the honesty and integrity of many elected officials. Since the overwhelming number of individuals in Government service are sincere, dedicated, and honest individuals, this is unfortunate. I believe the situation makes it incumbent on each Government officials to be as open and forthright as possible with the citizens he or she represents.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my third annual financial disclosure statement. This statement is aimed at two goals: First, indicating that in my private finances I have no conflicts of interest that prevent me from working on behalf of the citizens I represent; second, to show how I have used taxpayer funds in operating the offices of the 12th Congressional District.

I am very pleased to insert this voluntary statement:

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

PART I: PERSONAL FINANCES

A. Taxes

1975 Federal income tax paid to December 31, 1975, $8,840.

1975 Pennsylvania State income tax paid to December 31, 1975, $1,014.

1975 Cambria County, Pa., real estate tax on personal residence paid to December 31, 1975, $691.

B. Sources of all income

Salary of U.S. Congressman (total for 1975), $46,550.

Wages from Johnstown Car Wash of which I am Secretary (through December 31, 1975), $2,700.

Interest on savings account (held jointly with my wife/total through December 31, 1975/account at the Dale National Bank, Johnstown), $705.

Interest from the estates of my grandfather and mother who died in 1975, $1,277.

Interest from dividends held in the estates I inherited in 1975, $73.

Honorariums received:

Boeing-Vertol Corp. (for speech), $1,000.

Gulf Oil Co. (for speech at public forum), $1,000.

Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers (for speech), $1,000.

[Note: $1,000 of honorariums went for constituent services as noted later in report.]

Total income for 1975, $63,404.

C. Holdings and interests

1. Living accommodations. My wife and I jointly own the same home we have lived in since 1961. This is also the home of my three children. Currently my daughter is living at Indiana University of Pennsylvania which she attends as a freshman. The house is located at 109 Colgate Avenue in Westmont Borough, Johnstown. In Washington I rented an apartment during 1975 within walking distance of the Capitol.

2. Stocks. I own stock in the Johnstown Car Wash located on Roosevelt Boulevard. I have served as Secretary of the Car Wash organization since 1966. This year I inherited stock from my grandfather. It consists of a small number of shares of AT&T and 1st Tyler Bank of Sisterville, West Virginia.

3. Bonds. The only bonds I own are U.S. Savings Bonds.

4. Loans. The only money I owe is to the Dale National Bank where I have been banking since 1956. The loans are for routine home and family costs.

5. Transportation. I own a 1975 Ford and my wife owns a 1973 Ford.

6. Other assets. The only other assets I have are life insurance policies with a cash value, and a joint savings account at the Dale National Bank.

PART II: OFFICE REPORT

A. Office supply account

In 1975, I received $6,500 for the purchase of office supplies including paper, envelopes, stationary, paper clips, pencils, recording supplies and other daily office needs for the entire year. The office used $6,391.82. The remainder was carried into 1976.

An additional cost to this fund I would like to note is the purchase of American flags flown over the U.S. Capitol. In general, I ask persons requesting flags to pay for the flag themselves. There are cases, however, where a constituent or organization deserves to be honored for outstanding service to our area or the nation. In such instances I purchase the flags from this account. Examples during 1975 included several charitable institutions, the family of a deceased veteran, and individuals who made outstanding civic contributions. I feel this is a proper use of funds to commemorate special occasions.

B. Postage

During 1975 the postage allowance for each Congressman was $1,140. This is to purchase stamps for official business use not covered by the Congressional frank. This includes air mail and foreign postage. The occasion where our office uses it most is in purchasing special delivery stamps where it is important that we return a report or inquiry to a constituent as quickly as possible. The entire sum was expended in 1975.

C. Transportation

Each Congressman was reimbursed during 1975 for 27 trips to and from his district, or a total of $2,324.40. This is the same type of reimbursement a company would give to an employee traveling on official business. I traveled between Washington and the 12th Congressional District every weekend in 1975 that Congress was in session with only 1 or 2 exceptions. I traveled by car which I drove myself in virtually every case. My total travel to and from the 12th Congressional District greatly exceeded the total amount. I accepted the full reimbursement to which I was entitled of $2,324.40.

I believe these weekly trips are essential to hold Congressional Workshops, office hours, and other meetings to keep in touch with the people and give the citizens an opportunity to meet and talk with me, so I can hear their views and opinions.

D. Staff

In 1975, I was permitted a maximum of 18 staff positions and an annual staff salary of $230,061.00. Of this amount I filled all positions, but returned $19,477.44 to the Treasury in unused funds.

I have seven persons in my Washington office. This includes; an administrative assistant; a legislative assistant; a secretary; three case workers to handle black lung, social security, veterans, military, and other problems involving the federal government; and a receptionist.

The other staff members serve throughout the five district offices located in Johnstown, Kittanning, Indiana, Punxsutawney, and Somerset. All the staff members located in the district offices and all but two of my Washington staff either presently live or formerly lived in the 12th Congressional District. These are all dedicated, talented individuals. A single Congressman cannot handle all the problems of representing the citizens and researching major issues. These people are a tremendous help to me in serving the people, and the district office staff provide a vital link in each community between the citizens and myself.

E. Telephone and telegraph

My allotment of telephone and telegraph messages was 125,000 units for 1975. A unit is a term equivalent to one-quarter of a phone minute. Said differently, four units equal one minute of time on the phone. Those units cover long-distance calls. Unused units can be carried over to the next year. In 1974, I had 9,686 units remaining on December 31. Thus, for 1975, I had a total of 134,686 units. I used 102,383 leaving me with 31,596 which I carried over to 1976. These units are used for long distance calls to the 12th Congressional District on official business. My staff is instructed not to accept collect calls in order to make the most economical use possible of these units.

F. District offices

All of the district offices are in federal buildings except for the office in Indiana. Federal building space is rent free, so my total rental cost was $1,836. I was allowed $2,400 to cover rentals for three different offices, which means a total of $564 was returned to the Treasury unspent.

I am also allowed a total of $3,000 to cover district office expenses. This includes routine office needs and upkeep of facilities. The entire amount was spent in 1975.

G. Communications allowance

Beginning in 1975 the House authorized $5,000 to each member for the production and printing of newsletters, questionnaires, and similar correspondence qualifying as official business and mailable under the legal requirements of the frank. The fund covers production costs such as printing ink, stencils, machine rental, paper, and other direct supplies.

In 1975 I used the full amount for the printing of two district-wide newsletters, a district-wide questionnaire, a number of smaller citizen polls, and other official communication with our citizens.

In 1974 I used funds from my salary to pay these costs. I had started a communications fund prior to creation of the new House fund. Included in it was $1,000 from the honorariums I received. With creation of the Congressional fund, I disbanded the citizens committee. All the funds were used only for official communication on government business with the citizens of the 12th Congressional District. I believe such communication is essential to strengthen contact between myself and the citizens and to help bring Washington closer to the people.

H. Government travel

In February, at the personal request of President Ford, I accepted membership on an eight-member, bipartisan Congressional delegation to visit Vietnam and Cambodia to reassess U.S. policy in that area. The cost of this trip was borne by the executive branch from their normal travel funds."

COSTS OF PCB CLEANUP IN THE HUDSON RIVER ILLUSTRATES NEED FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL LEGISLATION

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 30, 1976

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times reported this week that the costs of cleaning the upper Hudson River of the highly toxic chemical, polychlorinated biphenyls, may exceed $20 million. The contamination has been caused by industrial discharges of the chemical into the Hudson, and has resulted in the Hudson River being closed to commercial fishing for the first time in history. PCB's are a toxic substance capable of causing skin lesion, destroy-

MONS 031312

ing cells in vital body organs, adversely affecting reproduction, and inducing cancer and death. PCB's have been discovered in the Great Lakes, the upper Mississippi River, and off the southern California coast, and Federal officials estimate that it may be 10 to 20 years before some of our waters will be suitable for commercial fishing.

PCB's have been produced commercially for the past 45 years, yet only recently has knowledge about the health and environmental effects of the chemical been developed. Unfortunately, this information has been developed too late to prevent massive exposure to the chemical. It is estimated that some 700 million pounds of PCB's have been produced and used in the United States. Of that amount more than half has already entered the environment; most of it is contained in landfills, contaminated soils, bottom sediments of rivers, lakes and coastal waters, and in air and water. Because the chemical was not adequately evaluated before there was widespread exposure, our only course of action is to try to prevent further damage and to repair, insofar as we can, the damage that has already occurred.

The great costs of cleaning the Hudson River indicates the folly of waiting for the adverse effects of a chemical to show up in our environment. Instead, we must begin finding out what chemicals may be hazardous before they go out into the market place. The costs in human lives, lost environmental resources, and dollars are too great.

The toxic substances control legislation, H.R. 10318, through its premarket notification and testing provisions, will enable us to keep dangerous chemicals off the market. In this manner, we can prevent chemically caused harm, rather than merely reacting to it.

Opponents of effective toxic substances legislation argue that the legislation will be too costly to the chemical-producing industry. I think the price tag for saving just one area from ruin by a single chemical indicates that the prices to society resulting from an absence of effective legislation will be far greater.

Mr. Speaker, I thought my colleagues would find the New York Times article most instructive. Therefore, I include it in the RECORD at this time:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 20, 1976]

PCB CLEANUP COST PUT AT $30 MILLION

(By Richard Severo)

It may cost more than $30 million to cleanse the upper Hudson River of the toxic chemical PCB's, and the State Department of Environmental Conservation plans to ask General Electric to pay "the entire cost of cleaning up the river it has damaged."

The estimate and strategy were indicated by Philip Ciffen, the department lawyer who is handling the state's case in an administrative hearing now under way in Albany. The hearing resumes today.

The company, which was found guilty of violating the state's water-quality standards last Feb. 9 because of its discharge of PCB's into the Hudson River from two capacitor plants north of Albany, has reportedly offered to pay the state at least $3 million in an out-of-court settlement.

Moreover the company has agreed to reduce its discharges of PCB's—polychlorinated biphenyls—to virtually none by June 1, 1977, to conform to new Federal standards.

PENALTY REJECTED

According to a statement made over the weekend by the Commissioner of Environmental Conservation, Ogden R. Reid, the major impediment to a settlement is the company's insistence in private negotiations that it not be required to pay a formal penalty for reclamation of the river, because that would constitute setting a national precedent. The money would be paid as a research grant or in some other way not onerous to the company.

Mr. Reid has not indicated what he thinks of General Electric's cash offer.

When the company's guilt was determined, the hearing examiner, Prof. Abraham D. Sofaer of the Columbia Law School, said that "the evidence that G.E. is responsible for the high concentrations of PCB's in the upper Hudson's water, sediment, organisms and fish is overwhelming." He added that the Department of Environmental Conservation had established "that other sources contributed negligible amounts of PCB's to the river."

"There is but one basic issue," said Mr. Ciffin. "Will the sediments already contaminated mean that, in the future, fish will be contaminated at unacceptable levels, long after General Electric stops using PCB's or reduces its discharges into the river to virtually nothing?" The department believes it has the evidence to support that assertion. General Electric's lawyer, N. Earle Evans, a veteran of litigation in environmental matters in cases involving other companies, feels that the state has not yet presented the evidence it needs to make its case, and in the last week he has made it clear he plans to cross-examine each witness closely.

POLLUTION NEAR TWO PLANTS

According to a Study prepared by the state, 458,000 pounds of PCB's are in the Hudson River, 61 percent of them within 30 miles of the two G.E. capacitor plants at Fort Edward and Hudson Falls. It is estimated that 84,000 pounds of the substance were discharged into the river by the company between 1950 and 1972.

The company was able last year to bring its discharges down to two or three pounds a day, and a spokesman for G.E. said yesterday that the discharge level had been lowered even further, to about a pound.

The company would not be able to reduce the discharge much further without making major changes in the two plants, which it is apparently willing to do. The two plants are very old, with antiquated systems of pipes and drainage.

Even small amounts of PCB's in the water are regarded as quite serious by public health officials, since the chemical has caused cancer in laboratory animals. Moreover General Electric conceded last November that at least 65 of its employes had become ill over a 15-year period from their work with PCB's. The illnesses included nausea, dizziness, eye irritation, allergic dermatitis, asthmatic bronchitis and fungus infections. More medical research is being conducted.

DANGER IS SPREADING

Testimony presented last week indicated that between 5,000 and 10,000 pounds of PCB's were moving down the Hudson River at a rate of between four and 10 miles each year, and according to research by the Department of Environmental Protection, types of PCB's that were abandoned years ago by the company are still being found both in the river sediments and in fish.

Commercial fishing for most species has been banned by Commissioner Reid, and people have been advised not to eat Hudson River fish.

The state has not yet decided just how the PCB's could be removed from the upper Hudson, between Troy and the two G.E. plants. The $30 million estimate is based on an approach that uses dredging, but no firm decisions have been made on that yet.

If dredging were used, about 1.5 million cubic yards of sediment would have to be removed, transported to a special site and incinerated with equipment capable of generating temperatures well in excess of 2,000 degrees Fahrenheit. PCB's are sticky but heavier than water. Thus, while they tend to "stick" to particles suspended in the water, they also tend to settle to the bottom.

J. P. STEVENS WORKERS FIGHT FOR UNION

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 30, 1976

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the experiences of two women workers have recently come to my attention. The stories of these two women are disturbing enough. The fact is, however, that they are typical of the experience of thousands of women and men who work for the J. P. Stevens Co. J. P. Stevens is the second largest textile corporation in the United States. Stevens operates 85 plants, almost all of them in the South. The company employs 44,000 workers, about half of them are women, and none of them have a union contract. The Textile Workers Union of America has conducted a 13-year campaign to organize the Stevens workers. The response of the Stevens company to the union campaign is illustrated by the experience of Maurine Hedgepeth of Roanoke Rapids, N.C.:

I was always a real good worker, but when I joined the union, all of a sudden, I wasn't a good worker any more. I mean I was working just as good but they didn't want to see me doing good work. I testified on behalf of other workers before the NLRB in September 1974. Two weeks after that I went on pregnancy leave. I was supposed to go back to work in January 1975. When I went back to get my job they told me there were no jobs available. And they'd fired me my husband the day before Christmas, after twenty-five years as a loom fixer. A new baby and neither of us had a job. The Stevens company made it real clear that they didn't like me telling the truth to the Labor Board. In 1969 I was reinstated with back pay. Four years is a long time to wait.

Four years is certainly a long time to wait to return to a job. Four years is too long to wait when a worker has been fired illegally for union activity. But 4 years is the length of time many workers like Maurine Hedgepeth, have had to wait. Why? There are too many built-in delays under current labor law. A worker who has been a victim of unfair labor practices finds that the remedy of law is slow, that justice is delayed, and in too many cases justice delayed is justice denied.

Maurine Hedgepeth is not the only worker who has been fired by J. P. Stevens for union activity. The company has been ordered to reimburse 289 workers over $1.3 million in back pay, because the company fired them illegally. They were

MONS 031313