PASTORE and Vice Chairman MEL PRICE to call these witnesses before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which is now meeting on this issue. I urge our colleagues to make similar requests.

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. KOCH's remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

VOTING RIGHTS AND COMMON-SENSE

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, surely one of the great laws of our time is the Voting Rights Act of 1965. By ending the systematic discrimination that had denied the vote to millions of our citizens because of their race, the 1965 law transformed the political face not only of the South, but of the entire Nation.

It is all the more unfortunate, then, that the 1975 "language minority" amendments to the voting rights statute seem to be falling far short of the high hopes many of us had held for them.

I supported the 1975 amendments, with some eagerness. My own district is on the Mexican border and it is within San Diego County, a covered jurisdiction, because more than 5 percent of the residents are of Hispanic descent. I believed this new expansion of the Voting Rights Act would encourage many more of our citizens to participate actively in the political process.

First reports from my district on how the new law is working have been disheartening. Rather than bring out substantial numbers of voters, the requirement that ballots and other voting materials be printed in Spanish as well as English appears to have added unduly to costs of conducting local elections—and given people fresh cause to wonder about the intrusion of "Big Brother" in municipal affairs.

Interestingly, complaints have come from cities in my district at opposite ends of the scale of ethnic sensibilities: Coronado, with an infinitesimal Mexican-American population, and National City, where at least two of every five residents are Mexican-Americans.

Coronado is unhappy, because the bilingual requirement will nearly double the costs of municipal elections the city is holding this week. Coronado is not impressed by the elaborate and costly procedures that must be followed in order to win exemption from the requirement. I agree; I do not see why the onus should be placed on this community to clear itself when it has done nothing wrong in the first place.

Mrs. Ione Campbell, city clerk of National City, says her town has always made special efforts to communicate with voters and prospective voters who are happier with Spanish, Tagalog, or some other language other than English. The extra money needed to print ballots in Spanish as well as English is taken from programs of direct benefit to minorities, she points out. And while adding Spanish to the ballot may be a gesture to Mexican-Americans, it ignores another sizeable local language minority, the Filipinos. The conclusion is inescapable: In their application, the Voting Rights Amendments of 1975 are themselves discriminatory.

Mrs. Campbell, the eloquent critic of the 1975 amendments, is herself an elected local official, up for reelection next week.

I think Mrs. Campbell is right. In the San Diego area, the dictates of the 1975 law amount to needless interference in the right of a local community to conduct its own affairs. The law should be radically rewritten, or repealed.

A pertinent article from the Chula Vista Star-News, for February 19, follows:

BILINGUAL BALLOTS: SOME VOTERS CONFUSED BY IT

South Bay residents confused by or objecting to the new bilingual ballots and voting materials may have an ally in a bill now before the U.S. Congress.

National City Clerk Ione Campbell said she has been getting calls from voters—not angry ones, but inquiring ones.

"'We know it is federal law, and you have to have them,' they say," Mrs. Campbell reports, "'but what can we do to change it?'"

Writing Rep. Lionel Van Deerlin urging him to support House of Representatives Bill 10990 is the best thing, said Mrs. Campbell.

Rep. Robert McClory (R-Ill.) is proposing repeal of sections of the Federal Voting Rights Act requiring expensive printing of ballots and pamphlets in several languages, said Mrs. Campbell.

Mrs. Campbell said the printing of ballots in both Spanish and English has doubled the city's printing cost for the March 2 election.

Candidates pick up the tab for the Spanish language versions of the campaign statements, said Mrs. Campbell, but the city feels the pinch even there.

The added weight of having two versions of each candidates' statement adds to the city's mailing cost.

"It affects election costs in a lot of ways that you don't realize right away," said Mrs. Campbell. "It is hard to say just how much it increases election costs."

An average National City municipal election costs $7,000 according to Mrs. Campbell, but the costs for the March 2 city election cannot yet be determined.

It costs the city $160 to have candidates' campaign statements translated into Spanish and it also adds to election legal advertising costs to have bilingual public notices.

"Representatives of various minority groups are complaining to congressmen that the multi-language printing is deflecting funds needed in other projects," said Mrs. Campbell.

"In all the years that I have been holding elections," she added, "there has never been a language problem."

In the past, Mrs. Campbell has used bilingual polling place workers in areas like the predominantly Mexican-American West Side, and bilingual election workers have been available at the clerk's Civic Center office to answer questions or go out to polling places if needed, said Mrs. Campbell.

National City has a large Filipino population, but Mrs. Campbell is not required to print the ballots in Tagalog, one of the principal Filipino dialects. Only Spanish presently is required.

The county's population make-up sets the requirements for all cities regardless of their individual demographics. Del Mar recently won an exemption from that since it has only an extremely small Mexican-American population which has indicated the Spanish translations are not wanted.

"It is based on more than just population," said Mrs. Campbell. "It also is based on which minority group exists that is 5 percent or more of the total population with a substantial portion of its members being illiterate, meaning an average of a 5th grade level or less of education.

"Some cities are having to print ballots in Mandarin and Indian dialects, and the expense is getting quite great compared to the number of people who use them."

CONTROL OF TOXIC CHEMICALS

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, with alarming frequency, chemical substances in commercial and household use are found to cause serious health or environmental hazards.

As a dramatic example, vinyl chloride has recently been discovered to cause cancer. Unfortunately, the danger of the chemical was not detected until after it had become one of our most widely used chemicals, finding its way into food wrappers, toys, dentures, phonograph records, furniture coverings, and household aerosols.

The cancer-causing effect of asbestos was discovered only after hundreds of asbestos workers and their families were exposed to harmful levels of the substance. Now researchers at the Mt. Sinai School of Medicine are discovering dangerous levels of asbestos in office buildings using asbestos construction materials. Consumers using asbestos-containing spackling, patching, and taping compounds may be exposing themselves to dangerously high levels of the substance during home repairs.

We now know that polychlorinated biphenyls, widely dispersed throughout our environment, are highly toxic and may be carcinogenic. For the first time in history, the Hudson River will be closed to commercial fishing, because it has been contaminated with PCB's. Similar threats face commercial fishermen in the Great Lakes area.

These are just a few examples of the irreparable harm chemicals can cause to human health and the environment. Liver, lung, kidney, and central nervous disorders, cancer, gene mutations, and birth defects are others. Repairing the damage caused by chemicals is often not feasible. Prevention is the only logical course of action. It is also a feasible course of action. Our testing and predictive capabilities are sufficiently developed so that we can now prevent harm, rather than merely reacting to it.

But right now there is no requirement that a manufacturer of a potentially harmful new chemical adequately test the chemical for safety before passing it off on the public. Right now, we do not

MONS 029709

at least 5 years within the 8-year period ending on the date of the sale. Form 2119 (Sale or Exchange of Personal Residence) is helpful in determining what gain, if any, may be excluded by an elderly taxpayer when he sells his home.

YOU COULD BE ELIGIBLE FOR THE RETIREMENT INCOME CREDIT

To qualify for the retirement income credit, you must (a) be a U.S. citizen or resident, (b) have received earned income in excess of $600 in each of any 10 calendar years before 1975, and (c) have certain types of qualifying "retirement income." Five types of income—pensions, annuities, interest, and dividends included on line 14, Form 1040, and gross rents from Schedule E, Part II, columns (b)—qualify for the retirement income credit.

The credit is 15% of the lesser of:

1. A taxpayer's qualifying retirement income, or

2. $1,524 ($2,284 for a joint return where both taxpayers are 65 or older) minus the total of nontaxable pensions (such as Social Security benefits or Railroad Retirement annuities) and earned income (depending upon the taxpayer's age and the amount of any earnings he may have).

If the taxpayer is under 62, the $1,524 figure is reduced by the amount of earned income in excess of $900. For persons at least 62 years old but less than 72, this amount is reduced by one-half of the earned income in excess of $1,200 up to $1,700, plus the total amount over $1,700. Persons 72 and over are not subject to the earned income limitation.

Schedule R is used for taxpayers who claim the retirement income credit.

YOU CAN LOWER YOUR TAXES IF YOU HAVE HAD MANY MEDICAL EXPENSES

If you itemize your deductions, a portion of your medical and dental expenses, your medical, hospital or health insurance premiums and drugs and medicines can be deductible.

Back supports, crutches, dentures, eyeglasses, hearing aids and batteries, physicians expenses, wheelchairs and X-rays are some of the other medical expenses which might also be deductible. Be sure to check Schedule A (Form 1040) to see if you are eligible.

HAVE YOU PAID CERTAIN TAXES?

Real estate taxes, state and local sales taxes, general sales taxes, state and local income taxes and personal property taxes that you have paid can be deducted. See schedule A (Form 1040).

HAVE YOU BEEN PAYING INTEREST CHARGES?

Interest paid on home mortgages, auto loans, installment purchases (television, washer, dryer etc.) can be deducted. Also some finance charges on bank credit cards and revolving charge accounts are deductible.

DO YOU CONTRIBUTE TO CHARITY? TO POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS?

In general, charitable contributions may be deducted up to 50% of your adjusted gross income.

If you make political campaign contributions, you can claim either a deduction up to $100 ($200 for couples filing jointly) or a credit with a $25 ceiling ($50 for couples filing jointly). In addition, you can voluntarily earmark $1 of your taxes ($2 on a joint return) for the Presidential Election Campaign Fund.

DO YOU TAKE CARE OF A DISABLED SPOUSE OR A DEPENDENT CHILD?

If so, you might be eligible for a deduction up to $400 a month or $4,800 a year if you have hired someone to care for a disabled spouse, a dependent under 15 or a physically or mentally disabled dependent. If a child is cared for outside the home, the maximum deduction for child care expenses is $200 per month for one child, and $400 per month for three or more children. For further information about child and dependent care deductions, see Publication 503, Child Care and Disabled Dependent Care, available free at Internal Revenue offices.

HAVE YOU PAID MORE TAXES THAN YOU OWED IN OTHER YEARS?

If you discover that you have overpaid taxes in prior years, you may file an amended return—Form 1040X—to claim deductions initially overlooked. Form 1040X must be filed within 3 years after the original return was due or filed or within 2 years after the tax was paid, whichever is later.

DO YOU NEED HELP IN COMPUTING YOUR TAXES?

For any questions concerning any of these or other items, contact your local IRS office at 120 Church Street (Between 8:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. or by phone; 732-0100). You may also obtain helpful publications and additional forms by contacting your local IRS office.

The following organizations will also provide free assistance to senior citizens in the preparation of their tax returns:

National Retired Teachers Association, American Association of Retired Persons, 11 West 42nd Street, 730-1411.

Lenox Hill Neighborhood Association, 343 East 70th Street, 744-5003.

Greenwich House, 20 Jarrow Street, 675-5085.

YMCA West Side Branch, 5 West 63rd Street, 787-4400.

HELPFUL TELEPHONE NUMBERS

Congressman Ed Koch, 264-3865.
Abandoned Cars, 964-1200.
Aging, Service for, 566-0154.
Air Pollution, 566-7900.
Ambulance, 911.
ASPCA, 876-7701.
Block Association Info., 566-1100.
Building and Heating Complaints, 566-4800.
Cars Towed Away, 541-4550.
Child Abuse Complaints, 794-4626.
Civilian Complaint Review Board, 741-8700.
Complaints against Phone Company, 458-5300.
Consumer Complaints, 566-7777.
Dead Animals, 566-2512.
Drug Store (24 hrs.—90th & Broadway), 566-3546.
Doctor's Emergency Service, 679-1600.
Electric of Gas Failure, 679-6500.
Family Court, 490-5772.
Health Dept. Info., 566-2237.
Human Rights Info., 566-5050.
Hydrant, broken or open, 566-7800.
Legal Aid, 577-3752.
Mayor's Action Center, 566-8700.
Medicaid Info., 566-2535.
Noise Complaints, 566-7900.
Parks Information Service, 472-1003.
Poison Control, 340-4494.
Potholes in Street, 566-5110.
Rape (Policewomen answer), 566-6000.
Rent Control Info., 566-3566.
Sanitation Complaints, 566-1800.
Sewer Backup, Street Flooding, 566-7800.
Shelter, Emergency, 344-2941.
Street Light Out, 566-5700.
Street Sweeping, 566-5555.
Suicidal Feelings, 796-6191(2)(2).
Suspected Narcotics Dealer, 841-4811.
Traffic Conditions, 566-1234.
Weather Report, 566-1212.
Welfare-Emergency Info., 566-2941.

SAFETY CONCERNS AND NUCLEAR POWERPLANTS

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, recent disclosures on alleged unsafe conditions at nuclear powerplants have led the public to question industry procedures and Federal safeguards at a time when the administration is calling for the establishment of more powerplants to meet increased energy needs.

Three employees of General Electric in California, Dale G. Bridenbaugh, Manager for Performance Evaluation and Improvement on GE's Mark I Containment, Gregory Minor, Manager of Advanced Controls and Instrumentation in the Nuclear Energy Division, and Richard Hubbard, Manager of Quality Assurance for the Nuclear Control and Instrumentations Department resigned their jobs on February 2 publicaly alleging safety defects in atomic reactors used to generate electric power in many areas in the country. These three engineers have testified that design problems and regulatory difficulties are such that nuclear powerplants are not safe. Dr. Robert Pollard, project manager of Indian Point No. 3 plant in New York has leveled charges at Con Edison and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on the unsafe conditions at the Indian Point plant.

Because of the lack of public confidence in the Independence of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and because of the real concern of scientists and engineers involved in the developments of these plants, I believe it is imperative that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy call as witnesses in its hearings on atomic energy experts not affiliated with General Electric, Con Edison, or the NRC to comment on the charges of unsafe conditions at powerplants. Also, experts outside the Government must be heard, as well as the agency witnesses if the public's fears are to be allayed. It is in the interest of the Congress to be sure that every precaution has indeed been taken to assure safety at the powerplants and that the Federal Commission is not allowing a potentially hazardous condition to continue because of its past acceptance of it.

This is a matter that requires considerable technical expertise to understand and judge. As a Member from Manhattan whose constituents are immediately affected, it is to the Congress and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that I must address the basic question of whether we are certain that those in charge of atomic installations have been honest with us, know what is happening and are adequately protecting the public.

Sufficient questions have been raised on the safety of these plants as to require a thorough hearing and that can only be accomplished by calling experts from outside the Government and those immediately associated with the controversial plants, as for example representatives of such public interest groups as North Anna Environmental Coalition in Virginia, the Union of Concerned Scientists in Cambridge, Mass., the Council on Economic Priorities in New York City or Business and Professional Persons in the Public Interest in Chicago to testify before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I have requested Chairman John O.

MONS 029710

even have a way of knowing what new chemicals are going onto the market. Adequate authority to get known harmful chemicals off the market is lacking.

Past experiences indicate that the risks are too great to continue without effective legislation regulating toxic chemicals. For this reason, Congressmen ECKHARDT, BROOMFIELD, and I are sponsoring toxic substances control legislation. Our bill, H.R. 10318, contains the basic features essential for effective control of harmful chemicals. The bill has been approved by the Consumer Protection and Finance Subcommittee. Consideration by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee should begin in the next few weeks.

Russell Train, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, recently addressed the National Press Club about the need for toxic substances legislation. Mr. Train pointed out that it is time to start testing chemicals, not people, in the fight against cancer and other major diseases. Before people are unwittingly exposed to chemicals that could kill them, we must take the trouble to discover the health effects of the chemical, and we must insist that the public interest be taken fully into account in deciding whether to "go public" with a potentially harmful chemical. Because his remarks so ably illustrate the need for effective toxic substances legislation, I am asking that Mr. Train's speech be included in the RECORD. I think Colleagues will find Mr. Train's comments helpful in considering toxic control legislation.

Mr. Train's remarks follow:

TESTING CHEMICALS, NOT PEOPLE: BANNING THE CHEMICAL THREAT UNDER CONTROL

W. H. Auden once remarked that: "Today in the technologically advanced countries . . . we have little to fear from nature; our only serious problem is man . . . His mastery over nature has, as it were, brought man back to the same point at which he stood when he was utterly helpless before her."

There are, however, some differences. It is, to begin with, no longer the creatures and forces of the natural world that most threaten us: it is no longer even such historic diseases as the pox or the plague; it is, instead, such strange new creatures of our own making as "bischloromethyl ether" and "nitrosamines" and "polychlorinated biphenyls" and "polyvinyl chloride." They are all around us—in our air, our water, our food, and in the things we touch. When they hit us, we don't feel a thing. Their ill-effects may not show up until decades later, in the form of cancer—or even generations later, in the form of mutated genes—when it is often, too late to undo the damage.

Most Americans had no idea, until relatively recently, that they were living so dangerously. They had no idea that when they went to work in the morning, or when they ate their breakfast—that when they did the things they had to do to earn a living and keep themselves alive and well—that when they did things as ordinary, as innocent and as essential to life as eat, drink, breathe or touch they could, in fact, be laying their lives on the line. They had no idea that, without their knowledge or consent, they were often engaging in a grim game of chemical roulette whose result they would not know until many years later.

They had no idea until, increasingly over recent years, they picked up the morning paper or turned on the evening news and learned of some new chemical hazard they had been exposed to; often for years and almost always unwittingly. Increasingly, as well, they learned about the appallingly high death rates as a result of cancer and saw people they knew and loved go through the awful agony of a death by cancer. As a result, I think, the American people are deeply concerned both over the pervasive presence of chemical contaminants throughout the environment and over the high death rates from cancer. And they may even make the connection between the two. But I do not think there is, among the public at large, any real understanding of the precise nature and extent of the hazards posed by chemical contaminants—as causes not only of cancer but of other serious ills and afflictions—or of what we can and must do to deal with them.

BENEFITS VERSUS PERIL

Let me highlight some of the most important points we should keep in mind about chemicals and their effects upon human health and life:

1. Over the past few decades, and especially since the end of World War II, we have released into the environment a vast volume of entirely new chemical compounds with little or no knowledge of their health effects and virtually no effort to determine these effects and to regulate the release of many chemicals that might be hazardous.

2. We have reaped enormous benefits from these chemicals—indeed, from the truly marvelous advances in chemical knowledge and technology that we have achieved throughout modern times. We must measure these benefits, not only in the economic terms that are apparent to us all, but in health terms as well. The fact that we are the first generation in human history to be virtually free of the major infectious diseases is, in no small degree, a result of the application of chemical advances to modern medicine and modern life.

3. The World Health Organization estimates that between 60 to 80 percent of all cancers are the result of environmental factors—in the broadest sense of that phrase. National Cancer Institute studies have shown that the highest cancer rates in the country occur in areas with the heaviest concentrations of industrial chemical use and activity. Yet of all the chemical agents in the environment, probably only a very small fraction is responsible for that large share of cancer. Indeed, the odds are that only a relatively small portion of the chemicals in our environment pose any serious health threats.

4. It may take only limited exposure to contract cancer. It typically takes anywhere from 15 to 40 years after that exposure for the first onset of cancer to occur. Because of that long latency period, we have reason to believe that the full impact of the chemical explosion we have experienced over the past 30 years has only begun to show up in our cancer statistics. Yet already, the experts tell us, one out of every four Americans now alive will ultimately contract some form of cancer.

5. A large and growing share of the diseases that cripple and kill us are caused by environmental factors—again, in the broadest sense of that phrase. These diseases are going to take an increasingly heavy toll upon our lives and well-being, unless and until we stop trying to deal with them by treating them after they occur, and start taking serious steps to prevent them from occurring in the first place. Our national health care effort must increasingly stress the prevention rather than the treatment of disease, and effective measures for the assessment and control of potentially dangerous chemicals and other agents *before* they enter the environment must be a key element in this new shift toward preventive medicine.

A VAST EXPANSION

To expand on these points: There are today more than 2 million different known chemicals; every year, this list grows by an estimated 20,000 new compounds. There are today more than 20,000 chemicals in actual commercial production; every year, this list grows by some 1000 new compounds. Of the more than 2 million known chemicals, only a few thousand have been tested for carcinogenicity and—aside from those used in food additives, drugs and pesticides—only a few hundred have been adequately tested. We know, in fact, very little about the health effects even of the 20,000 chemicals already in commercial production. We have no way of systematically screening the chemicals that do go into production; we have no way of knowing precisely which chemicals go into production every year. In other words, we not only don't know whether what's going out there is dangerous—we don't even know what's going out there.

We have, however, learned one thing: It's what we don't know that can really hurt us, even kill us.

Long after they have been loosed upon the world and the public at large, we have learned what an appallingly wide range of disease and death can be caused by chemicals—they can attack the liver, the lung, the kidney, the central nervous system; they can cause cancer, infant mortality, and genetic damage. We have learned, for example, that—

Mercury, lead and cadmium can attack the central nervous system;

Carbon tetrachloride and chlorinated phenols can destroy the liver;

Ethylene glycol and cadmium sulfate produce kidney diseases;

Asbestos and beryllium often lead to lung disorders; and

Vinyl chloride and arsenic cause cancer.

We have seen our fish contaminated by phthalates, our cattle poisoned by polybrominated biphenyls, and our forests killed by dioxin. Fluorides have destroyed forest seedlings, chloramines have killed oysters, and zinc has damaged our wheat crops. And now the fluorocarbons may be threatening the ozone belt.

CONTROL BILLS PASSED TWICE

When I became the first Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality in February, 1970—almost exactly six years ago—my very first directive to our small staff was to develop a legislative proposal for coping with the class of problems presented by chemical and other contaminants. A year later, in February, 1971, this legislation, known as the Toxic Substances Control Act, was submitted by the President to the Congress. Twice, over the past five years, the Senate and the House have passed versions of this legislation, but have been unable to agree on the same version. Last week the Senate Commerce Committee reported out Toxic Substances Control legislation for action by the Senate. In the House, the legislation is being considered by a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Over the five years since such legislation was first proposed, we have introduced into the commercial market an estimated 5000 new chemicals. We have done so without any systematic, advance assessment of their potential impact upon public health or our ecological resources. We find ourselves still without the authority we need to cope with such longstanding problems as those posed by polychlorinated biphenyls. Last week, you may recall, it was announced that, for the first time in history, the Hudson River will be closed to commercial fishing because it is contaminated by these chemicals. In the Great Lakes, commercial and sports fisheries that are being restored as the result of mas-

MONS 029711

sive pollution clean-up efforts are now being threatened by PCB contamination. We remain almost entirely unable to discover how harmful a compound can be until years after it has become a rather commonplace item in our everyday life, even a significant factor in our economy. And, over and over again, we find ourselves engaged in an extremely difficult and drawn-out struggle to protect the public from a hazard to which it has already been exposed while at the same time trying to avoid putting people out of business or out of work.

Polyvinyl chloride, for example, was first introduced commercially some 40 years ago. It is the backbone of much of our plastics industry. Its manufacture, according to industry figures, accounts for one percent of our Gross National Product. Yet it was not until 1974 that we discovered four cases of an extremely rare form of liver cancer among workers in a polyvinyl chloride plant in Louisville. Not until later did we find among these workers excessive cases of more common forms of cancer as well. Only in the last decade or so have we developed the scientific skills and analytic techniques that would enable us to anticipate these effects of vinyl chloride, and a Toxic Substances law enacted several years ago would hardly have helped us prevent this problem. But the odds are that, until we enact such legislation, we will be confronting more and more such situations in the future—and we can be absolutely certain that, until we enact such legislation, we will be unable to prevent them from occurring. I might add that our experience with vinyl chloride as well as with such chemicals as asbestos and, most recently, Kepone underscores the fact that it is on the job and in the workplace that the hazards posed by such chemicals are most immediate and acute. It is the workers, and the families of workers, in shops and factories where such chemicals are made and used who bear the brunt of the chemical threat and would benefit most from the early enactment of toxic substances legislation.

WE'D BE BETTER OFF

The plain fact is that, had the Toxic Substances Act been enacted five years ago when it was first proposed, we would be a lot further ahead in dealing with some potentially very serious hazards:

We would have begun to reverse the spread of polychlorinated biphenyls which are now destroying some of our valuable fisheries;

We would already have, as we now do not, reliable test information concerning the effects of vinylidene chloride which is widely used throughout the plastics industry;

We would have a greatly improved data base for determining the extent to which benzidine-derived dyes reconvert to free benzidine, a well-known human carcinogen, when these widely-used dyes are accidentally ingested or absorbed;

We would have taken a number of steps to clarify the chronic effects and, as necessary, to limit exposure to tris 2,3-dibromopropyl phosphate, which has mutagenic effects in microbial systems and is widely used as a fire retardant in textile products, including children's pajamas.

I do not think any of us is under the illusion that there is, or is ever going to be, any such thing as a simon-pure, antiseptically safe world. I do not think any of us imagines that there is, or is ever going to be, a real world without very real risks. But there is absolutely no reason why we cannot—there is, in fact, every reason why we must—take sensible steps to exercise some intelligent and effective control over the risks that we ourselves create. The basic aim of the toxic substances control legislation before the Congress is to help us gain that kind of control—to help us protect human health by bringing down to reasonable levels the risks that chemicals pose while preserving their benefits. We are not talking, in other words, of getting rid of all risks from chemicals, but rather of finding out what the risks are and, eventually, of removing "unreasonable" risks. We are saying that, whatever we do with these chemicals, we ought to know what we're doing before we do it, and we ought to do it with our eyes wide open.

We are saying, more specifically, that before people are unwittingly and unwillingly exposed to a chemical that could hurt or kill them, we take the trouble to find out what the health effects of that chemical might be, and we insist that the public interest be taken fully into account in the process by which we determine those effects and decide whether, or in what circumstances, we "go public" with that chemical. These decisions to test and go public cannot—as they now are—be left simply and solely in private hands. The public at large is deeply and directly affected by these decisions, and it must have—as it now does not—a very real say in the process by which they are made. The toxic substances legislation now before the Congress would, for the first time, give the public that say.

ADMINISTRATION SUPPORT

As you might suspect, there is some disagreeemnt about some of the details of the legislation before the Congress. The Administration strongly supports toxic substances legislation, but wants to make certain that it does not impose unnecessary red tape upon industry or government. Inevitably enough, environmentalists are concerned that the legislation will not be nearly strong enough; and industry, or at least some segments of it, is concerned that it will be strong enough to strangle the industry. Sad as it may seem, dull and undramatic as it may appear, the truth lies somewhere in-between. The differences in detail about, and among, the different pieces of legislation before the Congress are far less important than the fact that their common aim is to give public health far more of the weight that it deserves in the decisions by which chemicals enter and spread throughout the human environment—the common aim of giving the American people not only the opportunity to understand and assess the risks and benefits of these chemicals, but a decisive voice in sorting out these risks and benefits.

The legislation before the Congress would give us the authority, which we do not now have—

To get better information about the health and ecological effects, the distribution, the uses, the kinds and levels of exposure, of both known and new chemicals;

To help prevent hazards and harm to human health and the environment from chemicals before we make major economic investments in them;

To balance the various costs, risks and benefits involved before deciding whether, or under what conditions, a potentially hazardous chemical should be introduced into the environment;

To help coordinate the presently fragmentary and piecemeal Federal approach to toxic substances.

I consider it of urgent importance that the Congress act now—in this session—to enact effective toxic substances legislation. Remaining differences should be resolved as rapidly as possible. But it is more important to get legislation on the books now than it is to seek perfection. There will be time to improve legislative authority later as we gain more experience. But we can no longer afford to wait for the basic authority to deal effectively with the problems of chemical pollution.

SUBJECTED TO SCRUTINY

We have done a great deal over the past several years to improve the regulatory process at EPA—in particular, to make it far more open and equitable. Our decisions are subjected to more searching scrutiny, more critical review, from sources inside and outside the Agency and the government, than those of any other agency. We have made a strenuous and increasingly successful effort—most recently in developing our Drinking Water regulations and in setting minimum standards for procurement under EPA grants for the construction of wastewater treatment plants—to get all the major interested and affected parties actively and effectively involved throughout the process of developing a regulation. We also have the most open and rigorous process of economic impact analysis performed by any agency of the Federal government.

It is along these lines, according to these processes, that we would exercise our authority under toxic substances legislation. If the legislation does not require it, I would—on my own—appoint an advisory Committee which is broadly representative of all major interests to help advise us on implementation of the Act.

It is unfortunate that some segments of the chemical industry, which originally took an extremely constructive approach towards the legislation, has taken to actively lobbying against it. I do not believe that either the public interest, or the interests of the industry, are well served by charges that the legislation could—in the words of one industry spokesman—"cripple" the chemical industry and give the Administrator of EPA "mercidictatorial authority over the introduction of new chemical products." The only real "crippling" that is going on is the kind which this legislation would try to prevent—the crippling of who knows how many Americans every year who contract cancer or some other affliction after exposure to some hazardous chemical agent. Nor has it been on the "mercidictatorial authority" of the EPA Administrator that so many such agents are introduced into the environment without any effort to find out what their health effects are much less let the public have any say about whether or not, or in what circumstances, it is willing to be exposed to them. Let there be no mistake: the only kind of authority the legislation before the Congress would give us, and the only kind of authority we would intend to exercise, is the authority to act reasonably and responsibly in the public interest—and that includes the very real interest the public has in a healthy and productive chemical industry.

$100 BILLION IN SALES

The chemical industry has annual sales of over $100 billion. We have estimated that the annual costs to industry as a result of this legislation would range between $71 million and $142.5 million. The Manufacturing Chemists Association has estimated costs ranging from $900 million to $1.5 billion a year, with "start-up" costs of over $100 million. Dow Chemical Company estimates an annual cost of $3 billion. At the request of Congress, the General Accounting Office (GAO) analyzed and assessed these different estimates. The GAO concluded that the Dow Chemical estimates were the "least reliable," and that the EPA estimates were the "most reliable"—although they believed EPA's figures were about 50 percent too low. In testimony before Congress, a GAO spokesman said that "the EPA interpretation is closer than the industry studies to an accurate picture of what the legislation will entail." Indeed, recent developments suggest that real breakthroughs are being made in the development of faster and less costly testing methods. The GAO further pointed out that some of the estimates considered the costs to society in avoidable and unnecessary suffering and death as a result of exposure to hazardous chemicals—the huge expense that society bears because of the failure to invest enough

MONS 029712

time and money in determining the hazards of chemicals.

I should think, indeed, that industry would reap some very real benefits from the approach this legislation contemplates. The testing of potentially hazardous chemicals before "going public" with them would let us know, not only which ones are likely to be harmful, but which ones are not. Since these tests are by no means fail-safe or foolproof, we cannot precisely give a chemical an absolutely "clean bill of health," but the industry can market and the public can accept it with far greater confidence than they can now. Moreover, the "preventive" approach would increasingly reduce the likelihood that we would have to take action against a chemical after industry has invested extensive resources in its production. Far from "stifling innovation," the legislation should serve to encourage the industry to turn its remarkable skills and resources toward the discovery and use of less hazardous chemicals.

VALUE OF HUMAN LIFE

The issue before us is really very clear: will we continue to set so low a value on human life and health that we will refuse to take the thoroughly sensible and modest steps to protect them that the legislation before the Congress would involve? Will we, instead, bring better balance to the decisions by which chemicals are made and marketed by giving full weight to public health in reaching those decisions?

It is not, as some have suggested, a question of assuming that every chemical is dangerous until proven otherwise—although I would find that a preferable alternative to assuming, as we do now, that every chemical is harmless until we come up with a body count and a clear-cut case. It is a question, rather, of honestly and openly acknowledging that we simply don't know whether a chemical is dangerous or not and that, before we expose the public to it, we should take at least a reasonable amount of trouble to find out.

It is time we started putting chemicals to the test, not people. It is time we gave the people of this country some reason to believe that, every time they take a breath or eat or drink or touch, they are not taking their life into their hands.

It is time that, down here on earth, we took a couple of small, sensible steps on behalf of human health and life.

SHOCKING DIVERSION OF U.S. DISASTER RELIEF TO GUATEMALA

(Mr. OTTINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I know that all my colleagues share with me a strong desire to provide relief to the thousands of unfortunate victims of the recent Guatemalan earthquakes. Thus, I am sure that every Member of the House will be as shocked as I was to hear that news reports and eyewitness testimony coming from Guatemala indicate that our aid is being diverted to enrich privileged people in that stricken country but is not reaching the disaster victims who need it.

In the February 13th edition of Occidente, a Colombian newspaper, an article appeared which described this situation in one small Guatemalan city. That state of affairs is stated to be indicative of the problems which prevail in many other areas in need of disaster relief. Rather than reaching the poor, homeless, sick, the needy quake victims, foodstuffs and other important provisions are being hoarded and wasted by self-appointed relief officials and wealthy landowners.

As a former director of programs for South America in the Peace Corps, I am particularly interested in seeing that our aid gets to those who need it most. In light of the situation described by Occidente, I have asked Secretary of State Kissinger, as well as AID Administrator Daniel Parker—who is also serving as the President's Special Coordinator for International Disaster Assistance—and the appropriate House and Senate committees and subcommittee chairmen, to undertake an immediate investigation of the relief situation and to take whatever action is necessary to insure that relief efforts in Guatemala do reach those people for whom they were and are intended.

As the House International Relations Committee proceeds to consider H.R. 12046, the President's Guatemalan relief proposals introduced by our distinguished colleague from Michigan, Congressman CHARLES DIGGS, it is my hope that the committee will give this problem its most serious consideration. As presently written, H.R. 12046 would give the President authority to provide relief "on such terms and conditions as he may determine." I believe that we ought to add a proviso to this section which would insure that food, water, milk, clothing, and medicines are channeled through the International Red Cross, the American Friends Service Committee, or other organizations experienced in such distribution, rather than on a government-to-government basis...

Last week, I asked the Library of Congress to translate the February 12 article from Occidente to which I referred. For the benefit of my colleagues who are concerned about the Guatemalan situation, I am inserting the text of that translation:

[Source: Occidente, Feb. 12, 1976]

AFTER THE QUAKE: SNACKS FOR FOODSTUFFS

(Translated by Wesley Kerney)

A military patrol was dispatched to San Martin Jilotepeque after the government received reports from Cacicazgo about a family that hoarded the supplies sent for the people hit by last week's earthquake, the Emergency Committee reported today.

Members of the Alvarado family in the capital, who have properties in the city of San Martin, got the Emergency Committee to designate them as its representatives in that zone to control the distribution of foods and medicines.

There were reports that they were not carrying out their mission.

"They left hundreds of persons without food," said a press photographer who spent almost 24 hours there. "The Alvarados' ate until they stuff themselves and they threw food away, while hundreds of hungry women and children watch them and wait hours for a handful of grains."

Telesfo Cobera, Associated Press photographer who was stranded in San Martin because of lack of transportation for returning to this capital, communicated the matter to the authorities and they ordered an investigation.

The Emergency Committee applies severe penalties on those who speculate or try to hoard foodstuffs. Thus far it has evolved a notable effort towards having the assistance reach all the towns and it said that it won't permit private persons to hinder it.

"Yesterday morning the Alvarados' had a 40-egg tortilla made and they opened several dozen cans sent from Mexico", said Cotera.

"They had a big breakfast, they threw away the cans they didn't like, while starving children were scrambling from outside the barbed-wire fence that surrounds their camp, no one could get to the discarded cans", he added.

It was reported that Edgar Alvarado, 20 years old, heads the family group that imposed the embargoes. He and his brothers and friends go around armed with up to two pistols each and they have ignored the city authority.

"They treat the natives like beasts", said mayor Abelardo Hiles. "They keep them as servants and they order them to do very heavy work. Several times they have left several of those who comprise gangs that do the jobs they order without provisions".

Cotera said that Hiles was working with other groups to try to open the roads now blocked by the landslides, so a military patrol can reach San Martin. The Alvarados' control even the access to the fields where the government helicopters land and those who complain against them haven't been able to denounce them.

San Martin is one of the towns hardest hit by the earthquake. According to officials information, 2,500 of its 8,000 inhabitants died. But it has been repopulated through the immigration of natives from nearby villages.

The city had some 30,000 inhabitants according to the 1973 census.

Many natives interviewed by Cotera said that for two consecutive days they had been without provisions. The majority stands in line up to 12 hours during hand-outs.

Cotera said that Monday night the Alvarados' had a party around a bonfire. They have girl friends with them and they have preserved some United States girls who arrived in San Martin with international assistance corps such as CARE and CARITAS.

Meanwhile, seven injured persons who spent the night out in the weather were complaining. "It was awfully cold", said one of them.

Mayor Hiles said that the Alvarado's have taken command away from him by resorting to the communism they obtained from the Emergency Committee.

He added that no one protests because of fear of the weapons which the youths ostensibly carry.

One of the Alvarado's said that the mayor "is a drunkard" and assured that he has the committee's broad support.

Several natives said that at night they load up the jeeps they have in their service and take them out for parts unknown.

The family has farms in the region, one of them 12 kilometers out of San Martin, said the mayor.

IMPACT OF CANADIAN-AMERICAN AUTOMOTIVE AGREEMENT ON EMPLOYMENT IN UNITED STATES

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, the International Trade Commission issued a comprehensive study on the Canadian-American Automotive Agreement. In the report, the Commission concluded that since its implementation in 1965, the Canadian-American Automotive Agreement has primarily benefited the Canadian economy and also the multinational auto manufac-

MONS 029713

turers who dominate both the American and Canadian industry.

Those of us who were here for the debate may well remember that 10 years ago, the Congress of the United States passed the "Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965." (Public Law 89-283) which had as its purpose the implementation of the Agreement concerning automotive products between the Governments of the United States and Canada signed on January 16, 1965. A reading of the Record of the proceedings, as well as memories of my own participation as a Member of the House of Representatives at that time, cannot fail to convey the foregone approach with which this Agreement was implemented by law. During the course of congressional consideration, there were many Members of Congress who had serious misgivings about the legislation, not only with respect to actual provisions in the bill (H.R. 8940), but also with respect to the apparent fait accompli by President Johnson, who early in 1965 negotiated and entered into the Agreement with Canadian Prime Minister Pearson, subsequently presenting the Agreement to the Congress for implementing legislation. Consequently, the Congress, if unwilling to comply with the Presidential request, was put in the awkward position of appearing belligerent towards our northern neighbor at a time when trade wars and economic boycotts, particularly with respect to automobiles, were threatened with considerable frequency and obvious effect. There was also prevalent opinion that the measure was designed to placate and satisfy the political administration in Canada, and further, that there were some foreign policy decisions of a defense nature, of which neither the House nor Senate were apprised.

What was readily apparent, however, was that the undertakings were intended to assure the Canadians of a decrease in their auto trade deficit and a guaranteed share in the North American automotive products market. The obligations and conditions outlined in the agreement for U.S. duty-free treatment are relatively simple and uncomplicated. On the other hand, those for Canadian duty-free treatment are not. Simply stated, the purpose of the Canadian conditions was and is to use the regular or MFN Canadian duties as leverage to assure increased production in Canada of motor vehicles and original equipment, an economic result that would not otherwise happen. Also, its object was and is to provide an export market in the United States for the increased volume of Canadian production.[1] The ITC report of several weeks ago has confirmed that all these goals have been achieved.

The legislative process that followed the President's request for implementing legislation was characterized by unusually strong arguments. It was obvious that the issue was not an easy one to decide, not for Members personally nor for the Congress as a body.

It was with considerable hope that those of us who opposed the bill would find our objections mitigated by the practical application of the act, and I am sure those who voted for the bill hoped that the economic success for both the United States and Canada, projected by its passage, would materialize.

Unfortunately, neither group's expectations were realized, especially with respect to benefits of APTA to the United States. In retrospect, it is likely that during the 10 years of its life, APTA has contributed to the present unemployment in the U.S. auto industry, or at a minimum, contributed to a decline in growth in the work force. It can be said however, that Canada, its workers, and the multinational auto manufacturers have clearly benefited by APTA: the benefit to the United States and its workers engaged in all phases of auto manufacturing is far less apparent, and, in fact, obfuscated by congressional inattention to the agreement.

One member of the ITC, Commissioner Italo H. Ablondi, has skillfully pointed out in his supplemental views that—

> The relative structures of production within the United States and Canada's markets are governed by decisions made in the corporate offices in Detroit, which are based on the best interests of the multinational corporations' operations, regardless of United States or Canadian national interests. . . . In my opinion, the principal beneficiaries of the agreement are the multinational corporations that control U.S.-Canadian motor vehicle production. . . .

In light of this, a point to be made is that Canada, in an attempt to deal with the American dominance of her industry, has taken steps to insure benefits to her economy and her workers. The United States, on the other hand, has not yet done so. Instead, the United States continues to advocate a trade agreement that has precisely an opposite effect.

The most apparent indicator of APTA's deleterious effects on the United States is our balance of trade with Canada. The United States had traditionally maintained favorable balance of trade with Canada in auto products, and as late as 1968, the year the pact was implemented, our trade balance with Canada in motor vehicle products, not including parts, was +$67,025,000.[2] That changed abruptly in 1968, the first full year the pact was in effect, when the United States sustained a trade deficit of —$116,176,000, initiating a pattern of trade deficits that reached —$1,396,745,000 in 1973. At the same time, motor vehicle parts have yet to show a deficit, but a pattern of declining surpluses is apparent. Until 1969, presumably while supplying expanding and new United States-Canadian subsidiaries, the parts surplus continued to be approximately $600,000,000. However, in 1970, the surplus was halved, and in 1973, after 3 years at $300,000,000, it dropped to $68,-725,000.

Just as abruptly in 1974, the parts surplus soared to +$770,833,000, a number not reflective of free market activity, but instead directly indicating the stronger United States-Canadian subsidiaries auto employment situation which necessitated the use of American made parts to assemble cars in Canada, half of which made their way back to the United States.

The overall effect of the pact on the U.S. balance of trade has been to destroy the surplus the United States enjoyed with Canada and create a 1973 trade deficit of —$1,230,000,000, a level more than twice Canada's deficit in 1964, about which it so vigorously protested and upon which it based the necessity for the agreement. Legislative history of the act indicates that its purpose was to "equalize" the balance of automotive products trade. There was certainly never any intention to shift it so overwhelmingly to the Canadians, nor to permit the agreement to remain as such should it prove harmful to the United States, particularly since the sizeable value associated with automotive trade has negatively influenced our total trade balance with Canada and effected a deficit where none existed previously. Moreover, the balance of automotive trade with Canada is not reflective of free trade between the two countries, but rather a reflection of the internal needs of the various auto manufacturers, facilitating their own corporate integration for a North American market.

The auto manufacturers are quick to accentuate the large surplus in U.S. parts trade. Notwithstanding the previous discussion with respect to the decline in parts surplus, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the parts manufacturers are captive facilities of the auto manufacturers and the "supplying" of the "demand" that occurs between them is a direct reflection of the need for parts by Canadian subsidiaries. It is by no means a free flow of goods, subject to the ordinary fluctuations of the marketplace. Additionally, it is important to remember that the parts manufacturers in Canada, many of whom are either transplanted U.S. companies, or subsidiaries of them, are not yet developed enough to meet the needs of Canadian manufacturing. Given the Canadian goals as stated in APTA, it is probable that the trade surplus in parts will exist only until the Canadian parts industry is permitted to handle Canadian production demands—presently independent Canadian manufacturers are excluded by captive dominance of the market—at that point, the American surplus in parts will disappear. Our market, unless the terms of APTA are renegotiated, will stay wide open to Canadian auto exports, so that not only will we have lost our auto export market, but our parts export market as well. In the meantime, the obvious need be said: The greater number of cars produced and assembled in Canada, the greater number of U.S. parts will be exported to supply Canadian assembly. To the extent that the parts are destined for use in cars intended for the Canadian market, the flow of parts is beneficial; to the extent that the parts are intened for cars assembled in Canada but shipped back to the U.S. market, then this country gains nothing by the artificial parts surplus, and, in fact, loses assembly line and other jobs that it very desperately needs. Unfortunately, it is the latter situation that exists as a consequence of APTA.

Footnotes at end of article.

MONS 029714