and high prices for gas and heating fuel must be faced.

I feel that increased efforts to conserve energy as well as the development of alternative sources of energy are strong, although partial steps to solve the energy shortage problem. However, people would be much more willing to conserve if they honestly felt there were a shortage of crude oil. We must determine whether or not there is enough crude oil to refine more gasoline and whether or not there is, in fact, a shortage of crude oil.

I understand that the Energy Information Administration already has broad authority to collect data under the Department of Energy Act of 1977, the Federal Energy Administration Act of 1974, and the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act of 1974 as well as others. It is already beginning to implement a financial reporting system, and it has an Office of Energy Information Validation. These efforts are commendable and on the right track. However, the EIA depends on the industry for much of its information.

It seems to me that the data might have more credibility if the Energy Information Administration were responsible for collecting more raw data rather than depending on the industry for information. Both the American public and the oil industry stand to benefit when the

Federal Government acts as the repository or primary data bank for relevant information relating to energy. An independent data bank would be reassuring to the American people who have become increasingly cynical.

For the convenience of Members and interested persons, I have included the text of the concurrent resolution:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Resolving by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

Whereas, oil, natural gas and refined products made from oil and natural gas are essential to the United States' national interest and the well-being of United States' citizens;

Whereas, the United States faces a shortage in crude oil and refined products, especially gasoline, which threatens the United States' economy;

Whereas, the Department of Energy has the statutory authority to gather extensive information on oil and natural gas reserves, ownership interests in these reserves, drilling of wells, refinery capabilities, actual refinery production, oil company profits, imports, exports or any information needed to formulate energy policy;

Whereas, accurate information is vital to the development of a sound energy policy;

Whereas, the Department of Energy depends on the industry for much of its information;

Whereas, this Congress understands that the Department of Energy has begun a Financial Reporting System and has established an Energy Information Validation Office within the Energy Information Administration;

Whereas, however, the reliability of industry statistics and their efforts to refine available crude oil to produce gasoline are in question;

Now, therefore, be it Resolved, By the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring) that it is the sense of the Congress that the Department of Energy must expedite and strengthen its efforts to verify the information it receives, and, if need be, further develop its program so that it may be fully independent of industry statistics and become the primary information data bank.●

SHUR COLLIDES HEAD-ON WITH HOSPITAL COST CONTAINMENT

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, last week I brought to the attention of my colleagues the results of a survey of hospitals in my congressional district on the anticipated impact of implementing regulations promulgated by HEW—the so-called SHUR system.

The hospitals in the First District of Nebraska estimate an average cost of over \$38,000 per institution to implement SHUR and an average cost of \$54,000 a year to maintain the system. The average prediction for increased cost per day, per patient for both large and small institutions was \$4.

I am sure that if each of my colleagues chose to survey their hospitals they would receive a similar story. The regulations are an accountant's nightmare, and I am convinced they go beyond the intent of the law.

A recent editorial in the Lincoln Journal, one of the major newspapers in my district, summed up the SHUR regulations in its title: "Asking an Inch, Wanting a Mile." These observations from the editorial deserve special note:

There's a great difference between uniform, super-detailed accounting procedures imposed from Washington (which is even more than the Internal Revenue System requires of taxpayers!) and the submission of basic operational information already on the shelf.

That collides headlong with the Carter Administration's quest for cost containment in hospitals, doesn't it? Does the right hand know what the left hand is doing?

Those questions certainly deserve the attention of Congress, particularly as HEW prepares its final regulations.●

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO ASSIST NEIGHBORHOOD GROUPS

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which will enable neighborhood organizations to qualify for special third-class mailing rates. Currently it is extremely difficult for such neighborhood groups to receive the special third-class mailing privilege. This problem was brought to my attention by a neighborhood organization in Baltimore which finally received the special bulk rate mailing privilege only after a difficult year of working with legal counsel.

The problem stems from a contradiction in the Postal regulations, which I am confident this bill will correct. Presently, religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans, and fraternal groups qualify to receive special bulk mailing rates. Neighborhood organizations would seem to fall under either the educational or philanthropic category—especially since the definition of a philanthropic group's activities include: Lessening neighborhood tension and the burdens of government; and combatting community deterioration and juvenile delinquency. These are some of the prime functions of neighborhood organizations, yet further reading of the Postal Service's manual reveals that civic improvement associations are one of the several groups which are exempt from qualifying for the special third-class rate.

When I first started working with my neighbors in Baltimore to protect our community, we joined together to form a neighborhood organization. From those days I know how vital it was to keep all members informed of our efforts and the actions which needed to be taken to accomplish our goals. Most neighborhood organizations are purely voluntary in character and operate with very limited funds. Access to bulk mailing privileges would be very important to them.

Another problem which impedes neighborhood groups from readily receiving the third class mailing rate is their IRS

tax status. The IRS in most cases grants improvement associations—which include neighborhood groups—a 501(c)(4) tax status. The only problem with such a rating is that the Postal Service rarely awards third class mailing rates to groups with such a status. For the most part, the Postal Service automatically awards the majority of 501(c)(3) groups with such mailing rights.

My legislation will simply amend the Postal Service's regulations to include neighborhood organizations in the groups which presently qualify to receive third class bulk mailing rates. I hope that I will receive the support of my colleagues in my effort to correct the existing contradictions in the Postal Service's regulations.●

SAFE OPERATION OF NUCLEAR PLANTS

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill, H.R. 4174, to improve the safe operation of nuclear powerplants. For the past several years, I have been especially concerned over the safety of nuclear energy. The accident at the Three Mile Island Nuclear Powerplant almost 2 months ago has only heightened my concern, and of course the concern of my constituents.

My concern is so great, Mr. Speaker, because the congressional district I represent in eastern Connecticut is beyond doubt one of the most heavily nuclear-oriented districts in the Nation. Mine is a district with three operational nuclear powerplants, and another under construction. Included in the district are a shipyard which builds nuclear-powered submarines, and a company which manufactures nuclear reactor cores. The people of eastern Connecticut have lived in close proximity with nuclear facilities for many years, and understandably the accident at Three Mile Island was a very disturbing development after so many years of assurances that the odds of a nuclear accident occurring were infinitesimal.

The people of Connecticut have come to rely on nuclear power which provides approximately 58 percent of the electric power in the State. But the proximity of nuclear facilities to their homes poses an everpresent potential threat to their safety. At the present time, there are too many unanswered questions about the probability of another major nuclear accident occurring, the long-term effects of low-level radiation, and the hazards of nuclear waste storage and transportation.

I believe that the adoption of H.R. 4174 would do much to improve the safe operation of all nuclear powerplants in the United States, and I would urge my colleagues' careful consideration of its provisions.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that aside from introducing this legislation, I have also called for a moratorium of the is-

suance of new nuclear powerplant construction permits until our concerns over the safety of the entire nuclear fuels cycle have been adequately answered.

The text of H.R. 4174 follows:

H.R. 4174

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 is amended by adding the following new chapter at the end thereof:

"Chapter 21—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO NUCLEAR POWERPLANT SAFETY

"Sec. 311. MANDATORY SUSPENSION OF OPERATION.—

"a. Whenever the Commission determines that—

"(1) there has been—

"(A) an abnormal release of radiation, or

"(B) any other accident involving source material, byproduct material, special nuclear material, or any other radioactive material at any facility which uses any such material for the generation of electric energy (hereinafter referred to in this chapter as a 'nuclear powerplant'),

"(2) there is reason to believe that such release or other accident was caused in whole or in part by any design or mechanical flaw, and

"(3) such release or other accident may endanger public health and safety

the Commission shall order the temporary suspension of operation at each nuclear powerplant licensed by the Commission the design of which is similar to the design of the powerplant at which such release or other accident occurred.

"b. A suspension of operations ordered under this section shall continue in force for such period as the Commission deems necessary to correct the flaw involved or until the Commission determines that the termination of such suspension is otherwise in the public interest.

"c. The license of any nuclear powerplant may be revoked as provided in section 186 upon the failure of the licensee to comply with an order under this subsection and a civil penalty may be imposed with respect to such failure as provided in section 274.

"Sec. 312. COMMISSION INSPECTION REGIONS AND PERSONNEL.—The Commission shall designate inspection regions throughout areas within the United States in which nuclear powerplants are operating. Within each inspection region, the Commission shall assign such number of qualified nuclear powerplant inspectors employed by the Commission as may be necessary to insure that at least one such qualified inspector is on duty at all times at each nuclear powerplant within such region. Such inspectors within each such region shall be rotated among the nuclear powerplants in such region on a regular schedule.

"Sec. 313. EMERGENCY TEAMS; PUBLIC INFORMATION.—

"a. The Commission shall establish one or more teams of qualified engineers, scientists, radiation health experts, and such other qualified personnel as may be necessary to supervise activities involving a nuclear powerplant—

"(1) following any abnormal release or radiation from such powerplant or following any other accident at such powerplant involving any material referred to in section 311 a., or

"(2) during any other emergency at such a powerplant.

Upon the authorization of the Commission, any such team shall have the full legal authority to supervise all activities involving

any nuclear powerplant licensed under this Act for any period specified by the Commission following any release or accident referred to in paragraph (1) or during any other emergency at such powerplant.

"b. Following any release or accident referred to in subsection a. (1), the Commission, acting through the appropriate emergency team, shall inform the public affected or potentially affected by such release or accident of—

"(1) the status and nature of any radiation emissions from such powerplant, and

"(2) any evacuation plans which may be necessary.

"Sec. 314. NUCLEAR POWERPLANT CONTROLLERS; COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS.—

"a. The Commission shall train and employ (subject to title V of the United States Code) such nuclear engineers, technicians, and other personnel as may be necessary to operate nuclear powerplants licensed under this Act.

"b. As soon as practicable following the enactment of this section, the Commission shall require that each nuclear powerplant licensed by the Commission under this Act shall be operated by the employees of the Commission referred to in subsection a. Each licensee shall reimburse the Commission for the costs of training and employment of such employees.

"c. The Commission shall establish a secure communications system to provide for such direct communications as may be necessary between the Commission and individuals operating each nuclear powerplant licensed by the Commission under this Act.

"Sec. 315. QUALIFICATIONS OF PERSONNEL.—The Commission shall establish standards (including qualifications regarding training) for personnel employed by the Commission, or by any licensee, who are involved in the operation of any nuclear powerplant. Following establishment of such standards, no person may be assigned by the Commission to perform any duty at any nuclear powerplant unless such person meets such requirements and no person to whom such requirements apply may be employed by any licensee to perform any service at such a powerplant unless such person meets such standards.

"Sec. 316. STATE EMERGENCY PLANS.—

"a. Each State in which there is located any nuclear powerplant licensed by the Commission may submit to the Commission a State nuclear powerplant emergency plan which sets forth the actions which the State, and political subdivisions of such State, will undertake in the event of any accident at a nuclear powerplant in such State.

"b. No license may be issued or renewed by the Commission after the date of the enactment of this section for the construction or operation of a nuclear powerplant in any State unless such State has submitted a State nuclear powerplant emergency plan to the Commission and the Commission approves such plan.

"c. No State or local government or individual in any State in which there is located one or more nuclear powerplants shall be eligible to receive any Federal assistance with respect to any disaster under any provision of law authorizing disaster relief of any kind after the date one year after the date of the enactment of this section unless such State has submitted a State nuclear powerplant emergency plan to the Commission and such plan has been approved by the Commission.

"Sec. 317. RADIATION MONITORING NEAR POWERPLANTS.—The Commission shall conduct continuous monitoring for radiation in the environment within a 15-mile radius of each nuclear powerplant licensed under this Act.

"Sec. 318. CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION.—For purposes of determining whether or not the construction of nuclear powerplants is in

compliance with the requirements imposed pursuant to this Act, the Commission shall carry out an inspection and evaluation program concerning the construction of such powerplants. In carrying out such program, the Commission shall utilize only personnel employed by the Commission."

(b) The table of contents for such Act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"Chapter 21. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO NUCLEAR POWERPLANT SAFETY

"Sec. 311. Mandatory suspension of operations.

"Sec. 312. Commission inspection regions and personnel.

"Sec. 313. Emergency teams; public information.

"Sec. 314. Nuclear powerplant controllers; communications systems.

"Sec. 315. Qualifications of personnel.

"Sec. 316. State emergency plans.

"Sec. 317. Radiation monitoring near powerplants.

"Sec. 318. Construction inspection."

SEC. 2. Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission shall submit to the Congress a report containing a comprehensive plan for the safe disposal or storage of—

(1) spent fuel from nuclear powerplants licensed under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and

(2) other radioactive material associated with such powerplants.●

FARM WATER ACT OF 1979

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 21, I joined with my colleague, GUNN MCKAY of Utah, our distinguished minority leader, JOHN RHODES of Arizona, and several other Members of this House in the sponsorship of H.R. 4148, a bill to modernize the Reclamation Act of 1902.

This legislation was made necessary by the action of the Secretary of the Interior in his promulgation of regulations in August 1977, which represented another major engagement in the Carter administration's war on the West.

I have also cosponsored legislation by Mr. STUMP of Arizona, H.R. 160, a bill which would completely abolish acreage limitations applicable to land subject to reclamation law. It is my preference that all such limits be removed, so that Government hindrance of efficient agricultural production might be somewhat lessened. H.R. 4148, while less broad in scope than Mr. STUMP's bill, is nevertheless a major step in the right direction. Should Congress not see fit to abolish acreage limitations, then the least that can be done is to broaden the limits and reform requirements to the realities of present-day farming.

In grappling with the issue of reclamation law reform, there are two or three basic issues which stand out.

One of these is whether the Federal Government should tell our farmers where they should live, or how long they should live on the farm, or when they

can move to some other State to enjoy their retirement. There used to be a residency requirement for public assistance programs, but the Supreme Court said that was illegal. Now the Department of the Interior wants to impose a residency requirement on American farmers. This requirement is just as wrong.

Another issue is whether the Federal Government should stand by its word, or whether the Secretary of the Interior can do as they do in some totalitarian countries and simply decree that contracts entered into by the Department of the Interior are null and void. In essence, if the citizen affected by this highhanded action wants to get relief, he is told he must go to the Court of Claims—and how many individuals have the money to sue the U.S. Government?

And finally, there is also the issue of whether American farmers should be told how big a farm they can operate. Reclamation law now provides for a limitation on how much water can be put on land under a single ownership. Those who want water for more land can get it for their additional land, provided they agree to sell the excess land within 10 years. This would cause the breaking up of many land holdings. In California, we have found larger parcels of land to be more efficient units of production, and the 1902 limit of 160 acres to be very much out of date.

The Department of the Interior, as well as some of the legislation that has been introduced, would establish a farm size limitation by prohibiting the ownership or leasing of land above a certain size. If this occurs, farmers in reclamation projects will be denied basic property rights to which all other Americans are entitled.

The Farm Water Act of 1979 addresses all of these issues in a way which preserves the basic purposes of the Reclamation Act, but also recognizes the rights of the American people. I am hopeful that either this act, or H.R. 160, will become law in 1979.

Mr. Speaker, the Farm Water Alliance has written a clear and concise summary of the Farm Water Act which I would like to share with my colleagues:

FARM WATER ACT OF 1979

A BILL

The enacting clause of the Farm Water Bill of 1979, specifies that the Act would amend and supplement the acreage limitation and residency provisions of the federal reclamation laws, which are comprised primarily of the Reclamation Act of 1902 and the Omnibus Adjustment Act of 1926.

PREAMBLE

Section 2 states the purpose of the Act: to encourage and preserve viable farm operations in reclamation project areas. The Act places reasonable restrictions on federal project water recipients in return for the use of the public investment. This section recognizes that all taxpayers contribute to project costs and that none should be barred from the opportunity to share the benefits.

DEFINITIONS

Section 3 defines certain terms used throughout the Act.

VALIDATION

Section 4 stipulates that all federal written representations, rulings, opinions relating to the acreage limitation provisions upon which districts and land owners have previously re-

lled, will remain in effect—providing for consistency and fairness in government.

ACREAGE LIMITATION AND EQUIVALENCY

Section 5 increases the ownership limit on land eligible to receive project water to 320 acres in each water district—acknowledging the economic and technological changes that have occurred since the 160 acreage limit was set in 1902. A second major thrust of this section introduces an equivalency concept allowing areas with lower productivity potential, due to such factors as geology, crop economics and climate, to receive water on more than the 320 owned acres. This provision emphasizes fair application of the federal benefits to the users. A third aspect of this section preserves present law by allowing lenders that acquire property by foreclosure to sell within a five-year period without government price approval.

APPLICATION OF ACREAGE LIMITATION

Section 6 defines certain exemptions from federal reclamation law. Introduces a payout plan that gives reclamation districts the opportunity to repay the public investment in full or in periodic payments with interest, thereby relieving the land within the district from acreage limitations. Exempts from acreage limitations land that receives 25% or less of its irrigation needs from project water.

Also exempts from acreage limitations, depending on water sources, certain lands including: those receiving water from temporary projects; those within U.S. Army Corps of Engineers projects; lands on which water is merely diverted or regulated by project facilities; and lands receiving project water unavoidably through seepage, deep percolation or ground water recharges.

The water rates and contract costs would be determined in accordance with generally accepted utility rate-making standards.

CERTIFICATION

Section 7 concerns projects for which the public investment has been repaid, and provides for a certificate that can be recorded for lands within those projects, declaring that they are free of the acreage limitations.

WATER EQUIVALENCY

Section 8 provides that if less than 25% of the total irrigation supply of water to a tract is supplemental project water, the basic entitlement of 320 acres can be increased in proportion of the decreasing supply of project water. It allows more acres if less than 25% of project water is needed to complete a farm supply.

EXCESS LAND CONTRACTS

Section 9 stipulates provisions under which owners of land in excess of the 320 acreage limitation can receive project water, and provision under which excess lands can be sold. Those provisions include the private property owner's right to select the buyer and to sell the excess land at its fair market value, without reference to project water. Also, this section provides that for lands held in excess of 320 acres, project water can be delivered if a recordable contractor for the sale of the land has been executed under reclamation law. Upon disposition of excess lands, the Act further stipulates that the seller can retain rights to the property for non-agricultural purposes; and provides an extension of the ten-year recordable contract in which excess land must be sold, for the period that sales are not permitted either administratively or by court order.

ANTI-SPECULATION

Section 10 prevents land speculation in reclamation areas by removing the opportunity, under present law, for a buyer to purchase at the low, government approved price and resell immediately at the higher market value. This section prevents windfall profits to speculators and abuses of the federal benefit by requiring that landowners retain the property within a family

for ten years before selling it for anything more than cost plus an inflation allowance. Lack of compliance makes the land ineligible to receive project water.

RESIDENCY NOT REQUIRED

Section 11 amends the acreage limitation and repeals the outdated requirement of the 1902 Act (which was ignored in the 1926 Act) that required homes to be located in the neighborhood of the farm receiving project water. This section frees the private property owner from a government edict as to where the owner must reside.

APPLICATION

Section 12 specifies that the Act applies both to existing and future federal reclamation projects and stipulates that any exemptions or modifications of acreage limitations previously afforded will be honored by this Act.

CONSENT TO SUE

Section 13 grants landowners and other entities contracting with the federal government for project water the right to bring the United States of America into court for purposes of resolving conflicts in reclamation law—thereby helping to insure the integrity of government action.

CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT

Section 14 restates certain language existing in federal reclamation law that is consistent with the Act concerning the maintenance and enhancement of the fiscal integrity of federal water projects.●

A GOOD CHOICE TO HELP THE WORLD'S CHILDREN

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the announcement this past weekend that United Nations Secretary General Kurt Waldheim is appointing James P. Grant of the United States as the next Executive Director of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF).

Jim Grant is well-known to many Members of this Congress. For the past decade he has been President of the Overseas Development Council, a nonprofit research and public education institute concerned with the economic and social problems confronting developing countries and the importance of these countries to the United States in an increasingly interdependent world. Mr. Grant was previously a Deputy Assistant Secretary of State and Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development. He is also a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation, a founding board member of New Directions, vice president of the Society for International Development, and, by appointment of President Carter, U.S. representative to the Executive Board of UNICEF.

Under Jim Grant's leadership, the Overseas Development Council has been an indispensable contributor to American understanding of global development problems and to the ability of this Congress, and the executive branch as well, to make reasoned and informed decisions on U.S. policy affecting the developing world, and, indeed, the ability of legislators, administrators, and other leaders throughout the world and in in-

ternational agencies to better do their jobs of improving the condition of life for poor people everywhere.

Notably among ODC's more recent contributions are the physical quality of life index (PQLI) and disparity reduction rate (DRR) index, which for the first time offer practical measurements of life quality and of society's progress in reducing the disparity between the world's rich and poor.

On January 1 of next year Jim Grant will be leaving the circles of U.S. research and policy proposition, and returning to the world of day-to-day responsibility of implementing his ideas and making the most of the world's all-too-meager resources devoted to making life a little more fair and a little more promising for the nearly 1 billion people who live in abject poverty, and particularly, for the hundreds of millions of children who today see all-too-little hope of a secure and satisfying future.

There is no better place for Jim Grant to be able to translate his thoughts into action. UNICEF is one of the oldest of the United Nations family of people-assistance organizations. It is surely one of the most effective, and continues to enjoy the respect and affection not only of the millions of children and parents who have been assisted by it, but also by the millions of individual citizens who have contributed to it with the confidence of knowing that their pennies and dimes and dollars are indeed going to help a child to be nourished by milk, warmed by a blanket, or protected by an immunization.

Secretary General Waldheim's appointment of Jim Grant, an American, is a fitting reminder to all Americans in this International Year of the Child that we have a lot to contribute, and a lot to do, to transmit to all children a world less plagued by hunger, disease, and violence, and more beautiful and promising for all. I know all my colleagues in the House join in wishing James Grant a most successful tenure as executive director of the United Nations Children's Fund.●

THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, in just a few days, Memorial Day for 1979 will be here. All of us across the Nation will pause and remember loved ones and friends who came to the defense of our country in days passed. Recently, I came upon this writing by Clement A. Tamraz. It holds a special meaning for us on Memorial Day. It is entitled "The Unknown Soldier."

The material follows:

THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

He visited me in my reveries in the caressing melancholy of the warm evening and said, . . .

"It's been so long and so lonely since the day I left home. I dwell forever alone in the infinite realm of your tranquil mind, warmed only by your affection. Yes, ol' Buddy, if you are proud of what I was, then I am proud of what I am . . . your Unknown Soldier."

"If you forget me, I lose the immortal part of myself. I made self-sacrifice an infinite virtue when I gave my life for yours. Though your aching soul did not escape the tyranny of consuming anguish, I like to feel your sorrows are watered with dew of gratitude. If your heart does not persuade you to remember me, let not the words of any man. Yours, then, will be an unquiet soul."

"My commission was not to reason of the deeds, but do them; and I made you heir of my reward for precious deeds nobly done, richly won. I saved you from the terrifying villainy of your abysmal fears, and even the harmony of your peace was tuned by my fingers. You prayed for peace but I paid for it. Remember this: The chronicle of my attainments is the true history of our nation. Teach it that way."

"I hold all the attributes to majesty, for there is no rank higher than mine; and this exclusive honor enshrouds my unwearied spirit with celestial dignities becoming to my estate. I stand alone, none higher, or not at all."

"I never said 'Goodbye,' for I still dwell in all my Buddies' sighs and in the burning tears of every mother's eyes. Though it's been so long and so lonely, as God is my judge, I shall remain faithfully, forever and ever . . . your Unknown Soldier."●

CONGRESSMAN BILL BONER TESTIFIES IN SUPPORT OF CLEAR CHANNEL BROADCASTING AND THE GRAND OLE OPRY

HON. WILLIAM HILL BONER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to testimony I delivered before the House Communications Subcommittee on May 17, 1979:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM H. BONER

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I thank you for the opportunity to appear today to voice my strong support for the preservation of clear channel radio broadcasting.

As the Congressman representing the Nashville, Tennessee, home of the Grand Ole Opry and clear channel station WSM, I have introduced H.R. 1913, which has been referred to this subcommittee for consideration.

This legislation would prohibit the duplication of station assignments on the Class 1-A clear channel frequencies. In effect, H.R. 1913 would block implementation of the regulations now pending before the FCC that would limit the coverage of the nation's 25 clear channel stations to either 100 or 750 miles. To date, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to report that 44 of our House colleagues have cosponsored this bill.

I would like to speak briefly about the potential economic impact of the FCC clear channel cutback on Nashville's economy. Let me begin by explaining that the Grand Ole Opry is our city's primary tourist attraction, drawing millions of visitors to Nashville each year to see top country entertainers.

The major inducement for top name performers to appear at the Opry is the nationwide exposure they receive over WSM. The FCC's suggested clear channel cutback would eliminate this inducement and make it far more difficult for the Opry to attract the best entertainers it now features on a regular basis.

The inevitable result of a deterioration in the Opry's performances would be a gradual decline in interest and attendance, which in turn would adversely affect Nashville's vital tourist industry. As you can see, the FCC

proposal has the very real potential of destroying a unique American institution and causing economic hardships for one of our nation's great cities—Nashville.

Of course, reducing WSM's coverage to 100 miles would also be a terrible disservice to millions of Americans who tune in WSM each Friday and Saturday night for a type of entertainment available nowhere else in the world. I am sure I join the Chairman and members of the subcommittee in looking forward to testimony to be delivered in a few minutes by Minnie Pearl, whose name is synonymous with the Grand Ole Opry.

Mr. Chairman, the destruction of clear channel broadcasting would be even more heartbreaking because it is so unnecessary. I call your attention to a far more effective and comprehensive alternative open to the FCC. That is the narrowing of the space between frequency assignments on the AM band from 10 to 9 kilohertz. This would create 12 new AM frequencies. These would make room on the airwaves for many hundreds of new stations, while at the same time making available frequencies to which existing daytime stations could move to broadcast 24-hours a day, yield a maximum of only 125 new stations, while providing no relief whatever for daytimers. I hope the 9 kilohertz idea will be given careful consideration by the subcommittee as it searches for ways to encourage better service to the listening public by local broadcasters. I am confident the subcommittee will conclude that the 9 kilohertz plan is vastly superior to cutting back the clear channels.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude by urging the subcommittee not to let the final decision on the clear channel issue rest in the hands of the FCC. This agency has not shown itself to be responsive to the best interests of the American people, as its clear channel regulations demonstrate.

I hope that Congress will be given the ultimate authority in this matter. If the FCC is directed by Congress to solve the problem of enabling daytimers to broadcast fulltime, then Congress should reserve the last word for itself. I suggest a 60 day period in which either the House or Senate could veto whatever solutions the FCC proposes.

In broadcasting matters, as in virtually every other area, I believe strongly that we must stop allowing unresponsive federal agencies to make decisions that we in Congress, the elected representatives of the people, should be making ourselves.

Again, I thank you for the opportunity to appear before you this afternoon.●

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE FIRST CONCURRENT BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR FISCAL 1980

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, the House resoundingly rejected the conference report on the first budget resolution for 1980.

My good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and others were right on target in stating that the conference did not adequately reflect the actions of the House when on May 14, after 2 weeks of extensive debate and 25 rollcalls, we initially approved the resolution.

Today we were confronted with a conference agreement which provided \$1.9 billion more for military spending than

the resolution this House approved on May 14 and—incredibly—\$1.8 billion less for education, training, employment, and social services.

When the House version of the budget resolution was approved on May 14, I was not particularly proud of our work. Repeatedly, during those 2 weeks of debate, cut after cut was made in the name of "anti inflation," in services which are vitally needed by the poor, and by low- and moderate-income persons. I felt the budget we approved for domestic programs was unnecessarily restrictive. But, the conference version was even worse.

Education programs had been cut further, including title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Head Start, and student financial aid. Employment and training programs, including CETA public service jobs, had been seriously cut. Health care programs had been cut. Nutrition for the elderly, housing programs, and many other critical human needs programs had been meat-axed.

The only area that escaped severe cuts was military spending. Despite the will of this House, which repeatedly voted down amendments to increase military spending during our many days of debate, the conference report came before us with a \$1.9 billion increase in military spending.

Not only did the conference report fail to reflect the will of the House, but more importantly, the priorities were misplaced. Undue and unjustified cuts had been made in conference in vitally needed human needs programs, while military spending was increased.

The Federal budget is supposed to represent the goals and priorities of our Nation. It has even been said that the budget is the conscience of America. Yet, when you looked at the conference report, you could only scratch your head and wonder if that budget was truly addressing the needs of our Nation.

With the kinds of cuts that had been made, the conference report would have shortchanged the people least able to help themselves in the constant battle against inflation—the poor, the elderly, the low- and moderate-income wage earners, and residents of densely populated urban areas.

The conference report on the budget, if it had been adopted, would have necessitated cutbacks of essential services for important domestic programs without any noticeable reduction in inflation. In that form, the budget was unacceptable and I commend my colleagues who joined me in rejecting the conference report by a resounding vote of 260 to 144.●

ALTERNATIVES TO THE AMERICAN CAR

HON. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, with each passing day of long lines at the gas station and higher prices once you reach the pump, the American people are be-

coming more disgusted at our dependence on gasoline-powered automobiles. The current energy situation has taught us that we had better start taking a serious look at long-range alternatives to the American car.

We are now faced with the reality that there is only a finite amount of petroleum in the world, and transportation accounts for about half of the oil consumed in this country. In recent weeks, Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams has called for the "reinvention of the car" so we can have safe and fuel efficient transportation in this country. One option in this area is the potential use of electric vehicles, and to me, the development and use of practical electric cars is an obvious response to our dwindling petroleum reserves.

It was with unusual foresight that the Congress passed the Electric Vehicle Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1976. This act provided a starting point for administrative coordination of electric vehicle development, practical demonstration, and production incentive. We must continue to encourage the development and utilization of electric vehicles, and in this regard, I commend to my colleagues a bill by Congressman TOM CORCORAN which would allow electric vehicles to be included in the computation of corporate average fuel economy standards. This measure, which I, along with five others, have cosponsored, would provide a much needed incentive for the private manufacture of a large number of electric vehicles.

I recently had the pleasure of a test ride in General Electric's new subcompact electric car—the Centennial Electric. This four passenger test vehicle is a completely new design which utilizes components and battery systems not previously available. Although this is just an experimental vehicle—intended to show the strengths and weaknesses of the current technology—the electric car seems ready-made for stop-and-go urban driving. This car has a range of between 50 and 70 miles, and how many Americans—how many just in the Washington area—commute to work every day over distances such as these? Also, Mr. Speaker, about 11 million vehicles on the road today are second cars or delivery trucks used primarily for stop-and-go short-trip driving.

More research must be done so that electric vehicles can prove their worth to the American people. It must be shown that electric cars can compete with conventional cars in areas such as safety, reliability, and comfort. General Electric's test car is assisting in this effort. The Centennial Electric is billed as a laboratory on four wheels, and after riding in this laboratory, I am convinced that electric cars can compete with gasoline-powered models in the very near future.

The car I rode in was a front wheel-drive, and it was powered by 18 six-volt lead-acid batteries. It has a range of 75 miles at a constant speed of 40 miles per hour, and it can cruise comfortably at 55 miles per hour. Of course it is almost completely silent and has no pollution,

and after riding in it, I can assure you it has the "feel" of a conventional car.

However, Mr. Speaker, as a recent General Accounting Office report indicates, there are many improvements that need to be made before electric vehicles will be widely accepted. The biggest barrier to successful commercialization of electric cars is that they cost more than conventional cars. In this regard, I introduced legislation today which will encourage Americans to buy electric cars once they are available on the market. This measure provides a tax credit—similar to the credit available for insulating a home—of up to \$300 for the purchase of an on-the-road electric vehicle.

Our Nation's energy problems are not going to go away in the near future; there are no simple, easy answers for the short run. I believe the electric car provides hope for our long-term energy needs, and I urge my colleagues to consider this most logical alternative.●

PANAMA: A REAL ESTATE DEAL

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post published this morning an editorial dealing with the Panama Canal implementing legislation.

As the chairman of the MCPL Task Force on Panama Canal, I feel that this article depicts very well how certain Members have come to regard the Panama Canal Treaty. Further, it continues to show how this perception of an immense real estate deal has confused the issues, and if it is perpetuated, might jeopardize our interests which are now secure under the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues, and I insert it into the RECORD:

PANAMA: A REAL ESTATE DEAL

One thing you can say about the Panama Canal debate: No snap decisions are being made. The United States is now deep into its second decade of deliberations on its relationship with this small and (but for the accident of the canal) not overwhelmingly significant little Central American bend in the road. Panama stands at the head of a kind of pe/re index: more political energy may have been expended per square inch of real estate in Panama than in any other place.

The congressional debate has had, of course, various stages. Many thought and hoped that the stage culminating in the Senate's ratification of the Panama Canal treaties last year would be the last. But this was not to be. Yet another stage has arrived in which the canal is being perceived not as an instrument of the American destiny or as a vital link in commerce or defense or as the object of diplomacy but rather as the subject of a real estate deal.

To understand this you have only to look at the proceedings in the House, which is balking at enacting the legislation needed to put the treaties into effect—legislation to care for the rights of the American workers in the Canal Zone, to pay for the costs of continuing to defend the canal and so on. The treaties, duly ratified, are now law. Almost everyone in the House except the will-

fully obtuse accepts that. A great many fantasizers in that august body, however, wish either to renegotiate the terms of the treaties under the guise of passing legislation to implement them, or to make the implementation legislation so burdensome that the Panamanians will say "no" and perhaps commit some act of violence that will serve as pretext for the United States to suspend the treaties.

Whether the resisters in the House are doing this out of loyalty to their own and their unreconstructed constituents' views about the canal, or out of resentment at having seen the Senate monopolize the action so far, or for some other reason, should make several good books. The point now is that the resisters are in full cry, having almost ditched the required legislation in a vote last week, and the substance of their resistance comes down to their perception of the treaties as, in the words of one of them, Rep. George Hansen (R-Idaho), "an immense real estate deal."

All right, let us grant the point. The canal involves a lot more than a real estate deal but it involves that, too. If the reservations of Mr. Hansen and his colleagues are to be overcome, as they must be overcome to prevent heavy damage to the United States' continued efficient use of the canal, to American diplomacy and to the Constitution of the United States, then these reservations must be met. Simply put, the Hansen thesis is that Panama, which is taking over a valuable property built up by the United States, should pay for it. He has in mind some billions of dollars which the treaties, he accurately points out, fail to recapture. Well, why not?

The first reason is, or should be, obvious. The deal has already been made—in the treaty already negotiated, already ratified, irrevocably bound to transfer the zone to Panama come Oct. 1 regardless of anything the House does.

The second reason is that, in the eyes of the Carter administration and its predecessors and of the U.S. Senate (and, for those who care, of Panama), the deal was and is fair. The United States has had the use of the property for 70 years, on terms that, if not altered, unquestionably jeopardized the American interest in the canal. Under the new treaties, the United States will enjoy continued use of the property, under terms that Panamanians condone and have a stake in making work.

In brief, even if the Panama debate is reduced to an argument over real estate, the United States comes out handsomely. It is not, finally, with the resisters' politics that one must quarrel. It is with their real estate acumen.●

EUGENE BANDAY—PRESIDENT,
WILMINGTON JAYCEES 1978-79

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, since its inception, the Jaycees organization in Wilmington, Calif., has been a strong and positive force in the south bay area. In addition to its involvement in community betterment activities, it has been the inspiring and talent-developing catalyst that has produced numerous leaders who now help manage the affairs of our private and public institutions throughout southern California.

The 12 months ending May 31, 1979, have not been an exception. During this

period, the south bay community has witnessed a continuation of the Jaycees' long-standing tradition of community service and leadership training.

At this time, I would like to join in marking this past year of success by briefly highlighting the life and accomplishments of an individual who was instrumental in making this past year a memorable one, out going Jaycees President Eugene Banday.

Perhaps one reason for Eugene's success is his wide experience and knowledge with life in the harbor area. He gained this as he grew up and was educated in the local community. Eugene attended Wilmington's Banning High School and the local Los Angeles Harbor College before enrolling in Whittier College. There, he earned his bachelor of science degree. Throughout his educational career, he participated in school sports, joining tennis and football teams.

His involvement with the Jaycees is a long one. He joined the organization in 1969 and later moved to the positions of secretary and vice president before becoming president. His dedication and contributions to the group won him the Outstanding Chairman; Spoke; and Spark Plug Awards. Most notable of his accomplishments are his direction of youth programs, including the Jaycees youth employment program and Mayor Tom Bradley's summer youth program. By these job creating initiatives he helped provide immediate income opportunities for area youth and the on-the-job experience necessary for gaining future permanent employment.

Expressions of appreciation and congratulations should be bestowed where they are due. In this case, out-going Jaycees President Eugene Banday is deserving of both. My wife, Lee, joins me in offering this salute to an individual of merit. We wish him and also his father and mother, Lucilo and Josie Banday, a future of continued prosperity and happiness.●

TRIBUTE TO BISHOP ISSENMANN

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Ms. OAKAR. May 27, 1979 marks the 25th anniversary of Bishop Clarence George Isenmann's consecration as bishop. Bishop Isenmann served more than half of his tenure as Bishop in the Archdiocese of Cleveland, my life-long home. It gives me great pleasure to pay tribute to Bishop Isenmann and his many contributions, both to the community of greater Cleveland and to the community of greater Christian thought.

Although Bishop Isenmann has had positive and effective impact throughout the State of Ohio, I am most familiar with his numerous accomplishments in the greater Cleveland area. Bishop Isenmann's duration of service in Cleveland saw the establishment of three Catholic high schools, renovations of older classrooms, a diocesan department

of mental retardation, a deaf and hearing center and a rehabilitation center. Bishop Issenmann was an instrumental figure in the building of St. Augustine Manor, which is a nursing home, as well as a primary agent in the formation of the Commission on Catholic Community Action. Additionally, the Bishop was responsible for the establishment of San Juan Batista Parish, specifically designed for Spanish speaking Catholics. The diocesan Spanish Mission office and the Martin de Porres Center were erected during the Bishop's tenure.

Bishop Issenmann's broad range of concern embraced not only the Christian development of the mind and soul, but also granted equal consideration to social matters, both within the confines of the church structure and for society in general. For example, the Bishop oversaw the final stages of the opening of the Matt Talbot Inn, a home for alcoholics. He established the Priests' Senate, Clergy Personnel Board, Senate of Religious Women, parish councils and deanery reorganization; all direct results of Vatican II.

Bishop Issenmann has enriched the lives of thousands of individuals during his religious career. His devotion and dedication to christian principles has most assuredly been actualized in his concrete accomplishments. I am honored for the opportunity to make public my personal appreciation for the efforts and contributions of Bishop Clarence George Issenmann. ●

GROWING ENERGY PAINS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

HON. JAMES WEAVER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, before long, this Congress will have to come to grips with a very important regional energy issue, that of energy planning in the Pacific Northwest. We will determine how that region will plan its energy future, how aggressively it moves on energy conservation and renewable energy sources, and whether the anadromous fish will continue to suffer at the hands of the power planners.

On April 2, the Environmental Study Conference published an excellent fact-sheet, "Growing Energy Pains in the Pacific Northwest," by Sherry Howman. I would recommend it to all my colleagues:

GROWING ENERGY PAINS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

(By Sherry Howman)

A potentially explosive energy problem in the Pacific Northwest has been brewing for some time, and Congress now is being pressed to defuse it.

The problem is that the Bonneville Power Administration, the federal power marketing agency that provides half of the region's electricity, can no longer keep up with growing energy demand in the region and supply all its customers—industry and public and private utilities—with its cheap hydroelectric power.

BPA has joined with industry, utilities and many members of Congress from the region in asking Congress to act, and to act soon.

Although the problem is a regional one, the course that Congress takes in solving it could have major implications for the rest of the country.

The Crunch: BPA already has cut off or promises to cut off power to the private utilities and industry. And it even has warned the public utilities, which by law have preference over everyone else, that it will not be able to supply all their needs after 1983.

The agency is attempting to figure out how to allocate the remaining power after 1983. But Bonneville calls developing such an allocation plan almost pointless because it will be slapped with years' worth of lawsuits once the plan comes out, and during that time, the utilities still will not know their situation.

The only solution, BPA contends, is through legislation that will lay out an entirely new scheme for generating and allocating power.

Jackson Bill: Sen. Jackson (D-Wash.) introduced a comprehensive bill on the issue last year and is expected to re-introduce the same bill or an amended version within the next few weeks. Jackson would give BPA the authority to purchase power and implement conservation measures, and he would set up a new, more open, process for making energy decisions in the region. His bill also expands the preference clause.

But Jackson's bill is only the starting point. Amendments from the various interests in the region have been circulating on the Hill for weeks, and Jackson's bill is expected to be changed considerably during markup. Public utilities, for example, want to make sure they do not lose out on any preference benefits.

Environmentalists, who have the support of some members such as Rep. Weaver (D-Ore.), are outraged in particular at the purchasing authority section of Jackson's bill, which says that once BPA contracts with a utility for power from a proposed plant, it must buy the output even if the plant never works. That amounts to a federal guarantee and subsidy to the utilities, environmentalists say, and will encourage overbuilding of nuclear plants.

Instead they want much stronger conservation measures, something that Weaver plans to include in a bill of his own.

Some members who are not from the region worry about the possible implications for the rest of the country. The preference clause expansion and the purchasing section, as well as other questionable precedents, could be copied by the four other federal power marketing administrations.

On the other hand, some members say Bonneville could set a positive national example for the rest of the country for renewable resources, conservation technologies, and innovative rate structures and decision-making processes.

BACKGROUND

The problem before Congress centers on the Bonneville Power Administration and the future energy needs of BPA's service area—Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana west of the Continental Divide. BPA is the federal agency that sells and distributes inexpensive hydropower from the many federal dams in the Northwest.

In selling power, BPA by law has to give first preference to public, or consumer-owned, utilities. Once their demand is met, BPA can sell the surplus to industry and private, investor-owned utilities.

Public and private utilities serve both residential and industrial customers. Some industries, notably the huge aluminum companies, are served directly by Bonneville and are often referred to as direct-service industries, or DSIs.

Until the late 1960s, Bonneville was able to meet the demands of all three classes of customers—public and private utilities and industry. But then it became apparent that there would not be enough energy to go

around because of population growth and industrial expansion.

BPA started cutting back on private utilities because of shortages, forcing them to start investing in expensive nuclear and coal, or thermal, power plants.

By 1973, BPA had almost totally cut the private utilities off. Their rates shot up, while the public utility customers still enjoyed the cheap federal power. In fact, these customers have the nation's lowest priced electricity and a per capita electricity consumption twice the national average.

Unfortunately, the distribution of cheap and expensive power is very uneven. The burden of the more expensive power falls on Oregon, Idaho and Western Montana residents, which are served mainly by private utilities, while Washington gets the cheaper power through its mostly public utilities.

Regional War: The result has been a rising tension in the region, pitting neighbor against neighbor, pushing them to what has been characterized as the "brink of a regional civil war."

A Bonneville spokesman painted a bleak picture: some people live within sight of a federal hydroelectric plant, know that the power is cheap and have to pay rates that are two and three times that—all because a state or utility district boundary line puts that power off-limits.

They pay federal taxes but cannot get the benefit of a federally built plant, and some are faced with rate increases of up to 20 percent a year for every year in the foreseeable future.

The situation has caused many to seek ways to get the cheaper power, notwithstanding the fact that BPA's amount of power is fixed.

Going Public: About the only way to get the cheap power is to make oneself eligible under the preference clause, which means forming a public body or cooperative. The most prominent effort is the state of Oregon's recent formation of a Domestic and Rural Power Authority. Such a changeover may not be as advantageous as it would seem, though, because the new public body would have to buy the local distribution system in order to get the power delivered. The cost of buying the system from the private utility owner could run into millions of dollars, which could easily make up the difference the group is trying to save by going public in the first place.

And further complicating the picture is that BPA says it cannot guarantee its energy supply past 1983 even for its current preference customers. Already it has had to ask for voluntary cutbacks during this past winter's cold spells.

Thus, if any new public bodies are formed, they will not have a guaranteed source of power for any length of time, and they do not know how BPA will divide up the remaining amount of power.

Industries too—particularly energy-intensive aluminum, which originally located in the Northwest because of its cheap power—are feeling the crunch because BPA has said it will not be able to renew their contracts, forcing them to turn to more expensive power just as the private utilities had to do in the early 1970s. Their long-term contracts with BPA will start running out in 1981.

BPA right now is working out an allocation scheme for dividing up its remaining power after 1983. But most sources agree that no matter what BPA does there will be lawsuit upon lawsuit brought by groups unhappy with its decisions, carried right up to the Supreme Court if necessary.

Since Bonneville markets about 50 percent of all the region's power, and owns 80 percent of the transmission lines, it is the most logical entity to coordinate a regionalized effort to solve the problem. BPA also happens to be a federal institution, so it must come to Congress to make major changes.

In particular, BPA wants authority to purchase additional power and to implement

conservation programs. Such legislative authority, says BPA's administrator, "should enable us to act in time and diminish if not end the argument over who is to be served how much federal power and who has to be left without."

THE ISSUES

Conservation: Under Jackson's bill, as well as the companion House bill of last year, conservation was emphasized. BPA for the first time would be authorized to implement conservation programs, and it would be required to exploit all feasible conservation methods before buying new power. Then it could turn to renewable resources such as wind, solar and wood waste, and only as a last resort would it be authorized to buy nuclear or coal power.

Purchase "Guarantee": Environmentalists in general have no problem with giving BPA conservation authority, although they do say that Bonneville could have been doing a lot more than it has been under existing authority.

What they do have a problem with is the part on buying coal and nuclear power.

Under last year's bill, once BPA contracted with a utility to buy its power, the agency would be bound to pay for a set amount of power, even if that power never materialized. With such a "guarantee," utilities would be able to get more favorable financing terms. The risk of investing in a new plant would be spread over all the region's customers instead of just one utility because BPA would add the costs into its overall rates.

This "dry hole" provision is a subsidy to the utilities and would encourage overbuilding, environmentalists say, when what the region really needs is a more stringent conservation effort.

Utilities answer that overbuilding would not result because BPA would not contract for the power unless certain stipulations are met, such as that the new plant must fit in with the regional power plan, which is done in consultation with the public, and must be efficient, economic and reliable. If the plant does not meet those standards, BPA would not agree to buy the power.

BPA and the utilities also say that the contracts are similar to all such financing agreements. If you get a mortgage to pay for a new house and the house burns down, that does not obviate your obligation to pay off the mortgage, one BPA spokesman relates.

Even so, environmentalists point out that some studies have concluded that no new thermal plants, besides the six already under construction, would be needed until the mid-1990s if strong conservation programs are put into effect. And beyond that, environmentalists think it is possible that no more nuclear or coal plants will ever be needed.

BPA and the utilities believe conservation and renewables will simply not be enough to supply long-term needs.

Decision-making: The issue at this point in the debate becomes the decision-making process. Under last year's bill, the BPA administrator had the authority to decide when to start buying thermal power, with no provisions for public review and input. When it came time to actually contract with a utility for nuclear or coal power, there were provisions for public participation.

But they were inadequate, according to environmentalists, who say that if there was a comprehensive, mandatory provision for requiring public participation during all phases of the resource acquisition process, the fears of thermal overbuilding may well be diminished. If, for example, the BPA were required to abide by the Administrative Procedures Act, it would have to justify its actions every step of the way. BPA then would have to pay attention to growth scenarios other than those preferred by the utilities, a situation which environmentalists say might cast a different light on how much thermal construction really is needed.

Even with a better public participation

clause, environmentalists still want the purchase guarantee eliminated. With no assured buyer, utilities would tend to build fewer plants, and they would turn to the cheaper conservation and renewable resources instead, the environmental theory goes.

Who Gets the Cheap Power: Jackson proposed in his bill last year a complicated method for buying and selling power, the purpose of which was to settle the question of how to allocate Bonneville's cheap hydropower.

Essentially, Jackson's bill would expand the preference clause for low-cost federal hydropower to include residential customers of private utilities, instead of just customers of public utilities and cooperatives as the situation is now. Industrial customers of BPA would bear the brunt of that policy by paying higher rates.

This would be accomplished through a bookkeeping transaction, a "power exchange" in which BPA would get expensive power from private utilities and in turn give them an equivalent amount of its cheap power. The pool of cheap power would go to the private residential customers, while BPA would sell the expensive power to its direct-service industries.

The direct-service industrial customers would immediately have to give up their current contracts for cheap power with BPA. But under the new arrangement, they, in exchange, would be able to make new 20-year contracts. Though they would pay a higher rate, they would get a secure energy supply for the next 20 years.

One might wonder why industry does not just contract directly with utilities to get power, instead of going through the Bonneville middleman. It turns out that 85 percent of the direct-service industries are in public utility districts supplied by BPA. So they still would face the problem of BPA running out of power.

Another question is why the public utilities would go along with a power exchange, since in effect it would reduce the pool of cheap power available to traditional preference customers.

The answer is that they are not going along, at least not as the language is currently written. The Public Power Council, a group representing all the consumer-owned utilities in the Northwest, has drafted two major amendments that would take care of their concerns.

One proposal would stipulate that preference customers would be the very last customers to have their energy supply restricted if such action is taken by BPA.

The other would provide that preference customers would never pay more than what they would have paid for power without this legislation. This way, the public utilities would lose nothing and instead would gain a strengthened preference clause.

Setting Rates: The Jackson bill of last year gave Bonneville the broad discretionary authority to set rates for the power it sells. Conservationists and some members, notably Weaver of Oregon, take issue with this section. They want to specifically stipulate that the new electricity BPA buys be priced at its real cost, often called marginal or incremental pricing, instead of being averaged in with cheaper federal hydropower rates.

Environmentalists explain that the current method of pricing, referred to as melded or rolled-in, mixes the cost of new, expensive nuclear power with the cheaper power from federal dams and essentially disguises the actual cost of the new power.

Under the environmental approach, BPA would have a two-tier pricing system—the first tier being cheap hydro and the second being the higher rate that the agency would charge when it has to buy expensive coal or nuclear power to meet increased demand.

Since BPA sells wholesale to utilities, the "two-tier" pricing might not be passed directly through to the energy consumers, but

the policy would have the effect of encouraging utilities to conserve, proponents say. For example, if it would cost \$100 for a utility to get an extra unit of electricity from Bonneville, but only half of that to save it through conservation measures, the utility would most likely opt for conservation, both to save money and to avoid explaining to its customers why it did not choose the cheaper alternative.

Bonneville downplays the potential savings of such a rate structure. In addition, rapidly growing utilities would be hit hard with the expensive power, while slower growing ones would still be getting the cheap power.

Consumers and some municipalities might not see it that way. Seattle, for example, has refused to buy into a couple nuclear power plants being built by the Washington Public Power Supply System, a group of public utilities. Instead, Seattle City Light, the city-owned power company, is going ahead with conservation and renewable resources programs to help meet its power needs. If a two-tier structure does not go through, Seattle may end up helping to pay for the nuclear plants and their huge cost overruns even though it wanted no part of it.

NATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Some members are concerned about possible negative implications the Northwest power bill could have for the other power administrations: Southeastern, Southwestern, Western Area and Alaska.

Preference Clause: For example, if the preference clause is expanded to include residential customers of private utilities, such customers of the other power administrations may very well want the same kind of deal.

On the other hand, the preference clause would be strengthened if the Public Power Council's amendment goes through, by requiring that the traditional preference customers would always be the last to lose cheap power during shortages and that power will never cost them more than if there was never any legislation.

Power Purchase "Guarantee": Another area that has some members on the edge of their seats is the method for financing new power plants.

The arrangement whereby Bonneville contracts to buy power whether or not a plant ever works causes the bond ratings to be much more favorable than usual. So the cost of financing is lowered substantially—that is, the interest rate on the bonds is lower. The bond buyers and the utilities take little risk because BPA, a federal agency, is obligated to cover costs if anything goes wrong.

Environmentalists and some members have many concerns about the arrangement.

The Sierra Club says the "guarantee" is unnecessary and that the Northwest utilities should be treated the same as utilities around the country. "Financing of power plants should be a private function and not a federal one," it says.

Rep. Carr (D-Mich.), for one, strongly agrees. A member of the Water and Power subcommittee, Carr has been very vocal, wondering why the federal government should be favoring one region of the country. He wants to make sure that no more federal "guarantees" are allowed in the Northwest and, further, that such arrangements are not extended to the other power administration.

Bonneville and the utilities point out that it is not the federal government, but the region's ratepayers, that bear the cost. BPA is the only self-financing power marketing administration, so by law its ratepayers, not the federal government, must meet the contract obligations. A private utility spokesman said the utilities even plan to propose an amendment to specifically state that the ratepayers, and not the federal government,

will be obligated—just to make it perfectly clear. In other words, the region's ratepayers would back up the bonds, not taxpayers from all over the country.

The Treasury Department has not commented specifically on the federal subsidy argument, but it has said that there may be reverberations in the rest of the country. The holders of bonds floated by public utilities do not have to pay taxes on the interest earned from the bonds. Treasury testified that tax-exemption, coupled with the guaranteed backing of BPA, creates a bond that is "superior to all other tax-exempt securities issued by state and local governments. This adds to pressures on tax-exempt markets and consequently tends to increase the borrowing costs of schools, roads, hospitals, and other essential public facilities."

Conservation: A very positive precedent could be set for the rest of the nation by the new process BPA would use to decide what energy supplies will be tapped. Bonneville would be required to look at conservation first, then renewable resources, and, finally, conventional power plants. Each method would have to be cost-effective. And making that determination in a particular situation will require for the first time head-to-head comparisons of the three alternatives. A staffer in Weaver's office believes this cost-effectiveness provision is possibly the most important thing in the whole bill and will have significant national implications.

However, some still worry that Bonneville will not go far enough in implementing the conservation and renewable measures, especially since they believe Bonneville could have been doing a lot more already.

But Bonneville is eager to get the new authority and asserts that it is no longer a question of whether it will be done; the area has to have conservation and renewables to meet the region's energy demands.

Anti-trust immunity: Last year's legislation exempted the members of the Bonneville Consumers' Council and the Bonneville Utilities' Council from anti-trust laws for any action related to the council.

The council members, including utility representatives, would advise the administrator on what energy supplies to buy or not to buy. Some are concerned that this arrangement would foster anti-trust violations.

During testimony last year the Department of Energy came out against the anti-trust exemption, and Sens. Burdick, McGovern, Simpson and Wallop have expressed to Jackson their concern that the provision would set a bad precedent for the rest of the country.

Whatever provisions finally come out of the legislation could set the tone, for better or worse, for the rest of the country's power administrations and perhaps other regions' electric utilities.●

WELCOME TO NEW CITIZENS

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it is with particular pleasure that I congratulate 25 residents of Maryland's Second Congressional District who have chosen to become American citizens, with all of the responsibilities as well as freedoms that citizenship entails. Please join me in welcoming these newly naturalized Americans and extending to them our very best wishes for a happy and prosperous life in their new homeland.

Mrs. Chun Yea Fleming, Mr. Cyril

Emanuel Norman, Mr. George Nasif Karkar, Mr. Ahmad Anvari, Mr. Shee-Tei Liu, Mr. Gordon John Turner, Mrs. Young Soo Kim, Mrs. Antoinetta Bulota, Mrs. Esther Lilette Sawdaye, Mrs. Toyoko Rogers, Mrs. Un Cha Howard, Mr. Franklin Gerald De Gourville, Mr. Ury Kallayee, Mrs. Dalia Kallayee, Mrs. Ella Maud Arnold, Mrs. Hye Williams, Mr. Jan Klika, Mrs. Marie Klike, Mr. Edwin Goldman, Miss Kyung Han, Mr. Mun Sok Han, Mrs. Shirley Lay, Mrs. Corazon Soares, Mr. Muralidhar Mimmagadda, and Mr. Jason Eric Biederman.●

THE 1980 BUDGET

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, May 21, 1979, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE 1980 CENSUS

On April 1, 1980, the U.S. government will ask each American to stand up and be counted.

The 1980 Census will mark the twentieth time that the federal government has undertaken its constitutional requirement to count the number of people there are in the United States every ten years. The 1980 Census will be the most complex, most expensive, and, if the Census Bureau is right, the most accurate census taken in our country.

While the original intent of the census was to count the number of people in the country to determine congressional districts, the census has now taken on a new aspect, with as much, if not more, importance than reapportionment of congressional districts. The statistics gathered by the 1980 Census will be used to allocate more than \$50 billion in federal aid. Unemployment statistics will be used to allocate funds under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). Housing statistics will be used to give out Housing and Community Development Act funds. Funds given to counties under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are determined by census information. These are only a few of the federal programs that use census information to distribute funds.

Because so much money is involved in the numbers that are obtained by the census, there is a great deal of concern, especially from state and local governments that receive federal aid, over the accuracy of the count. It is estimated that the 1970 Census missed about 5.3 million people, roughly 2.5% of the population. A much larger percentage of minorities, especially in urban areas, was missed, however. The bureau estimated that it did not count almost 8% of the blacks in the United States.

The problems of taking the census are enormous. The Census Bureau will be trying to gather information on approximately 222 million persons in some 39,000 governmental units in 1980. In the past, the bureau has found many people who believe the census questions are an intrusion into their privacy (although all responses are kept confidential), and persons who are hiding from the government, such as illegal aliens and fathers living with their families on welfare, and do not want the government to know about them. Although there are legal penalties for not participating in the census, they are not enforced.

The Census Bureau is taking several steps to improve the accuracy of the 1980 count.

In a break from tradition, the bureau will initially try to take the count almost exclusively by mail. In 1970, approximately 60 percent of all responses came from persons who filled out questionnaires that were mailed to them, rather than answering questions by census "enumerators", persons who go door to door to ask the census questions. In the upcoming census, more than 90 percent of the population will receive mailed questionnaires. Enumerators will concentrate on rural areas where it is difficult to compile accurate mailing lists. Five households out of six will receive the short form, a questionnaire with only a few questions that should take no more than 15 minutes to fill out. One out of six families, however, will receive the long form containing about 70 questions that will take about 45 minutes to complete. These forms will be used to determine all types of information, from the state of housing in the country to the forms of transportation Americans use to get to work every day. Many groups have argued that the excessive length of the long form will discourage people from filling it out. If problems do come up with the response to the long form, the bureau must have to consider shortening it considerably in the future.

The number of enumerators will be increased substantially, from 165,000 in 1970 to 203,000 next year. The enumerators will be used to follow up on persons who do not send in their census forms, to get information in rural areas, and to canvass places missed in the past, such as bus stations and mission houses where many transient people live. Several liaison operations have been set up with minority groups and local officials to get advice on where elusive residents may be found, and for the first time the Census Bureau is setting up a procedure for local governments to review the information that is gathered before it is officially released.

The 1980 Census will have a special impact on the Ninth District. One of the three Census Bureau processing centers is in Jeffersonville. Between 1980 and 1981 temporary employment at the census facility will rise by 1,400 jobs from the current level of 2,900 jobs. The Jeffersonville facility will be processing about one-third of all the 1980 Census data, microfilming and coding information before it is fed into the Census Bureau computers.

The 1980 Census will be an important event in our country, and its outcome will have a profound effect on planning for the future, on funding distribution of federal aid, and on the make-up of congressional districts for the next decade. I urge every person to participate in the census and help make it as accurate as possible.●

COYNE CELEBRATES 50 YEARS

HON. GARY A. LEE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. LEE. Mr. Speaker, today, May 22, 1979, marks the 50th anniversary of the birth of a well-known national industry whose roots and base remain in my 33d Congressional District of New York. I would like to enter into the RECORD, this account of both the history of the Coyne Industrial Laundry Service and the corporation's founder, J. Stanley Coyne, who will be honored on his own 71st birthday this Saturday.

I feel assured that my colleagues will join with me in the celebration of these dates this year once they have had the opportunity to read the article from Syracuse magazine. It is the uniquely

American account of a man and a concept which have grown to multimillion-dollar service of need; a story that represents clearly how the opportunities this Nation first represented to the world remain available.

My warmest and most sincere personal congratulations go today to Coyne Industries and to J. Stanley Coyne. I offer this article for entry in the RECORD:

COYNE CELEBRATES 50 YEARS

On May 26th, a 300 guest birthday party will be held at the Hotel Syracuse to celebrate the 50th birthday of Coyne Industrial Laundries. The actual date of the beginnings of the Coyne enterprise falls on May 22nd, but May 26th is also the 71st birthday of J. Stanley Coyne, the company's founder and president.

A millionaire by age 30, Stanley Coyne has traveled a long and successful road from his birthplace on Cheney Street, Syracuse, New York. Coyne quit school at age 14, and ran away from home at age 16, after the death of his mother. He worked in a gas station for two years until encouraged to complete his high school education. Coyne saved enough money to put himself through business school, but due to the lack of employment opportunities found himself back working at a gas station in Syracuse after graduation.

While working at this gas station as a 19-year-old, J. Stanley Coyne had the beginnings of an idea which he later parlayed into a fortune. Getting grease and oil out of work clothes and cleaning cloths was difficult. One afternoon Coyne drove around in his Model T Ford, making inquiries of industrial plants, including H.H. Franklin and Adams Axle. After preliminary surveys, he decided that an overall cleaning service was needed.

During his spare time away from the service station, he started picking up work clothes, having them cleaned by a local laundry, which he later purchased, and established what was to become the Coyne Industrial Laundries chain.

Today CIL supplies 10 million cleaning rags to industry each month. Half a million workers in over 50,000 industrial concerns wear Coyne uniforms, making this Syracuse based company the largest solely-owned industrial laundry in the nation.

"I've come a long way from my first week's business of \$86 to doing \$50 million worth of business annually", Coyne states. "I've been 50 years pickin' the grease out of the buttons of overalls."

Coyne Industrial Laundries' success story reflects the hard work and initiative of the man who gave it its name. When Coyne was named Businessman of the Year 1979, by a local newspaper, his Vice President Ben LeStrange summed up Coyne's success with the attributes "persistence and determination." Stanley Coyne himself agrees with that description. He would disagree vehemently with those who say Horatio Alger stories belong to the past.

"The trouble with too many people today is they have too much wishbone and not enough backbone," Coyne argues. "Everyone is afraid of doing more than they get paid for. Success is determined by luck, and the harder you work, the more luck you have. All it takes is a lot of work, and America is still the one place in the world where it can happen. If you have your health, that's all you should ask for. You only go around once, and I decided to make the most of it."

Not until 1935 did Coyne have his own laundry. Then a small room at the rear of a fish market at 124 Cortland Avenue housed the one wash wheel and dryer. The fish market moved a year later and he purchased the small building. Later he purchased the

surrounding property and today owns the entire city block.

The general offices of CIL are located at 140 Cortland Avenue and they are still expanding and growing after 50 years of serving general industry with clean service.

The Coyne Industrial Laundries serves from Toledo, Detroit and Pittsburgh, east to Boston and from Maine south to the District of Columbia and into the Virginias.

The annual payroll amounts to more than \$10 million a year and customers throughout the Northeast number in excess of 50,000. They also supply general industry with a rental wiping cloth service which in the trade is known as shop towels. Treated dust mops, dust cloths and walk-off-rugs for public buildings, offices, schools, and hospitals make up another large sector of their total volume and services.

Over 1,000,000 gallons of water are used daily in the highly mechanized plants to sterilize the garments.

Clean clothing is provided by Coyne Laundries for over 500,000 people and over 10,000,000 wiping cloths are delivered to industries each month. CIL customers range from gas stations to large factories and food processing plants. Manufacturers of glass, steel, business machines, air conditioning, film, electronics, chemicals as well as offices, schools and colleges are all among Coyne customers.

A computer data processing complex is maintained at Corporate Headquarters in Syracuse where, in addition to keeping all records of both customers and Coyne personnel, all orders are transmitted and handled by an automatic wire service.

A fleet of yellow and blue trucks bearing the CIL trademark serve over 500,000 accounts at least once a week. The company also owns a 10 seat Beechcraft King Air turbo-prop airplane which is used for company service.

The philanthropic gift of the J. Stanley Coyne foundation is well known in Syracuse. A recent gift to LeMoyne College of \$1 million was presented to help the college establish a new library. Another recent donation to the Everson Museum was to establish a fund for the purchase of American art for its permanent collection. Other charitable community contributions include those to the Red Cross, Syracuse Symphony, Everson Museum Fund Drive, various hospital donations and the \$600,000 gift to Syracuse University to purchase artificial turf for the football practice field.

A member of the Syracuse Chamber of Commerce and the Manufacturer's Association of Syracuse, Coyne is perhaps better known for his work on the Board of Directors of the Lighthouse, Y.M.C.A., American Red Cross, Arthritis Foundation, and the Cerebral Palsy Association. In 1977 he was General Chairman and led a very successful campaign for the United Way. For virtually all of his business years, Coyne has been active in research and development projects for his industry's organization. Last year he won the coveted K.N.A. from the KEX National Association, a division of Milliken Company.

Stanley Coyne's belief is "Someone has to do it. We all make time for the things we want to do."

Coyne's company, meanwhile, thrives both in the U.S. and outside. In 1954 Coyne was asked by the U.S. government to set up a laundry in Puerto Rico as part of the program designed to improve the island's economy. Coyne expanded two years later and took CIL to Venezuela and Barbados. Coyne believes that a company that is expanding and growing is more fun to be around. "Nobody likes to be around a wake. Everybody in the company is healthier and happier when things are moving, from the telephone girl to the janitor."

Married to the former Sandra P. Alwin of New York City in 1967, the Coyne's divide their time between homes in Syracuse, Puerto Rico and Nantucket. A sports enthusiast, Coyne particularly enjoys golf.

Why stay in Syracuse all these years with CIL? Coyne replies, "Syracuse has been good to me. I have my thoughts about New York State just like a lot of business people, but our city is centrally located, has a good system of roads, essential to my operation. We may have the worst weather in the world, but we have the best people."

I'm very happy to be celebrating 50 years in the laundry business. I had no conception at the start that it would be this big. It's been just like watching a family—fascinating seeing it grow." ●

THERE IS NO ROOM FOR REWRITING THE PANAMA CANAL TREATIES

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this weekend the Washington Star published an article written by the Ambassador to the United States from Panama, His Excellency Carlos Alfredo Lopez-Guevara, dealing with the growing debate on the Panama Canal implementing legislation.

As the chairman of the MCPL task force on Panama Canal, I feel that the Ambassador's comments are crucial and address an aspect of the debate we have not been willing to face up to now: What will really happen if we do not implement the Panama Canal Treaty.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues, and ask to insert this article, published by the Washington Star on Sunday, May 20, 1979, in the RECORD.

The article follows:

THERE'S NO ROOM FOR REWRITING THE PANAMA TREATIES

(By Carlos Alfredo Lopez-Guevara)

In a recent article, The Washington Star's Joy Billington depicted me as a harried ambassador. This is accurate. After a harrowing process of negotiation, the Panama Canal Treaties were signed here in Washington, in the presence of the leaders of the Western Hemisphere. These instruments were immediately hailed as a masterpiece of statesmanship because they are conducive to preserving the canal as an efficiently run operation and at the same time give satisfaction to Panamanian nationalism—that is, Panama's yearning to complete her process of independence.

Once the Senate gave its consent to the treaties, it was not amiss to expect that the House of Representatives would work in harness with the Senate and the administration to enact the enabling legislation to properly implement the treaties. The treaties are the law of the land. The treaties will ineluctably enter into force on October 1 regardless of any action or omission of the Congress, because the instruments of ratification were exchanged on June 16, 1978. This was the last formal step necessary to establish the new relationship between Panama and the United States pertaining to the Panama Canal.

But obstacles remain, it is evident. Maryland Congressman Robert Bauman reportedly "hopes to make the legislation objectionable enough to Panama that the country would reject the treaties and have to negotiate new

ones." This is an utter mistake. Panama will not renegotiate any treaty. We stand ready to comply with our obligation under the treaty and expect the United States to act similarly. The negotiation is over.

There are some congressmen who realize the futility of trying to prevent the entry into force of the treaties but believe that they can rewrite them by means of the implementing legislation. One of them is Congressman George Hansen of Idaho, who pretends that Panama should bear the brunt of the expenses incurred by the United States in complying with the treaty. The key argument put forward by him is that the treaties were passed with assurances that there would be no expense to U.S. taxpayers or the U.S. Treasury. The foregoing is a glaring indication that in order to understand the treaties it is necessary to make more than a perfunctory perusal thereof.

There are no financial burdens imposed by the treaty upon Panama. On the contrary, Section XIII thereof, which provides for the transfer of property to Panama, expresses in unequivocal terms that the properties are transferred free of cost.

And this has a clear explanation. Up until 1939, the United States was paying to Panama an annuity equivalent to U.S. \$250,000 in gold, which was the same amount that the old Panamanian railroad company had been paying to Colombia since the last century for the concession to build, own and operate a railroad across the isthmus of Panama. This amount was increased in 1939 to \$430,000 because of the dollar devaluation. So it remained until 1955.

The background is that when the Isthmian Canal Convention was imposed upon Panama in 1903, the United States obtained two concessions. (a) the right to build, operate and defend the Canal, and (b) the right to exploit the railroad concession. It was a bargain: Two concessions and no additional burden to the U.S. Treasury. This is the best evidence to prove that the Isthmian Canal Convention was never negotiated. It contained no economic gain for Panama and a heavy political burden upon the newly born nation.

It is worth noting that when De Lesseps realized that the Panama railroad company was charging too much for moving the excavated material during the construction of the French Canal, he decided to buy the railroad company and he acquired it for U.S. \$25 million. The railroad enterprise never ceased to operate, not even after the French canal company collapsed. Thus, the United States received from Panama a running and profitable concern worth millions of dollars which was a key tool at the disposal of Stevens and Goethals to build the canal.

So, contrary to the meager amount received by Panama, the United States has been receiving all types of benefits, including military gains which cannot be assessed in terms of dollars and cents.

After 75 years of an unbalanced relationship, the time has arrived for Panama to begin reaping the benefits of her geographical position and to terminate a colonial situation not befitting the program of freedom enshrined in the Declaration of Independence of 1776.

Now some congressman are assessing the value of every material or installation that will be transferred to Panama, without realizing all the suffering sustained by my country during 75 years of enduring the presence and consequences of a foreign government. They seem to forget that the United States has withdrawn from several places in the world and left behind installations and materials worth billions of dollars and also the lives and blood of young Americans. In many instances those installations were left and remain in the hands of an enemy of the United States. This is not the case of the canal, the railroad, the ports and other facilities that will be transferred to

Panama free of charge. They will be left in the hands of a country that has been friendly towards the United States and its allies during two world wars. The canal will continue being used by the United States, which has a growing interest in the canal because 75 percent of the canal traffic originates from or is bound to the United States.

With the permanent neutrality of the canal, this waterway will always be open to all nations of the world on terms of equality in time of peace and war.

It must be emphasized that Panama has built and is operating at Charco Azul, on the Pacific side of the country, a deep sea port and land facilities to transship Alaskan oil. Once the port operates at full capacity it will handle as much oil as the United States imported from Iran. Alaska oil reaches the East Coast through the Panama Canal. This indicates that the commercial importance of the Panama Canal has been enhanced by the development of the Alaska oil resources and that therefore it is in the interest of the United States to create a peaceful and friendly environment around the canal. This aim can only be attained by helping Panama to have a sustained and balanced development.

I have the conviction that the qualities of statesmanship shown by the senators in making possible the ratification of the treaties will also prevail in the House of Representatives so that the enabling legislation will be in conformity with the treaties otherwise Panama will be entitled to denounce the treaties and consider herself free of the obligations she undertook thereunder. It is a well-known rule of international law that when a party commits a material breach of a treaty, it leaves the door ajar for the other party to denounce the treaty, which would then come to an end.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN WAYNE, A GREAT AMERICAN

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you an editorial by Marvin Stone, which appeared in the May 28, 1979 issue of U.S. News & World Report. It is a beautiful tribute to a great American, John Wayne.

A HERO TO FIT THE IMAGE

(By Marvin Stone)

John Wayne was again hospitalized, fighting a difficult battle, as he headed toward his 72nd birthday, May 26. In wishing him a happy birthday, our thoughts went back 25 years to our first meeting with the man on a movie set in Japan. We discovered then, as millions have since, that John Wayne is far more than a movie actor. He is the personification of courage and conviction in an age when both are in scant supply.

The reason John Wayne is one of the most admired men in the United States are as important as the fact. He has become a symbol of the virtues and the strengths that Americans like to believe are typical of their country.

Courage? Wayne has shown that repeatedly. His left lung was removed in 1964. He had open-heart surgery in 1978. Last January surgeons removed his cancerous stomach. Now he is again determined to win against great odds.

"He has a tremendous will to live," says Bernard Strohm, administrator of the UCLA

Hospital in Los Angeles where Wayne's stomach was removed.

Physically a strong man, John Wayne has clung to personal beliefs as rugged as his body, refusing to temper those beliefs to go with the prevailing winds.

At a time when the Vietnam War was widely unpopular, in 1968, Wayne backed the government's prosecution of that war by insisting on going through with the film "The Green Berets." Like most of Wayne's ventures, the film was successful, despite derision from some.

Although fiercely loyal to the Republican Party, Wayne has shown his independence on candidates and issues. When his candidate, Ronald Reagan, failed to get the presidential nomination in 1976, Wayne worked hard for the party choice, Gerald Ford. In the fight over the Panama Canal treaties, Wayne did his own thinking and decided he generally favored them. That bucked the conservative position.

Wayne demonstrated his loyalty to old friends when he joined Republicans attending Richard Nixon's \$250-per-person cocktail reception at San Clemente in August of 1978.

Katharine Hepburn, writing about Wayne in the TV Guide magazine in 1977, said this: "Politically he is a reactionary. He suffers from a point of view based entirely on his early years in the motion-picture business by people like himself. Self-made. Hard working. Independent. Of the style of man who blazed the trails across our country. Who reached out into the unknown. People who were willing to live or die entirely on their own independent judgment."

Pete Dailey, an advertising executive who has worked with Wayne, says: "He is viewed as somebody who is a rock of unchanging values. He projects a basic sense of honesty and understanding, and strong Puritan values. His image grew as he grew older. People have been exposed to him over a long period of time."

Wayne began making movies in 1928, while a student at the University of Southern California. He churned out many Westerns before he made his first big hit in "Stagecoach" in 1939. He won an Academy Award for his portrayal of Rooster Cogburn in "True Grit" in 1969. His last full-length feature was "The Shootist," released in 1976, in which he played the part of an old gunfighter, dying of cancer.

During the last half century, Wayne has made some 200 films. Often he played roles that his ancestors had lived—as pioneers, Indian fighters, fur traders and covered wagon travelers, helping to settle America over a period of many, many decades.

"People see John Wayne in the roles he played," says a longtime Hollywood observer. "In the main, he has personified the rugged American of the frontier, who made the country great." Folks today are looking for heroes, and there aren't many around. But in John Wayne, people—of all political shadings—have found one to fit the image.●

GERMAN DAY—CANAAN

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in Texas we have been proud of the great heritage from our forefathers. We are especially proud of our German ancestry. We join on this day, May 23, in celebrating the 30th anniversary of the Federal Republic of Germany.

In Dallas, Gershon Canaan has served

as our honorary consul since 1962. Every year at the State fair Canaan takes the leadership in arranging our "German Day in Texas." In 1979 we are proud that Dr. Franz Josef Strauss, Minister President of Bavaria, Germany has accepted the honorary chairmanship of the German Day in Texas.

This year on October 14, the Texas pioneers of Bavarian descent will be recognized for the achievement of the free State of Bavaria. Our Texas committee will include Teddy Trept as chairman and Herman Meiners, cochairman, Charles Heck and Christa Settle as executive officers.

The Texas Senate passed special resolution S.C.R. No. 74 submitted by Texas senator Bill Braecklein. Here are the key sections of this resolution:

TEXAS SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION S.C.R. No. 74

Whereas, Many Texans of German descent and many German Texan organizations throughout the state will celebrate in 1979 the 30th anniversary of the proclamation of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany; and

Whereas, The State of Texas is deeply indebted to the over one million Texans of German stock, who played a vital part in our history by contributing to our heritage their great cultural, educational, and scientific achievements; and

Whereas, The people of Texas extend their best wishes for the festivities planned on "Constitution Day" by the people of Germany; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas, the House of Representatives concurring, That the 66th Legislature hereby congratulate the Federal Republic of Germany for its outstanding efforts for unity, freedom, and democracy; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature hereby affirm its full support for the 30th anniversary celebration to be held on May 23, 1979. ●

LEGISLATION AMENDING THE SACCCHARIN STUDY AND LABELING ACT

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I—and a number of my colleagues—am introducing a bill which would amend the Saccharin Study and Labeling Act to extend the present moratorium for 3 years. The 18-month moratorium ends today, May 23, 1979.

I have introduced a 3-year extension of this moratorium not because I am unconcerned about the dangers from saccharin. The National Academy of Sciences review of the matter indicates that, at the least, saccharin is a low-level carcinogen. And we know that exposure to a number of carcinogens which may have a combined impact means a greater risk of cancer.

I am not unaware of the concerns of diabetics and others on a sugar-restricted diet who feel that without this food-substance they face a known health problem from sugar.

I expect that, after the moratorium pe-

riod, a substitute for saccharin which will be both safe and low-caloric will have been developed and ready for use. I think it is important that the industry continue their efforts in this regard with the understanding that we expect their cooperation.

I also expect that the Congress will have a chance to review and amend the food safety laws during the interim period to determine whether the rigidity of the Delaney clause should be changed to meet situations such as this one where a benefit is posed as well as a risk.

I know that there have been other proposals as to how to deal with this issue of saccharin and we may want to consider them as additional policy options using this extension of present law as a framework for discussion. Some have suggested that 3 years is too long a period of time and that 18 months would be more appropriate. Some would allow the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to act to ban saccharin for all purposes other than as a tabletop sweetener either during or after the interim period provided for in the bill. Some would allow FDA to act to take the necessary steps to remove saccharin immediately on the expiration of the interim period or before then if new scientific evidence indicates a greater danger than we had realized.

I expect the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, which I chair, to look into this issue and present legislation to the House along the lines being proposed. ●

**DR. J. M. HANKS, SUPER
SUPERINTENDENT**

HON. RICHARD C. WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, a new junior-senior high school was dedicated in the Ysleta Independent School District in my home city of El Paso. It is the J. M. Hanks Junior-Senior High School, and it is the first school in the district to be named after a person. This departure from tradition is well taken and most applaudable. Dr. J. M. Hanks is the superintendent of the Ysleta Independent School District, and has been since 1929, 50 years.

As laudable as his tenure have been Dr. Hanks' many singular accomplishments. As an example, the Governor's office of the State of Texas recently conducted a study of the State's school systems and the Ysleta district was cited as one of the top 12 districts in the State for providing top quality education per dollar invested.

He is also a dedicated innovator in his constant search for better and more effective educational methods. A form of bilingual education was taught in the Ysleta school system as early as 1948, far in advance of subsequent mandatory programs.

During his half century of superintendency, the Ysleta Independent School District has grown from three

schools to 44, and from only a few students to nearly 44,000.

In addition to his excellence as an administrator of education—for which he has received many awards and broad recognition—Dr. Hanks is also one of El Paso's most dedicated citizens. He is almost as well known and admired for his selfless and successful civic work as he is for his peerless achievements in education.

Dr. Hanks' phenomenal tenure as superintendent of a major school district, I am confident, is unmatched as is his continuing administrative excellence. ●

POSITIVE APPRAISAL OF FBI

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years the FBI and the CIA have been subject to a great deal of exaggerated criticism, and the effectiveness of these two major entities were adversely affected.

Therefore, I was pleased to note that the distinguished columnist Bob Wiedrich of the Chicago Tribune, saw fit to give a positive appraisal of the recent FBI actions in his column of May 16, which I would like to insert at this point:

THE FBI LIVES UP TO PUBLIC IMAGE

Americans just saw the FBI in action they feel most comfortable with.

Agents swept down in a helicopter over a southern California desert to shoot it out with a kidnapper trying to collect a ransom for the wife of a millionaire real estate developer.

They shot the kidnapper dead. They rescued the damsel in distress. All the patient planning that had preceded the dramatic climax to the case paid off in true detective-fiction style.

The public applauded. People liked what they read and heard about the event. It was the kind of federal police work they could understand.

The good guys were the FBI agents. The bad guys were the criminals.

The heroine was the victim, Mrs. Elaine Chaddick, who had the presence of mind to leave a trail of fingerprints behind as her captors dragged her off to three days of terror in the desert near Palm Springs.

The happy ending made the taxpayers feel good. The clean-cut men and women of the FBI had triumphed again.

However, as resounding a public relations coup as the Chaddick case produced for the FBI, it served to overshadow the equally important—and often more significant—work that agency is doing in the area of national security.

As long as the American people—and especially the civil libertarians—could bask in the reflected glory of an adventure story brought to a successful conclusion, the FBI agents were the good guys.

But let them step one inch out of line in the process of bringing a terrorist or traitor to heel and the boys and girls of the FBI would again be back in the soup.

The Chaddick case could be enjoyed because the cast of characters was clearly identifiable.

Nobody worried about the civil rights of an armed madman who shot off the heads of lizards in a frightening display of bestial boastfulness.

Let an FBI agent, however, even slightly bend the constitutional rights of a political terrorist dedicated to planting a bomb beneath the Capitol dome and the full weight of the liberal fraternity would be diverted to putting that agent behind bars.

It wouldn't matter that the bomber was bent on blowing up half the Congress for some perverted political philosophy. Or that some other FBI counterintelligence target might just have stolen some sophisticated satellite secret.

The FBI agent would immediately be labeled the bum. And the guy trying to bury the United States would become an overnight hero.

For that apparently is how easily some Americans can rationalize the difference between the types of work that the FBI is called upon to perform, each in the defense of the people who pay their salaries.

Actually, darned few FBI cases involve the kinds of cops and robbers work that so happily resolved the Chaddick kidnapping.

The public relishes watching a band of Mafia criminals getting hauled off to the courthouse by stern-faced FBI agents who infiltrated their ranks to smash a multimillion-dollar money-making scheme.

But rarely do they witness the scores of FBI agents painstakingly monitoring the activities of American citizens suspected of subverting their own country for a buck or political persuasion that can seriously damage the security of this country.

Such thoughts make them uncomfortable. They don't like federal agents poking around, prying into peoples' personal affairs.

It seems to make no difference that the agents might have reasonable grounds for suspecting that Citizen X is selling technology that might save the Soviets billions of dollars in research and development costs.

Or that Citizen Y is about to peddle military contingency plans that might compromise American armed forces effectiveness in some far-off corner of the world.

The FBI target is an American citizen entitled to all of the nation's constitutional protections. So even the appearance of snooping quickly rankles some people.

Yet, snooping for good reason is essential to the survival of the United States. But snooping inhibited by the threat of prison for the snooper is no snooping at all.

It makes an agent pull his punches, even though he knows his surveillance or investigative techniques are legal. He is afraid to go the extra mile in his efforts because he knows that people may fail to discern him as a good guy working in their best interests.

The easily defined roles in the Chaddick case are lacking. The agent doesn't want to be saddled with a bum rap.

So American counterintelligence work sometimes suffers. The FBI won't officially admit that, but I suspect that it is true.

And all because the American public likes its folk heroes to always wear white hats so that it can recognize a bad guy when it sees one. Oh, that reality were that simple.●

SAM WILLIAMS RECEIVES NATION'S MOST PRESTIGIOUS AWARD

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join President Carter in paying tribute to Mr. Sam Williams, president of the Williams Research Corp. of Walled Lake in my district in Mich-

igan, upon recently being awarded the Collier Trophy, our Nation's most prestigious aviation award.

I would like to share the President's letter to Mr. Williams, which was presented to him at the National Aeronautics Association banquet at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington on May 11.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1979.

Mr. SAM B. WILLIAMS,
The National Aviation Club,
Sheraton Park Hotel,
Washington, D.C.

MR. SAM WILLIAMS: I am pleased to congratulate you on your achievements in miniature engine technology which have won you the 1978 Collier Trophy of the National Aeronautics Association.

The design of the compact fan-jet engine has been instrumental in the success of the Cruise Missile Program, and it contributes significantly to the strength of our national defense. In accepting this prestigious honor, you join a select group of aviation pioneers who, through personal endeavor and talent, have helped advance America's technological leadership and scientific excellence.

You have my warmest regards on this occasion and my best wishes for the future.

Sincerely,

JIMMY CARTER.

Mr. Speaker, as the President's letter states, Mr. Williams received this distinguished award for the development and design of the world's smallest, high-efficiency fanjet engine. The development of this engine is a major contribution to the advancement of aeronautics in the United States, and to meeting our Nation's defensive needs by powering the cruise missile.

Sam Williams formed his own company in 1954 to meet the civil and military needs he foresaw for a small, efficient, inexpensive gas turbine engine. Conquering problems unique to small engines, he produced a series of turbojets in the late 1950's and 1960's which were used to power small drone aircraft, provide auxiliary power for industrial and aircraft applications and power the jet flying belt developed by Bell Aerospace in 1969.

The present Williams engine, for which he received the Collier Trophy, was considered a practical impossibility at the time of its inception by experts in the field. However, through his perseverance and innovativeness, Mr. Williams expanded the perimeters of the possible.

Mr. Speaker, America owes much to people like Sam Williams—people of vision, talent, and ingenuity. They have helped our Nation maintain its vitality and strength and have contributed greatly to its development.

Again, I offer Mr. Williams my heartiest congratulations upon being awarded the Collier Trophy. He joins a highly select and distinguished list of recipients who have been honored since 1911. Among these former recipients are:

FORMER RECIPIENTS OF THE COLLIER TROPHY

1976: U.S. Air Force/Rockwell International and the B-1 industry team, for the successful design, development, and flight test of the B-1 strategic aircraft system.

1975: David S. Lewis, General Dynamics Corp., and the F-16 Air Force industry team, for significant advancements in aviation technology.

1974: Dr. John F. Clark, NASA, and Daniel J. Fink, General Electric Co., for proving the

value of U.S. space technology in the management of the Earth's resources with special recognition to Hughes Aircraft Co., and RCA. 1973: The Skylab Program, with special recognition to William C. Schneider, program director, and the three Skylab astronaut crews, for proving the value of man in future space explorations.

1972: Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, USN, representing the officers and men of the 7th and 8th Air Forces of the U.S. Air Force and Task Force 77 of the U.S. Navy for "Operation Linebacker II."

1971: Col. David R. Scott, Col. James B. Irwin, and Lt. Col. Alfred M. Worden, U.S. Air Force, and Dr. Robert R. Gilruth, for demonstrating superb skill and courage as representatives of the space flight team, culminating in Apollo 15.

1970: William M. Allen, The Boeing Co., for introducing the 747 into commercial service with particular recognition to Pratt and Whitney Aircraft Corp., and Pan American World Airways.

1969: Neil A. Armstrong; Col. Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., U.S. Air Force; and Col. Michael Collins, U.S. Air Force, for the epic flight of Apollo 11 and the first landing of man on the surface of the Moon, July 20, 1969.

1968: Col. Frank Borman, U.S. Air Force; Capt. James A. Lovell, Jr., USN; and Lt. Col. William A. Anders, U.S. Air Force, for the successful and flawless execution of the first manned lunar orbit mission in history (Apollo 8).

1967: Lawrence A. Hyland, representing the Surveyor Program Team that put the United States on the Moon.

1966: James S. McDonnell, for leadership in advancing aeronautics and astronautics exemplified by the F-4 Phantom aircraft and the Gemini space vehicles.

1965: James E. Webb and Hugh L. Dryden, representing all Gemini program teams which significantly advanced human experience in space flight.

1964: Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, for achievements with respect to our air vehicles and national defense.

1963: Clarence L. "Kelly" Johnson, for designing and directing the development of Air Force A-11 Mach 3 aircraft.

1962: Lt. Cmdr. M. Scott Carpenter, USN; Maj. L. Gordon Cooper, U.S. Air Force; Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., USMC; Maj. Virgil I. Grissom, U.S. Air Force; Cmdr. Walter M. Schirra, Jr., USN; Cmdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., USN; and Maj. Donald K. Slayton, U.S. Air Force, for pioneering manned space flight in the United States.

1961: Maj. Robert M. White, U.S. Air Force; Joseph A. Walker, NASA; A. Crossfield, North American Aviation, and Cmdr. Forrest Petersen, for invaluable contributions to the advancement of flight as test pilots of the X-15.

1960: VAdm. William F. Raborn, USN, for directing development of the operational fleet ballistic missile weapon system—Polaris.

1959: The U.S. Air Force, the Convair Division of General Dynamics Co. and to Space Technology Laboratories, Inc., for developing and putting into operation the Atlas—America's first intercontinental ballistic missile.

1958: The U.S. Air Force and industry team responsible for the F-104 interceptor, Clarence L. Johnson of Lockheed Aircraft Corp., for the design of the airframe; Neil Burgess and Gerhard Neumann of the General Electric Co., for development of its J-79 turbojet engines; Maj. Howard C. Johnson, U.S. Air Force, for establishing a land-plane altitude record, and Capt. Walter W. Irwin, U.S. Air Force, for establishing a world straightaway speed record.

1957: Edward P. Curtis, for his presidential report entitled, "Aviation Facilities Planning."

1956: Charles J. McCarthy and associates of Chance-Vought Aircraft, in and to VAdm. James S. Russell and associates of the U.S.

Navy of Aeronautics, for conception, design, and development of the F-8U Crusader.

1955: William M. Allen and the Boeing Airplane Co., and to Gen. Nathan F. Twining and the U.S. Air Force, for development and operational use of the B-52.

1954: Richard Travis Whitcomb, NACA Research Scientist for discovery and experimental verification of the area rule.

1953: James H. Kindelberger and Edward H. Heinemann, for the development of the first supersonic airplanes in service.

1952: Leonard S. Hobbs of United Aircraft Corp., for design, development, and production of the J-57 jet engine.

1951: John Stack and associates at Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, NACA, for the concept and development of the transonic wind tunnel throat.

1950: The helicopter industry, the military services, and the Coast Guard, for development and use of rotary-wing aircraft for air rescue operations.

1949: William P. Lear, for development of the Lear F-5 automatic pilot and automatic control coupler system.

1948: Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics, for the development of an all-weather air traffic control system.

1947: John Stack, Lawrence D. Bell, and Capt. Charles E. Yeager, for supersonic flight.

1946: Lewis A. Rodert, for development of thermal ice-prevention system.

1945: Dr. Louis W. Alvarez, for development of the ground controlled approach radar landing system.

1944: Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, for demonstrating the airpower concept through employment of American aviation in wartime.

1943: Capt. Luis de Florez, USNR, for development of synthetic training devices for flyers.

1942: Gen. H. H. Arnold, for organization and leadership of the mightiest air force in the world.

1941: The Air Forces and the airlines, for the worldwide operations typified in the routes of the Air Transport Command.

1940: Dr. Sanford Moss and the Army Air Corps, for development of the turbosupercharger.

1939: Airlines of the United States, for their record of safety in air travel.

1938: Howard Hughes and his crew, for his round-the-world flight.

1937: The Army Air Corps, for design and equipment of a stratosphere airplane.

1936: Pan American Airways, for its trans-Pacific and overwater operations.

1935: Donald Douglas and his staff, for development of the DC-2.

1934: Maj. Albert F. Hegenberger, for blind landing experimentation.

1933: The Hamilton Standard Propeller Co., and Chief Engineer Frank W. Caldwell, for the controllable pitch propeller.

1932: Glenn L. Martin, for development of an outstanding biengined, high-speed, weight-carrying airplane.

1931: The Packard Motor Car Co., for the aircraft diesel engine.

1930: Harold Pitcairn and his staff, for their autogyro.

1929: The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, for the NACA cowling.

1928: Aeronautics Branch of the Department of Commerce, for development of airways and air navigation facilities.

1927: Charles L. Lawrence, for his radial air-cooled engine.

1926: Maj. E. L. Hoffman, for development of a practical parachute.

1925: S. Albert Reed, for development of the metal propeller.

1924: The U.S. Army.

1923: Personnel of the U.S. Air Mail Service, for night flying.

1922: Personnel of the U.S. Air Mail Service.

1921: Grover Loening, for development of the aerial yacht.

1917-1920: No award because of war.
1916: Elmer A. Sperry, for drift indicator.
1915: W. Sterling Burgess, for the Burgess-Dunne hydro-aeroplane.
1914: Elmer A. Sperry, for gyroscopic control.
1913: Orville Wright, for development of the automatic stabilizer.
1912: Glenn H. Curtiss, for the flying boat.
1911: Glenn H. Curtiss, for development of the hydro-aeroplane.●

OPEN HOUSE AMENDMENTS

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am submitting a new list of cosponsors of my Open House Amendments of 1979, 10 amendments to our House rules designed to strengthen our oversight and ethics investigative procedures and make our committee system more open and accountable. Today's list of 13 new cosponsors brings to 45 the number of Members who have cosponsored some or all of these amendments.

Today I would like to briefly focus on one of my amendments, House Resolution 254, which would amend clause 2 (g) (1) of House rule XI to require that all committee and subcommittee meetings be open to the public with only certain limited exceptions. While our House rules only permit committees to close hearings if the matters to be disclosed would endanger the national security or violate any law or rule of the House, committees may now vote to close committee meetings for any reason. My amendment would bring the open meeting requirement more in line with the open hearing requirement by only permitting closed meetings if matters to be disclosed would endanger the national security, violate any law or rule of the House, or involved internal committee personnel or budgetary matters. I am pleased to report that 42 of the 45 cosponsors of some or all of my amendments have cosponsored this open meeting amendment.

Despite this strong show of support for my open meeting amendment, there is growing evidence that a cloud is beginning to blot out some of the sunshine we introduced into this House in the early part of this decade. According to an article in this week's Congressional Quarterly by Irwin B. Arief: "Sunshine" BACKERS SEE NEW SECRECY TREND

Some members of Congress and Congressional watchdogs say they fear a trend away from the open meetings commitment of the early 1970's.

According to the report, three House appropriations subcommittees have switched from open to closed meetings. They are: Labor-HEW; State-Justice, Commerce, Judiciary; and Agriculture.

In addition to this report, I was distressed to learn that our own Select Committee on Committees, which is supposed to be recommending additional committee reforms, is holding closed-door briefing sessions and may not even have hearings. I have written a letter to

the select committee's chairman strongly urging him to hold open hearings.

Mr. Speaker, the argument most often made in support of these closed mark-up sessions is that open meetings only draw high-pressure lobbyists who interfere with the committees' deliberations, and that they encourage Members to grandstand for the benefit of such lobbyists. These arguments seem to justify the closed-door sessions on the grounds that such lobbyists are some kind of alien beings from outer space and not representatives of legitimate interests in our society. Lobbyists are people too and, moreover, in closing the door to them committees are also shutting out the general public and the press as well.

I do not defend the practice of lobbyists who take advantage of open committee meetings to disrupt those sessions by carrying on their lobbying while a committee is marking up a bill. Each chairman has an obligation to see to it that the dignity and decorum of the committee meeting is upheld, and all spectators should be reminded that they are there as spectators and not as participants in the meeting. The fact that there are long lines of people waiting to get into a meeting is no justification for shutting them all out. Committees should allow as many spectators into their meetings as a room can reasonably hold, and the Capitol Police should be able to maintain order in the hallways among those waiting to get in.

But the bottom line is that the people have a right to witness conduct of the people's business, and these flimsy excuses of disruptive lobbyists and Members grandstanding are not sufficient grounds for denying the people that right.

My open meeting amendment would insure against the closing of meetings except for the most sensitive purposes of protecting the national security or individual privacy. I hope this amendment will be given serious consideration by the Select Committee on Committees.

At this point in the Record, Mr. Speaker, I include the Congressional Quarterly article to which I earlier referred in my remarks, a summary of my Open House Amendments, and an updated list of the cosponsors:

"SUNSHINE" BACKERS SEE NEW SECRECY TREND

(By Irwin B. Arief)

A House Appropriations subcommittee vote to exclude the public from a meeting on a key 1980 money bill has raised concern that the House's commitment to "sunshine" may be drifting behind a cloud.

The Appropriations Labor-HEW Subcommittee voted May 16 to close a markup of the fiscal 1980 Labor-HEW appropriations bill. (Story, facing page)

"We've held open markups for the past four or five years," a subcommittee aide said. "We had every intention of holding an open markup this year, until we were inundated with people. We closed it because there were so many people in the halls and in our offices that two policemen couldn't get order. . . . We couldn't work with all those people breathing down our necks."

TREND DETECTED

Some members of Congress and congressional watchdogs say they fear a trend away from the open meetings commitment of the

early 1970s. (Congress and the Nation Vol. III, p. 377)

"I definitely detect a trend toward more closed meetings in the House," commented Rep. David R. Obey, D-Wis., a champion of House openness and a member of the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee. Obey voted against closing the May 16 session.

"It seems to be a case of creeping secrecy," commented Richard P. Conlon, staff director of the Democratic Study Group.

A CQ survey of the 13 Appropriations subcommittees indicates that two subcommittees in addition to Labor-HEW have switched from open to closed markups in the past several years. They are State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary and Agriculture.

Agriculture, according to staff aide Robert Foster, held only closed markups before 1977. The 1977 markup was partially open, he said, while the 1978 markup was entirely public.

The May 2, 1979, session was closed because the budget resolution was on the floor that same day, Foster explained. "We were concerned that we might enter into the floor discussions on the budget resolution," he said.

State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary began closing markups two or three years ago, staff assistant John G. Osthaus said. "The members feel it facilitates their discussion of the issues and the amounts to be appropriated. When the markups were open, the members felt it was a madhouse, with people rushing in and out and trying to command their attention. Now, the staff simply announces the results at the end of the markup."

MISSING LISTINGS

Secrecy has crept into other aspects of the Appropriations subcommittees' operations.

A number of subcommittee sessions have not been listed in advance or after the meeting in the Congressional Record, as House rules require. Subcommittee aides blame the omissions on administrative foul-ups.

A meeting of the Appropriations Energy and Water Development Subcommittee on May 9 to discuss funding for controversial water projects was not listed in the Record. Nor was it on the official list of hearings and markups posted in the press galleries.

Staff assistant Hunter Spillan said a routine announcement of the meeting had been given to the full Appropriations Committee. As for it being closed, "our meetings generally are closed because one-third of our appropriations deal with weapons and weapons research," Spillan explained. "Every year, they forget we closed it last year."

OTHER COMMITTEES AFFECTED

A spot check has turned up some closed meetings other than Appropriation subcommittees.

The Senate Finance Committee, for example, recently held 11 closed sessions with public and administration witnesses to help develop trade agreement implementing legislation.

"There's a great deal of confusion and bad reporting when you have it opened and you haven't completed your press release," explained a Finance Committee aide, "I guess it's a way of keeping it pure and simple until the recommendations have been completed."

A House Ways and Means subcommittee held about 15 days of closed sessions for the same purpose. "They are sensitive hearings," a staffer said.

Obey, in an interview, blamed much of the push for secrecy on lobbyists.

"You have a number of members frustrated because things they have said or done in open markups have been garbled by trade association newsletters and lobby groups," he said. "Also, you have a feeling that the lobby groups in this country have become so single-minded and so intense that maybe it's better to operate behind closed doors. You some-

times wonder who is having more influence—the lobbyists or the members."

Obey said he sympathized with the problem, but disagreed with the closed-session solution. "If the members can't stand up to the pressures in the room, they shouldn't be in the room," he said.

Senate Finance Committee aide: "There's a great deal of confusion and bad reporting when you have [a meeting] opened and you haven't completed your press release."

Rep. David R. Obey, D-Wis.: "If the members can't stand up to the pressures in the room, they shouldn't be in the room."

SUMMARY OF OPEN HOUSE AMENDMENTS OF 1979

No. 1. Oversight Subcommittees—Each committee other than Appropriations and Budget having more than 20 members would be required to establish an oversight subcommittee.

No. 2. Oversight Agendas—Each committee would be required to formally develop and adopt an oversight agenda and timetable at the beginning of each Congress and submit it to the Government Operations Committee within 60 days of the convening of the Congress. The Government Operations Committee would be required to hold hearings on these oversight agendas and, after consultation with the majority and minority leadership, publish the agendas together with its recommendations for coordination within 90 days after the convening of the Congress. The Government Operations Committee would also be required to assess the oversight activities reported by each committee at the end of each Congress and publish its evaluation.

No. 3. Ethics Investigations—The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct would be required to issue a report on any investigation it has undertaken. The House may direct an investigation by a resolution reported from the Rules Committee or by a resolution called up by any Member who has filed a complaint if the Committee does not vote to investigate it within 15 days after receipt of the complaint.

No. 4. Subcommittee Limitation—Each standing committee, other than Appropriations, shall establish no more than 6 subcommittees.

No. 5. Public Access to Committee Records—Each committee shall keep a verbatim transcript of all legislative and investigative action which shall be made available for public inspection unless it involves matters which would endanger the national security or violate any law or rule of the House. A separate summary would also be kept of all committee action which would also be available for public inspection.

No. 6. Proxy Voting Ban—No vote could be cast by proxy in committee.

No. 7. Open Committee Meetings—All committee meetings would be open to the public unless a committee majority votes to close a meeting for national security, personal privacy, or internal budgetary or personnel reasons.

No. 8. Quorum Requirement—A majority of a committee would constitute a quorum for the transaction of any business, including the markup of legislation.

No. 9. Committee Voting—A rollcall vote could be demanded on any question by any member of the committee, and would be mandatory on reporting any measure or matter and the results of such a vote would be published in the committee report.

No. 10. Conference Committee Transcripts—A verbatim transcript would be kept of all conference committee meetings with the consent of the Senate conferees. The transcripts of all open meetings would be available for public inspection, and all transcripts would be available for inspection by House Members.

COSPONSORS OF OPEN HOUSE AMENDMENTS

Cosponsors of all 10 Amendments: Mr. Burgener, Mr. Butler, Mr. Carter, Mr. Coelho, Mr. Collins, Mr. Conable, Mr. Conte, Mr. Corcoran, Mr. Coughlin, Mr. Edgar, Mr. Emery, Mrs. Fenwick, Mr. Frenzel, Mr. Gingrich, Mr. Gradison, Mr. Green, Mr. Hagedorn, Mr. Horton, Mr. Hyde, Mr. Jeffries, Mr. Leach, Mr. Lagomarsino, Mr. Lott, Mr. Lungren, Mr. McKinney, Mr. Marlenee, Mr. Solomon, Mr. Stangeland, Mr. Walker, Mr. Winn, and Mr. Whittaker.

Cosponsors of Amendment No. 1: Mr. Bedell, Mr. Gephardt, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Levitas, Mr. Maguire, and Mr. Ottinger.

Cosponsors of Amendment No. 2: Mr. Bedell, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Gephardt, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Levitas, Mr. Maguire, and Mr. Ottinger.

Cosponsors of Amendment No. 3: Mr. Bedell, Mr. Findley, Mr. Gephardt, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Glickman, and Mr. Maguire.

Cosponsors of Amendment No. 4: Mr. Bedell, Mr. Carr, Mr. Findley, Mr. Gephardt, Mr. Glickman, and Mr. Ottinger.

Cosponsors of Amendment No. 5: Mr. Bedell, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Findley, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Glickman, Mr. Jeffords, Mr. Maguire, Mr. Ottinger, and Mr. Symms.

Cosponsors of Amendment No. 6: Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Findley, Mr. Gephardt, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Jeffords, Mr. Simon, and Mr. Symms.

Cosponsors of Amendment No. 7: Mr. Bedell, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Findley, Mr. Gephardt, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Glickman, Mr. Jeffords, Mr. Levitas, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Symms, and Mr. Van Deerlin.

Cosponsors of Amendment No. 8: Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Findley, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Jeffords, and Mr. Symms.

Cosponsors of Amendment No. 9: Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Findley, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Jeffords, Mr. Ottinger, and Mr. Symms.

Cosponsors of Amendment No. 10: Mr. Bedell, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Findley, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Glickman, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Jeffords, Mr. Levitas, Mr. Ottinger, and Mr. Symms. ●

AWARENESS OF PRODUCTIVITY GROWS

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the most neglected and misunderstood economic concept has always been productivity. Higher productivity rates have been responsible for economic growth, higher wages, and bigger profits without inflation. Without higher productivity growth rates, there can be little economic growth. Without higher productivity growth rates, wage and price increases lead directly to higher inflation rates.

Until recently, mentioning the concept of productivity was met with incomprehension or lack of interest. Most economists were unfamiliar with productivity, and the administration followed its predecessor's lead in disregarding productivity altogether. This may have been acceptable during the years 1947-67, when the productivity growth rate averaged 3.3 percent, but this incomprehension and lack of interest has become alarming in recent years. From 1967-73, the annual growth in productivity slipped to 2.1 percent; and, from 1973-

77, the rate was 1.3 percent. During 1978, the rate fell below 1 percent; and we have recently learned that the figures for the first quarter of 1979 project an annual productivity decline of 4.5 percent. Not uncoincidentally, inflation has soared to double-digit levels during this same time period.

At long last, attention is now being focused on the problem of the lagging rate of productivity growth in both the private and the public sectors. The New York Stock Exchange and the Joint Economic Committee have issued insightful studies of the problem. As part of this new trend is an excellent article by Steven Rattner, which appeared in the May 8 edition of the *New York Times*; and I want to commend this article to my colleagues' attention.

The article follows:

**PRODUCTIVITY LAG CAUSES WORRY
EXPERTS FEAR EFFECT OF SLOWER GROWTH RATE
(By Steven Rattner)**

WASHINGTON, May 7.—Economists, businessmen and Government officials have become concerned about a market drop in the nation's productivity growth rate, a development they fear will reduce economic growth and increase inflation and unemployment.

According to the latest figures released by the Labor Department, the productivity rate in the first quarter of this year declined at an annual rate of 4.5 percent. Historically, the productivity rate in this country has increased about 3 percent a year.

Productivity is often thought of as efficiency. In its most commonly watched form, productivity refers to how much an individual worker can produce in a certain amount of time.

"Productivity growth in 1978 showed a very marked slowdown from accustomed rates," the Council of Economic Advisers reported earlier this year, "adding substantially to inflationary pressures and raising fundamental concerns about underlying trends."

The slump in productivity means the nation's outlook for long-term real economic growth has dropped to 3 percent from 3½ percent, the council has estimated.

Increases in productivity allow employers to increase wages without increasing prices because each worker is producing more. But slower productivity growth means that wage increases are not completely offset by output increases. This means higher costs for business, which raises prices, leading to more inflation. The higher prices cut consumer purchasing power, reducing economic growth and, ultimately, increasing unemployment. In short, without increases in productivity, economic growth is limited.

United States productivity averaged just 1 percent a year from 1973 through 1977 and dipped further to six-tenths of 1 percent last year.

Economists and businessmen agree that, contrary to some perceptions, productivity growth does not really mean working harder. Instead, productivity growth is thought to result from increased capital investment, a more highly skilled labor force, inexpensive energy, more efficient management and other efficiencies.

Although economists disagree over magnitudes, there is a general consensus on some of the factors involved in the productivity slump. Among them:

CAPITAL INVESTMENT LAG

According to the Council of Economic Advisers, a drop in the rate of capital investment may be responsible for the loss of half a percentage point a year in productivity growth. Between 1948 and 1973, the

ratio of capital to labor grew 3 percent a year. Since 1973, however, the rate of increase has been only 1¼ percent annually. The problem has been particularly acute in certain industries, such as steel.

"I think productivity on balance in the steel industry is not improving," said Bill Roesch, executive vice president of the United States Steel Corporation. "Capital investment hasn't remained as strong because profits haven't remained as strong."

GROWING REGULATION

Businessmen often attribute the productivity slump to increased Government regulation, which they contend has forced the diversion of investment funds and employee time to such tasks as emission abatement and safety—tasks that do not increase output. A study by Edward F. Denison, made while he was a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, found that environmental and worker health and safety programs alone cut conventionally measured productivity by 1.4 percent between 1967 and 1975.

LESS PRODUCTIVE LABOR

The vast influx of youths, women and minorities within the labor force has meant more workers with less experience and training. Between 1955 and 1973, this phenomenon cost productivity growth four-tenths of a percentage point annually, according to the Council of Economic Advisers. Since 1973 the loss has been about one-third of a percentage point, the council said.

Business is sensitive about acknowledging this phenomenon, but the increase in training and recruiting programs alone has added large costs. According to a study by the Business Roundtable, equal employment opportunity programs cost 48 companies \$217 million in 1977.

HIGHER ENERGY PRICES

The rapid rise in energy prices has cut sharply into business's ability to substitute energy-intensive machinery for people. "In my view, the reaction to higher energy prices is responsible for three-fourths of the productivity problems," said Dale Jorgenson, who is a professor of economics at Harvard University.

"We've cut our energy consumption by 15 percent in the last five years," said Herbert Lyon, vice president of the Dow Chemical Company. "That way, capital investment comes out as energy cost savings rather than as new capacity that might increase labor productivity."

SHIFT TO SERVICES

Part of the productivity problem has been the shift away from agriculture, where productivity gains have been comparatively large, toward services, where increases in productivity are hard to achieve. Between 1973 and 1977, productivity in services declined three-tenths of 1 percent a year, according to the Council of Economic Advisers.

One service-oriented company, the J. C. Penney Company, created a high-level study group about three years ago to work on improving productivity. The result has been a variety of new programs. "We've increased our productivity in the last two years," said Donald V. Siebert, chairman, but it's been a continual battle.

Some economists and businessmen blame a lag in innovation caused by a decline in spending on research and development. In 1964 such outlays totaled 3 percent of output. Last year they dropped to 2.2 percent.

The Government has become concerned with the trend and has started a number of studies of technological innovation, one of them being a study of the impact of Government regulation on technology.

This paradox has been observed: In the short term, lagging productivity can cause business to increase its hiring, thereby creating the illusion of prosperity. Last year

the economy added 3.6 million new jobs, far more than the moderate 4 percent increase in the gross national product would suggest. Economists believe that the difference was accounted for by the falloff in productivity increase.

"The implications are just beginning to be understood," said C. Jackson Grayson, director of the American Productivity Center in Houston. "They range from continuing high levels of inflation to a gradual stagnation of the American economy and the end of its world leadership."

In part, the lack of public understanding of the productivity problem probably results from the lack of reliable data.

"One of the most confusing things about productivity is measurement," said the Secretary of Labor, Ray Marshall, who is responsible for the statistics.

Of perhaps even more concern than the dismal productivity performance is the fact that few policy makers profess to have solutions. Changes in the tax system might be needed to improve capital investment. And the addition of women, minorities and youths to the labor force still seems to enjoy wide public and Administration support.

But the problem has already elicited a strong reaction from Capitol Hill. Senator Lloyd Bentsen of Texas, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, said recently that the United States ran the risk of "social upheaval" if it failed to reverse the trend toward smaller productivity increases.

Last Oct. 23, President Carter established a National Productivity Council to be operated under the auspices of the Office of Management and Budget.

Still, few persons are optimistic about improving productivity quickly. The Council of Economic Advisers has lowered its assumption of long-run productivity growth from 2½ percent to 2 percent. ●

WHY I CARE ABOUT AMERICA

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I submit for entry in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, the winning speech from the "Voice of Democracy Contest" in the District of Columbia.

Each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conduct a writing contest and award five national scholarships as top prizes.

Pamela Marie Hamilton, 104 Elmira Street SW., is this year's winning contestant in Washington, D.C. The theme of this year's contest was "Why I Care About America."

Congratulations to Ms. Hamilton for her outstanding work and for her deep and abiding faith in our great Nation. I am pleased to submit Ms. Hamilton's essay for your review:

ESSAY BY PAMELA MARIE HAMILTON

Long ago, when I was in kindergarten, my whole class would stand and, from memory, recite the pledge of allegiance. We were all so proud that we had finally mastered those few words that made us official school girls and school boys. We were happy because everyone knew you had to be able to say the pledge of allegiance before one could go to school. Little did we realize that in those few words were the staples of our whole existence.

Today, I am in high school and in a few years I'll be well into college. Yet, do I still

know fully the meaning of those words? More importantly, do I believe them? This pledge speaks of liberty and justice for all. Can this only be a dream of some crazed patriot? Surely, this is not the America I know today. True, America is not what she once was. She is two hundred and one years old and no longer a child. For some she is the golden land of opportunity, for others she is an ugly hell-hole seething with pain.

In the United States, there are violent crimes committed every second. There is widespread poverty and there are people dying from hunger. In Ohio, a city is in disgrace and out of money. Americans are said to live a fast life with no feeling, no hope, no true brotherly love. They have only love for material things.

Sounds dismal, doesn't it? But, think of how many people from all over the world scrimp and save to reach our border, our "pearly gates."

When I reflect upon the insides of my country, the heart and soul of what makes her so very good for some, I take a look at me. I'm healthy and young. I have parents whom I cannot imagine living without. I have a close knit family that cares for me and I for them—deeply. Deeper than anyone could imagine. I don't have a lot of money, or clothes or cars, but I have a place to grow and learn. America is a good place for me, my family and my friends, many of them. I could not think of living anywhere else.

Am I an exception? Perhaps not. But I know that if someplace can give me all this goodness, no matter how bad it is and how bad it seems, even if I am in the minority, then it is worth caring about. Worth living for. America has potential. That cannot be denied. She has the potential to be what no other country has ever been—an indivisible nation under God, bonded by love.

But, who is this America? Is it the Congress, that body of persons who possess the power to pass bills to tell us how to live? Is it the president who could start a new agency—the Department of Brotherly Love? Maybe its head could be called the Secretary of Good Feelings. Is it the courts, the group of justices that could possibly try a person for unloving behavior? They could impose a penalty of five years imprisonment. No, America's soul lies not there among these particularly. It lies in you and me, for we are America. And if we care for ourselves and our lives, then we may care for her. Then we may appreciate her goodness and, yes, her weakness, for no one is perfect.

America, like all other countries, is not perfect. It is a land that is a mixture of kindness and cruelty, richness and poverty, love and pain. While most people only see the negative aspects of this country, it has shown me a lot of good. That is why I care about America. Because I am a part of this land and I care for me! ●

NATIONAL PRODUCT LIABILITY ACT

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● **Mr. ERLBORN.** Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a measure to cure the pervasive disease known as product liability.

All of us have heard one story after another about mushrooming product liability insurance premiums. I know of no industry that has escaped this epidemic.

The National Machine Tool Builders' Association reported in 1977 that premiums in that industry had increased some

700 percent since 1970. One businessman in my district tells me his annual premium went from \$1,200 with no deductibles in 1976 to \$35,000 with a \$10,000 deductible.

Premium increases, however, are but one of the symptoms. Many companies, unable to pay the added costs, are folding, and that means people lose their jobs.

Other companies pass the higher costs on to the rest of us, as consumers. Some forget about insurance altogether, or self-insure.

Then there are those who are reluctant to develop new products or who discontinue making the items that account for product liability suits; and foreign goods enter the market to fill the gaps.

All of this has been documented by the Commerce Department's Task Force on Product Liability and in hearings by the House Committee on Small Business and other congressional committees. They have suggested a variety of solutions, including revisions of the 50 State laws, arbitration, and special tax treatment of self-insurance reserves, which, in my view, treat the symptoms and not the disease.

The significant change in product liability law we have witnessed over the past several years results from a series of court decisions. In effect, the courts have made manufacturers insurers. They have made manufacturers completely responsible for their own errors, for those of employees, and for users of their products. Negligence is no longer the primary requirement for liability.

The bill I am introducing today is identical to the measure (H.R. 6300) proposed in 1977 by our former colleague from Connecticut, Ronald A. Sarasin. I am convinced, as I was when I cosponsored the Sarasin bill, we need a uniform law to govern product liability suits that modifies the concept of strict liability which is denying common law defenses to manufacturers and distributors.

The National Product Liability Act I am proposing provides these defenses while preserving the basic right of the consumer against defective products. In fact, these protections are strengthened in that the bill requires adequate warnings and protections.

The National Product Liability Act provides the uniformity needed to cure the far-reaching problems of product liability.

A section-by-section analysis follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS—NATIONAL PRODUCT LIABILITY ACT OF 1979

SEC. 1. PURPOSE

To improve the safety of products manufactured and sold in interstate commerce, to reduce the number of deaths and injuries caused by such products, and for other purposes.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND SCOPE

Findings—that there is a diversity of laws in states affecting liability for products; that diversity has caused confusion and inequity, failed to adequately promote the safety of products and their use, adversely interfered with effective operation of interstate commerce; and without a uniform law, such conditions will continue.

The purpose of the Act, through the Congressional power to regulate commerce is, to establish substantive law of product liability; to establish certain procedural and evidentiary rules for such actions in state or federal courts; and to leave to the states those areas of law regarding product liability which are best determinable by local needs and considerations.

SEC. 3. PREEMPTION

Product liability action established under this Act preempts all existing causes and laws for the same purpose, regardless of the theory upon which they are based.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS

"Harm"—property damage, death, physical change or mental harm;

"Caused"—that which, unbroken by any efficient intervening action, produces harm and without which harm would not have occurred;

"Product"—machine, manufacture, composition of matter, or other tangible item or component or part thereto, including packaging;

"Leaves the control"—physically leaves the control of the original seller and/or manufacturer;

"Manufacturer"—one who fabricates, assembles or produces;

"Seller"—includes wholesaler, distributor, lessor, or bailor—one who is regularly engaged in selling (or leasing) such product whether for resale by the purchaser or use or consumption by the purchaser.

SEC. 5. PRODUCT LIABILITY ACTION

Establishes the grounds for suit against a manufacturer for (1) selling a product in a defective condition, or (2) failing to warn or protect against a dangerous or hazardous condition in the use or reasonably foreseeable mis- or unintended use. The right to sue is irrespective of the exercise of all possible care in the preparation/sale and irrespective of a contractual relationship between the manufacturer or seller and the user.

SEC. 6. PARTIES TO THE ACTION

A reasonably anticipated user or "innocent by-stander" who can prove that harm caused him was reasonably foreseeable from the condition or failure complained of. "Person" includes injured party, heirs, guardian, or employer or legal representative in subrogation action.

Allows party to a suit to indemnify on basis of misconduct; allows for comparative damages. Misconduct includes failure to comply with any safety standards which, if complied with, would have prevented the harm. Furthermore, retains the financial bar of workers' compensation for the employer.

SEC. 7. TIME FOR BRINGING SUIT

No later than 2 years from the time the harm is first sustained, discovered or in the exercise of reasonable care should have been discovered.

SEC. 8. LIMITATIONS, DEFENSES, AND DAMAGES

A product shall be deemed defective only if it is unreasonably dangerous for its intended use at the time it left the control of the party being sued. The test for defectiveness is whether it was "unreasonably dangerous" to an extent beyond that which would be contemplated by the ordinary and reasonable user. Here, a distinction is drawn between the level of knowledge expected of a consumer and of an employee. "Defective" condition may occur in design, plan, method of manufacture, structure, composition, testing, packaging, labeling or advertising of the product.

A failure to warn or protect against a dangerous condition, under normal conditions and use (or anticipated misuse) shall not extend to:

Safeguards, precautions, and actions which

a person reasonably could and should take for himself or herself—considering activity, training, experience, education and special knowledge, or

To situations where such safeguards, etc., would or should have been taken by such person similarly situated exercising reasonable care, caution and procedure, or

To situations where protection is not feasible, at which time the duty is only to warn.

Compliance with federal or state safety standards at the time of manufacture shall constitute a rebuttable presumption that the product design was not defective and that the defendant responsible for the design was not negligent with respect to such design. The presumption may be rebutted only by clear and convincing evidence that the manufacturer did not comply with such standard or regulation or that such standard of regulation did not address the risk complained of.

A party against whom such an action is being brought shall not be liable for damages occasioned by any harm which was not reasonably foreseeable at the time the product left the party's control.

Any party against whom the action is being brought shall be liable only for the amount of harm caused by the defective condition of his product at the time it left his control or his failure of duty in Section 5(2). In determining the amount, the following situations shall be taken into account:

Any alteration, modification or change of such product after leaving the manufacturer's control, unless with the specific consent and under instructions of the manufacturer;

The subsequent failure of any person who by law was dutybound to bring the product into conformance with health and safety standards;

The degree to which the misconduct of the harmed party contributed to his harm, including negligence, willful disregard of instructions, warnings or protections, or unforeseeable misuse of unintended use;

The degree of contribution of a subcomponent of the final product;

Any other facts that would tend to show that the harm that did occur was greater than the harm that would have occurred if the product had been used in the same condition as when it left the control.

The product shall be presumed to be safe, and all warnings, protections and instructions adequate after ten years. Such presumption shall be rebuttable only by clear and convincing evidence that the product was defective and that adequate duties to warn were not given; and no other person had control of the product subsequent to the time it left the control who could have been reasonably expected to conform the product to any existing standards which if done would have prevented the harm.

Any non-reimbursable benefits to the victim or heirs * * * shall be admitted into evidence during consideration of the amount that the harm that did occur was greater than of the award.

Evidence of any alteration, modification, improvement, repair or change in or discontinuation of a product can be introduced only by a party to show the condition of the product on the occasion of the harm.

Any advances in the state of the art or in standards and practices in the industry cannot be used as evidence to prove defective condition or failure to provide adequate warnings.

A Masters report can be required in any case at the federal level. The Master must have reasonable familiarity with the technology, background and operation of the industry in which the product resides.

In action brought under Section 5, no punitive or exemplary damages shall be awarded unless it is found that the sued party acted out of malice toward the harmed

person or willfully and wantonly disregarded public health and safety. Thus must be proved by clear and convincing evidence, and the trier shall separately state the amount of punitive or exemplary damages.

SEC. 9. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

The primary forum for trying such cases shall be the state courts, although federal action can be brought when the matter in controversy exceeds \$100,000.

SEC. 10. EFFECTIVE DATE

Provides that the provisions of this Act are not retroactive and shall control only those actions where the harm occurred on or after the date of enactment.

SEC. 11. SEPARABILITY

In any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this Act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby. ●

TRIBUTE TO SAMMY KAHN

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, each of us has a few constituents back home for whom we harbor particular respect and affection. They are usually individuals who have earned a similar respect and affection from their own communities through commitment of years of effort and participation in community affairs.

One such individual in my own congressional district is Sammy Kahn, longtime pharmacist and leading citizen of Los Altos, Calif., population 24,956. Sammy Kahn is also the brother-in-law of our colleague JIM LLOYD, and I know JIM agrees that both of us will do well to ever match in Congress the esteem and affection which Sammy Kahn has earned in Los Altos.

As the institutions of American small towns are fully as important as our national institutions, I hope our colleagues will not think it inappropriate to insert here in our national journal a recent tribute to Sammy Kahn from the Los Altos Town Crier:

SAMMY KAHN HONORED FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE

GIVEN BOARD OF REALTORS' 16TH ANNUAL AWARD

Longtime Los Altos resident Samuel ("Sammy") Kahn, who has been instrumental in guiding the city's orderly development, is the recipient of the 16th annual Community Service Award presented by Los Altos Board of Realtors.

The presentation was made April 18 during a luncheon attended by civic leaders, past recipients and board members at Rick-ey's Hyatt House.

Peter Volavrich, president of Los Altos Rotary Club which nominated Kahn for the award, introduced the 1979 recipient. The presentation was made by Ray L. Seewer, Board of Realtors president.

A pharmacist and pharmacy owner in Los Altos for almost 40 years, Kahn says of his adopted city, "I love it. I've always been right there to help when it's for Los Altos."

He has demonstrated this affection in many ways—working for the 1952 incorporation, serving twice on citizens' committees for review of the city's general plan and for

many years on the Los Altos Village Association's capital improvements committee, which has guided downtown development.

During World War II when there were no physicians practicing in Los Altos, he often counseled members of the community on their health problems, as well as serving on nightly 8 p.m. to midnight shifts to watch for enemy aircraft.

Also during the War, Kahn and his wife Annette, a registered nurse, set up a portable, 12-bed hospital in a Los Altos church for use in case of a local disaster.

For many years he acted and sang for the Fathers' Frolics to help raise funds for the Covington pool and Los Altos Youth Center. His starring roles included notable performances as Marlene Dietrich and the Shah of Iran.

For 29 years he has been a member of Los Altos Rotary Club. He also belongs to Palo Alto Elks Club and B'nai-B'rith and was a charter member of Congregation Beth Am.

Kahn, born and raised in San Francisco, opened his first pharmacy in Los Altos in December 1939 at the corner of First and Main Streets—now the site of the Bullfighter Inn.

After 16 years at that location, he built his present building, Kahn's Corner Pharmacy, at Third and Main Streets.

When Kahn and his wife Annette settled in Los Altos, the population was about 2,500. "But half of those were just here in the summer time," he said in a recent interview. "It was a real village."

He came here after 10 years as a pharmacist with H.L. Ladd Chemist in the St. Francis Hotel—"the swankiest drugstore in San Francisco."

Recalling his reception by the people of Los Altos, he said, "It took a while before they'd trust this slicker from San Francisco. But after one and a half to two years, everything was okay."

"You got to know everybody," he continued. "If there was a dance or a picnic, everybody got together." He remembered one occasion when he and his wife were driving home on the old two-lane San Antonio Road after attending a night movie and wondering "who the devil it could be" in the car behind them. It didn't occur to them that the driver might be a stranger.

A feature attraction of Kahn's first pharmacy in Los Altos was a "gorgeous Italian marble soda fountain counter," a popular gathering place for students from the old San Antonio School. "To tell you the truth I hated that fountain," he said, "because I knew nothing about it."

Kahn was among those who tried unsuccessfully to keep the train in Los Altos. Recalling his homesickness for San Francisco when he first came to Los Altos, he said, "Every morning when I saw the train leave that station I wanted to be on it."

During World War II, however, he was too involved in the problems of his new community to be homesick. "Annette and I didn't sleep the whole wartime because the Red Cross said it wouldn't serve us," he said.

With Guy Shoup guiding the project, the young couple organized a portable hospital in the old Union Church, where one room was turned into an operating room and all the equipment for the hospital was stored in the church altar area.

Drills were held to see how quickly the 12 donated cots could be set up as a hospital in case of an emergency. With all the doctors off in the service, some 60 nurses were standing by to volunteer their services.

"Fortunately, we never had to use it all," Kahn said.

He counseled residents for their minor illnesses, but if they were really sick they had to go to Mountain View or Sunnyvale to find a physician—inconvenient during wartime gas rationing.

"There was hardly a night during the war

when I didn't have to go back to the store to get something for somebody," Kahn revealed.

While his pharmacy was still located at First and Main, he let Los Altos Chamber of Commerce build its first building on his property at Third and Main—rent free—until he was ready to build his own drug-store at location. In 1955 the original Chamber building was moved to another site.

Kahn took his training as a pharmacist at the University of California in San Francisco. After her graduation as a nurse from French Hospital in San Francisco, Annette was in charge of a floor at Dante Hospital in the City.

Introduced by a mutual pharmacist friend, the Kahns were married Sept. 19, 1937.

They have two sons. Melvin Kahn, a pharmacist, has taken over the running of the store now that his father has semiretired. Melvin and his wife Mady have two sons: Mathew, 9, and Brandon, 6. Bruce Kahn employed by Polychrome Corp., lives in Pittsburgh, Pa., with his wife Carol and 10½-month old daughter Angela.

Kahn said he would most like to be remembered for his work in guiding the development of Los Altos through his years as an active member of the Los Altos Village Association.

"The city council and the planning commission listen to what we think should be done. We work very well with the city," he said, adding, "I hope they never destroy the looks or feeling of the town—its closeness." ●

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF COL. MICHAEL KOVATS DE FABRICY (1724-1779), COMMANDANT OF THE PULASKI LEGION AND VICTORIOUS DEFENDER OF THE SOUTH IN THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1979

● Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, the American Hungarian Federation, in cooperation with other Hungarian organizations, associations and churches of the American Hungarian community, saluted the 200th anniversary of the victorious defense of Charleston, S.C., the key city of the South in the Revolutionary War, by the Pulaski Legion, and commemorated the heroic death of Hungarian-born Col. Michael Kovats de Fabricy, Commandant of the Legion, near Charleston, on the 11th of May, 1779, with a "Congressional Banquet and Commemorative Program" in the caucus room of the Cannon House Office Building on Wednesday, the 9th of May, 1979.

The event was honored by a message of the President of the United States, and of several Members of the U.S. Congress. The commemorative message of the Citadel, Military College of South Carolina, Charleston, S.C., was presented by Brig. Gen. T. C. Pinckney, U.S. Air Force, Director, East Asian and Pacific Region, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, International Security Affairs, The Pentagon, an alumnus of the Citadel. The military merits of Col. Kovats, and the Legion (originally called "American Legion" or "Independent Legion") were expounded by Lt. Gen. Daniel O. Graham, USA (retired). Former Director, U.S. Defense Intelligence

Agency, national cochairman, Coalition for Peace through Strength. Another distinguished American, the Honorable Edward Mezvinsky, U.S. Representative to the United Nations Committee on Human Rights addressed the gathering of "The Pulaski Legion: a Model for Inter-Ethnic Cooperation."

Dr. Elemer Bako, area specialist in the European Division of the Library of Congress, and Director of the Bicentennial Research Department of the Washington Chapter of the American Hungarian Federation, lectured on "Col. Michael Kovats de Fabricy: Commandant of the Pulaski Legion: Man and Mission."

In the following, I wish to insert Dr. Bako's lecture:

We all have heard, by now, in the addresses of the two distinguished generals, about the historical and military values provided for us, for the entire Nation, for all future generations of Americans and the future waves of immigrants coming to the shores of this great land, who will appear on the stage of history to populate, to defend, to build and to lead this ever-growing country of the United States of America, in the lives of Hungarian-born Michael Kovats de Fabricy, and Polish-born Casimir Pulaski.

To emulate their importance to American history, particularly to American military history, is not my task tonight.

To compare their virtues, their leadership abilities, the forms and the substance of their demonstrated loyalty to the cause of the freedom and independence of the United States, to study their individual (but, basically, very similar) motivations in the service of universal human rights and liberties, is not my present task either.

This day, and this occasion particularly, are dedicated to the memory of the 200th anniversary of the victorious defense of Charleston, South Carolina, in the month of May, 1779, and especially by us, American Hungarians, to the bicentennial of the heroic self-sacrifice of Colonel Kovats, a lonely man, coming from the heartland of my own Hungarian nation, whose life was turned into an eternal example for all Americans, but, most of all, for all American Hungarians.

Colonel Michael de Kovats arrived to this country with the sense of a mission.

I shall appraise him as a fellow Hungarian, the very first among us, American Hungarians, who sacrificed his life in the defense of this great country, with that mission in his heart and mind.

In his background, he had a thorough, classical education, most probably received at the Reformed College of Debrecen, the center of Hungarian Calvinism, my own Alma Mater. As demonstrated by his letter dated January 13, 1777, to Benjamin Franklin, then American envoy in France, while waiting in the port city of Bordeaux, France, for his departure to America, Michael de Kovats has learned his Latin well: a language which had been used by Hungarians, Protestants and Catholics alike, as a shield to fend off the encroaching Germanization efforts by the Habsburg Kings, and by their enormous bureaucracy. More than that, the same Latin language, long recognized as the medium of expression of Classic Rome's democracy, had been used as a sword by Hungarian writers, historians and politicians, to expound their own beliefs in the ideas of liberty and independence, as they have been perpetuated in writing, in the same Latin language, in the laws and decrees of the Hungarian Constitution, ever since the reign of Hungary's first Christian king, Saint Stephen which began in the first year of the Second Millennium.

The shocks caused by the Reformation and

Hungarian nation, the two camps often struggling for the implementation of their own principles in the religious, educational or social domains of action. While Roman Catholic Hungarians received their backing from the Catholic powers within the enormous Holy Roman Empire, ruled by Habsburg Emperors (who, since 1526, were also Kings of Hungary), the Protestants (most of them Calvinists) had to struggle, in most situations, for survival. Led by the Protestant Princes of the Hungarian Principate of Transylvania, they turned to the Protestant powers of Europe: to England, Holland, Sweden, and, later, to the emerging Protestant rulers of Northern and Eastern Germany.

Most of these Protestant contacts crossed Polish territory. Consequently, the geographical closeness and geopolitical similarity between harassed Polish Catholics and Hungarian Protestants, both involved, again and again, in fighting off the same adversaries: the Habsburgs and the Ottoman Turks, who kept threatening their existence, created a degree of closeness, friendship and affection between Catholic Poles and Protestant Hungarians.

This is the key to the secret of the great friendship and solidarity between the two heroes, Pulaski and Kovats: here, in the United States, so far from their homelands, then again under foreign domination, they have found their common ground of action and they have accepted their common destiny, or, at least, they have worked out their common approach to their destiny.

The key to this common approach is given in the motto and the symbols of the "Pulaski Banner", actually planned and designed by Colonel Kovats. In this banner, he constructed several symbolic elements as historical references to two periods of Hungarian and Polish history into a solid unity of graphic statement on their own, new American situations: a Hungarian-Polish military unit on American soil put under the guidance of the Almighty and in the service of the United States, their new land of hope. The two periods of Hungarian and Polish history, the times of Hungarian-born Stephen Bathory, Poland's memorable king, at the end of the 16th century, and the first decade of the 18th century when Transylvania's Hungarian prince, Francis Rákóczi II led his 7-year struggle (in 1704-1711) against the Habsburgs, and found refuge in Poland after the lost struggle, are marked deeply in the memory of both nations.

Thus, the banner, also the symbol of the two self-exiled heroes, is a reflection upon the two, then oppressed nations of Hungarians and Poles.

The mission for which Colonel Kovats came to America was expressed in his memorable letter to Benjamin Franklin (of which I quote the following parts):

I am a free man and a Hungarian. I now am here of my own free will, having taken all the horrible hardships and bothers of this journey, and I am willing to sacrifice myself wholly and faithfully as it is expected of an honest soldier facing the hazards and great dangers of the war, to the detriment of Joseph and as well for the freedom of your great Congress. At last, awaiting your gracious answer, I have no wish greater than to leave forthwith, to be where I am needed most, to serve and die in everlasting obedience to Your Excellency and the Congress.

Most faithful unto death,

MICHAEL KOVATS DE FABRICY.

Michael de Kovats has kept his promise: he remained most faithful unto death to this country and to the cause of American independence.

He also fulfilled his mission: In the short span of a single year, he created, with the enthusiastic support of General

Pulaski, a very effective unit which managed to save the important city of Charleston for another year for General Washington and for the U.S. Congress, with a degree of heroism most uncommon in those times.

The 3 days of the "Battle for Charleston" against an overwhelming enemy, and the followup while, even after the death of Colonel Kovats, the strongly decimated Legion pursued the enemy, out of the Peninsula, and all the way back to Savannah, Ga., should be treated with much more accuracy, appreciation and reverence than the off-handish reference by some of our historians, particularly military historians to the events and the heroic deeds performed by the officers and men of this immortal Legion, in that "Thermopylae of the American South" as "skirmishes."

Three years ago, in the year of the American Bicentennial, I had the honor to address a very distinguished audience at The Citadel, the Military College of South Carolina, at Charleston, which, more than two decades earlier, has honored the memory of Colonel Kovats by naming a training field after him and setting up an impressive marker.

On the same occasion, Lieutenant General Segniou, president of The Citadel, made a statement in the course of his official address which resounded ever since in my heart:

I don't want Charleston to be remembered in the history books as the "city of surrender," after the disgraceful loss of the city in 1780, when thousands of American officers and men had been marched off as prisoners of war, but as "the city of victorious resistance" of May, 1779, when a small unit of brave, excellently trained and selfless men saved it and General Washington from a British attack across the South for a whole year.

Colonel Kovats' mission was, thus, accomplished. And, as his ancestors have done against the Ottoman Turks throughout 160 years of relentless warfare, and, whenever it became necessary, against the Habsburg kings in the course of the four centuries of their rule over Hungary, this deeply religious Christian hero of human rights and national independence has lifted up high the Banner of Liberty in one of the most critical moments of the American War of Independence.

It is time that we recognize the importance of his services to this great country and pay homage to the man, to the soldier, and to the hero of human rights and freedom.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of all meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an interim procedure until the computerization of this information becomes operational the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of

Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, May 24, 1979, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 25

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Office of the Secretary of Transportation.

1224 Dirksen Building

Select on Small Business
To continue hearings to examine the economic concentration in the newspaper publishing industry.

424 Russell Building

Joint Economic
To resume hearings on the Consumer Price Index figures, and on inflationary trends.

345 Cannon Building

JUNE 1

10:00 a.m.
Joint Economic
To hold hearings on the employment-unemployment situation for May.

5110 Dirksen Building

JUNE 4

9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 15, to prohibit discrimination on the basis of geography in the issuance and use of credit cards.

5302 Dirksen Building

Select on Ethics
To resume hearings in conjunction with the investigation of Senator Talmadge's alleged abuse of certain financial reporting rules of the Senate.

1202 Dirksen Building

2:30 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on H.R. 1786, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1980 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

S-146, Capitol

JUNE 5

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting, to mark up H.R. 1786, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1980 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

235 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Select on Ethics
To continue hearings in conjunction with the investigation of Senator Talmadge's alleged abuse of certain financial reporting rules of the Senate.

1202 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 15, to prohibit discrimination on the basis of geography in the issuance and use of credit cards.

5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 611 and 622, bills providing for the development

of domestic, international, and rural broadcasting stations, focusing on the implementation of cable television, the National Commission on Spectrum Management, and public resource fee schedules for nonbroadcast commercial uses of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum.

6226 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold closed hearings on the storage of nuclear waste.

S-406, Capitol

JUNE 6

9:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings to explore the impact higher education will have on youth in business for the coming decade.

4232 Dirksen Building

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 870, proposed GI Bill Amendments Act, S. 830, to eliminate the State's required payment in the educational assistance allowance program provided for veterans, and S. 881, to provide for the protection of certain Officers and employees of the VA assigned to perform investigative or law enforcement functions.

6226 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Select on Ethics
To continue hearings in conjunction with the investigation of Senator Talmadge's alleged abuse of certain financial reporting rules of the Senate.

1202 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Economic Stabilization Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on the gasoline shortages.

5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 611 and 622, bills providing for the development of domestic, international, and rural broadcasting stations, focusing on the implementation of cable television, the National Commission on Spectrum Management, and public resource fee schedules for nonbroadcast uses of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum.

1318 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 796, proposed Railroad Deregulation Act.

235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, on pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on S. 623, proposed Senate Election Reform Act, to be followed by consideration of legislative and administrative business.

301 Russell Building

JUNE 7

9:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To continue hearings to explore the impact higher education will have on youth in business for the coming decade.

4232 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the effectiveness of warning labels on alcoholic beverages.

155 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the national blood policy program.

318 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the Department of Energy's report on the status of the petroleum situation.

3110 Dirksen Building

Select on Ethics

To continue hearings in conjunction with the investigation of Senator Talmadge's alleged abuse of certain financial reporting rules of the Senate.

1202 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Business meeting to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for public works and economic development programs of the Economic Development Administration.

5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 611 and 622, bills providing for the development of domestic, international, and rural broadcasting stations, focusing on the implementation of cable television, the National Commission on Spectrum Management, and public resource fee schedules for nonbroadcast uses of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum.

6226 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 796, proposed Railroad Deregulation Act.

235 Russell Building

Rules and Administration

To continue hearings on S. 623, proposed Senate Election Reform Act, to be followed by consideration of legislative and administrative business.

301 Russell Building

JUNE 8

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Education, Arts, and the Humanities Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings to explore the areas of basic learning skills used in elementary and secondary schools.

4232 Dirksen Building

Select on Ethics

To continue hearings in conjunction with the investigation of Senator Talmadge's alleged abuse of certain financial reporting rules of the Senate.

1202 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 611 and 622, bills providing for the development of domestic, international, and rural broadcasting stations, focusing on the implementation of cable television, the National Commission on Spectrum Management, and public resource fee schedules for nonbroadcast uses of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum.

235 Russell Building

JUNE 11

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
International Finance Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 339, to facilitate U.S. exports relative to credit to Communist countries.

5302 Dirksen Building

CXXV—790—Part 10

Labor and Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To hold hearings to investigate the environmental effects of low level radiation.

4232 Dirksen Building

JUNE 12

9:00 a.m.

*Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 689, proposed Veterans' Disability Compensation and Survivors Benefits Act.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of tax-exempt mortgage financing.

5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Conservation and Supply Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 950, proposed Omnibus Solar Energy Commercialization Act.

3110 Dirksen Building

JUNE 13

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 611 and 622, bills providing for the development of domestic, international, and rural broadcasting stations, focusing on the implementation of cable television, the National Commission on Spectrum Management, and public resource fee schedules for nonbroadcast uses of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum.

235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Conservation and Supply Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 950, proposed Omnibus Solar Energy Commercialization Act.

3110 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to mark up S. 570, to control increases in hospital revenues (Hospital Cost Containment).

4232 Dirksen Building

JUNE 14

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 611, and 622, bills providing for the development of domestic, international, and rural broadcasting stations, focusing on the implementation of cable television, the National Commission on Spectrum Management, and public resource fee schedules for nonbroadcast uses of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum.

235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting on pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 668, to allow the Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Indians of Oregon to file a claim with the U.S. Court of Claims for alleged failure of the United States to fulfill treaty obligations.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the activities of financial institutions relative to the sale of insurance.

5302 Dirksen Building

JUNE 15

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 611 and 622, bills providing for the development of domestic, international, and rural broadcasting stations, focusing on the implementation of cable television, the National Commission on Spectrum Management, and public resource fee schedules for nonbroadcast uses of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum.

235 Russell Building

JUNE 18

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 611 and 622, bills providing for the development of domestic, international, and rural broadcasting stations, focusing on the implementation of cable television, the National Commission on Spectrum Management, and public resource fee schedules for nonbroadcasting uses of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum.

235 Russell Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
International Finance Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 864, to establish an office within the Department of Commerce, which would promote and encourage the formation and utilization of export trade associations.

5302 Dirksen Building

JUNE 19

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To resume oversight hearings on the trucking industry's economic regulation by the Federal Government, focusing on household moving and the problems confronting both the household goods carriers and the consumers they serve.

235 Russell Building

*Energy and Natural Resources

To hold oversight hearings on the activities of programs administered by the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977.

3110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
International Finance Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 864, to establish an office within the Department of Commerce, which would promote and encourage the formation and utilization of export trade associations.

5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 611 and 622, bills providing for the development of domestic, international, and rural broadcasting stations, focusing on the implementation of cable television, the National Commission on Spectrum Management, and public resource fee schedules for nonbroadcast uses of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum.

1202 Dirksen Building

JUNE 20

9:00 a.m.

*Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 759, to provide for the right of the United States to recover the costs of hospital nursing home or outpatient medical care furnished by the Veterans' Administration to veterans for nonservice-connected disabilities to the extent that they have health insurance or similar contracts.

6226 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on S. 446, proposed Equal Employment Opportunity for the Handicapped Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 796, proposed Railroad Deregulation Act.
235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting on pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
*Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 568, to provide for the potential contribution and advancement of women in scientific, professional, and technical careers, and on proposed national health insurance programs.
457 Russell Building

JUNE 21

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to develop techniques for analyzing and stimulating technological and industrial innovation by the Federal Government.
6226 Dirksen Building

*Energy and Natural Resources
To resume oversight hearings on the activities of programs administered by the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977.
3110 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
To continue hearings on S. 446, proposed Equal Employment Opportunity for the Handicapped Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Financial Institutions Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to establish financial reform programs.
5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 796, proposed Railroad Deregulation Act.
235 Russell Building

*Labor and Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 568, to provide for the potential contribution and advancement of women in scientific, professional, and technical careers, and on proposed national health insurance programs.
457 Russell Building

JUNE 25

9:30 a.m.

Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 192 and 208, bills to provide for the tax treatment of foreign investors for property located in the United States.
2221 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1177, to establish a partnership between the Federal Government and the States in the planning and provision of mental health services.
4232 Dirksen Building

JUNE 26

9:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on S. 1076, proposed Multiemployer Pension Plan Amendments Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To resume oversight hearings on the trucking industry's economic regulation by the Federal Government.
235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Conservation and Supply Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 734, proposed Federal Power Marketing Revolving Fund Act.
3110 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and the Humanities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed authorizations through fiscal year 1984 for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute of Museum Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

JUNE 27

9:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
To continue hearings on S. 1076, proposed Multiemployer Pension Plan Amendments Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To continue oversight hearings on the trucking industry's economic regulation by the Federal Government.
235 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation to develop techniques for analyzing and stimulating technological and industrial innovation by the Federal Government.
6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting on pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and the Humanities Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed authorizations through fiscal year 1984 for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute of Museum Services.
1318 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Conservation and Supply Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 734, proposed Federal Power Marketing Revolving Fund Act.
3110 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and the Humanities Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed authorizations through fiscal year 1984 for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute of Museum Services.
4232 Dirksen Building

JULY 10

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Resources and Materials Production Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Outer Continental Shelf Leasing program.
3110 Dirksen Building

JULY 11

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
To resume hearings to explore the impact higher education will have on youth in business for the coming decade.
4232 Dirksen Building

JULY 12

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
To continue hearings to explore the impact higher education will have on youth in business for the coming decade.
4232 Dirksen Building

*Veterans' Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the efforts made by the Veterans' Administration to provide information on benefits due incarcerated veterans.
6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Resources and Materials Production Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on the implementation of the Outer Continental Shelf Leasing program.
3110 Dirksen Building

JULY 24

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
To resume hearings on S. 446, proposed Equal Employment Opportunity for the Handicapped Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

CANCELLATIONS

JUNE 6

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings with the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology of the Committee on Science and Technology, to examine U.S. policies and initiatives of the U.S. Conference on Science and Technology for Development.
5110 Dirksen Building