

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SPECIAL OLYMPICS ACTIVITY FEATURED IN COLMAN MCCARTHY ARTICLE

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Washington Post recently published an article by Colman McCarthy on the Special Olympics program. Special Olympics provides to more than a million retarded children and adults an opportunity to participate in sports activities. I have had the privilege of organizing Special Olympics programs and have been impressed by the joyful participation of these special athletes in these games.

I know that all Members of the Congress understand the value of such unique competition. It has been my responsibility, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on the Handicapped, to cooperate with the Kennedy family in this worthwhile endeavor.

Special Olympics began in 1968 when Eunice Kennedy Shriver initiated a modest program for a few children. This year 21 countries will send athletes to Brockport, N.Y. for the international games.

I submit the following article for printing in the RECORD:

SPECIAL OLYMPICS: "A SPIRIT OF PLAYFULNESS"

(By Colman McCarthy)

As with most other males who were conditioned early to believe that success in sports meant playing for big money in big arenas, I learned only slowly that that was false. My teachers in the lessons of true athletics have been some mentally retarded youngsters, children who are part of the Special Olympics program.

This month and the next is the height of their summer season. More than a million retarded children, with a mix of adults too, are participating in one or more of the 14 sports offered in the Special Olympic games in every state and nearly every county of the country. Over 250,000 volunteers are involved. Winter games are held in 42 states, with international games held every four years. In mid-August, 3,500 competitors from the United States and 20 countries will turn Brockport, N.Y., into the center of the sports world.

Thanks to the bustle of Eunice Kennedy Shriver, who herself is a one-woman track meet of sprinting energy and high-hurdle push, what began in 1968 as a modest effort to fill the time of a few children for whom time and a lot else hung heavily, has become a stirring success story. More than any other movement in American sports in the past decade, Special Olympics has gone into communities, neighborhoods and families to spread a spirit of playfulness that is, or should be, the essential vibrancy of sports.

I have been to enough of the meets to know exactly what in American sports is worth celebrating and what isn't. If given a choice of watching a World Series Game or a Special Olympics competition, I would take the latter. If I could have an hour to spend

talking with Elvin Hayes of the Washington Bullets or a Special Olympian who takes two minutes for the 100-yard dash, I would go with the young sprinter. Last year, I ran a few miles with Bill Rodgers, the distance man who has won three Boston marathons; but I had more of a thrill when I did a lap with a retarded child.

I call him retarded, which is the label most of us use, only because his limitations are conveniently definable. The IQ scores and reports of "the child experts" categorize the flaws and so let us, the seemingly healthy, go on about our business of normalcy.

But if the poet Wallace Stevens is right, that "We are all hot with the imperfect," then what has been happening through the Special Olympics is unique: The mentally retarded are helping the intellectually retarded.

The latter are those of us whose minds build shelves for the handicapped and then stash them away like undusted bric-a-brac to be forgotten. Or those who hire zoning lawyers to defend the purity of the neighborhood when the retarded dare move into a half-way house. Or those who read the latest newspaper expose about the filthy conditions in the state home for the retarded and murmur that "Something should be done." By someone else.

One of the beauties of the Special Olympics is that it has attracted the someone elses in amazingly large numbers—the quarter of a million volunteers. Few national programs are receiving the unsalaried energies of more groups, from amateurs like the American Legion and the Road Runners Club of America to the National Basketball Association.

As for those volunteers who do more for the retarded than any outsider can imagine—the fathers and mothers of the children—they report that Special Olympics can enhance family life in the most uplifting of ways.

I have seen this in my own neighborhood, in Angela Mann, a 15-year-old who has Down's syndrome and who won two medals in the District of Columbia Special Olympics earlier this month.

Her father, Dr. Jesse Mann, a professor of philosophy at Georgetown University and the only person I know who can discuss Heidegger while mowing his lawn, tells of Angela's new sense of her abilities. Now that she has seen herself excel in the 50-yard dash, she has become open to finding more occasions to excel.

Other families around the country report the same, according to Mrs. Shriver: "Special Olympics, through its teaching clinics and the Let's Play To Grow Program, is helping parents gain knowledge and confidence in working with their retarded children."

Not every retarded child is in Special Olympics and not all parents are blessed with the spiritual strength to keep nurturing their child despite the seemingly slow progress. But in only a decade, Special Olympics has become a world-class example of what can be done if a few people put their minds—and their bodies—to it. ●

TRIBUTE TO FRED V. PANKOW

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr.

Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues the impending retirement from education of Fred V. Pankow, superintendent of Lanse Creuse School District for the past 20 years.

Having spent the last 30 years involved in teaching and education, Mr. Pankow will typically remain in education, retiring to continue work on his doctorate degree at Wayne State University.

Mr. Pankow's dedication to his work, the school district, its parents and teachers is legendary. His name is considered synonymous with education in Lanse Creuse and has been for years. During the span of his leadership at Lanse Creuse, the size and scope of education in the district has grown, preparing thousands of young people for adult responsibilities.

The community in which Fred Pankow served is better off for having had a man of his dedication and leadership at the head of its most important service, the education of its children. Because of his influence, Lanse Creuse has produced many successful men and women, who in turn, contribute to the community, State and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, for his part in the important process of education, I would like to congratulate Fred V. Pankow on his service to Lanse Creuse and extend to him and his family the best of wishes for the future. ●

TRIBUTE TO MERVIN WINEBERG

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the small community of Adams in my congressional district, and the larger community of Berkshire County, were saddened recently at the untimely passing of a business and civic leader of great humanity and conscience. Mr. Mervin Wineberg, president of the Adams Super Markets, Inc., died on May 18.

I had been privileged to call Mervin Wineberg a friend for a good many years. A native and life-long resident of Adams, he was always looking out for the welfare of his neighbors. Often times, when people of his acquaintance had some difficulty, it was to Mr. Wineberg that they would turn. He always did his best to help them. I can remember many, many times when he would write to me seeking the assistance of my office on behalf of someone who had come to him for guidance.

It was not only private individuals who knew they had a friend in Mr. Wineberg. Community leaders also sought his counsel and aid. An astute and successful businessman, Mr. Wineberg was able

to compliment the needs of the communities of Berkshire County with good financial sense.

Adams Super Markets, Inc., a family-run business, thrived under Mr. Wineberg's direction. Today, it is an eight-store chain with three of the stores located in urban renewal areas in Adams, North Adams, and Pittsfield.

Mr. Wineberg was also active in other business ventures and was instrumental in preventing the closing of the Arnold Print Works in Adams, and, in so doing, in salvaging 750 jobs.

Mr. Wineberg also generally lent his time, energy, and talent to educational and religious concerns. He served as chairman of the Adams-Cheshire Regional School Committee and was a director of the Francis Ouimet Scholarship Fund. His company also offered scholarship aid to worthy students throughout the county.

He was a former president of Temple Anshe Amunim, and was chosen as the temple's "Man of the Year" in 1971. He was also a member of the Congregation Beth Israel. He was a leader in the United Jewish Appeal and Israel bond drive efforts.

Mervin Wineberg was a dedicated and devoted family man, the father of three children. At this time, I would like to express my heartfelt sympathy to his wife, Florence, and the entire Wineberg family at the passing of this good man and good friend. ●

BILL TO IMPROVE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am offering for introduction a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, to improve food stamp program fiscal accountability through reductions in inaccurate eligibility and benefit determinations and intensified fraud detection and recovery procedures; and to remove specific dollar limitations on appropriations while continuing to limit expenditures to available funds; and for other purposes.

This bill contains all of the provisions (with some revisions) in the suggested legislation transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture on May 21, 1979, plus two rather important sections that were not included in the administration's version even though the administration "strongly supports" them, because the administration preferred not to draft the actual language to be used in light of potential jurisdictional problems. The two new provisions—providing access for departmental and State officials to Social Security Administration and State unemployment compensation agency records in order to verify and audit food stamp eligibility subject to various safeguards against abuse of such information—would considerably enhance the integrity of the food stamp program. ●

A PROFIT OF WINDFALL TAXES

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, in his syndicated column, Patrick Buchanan recently asked: "Who gets the windfall profits?" The answer, under the President's proposal, is big government.

If our country is to have the gasoline and heating oil it needs, the profits generated by decontrol must be invested in more energy production, not in more bureaucrats.

Mr. Buchanan makes this point eloquently. I would like to bring his column to my colleagues' attention.

The article follows:

WHO GETS THE WINDFALL PROFITS?

(By Patrick Buchanan)

WASHINGTON.—Like the man said, it took Mr. Carter's energy team two years to master Economics 101, and they still have not got it quite right.

The decontrol of oil prices was necessary, courageous and correct. Had the decision been taken two years ago, instead of all that claptrap about the "moral equivalent of war," we would be that much further along toward regaining energy independence.

Not all the fault lies with Carter. In truth, the United States has lost almost six years since 1973, deluding ourselves, refusing to confront the reality of higher oil prices mandated by the OPEC cartel. As a consequence, invaluable time has been wasted, and our economic and political dependence upon the Persian Gulf has grown ominously.

But, having taken the tough decision, the President is now working feverishly to deny himself and the country the economic benefit that could result from it.

First, the price controls on old oil will not be wholly phased out for almost two and a half years. As one critic notes, an oil producer of even average intelligence will ask himself: "Why produce oil now at \$6 a barrel, when in 28 months, (we) can get \$15 to \$20 a barrel?"

Second, the President has coupled decontrol with demagogic attacks upon the oil companies and their lobbyists for wanting to keep their customary share of the profits that will accrue as a consequence of Mr. Carter's decision.

Well, let us put this windfall profits picture in perspective.

Under existing tax laws, local, state and federal governments will take some 60 cents of every dollar in "windfall profits." So, who is ripping off whom?

Not only does the President and his staff want the right to spend half of the oil companies' profits—their customary rake-off—but they also want to collect and allocate another half of the oil companies' share.

By what right?

At least it may be said of the boys at Exxon, Mobil, Texaco and Shell that they have explored, drilled, produced, refined and marketed oil and gas—as their contribution toward solving the energy crisis.

Why should three of every four dollars in new profits we turned over to Big Government, whose politicians created the energy crisis with the idiotic rules, regulations and controls they themselves are now abandoning?

Whose profits are truly "unearned?" Big Oil's or Big Government's?

Of late, Mr. Carter and his crew have exhibited a schizophrenia about the whole question of profits. In a "Dear Friend" fund-

raising letter, sent out on White House stationery, Mr. Carter boasted that, under his regime, "corporate profits are up 37 percent." In his 1979 Economic Report, he claimed that "business profits rose more than 10 percent in 1978."

When the statistics came, however, to confirm Mr. Carter's claims, Hamilton Jordan denounced the same profits as "unnecessarily high," and the President's inflation fighter, Fred Kahn, called them a "catastrophe" which has "put business on trial in the eyes of the American people."

Now, given recent revelations about the financing of the peanut warehouse, perhaps Mr. Carter does NOT appreciate the role of profits.

But his re-election, and perhaps his renomination, may depend upon them—as does the performance of the American economy, matter of considerably higher importance to the Western world.

Profits are the seed corn of the economy. They provide the investment capital which means productivity growth—the antidote to inflation. When they are high and rising, so is the stock market, and the equity and spirits of 25 million investors. When profit margins are strong, more money is available for workers' pay hikes and increases in benefits. When the profit picture improves, local and state treasuries fatten; and there is a reduced federal deficit, since taxes at all levels of government customarily tax more than half the profit of every corporation of other than minuscule size.

And if it is true, as Mr. Kahn suggests, that there have been corporate price-gouging and obscene profits of late, why is the stock market lower today than it was 10 years ago? ●

OSHA REGULATIONS—THE COSTS ARE TOO HIGH

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of our colleagues frequently hear complaints about the cost of compliance with myriad Federal regulations. These Federal requirements are often inflationary and counterproductive. They do not add to our manufacturing capability and cost thousands of manhours and millions of dollars.

We must strike a sensible balance between the costs of regulation and the benefits our society garners from such compliance.

The nub of the problem is that our Federal regulatory agencies are not mandated to consider the cost of compliance when promulgating their rules.

The upshot is that these costs are hurting our ability to compete with foreign industries.

That is why I am cosponsoring H.R. 3156. This bill will require the Secretary of Labor to prepare an economic analysis of the costs of OSHA regulations. The analysis would cover six aspects of compliance:

1. Potential inflationary or recessionary impact.
2. Direct or indirect costs incurred by businesses.
3. Effects of competition in businesses and industries with particular attention to the impact on small business.
4. Direct or indirect costs on employment.

5. The impact on our balance of trade between United States and foreign industries.

6. Impact on productivity in enterprises affected by the proposed regulations.

If America is to continue as an economic power, it must free itself from unnecessary Government regulation. This bill provides a starting point.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to make a new beginning for the American small businessman.●

OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK
SUPERINTENDENT

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, without question the National Park Service is one of our most cherished agencies, working to preserve and protect millions of acres of public lands and providing important services to vast numbers of citizens who enjoy our national parks.

The Olympic National Park in my district is one of the largest in the country—the boundaries of which now include almost a million acres. In addition to its size, the Olympic National Park is the most spectacular in terms of rugged scenic beauty—including even Washington's substantial upper coastline and the amazing Olympics. It is, indeed, a national treasure.

But to local residents the park represents some unique problems. Its sheer size makes the Government an imposing landowner in the area, denying the local government of a needed tax base. Park policy also disallows harvesting of timber which is critical to the commodity productions' interests. Park policies and regulations affect many local citizens, particularly with respect to inholders in and around Lake Crescent who face an uncertain future there.

The Olympic National Park has been viewed with suspicion and hostility in past years. This is due to its size, past policies, and management activities. When I was elected to represent this area in 1975, the Park Service was the target of much criticism. Both its management and policies were controversial and, frankly speaking, the agency had little public support in the area.

All that changed in 2 short years with the arrival of Jim Coleman as the new superintendent. Sensing the need to build public confidence in the Park Service, Jim Coleman devoted himself to working with local residents on issues and, without changing significantly Park Service policies and standards, gained public respect for his agency. His accomplishments were extraordinary considering the short period with which he had to work, and were based on the historic ideals of public service—ability, dedication, hard work, patience, and a true commitment to the public.

That is why many of my constituents are dismayed and distressed over the un-

expected transfer of this exceptional public servant. While it represents a promotion, it also is unusual for such a transfer to occur within a short period. It raises suspicions in the upper peninsula as to the motives of the National Park Service and some concern over the future management and policy of the Olympic National Park.

Mr. Speaker, the Port Angeles Daily News and Forks Forum have editorialized on this matter and, I believe, accurately reflect the views of my constituents. I would like to include the two articles in the RECORD:

[From the Daily News, May 3, 1979]

RUNNING THE PARK

Ordinarily we would wish the departing Olympic National Park superintendent good luck in his next assignment. But that is not what must be written about Jim Coleman.

Coleman, who has held the superintendent's post since May of 1977, deserves more than a pat on the back. The Olympic Peninsula should go to bat for him as he has for it during the last two years. Those who have seen his contributions so far, and can see that his work is not yet finished, should speak out.

The National Park Service is wrong in transferring Coleman against his wishes after an unusually short stay. It is not just that superintendents traditionally stay much longer; Coleman should stay because Olympic National Park and the people of the Peninsula need him. It would be in the best interests of both if the decision to move him now were reversed.

For years the park and Peninsula residents had feuded. Sometimes it was over small issues, sometimes very important ones. Much of the misunderstanding and distrust stemmed from policies set in Washington, D.C., and enforced by local park officials. Those park officials have been seen locally as mere extensions of a federal bureaucracy some 2,500 miles away. Sadly, that perception has all too often been true in recent years.

Coleman has spent his time here changing that perception. He has convinced nearly everyone with whom he has worked that his interest lay in the Olympic Peninsula, its park and its people. While it has taken a lot of work on his part to get this far, he is not yet finished. Here are several instances:

—The dispute between in-holders and the park is moving toward a solution, thanks in large degree to Coleman. But the issue is not completely resolved. His help is still needed to set the tone for administering the new park policy.

—The oil port issue is really just coming to a head. Coleman's expertise on air quality, acquired by attending a school in Arizona in January, is still needed. The park's chief concern about a port here is that park air might be polluted. Air pollution, of course, also is a concern of the people who live on the Peninsula. We would breathe easier if Coleman were here to help fight the battle for clean air.

—Lastly, Coleman is needed to finish his polishing of the park's image. Park relations with residents since 1977 have improved dramatically. But no man can undo in two years what some have seemingly spent careers doing. Coleman just needs more time. The Peninsula needs to get along well with a neighbor as large as the park. A state of constant strife is unhealthy for us all.

All of these comments are of a selfish nature. Our main considerations have been of the needs of the park and the Olympic Peninsula. What of Jim Coleman's needs? They tell us he likes living here. In other words, he shares something with us.

If he is so good for the park and so good

for the Peninsula and he likes living here, why is the National Park Service moving him? Because, we surmise, it is good for the bureaucracy to move him. That reasoning does not wash. The federal government should be managed for the benefit of the people. Yet here we have a case which proves the very point Coleman has tried to disprove during the last two years: The National Park Service is run for the National Park Service not the people.

[From the Forks Forum-Peninsula Herald, May 3, 1979]

PARK SUPERINTENDENT SHOULD BE RETAINED

(By Lorraine Berg)

He says he doesn't want to go, his workers don't want him to go, and those of us who have worked with him don't want him to go, and if he goes, you'll probably notice it right away. Who is going?

Jim Coleman, Superintendent of the Olympic National Park, that is who.

After two years here, Coleman's work has started to show, for a park superintendent has lots of power locally.

The road around Lake Crescent, for instance, has directional signs, reflectors, and more patrol cars (or at least more visible ones). Accidents have been cut dramatically. Also the road has been more pleasant to use, certainly not detracting from the tourism angle either. Happy tourists stay longer and come back, both boosting the economy locally.

Rialto Bridge is being built. We can thank Coleman at least in part, for that. It is slow in being built, but he gave his word that it would be built, and Coleman has proven to be a man of his word.

Shelters in the park were slated to be destroyed. Many had been torn down. Many more were slated for the fire, but Coleman listened to local woodsmen and left them standing. That made the park a little safer for the back-country hiker who might get caught in untimely cold weather.

ByPass: Coleman worked for the ByPass, and had spoken out publicly for it. Meanwhile, the road around the lake has been improved.

Hurricane Ridge has been kept open during the week, instead of just the weekend, bringing happiness to many local skiers, instead of just catering to out of area visitors on the weekend.

Coleman has been instrumental in the retention of Kalaloch, because prior to his arrival, it was scheduled to be phased out. Now, extensive remodeling and rebuilding is being done.

Soleduck Hot Springs is still running, doing a land-office business last year.

And last but not least, Coleman has made it okay to be part of the U.S. Park Service again. He listens and acts on local citizen ideas and complaints.

He has imported a crew of rangers, aides, naturalists, and others who just have a great attitude toward the people who live here. Rangers and naturalists have presented slides, movies, and talks at schools and clubs, turning local attitudes around.

Have you noticed, that for the first time in years, U.S. Park personnel appear in Forks in their uniforms? And did you notice, the park service has an office in Forks, with two rangers, Marty Ott and Keith Hoofnagle living here?

That was no accident that it happened when it did. That was Jim Coleman's fine diplomatic handwork.

Senator Henry Jackson, when we called him about this so-called promotional transfer, said he has seldom had more calls about any particular person, than he has about this superintendent.

"Just two years ago, we were wondering what we could do to turn the situation around about the Park," Jackson's aide, Bob

Turner says, "and now we're getting calls in favor of a superintendent."

The aide said letters from local people would probably carry more weight than phone calls, although the phone calls are not being ignored, either.

He said the reason Coleman was being transferred to Pennsylvania was because Coleman has a background in history, which is needed in the Valley Forge, Gettysburg, Shenandoah National Park, and Assateague National Seashore, which are all part of the National Park Service Mid-Atlantic Region that Coleman has been named deputy-director of.

Turner said some callers believe Coleman is being transferred because he was "too helpful" to the inholders around Lake Crescent. He said Jackson's office is very concerned about the whole matter.

Jackson will have some say in the replacement of Coleman, too, and is very concerned that the replacement, if Coleman is transferred, be some one with the same good attitude that Coleman has.

Senator Warren Magnuson's aide Gretchen Kienan, said the Senator, like Jackson, is "aware of the problem," but he has received no letters.

"We have not been asked formally to investigate the situation," she said, "and some letters would help."

Coleman has said in an interview with the Daily News executive editor Don Paxson that the appointment in Pennsylvania is, "an honor to me but I really wanted to stay here longer."●

THE 61ST ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, Monday, May 28 marked the 61st anniversary of Armenian independence. On this day each year, people of an Armenian ancestry contemplate their past and redouble their efforts to secure freedom and independence for all Armenians.

This anniversary should encourage sober reflection. On May 28, 1918, spurned by Woodrow Wilson's 14 points and motivated by their respect for human rights, the people of Armenia declared their independence. This action demonstrated how relentless struggle can surmount oppression and secure liberty. In our contemporary society, where human rights is a prominent issue, we would be wise to remember the struggle for Armenian independence and learn from their spirited determination. Like our Armenian friends, we should share their remembrance and rededicate ourselves to the ideals in which they believe.

Because of the persecution they have experienced, Armenians possess an inherent respect for freedom and human dignity. Armenian Americans have been second to none in their support of this country and the ideals upon which it was built. Their unselfish motivation drives them to seek the implementation of these values throughout the world.

Despite suffering centuries of persecution, the Armenians continue to nurture and augment their religious, cultural, and linguistic identity. This in itself is a testi-

mony to their national character. Hopefully this persistent dedication to national self-determination will reward them with the satisfaction of restoring freedom to the people of Armenia and to the land which is their historic birthright.

Armenians worldwide have suffered the depths of human cruelty and I believe it is time that we recognize their right to independence. I only hope that their courage persists until justice prevails and independence arrives with the guarantee of freedom for their people.●

IN HONOR OF GEORGE H. BEAUBIAN III

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, the son of Mr. and Mrs. George Beaubian was taken from us on May 26, 1979. I had the honor to deliver his eulogy, and I would like to share it with my colleagues:

EULOGY

George H. Beaubian, III, affectionately known and remembered as Tres Beaubian, was born on April 11, 1960, and was taken from this life on May 26, 1979.

Death in youth seems so unnatural. We somehow expect death to visit only the old, for in their life has run its course. The old have tasted all that life has to offer: The meaning of childhood dreams and yearnings; the Noon day of keen youth's discerning; the afternoon of middle age with its harvest whether great or small; and finally, the evening of old age when the body is warmed by the memories of years gone by, but chilled by the waning of its physical strength. We expect death then.

But that a life should be cut off in the budding of youth or ripening manhood before it has run its course or tasted its wonders fully, seems so unnatural. But its like that. Death visits us at all seasons. It visits the infant of a few days, the man or woman of many years, and sometimes, sometimes as with Jesus of Nazareth on Calvary, so with our own "Tres" Beaubian—the sun goes down as it rises.

For those who measure life in conventional terms, Tres had a short life. But, those who knew and loved him recognize that the quality of Tres' life far exceeds the number of years he shared with us.

Tres was a loving and gifted young man. Throughout his life, he seemed to gain the greatest measure of happiness when he was giving of his time and talents to others.

With his innate mechanical talents, he could fix anything. Often you would find Tres up to his elbows in grease and spare parts as he labored to fix something for a friend, or a relative.

His sense of wonder about and love for animals was equally as intense as his desire to be of service to his friends and family.

We can take a measure of consolation, however, in the fact that Tres, in his short years, lived a full and eventful life and through those of us whose lives he touched, his life continues.

Some people seek to amass riches and power in their lifetimes. Tres Beaubian only had the opportunity to seek beauty. Riches and power always pass but, beauty remains.

Tres' life was dedicated to love, to family and to friends—because his was a beautiful life, Tres Beaubian remains with each of us forever.●

CONGRESSMAN FRANK ANNUNZIO ANNOUNCES RESULTS OF 1979 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce the results of a legislative poll which I conducted recently to obtain the opinions of citizens residing in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois which I am privileged to represent.

More than 12,000 questionnaires were completed and returned, and I want to express my appreciation to my constituents who involved themselves in the decisionmaking process by responding to this survey.

Eighteen broad questions were asked relating to both domestic and foreign policy issues, and the responses on the questionnaires were tabulated by computer. Before listing a numerical summary of the tabulation, I want to point out some significant reactions to several important issues.

The strongest response on the 18 questions was on crime, with 96 percent favoring the imposition of extra penalties on persons found guilty of committing crimes with guns or other deadly weapons. I strongly feel that tougher penalties can serve as a forceful deterrent to serious crimes and, therefore, I have sponsored legislation severely increasing prison terms and making these prison terms mandatory, with absolutely no probation or parole, for those who commit felonies with a firearm or other deadly weapon.

The second strongest response was on sunset legislation, with 90 percent favoring periodic evaluation of Government programs and the setting of automatic termination dates for those not specifically reauthorized. I have cosponsored sunset legislation in the 96th Congress and shall continue to push for passage of this legislation in order to assure that our budget resources are used efficiently in meeting national needs.

The third strongest response was on forced busing of schoolchildren, with 88 percent expressing opposition to forced busing. My own position on this issue has been consistently against forced busing. Despite the fact that Congress has voted time and again against forced busing, various court decisions have held that busing is constitutional. I feel the only way to resolve the busing question once and for all is through a constitutional amendment. I have sponsored legislation to provide for such an amendment and shall continue to work vigorously toward its enactment.

Also receiving an 88-percent affirmative vote was the proposal to provide a \$5,000 tax exclusion from gross income for any amount received as an annuity, pension, or as other retirement benefits. I have consistently supported a \$5,000 tax exclusion for retirees and am convinced it is needed now more than ever, because of the galloping rate of inflation. In earlier Congresses we have

been successful in increasing existing tax credits for the elderly. But these increases have not gone far enough, and consequently, I reintroduced my \$5,000 tax exclusion bill in the 96th Congress and I shall continue to work for its early approval.

A total of 87 percent of those who responded expressed their support for legislation that would require our Nation's hospitals to hold their average annual increase in charges below a fixed limit. Hearings have been completed in the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee on legislation to impose mandatory limits on yearly increases in the skyrocketing costs of hospital care, and this legislation is now awaiting further congressional action.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, 85 percent of those who responded to my survey indicated they felt that the employment of persons illegally in the United States should be made unlawful. In the past I have strongly supported legislation to penalize employers who hire illegal aliens, and although such legislation has passed the House of Representatives twice, it has died in the Senate both times. During the 96th Congress, I shall continue to extend my support to bills penalizing employers who knowingly hire illegal aliens.

It is also interesting to note that of those who returned the questionnaire, the largest number—46 percent—were in the 45- to 64-age category, while the smallest number—12 percent—were in the 18- to 29-age category.

Mr. Speaker, the following is the completed questionnaire tabulation according to percentages:

THE 1979 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE
(Figures in percent)

1. Congressional campaign financing: Do you favor public financing of election campaigns for the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate?

Yes	35
No	52
Undecided	13

2. Balanced budget: Do you favor a Constitutional Amendment to eliminate deficit spending and to require an annual balanced Federal budget unless a national emergency were declared by the President and the Congress?

Yes	82
No	12
Undecided	6

3. Hospital cost containment: Do you favor legislation to require the nation's hospitals to hold their average annual increase in charges below a fixed limit?

Yes	87
No	9
Undecided	4

4. Illegal alien labor: Do you favor legislation:

(a) to make unlawful the employment of illegal aliens?	
Yes	85
No	11
Undecided	4
(b) to adjust the status of illegal aliens now in the United States to permit them to remain here legally?	
Yes	85
No	11
Undecided	4

Yes	26
No	65
Undecided	9

5. Health insurance: Do you favor legislation to provide all Americans with national health insurance?

Yes	54
No	36
Undecided	10

6. Social Security financing: Do you favor balancing the social security budget by:

(a) raising tax rates equally on employer, employee, and the self-employed whenever additional revenues are needed;

Yes	38
No	51
Undecided	11

(b) raising taxable wage base ceilings;

Yes	39
No	48
Undecided	13

(c) using general revenues as a supplementary source of funds;

Yes	57
No	33
Undecided	10

(d) making selective cuts in benefits such as payments for dependent children in college, lump-sum death benefits, etc.;

Yes	49
No	42
Undecided	9

(e) bringing Federal, State, and local government employees under the Social Security System?

Yes	57
No	33
Undecided	10

7. Sunset legislation: Do you favor sunset legislation which would require periodic evaluation of government programs and set automatic termination dates for those not specifically reauthorized?

Yes	90
No	3
Undecided	7

8. SALT II: Do you favor a second strategic arms limitation agreement with the Soviet Union as a means of enhancing U.S. security and reducing chances for a nuclear war?

Yes	67
No	21
Undecided	12

9. Defense: Do you favor a boost in defense spending by three percent a year in real terms (after inflation) for the next five years as pledged to our NATO allies by the Administration?

Yes	55
No	33
Undecided	12

10. Relations with China: Do you favor:

(a) continuation of diplomatic relations with the Peoples Republic of China?	
Yes	83
No	9
Undecided	8

(b) cutting of relations with the Chinese government in Taiwan?

Yes	11
No	79
Undecided	10

(c) a two-China policy by recognizing Taiwan as a separate sovereign state?

Yes	78
No	11
Undecided	11

11. Draft law: Do you favor reinstatement of peacetime registration for the draft in order to insure U.S. defense preparedness?

Yes	66
No	26
Undecided	8

12. Abortion: Do you favor the use of Federal funds for the purpose of performing abortions?

Yes	24
No	71
Undecided	5

13. Busing: Do you favor a constitutional amendment to end forced busing while at the same time assuring equal educational opportunities for all students wherever they are located?

Yes	88
No	10
Undecided	2

14. Education department: Do you favor creation of a separate Department of Education designed to consolidate all Federally funded and administered educational programs?

Yes	55
No	30
Undecided	15

15. Inflation: Do you favor anti-inflation legislation recommended by the President for:

(a) a two-year extension of the Council on Wage and Price Stability?

Yes	57
No	22
Undecided	21

(b) "real wage insurance" to underwrite the wages of workers whose companies comply with voluntary wage-price guidelines?

Yes	47
No	30
Undecided	23

16. Oil shortages: Do you favor resolving possible oil shortage problems caused by Iran's oil strike through:

(a) restrictions on weekend gasoline sales?

Yes	40
No	52
Undecided	8

(b) parking restrictions for commuters?

Yes	38
No	46
Undecided	16

(c) controls on lighted advertisements?

Yes	81
No	13
Undecided	6

(d) decontrolling of oil prices?

Yes	36
No	49
Undecided	15

(e) rationing?

Yes	29
No	59
Undecided	12

17. Crime: Do you favor:

(a) imposition of extra penalties on persons found guilty of committing crimes with guns or other deadly weapons?

Yes	96
No	3
Undecided	1

(b) making it illegal to possess a handgun?

Yes	57
No	38
Undecided	5

18. Retirees: Do you believe there should be a \$5,000 tax exclusion from gross income for any amount received as an annuity, pension, or other retirement benefits?

Yes ----- 88
No ----- 7
Undecided ----- 5

Age: To help me analyze results of this poll, please indicate: (circle the appropriate answer) (optional):

(a) 18-29 ----- 12
(b) 30-44 ----- 22
(c) 45-64 ----- 46
(d) 65-and-over ----- 20

MASS TRANSIT, ENERGY, AND THE CITIES

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, the May issue of *Modern Railroads* magazine features an excellent article on mass transit and its role in promoting energy conservation and urban revitalization. Transit is no cure-all to the energy crisis—not by a long shot—nor is it the saviour of our cities. Investments in rail transit systems, however, can play a valuable role in promoting both goals.

The great cities of the world have long recognized the importance of efficient public transportation. During the past decade, Canada in particular has made great strides in this field, with new transit systems or extensions built in Montreal, Toronto, and Edmonton. More transit lines are planned for other Canadian cities, cities whose population size would effectively disqualify them for similar grants from the U.S. Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

The Canadians and others are succeeding, while we are failing. We do not like to hear talk like that, but it is indisputable in this case. If you would like to learn more, I urge you to read this timely article entitled, "Will it Take a Crisis?":

WILL IT TAKE A CRISIS?

(By Terry Breen)

Many uncertainties cloud the future of rail transit, but the mode's major roles are not among them. As largest capacity hauler of all transit modes, as efficient user of alternative sources of fuel, and as shaper of quickly growing cities and re-shaper of mature ones, rail transit will be a welcome asset in cities faced with diminishing petroleum supplies, a possible stabilization in automobile use, and an evergrowing population.

Among the major uncertainties in rail transit's future are the stances concerning public policy and funding to be taken in Washington. It shouldn't require a severe crisis of some sort to propel the federal government into increasing significantly its financial stake in rail transit—but, regrettably, it may.

For years, industry officials, planners, and scholars have recognized the necessity of rail transit in our future, and now our political leaders show signs of being interested as well. So the question is not whether rail transit will play a big part in the future of our urban areas, but how and when.

URBAN SURVIVAL?

It almost goes without saying that, unless our central cities continue to serve a pur-

pose, there would be little need for rail transit systems. The transit professionals we contacted for this article give the cities a vote of confidence.

"American cities have turned a corner," says Frank Herringer, a former UMTA administrator and BART general manager, and now a vice president with Trans-America Corporation. "Basically, they're either stabilizing or improving—I don't see them decaying any more. The country generally recognizes the need for urban centers and is willing to invest in them."

John E. Hirten, a planner currently working as a consultant with the Office of Management and Budget, sees the cities as holding up in the future "because they'll have to." Says he: "The viability of our cities depends on public policies which will have to recognize that it's less wasteful and more efficient from an energy point of view to intensify development in the urban cores that already exist than it is to continue to spread our utilities and facilities out in low density development."

Ronald J. Hartman, senior transportation planner with APTA's Office of Planning and Policy Analysis, believes that "everything points to a tremendous renaissance in the central cities. Issues that 10 years ago were not big—like energy supplies, environmental concerns, and land use—have suddenly become so, and they all point back to the efficiencies of the central city."

Louis J. Gambaccini, commissioner of transportation in New Jersey, and former general manager of PATH, is not convinced that a full scale "renaissance" is on the way in our cities, but is certain that development on the outlying areas of cities has run its course.

"As a country," he says, "we've grown up with an addiction to the automobile—the convenience of point-to-point coverage, the speed, and that sort of thing—but all of that is changing. Government funding policies are moving away from feeding the appetite of the automobile—the highways, the parking lots, the suburban and exurban development."

REVITALIZATION

If it's agreed that the central city is vital to metropolitan life, then it's important that rail transit systems be around to strengthen the central city and tie it to the rest of the metropolitan area.

"There's a direct relationship between a rail transit system that makes a number of stops within a downtown area and the viability of the downtown," says Dr. John A. Bailey, a noted engineer and planner with the Philadelphia firm of Louis T. Klauder & Associates. "For instance, the most livable and culturally active cities—such as San Francisco, Philadelphia, Chicago, Boston, and New York—all have extensive rail transit systems. The cities in the greatest disrepair, like Detroit and Cleveland, lack adequate rail transit service in their downtown areas. Detroit has no system at all, and Cleveland's system has very few stops downtown."

Mr. Hirten strikes a similar note: "One might say that most of our cities are already developed, or framed at least, in terms of structure. But rail transit could have, and should have, a lot to do with shaping the next generation of development. We should keep in mind that San Francisco was in the doldrums until after BART was approved and a surge of building began downtown. And now, in Washington, D.C., new building is starting to happen due in large part to Metro's success. It's clear that, in the future, electric rail systems in the variety of forms—commuter, rapid transit, so-called light rail, and maybe even electric trolley buses—will be rediscovered because of the energy problem, but people will soon realize that these systems serve a very fundamental purpose in urban development."

Mr. Herringer agrees. Says he: "Rail transit enables a city to function and grow without adding highway capacity, which means

without affecting the environment in the city, without increasing pollution, and without increasing dependence on the automobile. Rail transit has good prospects for the future because of this ability, and also because the era of building highways is over. Combine the continued pressure from an ever-growing population and economy with a leveling off of new highway capacity and you find that you need some outlet for transporting people—and that outlet is rail transit."

But what kind of system will be best suited to serving the needs of the future?

From most of the people we've talked to, the answer comes ringing in: an integrated, perhaps balanced, system that takes the rider from as close to his home as possible to his destination while giving him the feeling that he is being moved by a single system rather than by a bunch of fragments. Such a system might combine basic rail service wherever possible with feeder bus service and perhaps commuter rail service.

Of all the cities in North America, Toronto emerges as the leading model of integrated mass transportation.

"Toronto is an excellent example of building and expanding incrementally as you also vary feeder bus services and try to guide related development around stations," says Mr. Gambaccini. "What we should be after in our systems is a family of services. The art form, of course, involves blending these services together in the most creative way so that each works at its optimum level."

Dr. Bailey is another of the city's admirers: "Thirty years ago Toronto was merely a sort of Midwestern distribution center in U.S. terms, but now it is the most exciting metropolis in the continent because of its investment in rail transit. The government there has achieved a logical reinforcement of transit decisions with all other kinds of development decisions. Unless we in the U.S. achieve this, it will be nearly impossible to bring rail transit to the point of serving substantially more riders than it does now."

MOSTLY EXTENSIONS

Investment in major new heavy rail systems in the next decade, it seems, will be the exception rather than the rule. The rule will be investment in improvements and extensions to existing systems. New starts in light rail, however, may be more likely, unless costs escalate at an increasingly quicker pace and put the price of building a system out of sight.

The investment policy of rail transit's primary financier, UMTA, is of paramount importance. Current UMTA policy is that the agency "will continue to finance the construction of new rail lines and extensions to existing rail systems in those urban corridors whose population densities, travel volumes, and growth patterns indicate a need for high-capacity, high performance mass transportation service."

In deciding which new rail segments to fund, UMTA says it will give preference "to corridors serving densely populated central portions of metropolitan areas, including central cities and close-in suburbs, as well as to metropolitan areas which view rail transit investment as part of a long-term regional strategy to protect the environment, conserve energy, promote urban economic developments, and support orderly patterns of metropolitan growth."

Certainly, there is much speculation and debate about cities which would be good candidates for both heavy rail and light rail. One of the more interesting lists of likely candidates is contained in a study done recently by a New York firm known as the Regional Plan Association.

As likely candidates for new heavy rail systems (excluding Baltimore, Atlanta, and Miami, which are building systems) the study lists Los Angeles, Honolulu, Houston, Detroit, Dallas, and Seattle.

And, for light rail systems (excluding Buf-

falo, which is building a system) it lists St. Louis, Milwaukee, Providence, Minneapolis-St. Paul, San Diego, Indianapolis, Louisville, Denver, Cincinnati, Portiana, and Columbus.

We at *Modern Railroads* agree that these cities appear to be likely candidates, but consider it a long shot indeed for more than an handful of them to get either light rail or heavy rail systems underway within the next 10 years. It would take a substantial increase in federal commitment to do more.

In the next 10 years, we believe that Detroit, Honolulu, and Los Angeles will be the best bets for heavy rail systems, and Portland and San Diego the best bets for light rail systems.

Also in the next decade, we see much activity in extensions to systems, especially in Eastern cities, and perhaps on BART in Oakland or San Francisco. Extensions to airports we see as constituting a major push in the 1980s. Outside of Europe, only Cleveland's rapid transit system directly ties downtown to airport. The Metro in Washington brings the rider within a long walk of the terminal at National Airport, but this is certainly better than nothing. We consider likely candidates for airport extensions to be Chicago, New York, Newark, Philadelphia, and San Francisco.

MONEY, MONEY, MONEY

When the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978 came into being, transit supporters applauded Congress for legislating a modest increase in the funding authorization for mass transit. But the total authorization—\$15.66 billion between fiscal years 1979 and 1983—is, of course, a ceiling limit, which may, and probably will, be undercut by Congress in its appropriations. Already, things are headed in that direction: Congress' mass transit appropriation for fiscal 1979 was \$239.5 million below the authorization.

Despite this shortfall for fiscal 1979, the Carter administration, in its fiscal 1980 budget proposal, calls for Congress to appropriate just \$2.82 billion of the \$3.27 billion authorized to be spent on mass transit in fiscal 1980. APTA, with due cause, has besieged Capitol Hill with demands that Congress close the shortfall gap for fiscal 1979 with a supplemental appropriation and bring the appropriation for fiscal 1980 up to the amount authorized.

We view, on one hand, the Carter administration's pleas to the public to cut gasoline consumption in the face of uncertainties in Iran and, on the other, its slim budget requests for mass transportation, as highly inconsistent, if not downright ludicrous. We can only hope that Congress will come to the rescue for fiscal years 1979 and 1980, and, if it needs to, in the years beyond.

Dr. Bailey sees more and more federal money becoming available in the years ahead for rail transit, but believes that the money will "lag the need until we have a major petroleum crisis." But all will not be sweetness and light at that point because a response to such a crisis might beget another crisis in cities with little or no rail transit capability: that of discovering, almost overnight, that "the physical barriers of engineering, land acquisition, transit car acquisition, and the like, will make it very difficult to provide anything as fast as we need it."

Even in cities with considerable mass transit capacity, another crisis of sorts could crop up. John Hirtin describes the scene: "If everyone starts taking transit very suddenly in a city, say, like Washington, transit would become overcrowded and dirty and hot and messy, and transit's role would be pretty much defeated. So, very simply, as a country, we must have the foresight to prepare for any crunch."●

THE SUGAR SUBSIDY: THE SWEETEST DEAL

HON. DANIEL B. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the issue of subsidizing the sugar industry will soon be considered by the House. I do not see a single reason why, in light of skyrocketing prices, the American taxpayer should continue to subsidize the sugar grower.

I know of no reason why the United States should maintain a program whose goal is to keep the price of sugar artificially high by limiting total supply to a level sufficient to achieve a domestic producer's price as determined by a political formula rather than the free market. Because we have such a program, we have seen over the course of the past 40 years price fixing, quotas, Government decrees, international trade barriers, uneconomical production, subsidies, and total bureaucracy as hallmarks of a plan that long ago outlived its usefulness.

The program has not kept prices from running wild, nor has it always assured adequate supplies at stable prices. In fact, by providing some foreign nations with privileged and arbitrary access to the U.S. market, it has been to some degree responsible for the volatile world price of sugar.

In the June 4, 1979, issue of *Time* magazine, there is an informative article on this matter entitled "Going Sour on Sugar Payoffs." In it, *Time* observes that for every 1 cent increase in sugar price supports, \$500 million a year is added to Americans' grocery expenses. At a time when we are supposed to be fighting inflation, I think it is reprehensible that there is a program which unnecessarily costs the American consumer extra dollars and causes artificially high retail prices.

I would urge my colleagues to give serious consideration to the article from *Time*. It is hereby inserted into the Record for their review:

GOING SOUR ON SUGAR PAYOFFS—SOME LUMPS ON CAPITOL HILL

When it comes to protectionism, the sugar industry has been given some of the U.S.'s sweetest deals. For 40 years cane and beet growers were shielded by import quotas that not only helped keep domestic prices at twice the world level, but also fostered corruption and bribery and made Congressmen like the late Harold Cooley, Democratic chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, virtual Secretaries of State for Sugar.

Congress scrapped the quotas in 1974, but the sweetheart spirit survives. Under a four-year-old program of Government subsidies and price supports, growers still get twice the world level, or at least 15¢ per lb. Now they are pushing legislation to add another eight-tenths of 1¢ to supports, and to keep the price rising by a full 7% annually until 1981. The raise may not seem like much, but each one-penny increase adds \$500 million a year to Americans' grocery expenses.

Sugar growers claim that they need the increase to cover their rising costs, but for the first time in memory Congress does not seem so ready to swallow their sweet

talk. With voters fuming over sky-high food prices, many Congressmen would just as soon see the bill never come to a vote. Says Massachusetts Republican Margaret Heckler, a member of the House Agriculture Committee: "Inflation is the nation's No. 1 enemy, and things just cannot stay the same for easy subsidies. The sugar bill represents the legislative process at its worst."

The U.S.'s 19,000 growers constitute a mere one-half of 1% of all farm families, but propping up their prices last year cost taxpayers and consumers \$2.6 billion in support payments and artificially high retail prices for the sweetener: The subsidy system has also created an ever growing Government stockpile of sugar, currently 193,000 tons, that now lies rotting in Florida and Texas warehouses.

The struggle over sugar is an embarrassment for Jimmy Carter. Eager to slow the rising cost of food, the Administration condemned the bill when it was introduced in the House last February by a coalition of farm-state legislators. But when sugar industry supporters in Congress threatened to retaliate by blocking approval of the international trade agreement that was endorsed last month in Geneva, the White House abruptly switched signals and said the President would support the bill. The turnabout left White House Inflation Adviser Alfred Kahn in an impossible situation. Asked during House Agriculture Committee hearings if he considered the bill inflationary, Kahn replied: "Let the record show an embarrassed silence."

The industry itself is split on the legislation. The bill puts a limit of \$50,000 in total direct payments to any grower, and that is welcomed by small farmers such as Idaho sugar-beet growers but bitterly opposed by plantation-scale growers in Hawaii and Louisiana. Another of the bill's clauses raises the minimum wage for field hands from \$3 to \$3.30 an hour, and Democratic Senator Russell Long of Louisiana argues that the provision would require an even higher level of price supports for growers. With that in mind, Idaho Democratic Senator Frank Church is pushing for a rise to 17¢ per lb. Frets one industry lobbyist in Washington: "All this agitation for more subsidy is going to kill the goose that laid the golden egg." If so, it is about time.●

PROBLEMS OF RECOGNITION OF RHODESIA

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to an article concerning Zimbabwe-Rhodesia which appeared in the May 31 edition of the *Washington Post*. This article offers an important reminder that America has vital economic and strategic interests not only in the southern African region but throughout sub-Saharan Africa, and that a precipitous decision by the United States to lift sanctions against Rhodesia will have the most negative repercussions not only in Rhodesia but throughout the African continent. The carefully nurtured relationships which we have developed only recently with many African nations will be directly undermined by a premature initiative on our part. Countries such as Nigeria, Botswana, Liberia, Ivory Coast, Senegal, Gabon, Cameroon, Sudan, Mali,

and Kenya—which we regard as moderate and friendly toward the United States—would clearly regard a unilateral initiative by the United States to lift sanctions at this time as a deep affront and as tantamount to an American decision to oppose majority rule in southern Africa. To decide to lift sanctions against Rhodesia without the support of our friends in Africa—indeed, without even serious consultation—will only mean our isolation in a continent in which the United States has vital economic and strategic interests. The article follows:

NIGERIANS WARN WEST ON RECOGNITION OF RHODESIA—LAGOS A MAJOR SUPPLIER OF OIL TO UNITED STATES

(By David B. Ottaway)

LUSAKA, ZAMBIA, May 30—Nigeria, black Africa's major oil exporting nation, has sent warning signals to the United States and Britain that it will retaliate if they recognize the new black-led government under Bishop Abel Muzorewa in Rhodesia.

The signals are regarded as significant since Nigeria now is the second-ranking exporter of oil to the United States, a role that is given added weight as a result of gasoline shortages.

The United States currently imports approximately 1 million barrels of oil daily from Nigeria, or about 15 percent of its total imports, at a cost in excess of \$5 billion yearly.

Although the Nigerians have not yet specifically threatened an oil embargo, they sent a statement to all embassies here in Lusaka early this month assuring African and Western nations that they will make an "appropriate response" to any American or British steps toward recognition.

In addition, they have told U.S. Embassy officials in Lagos privately that this response may be far stronger than Washington now anticipates, according to diplomatic sources here.

Nigeria already has given a bite to its warning by excluding British companies last week from bidding on a \$200 million port construction contract despite a British loan for the project. It also told the British they may be shut out from all federal government contracts if Margaret Thatcher's new conservative government recognizes the Muzorewa government, according to British commercial and diplomatic sources here.

The Nigerian action reportedly has sent British officials scurrying to reassure Lagos that London has no intention of "rushing" to recognize the Muzorewa government.

But the Nigerians have made their point, namely that they are serious in their stated intention of using their economic weight to halt what one British newspaper has called "creeping Western recognition" of the new black-led government in Zimbabwe-Rhodesia.

Nigerian civilian and military leaders are reported to be discussing such retaliatory measures as nationalization of British or American companies, an oil embargo, withdrawal from the British Commonwealth and a ban on British and American companies bidding on Nigerian contracts.

U.S. investments in Nigeria amount to about \$1.2 billion, most of it in the oil and gas industry, according to the U.S. Embassy in Lagos.

In addition, Nigeria slowly has been displacing South Africa as the biggest market for U.S. goods in sub-Saharan Africa. In 1977, U.S. exports to Nigeria were just under \$1 billion while those to South Africa slightly above.

While figures for 1978 were not available here, it seems likely Nigeria has surged ahead by now given the upward trend in economic trading between the two countries.

Nigeria is coming under increasing pressure from the so-called front-line states involved in the Rhodesia conflict to use its economic influence with Washington and London as a last resort to halt Western moves toward recognition. These states are holding fast in their support for the Patriotic Front, the alliance of black nationalist guerrillas seeking to overthrow the Muzorewa government.

Presently, the five front-line leaders are trying to arrange a summit meeting that would include both Nigeria and Ethiopia to draw up a concrete military and political plan to counter the new black-led Zimbabwe-Rhodesia government. This would presumably include economic retaliation from Nigeria and military assistance from both Nigeria and Ethiopia for the guerrillas and their front-line backers.

Western observers here are still uncertain just how far Nigeria is willing to go in using its economic weight with either London or Washington. It has never shown much interest in an oil embargo before, although it has made known its special concern for the wars of liberation being fought by black nationalists against the white-dominated governments of south Africa.

A 1977 attempt to punish the British-owned Barclays Bank for its investments in South Africa by throwing it out of Nigeria backfired and ended in hurting Nigerian interests more than British ones.

The Nigerian government has made it clear it does not regard the Muzorewa government as legitimate. The Nigerian chief of state, Gen. Olusegun Obasanjo, said Friday that Nigeria regarded the April elections in Rhodesia as "a mockery of democracy" and had no intention of recognizing the results.

Meanwhile, the government-owned Daily Times had warned in an editorial that the Carter administration would be making a "serious mistake" if it decided to build its relations with black Africa on the "political fraud" being perpetrated today in Zimbabwe-Rhodesia. Other Nigerian newspapers have said Washington's credibility in black Africa would be badly shaken and Nigeria would be obliged to take action against it. ●

MORTGAGE REVENUE BONDS

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the construction season in Alaska has begun. Unless bond sales are finalized, housing projects in many areas of Alaska will not begin this season. The potential effects of this situation would be devastating for there will be even higher unemployment than that which currently exists, and many Alaskans will not have homes this year. Passage of the Udall-Anderson bill severely dimmed the future economic situation for Alaska and I do not feel that Alaskans are willing to accept another blow to the economy. I commend to you and my colleagues, an article that recently appeared in the Anchorage Daily News concerning the need for tax exempt mortgage revenue bonds:

THREAT TO HOME LOANS

(By Brian A. Huntley)

Alaska residents will pay thousands of dollars more for home loans if a proposed freeze on loan applications by the Alaska Housing Finance Corp. becomes a reality next week.

The AHFC, threatened by a U.S. House bill

(HR 3712) that would eliminate the tax-exempt status of its bonds, reported it will stop accepting loan applications from banks next Friday.

If the tax-exempt status on the bonds which AHFC sells to raise its mortgage money is eliminated, interest rates for homeowners forced to turn to commercial banks would jump by three percent.

For a borrower of \$65,000, the hike in interest rates would mean monthly payments of about \$135 more.

The Ways and Means Committee is considering a transitional ruling which would allow state housing corporations to sell bonds approved prior to the bill's introduction on April 24 (this year).

Jack Linton, AHFC executive director, noted a \$105 million bond issue set for June 21 is covered by the Ullman bill. If an amendment is not passed, Linton added, AHFC will not process any more mortgage loan applications after June 8. "After that," Linton noted, "we'll be out of money."

More than 850 loans totalling \$57 million are currently being processed by AHFC. These loans will not be terminated if the compromise amendment fails.

Alaska Housing Finance Corp., a state-managed mortgage financier, serves as the largest source of home mortgage loan funding in the state. More than 27 percent of home loan funding in Anchorage and 65 percent outside of Anchorage are provided by AHFC.

AHFC sells housing bonds on national markets, financing low-cost mortgages with the sale funds. Commercial banks currently are charging 11¼ percent interest on home mortgages, but through the discounting process, AHFC is charging only 8¾ percent.

The AHFC program has offered more than \$500 million in Alaska loans since 1971. In 1978, it generated \$138 million worth of home mortgages.

But the Internal Revenue Service and the U.S. Treasury Dept. have been lobbying heavily against tax-exempt bond funding, because it reduces tax revenues.

David A. Rose, executive director of the Alaska Municipal Bond Bank, blasted the Treasury's involvement in the Ullman bill as "insidious. . . . It constitutes control of the bond market without law—just by introduction of a bill."

Rose added, "Making the bill retroactive to its introduction date is unacceptable. No bond counsel in America is going to issue an opinion on these tax-exempt bonds. The Treasury has manipulated the market and effectively locked it up with the bill."

But Rose is optimistic about the passage of an amendment (or rider) to the Ullman legislation. "I am reasonably confident that some compromise will go through—there should be considerable pressures from the housing and investment industries."

If a compromise action fails, however, Rose acknowledged Alaska will be hard hit.

"We knew there was debate over tax-exempt bonds, but we didn't expect legislation would target state mortgage agencies," he said. "And if the AHFC is forced to close in June, more and more demand will be placed on a finite amount of money in the state."

"That means less money for business loans and commercial economic development. And with that problem, a limited pot of funds, we can't sustain both housing and industry in Alaska. It will definitely hurt the economy," Rose said.

Perry Eaton, AHFC chairman, blamed "the greed of underwriters" for precipitating congressional action. "They erected a new market for municipalities selling bonds—then the pressures from the Treasury and IRS grew. Now we're all faced with imminent disaster," he added.

Eaton shares Rose's view that the pending congressional action "is a law without a bill. . . . It is a de facto limitation of bond sales—a moratorium on any tax-exempt mortgage bonding," he said.

Eric Wohlforth, AHFC's bond counsel, said he plans to continue lobbying in Washington next week.

Wohlforth urged additional efforts by Alaska residents to press Congress for a compromise. "Our economy will be dealt a severe blow," he added, "and unless we get an immediate exemption our service to the state will be irreparably damaged." ●

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM AMENDMENT

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will extend the Great Plains conservation program. My amendment to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is simple. It will basically extend the program until 1991 and raise the annual and program funding authorizations to \$50 and \$500 million respectively.

The intent of this legislation is twofold. One is that a 10-year extension will insure proper and necessary oversight of the program. Second, the program has been successful and so well received that presently there are over 5,000 persons waiting to participate in the 10 Great Plains States alone. This, in fact, is the only major problem the program has encountered. Due to a shortage of funds, these people are unable to participate. My amendment would alleviate this problem by increasing the annual and program authorization limits. In addition, by raising these caps, the program should be better able to compensate for inflationary pressures.

I would like to emphasize at this time that I do not feel this program should be expanded beyond the original 10 Great Plains States. These States are uniquely susceptible to wind and water erosion due to their geographic location and physical terrain. Considering the present waiting list of 5,000 and the fact that only 1,700 new persons were able to participate last year, it seems inconceivable to further dilute the available funding to persons outside the Great Plains States. Furthermore, at the program's inception it was determined by the Agriculture Department that 180 million acres in these 10 States needed some form of conservation. To date, only 104 million have been contracted, and many of those are in need of further assistance since their original contract expired. Again, I would like to emphasize that we should take care of those in the original 10 States before even considering expanding the program beyond the Great Plains region.

The need for the continuation of this program is immediate. Several hundred million tons of topsoil are lost annually in these States. The GPCP saves an estimated 240 million tons annually. Although GPCP cannot preserve all of

this topsoil, it does slow down the erosion process and reduces the immediate impact on landowners.

In my home State of South Dakota, a survey was conducted after the drought years of 1975-76 of 418 farmers and ranchers, one-half of whom were participating in the program and one-half of whom were not. Their findings concluded that 37 percent of those who were not participating had experienced overgrazing or moderate-to-severe wind erosion. Thirty-five percent of those participating were substantially better off than their counterparts in these same two areas.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the Great Plains conservation program does work. It is not a cure-all, but it does respond to a significant problem that has faced and will continue to face the farmers and ranchers of this region. Considering the enormous amount of land lost every year to urbanization and the fact that the world's population is expected to increase to 6 or 7 billion by the year 2000 should impress upon us the need to facilitate food production in America, a resource that has produced over \$20 billion annually in exports and given its producer the deserved reputation as the most efficient and productive worker in the world. There is no doubt in my mind that the GPCP has been an effective formula for preserving our precious heartland's agricultural topsoil. The continuation of this program is the obvious and logical step in easing the potential disruptions posed by another drought or some other inclement weather conditions. ●

A PROPER PLACE FOR THE PRESIDENT'S PAPERS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the past several years we have observed some controversy over the rightful ownership of Presidential papers. That issue has been settled by action of this Chamber. Presidential papers belong to the American people. However, we have hit a hurdle in making a final determination over how to provide maximum access to the papers.

In a recent issue of the New York Times, Robert L. Hardesty of Austin, Tex., hit upon this problem. Many of you may be familiar with Bob from his distinguished Government service with the Johnson administration to his present service as a member of the Board of Governors of the U.S. Postal Service. In our central Texas area, Bob Hardesty has been a grassroots organizer for the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library in Austin, and is now vice chancellor for administration of the University of Texas system.

Having served as speechwriter for President Lyndon Johnson and in other ways having worked with Presidential papers in trying to make them available

for public research and consumption, Mr. Hardesty has hit upon some practical suggestions for improvement. I am glad to bring to my colleagues' attention a reprint of his article from the New York Times entitled "The President's Papers," and I insert it herewith for the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 29, 1979]

THE PRESIDENTS' PAPERS

(By Robert L. Hardesty)

AUSTIN, Tex.—After two centuries of confused tradition, culminating in trauma, we have finally settled the issue of who owns the papers accumulated by a President during his Administration. From George Washington's time on, it was assumed that they belonged to the President himself. Watergate threw that tradition into sharp question.

Last year, Congress finally reversed that tradition and, in legislation signed by President Carter in November, declared that those papers belong to the people. That was welcome news. The papers of any President, for better or worse, are part of the historic record of the nation. Unfortunately, last year's legislation only went halfway toward assuring the safety and integrity of those Presidential papers.

The disturbing fact is that the Presidential papers—and indeed most of our national documents—are still under the control of the General Services Administration, the parent organization of the National Archives. I suppose that the scandal-ridden G.S.A. has had enough criticism without my adding to it. But the scandals are not what bother me, in this particular case. It is the heavy-handed partisan nature of the G.S.A. that disturbs me most—along with the agency's basic insensitivity to the needs of the National Archives.

This uneasy relationship between the two agencies has existed since the days of the Truman Administration when, in an effort to streamline the executive branch, the number of persons reporting directly to the President was greatly reduced. It was then that the National Archives was placed under the supervision of the politically-oriented G.S.A. It would have made as much sense if someone had decided to place the Smithsonian Institution under the supervision of the Corps of Engineers. Historians warned of the potential for mischief that the move created. It took 30 years for those warnings to bear their bitter fruit.

In the waning days of the Nixon Administration, we finally saw how a political deal between a President and one of his appointees threatened the integrity of the National Archives and nearly resulted in the loss of the documents of a critical time of our history. That was when Mr. Nixon and his Administrator of the G.S.A., Arthur Sampson, entered into an agreement that would have given Mr. Nixon the right to destroy the materials that gathered in his White House.

That must not be allowed to happen again. But as long as Presidential documents are under the control of a politically-oriented G.S.A., what happened in the Nixon period can certainly happen again.

The General Services Administration is the Government's landlord. It constructs the buildings that house the Federal bureaucracy, cleans the halls inside those buildings, clips the shrubs outside, and supplies the pencils for those who work there. Admittedly, the landlord is an important functionary in the Government's operations. But this custodian of the nation's brooms has no particular qualifications for handling Presidential papers—much less all of the rest of the priceless official documents of the executive branch.

Now that the issue of the ownership of Presidential papers has been settled, the time

has come to complete the task and determine where those papers should be kept to assure their integrity. The Archivist of the United States, traditionally a nonpolitical scholar, is the official who has day-to-day control over the documents of our history. His independence must be protected. One solution might be the creation of an independent National Archives, with the Archivist accountable to Congress. Another answer might be the alignment of the Archives with a more congenial agency than the G.S.A., such as the Smithsonian Institution. Still another answer might be to place the Archives in the proposed new Department of Education (assuming that department ever comes into being).

It should not be too difficult to find an answer, and with it a proper home for the documents of our history. A committee composed of both scholars and representatives of government helped illuminate the issue of ownership of White House papers, on which the Congress acted last year. A similar committee could now help complete the task. Either the President or the Congress should appoint such a committee. It is time to put our records under lock and key—and turn the key over to someone who truly understands what the National Archives is all about. ●

FOREIGN TRADE: ARE WE LOSING A BATTLE?

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, foreign trade is one of those arcane economic activities about which much is written and discussed, but of which little is generally understood. It is gratifying then when an expert in the field sets forth dearly and cogently some truths about the U.S. performance since World War II and puts in perspective the tremendous international economic strength of our country.

Burton Joseph, a highly respected Twin Cities businessman and leader in civic, cultural, and religious affairs, has written an excellent analysis of foreign trade which was reprinted in the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer-Press for June 3, 1979. I recommend it highly to my colleagues.

The article follows:

FOREIGN TRADE: ARE WE LOSING A BATTLE?
(By Burton M. Joseph)

To take a contrary position on American export potential in 1979 is a sacrilege of the highest order. The standard line as fashioned by the Western European leaders (President Valery Giscard d'Estaing of France and Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of Germany) is that the United States refuses to discipline itself enough to correct its budgetary deficit or to become productive enough in its manufacture for export markets to reduce or to eliminate the huge balance of payments deficit.

I think the theory is hogwash and I believe the U.S. is about to reemerge as an efficient, competitive exporter as a result of the enormous devaluation of the dollar to the level that makes American labor once again, after 10 to 15 years of a punishing negative trade interregnum, competitive in world markets. Sounds crazy? Let's trace a little history to see if the world trade pendulum is cycling back to the U.S.

FOREIGN CURRENCY DEVALUATIONS

Following World War II, the superb American manufacturing, marketing and economic apparatus had the world trade markets pretty much to itself. Both Western Europe and Japan, today's giants, were clearing the rubble and reassembling their manufacturing and financial base. One by one, following the lead of Germany and England, most of the countries around the world conducted a series of devaluations against a continually stronger dollar.

We tend to forget that in 1948 the Germans replaced the reichsmark with a brand new unit, the deutsche mark. In effect, the Germans started over. And, after the war, the British took the \$6 pound sterling and let it go down step-by-step to where it bottomed out at \$1.77. Even more dramatic, De Gaulle exchanged one new French franc for 100 old French francs.

These were necessary vital steps taken to make German, English, French (and other) labor and industry competitive in world markets. By the mid-1960s, the balance of the world's manufacturing and selling structure outside of the U.S. was tooled up and ready to exert export trade superiority.

U.S. LOSES MARKET DOMINANCE

That is precisely what happened. American industry group after industry group lost its competitive place—not only in world export markets, but in the U.S. as well. It has been quite a shock to our economic well-being and our national pride to see us lose markets overseas and within the U.S. to foreign textiles, shoes, TVs and radios, typewriters, steel, autos—the list is long and infamous—to countries whose labor costs and productivity made them a better and cheaper source of supplies.

World trade now exceeds \$1 trillion per year. This staggering figure, reduced to more understandable proportions means that one-sixth of everything made, grown or mined on earth is traded between nations.

To lose in this dynamic and crucial activity is bad enough, but in 1973-1974 we were forced to accept a five-fold increase in petroleum import costs which forced competing energy sources in the U.S. to move up nearly as fast. As the prime energy user of the world, the entire cost base of our economy—particularly industries that are labor-intensive or have high energy requirements—became badly skewed against those in competing countries with lower per unit labor costs and lower per unit energy inputs. Small wonder the sudden reversal of our trade balance and the enormous trade deficits (\$20-\$30 billion per year) of 1977, 1978 and apparently 1979.

TURNAROUND PREDICTED

In my opinion, this abysmal record is finished. We have a new scenario, I am convinced that the for-the-record statements from Washington's political leaders that the American government is doing everything within its power to stop the decline of the American dollar against foreign currencies are just that—statements for the record. In truth, our governmental leadership is satisfied to permit the dollar to float down in value against the world's other major currencies until American labor is once again competitive with other world labor.

No wonder German and French political leaders, their banks and businesses are calling for the Americans to do something to check the decline of the dollar. Believe me, it's not because they view the dollar as so important to their own economic stability, but because the cheap dollar guarantees competition for their goods in world markets. They unfortunately forget our willingness to stand by in the late 1940s and 1950s when they devalued, became competitive against us and took over many of our markets. Now it

will be their turn to see us regain some of those markets.

When American goods, other than our low labor input items such as raw grains or high technical input items as commercial aircraft, start to sell once again in world markets, we will have reversed the trade cycle and find ourselves as increasingly effective exporters and less interested importers. The decline of the dollar's value against the currency of our competitors gives us the prime weapon to win back our overseas markets.

EVERYONE 'BUYING AMERICAN'

Do you know that American manufactured cars are a hot item in Germany? General Motors' Oldsmobile will sell for about \$11,000 in Frankfurt compared to a similar model Mercedes at \$18,000. American real estate properties and U.S. commercial enterprises are on the target "buy" list of every important foreign business group. To the foreign businessman, the bargains that abound in the American economy are unbelievable and become better each day as the dollar declines in value against the currency of the foreigner's country.

Why then, with all these bargains, does the dollar still show weakness? It won't for long and a major rebound is just ahead of us as our trade figures improve dramatically in 1979 and 1980, and as we finally reduce our energy imports. You can own the dollar in 1979, feel safe with it and begin to make some money with a long position in dollars in 1979, and surely by early 1980.

With American labor and American products competitive and selling once again in world markets because the decline in the dollar's value has made it so, our export trade will lead the U.S. to a major industrial boom—a boom that has great implications for our position in world political and commercial leadership. ●

RHODESIA NEEDS AMERICA'S HELP

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, by William Randolph Hearst, concerns the new relationship that the United States should now establish with Zimbabwe-Rhodesia.

I share Mr. Hearst's hope that the United States and Great Britain will act quickly to establish formal relations with the constitutionally elected Rhodesian Government. To continue to impose sanctions is to encourage more bloodshed from the terrorist leaders, who refused to participate in the recent elections.

The editorial follows:

RHODESIA NEEDS AMERICA'S HELP

(By William Randolph Hearst Jr.)

NEW YORK.—Rhodesia has arrived at a turning point in its history. This coming Friday its name will be changed to Zimbabwe-Rhodesia, it will install its first black prime minister, and for the first time in 90 years its doors will be open to a free and representative biracial government.

Rhodesia's future of freedom is anything but certain, however. How far it will turn in that direction depends a lot on the help and understanding it receives from Great Britain and the United States. Despite the dramatic changes to take place five days hence, the struggling African nation needs Anglo-

American assistance in the form of lifting trade sanctions, and a lifting of the West's insistence that two guerrilla leaders participate in the new government.

It is my hope that such assistance will be forthcoming, quickly and willingly, from a United States and Great Britain that have always championed both the principle and practice of popular government. The absence of such help could mean that Rhodesia will be forced to go it alone, its economy hamstrung by trade barriers and its transition regime choked—if not killed—by the two terrorist leaders, Joshua Nkomo and Robert Mugabe.

The elections that brought Margaret Thatcher to power in Britain brought hope to us all that Rhodesia's moment had indeed come, and that Friday's turning point would be permanent, not just a gap between two periods of turmoil.

That hope was renewed last week by Secretary of State Cyrus Vance's three-day visit in London, and his talks with leaders of the new Conservative government. There are signs both nations may be pulling away from outmoded policies, and the negative attitudes articulated by our ambassador to the United Nations, Andrew Young.

The stakes are high. Rhodesia's future hangs in the balance. An opportunity for Rhodesia to make a beginning toward a truly representative government may not come again in your lifetime or mine.

Prime Minister Thatcher, as candidate Thatcher, spoke convincingly of her wish to recognize Rhodesia as soon as free and fair elections were held, and in other ways to help it along its independent way. She embodied the Conservative Party's liberal attitude toward Rhodesia, as compared with the Liberal Party's more rigid stance.

She extended that theme in her first appearance before the British Parliament, when like all prime ministers she submitted herself to a rugged question-and-answer period. When asked, "What about Rhodesia?" she said she was sending a special envoy to Africa to sound out the views of governments in the area. She said she hoped the day would soon come when her country would be satisfied with Rhodesia's progress toward a black-majority regime, and would recognize Rhodesia as a legal entity.

The Carter administration was wise to respond to the British elections by sending Mr. Vance to London. It could hasten the day Rhodesia, like Kenya, could become a showcase of democratic experimentation, an example of how blacks and whites can live peacefully in Africa under the same roof.

Lord Carrington, Britain's new foreign secretary, took an extremely enlightened view of developments in Rhodesia. He seems to understand, better than our state department, the revolutionary nature of what has been taking place there. He told Secretary Vance:

"It is our responsibility to try to bring Rhodesia to legal independence in conditions which will afford that country the prospect of a more peaceful future. To that end it will be our objective to achieve a return to legality in conditions of the widest possible international recognition.

He praised their elections as fair, emphasizing that every man and woman, black or white, was allowed to vote.

"There is now an African majority in Parliament," he said, and then looking ahead to this Friday he added, "... and there is soon to be an African majority in government also. It would be morally wrong to brush aside an election in which 64 percent of the people cast their vote."

Brushing aside is something President Carter has been adept at, so far. The world will be watching to see whether he continues this policy on June 15, the deadline for a presidential decision on the fairness of Rhodesia's elections and the lifting of sanctions.

No election ever took place without a little laxity on someone's part. But the balloting

in Rhodesia was monitored by dozens of impartial observers, despite the stubborn refusal of Washington and London to dispatch their own professional monitors. Among the most diligent watchdogs were representatives of Freedom House, a private New York organization many of us respect because of its independence and its concern for human rights and civil liberties throughout the world.

Freedom House didn't just take a quick look and dash off a press release. It took the pains to write a 72-page report, full of documentation and recommendations. Its documents led to the conclusion the elections in Rhodesia were a "relatively free expression of the will of the people," which in turn led to the recommendation the United States ought to change its policy.

This report, as well as those of other impartial observers, convince me Lord Carrington is correct to say it would be "morally wrong" to ignore the free voice of Rhodesia, a solid majority of whose citizens went to the polls in an effort to change the course of history. The "morally right" thing for Carter to do is to change the course of our own diplomatic history, and recognize that Rhodesia's moment has come.

The Carter-Young-Vance policy argues that recognizing Rhodesia's transition government without including the guerrillas would prolong the war. That's what I call a policy of fear, and we should have no part of it. If Rhodesians want representative government, however difficult and imperfect the transition will be for the next 10 years, the United States should help them.

The Carrington-Vance conversations may be a good omen as Rhodesia prepares to launch its first black-white government on Friday. Difficulties lie ahead, but there is great hope for the nation's future when the British government talks about legal independence, and the "widest possible international recognition."

What's needed on this side of the Atlantic is for Carter to demonstrate the kind of flexibility, ingenuity and resourcefulness that made him the creator of peace in the Middle East.

The result could be a free and responsible Rhodesia, dedicated to a spirit of liberty of which all free nations could be proud. ●

TAX-EXEMPT MORTGAGE REVENUE BONDS

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct your attention to legislation pending before the House Ways and Means Committee regarding tax-exempt mortgage revenue bonds. These types of bonds are used to finance a large portion of housing units in my State. Although I realize the measure proposed by my distinguished colleague and chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. ULLMAN of Oregon, is designed to correct a misuse of these bonds, unique circumstances in Alaska create a real need for tax exempt mortgage revenue bonds. I am including in the RECORD, an editorial that appeared in the Anchorage Daily News of June 1, 1979, addressing this important issue. I strongly commend this to my colleagues so they may better understand the specific housing problems of Alaska.

The editorial follows:

OUR HOUSING MARKET FACES A THREAT

Alaska Housing Finance Corporation isn't exactly a household word in Alaska, but thousands of residents know the agency well. It has been the key ingredient in almost 40 percent of the home mortgages in our state in the last nine years.

Now that program is in danger of immediate collapse, the potential victim of legislation under consideration in the U.S. Congress that could gut the housing loan program in the state by removing AHFC's tax exempt status. A June 8 deadline looms for decisions affecting this summer's construction season, and the odds for favorable resolution are estimated at no better than 50-50 today.

Alaskans are accustomed to the unpopular fact that federal legislation can have dramatic impact on their lives, but this case is even more serious than most. This time, it's the mere threat of legislation that raises danger.

AHFC can purchase mortgages from low and middle income home buyers at rates considerably below conventional financing because it can sell bonds at low, tax-exempt rates. The difference in interest rates triggered by the tax exempt status can mean mortgage payments 2½ percent under other loans—a difference of about \$140 in monthly house payments. For many Alaskans, it's the only hope for home ownership.

Since 1970, thousands have used that advantage to buy homes. Some 27 percent of home loans in Anchorage came under the plan, and fully 65 percent of the mortgages in other regions of the state are held by AHFC. That accounts for four of every 10 home loans in the state, a major percentage of the market and a crucial factor in the entire state economy.

The agency needs to sell \$105 million in tax exempt bonds June 21 to finance the 1979 construction season. Because of the seasonal nature of construction in the north—and because AHFC has operated so efficiently in the past—builders, lenders and buyers have already proceeded on the assumption that the money would be available. If it isn't, the results could be calamitous.

A total of 863 applications for the AHFC mortgage money are already pending for this season. Builders have embarked on projects financed by credit from suppliers on the expectation that the June 21 sale would make money available. The bond markets, as always, would be ready and eager to buy the AHFC bonds except for one fact.

That fact is that the proposed federal legislation would prohibit the sale of such bonds to finance mortgages. Even though it is only a proposal at this time, the possible consequences are so severe that bond buyers won't touch the offerings unless something changes.

Alaskans must labor mightily to win concessions from the legislation immediately. Unless mark-up of the proposal—which could begin any day now—includes recognition that programs like AHFC should be allowed to proceed, the June 21 sale is dead. "We're out of business June 8 if that happens," AHFC officials say, and if they are, so are lots of others.

Bankruptcies of builders, unemployment for construction workers and lack of financing for buyers all loom as immediate impacts. Through the "ripple effect," that impact would translate into disastrous effects for supply firms, service industries and the state's economy in general.

It won't be easy to focus attention on Alaska in this debate, but it's an effort that must be made. AHFC and some other officials have pulled out the stops in trying to lobby the Ways and Means Committee, but they need all the help they can get. Alaska's senators, state liaison personnel in Washington and Alaskans with contacts in the Congress all should move with speed to make sure the message reaches the Congress.

There have been some abuses nationally in use of the tax exempt bonds. Additionally, there are millions of dollars involved from short-term issues of eastern cities that may overshadow the Alaska stake in this question. Legislative strategy also may hurt the state, because opponents of the proposed bill don't want to make accommodations, on the theory that if the bill is more hurtful, it will have less chance of eventual passage.

Those factors and others combine to make the Alaska struggle an uphill one. Capturing the attention of the powerful Ways and Means Committee, the IRS and other interested parties will be difficult, but must be done.

Whatever the eventual outcome of the bill, Alaskans must at least win authority to hold the June 21 sale that was scheduled and approved before the legislation was introduced. A whole construction season, the welfare of thousands of Alaskans and much of the economy of the state hangs in that delicate balance. ●

TRAINS ARE BACK

HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, public transportation in this country has undergone a significant turn-around in recent weeks. Tracks are back. During the Memorial Day weekend, more people rode the train than during that same weekend at the height of World War II—the peak U.S. passenger trains. Amtrak has had to reject any further requests for United States of America rail because all passages have been booked for this summer.

It has long been speculated whether people would really turn to the trains when the price of gas and the supply of gas became near prohibitive for vacation and business travel. Now we know. The public depends on the trains to be there—to meet their transportation needs when the private car can no longer be used.

The following is an article from the business section of the Washington Post (June 1, 1979) remarking on the sudden boom in passenger rail. Surely the Congress will recognize this signal and vote for the Amtrak authorization for fiscal year 1980—H.R. 3996.

The article follows:

TRAVEL RECORD NATIONWIDE ON AMTRAK RAILS

(By William H. Jones)

According to conventional wisdom, Americans have given up on passenger trains to such an extent that the rails never again will rival highways for intercity travel.

But this month—not counting Memorial Day—Amtrak carried more passengers between Los Angeles and San Diego than in previous rail history.

Amtrak's San Diego carried 128,037 riders from May 1 to May 27, breaking an all-time record of 125,000 passengers carried during the month by the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad during World War II, when rail travel was at a peak.

Moreover, on the 8:30 a.m. departure for San Diego on May 27, all seats were occupied and there were 280 standing passengers, even though Amtrak had attached 12 passenger cars instead of the normal 5.

These new figures, distributed to Amtrak's

employees on Tuesday night, point to an unusual situation that has developed in California because of gasoline shortages.

But the new statistics also show a nationwide pattern of sharp increases in rail passenger business in the wake of congressional decisions to permit the Carter administration to begin planning for a 43 percent cut-back in Amtrak routes on Oct. 1.

According to the ridership figures: The Memorial Day weekend was one of the biggest on record for Amtrak, although exact data has not been compiled. Stoodees were reported on 39 trains, and such key stations as the railhub at Chicago and Union Station here reported heavy loadings on virtually all trains.

Trains with standing space only included Boston-Washington routes and the Hilltopper south of Washington, because of heavy travel to the Kings Dominion amusement park near Richmond.

Last Friday, the Amtrak reservation system contained the names of 200,000 persons seeking future space—90 percent higher than advanced reservations at this time last year. Dollar volume of sales at the five main reservation centers now exceeds \$1 million a day compared with \$600,000 a year ago, and ticket sales through automatic machines are up 18½ percent.

Amtrak had expected the reservation overload to ease a bit after United Air Lines resumed some of its services Monday but spokesman Joseph Vranich said yesterday that the reverse has happened. Phone volume still is on the increase. Of callers to Amtrak reservation centers last week, 1.4 million got busy signals—a situation expected to be helped this week as 100 new reservations clerks started their jobs after several weeks in training.

Meanwhile, there is no clear indication about the future of Amtrak. Members of the House and Senate are preparing various amendments to Amtrak authorization bills—all of which plan to keep some trains in business that now are scheduled to be halted after Sept. 30. Final decisions may not be made until late in the summer because pro-Amtrak legislators are counting on a strategy of allowing the energy crisis to demonstrate Amtrak's advantages, especially if gasoline remains in short supply during coming weeks.

According to the Carter Administration plan, two dozen trains are due to be stopped and Amtrak plans to post notices on such routes 30 days before discontinuance.

Typical of the support for specific trains now building on Capitol Hill, an aide to Rep. Richardson Preyer (D-N.C.) said this week that Amtrak's Crescent between Union Station and New Orleans may still have a chance for survival if ridership gains continue. The Crescent is among trains due to be stopped under the administration plan. ●

POLISH AMERICAN WOMEN TO BE HONORED

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, on June 9, 1979, three outstanding Polish American women will be honored for their achievements by the Polonia Media Conference VI, at Marymount College of Virginia. These three women are: Stella Walsh, an athlete who starred in the Olympic Games of 1932 and 1936, winning several gold medals; Virginia Luty, an enterprising housewife who originated her own "Polish Art and Crafts Import Parties"

to distribute authentic Polish-made craft items such as wooden figurines, music boxes, ethnic dolls, and ceramic pieces; and Dr. Mary Kuburczyk, who teaches at Kent State University in Ohio where she has established a formidable reputation as a professor who derives enjoyment from her teaching and demands excellence from her students.

While all three of these women deserve the high honor bestowed on them, I would like to tell you a little bit about one of my constituents, Stella Walsh, who is, indeed, a world-famous track star of legendary name.

Stanislawa Walasiewicz was born in Poland in 1911 and then came to the United States at a very young age when she became Stella Walsh. Stella grew up in Cleveland, Ohio, and attended South High School where she showed a flair for athletics, winning her first track medal in the Cleveland Junior Olympics, in 1927, at the age of 16. This would mark the beginning of a long and auspicious career in track on a national and international scale. I am proud to say that Cleveland was the starting-point of Stella's rise to world fame as an athlete. An incredible success story was born in Cleveland in 1927, when Stella Walsh sprinted to her very first track medal.

Stella Walsh qualified for the U.S. Olympic team in 1928 but was not permitted to compete because she had never been naturalized as a U.S. citizen. But she became U.S. champion in 1930 in the 100-yard dash, blazing to the finish line in such a flash that she was nicknamed the "20th Century Flash." In 1932, to make up for her disappointment at not being able to compete for the United States in the 1928 Olympics, Stella accepted an invitation to run for Poland in the Olympic games. She raced to a gold medal in the 100-yard dash, setting a world record of 11.9 seconds.

The Polish Government honored her with lavish praise and held a public celebration in her name. Stella toured Europe and the Far East in 1934 as a representative of Poland. In the 1936 Olympic games, Stella ran a strong race but finished second to an American sprinter named Helen Stephens. However, not winning this race did nothing to diminish the brilliant track record Stella would achieve, a record including 65 different world and national track titles, some of which have never been broken. Before she hung up her spikes, Stella Walsh had won 5,000 track and field medals and trophies.

Stella Walsh has been inducted into the Ohio Women's Hall of Fame and into six others as well. She stands proudly beside Jesse Owens and Harrison Dillard as Cleveland's all-time top track performers. Stella Walsh may well be the greatest woman track and field athlete not only of this century but of all time. It is a privilege and an honor to extend personal congratulations to a fellow Clevelander, Stella Walsh, and to the other recipients, Virginia Luty, and Dr. Mary Kuburczyk.

The Polonia Media Conference members are to be congratulated for their awareness of these outstanding women whom they are honoring. ●

CONGRESSIONAL PUBLIC
FINANCING

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times recently editorialized in favor of congressional public financing. Although the House Administration Committee has dealt the idea a setback, I remain convinced that public financing would improve the way House and Senate campaigns are conducted. The Times editorial points out that public financing would increase the number of viable challenges to incumbents, the major reason why Congress has rejected congressional public financing so far. They also note that the influence of special interests will be reduced by public financing. As the role of political action committees increases, public financing will be a more acceptable alternative. The editorial follows:

A CLEARLY CORRUPTING SYSTEM

We were early supporters of partial public financing of presidential elections, first tried in 1976, and we now think the time has come to fund elections for the Senate and the House of Representatives in the same way.

Our reason for favoring public subsidies for presidential candidates was their increasing dependence on massive contributions from special interests. Candidates from both major parties had become too beholden to their biggest bankrollers, ranging from labor unions to corporations.

Until now, however, we have been against extending public financing to congressional candidates. It was our opinion that full disclosure of political contributions was an adequate safeguard against corrupting influences. We also thought that public financing and its concomitant spending limits would work unfairly in favor of incumbents.

But it has become evident that candidates for the House and the Senate have also become dangerously dependent on special-interest money. It is just as apparent that the booming costs of running for congressional office have become a deterrent to challengers who might otherwise oppose incumbents.

Those changing realities compel a change in our view.

Spending by congressional candidates in 1978 was almost 150 percent higher than in 1976, and too much of the additional money came from political-action committees (PACs), representing the most powerful lobbies in Washington.

Last year, the PACs gave House and Senate candidates \$35.1 million, eight times the \$4.4 million spent on congressional races by the Democratic and Republican parties.

There has also been a tremendous increase in the number of political-action committees—from 600 in 1975 to more than 1,900 in 1978. The largest gain has been in committees representing corporations—from 89 in 1975 to more than 800 in 1978.

Until recent years, the political-action committees gave most of their money to powerful incumbents whose committee positions gave them life-and-death control over important legislation. But now the committees are spreading their largesse to larger numbers of senators and representatives and, for the first time, are investing heavily in new members of Congress.

Last year, the PACs gave an average of \$43,000 to candidates now serving their first term. Two of them—Democrats from Texas—

got more than \$110,000 each from the committees, and found themselves under obligation to their benefactors before they even took the oath of office.

One of the post-Watergate political reforms was a \$10,000 limit on the amount that a PAC could contribute to a single candidate—\$5,000 in both the primary and general elections. The rationale was that \$10,000 could not buy too much influence. But the recent proliferation of committees representing the same economic interests destroys that presumption. One of the winning freshman Democrats from Texas acknowledges that most of the more than \$110,000 that he got from the PACs came from a number of committees representing different aerospace companies.

In the same way, PACs representing unions or trade or professional associations can pool their contributions to become the major contributor to candidates and, more often than not, the major influence on their voting record.

We believe that the growing power and resources of the political-action committees, which all but negate the importance of the political parties and which diminish to a nullity the importance of the small contributor, call for a public system of financing Senate and House elections.

S. 623, now awaiting its first committee test in the Senate, and HR 1, which is in serious difficulty in the House, would fund congressional races in much the same way as presidential elections. HR 1 was struck down by the House Administration Committee late last week by a 17-8 vote, but Common Cause and other advocates of public financing will attempt to force a floor vote through the Rules Committee.

Both the House and Senate measures would cover only general elections, and would become effective next year. To be eligible for matching funds from the \$1 voluntary income-tax checkoff, House nominees would have to show a broad base of support by raising \$10,000 in contributions of \$100 or less—and 80 percent of the amount would have to come from the candidates' own states. As a condition of receiving federal funds up to a limit of \$60,000, House contenders would have to accept an overall spending limit of approximately \$195,000.

In Senate races, the fund-raising necessary to qualify, the limit on matching funds and the spending ceiling would depend on the population of the state.

The matching dollars would amount to approximately \$30 million for House contenders and \$18 million for Senate nominees every two years.

Both the House and Senate measures also restrict the amount that candidates can contribute to themselves—\$25,000 and \$35,000, respectively. The limits now in effect for outside contributions—\$1,000 from individuals and \$5,000 from PACs—would remain the same. As in presidential elections, a party's nominee could reject public financing and the spending limits, but their opponents who did accept the subsidies would receive additional matching funds.

One of our objections to the new legislation and to the present mode of funding presidential elections is the binding limit on overall spending and on the expenditure of a candidate's own money. It strikes us that such controls impair a candidate's ability to communicate with the voters, and thus restrict the First Amendment guarantee of freedom of expression.

But the fact that nominees can choose not to accept public financing and its limits answers that objection, if not fully.

We are still convinced, however, that public financing will favor incumbents. Most successful challengers have had to outspend their opponents, and by a considerable amount, but they will not be able to do that

if they accept the public subsidy. More than 90 percent of incumbents win reelection because they receive most of the political-action money and because they begin the race with a giant head start: office slush funds, the franking privilege, newsletters to their constituents, aides who specialize in public relations and many more advantages—all paid for with taxpayers' funds.

But we urge the enactment of HR 1 and S. 623 because the availability of public money would at least encourage more frequent and more credible challenges to incumbents in districts that are marginal because the incumbents' performance has been marginal.

More important, public financing would all but eliminate a clearly corrupting system in which national legislators owe too much to the special interests and too little to their constituents. ●

THE SUGAR STABILIZATION ACT
OF 1979

HON. JOHN B. BREAU

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. BREAU. Mr. Speaker, American sugar producers face serious economic problems today which threaten their existence. Indeed, in recent years, Louisiana sugar mills as well as sugar factories elsewhere in the Nation have had to shut down due to severe economic loss. Historically, once these facilities close, they do not reopen. And, as the mills and factories go, producers dependent on them must either close operations or face higher costs of transporting commodities to more distant facilities. America needs a strong domestic sugar producing industry. To accomplish this, we must adopt a national sugar program as proposed in the Sugar Stabilization Act of 1979. Only then will this Nation have the stability in supply and price so necessary for both consumer and producer. For this reason, I submit for my colleagues the following:

SUGAR LEGISLATION: WHAT'S AT ISSUE AND AT STAKE FOR U.S. PRODUCERS AND CONSUMERS

The issue in brief: Without a national sugar policy such as contained in The Sugar Stabilization Act of 1979, the U.S. sugar industry faces likely collapse—leaving U.S. citizens in the clutches of a new worldwide cartel—this one keyed to food.

SOME COMMONLY ASKED QUESTIONS

How much would this proposed program raise the price paid by U.S. consumers for sugar?

Very little. In fact, the Carter Administration's plan to raise the price less than one cent per pound—from 15 to 15.8 cents—which, based on current consumption, would mean no more than \$3.00 per year more for a family of four. This modest increase would enable most U.S. growers to stay in business.

Is legislation really necessary?

Sugar is grown in the U.S. (see box on other side) by nearly 20,000 farm families, who employ with sugar processors approximately 100,000 workers. For most U.S. producers who supply American consumers with about 55 percent of the sugar they use, it has been a constant struggle to stay in business. In fact, of the nearly 100 cane and sugar beet processing plants which existed just a year ago, ten have been forced out of business.

Why is it in the interest of U.S. consumers to maintain a viable domestic sugar industry?

If recent past history tells us anything at all, it's that only a domestic industry can assure U.S. consumers adequate supplies at reasonable prices. Put another way, allowing the U.S. to become totally dependent on foreign producers would mean that U.S. consumers would have to suffer the consequences of the wildly fluctuating prices and supplies which characterize the world market—as we saw happen in 1974, when the price of sugar shot up from 12 to 65 cents in less than six months.

What is the so-called world sugar market and how does it work?

The world sugar market is an international dumping market with very little free trade and no "fair trade" at all. Some 85 percent of the sugar produced around the world is consumed in the country of origin. Five-sixths of all sugar, and over half of that amount traded internationally, is subject to government controls and protected by such trade agreements as Cuba's pact with the USSR, the European Economic Community's agreement with Africa, Caribbean and Pacific countries and Australia's pact with Japan. What's left over—if there is any—is dumped in the world marketplace with no commitment for buyers or sellers. If supplies are scarce, as they were in the early 1970's, prices are high. But, if there's a surplus, as is currently the case, prices are well below the cost of production any place in the world. The U.S. is virtually the only major importer with no long-term policy to protect its own sugar producers and consumers from this unreliable, residual world sugar market.

Can you give a concrete example?

Well, if the U.S. had produced no sugar in 1978, and relied exclusively on imports for the 10.9 million short tons we consumed, the impact on world prices would have been dramatic. Initially, it would have meant a 6.4 million short ton increase in U.S. demand for sugar imports—almost a 50 percent increase in the demand for world free sugar. That probably would have meant an increase in the world price of sugar of several hundred percent—perhaps reaching the record highs, or surpassing the record highs, of 1974.

Besides making sure U.S. consumers have all the sugar they want, at reasonable prices, what other benefits would the proposed legislation have?

Because the desired price level would be accomplished through a combination of import fees and back-up import quotas, it would mean a sizeable income for the U.S. Treasury. Based on a world price of ten cents per pound—which is well above the present level of 7-8 cents per pound—the U.S. Treasury would realize an additional \$490 million from tariffs and fees if we import five million tons of foreign produced sugar. Any direct payment to growers to especially assist small, family farmers would not exceed a half cent per pound (this is consistent with existing commodity programs). Thus there would be an outlay of only \$45 million but the end result would be a \$445 million net gain to the Treasury.

What are the major provisions of the proposal?

The proposed sugar price stabilization act would do the following:

1. It would authorize U.S. participation in the International Sugar Agreement.

2. It would support the domestic price of raw sugar near the cost-of-production level of crop years 1978-81.

3. The price would be supported primarily through the use of import fees, with back-up import quotas. A maximum 1/2 cent per pound direct payment would be made to producers to assure a return tied to cost-of-production increase.

4. Field workers would be guaranteed

wages set at levels above Fair Labor Standards Act minimum.

THE U.S. SUGAR INDUSTRY

Nearly 14,000 farm families in 18 states grow sugar beets and more than 5,000 farmers are involved in sugarcane production in Florida, Texas, Hawaii and Louisiana. This production accounts for approximately 55 percent of sugar used domestically. The remaining 45 percent must be imported.

Approximately 100,000 employees work on these farms and in 44 beet processing plants and 48 cane processing plants. However, 7 beet plants and 3 cane plants have closed in the past year because of low sugar prices.

There were 5,894,000 short tons, raw value, of U.S. sugar produced in 1978 eliminating the need to be totally dependent on foreign producers.

SUGAR PRODUCERS SOUR

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON.—Jimmy Carter's protestations of concern for the little man have failed to worry Big Business—and with good reason. Many big corporations are booming under the Carter administration.

Oil profits are soaring; the nation's bankers are in clover. Prices the consumer pays forge steadily upward.

There is one exception to the inflationary spiral that every grocery shopper has noticed: The price of sugar has plummeted in the last five years.

Carter can take credit for keeping sugar prices low. Last year, in a bitter congressional battle, the administration succeeded in blocking legislation that would have raised the tariffs on imported sugar.

A victory for the consumer? In a modest way, yes. But an even bigger victory for Big Business—and one firm in particular: Jimmy Carter's old corporate angel, Coca-Cola. The 2.3 cents-a-pound tariff would have made a barely perceptible dent in the average family's food budget; but it would have cost Coke and other commercial users millions of dollars.

Coca-Cola is the nation's biggest sugar consumer. World sugar prices dropped from a peak of 60 cents a pound in 1974 to less than 10 cents a pound today. Meanwhile, Coke's net profits in the United States rose from \$203 million in 1974 to \$374.6 million last year.

The Atlanta-based soft drink colossus was understandably in the forefront of the three-year fight against the sugar tariff increase. At one point, according to Time magazine, Coca-Cola's chief purchaser, John Mount, threatened to "call in a few chits and have the president veto the farm bill" that contained the sugar price hike.

Mount says he can't remember making such a statement, but the "chits"—or IOU's—could reasonably be construed as the result of financial and political help Coke and its executives gave Jimmy Carter in his gubernatorial campaigns and his run for the White House.

Not surprisingly, the White House vehemently denies any "Coke connection" was involved in its campaign against the sugar tariff increase.

The harsh impact of the cheap-sugar policy is being felt, meanwhile, in the domestic sugar cane and beet industry. In the past three years, 10 major refineries in Louisiana have folded; nine of the 26 remaining are financially shaky, our sources report. In the Northwest, four major sugar beet refineries have shut down.

The General Accounting Office reports that "substantial defaults on government loans (to domestic sugar producers) are occurring as a result of low-cost sugar imports." The Labor Department reports that 4,500 sugar workers have been laid off in the past three years.

From Louisiana to Idaho to Hawaii, the U.S. sugar industry is paying through the nose for the soft drink industry's bubbling

profits. The higher tariff was considered vital to domestic sugar producers, and one government study concluded that it was "unlikely any significant quantities of sugar would be grown in the United States if American producers had to compete on the open world market with sugar produced with cheap tropical labor under subsidy in other countries."

If the domestic sugar industry does indeed collapse, as it is showing alarming signs of doing, it would throw thousands out of work and add more than \$500 million to our trade deficit.

Ironically, the depression in the industry is occurring at the very time the government is calling on sugar producers to begin making alcohol fuels. Raw sugar is one of the finest possible materials with which to manufacture alcohol fuel, which could help reduce our oil imports.

In fact, the Louisiana state government is considering a massive program to convert some of the state's sugar industry to alcohol production. The 10 refineries that have shut down because of foreign competition would cost more than \$400 million to replace.

The crisis in our sugar industry is not imaginary; it's the real thing.

Footnote: A few months ago, the Carter White House partially backed down and announced it would support a 5 percent increase in U.S. sugar prices.

Press probe: Richard Nixon's White House investigators were as notorious for their incompetence as their boss was for his detestation of the press. Thus there is a certain pathetic humor in a memo that was recently shown to us. ●

JUSTICE AND PEACE COMMISSION OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF BOSTON DENOUNCES THE PROPOSED REVIVAL OF SELECTIVE SERVICE REGISTRATION

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent action taken by the House Armed Services Committee, a provision was included to authorize mandatory registration for the draft by all males turning 18 after December 31, 1980. I have a number of objections to this move, and bring two of them to the attention of my colleagues at this time.

Fundamentally, there has been no demonstrated need for a return to registration of the draft. The latest Department of Defense statistics indicate that the All-Volunteer Force has reached all-time records in such areas as troop morale, intelligence, discipline, and personnel retention. The Acting Director of the Selective Service System has stated publicly that the All-Volunteer Force can meet Department of Defense induction requirements with the current budget request for the system. Further, the Secretary of the Army has stated publicly that we do not need a return of the draft. As proponents of registration point out, a return to some degree of actual induction is a natural next step after registration.

The second item of concern is the manner in which the Armed Services Committee has chosen to address the registration issue. By attaching the authorizing language to the Department of

Defense Authorization Act, the provision's sponsors have acted to avoid the public debate that this issue demands. The registration language, as it stands, is a major revamping of the 1975 Selective Service Act, and should, therefore, be debated as a bill by itself—not as an addendum to a major authorization bill.

With this in mind, I am attaching for the benefit of my colleagues a letter from the Father Michael F. Groden, chairman of the Justice and Peace Commission of the archdiocese of Boston. Father Groden succinctly argues that the Armed Services Committee action to include authorization for the registration of 18-year-old males requires further debate. The letter follows:

BOSTON, MASS.,
May 23, 1979.

HON. ROBERT DRINAN,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DRINAN. The Justice and Peace Commission of the Archdiocese of Boston, at its most recent meeting, on May 19, 1979, asked that I write you to express the members' concern about the inappropriately nasty and virtually hidden manner in which legislation to restore registration for the draft is taking shape.

We view with regret the impending House vote on four Selective Service provisions, which the House Armed Services Committee is sending to the floor as an amendment to the Department of Defense authorization bill, a form which promises to guarantee less than desirable Congressional deliberation on so momentous a change in public policy. It seems particularly unfortunate that the issue apparently will not be debated at all in the Senate, since the proponents of registration appear to be avoiding the exposure that a floor discussion would bring in favor of Conference Committee adoption of a House-passed amendment.

Further, this "back door" strategy seems to contradict the spirit of the final section of the amendment itself, which specifies that "the Selective Service System should remain administratively independent of any other agency, including the Department of Defense.

If this legislative method is the clear maneuver it seems to be, we feel that it does a disservice to our need as a nation for full public and Congressional deliberation over the taking of a first step towards the restoration of peace-time conscription. In its own right, too, registration may be seen as potentially affecting rights of privacy and thus deserves full debate.

Consequently, we urge you to reject the precipitous inclusion of the amendment restoring Selective Service Registration when it reaches the House floor as part of the Department of Defense authorization bill. We encourage you to call for the full debate the issue deserves in both houses of Congress, which only a separate legislative vehicle can assure.

Sincerely yours,
Rev. MICHAEL F. GRODEN,
Chairman. ●

INFLATION'S IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESS

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the future of the American economy. Inflation continues

to ravage the pocketbooks of working class America, productivity is at its lowest point in years, and our Nation still lacks an acceptable and effective energy policy to combat rising energy prices.

Those problems probably have more of an impact on small businesses than anybody. Inflation works quickly on 50 percent of those small businesses who must regularly borrow. According to James McKevitt of the National Federation of Independent Businessmen:

... Inflation not only heightens the extent of cash needed, but also requires its financing at higher rates. This situation is particularly devastating in firms with relatively high inventory and low turnover.

Consequently, over 10,000 small business concerns fail each year, a lot of them, because of their inability to meet capital needs.

Clearly there is a need to help those small businesses struggling to survive. In the past, small businesses have shown their excellence in the areas of innovation and inventions. Despite receiving barely 3.5 percent of Federal research and development grants, small businesses have produced 4 times as many innovations per research dollar as medium firms and 24 times as many as large firms.

For this reason, I have become a cosponsor of the Small Business Procurement Reform Act (H.R. 2447), which will give small businesses a better opportunity to bid on Government contracts through reforms and simplification of the Federal procurement policy.

This bill will do many things. It will assist small companies by:

Guaranteeing that firms have at least 30 days to bid on each contract, thus protecting small companies which are often the last to hear of new contract opportunities;

Requiring that each Federal agency work toward at least 20 percent small business participation in its procurement activities;

Directing each agency to break its large systems procurements into smaller components (to the extent practicable), so that small businesses have greater opportunity to submit bids;

Requiring that each agency provide small businesses, on request, a copy and summary of each Federal law and regulation which must be complied with in the performance of any contract under \$100,000;

Requiring Federal agencies to justify every instance in which goods or services are procured without competitive bidding;

Requiring that materials needed to prepare bids on Federal contracts be available in as many locations as possible, rather than just in Washington; and

Authorizing the Small Business Administration to establish "arbitration panels" to resolve minor contract disputes without the time and expense of litigation.

I feel this bill will go far toward stimulating the small business sector of our economy that has been neglected over the years, especially in procuring Government contracts. Opening up our economy to these people will benefit

everyone and signal an end to the marriage the U.S. Government has had with large corporations only. I am absolutely convinced that much of our governmental business would be better handled by local business and industry. ●

NO. 1 GRADUATE OF THE NAVAL ACADEMY

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the privileges of serving in Congress is the opportunity it gives to get to know some of the best of America's youth—those who seek and receive nominations to the various service academies.

I rise today to recognize and honor one of those young men, Almond J. Drake III, of Pinetops, N.C., in my district. This young man has just graduated from the Naval Academy at Annapolis with a perfect 4.0 average, first in his class of 1,330. Given the rigorous nature of these academies program at the Naval Academy, a "straight A" average would be a remarkable feat in itself, but Al has accomplished this while serving as a battalion lieutenant commander and as manager of the varsity basketball program. It gives me a great deal of pride to have nominated this young man to Annapolis, and I look forward to his continued superlative academic record and outstanding service to the Nation as he enters medical school in the fall.

I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to an article by Steve Levin, which appeared in the Raleigh, N.C., News and Observer on June 1, 1979, recognizing the accomplishments of this outstanding midshipman:

PERSEVERANCE PAYS OFF FOR TOP MIDSHIPMAN
(By Steve Levin)

PINETOPS.—Almond J. Drake III readily admits that during his first two weeks at the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis, Md., he couldn't find the barbershop without getting lost.

But once the Edgecomb County native got situated, there was no stopping him.

At graduation ceremonies Wednesday, Drake was first to receive a diploma as the No. 1 graduate in his class of 1,330. He finished with a perfect 4.0 grade point average—a straight "A" student.

"Everybody likes to be successful at something," the 22-year-old ensign said Thursday at the home of his parents, A. J. and Sally Drake.

PERSONAL DESIRE

I had a desire to prove to myself that I could do it," he said. "It was kind of my desire to prove that somebody from a rural Southern area could do as well as anybody else."

Drake's story has all the ingredients of a "hometown boy makes good" saga: dedication, hard work and perseverance.

He decided in the ninth grade that he wanted to go to the Naval Academy, but it wasn't easy getting there.

Although he was nominated for the academy near the end of his junior year in high school by U.S. Rep. L. H. Fountain, D-N.C. the application was rejected after a physical examination disclosed that Drake's vision was slightly impaired.

After an eye operation, Drake wrote the Armed Forces Medical Review Board in Denver, asking that his application be reconsidered.

LATE NOTICE

The letter was lost in the mail and it was mid-May of Drake's senior year at South Edgecombe High School before his second letter was received and he was notified of his acceptance—just one month before the academy's year began.

Drake's beginnings at the academy tracked the same course as his attempts to get there: bumpy.

During the first part of his freshman, or "plebe" year, Drake said, officers wrote on his records that he "seems lost, disoriented; a bit slow to make the transition from civilian life."

"Plebe year" was preceded by "plebe summer." Drake likened the plebe summer program to a boot camp.

INDOCTRINATION

"The idea is to indoctrinate you to the military, to get you through the conversion from civilian to military life," he said. "Everything is structured to train you to react with confidence and get used to the military way of doing things."

Since he was used to living on his father's hog and tobacco farm, Drake said he had a hard time adjusting to academy rules that prohibited him from leaving base. That was also the last year of the all-male academy.

And then there was harassment from upperclassmen, who would order plebes to recite naval history and minutiae from a booklet called "Reef Points."

"It really makes you step back and decide, 'Is this really what I want to do?'" Drake said, "Do I really want to go into the Navy or not? Everybody thinks about quitting and going back home, but because we're in a group, nobody wants to say he couldn't take it."

CHANGES COURSE

"Apprehension and fear of not being able to make it caused me to work hard my plebe year. I decided that when I think back 10 years from now, I would have wanted to graduate from the Naval Academy. What I was getting was a lot more than I was giving up."

Midway through his four years at the academy, Drake decided to change his major from oceanography to medicine. He will enter Duke University Medical School this fall, after which he will fulfill his naval commitment by serving nine years as a Navy doctor.

"Don't think I didn't think about doing that for a while," Drake said of the time he will be giving the Navy. "It wasn't a decision off the top of my head. I see part of that time at least as a good way to get some background and training."

"Medicine is something I'm really interested in. I kind of feel like the preparation and training I got at the academy is going to help me out."

MOYNIHAN AND THE COURT

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion the RECORD an article by James Reston which appeared in the June 3, 1979, New York Times.

The question posed in the article is clear: Will Congress debate and decide the public policy issue of governmentally

supplied financial aid to the Nation's nonpublic and religious elementary schools.

By avoiding a debate on the controversial issue, Congress does not lay an issue to rest. It only delays a coming to grips with one of the overriding issues in our contemporary society. I agree with Mr. Reston that Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN should be commended for having the courage and the insight to address this vital issue.

The article follows:

MOYNIHAN AND THE COURT

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 2.—In the last few days, the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that the State of New Jersey cannot constitutionally provide a special income tax deduction for parents who send their children to religious or other private schools.

The court did not exhaust itself over this fundamental question. In a one-sentence order, without going over the argument it has heard many times before, it simply affirmed a Federal Appeals Court ruling that the proposed New Jersey tax deduction had the primary effect of advancing religion and thus violated the First Amendment.

Accordingly, we come to the end of another school year with one of the fundamental philosophic questions of public policy unresolved, ignored by our most religious President despite his campaign promises not even debated seriously in the Congress, and therefore left to the Court's interpretation of the Constitution.

The issue here is not the Supreme Court's order—that was expected. The issue is whether the constitutional question should block debate on the wider philosophic question of public policy: Is it in the public interest or not to provide tax relief to rescue private schools, now in deep financial trouble, and maintain the diversity of our educational system? Or should this threshold question of public policy be evaded in advance by a constitutional decision of the courts?

Senator Moynihan of New York has raised this question in a carefully, even brilliantly, argued speech in Staten Island. He made the following points:

The nonpublic schools in the United States are declining in numbers. In 1965, there were 13,292 enrolling 5.6 million. In 1977, this had dropped to 9,797 private schools with an enrollment of 3.3 million.

An argument could be made, he said—though he wouldn't agree with it—that this decline in private and religion-oriented schools was a good thing, but this question of public policy has not only been evaded but confused by contradictory statements by the executive and judicial branches of the Government.

For example, he said, in the 1976 Presidential election campaign, both party platforms promised aid to nonpublic education, and Mr. Carter was especially eloquent in his support. "Yet here we are," he went on, "two and a half years later, and once again nothing has happened."

Vice President Mondale has tried to get aid to the private schools but the Administration he represents has consistently opposed tax credits for families with children in private schools.

"In the years since 1947 * * * Moynihan said, 'the Court's decisions have become evermore confused and contradictory.' It has agreed to provide Federal aid to church-related colleges but not to parochial schools. It has decided that it is constitutional to provide nonpublic school pupils with 'books' but not with 'instructional materials and equipment.'"

This violates Moynihan's sense of logic and

provokes his sense of humor and Irish temper, which are considerable. But he objects mainly to putting the constitutional questions in the courts before the public policy question in the Congress and keeps coming back to this point. What he is arguing for is that the public policy question be debated before the courts act.

"There has arisen in the course of recent generations," he says, "a body of opinion in our society which is sincerely opposed to the influence of religious belief and religious institutions in the secular activities of the society. * * *

"I would wish to stress that in my view it is entirely legitimate to raise this proposition. There is a clear argument to be made for a single secular school system, just as an equally clear argument can be made for a plural school system. My objection is to the use of the constitutional issue to prevent resolution of the issue of public policy."

Back of this question of what comes first—public policy or constitutional decision—there is, however, another question ignored by both Moynihan and the Supreme Court.

This is whether this nation, in this secular and permissive age, is somehow threatened by helping finance the instruction and practice of religion, or whether it is in trouble for lack of religion.

Nevertheless, the junior Senator from New York has developed the habit here in his first term of raising fundamental questions and defining them in clear and even eloquent language. It is a rare and troubling habit in these parts, and occasionally some people listen. ●

THE FAILURE OF BUSING

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the large-scale busing of school children in pursuit of racial balance has turned out to be a dismal failure in Detroit and elsewhere.

Accordingly, one might expect that this misguided idea would slowly be allowed to sink into oblivion. But no, some Federal bureaucrats and private organizations are persisting in pushing this unpopular and unwise remedy—and on a massive scale.

The Detroit News, in a May 23, 1979, editorial, reviewed the latest twist of the busing story, and presented an excellent and damaging analysis on why busing makes less and less sense as time goes on.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, the editorial is set forth below:

BUSING

Considering the questionable results of the nation's experiment with forced busing of school children, it is discouraging to read that neither the NAACP nor the Justice Department has abandoned the possibility of massive busing between Detroit and its suburbs.

At the behest of the NAACP, which has never been satisfied with the Detroit-only concept of forced busing, the Justice Department recently sent investigators here to look for evidence that might support a lawsuit in behalf of a metropolitan plan.

True, this expenditure of time, money, and energy may be justified on a strictly legalistic basis. Though the U.S. Supreme Court in 1974 rejected cross-district busing for Detroit and 53 surrounding communities, the court said such a remedy might be applied under certain conditions.

"An inter-district remedy might be in order," wrote Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, "where the racially discriminatory acts of one or more school districts caused racial segregation in an adjacent district or where district lines have been deliberately drawn on the basis of race."

In the four years since the court handed down that ruling, nobody has found evidence on which to build a credible case for cross-district busing in the Detroit area. Putting that point aside, however, why should anyone feel compelled to use a badly-flawed remedy merely because it would be legal? Surely the community and its educators are more imaginative than that.

The only real justification for busing would be its ability to provide enduring educational benefits for blacks without in any way lowering the quality of education for anybody. Educators and other social scientists cannot agree that forced busing has actually improved student achievement.

Nor does the busing of students in the cause of desegregation seem to improve the self-esteem of black boys and girls. Indeed, many blacks resent the suggestion that the esteem of a black child or his ability to learn depend on his sitting next to a white child on a bus and in the classroom.

Forced busing takes children away from their own neighborhoods at enormous expense, inconvenience, and anxiety to parents and taxpayers. When buses cross district lines, the important concept of local control of schools goes down the drain. When society buys buses, it has just that much less money for teachers, books, test tubes, and classrooms. A desegregation device which exacts such sacrifices from the community should offer something of apparent and overriding value in return. Forced busing doesn't.

Though the NAACP happens to be the most assertive proponent of massive cross-district busing, one would err to assume that blacks universally embrace the proposal. Polls have shown that substantial numbers of blacks share the misgivings of the whole community with regard to forced busing.

Busing is not an issue between blacks and whites, conservatives and liberals, Republicans and Democrats, or suburbanites and city dwellers. With the passage of time, forced busing makes less and less sense to any of these. Isn't it time the NAACP and the Justice Department caught on, too? ●

AMTRAK DILEMMA

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, as the American people turn to Amtrak as their major form of transportation this summer, they face a system with antiquated, deteriorating cars whose continuation is in desperate need of capital to rebuild and refurbish the system. I hope all my fellow colleagues will read this article explaining the dilemma Amtrak faces and support efforts to restore it to a workable, available alternative to our current energy situation:

AMTRAK IS ENTERING ITS BUSIEST SUMMER WITH AN AGING AND DETERIORATING FLEET

(By Albert R. Karr)

WASHINGTON.—Amtrak is heading into what's clearly going to be its busiest summer with aging trains that are falling apart at an accelerating pace.

The National Railroad Passenger Corp., as

Amtrak is formally known, is experiencing a sudden climb in demand from energy-conscious customers. Ridership is spurring and would-be passengers are besieging Amtrak reservations offices with unprecedented bids to book space on trains well through the summer.

But Amtrak also is beset by a rapidly shrinking fleet of passenger cars as the busy equipment wears out faster than before. Besides getting older, cars are suffering from lack of maintenance by Amtrak, which is reluctant to upgrade many cars it probably won't be using once a Carter administration-dictated cutback in the train system takes effect this fall.

So sleeper space will be more difficult to reserve this summer; thousands of hungry travelers will have a tough time finding a dining-car table because there won't be many dining cars, and a rising number of people won't even be able to board the train at all, Amtrak warns. "This is as tight a situation as Amtrak has had in its (eight-year) life, and the further we go into the summer the worse it's going to get," says Robert Gall, Amtrak's director of market research.

FLEET HAS SHRUNK

Although Amtrak has replaced roughly a third of its equipment with new "Amfleet" and other cars in recent years, the Amtrak fleet has shrunk to about 1,400 serviceable cars from nearly 2,000 when Amtrak took over passenger-train operations in 1971.

That's an annual drop of about 75 cars. But the pace is speeding up; this summer alone, Amtrak expects to lose 125 cars. Rather than put about \$225,000 apiece into rehabilitating cars that won't be needed when the route-slashing plan takes effect Oct. 1, Amtrak will send those cars to the scrap heap. Indeed, Amtrak backed the administration's route-cutting plan, arguing that the line lacks good equipment to operate its existing 27,500-mile system.

In the current pinch, Amtrak will make limited repairs to about 85 old cars—getting wheels and axles in shape for safety reasons and trying to fix the air conditioning for comfort.

But that will be of only modest help. By Labor Day, Amtrak expects to have only 379 coaches in service, down from 401 at the start of summer in 1978; its diner fleet has fallen to 72 units from 92 a year ago, and sleepers to 135 from 191 last year. Amtrak doesn't have enough diners or sleepers for the usual makeup of such long-haul trains as those between New York and Florida and between Chicago and the West Coast.

"ANTIQUATE MUSEUMS"

"There are days when we operate trains for which sleeper service is advertised, and we end up without any sleepers for them," concedes Alan Boyd, Amtrak president. About two-thirds of Amtrak's car fleet is the old equipment it took over from railroads in 1971, and those cars average more than 29 years of age. Mr. Boyd says his fleet is mainly "traveling antique museums." Amtrak's requests for funds to buy more new cars for short and medium-distance routes have repeatedly been rejected by administration budgetmakers.

Amtrak has been counting on having 285 new bilevel "Superliner" cars to upgrade its fleet, but their delivery has been delayed for two years, largely by a strike last year at Pullman Inc., the supplier. Amtrak currently has only 17 of the new cars, and expects to have only 47 by September.

That will be too late. About 20 days during July and August are usually busy for Amtrak, but this year many trains have been jammed for several weeks. Over the Memorial Day holiday weekend, 39 trains—about 15 percent of the system—had standees, up to nearly 300 on some trains. Usually, only 10

or 15 trains have any standees during that holiday.

TIGHT BOOKING

Service on the tightest routes, the Chicago-San Francisco "Zephyr," the Chicago-Los Angeles "Southwest Limited," the New Orleans-Los Angeles "Sunset Limited," and the Chicago-Seattle "Empire Builder" and "North Coast Hiawatha," are 100 percent booked, or nearly so, for the next two weeks. And some of those trains are close to being fully booked for the four weeks after that.

After a ridership decline of 1 percent last year, Amtrak system ridership rose about 7 percent in this year's January-April period. Early counts indicate a rise of perhaps 20 percent in May.

Amtrak reservations people have been losing calls by the droves, they're coming in so fast. When Amtrak asked about 250 new customers why they were calling, 90 percent said they're worried that they might be unable to complete summertime trips by auto because gasoline might run out. ●

LIBERTY, ACHIEVEMENT, AND HOSPITALITY

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, Henry Fairlie, because he was born and raised in England, often sees clearly what native Americans overlook.

In last Sunday's "Outlook" section of the Washington Post, he discussed the "zest and brawn" of Texas, as contrasted with the decadence of the East.

The spirit of individual liberty, of achievement, and of hospitality that Mr. Fairlie finds in the West, especially in Texas, was once as prevalent in Boston and New York as in Houston. But Government has changed all that.

Freedom—political and economic (and the two are inseparable)—makes life worth living. Bureaucracy, big government and regulation have about them the stench of decay.

I would like to bring Mr. Fairlie's excellent article to my colleagues' attention:

BEYOND THE ALLEGHENIES, AMERICA STILL HOPES

(By Henry Fairlie)

Wherever I go west of the Alleghenies for a while, I feel refreshed almost on my first morning, as if there the real life of America is still coursing. I look back at this Northeast that boasts so much of itself, and in comparison it seems forlorn and nailbiting and fretful.

It used to be only a cliché to say this, but now its truth has the force of revelation. What was said some 60 years ago by Randolph Bourne, the American critic who died, so tragically young, seems more clear and urgent even than when he wrote it: "No Easterner can pass very far beyond the Alleghenies without feeling that American civilization is here found in the full tide of believing in itself"; in the East "no one really believes that anything startling will be done to bring about a new heaven and a new earth"; "Hope has not vanished from the East, but it has long since ceased to be our daily diet."

If we no longer believe that this full tide is still flowing, is it not because the East has ceased to look to the West? The only real

work of Boston and New York and Washington, after all, is to draw a map of America from which most of America is eliminated.

The annual migration of our eastern intellectuals is about to begin. And where do they go? They go to Martha's Vineyard and the Hamptons and Cape Code. Squeezed for the rest of the year into this narrow corridor of the Northeast, they now squeeze themselves for the summer into even narrower corners of it. Having talked to each other for the past ten months, they now pack their bags, and flock to where they may still talk to each other.

Then they come back again, to redraw their baleful maps, refreshed by their own dejection. Yet it is not very long since the East was willing to look to the West for inspiration, when it responded eagerly to the flowering of new life in the Great Valley.

It is zest and brawn that I find in the West, and it should at once be clear that I am not talking of California, for these are hardly the words that it pricks in one's mind. Nothing was more invigorating on a recent visit to Texas than to find that the Texan's mild amusement at California has hardened into contempt. He feels that he has no more in common with it than with Florida. An old man in Houston, still with something of the wildcatter in him, said dismissively to me: "Florida is where the old go to die—yes? Well, California is where the young go to die."

West of the Alleghenies, then, but east of the Sierra Nevada. And how does one encounter its zest? First, in its hospitableness. There is no other hospitality like it in the world. It is as if every table has been laid in the expectation that a stranger will pass through town. And not only for the stranger, but for the neighbor as well.

I do not know the origins of the phrase—so felicitous and so American—to "visit with" instead of to "visit". But it is only in the West that I hear it, or from Westerners transplanted to the East. A friend in Colorado who was trying to explain it to me said: "You can visit with someone with whom you just stop to chat on the street." It is a concept that alters the way in which a neighbor may just drop in. Not only does a place seem always to be laid, but the time seems always to be made available. Yet these are people busy with making and producing.

But this hospitableness tells of something else. There were no servants in the West, as it grew, in the sense that there were in the East and in Europe. Hired hands and hired help, of course, but no idea of the servant. There was no work that only the servant was able to do. That is why the millionaire and even the multimillionaire in the West is as likely as not to be found in the kitchen; not peering at a few pebbles of charcoal on a grill, but moving quite naturally among all the modern gadgets, drinking and talking as he whips something up or takes it suddenly into his head to roast a whole ox.

There is democracy in this; and there is zest in it. Everyone is able to take part in every activity. The open-plan house is quite natural to the West. Everything that makes the liveliness of a home is there done in front of one.

Then there is the land. To believe that the land is the source of virtue and strength in a people is now regarded as sentimental. Yet close one's eyes as one leaves the West, and one sees these people in their great land. Talk of Texas to those who do not know it, and they think only of its oil. But leave to Texas all its oil, all its refining, all the petrochemical industries built on them, and Texas would die without its agriculture.

No Texan ever forgets it. But then neither does anyone in Chicago. Walk down Michi-

gan Avenue in Chicago, and still you feel the prairie at your back. Stand in the now cosmopolitan heart of Houston, and someone will soon remind you that Texas is wheat; that it is cotton and rice and sorghum and cattle; that it is tomatoes and peanuts and even goats. Name whatever grows from the earth, and Texas (of course) has it!

This presence of the land in the West is quite different from that of the countryside in the East. The industrial towns of New England seem disfigurements of the countryside; but the huge new cities of the West seem to rise out of the plains. As one drives toward them, what is more, that is in fact what they do.

W. H. Auden once said that the last time that the town and the countryside were in a harmonious relationship with each other was in the 18th century. But he was thinking, of course, of Europe, and he might have been thinking of Europe's extension in New England. When one gets into the West, the metropolis falls in place, against the vastness of the Great Valley; and since the Westerner thinks nothing of getting into his car and driving 200 miles to go to a cocktail party or a drive-in movie, the hugeness of the prairie with all its changes of seasons is at least as accessible to him as the fenced-off countryside of New England.

When the presence of the land is so strong, work is something that is meant to produce. Out in the West, they still produce. One of the reasons why wealth in the West is less offensive than it is in the East is that it at least comes from producing and making. All that Boston and New York and Washington make are images of the rest of the Americans who are making things. Wealth here is paper; out there it is products.

It is typical that Houston in recent years should have had a chic restaurant for the young with the name of "Daddy's Money." There is still in that the edge of contempt for a younger generation that will not go out and make its own way in the world by itself making and producing. The West should tighten its laws of inheritance.

There is still the space to make—but time also is different. It is unnerving to look at the holes of the worked-out mines in the sides of the Rockies, and realize that it was only yesterday that men and women clawed and grubbed in them with their hands. It is awesome to stand in the emptiness of the great railroad station at Cheyenne, and realize that its whole legendary story took place in little more than a lifetime. It is strange to sit with an international oil banker in Texas and realize that the memory of the republic is still actual to him.

This time-scale is now as lost to the East as it is to Europe. It is so compressed and, for that reason, still so open. The West is still making. That is why its deserted towns and villages tell so much. They grew and boomed and died, all in so short a span, and there has not been the time, perhaps there will never be, to clean them up or trick them out with boutiques. The history of the West does not need to be preserved, because its history is still in the process of decay and growth. The West is for this reason strangely a place of ruins among the new.

I sometimes have the feeling that the East is now closing down America, that it is putting up the shutters, to share the fear and failure that live at the heart of the Old World. It is true that much of the new in the West is ramshackle and tawdry, especially in the smaller towns that still spring up, but one turns back to Randolph Bourne as he wrote of the West: "It is a litter of aspiring order, a chaos which the people are insensitive to because they are living in the light of a hopeful future." So it once was of Venice or Amsterdam as they grew . . .

So it still is west of the Alleghenies . . .

And few things seem more important to me than that Texas, with its zest and brawn, thrusts not east and west, but north and then out into the Great Valley, into the prairie where time and space are different. ●

EARLY SIGNS FROM NEW BRITISH GOVERNMENT SHOW LITTLE IN TERMS OF NEW INITIATIVES FOR PEACE IN IRELAND

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the 128-member Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs I have been actively watching the developments in Great Britain following the election of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. What has not emerged as of yet is any sign of a new initiative by her government to advance the cause of peace and justice in the troubled nation of Ireland.

The large 43-seat majority which Prime Minister Thatcher enjoys in Parliament should remove one of the main obstacles which hamstrung her predecessor, Mr. Callaghan, in substantively addressing the Irish question. Further, the unprecedented level of American interest in seeing peace in Ireland should be a further incentive for action by the new British Government which is traditionally sensitive to American concerns.

Yet, as in today's article in the New York Times entitled "British Vote Brings No Hope for Ulster" indicates, things at this stage do not look promising. If anything, the potential for a widening of differences and the ensuing conflict seems more direct than a new peace initiative.

In the spirit of peace, I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 122 which calls upon Great Britain to embark upon a new initiative for Ireland—one which restores all human rights and promotes self-determination. The measure which I introduced on May 17, 1979, has 53 cosponsors and I am confident of many others. The United States seeks not to impose its will in the Irish question, but rather assist in breaking the stalemate in Ireland which has crippled the nation in recent years.

At this point in the RECORD, I wish to insert in the following order, the aforementioned New York Times article, the text of House Concurrent Resolution 122, and the list of cosponsors.

The material follows:

BRITISH VOTE BRINGS NO HOPE FOR ULSTER

(By William Borders)

BELFAST, NORTHERN IRELAND, May 30.—Although Britain's general election earlier this month brought signs of some major change to the rest of the country, it brought this sorely troubled province almost nothing to relieve the prospect of more confrontation and more violence.

In the view of knowledgeable people in Belfast, a battle-weary capital still patrolled by the army and still in a state of siege, the advent of a Conservative Government under Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher is likely to make little difference in Northern Ireland's quest for peace.

"Everything here tends to be measured in terms of its relation to our basic constitutional question," a professor explained. "On that, there is no sign that Maggie Thatcher has any particularly new ideas."

In the election of the 12 Northern Ireland members of Parliament, the only gain was made by the Rev. Ian Paisley, leader of the most militant of the several Protestant factions, an outcome that distressed moderates in both the Roman Catholic and Protestant communities.

PAISLEY'S GAINS AMBIGUOUS

Mr. Paisley's Democratic Unionist Party, of which he was the only member in the last Parliament, took two seats away from the official Unionists, giving it three seats in the new Parliament. In all the other races, the incumbents were reelected.

But in the kaleidoscope of Ulster politics, with its overlapping parties and its shifting alliances, even Mr. Paisley concedes that his party's gains were ambiguous. Its two new members of the Parliament won by extremely narrow margins and Mr. Paisley's own margin was down sharply.

A fiery and magnetic orator who favors cracking down harder on the Irish Republican Army guerrillas who are trying to drive the British out of Northern Ireland, Mr. Paisley said in an interview that "the real test of the popularity of our ideas" will be in the elections next month for the European Parliament, for which he is also a candidate.

"All we want in Northern Ireland is the rule of the ballot box—that is, simple democracy," Mr. Paisley said as a highschool marching band tuned up for a campaign parade that he was to lead through Armagh, a tense and bitterly divided town near the border with the Irish Republic. "The People who are in the majority should rule."

OPPOSED TO COMMON MARKET

Mr. Paisley, who is thought to have a good chance of winning one of Northern Ireland's three seats in the European Parliament, opposes Britain's membership in the European Economic Community. He thinks it is a bad deal economically for the country and believes the Common Market is dominated by Roman Catholics.

The best-known candidate at the other end of Ulster's ideological spectrum, Bernadette Devlin McAliskey, is also using the European election as a referendum on domestic issues. She is demanding immediate British withdrawal from Ireland and "self-determination for the Irish people."

Mrs. McAliskey, who is now 32 years old and the mother of three, has lost little of the fierce determination that brought her international attention 10 years ago when, as Bernadette Devlin, she was waging the struggle for Irish nationalism from the House of Commons.

Although she is given little chance of winning in the European election, some people think Mrs. McAliskey, who lost her seat in Parliament in 1974, will take enough votes away from John Hume, the other leading Roman Catholic candidate, to insure that all three seats go to Protestants. But to her, "the campaign is more important than the outcome."

"NO BRITISH SOLUTION"

"The parliamentary campaign that just ended showed that there is no British solution to our problems here in Northern Ireland," she said over a cup of coffee. "The only course is for the Brits to get out and let us solve our own problems."

Mrs. Thatcher and former Prime Minister James Callaghan both declared during the election campaign that London's approach to Ulster's problems was not an issue between them. Humphrey Atkins, the new Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, in his only public statement so far, has given no indication of any significant shift in this policy.

But there are two areas of possible change under the Conservatives that concern people here. One is the prospect that Mrs. Thatcher's Government might bring back capital punishment. In a land where terrorist murders are routine, many Protestants would welcome the reimposition of the death penalty. But many Catholics fear it would lead to greater division.

"It's bad enough having hundreds of Catholic political prisoners," a member of the Catholic minority said. "But imagine the reaction in the streets if instead of being simply jailed they were being hanged at the rate of one or two a week."

Another change in the national political situation, as viewed from here, is that unlike Mr. Callaghan, Mrs. Thatcher has a solid majority in the Commons. She therefore has no need of the voting support of any of the minor party members, such as the ones from Northern Ireland.

"I am afraid that might make her tend to ignore us," an Ulster Unionist Member of Parliament said. "At least, we have certainly lost some of the bargaining power we used to have."

H. CON. RES. 122

Whereas the cornerstone of United States foreign policy is respect for human rights; and

Whereas part I, article I of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which both the United States and the United Kingdom are signatories, states that all people have the right of self-determination; and

Whereas the United States Congress is deeply concerned over the tragic situation in Ireland; and

Whereas the United States has a meaningful role to play in the search for a just and lasting peace in Ireland: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United States Congress calls upon the Government of Great Britain to embark upon a new initiative for Ireland that ends all violations of human rights and promotes self-determination.

SPONSORS

Pursuant to Clause 4 of rule XXII of the rules of the House of Representatives, the following sponsors are hereby added to House Concurrent Resolution 122:

Mr. Lederer of Pennsylvania, Mr. Walgren of Pennsylvania, Mr. Lent of New York, Mr. Richmond of New York, Mr. Won Pat of Guam, Mr. Lee of New York, Mr. Guarini of New Jersey, Mr. Rangel of New York, Mr. Addabbo of New York, and Mr. Vento of Minnesota.

Mr. Downey of New York, Mr. Gilman of New York, Ms. Oaker of Ohio, Mr. Michael Myers of Pennsylvania, Mr. Mavroules of Massachusetts, Mr. Mottl of Ohio, Mr. Barnes of Maryland, Mr. Dellums of California, Mr. Conte of Massachusetts, and Mr. Yatron of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Carney of New York, Mr. Wolpe of Michigan, Mr. Stratton of New York, Mr. Hollenbeck of New Jersey, Mr. McKinney of Connecticut, Mr. Peyser of New York, and Mr. Weiss of New York. ●

THE GREAT OIL AND GAS SHORT-AGE OF 1979: WE HAVE BEEN HAD

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1979

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the American people are suffering from the most

organized campaign of deception by the oil industry in the history of our Nation. Unfortunately, this program is being fostered by the present administration when, on June 1, the decontrol of domestic oil prices was put into motion.

I believe the following article by Michael Kramer and Dave Marsh reprinted from New York magazine June 4, 1979, presents an extremely persuasive picture of the true nature of the present gas shortage.

I once again urge the President and the Congress to put an end to this consumer fraud by taking immediate action to replace oil price controls, roll-back of gas and oil price to pre-1979 levels, and creation of a federally controlled agency to oversee the importation and distribution of oil products.

[The article follows:]

BIRTH OF THE GAS-PUMP BLUES—CELEBRATING A BLESSED EVENT

If you're one of those people who think Jimmy Carter is whistling "Dixie" when he moans about the oil crisis, take heart. You're right: We've been screwed. The Great Oil and Gas Shortage of 1979 is a bastard child, the product of government bungling and industry greed.

You don't have to be a Nobel laureate in economics to follow the story. Simply accept this premise: The oil business is in business to make money.

SUPPLY

The next time an oil-company heavy-weight blasts the ayatollah, consider this—the Iranian revolution has been a godsend for the oil industry, the best thing to happen since the embargo of five years ago. Just as the embargo turned out to be an excuse for the last big jump in oil prices, so this time is the Iranian uprising.

Behind every scam are accommodating statistics, so perhaps it should come as no surprise that the oil-industry data trotted out by government and company spokesmen alike all come from one source: the oil industry itself. What may come as a surprise however, is the fact that those very same statistics, when carefully examined, exonerate Iran and implicate the industry and the American government.

For every single month since the Iranians turned off the spigot, America has actually imported more oil than during the comparable month in 1978. That's right. More.

This past December, when Iranian oil flowed smoothly, United States petroleum imports stood at 8.9 million barrels a day. In January, without Iran's contribution, imports fell to 8.5-million barrels a day. But this was still 450,000 barrels a day more than had been imported during the same month a year earlier. On a quarterly basis, America took in 40 million barrels of oil more during the first quarter of this year than was imported during the same period a year ago.

Where did all this oil come from? From the rest of the oil-producing world, which did, in fact, increase its production.

DEMAND

The reason for our current crisis, says the government, is insatiable demand—even increased imports can't quench our thirst.

True enough—January demand was up 8 percent over a year ago, and February showed a 5 percent jump. But then the graph lines even out. In March, American demand for gasoline was just 1.5 percent higher than in March of 1978. In April, when the trees and meadows turn green and driving becomes a pleasure, gasoline demand actually fell to a level equal to that of April 1978 and a full 2 percent below the April 1977 consumption, a year the industry considers normal.

Given these supply-and-demand numbers, how do we explain the present pump panic? One answer comes from John O'Leary, the deputy secretary of energy. He calls the oil industry's performance "prudent" management. Four decisions help define O'Leary's version of "prudent" management. Two were made in the boardrooms of Big Oil, two at the White House.

Nineteen seventy-eight was a year of stable oil supplies and slightly depressed prices. As described by Exxon board chairman Clifton Garvin, "Last year and the year before, there was a surplus in production capability around the world of about 10 percent, and those in the media came to refer to this as a glut. It's not a glut." Okay. When does 10 percent overproduction not lead to a glut—and the natural corollary, cheaper oil and gas? When you keep the stuff off the market.

Rather than take advantage of the increased supplies and bargain-basement prices, American oil refineries did just the reverse: They spent the year of 1978 running down their stocks of crude oil and gasoline. Imports were held below the levels considered normal, and crude reserves were taken from the storage tank, converted into gasoline, and sold. When prices are cheap and supplies seem stable, there's no profit in holding on to a commodity. So, in 1978, American oil men didn't.

Since the oil business never misses a chance to carp about the instability of its supply sources, one wonders why the industry operates on just a two-week inventory. The answer seems to be that a low margin of supply provides greater opportunity for market manipulations—like the contrived panic that peaked at the lead-free pumps in California this month.

As the industry ran down its stocks of crude oil in 1978, the supplies of motor gas were run down even further. By August of 1978, crude had been depleted to 7 percent below the levels of a year earlier, but gasoline had run down a whopping 18 percent. This pattern continued throughout the year—well before the Iranian cutoff.

Since the beginning of this year (after the Iranian shutdown), American crude-oil stocks have been rebuilt, from 297 million barrels on hand in January to 322 million barrels in April. Meanwhile, gasoline supplies have gotten shallower. In other words, since January, supplies of crude oil have been building up in American storage tanks faster than the industry has been willing to turn them into gasoline for our cars. Or, as John O'Leary so mildly put it to a congressional hearing: "Refiners appear to have been somewhat conservative in their use of available crude oil and gas stocks."

It's not our fault, says the industry. "We just don't have enough equipment in place to supply the demand," says John Simmons, president of ARCO petroleum products. "Our refineries are producing at their maximum," echoes board chairman Fred Hartley of Union Oil of California. "Actually," adds Exxon's Garvin, "in the first four months of this year, the refineries in this country are operating 3 or 4 percent above what they were a year ago." Actually, the industry's own data say otherwise: For the first four months of this year, according to the American Petroleum Institute's figures, the nation's refineries worked at just 85 percent of capacity, about the same rate as in 1978, at which time, the industry itself has admitted, the policy was to underproduce in order to reduce inventories. Is it any wonder that demand—and prices—soar?

Into this situation—low crude supplies due to industry sell-offs and a demonstrated reluctance to convert what crude there is into gasoline—comes the Carter administration with two apparently important moves.

The first federal step to "correct" the problem involved the re-allocation of gasoline supplies to retail dealers scheduled

for May 1. Says Samuel Van Vactor, Oregon's chief energy planner: "The Energy Department screwed up. . . . The new regulations encourage companies to cut back" on their allocations, so again a product of quickly rising value stayed in the storage tank—and became more valuable. Of course the industry calls this "prudence." "We had no idea how the new federal allocations would work," says one industry source, "so we felt we had to reduce our May shipments to dealers just to let things sort themselves out." In effect, things sorted themselves out in motorists' panic.

Since more and more drivers need the lead-free stuff, the panic was worse there, and again the Carter administration seems to have helped the worst to happen.

As the Iranian situation began to affect the price, but not the supply, of crude oil, the administration advised the oil companies to help moderate the OPEC price rise by avoiding the lighter-weight, higher-priced kinds of crude. The industry cooperated—but it did not leave the market entirely. American purchasers bought the less expensive, heavier crude, leaving the lighterweight oil to the Europeans and Japanese. The net effect of the administration's recommended "boycott" was no real boycott at all, and the price of all types of oil fell not one cent. Worse still, American gasoline consumers were severely penalized by this action since the unleaded gasoline we are required to use in our cars in order to comply with governmental regulations is made mostly from the very same lightweight crude our government was telling our oil companies not to buy.

A Chevron spokesman sums up the situation best: "Had we the same [lighter-weight] crude available this year as we had last year, we could make 3 percent more gas right now and 7 percent more for the summer." Which would obliterate the shortage.

The future? The administration is finally encouraging the oil companies to buy lightweight crude, so supplies of lead-free gasoline should be plentiful before long. The prices will be higher, undoubtedly—but not, as the evidence suggests, inevitably. ●

LLOYD WESTON'S "TIP-OFF"

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, one of the important newspapers in my district is the Addition Leader. The publisher and editor, Lloyd H. Weston, is one of the most widely read and influential journalists in the Chicago area. In his recent column, "Tip Off," he addressed the serious issue of our energy crunch. I am pleased to share his comments with my colleagues:

TIP-OFF

(By Lloyd H. Weston)

PUT THAT IN YOUR HOOKAH

"If Americans don't cut consumption (of oil), OPEC will raise prices. If you don't help . . . then God help you."

Supposedly America's best friend in OPEC, Oil Minister Sheik Yamani of Saudi Arabia, issued that blatant threat to Americans in a CBS interview over the weekend.

Yamani—who took time out for the interview from celebrating his daughter's graduation from an American university Sunday—was dapper in his Brook's Brothers suit, his luxury limousine, his entourage of servants, his polished fingernails, his neatly trimmed Van Dyke and diplomatic immunity.

America, he said "you will have to reconsider your life style."

With friends like that, America needs no enemies in OPEC. Such pomposity from a diplomat—a guest in our country—is unthinkable, and should be answered in kind. It makes us wonder if maybe colonialism wasn't so bad, after all.

The President and Congress of these United States have no business even considering stand-by rationing of gasoline until America considers rationing of exports of wheat and other food stuffs to our high-living "friends" in the Arab world. Indeed let's consider pegging the price of an exported bushel of wheat to our cost for a barrel of oil.

Who are these insolent foreigners to dictate "lifestyle" to America while whole populations in their homelands live in abject poverty?

Get off your high camel, Yamani! Americans will tolerate gas lines, if they have to, but don't rub our faces in your oil. If you are truly our friend, then show it. If you are not, then Allah help you! ●

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT CARTER AND HON. JOHN BRADEMAS AT INDIANAPOLIS JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I had the pleasure of attending the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner held in Indianapolis, on Saturday, June 2, 1979. The theme of the dinner was "From City Hall to the White House" and the honored guest and keynote speaker was President Jimmy Carter. The speeches given at this dinner by President Carter and my distinguished colleague and majority whip, the Honorable JOHN BRADEMAs, were both illuminating and inspirational. I would like to share their words with the rest of my colleagues and insert them now into the RECORD:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAs

Mr. Chairman; our most distinguished visitor in Indiana tonight, President Carter; my distinguished colleagues in Congress, Senator Bayh and Congressmen Hamilton, Jacobs, Evans, Fithian, Sharp and Benjamin; friends, fellow Democrats and Republicans who've come in search of salvation, I am honored to have been invited to speak to you briefly this evening.

Mr. President, the enthusiasm and the numbers you see here tonight clearly show the vitality of the Democratic Party in Indiana. This extraordinary turnout is an encouraging harbinger of Democratic victory in 1980.

So let me here congratulate our State Chairman, Don Michael; State Vice Chairman, Patty Evans; Treasurer, Claude Magnuson; Secretary, State Senator Katie Hall; and all the State Committee staff and volunteers who have helped make this the most successful Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner ever held in Indiana.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I understand that I have two or three assignments tonight.

First, I have the privilege of presenting to all of you my Democratic colleagues in the House of Representatives. When I speak of the Hoosier Democrats in the House, I speak from personal knowledge. They are as able a group as represents any state in the nation.

From the Ninth District is a man who serves as an Assistant Whip and who is

widely respected for his ability in several fields. He is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and Chairman of its Europe and Middle East Subcommittee. He also serves on the Ethics Committee and the Joint Economic Committee—Lee Hamilton!

From here in the Eleventh District is one of the wittiest and most popular Members of the House and a member of the important Ways and Means Committee, a man well known to all of you—Indianapolis' own Andy Jacobs!

From the First District, a member of the Appropriations Committee, another key position for our state, in his second term and already Chairman of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee, where he is a careful watchdog of the public purse—Adam Benjamin!

From the Second District, an influential member of the Agriculture Committee, vital to the economy of Indiana, also a member of the Foreign Affairs and Government Operations Committee and one of the hardest-working Members of the House—Floyd Fithian!

From the Tenth District, a man who has the difficult task of being Indiana's voice on energy in the House—a man who serves on both the Commerce and Interior Committees and who in the last Congress was chosen by Speaker O'Neill to sit on the special committee that produced the first comprehensive energy bill in generations—from Muncie, Phil Sharp!

From the Sixth District—also your neighbor, this Representative sits on the Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee, the Government Operations Committee and the Select Committee on Aging—all seats that help him assure that Indiana properly benefits from the legislation these committees write—Dave Evans!

So, ladies and gentlemen, our state is fortunate in having a Democratic delegation in the House of Representatives composed of Members who serve on nearly every key committee there.

Mr. President, Indiana is well served by its Democrats in the House.

And Indiana and you, Mr. President, are also well served by three members of your staff who have returned to their home state tonight to demonstrate that some people in Georgia White House speak with a Hoosier accent.

Well known to all of us here is the President's Deputy Appointment Secretary, a young woman whose late father was the beloved mayor of my hometown of South Bend, and who, I am proud to say, was a former student of mine when she was in college, Fran Voorde.

The Assistant to the President for Political Affairs and Personnel is the person whose efforts in Iowa in 1976 helped Jimmy Carter become a viable candidate for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency—Tim Kraft of Noblesville.

And working closely with us in the House is another able young man, whom I have known since his days as President of College Young Democrats in Indiana, the President's Special Assistant for Congressional Liaison, Terry Straub of Indianapolis.

All these Hoosiers, Mr. President, the Members of the House and of your staff, are proud to welcome you to Indiana tonight.

I may say to my fellow Democrats from our State that, as Majority Whip of the House, I have the privilege every other week of joining Speaker O'Neill and the other Members of the House and Senate Democratic Leadership for breakfast at the White House with our distinguished guest. Indeed, only yesterday and earlier today my wife and I had the honor, together with several other members of Congress, of being guests of President and Mrs. Carter at Camp David.

So I can say to all of you that I know from these several meetings as well as from others the remarkable intelligence, the integrity of purpose and the profound dedication to the best interests of our country of the President of the United States.

Let me remind all of you here, at a time when we hear a stirring of criticism in the country, that President Carter undertook the leadership of this Nation some twenty-nine months ago. While it may not have been the worst of times, it was far from the best of times. His Republican predecessors—Presidents Nixon and Ford—bequeathed him a deficit-plagued economy deep in the throes of recession and a foreign policy that was like unraveled string—lots of dangling ends that were not tied down.

Today, instead of the \$66 billion deficit left by President Ford, Congress has just adopted a target budget resolution that brings that deficit down to \$23 billion next year, with a real prospect of a balanced budget in the following year.

Today, rather than an unemployment rate over 8 percent, the figure is below 6, and in the less than 30 months of the Carter Presidency, we have created some 8 million new jobs—a record unsurpassed in our history.

In the field of foreign affairs, too little, in my view, has been made of President Carter's achievements.

He has normalized relations with the world's most populous country, the Peoples Republic of China, without jeopardizing the freedom of the people of Taiwan.

He has won ratification of the Panama Canal treaties, an accomplishment which while not earning him much political popularity has reflected this Nation's commitment to justice in world affairs.

In two weeks, he will be in Vienna to sign a SALT Treaty—the product of seven years of negotiations by three Presidents to find a way to diminish the danger of nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union.

And during President Carter's Administration, no American fighting man or woman has lost his life in war.

As a nation, we face many difficult challenges still—inflation and energy are but the two most dramatic—but working together, President Carter and the Democratic Congress, I assure you, will not flinch from continuing the search for solutions to those challenges.

So, Mr. President, we welcome you warmly tonight to Indiana. You are among friends.

And now, as I conclude, I have the further privilege of being able to present to you one of Indiana's most distinguished sons and one of our greatest public servants, a man with whom I have had the honor of serving in Congress for sixteen years. The distinguished senior Senator from Indiana, the honorable Birch Bayh.

There is little that I can say about him that others have not said many times before. His attributes and accomplishments are well known to you all.

He is a man of commitment, of conviction, of courage.

Few Senators of the United States have pursued their goals with such tenacity as has he, and fewer still have achieved the success in the pursuit of those objectives that he has enjoyed.

But it is hard work and vigorous effort, not accident, that have brought him the respect of his colleagues and the influence that has enabled him to do so much for Indiana and the nation.

Chairman of the Senate Select Intelligence Committee, Chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee and also of the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, he will next year, as you are all aware, be seeking a fourth term in the Senate,

something no previous Hoosier has ever accomplished.

But this Hoosier will, because his work on behalf of Indiana and the nation deserves it. I want to say one more thing before I present him and that is to voice to him for all of us the deep sorrow we feel at the loss of his wonderful and courageous wife.

Marvella Bayh was a remarkable person, a warm, outgoing gracious woman whose faith and courage continue to inspire us all. She has set an example to us for which we shall always be grateful.

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT CARTER AT THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER

It is a pleasure to be back home in Indiana—it's like coming home because of all the wonderful Democratic friends my family made here. You gave us a warm Hoosier welcome when we were still strangers knocking at your doors.

One of the first people to invite us in and offer his support was Andy Jacobs—I'll never forget that, Andy, and I thank you.

During my campaign for President I used to wonder why no matter where I started out, I always ended up in Indiana. Then I realized the Indiana mafia on my staff was doing it. Sometimes it seems that we have more people in the White House from Indiana than we do from Georgia. I can understand your pride in Tim and Terry and Fran. But I hope these honors don't go to their heads and make them ask for pay raises.

We don't just have Hoosiers in the White House. I appointed Bill Schreiber to the U.S.-Canada Boundary Commission and he's doing a good job. We have only ceded a small portion of our territory to Canada during his tenure.

Back here in Indiana Don Michael is building up the party from the precinct level. You have a strong group of mayoral candidates that can win this fall, and next year you can elect a Democratic governor in the tradition of Governors Henry Schricker, Roger Branigan and Matt Welsh.

STRONG INDIANA DELEGATION

Next year, too, I want you to remember when it comes to electing Democrats to the U.S. House of Representatives that seven is not as good as eleven. With the support of stalwart Democrats like Dallas Sells (UAW) and Willis Zagrovich (AFL-CIO)—and all of you here—you can elect 11 Indiana Democrats to join Birch Bayh in Washington.

Indiana already has an outstanding Democratic Congressional delegation: Lee Hamilton's support has been a key factor in crucial votes on foreign affairs. Phil Sharp is making sure our energy resources are fairly shared, Floyd Fithian knows what farmers need and Adam Benjamin helped us keep the budget deficit down.

The Republicans spent a lot of money to put a third Crane in Congress, but the people of Indiana wisely decided to keep David Evans.

As Democratic whip, John Brademas has shown the kind of leadership that causes the American people to keep a solid Democratic majority in both houses of Congress.

In three terms Birch Bayh has come to symbolize the kind of courageous action which molds the direction of the United States Senate.

We all share in his loss. Marvella Bayh's spirit and courage were an inspiration to the nation. She was able in a wonderful way to share her faith and to instill some of her courage in the lives of others who suffer. We miss her radiant presence.

The last time I was in Indiana I spoke at Notre Dame about our foreign policy aims and our intention to support human rights throughout the world. In the two years since then, much has happened. It has been a time

of rebuilding. We have accomplished a great deal. We have much more to do.

PROSPERITY, VISION, TRUSTS, PEACE

When they write the history of these years, I hope they will say four things about what you and I have done together.

I want them to say that we have made America prosperous again, that we believe—as Democrats—in hard work and that we have put our people back to work.

I want them to say that we were not afraid to tackle difficult and controversial issues and that above the short-term political advantages we might have gotten, we always placed the long-term good of our nation.

I want them to say we restored the trust and confidence of the American people in our own government. Most of all, I want them to be able to say that America has been at peace, and that we helped lead the world away from war.

If we can build on this New Foundation of peace, trust and prosperity, we will have kept faith with our party and with the American people. We will enter the 1980s as a proud, confident, strong and unified nation. We will bring our nation—and the world—closer to a time when war, hunger, poverty, injustice and oppression will be no more. This is what you and I can do. This is what you and I will do—together.

It is sobering to remember the cynicism and distrust of those in power a few years ago, to remember the disappointment and sense of betrayal that clouded our land. Great changes have taken place. We have demanded a government that does not need to cover up, that deserves the loyalty and trust of the people.

There are no more government lies, no more enemies lists, no more sell-outs.

President Andrew Jackson summed up my own beliefs when he said, "There are no necessary evils in government. Its evils exist only in its abuses."

One way we end the abuses is to put good people in government, like Jim Joseph and Leo Krulitz at the Interior Department and Bob McKinney at the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY ACHIEVEMENTS

When I took office in January 1977 more than one worker in ten in Gary was out of a job. Republican economics said we had to tighten our belts, and you know whose belt got tightened. Democratic economics have taken people off the unemployment rolls by giving them jobs—more than 8 million new jobs since I took office.

Republicans talk about the dignity of work—Democrats create jobs so people can work.

Republicans also talk a lot about balanced budgets, but in the eight years they were in the White House the budget deficits were greater than the total for all the other 192 years of our nation's history combined.

Republicans talk about cutting deficits—Democrats cut them. By 1980 we will have cut the deficit by more than half. At the same time we have substantially increased aid to the old, the sick and the poor. We have made unprecedented commitments to teach youngsters basic skills and to enable young people to get a college education.

Farm families have been strengthened, net farm income raised, and agricultural exports set new records every year. You have certainly not seen any grain embargoes during this administration.

We have accomplished a lot, but crucial questions still face us—on energy, on inflation, on keeping the peace in a dangerous world.

A Senator jokingly said awhile back that I had tackled every unpopular issue that was before our nation and when there were

none left, I went out and looked for one. There have always been some left.

HARD CHOICES, POSITIVE SOLUTIONS

I did not go out and look for tough issues—they were around long before I got here, but the Republicans before me were too busy doing other things to tackle them.

The Democratic Party is the party of the people because the people trust us to make the hard choices on these questions for the good of the whole nation and all its people.

They gave us a majority in both houses of Congress so we could find positive solutions. They did not give us majorities so we could vote down every solution offered, complaining that they were not perfect. There are no perfect solution, but I believe the people are willing to follow us if we meet our responsibilities and devise the best solutions we can.

One of the most immobilizing fears in our nation today is the fear of being misled and cheated. As much as anything else, this keeps our people from conserving energy and doing our part to hold down inflation. I believe Americans are willing to do their part as long as they feel everyone else will.

When governors and Congressmen and local leaders demand special treatment for their constituents, they do them no favors. Instead, they breed an attitude of "me first—others last."

In the long run we will all suffer if we delay and dally in the mistaken belief that our problems will miraculously disappear. The choice is between temporary inconvenience now or real hardship later.

There are no magic cures. We can't plan and harvest our crops with mules. We can't fuel our factories with fireplaces.

The times require plain talk and political courage—from Democrats. The people have entrusted Democrats with governing this country. They will again entrust Democrats with governing Indiana. But I don't believe they will again accept lame excuses from anyone who says that "this is a no-win situation, so we won't play."

That is a cop-out, and we were not elected to hide or withdraw from a fight.

ENERGY SECURITY

There will be strong pressures in the coming weeks to continue government controls on oil. As you know, the controls are not working. You have seen what has happened to prices. These controls encourage waste, discourage production of oil in the United States and subsidize oil imports. We are in this mess today in part because we insisted too long on that course. We must cut our dependence on foreign oil. Our OPEC suppliers warn that we must conserve. Our Allies warn that we must conserve. The message must be clear to all Americans—we cannot continue to increase our use of oil and gasoline in the face of reduced supplies.

The windfall profits tax will let the oil companies keep 29 cents of each dollar which should increase exploration and production of domestic oil. We estimate that through increased production and conservation, decontrol will reduce imports by one million barrels of oil per day.

The tax will finance a new Energy Security Fund which will ease the burden on those least able to pay higher fuel costs and will pay for improved mass transportation and additional research and development of alternative energy sources such as gasohol and the power of the wind and sun. It will mean that such concepts as coal liquefaction and gasification will become realities, so we can make use of more Indiana coal.

We have a great nation which can meet any challenge if we work together. We can solve the energy problem with the same courage and pioneer spirit and a sense of partner-

ship which is exemplified by the people of Indiana.

Our economic, military and political strength are unsurpassed by any other nation on earth. We are at peace.

The founder of our party, Thomas Jefferson, looked back on his long years of service to the nation and said with pride, "During the period of my Administration, not a drop of the blood of a single fellow citizen was shed by the sword of war."

I am also proud that not a single drop of American blood has been shed in war during my own Administration, and I pray to God every day that when my years as President are over I can still share Jefferson's achievement.

SALT II

The SALT II Treaty is a part of our efforts to wage peace.

There is no doubt in my mind that the treaty enhances our nation's security and the prospects for sustained world peace. There is no doubt that the treaty, when ratified, will contribute to continued detente and will greatly reduce the possibility of nuclear war.

There is no doubt that the treaty will contribute to increased control over the future development and deployment of nuclear weapons. There is no doubt that it will improve our chances of getting other nations to restrain the proliferation of nuclear weapons capabilities if the United States and the Soviet Union can demonstrate that we can constrain ourselves.

SALT II is part of a process that began when Eisenhower was President. He said the greatest disappointment of his Presidency was that more progress was not made toward nuclear arms limitations. If SALT II is not ratified—if, after seven years of negotiations under three Presidents, a carefully balanced agreement in our own country's interests is rejected—the process of controlling nuclear weapons would be difficult to resurrect.

This treaty does not depend on trust in the Soviet Union. We can verify it. Our national security is enhanced, not endangered by SALT II.

Failure to ratify this treaty would not only add unnecessary billions to our defense budget—it would add to global instability and the threat of a catastrophic war.

During my campaign I promised you here in Indiana that we could have a government as good as our people. Some critics dismissed this as empty rhetoric, but you understood what I was saying.

Our foreign policy is as good as our people when we speak out for human rights around the world—and we will continue to protect human rights as long as I am President.

MIDDLE EAST PEACE

Our foreign policy is as good as the American people when we work to bring peace not only to our own shores, but to ancient enemies. We will continue to work for peace around the world.

We won a victory of this kind when a peace treaty was signed two months ago between Egypt and Israel. We saw the first fruits of that when Israeli ships sailed through the Suez Canal and when occupied territory was returned to Egypt and the borders between Israel and Egypt were open last weekend.

That treaty was possible because of two courageous leaders, President Sadat and Prime Minister Begin. We were able to help at a crucial point because of the moral strength, the moral leadership of our nation. That treaty was not a personal accomplishment, though I was proud and grateful to be a part of it. Whatever I was able to contribute was possible only because those two nations recognize that the American people—not just one particular American

President, but the American people—will always support those who seek freedom and justice and peace.

That is what the United States government must stand for in the world—not just during one Administration, but for as long as we call ourselves a free people.

Freedom, justice and peace—these are the sources of our true power on which all else must rest. These are the principles which have made America great.

STRONGEST COUNTRY ON EARTH

One of our finest blessings as Americans is that we have the right to speak our minds, to complain and debate and resolve issues in the political arena.

In our eagerness to do that, sometimes we forget how much we have accomplished—the extent of our material abundance—and the wonderful treasure of our freedom. We cannot afford to forget our blessings. To lose sight of our basic strength would be even more unrealistic than to ignore our present problems.

Our land is broad, our people diverse, and many are frightened by a future they see as very different from the past we have known. It will be very different just as our world is very different from that of our ancestors, but this should not be a cause of fear. The problems are real and they are serious, but they are manageable if we have the courage and the will to face them together. There is no doubt that we have the strength.

We have a degree of freedom and respect for the individual, and a commitment to providing the greatest possible opportunity for all of our people that is unmatched through most of human history. We do indeed live in the strongest country on earth.

We cannot let all that strength, all the innate power of our natural and human resources, be frittered away in fear and futility. Franklin Roosevelt understood how fear can immobilize people, and in a much more desperate moment he warned us of the power of fear to destroy. We cannot let fear of change, of uncertainty or the fear of some manageable limit on material goods immobilize our mighty nation.

I am very proud to be a part of you, proud to be the leader of our party and of our nation. In difficult periods we Democrats have always seen—not doubt, but hope, not divisiveness, but unity—growing out of a respect and understanding of our diversity and our human strength. We have never failed our country and we will not fail it now.

A BRIGHTER FUTURE

We do have problems.

We can solve these problems. We can be strong and at peace. We can make our economy work, but we cannot do it with slogans or gimmicks or magic.

America must solve her problems the same way each of us solves our own problems—with hard work and persistence, and occasionally, some pain and sacrifice.

We must not confuse difficulty with defeat.

The actions we take to get through our current problems will enhance our strength for a future that will be even brighter than our past. I look forward to those years—next year, the next decade, the next century—because I know our people have the will and the strength of character to make them better. ●

SURFACE EFFECTS SHIP

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, for years, I have been an ardent and an out-

spoken fan of the Navy's surface effects ship. I have seen it through design. I have driven the 100-ton prototype. I know what it can do. And I fail to see why each year, we go through the same problems with funding a 3,000-ton version.

This ship is the most revolutionary concept in seapower to come before us since the Navy converted from coal-fired powerplants to oil. Its applications are limitless. But we must build to find out just what the SES can do. This continual dragging of feet on funding is ridiculous. If the attitude toward this new concept had existed at the dawn of time, it is doubtful that the wheel would have ever been invented.

The following editorial that appeared in the May issue of Government Executive calls attention to the potential of the surface effects ship and sets out clearly and logically what it is and where it is going.

THE 100-KNOT NAVY

LIKE CANCELLING AVIATION AFTER
KITTY HAWK

(By John F. Judge)

The program is the Navy's Surface Effect Ships (SES)—vessels that operate on a cushion of air. Because of the resultant reduction in drag, such designs are capable of over-the-water speeds of up to 100 knots.

This is roughly more than twice the ability of conventional surface ships whose top speeds are limited by a number of factors.

But the potential of a surface ship capable of twice the speed of a torpedo, three times the speed of the latest displacement ships and available in military sizes would completely rewrite the rules of warfare at sea—particularly by the other side who has a growing conventional fleet of substantial size.

The SES quick reaction time, relative invulnerability to mines and torpedoes and a reduced susceptibility to missile attack due to its high speed maneuverability—and the ability to loiter, on or off cushion—combine to provide the potential for improved effectiveness in tasks currently assigned to surface combat ships of comparable size.

Recent Confusion—SES development was started in the U.S. by the Navy in 1961—that is nineteen years ago—and has been under relatively steady progression since that time.

The current status starts with the position as stated by Secretary of the Navy W. Graham Claytor, Jr., in part that . . . "The Navy considers (the Surface Effect Ship) one of the most important ship development programs now under way or contemplated. The near term military value and the long term potential of this technology have been confirmed and reconfirmed. . . ."

Contrast this statement with the following taken from testimony of Dr. W. J. Perry, Defense Research & Engineering on the 1980 budget last February.

"After a thorough examination of all the issues involved, the Navy recommended against continuing with the development of the 3000-ton SES test ship in this budget. The Navy's analysis showed that the payoff from this program was distant and very uncertain, and that SES's of the type being developed were unlikely to have a significant impact on our naval posture. After conducting my own review, I concurred in the Navy's recommendation. We plan to request that the balance of the funds appropriated in fiscal year 1979 be used to pursue vigorous development of the technology and system concepts leading to an advanced ship program which will achieve some of the performance advantages of the SES without suffering its penalties in payload, cost and fuel consumption."

Much has been written over the years in

many publications about the tremendous impact of the 100-knot Navy on blue water operations. One solid-point, often ignored, is the equally, if not larger, effect the strong development of such a fleet has on the opposition—who is now well embarked on a major ship building program. The speed and other attributes of the SES designs profoundly affect the operational tactics of opposing conventional forces—including nuclear subs. And naval vessels, no matter which country builds them, are built according to carefully defined mission needs which, in major part, evolve from the ability of the opposition's combatant ships.

So the potential of the SES has ramifications far beyond mere combat scenarios. It goes to high speed logistics which by itself wipes out certain advantages accruing to high speed nuclear submarines. Even beyond this, there is a potential in a lessening need for conventional foreign naval bases.

In anti-submarine warfare aspects (the one area that DOD feels worth concentrating on in the so-called proof level of SES) the SES in combination with both tactics and the newer aircraft provide a major disruptive influence on the deployment and activity of opposing submarine forces.

So there are many positive aspects. There is no real major technological challenge in finishing out the program to the launching of a 3000-ton SES prototype.

The program is not in the Fiscal 1980 budget. It has already slipped, which increases the offing.

So what is happening is that the ball has arrived in Congress' court. And it looks like the U.S. nuclear sub developmental history may be in the process of repeating itself.

Team concepts?—The Subcommittee on Research & Development of the House Committee on Armed Services is positive on the SES. They asked the military if the SES was in the fiscal year 1980 budget and, "if not, which activity terminated it and why?"

The answer: "It is not in the budget. It was not included due to lack of affordability in the light of higher priority items."

Note that the answer avoided the question. The subcommittee also noted this. The explanation moves into budget gamesmanship. The Navy found, in the 1979 budget exercise, that the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) removed that program after the Navy had included funding in its request to OSD—along with the funding. So, in working up the 1980 budget, the Navy took the view that it could not afford to lose both the program and the funding. In the course of the development of the 1980 DOD budget, the Navy did include, at a meeting, the levels of priority for the SES.

Confusing?

Not to the experienced Congressmen on the Subcommittee. They knew what they were hearing. Said one Representative. . . . "does anybody over there (at DOD) have any courage to get the message up to Secretary of Defense Brown and to the President by saying 'Look, you people, you're not being honest with the American people. We have some really big needs in the Navy and especially in our Armed Forces' . . . This three percent increase is going to wind up about 1.5 percent, if we are lucky and here's HUD getting something like a 10 percent increase and nobody says anything about that. My point is—when is anybody going to get tough and get the word up to the president."

" . . . It makes our job very difficult coming out with a program that inevitably, as soon as it looks good, it gets cancelled. If the Soviets ran our system they couldn't be doing a better job . . ."

Another Member of the subcommittee succinctly outlined the problem. Said he, in part . . . "When the Chief of Naval Operations says we can fulfill our mission as long as it is peacetime, it's about like somebody in the volunteer Army saying that as long as our job is to show up for Memorial

Day parades, the Army can foot the bill—but, in terms of going to war, we have problems.

"... I remember asking General Brown before his death about the B-1 decision and I said that you know if the Public is not getting the truth on this, when is it that some of you top people are going to say 'Look Mr. President, we can't go with you on this. In our judgment, if you do down this road we are resigning and we are coming out and telling the Public why.'

"General Brown said that the time may come when we have to do that but the B-1 is not that time. And when the military was organized to line up behind the Panama Canal issue, I think it was General Brown or General Jones who said, at the time, that this is not the point to fall on our swords.

"Well, maybe the SES is not the time either... maybe this is not the decision to fall on your swords—but somebody has to tell the Public and the only voices that are coming out are dissidents in Congress who say the experts are wrong.

"We have some serious deficiencies and they are not being addressed—and you are not going to address them with more food stamps or bigger regulatory agencies, because these are the only programs that seem to be growing up here by the Administration's selection.

"You know, if you walk to the White House and flop a sweaty brassiere on the streets and scream ERA, the TV cameras are stacked up all along Pennsylvania Avenue.

"But if you come up here and say we need something for the national defense and you have a hundred Congressmen to back it up, you cannot even get the networks to show up.

"... At what point do we come out and go Public? Maybe this (SES) is not the issue—but when is the issue? The trends are bad. The State Department says that in three or four years we will have to knuckle under because we won't have the equipment to stand up. Why don't we have the equipment? It is because of days like today."

Affordability—The amount the Navy initially requested for the SES in the 1980 budget exercise was \$106.8 million. To date, the SES program has been funded to the tune of approximately \$338 million. It is estimated that putting a 3000-ton prototype SES in the water could cost more than an additional \$400 million—which would make the SES to the prototype state a total investment exceeding one billion dollars.

Contracts have been let—in 1976—for the design, subsystems verification and long lead procurement with an option to construct the 3000-ton prototype.

And to partially offset program cost increases due to stretchouts and the larger ship size (the initial moves were to a 2000-ton vessel) the combat element of the prototype has been limited to anti-submarine warfare features only. Provisions to later install anti-air and anti-surface combat systems have been made.

There is little visible support for the SES at the DOD level and the reason for the elimination of the program in the budget is due to a combination of things. But basically, the idea is that the cost of carrying the SES to prototype stage—at which time the DOD claims the proof of the potential can be demonstrated—is simply not affordable in the light of the current overall R&D allocations. Thus a set of priorities.

So the R&D element of the DOD budget is the problem and it is this entire area of national defense that worries many on and off Capitol Hill. It is this element of defense funding that paves the way for a strong and credible defense five to fifteen years from now.

The DOD budget has, in spite of the totally misinformed clamor of its critics, been a very tight exercise for the past several years. And the R&D portion have felt the pressure the most because many of the other ele-

ments in military appropriations are as fixed as the Social Security system.

The concern is growing that, in the face of Soviet expenditure in this area over the same time period, the posture of the U.S. in the near future may not be as strong as it might have been had R&D received more attention in the past.

The SES may not be the battleground over which the larger issue of effective R&D findings will be fought. But it could be that the surface effect ship program is the final straw between political expediency and the complex price of liberty.

The method for avoiding that issue is already in progress. The House Armed Services Committee will probably insert the SES back into the Navy's appropriation and do so on a line item basis—which gives the program high visibility to oversight.

But the larger issue, R&D, is still smoldering and getting warmer. ●

PROF. RAUL S. MANG LAPUS SPEAKS ON INTERNATIONAL DEMOCRACY VERSUS RACISM

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. Speaker, Prof. Raul S. Manglapus of American University recently spoke on "International Democracy versus Racism" at the Conference of Democracy International. Professor Manglapus, former Foreign Minister and Senator in the Philippines, is cochairman of the organizing committee of Democracy International. He also is president of the Movement for a Free Philippines (MFP).

I commend his timely and thought-provoking comments to the attention of my colleagues:

INTERNATIONAL DEMOCRACY VERSUS RACISM (By Raul S. Manglapus)

This human gathering committed to liberty is fortunate to be born with ready allies, visible, strong and irreplaceable. They are the international groups that labor to protect prisoners of conscience, to investigate practices in the administration of justice, to evaluate the status of universal freedom. We seek to assist them by unting for the restoration or for the strengthening of the political system that we believe to be the only guarantee for conscience, justice and freedom. That system is pluralist democracy.

Our main antagonist is not so visible. But it is there. We call it Stability International the unseen but living alliance of those who have made a god of stability, placed it on an incensed altar, and offered it all forms of homage—money, arms, planes, tanks, credits, and security guarantees.

Stability International is our principal enemy not because democracy is the antithesis of stability but because they have disfigured the image of true stability, giving it the shape of authority without consent, public order by the gun, and participation by coercion, clothing it with the illusion of an uncorrupt and crimeless society by the quick expedient of banning the publication of corruption and crime, the semblance of industrial peace by imprisoning strikers, the appearance of popular support by the regimentation of the young and the prostitution of the civil servant.

This was Greece under Papadopoulos, Thailand under Thanom, and Iran under the Shah. This is Nicaragua under Somoza, South Korea under Park, the Philippines under Marcos.

In Iran, the democratic National Front fought in isolation as the American ambassador cuddled up to the Shah. In Nicaragua, the United States thought of withdrawing military aid from Somoza only after guerilla action had begun to tell, after even urban moderates had declared a strike, and after the blood of hundreds of Nicaraguans had been copiously shed.

Even where democracy had been regained with the blood of peaceful marchers shouting Jeffersonian slogans, U.S. policy remained devoted to its deceptive god. In the spring of Thailand democracy, which began in late 1973, U.S. economic and military assistance programs were cut, instead of being increased, contributing, in the view of experts, to its collapse in 1977. U.S. policy makers appeared to doubt the capacity of the Thais to sustain a stable democracy and preferred to await the pleasure of the Thai generals behind the scenes.

No official word of encouragement was heard from Washington to animate the struggling Thai democrats. Yet, when Spain and Portugal returned to constitutional freedoms, the United States, along with the Western democracies, rushed to fortify the two renewed democracies with moral and material aid.

Are we correct if we here discern a hint of racism? I think we are. Spaniards and Portuguese are, after all, white caucasians. But Latin Americans? Most of them, like the Nicaraguans and the Brazilians, are of mixed blood. As for Iranians, Koreans, and Southeast Asians—they are all so terribly non-white.

This is the racism of George F. Kennan who, confusing form for substance, preaches that democracy is an Anglo-Saxon invention whose values should not be imposed outside of Europe and the U.S., of William F. Buckley, Jr., who denounces President Carter for applying his "collected opera of human rights" to non-Western societies, and of William Randolph Hearst, Jr., who, ignoring the identical Chinese, Korean and Japanese characters for minzhu or democracy, the Malay merdeka, the Tagalog kalyaan, has made the astounding scholarly revelation that there are no Asian words for democracy or rights—only for duties.

This is the reluctantly yielding racism of Ian Smith in Rhodesia, of Vorster in South Africa—indeed of those who in their passion for ideological totalitarianism would deny that the peoples of Eastern Europe and Central Asia are capable of democracy.

Do not look for democracy in the superficial accounts of history—of Russian Czars, of Ming Emperors, of Mogul despots, of British and European royalty, of Southeast Asian kings. Look for it in the traditions of the villages everywhere—in Asia, Europe, Africa and Latin America, where in spite of centralized monarchies that could not, even with improved communications, come down to run the daily lives of the people, customary laws of democratic consensus were highly developed—the adat among the Malays, the wergeld among the Germanic peoples, the common law among the British—all providing the hedge against centralized repression and the future substance of institutionalized democracy.

This substance, in Asia and Africa, took on forms borrowed from Western colonials, but the substance was indigenous—always—for freedom knows no culture or color.

Buckley is good at words, but in calling President Carter's policy on human rights a "collected opera" he has shown how semantic cleverness can not disguise a biased and shallow perception. For other Presidents may have stood for it before him, the U.S. Congress may have in fact anticipated him by enshrining it in legislation, but President Carter is the first Chief of State of a world power to come forward with an unabashed policy on human rights.

What need have we then of a union of democrats like this, if the President of the strongest nation on earth has already proposed to promote human rights all over the world?

Because this nation, no matter how powerful, must face its dilemmas, its moments of hesitation. It can yield, as it has yielded, to the temptation of choosing the comfortable option of "not rocking the boat," of falling on its knees before the false idol of stability.

This nation must be reminded that its own founding premises are universal, not just American, that stability is not in one man but in all the people, and that dictators, with or without U.S. help will fall, but the return to freedom is bloodier and more damaging to the American image when U.S. support for the repression is stubbornly maintained.

And there are many, in this country and elsewhere, who must also be reminded that political, economic, and social rights are indivisible—that the dignity of the poor, the racially discriminated, the dispossessed minorities, can only be satisfied when they are given the political rights with which to fight like Martin Luther King, for economic and social equality in a pluralist society and not when some self-appointed autocrat proceeds to redistribute goods at the expense of liberty. Marcos, Park and the Shah have said "development comes before political rights." B. P. Koirala, the Nepalese patriot, has responded "No. Development begins with political rights!"

We agree with King and Koirala and raise the banner of Democracy International. We shall make the chancelleries of the world resound with our cry of freedom. It shall not be an artificial cry. For it is in fact an echo. We are but the echo of the millions of our compatriots in our homelands, whose cries are stifled and who look to us, as we here enjoy freedom, to use that freedom to unite and act to restore democracy where it has been lost, and to vitalize it where it has returned.

We now expose our antagonism for the brittle pretension that it is. Democracy and stability are one. The world can ignore that truth only at the peril of losing liberty forever.●

STRONGER CIVIL DEFENSE NEEDED

HON. ANDY IRELAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial from the Sedalia Democrat, of Sedalia, Mo., points out the need for stronger consideration of civil defense.

I include herewith a copy of an editorial by F. D. Kneibert, editor:

CIVIL DEFENSE NEED CLEAR FROM REPORT

Thanks to Rep. Ike Skelton, increasing attention is being paid to civil defense preparedness, especially as it affects certain high-risk areas of the country.

One of those areas includes 15 counties in west-central Missouri that contain Minuteman missiles assigned to Whiteman Air Force Base. These missiles are sure targets in any Soviet attack scenario. And all of our land-based missiles will become vulnerable in the early '80s to a Soviet strike, the result of the steady Russian strategic build-up and our accompanying apathy.

A report from the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, written as a result of Skelton's amendment to last year's defense authorization bill, makes sobering reading. It describes in detail the human casualties and materiel damage that would result from a Soviet at-

tack. A summary of the report is to be found elsewhere in today's paper.

In Pettis County, there would be virtually no survivors with 15-30 minutes warning and current civil defense capabilities. About 20 percent of the population would be blast fatalities, with the remainder succumbing to fallout. Forty-one percent of housing in the county would be severely damaged, with the rest suffering moderate damage.

The remaining counties in the high-risk zone would suffer to varying degrees in an attack, depending upon their location. Of the nearly 300,000 people living in this area, an estimated 191,000 would become casualties with current civil defense protection and 24 hours warning.

Obviously, Skelton is correct in calling this situation unacceptable. We are certain he has the support of his constituents in seeking to upgrade the nation's civil defense to where it can even remotely begin to meet the need.

Unfortunately, it's an open question whether our leaders, whose disastrously poor judgment allowed us to get in this fix in the first place, can take the necessary steps to help us get out of it.●

TIMELY WARNING ON INFLATION

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the following article on inflation, which appeared in the San Diego Union on April 29, and was written by George Marotta, public affairs coordinator of the Hoover Institution of War, Revolution, and Peace.

Mr. Marotta's comments give us an excellent and timely warning we should all heed.

[From the San Diego Union, Apr. 29, 1979]
ALONG WITH MOTHERHOOD, APPLE PIE? CAN INFLATION BECOME OUR WAY OF LIFE?

(By George Marotta)

Now that inflation has been with us for over a decade many Americans are beginning to learn how to live with it. Furthermore, they are becoming wise in the ways of protecting themselves against its adverse effects. As it continues to persist, a growing number of individuals are even actually learning how to profit from inflation.

Herein lies a growing menace: the more we learn to hedge against, or profit from, inflation the less effort will be exerted to try to stop it. Each unsuccessful bout we have with this problem leaves us at a higher level than before.

The danger exists that it could become so ingrained in our decisions that it will rise beyond our control. The horror stories about the hyper-inflation of some of the Latin American countries and the inflation in Germany following World War I should remind us that it could happen here.

Inflation is already more of a divisive element in our society than we realize. Because most people equate inflation with increase price levels, business is blamed for causing the problem. Labor demands higher wages to keep up with the increased prices. Business raises prices because it anticipates higher wages and controls.

Each element of society is more interested in keeping up with or getting ahead of the problem than in looking for ways of eliminating it. Those who have cost-of-living escalators in their work contracts complain that their increases lag behind inflation. Those without these wage adjusting benefits seek

them. These adjustments give people the illusion that they are keeping up with inflation and they are somewhat pacified.

Inflation is destructive to our basic values. It encourages spending beyond our means. Our spending and borrowing accelerates as we try to get out of dollars which decline, into properties that will retain or gain in value. People who splurged years ago on gold jewelry, diamonds, Persian rugs, antique furniture and fine art have seen their value steadily mount. Our tax laws encourage borrowing with its interest deduction allowance.

While "spenders" are rewarded, savers who try to provide for future needs are penalized. Prudent savers who put their money in U.S. Savings bonds have taken a beating. Every \$100 invested in such bonds 10 years ago is worth only \$89 now. Bank savings last year lost 3.5 percent (the passbook savings rate was 5.5 percent, but inflation ate up 9 percent). Furthermore, the loss increased as a result of federal and state taxes imposed on the interest.

The middle classes who find their savings eroded and their lifestyles deteriorating feel that the rich can protect themselves, while some of the poor are protected by government welfare programs.

The eroding value of the dollar reduces respect both here and abroad. It also affects our other values by turning our world upside down. Saving and investing, previously a virtue, became gambling while spending and borrowing became investing.

A society cannot debase its currency without affecting also its other values. The work ethic diminishes in direct proportion to the instability of the value of wages. Individual responsibility is eroded by uncertainty regarding the future value of the currency.

Uncertainty over the value of purchases causes confusion and mitigates against careful spending. The current boom and spread of gambling from Nevada to Atlantic City reflects a desire by people to reap pleasure from the national currency before it completely loses value.

The growing contempt by people toward the cost of government is reflected in the overwhelming passage of Proposition 13 in California. This was a vote by people against inflation—not against local government. Most realized that the high property taxes were caused by the inflated value of property.

"Substantial deficits in federal finances is mainly responsible for the serious inflation that got under way in our country in the mid-1960s," according to former Federal Reserve Board chairman Arthur Burns. Trying to use Keynesian fiscal policies to limit unemployment has resulted in federal deficits in 23 out of the last 28 years. However, the claim that deficits promote full employment is refuted by the continuing decline in productivity and investment which is the only true base of long-term employment.

It is especially ironic that government, the main cause of inflation, should also be one of its major beneficiaries. This is because government revenues automatically rise faster than inflation because people are pushed into higher tax brackets. A 10 percent price rise results in a 16 percent increase in government revenues.

The disillusionment of the people increases as it watches the government tinker around the edges of the problem it created to enhance its power by instituting wage and price guidelines. Everyone knows that wage and price increases are the symptoms—not the cause—of inflation. It appears that the guidelines have served only to accelerate wage and price increases by business and labor which anticipate the imposition of actual controls.

Respect for government decreases further as one observes the federal officials "jaw-boning" business, labor, and the hospitals. These are futile attempts to divert the pub-

lic attention from the main cause of inflation, government deficit-financing.

Inflation hits many of the poor and elderly especially hard and breeds discontent. It creates bitterness between economic classes as the poor perceive their helplessness and lack of sophistication in developing hedges against, or profiting from, inflation.

The elderly, especially those on fixed incomes, realizing the folly of their previous attempt to provide for their own futures, are turning to government more and more for their needs, and passing the bill to youth. The more politicians rush to fill their health and welfare needs, the less will people save in the future to provide for themselves.

The problem of inflation enhances the power of union leaders as they mount more frequent wage increase campaigns on behalf of their memberships.

Asset-rich companies have less incentive to develop and exploit resources in the face of possible higher returns in the future.

Inflation spreads doubts about the free enterprise system itself. The high interest rates imposed to slow inflation divert funds from the long-term investments which create future profits and jobs. The uncertainty regarding the future rate of inflation and possible government remedial actions hampers business planning.

American companies seem to be merging because inflation prevents them from entering new markets on their own or starting new long-term projects. In addition, the weak U.S. dollar has contributed to a 23 percent increase in acquisitions of American companies by foreign companies.

More and more people feel that they are constantly having to work harder and harder just to maintain their present standard of living. This general frustration and resentment could have serious social consequences. If enough people give up believing that inflation can be checked, we will surely have hyperinflation with all sorts of unpredictable consequences.

Those who try to benefit from it will find that inflation is like a chain letter scheme—the earlier participants will reap large returns, later players will benefit less, and the most recent will lose heavily. If more people try to accommodate to inflation and even benefit from it, we will have a harder time bringing this problem under control.

Some believe it would take a 20 percent annual inflation rate for things to get out of control in the United States. Slowly, but steadily, we are approaching that level. The price rise in February was 1.2 percent. If that rate were to continue, it would amount to 14.5 percent for 1979.

It may be later than we think. ●

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD STAY OUT OF EDUCATION

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government's interference in education is already at a high level, as demonstrated by George Will's recent article on the attack on Grove City College.

If we establish a separate Department of Education, control will be centralized and strengthened even more.

Constitutionally, the Federal Government has no business involving itself in local education. When it does get involved, the results are stultifying.

HEW'S GRIP ON GROVE CITY

(By George F. Will)

Grove City College's troubles began, as many American's troubles do, with a letter from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It began "Dear Recipient" and ordered the college to sign forms confirming compliance with Title IX regulations against sex discrimination.

Such confirmation is required of institutions receiving federal aid. But Grove City insists that it neither seeks nor receives any aid, and it assumed the letter was a simple mistake. Alas, HEW's mistakes rarely have the virtue of simplicity.

The college president says: "I was told in strong terms that they would bring us into compliance one way or another." And he began receiving "insistent, harassing and threatening" calls from HEW.

The college, a small institution in western Pennsylvania, considers itself independent and is determined to remain so. HEW claims the college has forfeited its claim to independence. When HEW acted, about 140 Grove City students were receiving federal tuition grants. HEW argues that such aid to students who choose to use it at Grove City constitutes aid to the college.

The college argues that this is a petty justification for extending HEW's jurisdiction to an institution that has made substantial sacrifices—in terms of direct aid it has not sought—to remain outside such federal jurisdiction. The college says tuition grants establish a relationship only between the government and the student, and the college's only role is in certifying to the government that the student has matriculated.

HEW replies that tuition grants enlarge the number of young people who can consider attending college, so Grove City "benefits by having its pool of potential students increased." HEW's position has a certain chilly logic. And it calls to mind G. K. Chesterton's theory that a madman is not someone who has lost his reason, but rather someone who has lost everything but his reason.

The college has no quarrel with Title IX: "As a matter of Christian belief, it has treated males and females equitably since long before HEW was created." The administrative law judge who ruled that he is powerless to overturn HEW's claim of jurisdiction also emphasized that "There was not the slightest hint of any failure to comply with Title IX, save the refusal to submit an executed assurance of compliance. . . . This refusal is obviously a matter of conscience and belief." Indeed it is: The college believes, reasonably, that signing the form would acknowledge HEW's jurisdiction, and that no good can come of that.

The judge held that HEW was "total and unbridled discretion" in requiring compliance forms. The college is challenging this in court, although Congress, the ultimate source of such discretion, should have the sense to slip a bridle on HEW's imperial bureaucracy.

This latest example of HEW's territorial imperative comes as the dust is still settling in Washington from the splendid Jefferson Lectures delivered by Edward Shils of the University of Chicago. Shils argued that government has come to regard universities as instruments of public policy, and the universities have been eager to be used as such.

After 1945, academic ideology favored a society in which government is "ubiquitously active and omnipotent," and government took responsibility for ensuring the supply of the educated manpower needed for a "knowledge-based economy." The economists who argued the need for such manpower, and the scientists who were elevated in social standing by their argument, were academics. The logic of their argument was that aca-

demics had an enormous claim on society's resources.

In the 1960s, government's goal became the promotion of equality. Rather than recognize that universities are meritocracies, and inherently unsuited to be instruments for that policy, government set about subverting the essence of universities—the rule of merit. It diluted intellectual criteria with sexual and racial criteria in the admission of students and selection of faculty.

Many academics did not resist the saddles and bridles of regulations that came with government aid and enabled government to treat universities as broken horses. Grove City is suffering, in part, the consequences of this "treason of the clerks," the selling-out of fragile, subtle values. But surely HEW has enough tame horses to ride, and can leave alone the spirited, endangered species represented by Grove City. ●

SHOWDOWN APPROACHING FOR DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the House of Representatives may very shortly undertake consideration of H.R. 2444, the bill to create a Federal Department of Education. I believe it is one of the most important pieces of legislation which will be acted upon by the 96th Congress.

I am proud to have been one of the 72 original sponsors of H.R. 2444, which was introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, Mr. BROOKS. I have participated fully in the deliberations of the committee on this legislation, and I believe that the bill we are recommending to the House will achieve much-needed improvement in the administration of the Federal education programs, will produce substantial savings in costs, and will provide national leadership which is sorely needed in American education.

I have just seen an excellent article stating the pros and cons concerning the proposed Department written by George Neill, assistant superintendent of our California State Department of Education in Sacramento. This article appeared in the June 1979 issue of the Phi Delta Kappan, a highly respected professional journal in education. Because I know many of my colleagues are interested in the facts on this matter, I include Mr. Neill's article in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Phi Delta Kappan, June 1979]

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION NEARS SHOWDOWN IN HOUSE

(By George Neill)

The proposed Department of Education, the hottest education issue in Washington for the past two years, teeters at this moment in a "to be or not to be" status.

The final verdict is now in the hands of the House of Representatives, the point where the department was derailed last fall. A vote of yea or nay is expected by the end of this month.

The outcome at press time is highly uncertain. Odds are no better than 50-50, even with unquestionably strong support from the

Carter administration. If similar support had been forthcoming last year, insiders say, success would have been assured. It is much tougher now. By delaying the decision until this year, the opposition won needed time to build a stronger attack.

Opponents are tossing an ingenious array of boobytraps and roadblocks in the path of the bill. Almost certain death was averted when skilled Senate leadership managed to detach an amendment by Senator Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) that called for restoration of voluntary prayer in public schools. Another killer amendment—proposed with undoubted devilish intent by Senator Daniel Moynihan (D-N.Y.)—called for bringing all education activities in the federal government into the new department, thus upsetting careful administration efforts to leave out functions that would upset powerful special interests. The administration wants to avoid unnecessary opposition; Moynihan seeks to stir it up. One wants to pass the bill; the other wants to sabotage it.

Surprisingly, the attacks against the proposed department are increasingly vehement. Arguments first voiced by the American Federation of Teachers are now repeated in shrill tones from both the left and the right.

Much of the attack is based on scare tactics hardly worthy of a serious discussion of an important policy issue. In the view of many informed observers, "Demagogic" may not be too strong a term to describe some of the fears being spread by supposedly responsible voices.

For example, who really believes that the National Education Association could dictate the directions of the new federal department? To those who know the Washington scene, that's laughable. If the NEA has so much influence over federal bureaucrats, why doesn't it have more of a voice in the happenings at the U.S. Office of Education and the National Institute of Education?

Besides offering the NEA red herring, opponents are playing up abhorrence of bureaucracy, which had much to do with the success of Proposition 13. The cry goes something like this: "Now they are at it again, creating a whole new agency, spending more money and concentrating more power in Washington."

It sounds like the George Wallace of the early 1970s, but this time it's being said by people like Albert Shanker, president of the AFT; the Washington Post; and the New York Times.

Unfortunately for those who would like to see education have a stronger voice in the executive branch, these attacks against more bureaucracy, more spending, and more federal control are having a damaging effect on the department's prospects in the climate of today's Washington.

Proponents of the measure believe these charges are ridiculous. They find it hard to see how bringing together already functioning government units from six different departments adds to the bureaucracy, increases costs, or strengthens federal control of education.

If the President is successful, he will, in forming the department, remove education units from the bureaucratic nightmare of HEW and five other departments. A secretary of education would report directly to the President. At present the education units report to department secretaries who usually have "more important" things than education to worry about.

The current weak voice of education in the federal establishment is one of the reasons given by First Lady Rosalynn Carter for favoring the new department. She told a press conference that she has "lobbied Jimmy" about the department because education does not get enough attention in the present scheme of things. She said it is rarely mentioned at cabinet meetings.

"It's lost in HEW . . . It's never brought to the forefront and never discussed. I think we need the Department of Education," she added, "to give visibility to it and to be concerned about the quality of education in our country."

A contrary view was expressed by former President Gerald Ford at a news conference held in New Orleans by the American Association of School Administrators. When asked by this reporter if he thought education already had an appropriately strong voice in the federal government, Ford replied with a most positive "yes." His reason: Strong appointees as U.S. commissioner of education and assistant secretary of HEW for * * * and were heard at the top levels of government. After Ford left, a wag in the back of the room asked: "I wonder if he was talking about Virginia Trotter (Ford's assistant secretary of HEW for education) or Ed Aguirre (Ford appointee as U.S. commissioner of education)?"

Another negative force cited by pro-department forces is the role of Joseph Califano, HEW secretary. Before the administration was firmly committed to the department, Califano was outspoken in his opposition. Recently, he has been quiet. A powerful influence in official Washington, Califano has discreetly let people know he is against the bill. No one can prove, as some have charged, that he has been fighting a quiet but firm rear guard action throughout the debate to undermine any effort to take the E out of HEW and thus diminish his turf. On the surface, at least, Califano must appear to be a good team man.

Two of the most effective spokesmen for the administration's position are James T. McIntyre, Jr., director of the Office of Management and Budget, and Ernest L. Boyer, U.S. commissioner of education.

McIntyre makes a strong case when he points out that the commissioner has little authority or flexibility to manage the programs for which he is responsible. Another problem he cites is the lack of coordination among federal education and related programs. Both of these problems would be solved with the creation of the new department, McIntyre claims.

When asked how much it will cost to set up the new department, McIntyre said it would be \$10 million during the first year of operation. But this will be offset by "the savings that result from the elimination of unnecessary overhead and duplicative staff functions in the Office of the Secretary of HEW and in the HEW Education Division," he said. "In the long run, we expect additional savings through improved financial management systems geared specifically to education programs and more efficient program administration."

Boyer speaks bluntly about the need for change. "To put the matter as pointedly as I can," he told the Senate Committee for Governmental Affairs, "the current organization is indefensible." He points to unclear line/staff relationships between the education units in HEW and concludes that "administrative effectiveness is inevitably diminished." Continuing his attack on the current system, Boyer said "it's sometimes hard for outsiders to decide who's in charge and where responsibility should be fixed; actions are taken by unknown people who cannot be located in a fragmented, overlapping structure." A secretary of education administering a single department "would be more visible and more accountable to the people," Boyer concluded.

The pros and cons are being weighed by members of the House as they approach their day of decision. Meanwhile, in keeping with our times, President Carter's National Advisory Committee for Women has met and asked the White House to name a woman as the first head of the still-to-be-formed department. ●

PANGRATZIO CLEARS THE AIR

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, a letter that appeared in *Industry Week* a year ago, May 15, 1978, becomes more and more relevant as our economy is slowed to a halt by the coercive utopians whose purpose is to reduce the American people to poverty.

Recently reprinted by the International Institute for Economic Research, "Pangratzio Clears the Air" is a parable for our time. It demonstrates the utter folly of this Congress in enacting the laws it has, in giving enormous and unconstitutional powers to irresponsible bureaucrats, and in sustaining those laws and those bureaucrats by endlessly handing over billions of the taxpayers' money.

We have embarked upon a course to disaster. The longer we persist in maintaining this course, the worse the approaching disaster will be. July 1, 1979, is the date on which all further development in most of this Nation will stop, unless Congress acts quickly. It is unbelievable that this body gave the Environmental Protection Agency the power to shut down an entire State if that State does not have an implementation plan approved by the EPA. The threat of no growth is about to be executed. The victims will be the American people. I hope that we, as representatives of those people, will act before it is too late.

The article follows:

PANGRATZIO CLEARS THE AIR

Dear Mr. Editor: Maybe you never heard of me. My name is Pangratzio Squiza. I am writing to tell you about me and the Environmental Police.

I see from your magazine that they are trying to put lots of steel mills out of business. But my story is different. They won't let me go into business.

About ten years ago, I decided to build one day a shoe factory. It took me over eight years to save enough money to be able to get a loan from the bank. About a year and a half ago, I hired an engineer fellow to make designs for my factory. That cost me lots of money, but I paid it, because I don't know how to make designs for a shoe factory. What I know is how to sell shoes.

Well, this engineer fellow designed for me a factory that has a boiler that burns up coal to make steam. He tells me I got to have steam and I got to burn coal. So I took the plans he made for me to my lawyer friend. He wasn't too good a friend, because he charged me a lot of money to explain about the Environmental Police. He said to me that if I am going to burn coal, I have got to get somebody from the Environmental Police to give me a permit.

So I asked him, how do I get a permit?

First, he says, I got to have an *environmental impact statement*. To get one, I had to go and hire some fellows who make these environmental impact studies, which tell you all about how a factory will make new pollution problems. And they charge a pretty good buck to do it. It took them almost a year to write up my study. Then I took the study to the man at the Environmental Police and I told him where I was going to build my shoe factory. He told me I had a

pretty good study there, but I got a pretty bad location.

I asked him, "What do you mean, a bad location? It is right in the city. There are lots of good workers there. Lots of them are out of work and I'll be able to give them a job. There are highways, banks, and railroads close by. I got a good location!"

He says to me, "For you, maybe. But not for the environment. Your factory will make air pollution. And you are in a non-attainment area."

So I asked him, "What is a non-attainment area?" And he tells me it is a place where they already got too much air pollution. And they don't want to let anybody else in.

Well, I asked him, isn't there any way they can let me build my shoe factory in the city? And that is when he told me about offsets.

You see, the Environmental Police have what they call an offsets policy, which is a thing somebody figured out would get new factories into dirty cities. They will let in a new factory if somebody does something about an old factory.

So I asked him what I got to do.

He told me there was a bunch of things I could maybe do. First, he said, maybe I could clean up one of my other factories in that city. But I told him I don't have no other factories in that city.

Then he said maybe I could buy somebody else's factory and shut it down. But I told him I haven't got enough money to buy somebody else's factory. I barely got enough to pay for my factory that I want to build.

Then the man at the Environmental Police said maybe I could make a deal with somebody who already has a factory and get them to clean up their pollution to make room for my pollution. That is what they call an offset.

So I went home and I called a few people I know who know people who have factories. And then they called those other people to ask if they would put in pollution controls to help out Old Pangratzlo.

Then they called me back.

The news wasn't very good. Most of the people they called just laughed. One man thought maybe he could help me, but then he talked to his lawyer and the lawyer told him that if he worked out a deal like that for me, maybe somebody else who wanted to build a factory would say it was a conspiracy. And that might make a big problem with the Antitrust People.

I was getting pretty sick of all the excuses until finally one of my friends found a factory that would help to get me an offset. And I went back to the Environmental Police and told them I found an offset.

They wanted to know the name of the other factory. And when I told them, they said, "No deal!"

I asked why and they said it was because the other factory was dirty. I said, "Of course it's dirty. How you gonna get an offset at a clean factory where they already got stuff to get rid of air pollution?" But the man at the Environmental Police told me the rules said I had to find an offset at a clean factory where they already got the pollution machines the state told them to get.

Well, while I was out looking for a clean factory to clean up, the Congress—they changed the rules. They call them the Clean Air Amendments. These new rules tell the Environmental Police how to work their offsets policy.

Before they voted on the new rules, I called up my congressman and told him about my problem. He told me they would fix me up good with new rules for offsets.

Well, maybe they tried. They wrote something that sounded pretty good, if you could understand it. These new rules say a state can give a permit for a new factory, some-

times, even if the new factory can't find an offset. They call this a waiver.

So I called a man at the State Capitol to ask him if they would give me a permit without getting an offset by using the waiver. The man told me that maybe they could give me a waiver, but first they had to figure out what they had to do to get permission from the Environmental Police in Washington to give out waivers. He said he thought they had to make a plan so that by 1982 there wouldn't be any more non-attainment areas. They needed to clean up everyplace fine, so that nobody lived in a dirty area.

I asked him how long it would take them to make that plan. He said about two years. I told him I couldn't wait two years to get a permit. The bank said it would lend me the money now for my factory, but in two years it might not want to.

They then told me there is something else in the new clean air rules that might let them give me a waiver before they make their new plan—if they make up an inventory list of all the pollution that is coming out of all the smokestacks and if they draw up a quickie plan to start getting rid of some of it. The quickie plan has to be better than their old plan—he called it a State Implementation Plan—but maybe not as good as the new Attainment Plan.

But the man at the State Capitol said that if they do all this for me and give me a waiver now, there is something I gotta do for them. I got to put in what he calls L.A.E.R. That means pollution controls to get the lowest achievable emission rate.

How low is the lowest achievable emission rate? I asked him.

He said he wasn't sure, because Congress told the Environmental Police they could have nine months to figure that out. He said something about a lot of fine print in the new law, something that said L.A.E.R. was as low as the lowest amount allowed by the toughest state, unless it was not achievable.

I asked him: "How do you know if it is achievable?" He said that if it is not achievable, it would be up to me to prove it. He said he could not give me a number because he did not know if anybody proved how low you can go.

Well, I went back and called the fellows who wrote my environmental impact statement to ask them if they knew how low you can go. They weren't too sure, but they thought if I did four things I could get my sulfur emissions pretty low. First, I should buy low-sulfur coal. Then I should use a coal-cleaning process to get out more sulfur. Then I could burn it on a fluidized bed—which is a thing that grabs the sulfur while the coal is burning. And after all that, I could put on a scrubber to get out any sulfur that is still left when the smoke comes up the smokestack.

"If I do all those things, would that be L.A.E.R.?" I asked.

They said maybe.

"How much it's gonna cost?" I asked.

They said it maybe would cost about twice as much as it would cost me to build my factory.

That's when I decided the man at the State Capitol was nuts. So I'd build my factory in another state. But when I called this other state, they told me to forget it, because no matter what the Congress and the Environmental Police did, they weren't going to give any waivers to their offsets policy. They said the people in their state want them to be tough with polluters.

So I decided to stay in my own state, but build my shoe factory out in the country because the air is clean out there and it wouldn't be a non-attainment area. And I wouldn't need an offset or a waiver.

That's when the man at the State Capitol told me about non-degradation, which means

an area is so clean already that they want to keep it that way. He said there are three kinds of nondegradation areas. The best kind, he said, is Class 1, which is like a national park and nobody is going to build a factory there. But I was O.K., because my new property was in a Class 2 area, which is a place where they will let in only a little bit more air pollution.

I told him my factory would only make a little bit more air pollution.

He wanted to know how much more. I said I would have to ask the man who made up my plans. So I went to the engineer fellow and he told me how much sulfur and particles my factory would make every day.

I went back to see the man in the State Capitol and I told him what the engineer fellow said. He told me to hurry up and get my application for a permit in, because somebody else might come in with an application before me, and his factory might use up a thing they called the allowable increment—and then they wouldn't be able to let me come in with my factory.

So I hurried up and filled out my application for the Class 2 area. And I was lucky because when I came back the man told me I was the first one and so there shouldn't be any problem.

But then he told me there was something wrong with my application. He said it didn't explain how the smoke from my factory would be blown around by the wind—and they had to know about that because not too far away is a Class 1 non-degradation area. He told me that before I could get a permit to build my shoe factory in the Class 2 area, I had to prove that my smoke wouldn't blow into the national park.

"You mean ever?" I asked him.

He said no, but it couldn't blow into the national park more than 18 days every year. The Congress decided that a Class 1 area has to be clean only 347 days every year—but only if somebody asks for a permit and gets turned down and the governor decides to give him a variance and the President goes along with it. If you don't get a variance from the governor, then the Class 1 area has to be clean 364 days every year.

So I asked the man at the State Capitol how I could find out if the smoke from my factory would make a problem for the national park. He said I had to get an air modeling study.

I found some new experts who know about air modeling and they did a study for me. They did a pretty good job. But I had to pay them a fat buck. They told me that my air pollution wasn't too bad and it wouldn't make a violation of the allowable increment in the Class 1 area more than about five or six days every year.

I said, fine, that should make the Congress and the man at the State Capitol very happy.

But when I went back to the State Capitol with my engineering plans, my environmental impact study, and my air modeling study—that's when the man told me I was too late. He said somebody came in two days before me with all that stuff and they gave him a permit. And they couldn't give me one, too, because if they let in two factories, then the allowable increment would be violated.

So now I can't build my shoe factory. But that's all right. Because I took a look at my savings account the other day and I discovered that the money that I was going to put into the business I have already spent on the engineering plans, the lawyer's fee, the environmental impact study, and the air modeling study.

Even if the fellows at the Environmental Police would give me a permit for my factory now, I couldn't afford to build it.

So if you know of anybody who would like a good set of plans, please let me know. ●

THE MOVE TO SABOTAGE THE
CANAL TREATIES

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, Sunday's Washington Star published an article by William F. Buckley which challenges the House to consider well our prospective actions to implement the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977. I think Mr. Buckley is right when he suggests that the House has an obligation to accept the treaty as the law of the land and to refrain from an unwise call on the U.S. Marines.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Star, June 3, 1979]

THE MOVE TO SABOTAGE THE CANAL TREATIES

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

Concerning the effort by members of the House of Representatives to derail the Panama treaties, a few observations:

(1) There is only one discipline indispensable to self-government. That is acquiescence in a political fait accompli. The reason democracy doesn't work in most countries in the world is that corporate political decisions are not accepted as binding by the whole of the population. Vice President Richard Nixon had very good reason to believe, in November 1960, that he had in fact won the election. It is the most statesman-like act of his career that he failed to press his claim. Because if he had done so, the country would have been thrown into chaos. Better, in other words, to have permitted Mayor Daley to steal votes in Chicago, than to dismantle the Republic.

(2) The current effort by a few congressmen to draft legislation implementing the Panama treaties isn't, in the proposals of Congressman Hansen, an effort at devising harmonious legislative devices to implement a treaty passed by two-thirds of the U.S. Senate. It is, really, an effort to repeal that treaty. None can, in clear conscience, recognize it as anything but that.

Another way to put it is this: if the Hansen proposals were written into law, the resulting situation would be one that Panama would never have agreed to during the decade of negotiations that led to the 1977 treaties. Moreover, the Hansen proposals ask for more than United States negotiators ever asked for under four presidents, two of them Democrats, two of them Republicans.

Among other things, Mr. Hansen is asking the Panamanians to pay to the U.S. the cost of constructing the canal, plus interest. One wonders why, while he is at it, Mr. Hansen hasn't proposed that Panama also reimburse Congress for the time it has spent in discussing the Panama problem.

The fact of it is that the Hansen proposals are parliamentary exploitation of an unseemly sort. They are the equivalent of a Democratic Congress refusing to pay the cost of the inaugural ceremonies of a Republican president.

(3) Any discussion of money, in the Panama treaty situation, is easily confused if one doesn't take carefully into account that revenues from the operation of the canal aren't infinitely expandable. It is all very well to say, blithely, that the Panama Canal Commission should raise the toll charges 20, 30, 50, 100 per cent. But the demand for the canal is highly elastic. As matters now stand, a freighter traveling from Osaka to New York will flip a coin in deciding whether to use the Panama Canal or the Suez Canal.

The United States has a clear interest in keeping the cost of the canal down. And, under the treaty, a commission the majority of whose members are U.S. citizens would set the toll charges. To impose on Panama economic burdens that could only be discharged by raising those toll charges would result in heavy impositions on shipping, and higher costs to importers and consumers; and, at the margin, to diminished gross revenues as a result of unbearable costs. Thus the Hansen proposals, viewed economically, are an invitation to make the Panama Canal obsolete.

(4) Assuming the Hansen proposals carried in the House, what would the situation then be? Well, the Senate obviously would decline to go along. A majority of the Senate is hardly going to vote to undo what two-thirds of the Senate voted to do last year after the most prolonged debate since the Missouri Compromise. Under the circumstances, the treaty, scheduled to go into effect on October 1, 1979, would be frozen for lack of funds required for its implementation.

This would leave us with what? Not with the Treaty of 1903. That treaty was formally repealed by the Senate when the fresh treaties were enacted. There is no way that Congressman Hansen can bring back the old treaty. We would be left without an operative arrangement with Panama. In legal limbo, so to speak. Panama could then legally seize the canal, withdrawing its commitments under the 1977 Treaty on the grounds that the partner to that treaty had not acted in good faith. And we would then be left with—the United States Marines. Period. We would have cut ourselves off from juridical and moral and military rights we now formally have, but which some people are prepared to give away for one round of applause at an American Legion rally.●

HEROISM AWARD TO BRANISLAV
"BRANKO" ILIC

HON. ADAM BENJAMIN, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. BENJAMIN. Mr. Speaker, allow me to take this opportunity to ask my colleagues to join with me in commending and congratulating Branislav "Branko" Ilic of Whiting, Ind., who on June 12, 1979, will be the recipient of a special heroism award given by the Whiting community in appreciation of his valiant lifesaving efforts while a tragic fire blazed through an apartment building on the south side of Chicago on March 28, 1979.

Mr. Ilic was driving by the scene when he noticed smoke coming from the building. He immediately jumped from his car and, with no regard but for those entrapped, ran into the building to alert the residents and assist in their evacuation. In this attempt, he subsequently required hospitalization. Whereas others might have chosen to ignore the situation, Mr. Ilic cared enough to get involved. The survivors of this tragedy can indeed be grateful that a man of Mr. Ilic's character arrived upon the scene.

His heroics, however, are of little surprise to those who grew up with him. Following his emigration from Yugoslavia to the United States as a young boy, "Branko" quickly rose through the

ranks of the Boy Scouts, earning many badges and honors.

A Whiting (Ind.) High School graduate, "Branko" continued his education at Ball State University where he graduated from the School of Education and excelled in soccer. He has since become very active in the recent soccer movement in Indiana and Illinois. He has also served as a court bailiff for Whiting City Court Judge William J. Obermiller.

The appreciative citizens of Whiting have chosen to honor Branislav Ilic by the presentation of the heroism award. I proudly join them in saluting this outstanding man.

Mr. Ilic is presently planning the opening of a sporting goods-soccer store and I'm sure my colleagues join me in wishing "Branko" Ilic and his family every success.●

AWASH IN OIL AND OUT
OF GASOLINE

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, what we are now witnessing in the current gasoline shortage is the cumulation of things that have been going on for years. We are seeing the cumulation of years of agitation by the environmentalists and others against new refineries. We are seeing the cumulation of the blocking of the Alaskan pipeline for years. We are seeing the results of the years of delay in building a pipeline across the West to bring the Alaskan crude to the rest of the Nation. The newsletter "Access to Energy" for June 1, 1979 recently summed up this situation very well. It pointed out who should be sharing the blame in California. The article follows:

AWASH IN OIL AND OUT OF GASOLINE

What has happened to California will soon happen to the rest of the country. In California government regulation was merely wedded to de-industrialization earlier and with a heavier dose of insanity.

When the sham-environmentalists lost their battle against the Alaskan pipeline, they were quick to man the second lines of defense: Legal prohibition of exporting Alaskan crude to Japan (and trading it for oil from Japan's present suppliers such as Mexico); no refineries; and no pipelines.

When, in 1975, Dow Chemical tried to build the world's cleanest refinery—a \$1 billion, 1,000-job plant—Jerry Brown-out's de-industrializers so obstructed Dow with red tape, permits and environmental impact reports that some 40 permits and more than \$1 million later the company gave up.

When Sohio tried to build a crude terminal at Long Beach with 200 miles of pipeline across California to connect with the existing system that would have brought Alaskan crude to the rest of the country, Brown-out and Tom Quinn, chief of one of his wrecking crews, beat the life out of this project, as they had beaten it out of the Sundesert project and all other energy facilities threatening to give California what it desperately needed.

All of this went on behind a nightmarish smokescreen of eyewash and hypocrisy. California did not need any power plants, claimed Brown-out, because he was going to generate electricity by windmills, burning corn

husks, and by introducing solar power with the help of such renowned scientists as Solarcal's director Tom Hayden. His "scientific" adviser R. Schweikart discusses the future of nuclear energy in a public meeting with a metallic star pasted to his forehead and dancers beating drums circling the panel of "energy experts" around him.*

It is, of course, not possible to dupe the gullible forever with baloney about Californian current from corn husks and wonderful warmth from wood waste, and Brown-out's cronies have now quietly taken action to ease the construction of coal-fired plants and have requested permission to be exempted from the federal ban of building more oil-fired power plants. With the mental acrobatics of one who explains why your local fire department's water hoses should prudently be replaced by gasoline sprays, R. Maullin (heading another of Brown-out's wrecking crews) claims that oil-fired power plants will result in burning less foreign oil.

Meanwhile Brown-out himself takes to the streets of Washington, D.C., to rave against nuclear power on the very day that the gasoline lines in California grow up to 8 miles long, as he prepares for next year's campaign, in which he may run for Queen of the USA.

Few things could be more typical for the abyss between those who want to produce wealth and those who want to redistribute it than the gasoline lines. The cause, say the redistributors, is the oil companies' greed for profits; the cure is rationing the shortages and post-officiating the oil industry.

No, say the producers: Get the regulators and deindustrializers out of the way, and let us freely produce America's hamstring energy resources. ●

NATIONAL GRAIN BOARD

HON. JAMES WEAVER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the testimony I delivered today before the House Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains, concerning the potential benefits of the establishment of a national grain board, as proposed in my bill, H.R. 4237.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY ON H.R. 4237

(By Jim Weaver)

Chairman Rose, gentleman of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains, I am honored to come before you today to speak on behalf of H.R. 4237, the National Grain Board Bill of 1979. I will seek to show the great need which currently exists for a strong, forward-looking American grain export policy, and to demonstrate how the creation of a National Grain Board would benefit American farmers and consumers, as well as the people of other nations.

Since the dust storms of the depression years, the United States has truly become the world's granary. In 1978, we exported over 3.3 billion bushels of wheat, corn, and other grains. Each year, we export over two-thirds of our total wheat harvest. Over half the grain in international markets comes from the United States.

In a world in which the total demand for food is steadily increasing at the rate of over 3 percent per year, any nation with such a tremendous agricultural resource should be expected to boast a healthy farm economy and an enviable balance of trade.

Yet the American people can boast of

neither of these benefits. Our farm economy is, by any rational measure, disintegrating yearly, and our balance of payments is in the worst shape in the history of the republic.

From the point of view of the American public, not just farmers, but consumers as well, our national grain policy is every bit as bankrupt as our national oil policy.

Since the 1930's, four million family farms have disappeared from the American agricultural scene. 27,000 more are expected to go under this year. Corporate farms administered by huge, vertically integrated agribusiness corporations annually take over and dominate an increasingly large portion of the farm economy.

The corporate take-over of American farming has not profited consumers either. Food prices are rising at unprecedented rates. Earlier this winter, food prices rising at an annual rate of over 16 percent accounted for more than a third of the rise in the Consumer Price Index as a whole.

Every American citizen suffers under the long siege of our balance of payments deficit. In relationship to Japan alone, we face a deficit of over \$11 billion. Our total balance of payments deficit is over \$30 billion. Last year our imports increased by \$28 billion, while the value of our exports rose by only \$6 billion.

What all these figures prove is that we have yet to learn, as a country, the hard-nosed facts of the game of international trade. In a recent article in the Atlantic, economist Eliot Janeway put the matter very well:

"The United States is suffering from an antiquated and amateurish willingness to muddle along, paying more cash out of one pocket for oil imports, collecting less cash in another pocket from exports, and wasting dollars to settle its disastrous deficits. The price every American is paying for the politics of gullibility and the economics of appeasement is intolerable interest rates . . . They are both a consequence and cause of inflation."

There is little doubt that this intolerable inflation is caused, at least in part, by our seeming unwillingness to trade aggressively in the international market where we enjoy a natural advantage.

In 1970, oil and grain brought virtually the same price on the international market—\$2 for a bushel of wheat, \$2 for a barrel of oil. Since then, we have watched as the OPEC nations, through concerted political action, have successfully hiked the price of oil to almost nine times what they were getting then.

Mr. Chairman, grain is to the United States what oil is to the Arabs—it is our greatest potential trade resource. Yet we have not managed to turn this great resource to the benefit of the American farmer, or the American public. While oil is now selling in the international spot market for \$30 a barrel, and with the OPEC price hovering between \$16 and \$18 and threatening to go up, we are still getting only about \$3 for a bushel of wheat.

This stunning discrepancy simply emphasizes the misguided nature of our national grain export policy. The National Grain Board Bill of 1979 is designed to change that situation.

It is designed to give the United States the means by which to cooperate with the grain boards of Canada and Australia to raise the international market price for grain.

It is designed to allow the federal government to barter grain for foreign oil.

It is intended to provide a better return for American farmers.

It will provide us with the ability to monitor effectively the purchases of American grain made by foreign governments and pre-

vent further reenactment of the great grain robberies of 1972 and 1975.

It will not require the creation of any new bureaucracy, as the Grain Board would be the existing Commodity Credit Corporation.

A properly managed Grain Board would have a significant impact on our national balance of payments problem.

It would stabilize world grain prices and encourage Third World countries to develop their own agricultural resources.

And it would not cost the American taxpayer a penny.

Mr. Chairman, when I say, "Let's start getting a barrel for a bushel once again," I don't mean that a National Grain Board should be expected to immediately raise the price of wheat to \$16 a bushel. I think only our own Department of Agriculture has chosen to take that phrase so literally. What I mean is, it's time we started using our grain resource in a rational way to benefit the people of the United States, it is time we began to close the gap between grain prices and oil prices, instead of letting the difference grow continually larger and larger.

If a well-managed grain board were able to raise the average price of American grain in the world market by even \$1 a bushel, (and there is every reason to assume that it could do so), we could reduce our balance of payments deficit by \$3.3 billion. And judging by the response which people have been giving to the "barrel for bushel" slogan, the vast majority of the American public thinks that would not be such a bad idea.

Yet, without a Grain Board, such an improvement is most certainly impossible. Because our national grain policy now caters to the needs of the huge grain companies and agribusinesses, just as our oil policy is catered to the needs of the energy industry.

In fact, there are many parallels between the world grain trade and the world oil trade. Grain is a necessity worldwide, as is oil. In international trade, grain is almost totally controlled by five enormous multinational corporations. In oil the number is seven. These corporations do not report to the American people, nor do they owe us any particular allegiance. The grain corporations—Cargill, Continental, Louis-Dreyfus, Bunge, Andre, are even more secretive in their operations than the giants of oil. They are family owned, and are not required to make annual public reports to their stockholders. As a result, we know very little about them. What we do know is the result of some very fine investigative work on the part of a few journalists and Congressional committees.

We do know that these giant grain companies, once again paralleling the energy industry, are using their enormous profits to diversify their control of U.S. agriculture. And they do make enormous profits: In 1972, Cargill had net sales of \$5.2 billion, and enjoyed profits of \$107.8 million on a net worth of \$352.4 million. In 1979, Cargill has projected sales of \$12.6 billion and profits of over \$150 million.

Evidence accumulated in Dan Morgan's recently published Merchants of Grain indicates that Cargill is using its grain profits in a successful effort to exercise a dominant influence in other areas of agriculture as well. According to Morgan:

"Between 1970 and 1978, Cargill bought two steel companies, Ralston Purina's nationwide turkey processing and marketing facilities, Texas and Kansas based flour companies with their own lines of grain elevators, 137 grain elevators in Canada, a solid waste disposal plant in Delaware, a Memphis cotton company, and a Nevada life insurance firm. The bill for all this was in excess of \$300 million."

Cargill has since acquired MBFXL, the nation's second largest beef packing house. As Morgan says: "(it is now) possible to say that Americans eat steak cut from animals

*Los Angeles Times, 4/15/79.

fattened on Cargill grain in Cargill feedlots and slaughtered in a Cargill packing house."

Mr. Chairman, this economic concentration has been disastrous for consumers and producers alike. We know that these vertically integrated conglomerates are able to use their dominance of the agricultural chain of production and distribution to make enormous profits. They are also known to use their extensive networks of foreign subsidiaries to avoid paying U.S. taxes, and to avoid federal reporting regulations which they find onerous. They can and do manipulate market instabilities for their own benefit, and to the detriment of their customers both here and in Third World countries. And their ever-increasing profits stand in stark contrast to the economic difficulties faced by farmers here at home.

But the grain companies are not the sole beneficiaries of the current grain policy of the Department of Agriculture. It also benefits foreign governments. As Senator McGovern pointed out in the debate on the Senate resolution urging President Carter to work toward the possibility of American participation in a wheat-exporter's cartel, many of the largest importers of American wheat are currently reaping double profits from our low prices. The Japanese Government, for instance, buys our wheat at the going price, around \$3 a bushel, and then adds an import tariff of almost double the original price before turning around and selling it to their own millers for between \$9 and \$11 a bushel.

This is not an isolated instance. It has been estimated by authorities in the field that over 80 percent of all American grain exports are purchased by countries with central purchasing commissions. The National Farmers Union has published a list of the various internal price support levels established in over 40 countries to which the U.S. exports wheat, ranging from \$4.08 in Chile to an astonishing \$22.97 in Japan.

In this situation, for representatives of the USDA, or the grain trade, to claim that the establishment of a National Grain Board would disturb the delicate balance of the free market, borders on the ridiculous. There is no free market in the international grain trade—and the only nation which has not yet faced up to that fact is the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this is not just a theoretical question. The naïveté of the Department of Agriculture in dealing with the giant grain conglomerates and with the purchasing commissions of foreign governments has cost American taxpayers millions of dollars. The record of the great Soviet grain robbery of 1972 speaks for itself. That disaster, in which the Soviets were able to buy 18 million tons of American grain at artificially low prices, and without the knowledge of the USDA, caused U.S. food prices to jump almost 20% in a single year. After that, Congress amended the Agriculture Act to institute, for the first time, very minimal reporting requirements for export grain sales. Representatives of the Department of Agriculture lobbied against even these reporting requirements, although they were proved inadequate only three years later, in 1975. In that year the Soviet purchasing commission again made off with over 10 million tons of U.S. grain, once again spot purchased at conveniently low prices, once again under the nose of the Department of Agriculture.

Representatives of the Department of Agriculture have made many statements in opposition to the establishment of a National Grain Board. But basically, they all boil down to the same tired phrase: "We just can't get any better price for our wheat than we are getting now."

Yet it is clear that foreign customers will pay more than \$3/bushel for American wheat. In Japan, millers are already paying \$11. In the common market countries, they pay \$7. In Korea and Switzerland, over \$10. In Taiwan, \$7.50. In fact, the United States

currently sets the world price floor for wheat, by underpricing every other exporter and sweeping the bottom of the market.

And it is also clear that the other major grain exporting nations, Canada and Australia, are more than willing to consider the possibility of international cooperation to raise world grain prices. When Senators McGovern, Melcher, and Bellmon met with representatives of the Canadian Wheat Board last year, they were assured that the Canadians were interested in ending price competition between the two nations and at arriving at a "reasonable price that Canadian and U.S. wheat could be sold for in international markets." And the senators received written assurance of the same kind from the Australian grain board, and from representatives of the Argentine government.

Mr. Chairman, the National Grain Board set up under this bill could indeed raise the international price of grain. By cooperating with the Canadian Wheat Board and Australian Grain Board, and by offering long term contracts to the purchasing commissions of foreign governments, it could completely alter the structure of the international grain market.

Curiously, the same people who object to the establishment of a National Grain Board on the grounds that it could not effectively raise the international market price of grain, claim in the same breath that it would raise consumer prices here at home. Now it is hard to see how those two claims can both be true, and in fact, neither one is supported by the evidence.

According to studies undertaken by two well-known agricultural specialists at the Library of Congress, Mr. Walter Wilcox and Mr. Barry Carr, a grain board could effectively raise the international price of American grain and bring a better return to American producers. I would like to quote from Mr. Wilcox' report:

"The U.S. National Grain Board might announce minimum prices for key grades of wheat at the main ports. It is probable that the Board would set minimum prices slightly higher than the current levels, expecting other major exporters, especially Canada, to adopt similar price policies. . . . If several of the major exporters, especially Canada and Australia, adopt similar export price policies there could be some short run gain to the producers in the exporting countries with only a small reduction in exports from the potential that might have been sold at somewhat lower prices."

Mr. Carr investigated the relationship between raw wheat and the retail price of bread on the domestic market. The raw wheat component in the final retail price of bread is surprisingly low: consistently less than the cost of the plastic in which the bread is wrapped. Current estimates show that at the existing price of \$3/bushel, raw wheat cost contributes less than 3¢ to the price of a loaf of bread. To quote from Mr. Carr's report:

"A substantial increase in farm value may have little or no impact on the retail price when the farm value of a product represents a small percentage of the retail price, as is the case of products requiring a high degree of processing. . . . An increase in the wheat price from the current level of \$3.00 to \$3.60 would add less than one cent to the raw material cost of a loaf of bread."

But aside from getting a better price on cash sales, the Board could also barter grain for oil or other strategic materials.

The current cost of production for a bushel of wheat is estimated between \$4 and \$5, depending on the region of the country and exactly what cost factors are included. Either way, at the current export sale price of about \$3.10/bushel, American farmers are

losing over \$1 billion a year in equity through overseas sales.

That is the reason why this bill contains a minimum export price equal to the target price of each crop handled by the board. And that is also why the revenues which come to the board, in excess of the cost of purchasing, storing, and handling the grain, are to be returned to the farmers.

The National Grain Board is explicitly intended to bring a more just return to the American farmer. Still, we must insure that farmers are adequately represented in the policy-making process by which the board forms its long range goals and also its day to day operations.

In response to this need, the National Grain Board Bill would establish a farmers' advisory commission to work closely with the Board of Directors of the Grain Board. The advisory commission would give farmers a much needed voice in grain board operations, and would also tend to direct the board away from the kind of policy, practiced by the Commodity Credit Corporation at times in the past, which damages the interests of producers. This advisory voice given to farmers, added to the established minimum export price, will prevent "dumping" grain at prices injurious to the farm community.

The grain board is also explicitly directed to get the highest possible international price for American grain. It is my belief that this policy will benefit not only the citizens of this country, but also the people of other nations, including third world countries.

The grain board's export policies would be controlling in the area of commercial sales. The concessional sales programs currently administered under P.L. 480 could be expected to go on much as they do now. Yet the actions of the board would tend to alleviate some of the problems experienced by grain-dependent third world countries.

Currently, price fluctuations in the international grain market, over which developing nations have very little control, cause these nations great hardship. A grain board would act to stabilize prices over the long term, providing a benchmark for agricultural policy for third world nations.

The gradual rise in export prices which a grain board could achieve would encourage agricultural investment in nations which currently have no incentive for such investment because of the artificially low price of American grain.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the Subcommittee: as you know, I have introduced a National Grain Board Bill in each session I have been in Congress. I am dedicated to the idea that the American government should act on behalf of all Americans to establish a National Grain Board and transform our grain export policy. Grain is our greatest trade resource, and it is time the American people and the American farmer reaped a just reward for being the world's granary. A just reward for providing Russia with wheat, Japan with soybeans, Europe with corn.

But I am not so dedicated to the present form of this idea as to be inflexible. You gentlemen have a great store of knowledge concerning these matters. I ask you to look at this bill with an open mind and to give it the full benefit of your expertise. Where you find sections which you consider awkward or capable of improvement—amend them, improve the idea. But do not deny this possibility to the American people or to American farmers.

We can no longer afford to tolerate a situation in which foreign countries buy our grain at bargain-basement prices while we are paying out billions for exorbitantly expensive foreign oil.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify before you today. ●

ZIMBABWE RHODESIA: "LITTLE HAS CHANGED"

HON. ANDREW MAGUIRE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert a column by William Raspberry from the Washington Post of June 1, 1979 into the RECORD. In this article, the author argues convincingly for the retention of sanctions against Zimbabwe-Rhodesia. By using the analogy of the suspension of a National Collegiate Athletic Association member college for recruiting violations, he points out that once sanctions had been initiated, the burden of proof rests with any new government to prove that all past grievances had been resolved. Mr. Raspberry shows that this has not occurred, as most of the changes in the Government have been superficial.

Mr. Raspberry further discusses the geopolitical implications of the United States lifting sanctions. Not only would we align ourselves with the white racist regime of South Africa, but we would find ourselves and the Soviet Union backing opposing sides in another war of liberation.

Finally, of course, there is the whole issue of Nigeria's reaction—Nigeria being our second biggest supplier of foreign oil.

The question of whether or not to lift sanctions in Zimbabwe-Rhodesia involves more than comparing the legitimacy of Zimbabwe-Rhodesia's elections with those in other countries; it also involves consideration of Rhodesia's past performance, the structure of its new government, and the implications of such action in our own country.

The column follows:

ZIMBABWE RHODESIA: 'LITTLE HAS CHANGED'
(By William Raspberry)

If it were proposed today that the United Nations Security Council impose mandatory sanctions against Zimbabwe Rhodesia, the proposition would fail.

After all, the country now has an interracial government in whose election the black majority participated. Ian Smith, the long-standing symbol of minority rule, has been replaced by a black prime minister. The country is a long way from one-man-one-vote democracy, but it no longer is the world's worst example of racist rule.

If enough has changed so that sanctions wouldn't be imposed today, doesn't it follow that the previously imposed sanctions should be lifted?

Not necessarily. A useful analogy might be to a National Collegiate Athletic Association suspension of a member college for recruiting violations. The NCAA wouldn't dream of lifting the suspension after the offending college had improved only to the point where its recruiting violations were no more egregious than those of several other members. Once the penalty is imposed, perfunctory reform is insufficient for a return to good standing.

The reform in Rhodesia has been perfunctory at best. The refusal of the white minority to relinquish control, which led to the imposition of sanctions 15 years ago, remains the essential fact of life there, the recent cosmetic changes notwithstanding.

A cursory review of the new constitution, adopted without any black participation whatever, reveals how little has changed.

To take one example of dozens available, the constitution's Declaration of Rights provides that, "No person shall be deprived of his life intentionally save in execution of the sentence of a court in respect of a criminal offense of which he has been convicted."

On the surface, that is a significant reform. But look beneath the surface at the exceptions. "A person shall not be regarded as having been deprived of his life in contravention of this section if he dies as the result of the use . . . of such force as is reasonably justifiable:

"a) For the defense of any person from violence or for the defense of property; or

"b) In order to effect a lawful arrest or to prevent the escape of a person lawfully detained; or

"c) For the purpose of suppressing a riot, insurrection or mutiny; or of dispersing an unlawful gathering; or

"d) In order to prevent the commission by that person of a criminal offense . . ."

Then:
"It shall be deemed sufficient justification for the purpose of [this] subsection . . . if it is shown that the force used did not exceed that which might lawfully have been used in the circumstances of that case under the law in force immediately before the fixed date" (italics added).

In other words, the constitution prohibits the use of deadly force, except under virtually any circumstance imaginable—including circumstances under which it would have been legal under the old Rhodesian law.

But the sham of constitutional and electoral reform is not the only problem with the lifting of the sanctions.

Of more practical concern to the United States are the geopolitical implications of removing the sanctions.

A precipitous American move to support the government of the new prime minister, Bishop Abel Muzorewa—even to the extent of lifting the sanctions—would have the effect of placing the United States in the pro-white-minority camp of South Africa, against the whole of black Africa and most of the Third World.

Once the decision is reached that the Muzorewa government is okay, how could we say no to a request for military aid in the continuing guerrilla war? If we wind up supporting the white minority, along with South Africa, against the Patriotic Front, the result could be politically disastrous, here and around the world.

We would lose our still-considerable influence with such Front Line states as Zambia, which would almost certainly come under increasing military attacks by Rhodesia. The Soviet Union would increase its support for the guerrillas, making them the good guys in yet another war of liberation.

Then there is the pragmatic question of the likely reaction of Nigeria, our second biggest supplier (behind Saudi Arabia) of foreign oil.

If lifting the sanctions were clearly the right thing to do, we might be prepared to live with the consequences of that choice. But it isn't that clearly right, and the United States would be well-advised to move with extreme caution.

We have disasters enough already.●

POPE JOHN PAUL II

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, many of us have spiritually shared the trip of

Pope John Paul II to his native Poland. We have praised God for his defense of human rights and the Christian faith in a region of the world where freedom and religion are cruelly oppressed.

Massive assemblies of the people of Poland prayed with the Pope and were elated by his words of faith and hope. The spirit of these people for their national independence and their faith can never be stilled by the oppressive forces of Soviet power. They are an example for the whole world. Pope John Paul II is a great pastor, and we should be thankful for the presence of this wonderful Christian leader on the world scene.●

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
AMENDMENT

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, two of Carter's worst campaign promises were cargo preference and a Cabinet Department of Education.

Both were made to well-heeled labor organizations.

There is a valid argument, however, for taking the present collection of minor offices in the educational field out from under the vast complexity of HEW. While the present Office of Education has few responsibilities other than writing checks or selecting grant recipients, it is hard to even find their offices, let alone have one of their minor functionaries be able to get the attention of Secretary Califano.

As a separate office, Education would undoubtedly do better work than it presently is doing, and it would also be more accountable to the States and local school systems whom it allegedly serves.

Therefore, when H.R. 2444 to create the Cabinet-level Department reaches the floor, I will offer a simple amendment to make the proposed new agency independent from HEW, while not assigning it the dignity of Cabinet status and the inherent powers of policy making which cabinet status infers.

The findings section of H.R. 2444 will then read as follows:

Sec. 101. The Congress of the United States finds that—

(1) education is fundamental to the development of the individual and to the growth of the Nation;

(2) the current structure of the executive branch unnecessarily submerges the Office of Education in the large and unwieldy bureaucracy of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which of necessity directs its primary attention to the problems of health and welfare;

(3) the primary responsibility for education has been and should remain with State and local governments, public and non-public institutions, communities, and families;

(4) there is a continuing need to ensure equality of educational opportunity and to improve the quality of education and it is appropriate that there be an independent Office of Education in the Federal government to coordinate assistance to State and local governments; and

(5) the number, fragmentation, and complexity of Federal education programs has created management problems at the Federal, State, local, and institutional levels, which should be ameliorated by separating, simplifying, and decreasing the size of the U.S. Office of Education.●

THE LOMITA LIBRARY—65 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on June 9, 1979, the Friends of the Lomita Library, library officials, and patrons will join in celebrating the 65th anniversary of the Lomita Library. And, rightfully so. The people of Lomita can well be proud of their library and the community members who have worked so hard throughout these past 65 years to promote its growth.

It is hard to believe that this fine community library started, in 1914, in a small local clubhouse. They had only 232 books—mostly donated—and a volunteer custodian. When they first opened the door there were only 14 library cardholders registered.

The library did not remain long in these makeshift quarters. In 1918, it was moved to a storefront room in the Smith Building, located at Lomita Boulevard and Narbonne Avenue. This was the library's home for the next 10 years. Both patronage and the library's collection grew modestly during these years. By 1927, 857 people were using its 1,973 volumes and 12 magazines.

In 1928, the Lomita Library again moved to larger quarters. This time to 24704 Narbonne. It stayed in this 1,000-square-foot building for the next 32 years.

By 1960, the library's collection had tripled and it moved to the building which formerly housed the Lomita Pioneer Press at 24648 Narbonne Avenue.

The 1970's brought on greater growth and demand for library services. Citizen interest led to the formation of the Friends of the Lomita Library organization. With Linda Croyts as its first president, "The Friends" supported a number of library improvement programs. Their hard work and fundraisers made possible the purchase of new equipment, books, and magazine subscriptions.

It was in 1976 that the Lomita Library became permanently established in the community. After months of planning and construction, the Lomita Library was dedicated on April 10, 1976, as part of the new city civic center.

Today, the Lomita Library offers its many resources—including over 20,000 volumes—not only to students and citizens of Lomita, but to the whole area. The library's services provide countless hours of education, relaxation, and pleasure for those who enter the doors.

Mr. Speaker, America's free public libraries are one of our most valuable resources. They do not "grow overnight." They only come about because of the people in the communities across our Na-

tion who care. People who care enough to donate their time, energy, and money for the good of the fellow citizens.

The Lomita Library exists today just because of these people who cared, who gave willingly of their time, energy, and funds. Their concern, interest, and efforts have built an everlasting contribution to the community.

My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating and thanking everyone who has supported the Lomita Library during these past 65 years. A very fine job, indeed.●

FATHER JOHN SERVODIDIO

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the five boroughs of New York City include my own district of Staten Island, which has too often been forgotten by those who think of the boundaries of New York as stopping at the edges of Manhattan. Fortunately, however, the Borough of Staten Island has never been forgotten by men like Father John Servodidio.

Father Servodidio is one of those unique people who seems to be everywhere, and particularly where he is needed the most. His service to the community is now celebrated by the city with the observation of the silver anniversary of Father Servodidio's ordination to the priesthood. It is hard for us who know him to believe, because Father John is as youthful, as energetic, and as thoroughly concerned with our community in 1979 as he was in 1954. He certainly could have been successful in any field he might have chosen, but we are most fortunate that the one he finally chose was to be of vital service to all people.

His extensive background includes virtually every position in which he could be considered to be directly helping those in need: since 1967, he has been district director of the Catholic charities of New York, and the family and community service of Staten Island; he is chairman of chaplains of the drug abuse control commission, Arthur Kill Rehabilitation Center of Staten Island; and he has held numerous similar positions of responsibility. He is a member in good standing of literally dozens of organizations devoted to community service, ranging from the American Legion, Kiwanis, and Boy Scouts, to the Youth Council, the Urban League, Catholic Youth Organization, and on to such specialized groups as the Staten Island Community Corporation, the Regional Mental Retardation Program, the Community Health Council, and other health-related organizations. The list is almost too long to include here, but the point, quite obviously, is that Father Servodidio is a man whose interest in the welfare of the community is matched only by the endless devotion of his efforts to see that those interests of the people of the community are well served.

And in those areas where he is well known for his expertise, none exceeds his

special attention to the problem of drug addiction, particularly among children. He is well known and respected for his presentations regarding such addiction, the rehabilitation of the addict and his family, and the role of religion in the process of rehabilitation. He is frequently sought for media appearances in this field.

The people of New York will celebrate Father Servodidio's quarter century of service with a Silver Jubilee dinner in his honor on June 13th. It is a true opportunity for us to show our appreciation for the years of love and commitment that he has shared with us. It is now time for we New Yorkers, and especially we Staten Islanders, to return that love and devotion.●

REPORT ON 15TH MEETING WITH EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT DELEGATION

HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter congressional recess, I had the honor of leading a study mission to Paris to meet with a delegation of the European Parliament. This meeting was the 15th in a series of regular semiannual exchanges which has been in existence since 1972.

Our delegation was cochaired by my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN). It also included: the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. FITHIAN), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GRAY), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MADIGAN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STANTON).

All of these Members were active participants in the discussions with our European colleagues on a number of agenda topics of vital concern to our respective governments. I am grateful to all of them for their individual contributions and for their assistance to me on my first assignment as chairman of the U.S. delegation.

Mr. Speaker, we live in an era in which much media attention is devoted to other, perhaps more exotic and remote areas of the world. Without in any way denigrating the importance of developments in those regions, I have the impression that we tend to overlook some of the significant events occurring in Western Europe, where we have so much at stake and where developments in trade and mutual security affect us so directly.

The year 1979 is, in fact, an important year for Europe: The nine member-nations of the European Communities will be holding their first direct elections to the European Parliament on June 7 and 10, an event which is of considerable consequence in the movement toward European unity. It is, in fact, an unprecedented undertaking which merits our collective recognition and support.

Moreover, the multilateral trade nego-

tiations have recently been concluded and now await congressional action, while NATO has just celebrated its 30th anniversary—April 4.

It is for these reasons, among others, that I include in the RECORD at this time a detailed report I have just submitted to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (Mr. ZABLOCKI) on the purpose of our mission, the policy questions reviewed and discussed, and the information received and imparted. I believe that anyone who reads this material in its entirety will conclude that in Paris we were engaged in serious business which is directly related to our legislative responsibilities. I also believe that the issues we discussed are of crucial importance to all Americans, who will be affected, in one way or another, by their outcome.

As a former member of the fourth estate, I also commend this report to our friends in the press gallery and ask them to give its substance the same careful scrutiny which is normally accorded to the administrative aspects of congressional travel.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1979.

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During last April's Easter recess, I had the distinct privilege of leading a study mission to Paris. The primary purpose of this trip was to meet with a delegation of the European Parliament in the context of a semi-annual parliamentary exchange that has been in existence since 1972. This was, in fact, the 15th meeting of the two delegations and was, in my judgment, a highly informative and successful one which I would like to report on in some detail. This meeting was also the last one with members of an appointed European Parliament. Our next encounter, in October of this year, will be with members of a directly elected body.

Let me record at the outset that my distinguished colleagues, Representatives Sam Gibbons and Larry Winn, Jr., who served as co-chairmen of the delegation, were particularly helpful to me in my first assignment as chairman of the U.S. group. Other members of the delegation, which included Representatives Floyd Fithian, Benjamin Gilman, William Gray, Bill Frenzel, Edward Madigan and J. William Stanton, all performed with distinction and made important individual contributions to the substantive discussions. I am grateful, indeed, for their participation and support.

1979 is a particularly important year in the history of Western Europe and its relationship with the United States: At this moment, the nine member-nations of the European Communities (EC) are preparing for the first direct elections to the European Parliament, to be held June 7 and June 10—an event which marks a significant milestone in the movement toward European unity. Just prior to our arrival in Paris, the Multilateral Trade Negotiations had been concluded and are presently awaiting action by the Congress. The NATO alliance celebrated its 30th anniversary on April 4 of this year and is now undergoing an intensive effort to strengthen its combat effectiveness. Europeans, like Americans, are concerned over the future availability of energy supplies and are paying considerably higher prices for gasoline. The eventual outcome of SALT II and its implications for Western Europe is

also a subject of widespread interest and concern.

Since France holds the rotating presidency of the Council of Ministers of the European Communities during the first six months of 1979, it was fitting that the French capital was selected by our European hosts as the site of our meeting. During our stay in Paris, we had the opportunity to meet with a variety of U.S. and French government officials to review U.S.-French bilateral relations and assess France's political and economic situation. We also conferred with representatives of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the International Energy Agency (IEA) and discussed a number of macro-economic issues of concern to industrialized countries.

Upon arrival in Paris, the delegation was briefed, on April 14, by two political officers from the U.S. Embassy in Paris on French defense and nuclear policies and on French internal politics.

A consensus exists among all of France's major political forces regarding defense policy, including the existence of a French independent nuclear force. Although controversial for many years, the French nuclear force is now supported by all the major political parties in France, including the Socialist and Communist parties.

Under a five-year defense plan initiated in 1976, French defense expenditures will grow from 14 to 20 percent of its total national budget. France has been increasing its defense outlays by over four percent annually in real terms. This trend preceded the decision taken at the London Summit in May 1977 by the United States and its allies to increase real defense spending by three percent annually.

France has a twelve-month universal conscription system, which drafts approximately 500,000 men per year. However, the pool of available draftees is much larger than necessary to meet annual quotas so that many young men are not actually inducted into the armed forces. Draftees have the option of serving 16 months of alternate service in such areas as health or the French equivalent of the Peace Corps (Coopération).

France has been a member of NATO since its creation in 1949. In 1966, however, France withdrew from the integrated command, and NATO installations were removed from French soil. While there is little likelihood that France will ever again participate in NATO's integrated command, France has cooperated, in a low-profile fashion, in some NATO military-related projects. Government leaders remain skeptical, however, about the concept of weapons standardization. France herself produces the entire gamut of weapons, from small arms to nuclear weapons, and values her ability to do so in the face of American domination of the arms market.

With regard to nuclear proliferation, France, while not a signatory of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, has pledged to act as if she were a signatory. France has asked Pakistan to renegotiate the terms of their contract for the provision of a nuclear power plant. Overall, there has been an increased awareness in France of the hazards of nuclear proliferation and the government has made serious attempts to control the problem.

Following this assessment of French nuclear and defense policies, the delegation was briefed on the current political situation in France. The Fifth Republic Constitution established a strong President, as well as an active prime minister and cabinet which presently carry out the day-to-day responsibilities of government.

There are four major political groups in France today. The Union pour la Démocratie Française (UDF) is a coalition of centrist parties, including President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing's own Republican Party. The

Rassemblement pour la République (RPR), or Gaullist party, forms the Presidential majority with the UDF, although it frequently bickers with its ally and disagrees on such issues as economic policy and the future of Europe. On the left, the Parti Socialiste (PS), often perceived as the largest and most dynamic party in France, encompasses a wide array of political elements, ranging from moderate social-democrats to avowed Marxists. Finally, the Parti Communiste (PC), which commands about 20 percent of the electorate in France, remains a highly disciplined and uncompromising party. Both leftist parties are constantly at odds with each other and their erstwhile alliance has disintegrated.

Evenly divided between the forces of the right and the left, France is the scene of bitter in-fighting between and within the two ideological components of French political life. On the right, Gaullist leader Jacques Chirac does not hesitate to criticize the policies of President Giscard d'Estaing and his Prime Minister Raymond Barre, while he continues to support the government in Parliament. He clearly recognizes that any effort to bring the government down would merely result in new parliamentary elections, in which the left would have a new chance to gain power—a chance which they lost in the last parliamentary elections of March 1978. Although in disagreement with the government on many issues, the Gaullists support the government's programs because there seems to be no realistic alternative to its continuance in office at the present time.

On the left, the Socialists and the Communists continue to attack one another in the aftermath of the March 1978 elections. The split between the two coalition partners of the left in September 1977 appears to be the primary reason for the failure of the left to win a majority of seats in the National Assembly. Faced with the prospect of becoming the junior partner in a leftist coalition, the Communist Party terminated its alliance with the Socialists. The split persists today. According to recent press accounts, the May Congress of the Communist Party has confirmed the position and strategy of Secretary-General George Marchais. The congress of the Socialist Party, held in early April saw First Secretary François Mitterrand retain administrative control of the party, following a challenge to his leadership from Michel Rocard, who is widely believed to be Mitterrand's eventual successor.

On April 16, at the U.S. Embassy in Paris, the delegation met with the Country Team to discuss France's political and economic position in the world, the political dimension of NATO, and key issues facing Europe.

Deputy Chief of Mission Christian Chapman provided an overview of France's position in the world. Despite the vagaries of her politics, he observed, France remains a very stable society. The development of an extensive social security system that has eliminated the most flagrant pockets of rural and city poverty and offers substantial welfare and health protection to all segments of the population; the strong cultural attachment that Frenchmen have to their country ("patrie"); and the highly centralized political system, characterized by an effective and extensive government presence throughout France and by the existence of an elite group of national bureaucrats who have traditionally run the affairs of the state—all these factors have ensured a relatively stable French social and political system, so that governmental change at the national level would most likely have little impact on the broad outline of French domestic and foreign policy.

French foreign policy is still very much influenced by the ideas of independence and freedom of action espoused by General Charles De Gaulle. France adopted a special

stance within the Atlantic Alliance; took the initiative in opening relations with the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and the People's Republic of China; and maintains a special relationship with the Arab and African states.

The French economy, at the present time, while afflicted with many trouble spots (particularly unemployment and inflation), remains essentially strong. The central government has a great deal of influence on the economy (large public sector) and has a direct role in determining the directions to be taken by many sectors of the economy. In the past year, the current government has taken bold steps to decontrol certain industrial prices and the prices of some social services, in order to allow market forces to play a greater role than they have in the past in the French economy. In order to maintain its balance-of-payments surplus, France has adopted, as a major economic priority, the promotion of exports (particularly in high-technology items).

Representatives from the U.S. Mission to NATO in Brussels reviewed the role and importance of NATO in the current international political and military scene. As I noted earlier, NATO celebrated its 30th anniversary on April 4, 1979, and is now in the midst of an intense effort to restructure and restructure itself to meet what is perceived to be a continuing and growing threat from the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies.

Recent decisions and current efforts to strengthen NATO are based on the perception of a Soviet military buildup in central Europe and increase Soviet activity in the rest of the world. NATO nations have decided to increase their defense spending by 3 percent in real terms annually and to carry out a "longterm defense plan" which identifies areas in which NATO needs improvement. One such initiative is the creation of a committee of national armaments directors, whose task is to promote better cooperation in the area of weapons research, development and procurement.

While our European allies have taken a more active role in NATO, the strong U.S. participation in the organization remains a necessity.

A representative from the U.S. Mission to the European Communities in Brussels outlined the major issues before the European Communities in the next several years. The most important event of the year, of course, is the direct election to the European Parliament. The election is serving to further sensitize the nations and peoples of Europe to the concept of European unity. Several transnational parties (the Socialists, Liberals, Christian Democrats) have been formed and their candidates are running on common platforms. Whether direct elections will enhance the influence and effective powers of the European Parliament is unclear. However, it appears certain that the higher profile given to the Parliament as a result of these elections, the mandate assigned the new parliamentarians by the electorate, and the presence of figures of national stature in the assembly, may give the Parliament greater political "clout" and accord it greater influence in EC decisions, particularly in the budgetary field.

An important issue facing the EC, which will preoccupy it for several years to come, is that of enlargement, with the prospective entry of Greece, Portugal and Spain in the 1980s. Negotiations with Greece have been concluded and Greece, after signing its treaty of accession to the EC on May 28, 1979, will enter the EC in January 1981 as a full-fledged member. However, Greece will be undergoing a five-year transition period before it is fully economically integrated into the EC.

The European Monetary System, originally agreed to in late 1978, began operating in late March 1979. This system is expected to create greater monetary stability in Europe

and is perceived to be an important step towards full economic and monetary unity in Europe. The United Kingdom, however, has not joined.

How to assist Turkey will also be an important concern for the EC in 1979 and thereafter. The EC has provided several billion dollars in long-term economic assistance over the past several years to Turkey, an associated member of the EC. (This allows Turkey to benefit from some trade concessions.) While the EC is receptive to Turkey's need for aid, it does not have the mechanisms to provide short-term assistance, which is Turkey's most immediate requirement.

Finally, another immediate issue facing the EC is the renegotiation of its trade agreement with Yugoslavia because of recent Yugoslav dissatisfaction with some of its terms.

On April 17, 18 and 19, the delegation engaged in three plenary sessions with its counterpart from the European Parliament. As mentioned earlier, this was the fifteenth time that our two institutions have met to discuss issues of mutual concern.

The first plenary session was devoted to a "question time," in which each delegation asked two questions of the other delegation on topics of current interest. The U.S. delegation led off with a question on trade, which Mr. Frenzel presented:

"The United States Congress is concerned that the provisions establishing new international codes of conduct, emerging out of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations (MTN) be forcefully and effectively implemented, and is making efforts to ensure that the United States government is properly organized to carry out the implementation of the codes in an effective manner. What plans are European Communities making and what steps are being taken in Europe with respect to the effective implementation of these new codes?"

Mr. Jan Baas responded for the Europeans by stating that the necessary structures for implementing the agreement emerging out of the MTN and its codes are already in existence. Once these agreements become part of the body of law of the European Communities, the agreements will be complied with. The Europeans expressed some concern that the U.S. Congress might delay approval of the trade agreements and attempt to modify them in response to domestic constituent and interest group pressures. Both delegations, however, agreed that these agreements were a significant step towards promoting greater and freer trade for all nations and that it was important that the interests of the nations themselves should be given priority over local and regional interests, although these needed to be taken into consideration.

Another concern, however, was the growing competition from the developing world, with which all the industrialized nations will be increasingly confronted. No Third World nation has as yet signed the agreements regulating world trade. The results of the UNCTAD conference in Manila would give an indication of the future nature of trade relations between the industrialized and the developing nations.

The European delegation, through Mr. Hans Edgar Jahn, then addressed its two, related, questions on detente:

"In the view of the U.S. Congressional delegation, will there be a significant move towards detente in the world in the next two years, in particular in the 'crisis-ridden crescent' and in multilateral fora and negotiations?"

"What specific actions, if any, can the United States and the European Community take in the next few years to encourage further detente in the world?"

Messrs. Madigan and Stanton made the initial responses for the U.S. delegation. Mr. Madigan stated that if by detente one meant the avoidance of conflict, the alleviation of tension, and the enhancement of stability

without jeopardy to the autonomy or freedom of choice enjoyed by countries in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf, then the success of detente is likely to depend on such factors as: (1) whether the conditions for detente actually exist or can be brought about by thoughtful diplomacy and concerted action; (2) the way in which the West responds to future events in the sensitive region, known as the "crisis-ridden crescent," extending from Turkey to Somalia (avoiding erratic fluctuations in policy formulation and implementation); and (3) the character and momentum of what is now called the Islamic revival.

Mr. Stanton then identified three elements in U.S. detente policy: military-security; economic; and scientific-cultural.

Political and military competition will continue both in Europe and in the Third World. A key question, therefore, is the validity of linkage. The previous two Administrations linked their willingness to relax tensions with the U.S.S.R. to Soviet activities worldwide. Soviet aggression in Africa or Asia would adversely affect the United States' pursuit of SALT and increased trade. President Carter and Secretary of State Vance have disavowed linkage. They have repeatedly stressed that they see the SALT talks as completely separate from what the Soviets do in Ethiopia or Cuba, for example. U.S. relations with the Soviets are now pursued on different levels.

The strategic arms limitation talks, the mutual and balanced force reduction negotiations, and the conventional arms transfer talks provide indispensable fora, which have become an integral part of the process of detente.

In the trade area, reconsideration could be given to the Jackson-Vanik amendment in the Trade Reform Act of 1974, linking liberalized emigration from the Soviet Union to trade concessions by the United States. A straight repeal of the Jackson-Vanik amendment may be difficult at this time, but some modification of the provisions may be advisable.

Another area of importance is that of scientific, academic and cultural exchanges. Not only do these exchanges promote cooperation in key areas of academic and scientific research, but they also contribute to improved mutual understanding between our two nations over the long term.

Through such exchanges, Americans have access to and can better understand the Soviet system; the Russians as well have an opportunity to learn more about the American people and their political system. Personal contacts are established that facilitate informal communication outside normal governmental channels.

One must stress, however, that the pursuit of detente in the ways just mentioned must be complemented by firm actions or the willingness to take firm actions, whenever U.S. and Western interests are jeopardized in the world.

During the subsequent discussion on prospects for detente, the participants stressed the need to pursue detente and the reduction of tensions. However, the pursuance of such a policy should not signify abandoning military means to achieve political objectives, if necessary. An effective and continuing human rights policy towards the Soviet Union should also be part of the detente policy.

The process of detente would be aided by the conclusion of a SALT II agreement, the successful completion of the Middle East peace process, and forceful steps to impede the further proliferation of nuclear weapons. All agreed that cooperation between the United States and its European allies was an essential ingredient in successful implementation of a policy of detente.

Finally, Mr. Maurice Faure, of the European Parliament delegation, answered the second question from the American delegation, presented by Mr. Gilman:

"What are the domestic political implications of the direct elections to the European Parliament, and what consequences will they have on the process of European integration."

The direct elections to the European Parliament are part of a long gradual process towards integration that began with the signing of the Treaty of Rome in 1957. In assessing the putative power of the European Parliament, Mr. Faure stressed that the Commission of the EC, the only EC institution in any way responsible to the Parliament, did not actually acquire all of the powers it was expected to under the Treaty of Rome. Thus the Parliament has been engaging in a dialogue with an institution which has little ultimate executive responsibility for the affairs of the EC. In effect, the Council of Ministers, which is an institution based on the representation of national governments and interests, has acquired almost all of the executive powers of the EC.

The European Parliament has three major roles at the present time. The Parliament can give advice to the Commission, but the Commission need not take it; it can also question the Commission and the Council on policy issues, although nothing can be done if the Parliament receives what it considers to be inadequate answers; and finally, the Parliament has begun to acquire some budgetary powers of its own (over about 10 percent of the EC budget).

While the directly elected European Parliament may not acquire any more specific powers, direct elections should have the salutary effect of permitting a full-fledged debate on the issue of Europe and Europe's future in all the nations of the EC. In many cases, however, the elections have become a test of strength of the political forces within some member-states and are being contested on the basis of internal political considerations. Although this may seem an unfortunate development, it does have the merit of mobilizing the interests of many elements of the European electorate into participation in a European election.

The European Communities and their Parliament have been integral elements in the development of Western European unity in the post-World War II era. The idea was to create European-wide institutions that would accomplish concrete actions to facilitate intercourse among all the nations of Europe, through the free movement of goods, people, and capital, the stimulation of competition, and industrial and agricultural development.

How Europe and its parliament will develop in the future remains unclear. Further moves toward European unification must stem from a political decision. European unity cannot and will not evolve solely via economic integration, but only because there is a political will to move in that direction.

The second plenary session was devoted to a consideration of the issue of United States and EC relations with what have come to be called the Advanced Developing Countries (ADCs). I presented a paper at this session entitled "The United States and the Advanced Developing Countries." Mr. Winn also presented a paper, entitled "New Policies Toward the Advanced Developing World," as did Mr. Jahn from the European delegation, entitled, "The European Community's relations with certain developing countries emerging on the international political scene."

The papers and subsequent discussion centered on the growing importance, both political and economic, of the ADCs, and on the extent to which both the U.S. and the EC were developing their relations with them. In many ways, these nations remain underdeveloped; yet, in other ways, they have achieved a degree of economic and

political development that makes them potent actors on the world scene. The ADCs present many challenges for policymakers in the Western world. Many of these ADCs are of crucial importance because of the natural resources or the strategic positions they enjoy. Many ADCs still face tremendous development problems and require various types of assistance, including increased trade access to Western markets and programs promoting technology transfer.

At the same time, ADCs, particularly the wealthier ones, must realize, as they move up the development ladder, that they should assume some of the responsibilities commensurate with their increasing importance and strength in the developing world.

Many of these nations, however, are facing grave social problems and some, like Iran and Turkey, are beset by the dislocations caused by the Islamic revival. Our relations with these nations must be such that some attention is paid to the needs of the people of these countries which are experiencing severe social and economic dislocations. The management of relations with this category of developing nations is difficult, because, although they may be emerging regional powers in their own right and have relatively good infrastructural capacities, they remain in need of some type of assistance, whether technical or commercial.

Both delegations seemed to agree, however, that our current efforts needed to be improved and perhaps coordinated. A unified approach to these and other developing countries might be the most effective way of demonstrating our concern about the fate of these nations and their peoples. The UNCTAD conference in Manila should be closely monitored for Third World views on the trade policies and development aid strategies of the industrialized world.

Mr. Gilman made a brief presentation on behalf of the American delegation on the importance of helping Third World nations in the area of narcotics interdiction. In the light of the dramatic increase of narcotics trafficking in Western Europe and the United States, he urged the European nations to contribute more to international mechanisms charged with combating drug trafficking. He suggested that perhaps a coordinated effort could be undertaken by both the EC and the United States in this area.

The second plenary session also included a brief discussion of proposals submitted by Representative Christopher Dodd (who was unable to attend the meetings) on better methods of coordinating the human rights activities of the United States Congress and the European Parliament. Mr. Dodd had suggested the possible designation of staff members of appropriate committees as "human rights liaison officers" who would keep each body informed of the human rights activities of the other; the presentation of written or oral testimony by parliamentarians before committees of the other legislatures; and the writing of a joint report outlining the human rights concerns of both bodies.

Mr. John Prescott, a member of the European delegation, after describing the European Parliament's activities and the work of the U.S.-European Parliament interparliamentary group in the field of human rights, concurred with Mr. Dodd's suggestions and expressed the hope that the institutionalization of human rights monitoring by both institutions would come about. Both delegations then agreed that the staff of the delegations should prepare suggestions for the next meeting on ways to implement these proposals.

At our third and final plenary session, we took up the related issues of atomic energy and nuclear proliferation, thereby continuing a dialogue first initiated two years ago in conjunction with the enactment of the U.S. Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act. Mr. Fithian and European Parliamentarian

Ronald Brown both introduced draft resolutions on the nuclear issue, which helped to provide a useful focus for discussion and debate. Brown's resolution set forth a number of areas where U.S. and European views seemed to coincide, and it identified other issues upon which further consultation and collaboration would be required. The Fithian resolution augmented the Brown proposal by specifying the need for U.S.-European cooperation in the International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation (INFCE) on special safeguard improvements, and in devising common policies of response in the event of nuclear violations. Both resolutions were combined into a single resolution expressing a consensus of views on the nuclear issue by all of the parliamentarians present.

It is significant, in our view, that the European delegates agreed unanimously to endorse the correction of safeguard implementation deficiencies which were identified in 1977 by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Gaining European support for such reforms has long been an important objective of U.S. non-proliferation policy. It should also be noted that the Brown and Fithian proposals led to the first such resolution ever to be considered, amended, and approved by a meeting between the U.S. Congress and the European Parliament.

Understandably enough, the delegates spent a large portion of their time in this third session speculating on the cause and implications of the recent nuclear accident at Three Mile Island. Widely divergent views were expressed on this subject by various members of the two delegations.

Mr. Fithian argued that while it was impossible to speak authoritatively on this matter, deep concern existed about the disturbingly large gaps affecting our understanding of currently deployed—not to mention the more advanced—fission reactor systems.

While in Paris, the delegation also met with Jean Francois-Poncet, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs Dr. Ulf Lantzke, Executive Director of the International Energy Agency (IEA); and Ambassador Herbert Salzman, U.S. Ambassador to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Brief visits were also made to the two chambers of the French Parliament, the National Assembly and the Senate.

In our meeting with Mr. Jean Francois-Poncet, who for the first six months of 1979 is the president-in-office of the Council of Ministers of the EC, we discussed a series of foreign policy issues, including the upcoming direct elections to the European Parliament, French nuclear export policies, the situation in the Middle East, the negotiations on a Lomé II convention, and the prospects for detente.

In his meeting with us, Dr. Lantzke reviewed the world energy situation in the wake of the events in Iran and the nuclear accident at Harrisburg. He presented a rather gloomy picture of energy (particularly oil) availability in the coming years. Although the oil supply situation in the first quarter of 1979 had been manageable, there would be a 5 percent shortfall in oil supplies in 1979, even with a resumption of Iranian production. However, the 1979 shortfall, with education of the public and conservation measures, could be dealt with.

Even before the events in Iran, it had been forecast that the market for oil would be tight in the coming years. Assuming levels of production in Saudi Arabia of 12 million barrels per day (bpd), in Iran of 4 million bpd, and assuming that current solar power production is increased fivefold and nuclear power production twelvefold, there would still be an energy "gap" equivalent to 10 million bpd by 1990. Dr. Lantzke emphasized the need to increase nuclear power and coal production.

He also suggested several initiatives that the United States could undertake to deal with its growing energy problem: the public needs to be informed that a serious energy problem exists and educated about the objectives of U.S. energy policy; domestic oil prices should be raised to world levels; regulatory processes need to be clarified so that production will not be impeded; nuclear production should be expanded. Although there is not as great a need to make the public aware of the energy problem in Europe, he recommended a greater conservation effort there.

Dr. Lantzke reemphasized that there would be serious energy shortfalls in the 1990s and that this energy shortage could seriously limit economic development. In order to meet the energy gap caused by declining availability of oil resources, coal and nuclear power production would have to be substantially increased in the coming years. Since it was unlikely that international organizations could do much to affect national energy programs, including the development of nuclear power, national governments would have to convince their publics about the need for conservation and for increased energy development.

Our final meeting in Paris was with officials of the OECD. The U.S. Ambassador to the OECD, Mr. Salzman, and members of his staff, as well as a representative of the OECD Secretariat, outlined for us the many important functions performed by the organization. Its most important role lies in the fact that it provides an indispensable forum for the discussion of common economic problems among the 24 industrialized nations that compose its membership as well as a focus for economic policy coordination and for seeking possible solutions to the interrelated economic problems facing the industrialized democracies.

Organizationally, the OECD comprises a number of decision-making bodies, including the OECD Council which is at the apex of the decision-making process and on which the Permanent Representatives of the 24 member-nations sit; the Development Assistance Committee (DAC), which oversees the development assistance activities of the members; and a variety of other consultative bodies, permanent and ad hoc, which are responsible for examining many of the multinational technical and economic issues facing the industrialized world.

The OECD is also active in the North-South dialogue. It has a positive image in the developing world. Through its DAC, it discusses the types and amounts of aid that each nation should be providing to the developing world. The DAC has established that developed nations should attempt to provide an amount of governmental assistance equal to 0.7 percent of the GNP. The United States provides approximately 0.22 percent of its GNP in official economic assistance to developing nations. (The Federal Republic of Germany provides comparable levels.)

However, there is a growing consensus that private capital flows to developing nations, especially those considered as ADCs, will become increasingly necessary in the years ahead. Expansion of exports from these nations, including those which may directly compete with goods produced in developed nations, will also be required if the less developed countries are to get their balance-of-payments into equilibrium.

At the end of the week, two of our members, Mr. Fithian and Mr. Madigan, spent two days in West Germany conferring with business and governmental officials. Meanwhile, I journeyed to Luxembourg for a brief visit to the headquarters of the European Parliament.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that this study mission was valuable

to me as an educational opportunity: It enabled me to learn more about our European allies, the European Communities, and some of the problems which confront them. I know that my colleagues who accompanied me benefited equally from the experience.

In a broader context, however, I am convinced that the issues we considered are of vital importance not only to members of our delegation, but to all Americans who will be affected, in one way or another, by their eventual resolution.

This parliamentary exchange provides a unique and invaluable forum for the discussion of common problems that are of concern to legislators on both sides of the Atlantic. I look forward to its further development, as the European Parliament enters a new era in its history following the elections in June.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to you for having appointed me chairman of a delegation with which I am proud and honored to have been associated.

Sincerely,

DONALD J. PEASE, M.C. ●

CSUN MATADORS NATIONAL CHAMPS

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the 1978-79 academic year was a highpoint for the California State University at Northridge Matadors who captured this year's cross-examination debate championship. This is the second time in 3 years that the Mats have placed first in national competition. Dr. Raymond Zeuschner, associate professor and director of forensics at the university led the team to this high honor. His continued dedication to the team and encouragement to the students helped bring the Matadors to the national finals.

The Matadors spent 28 weekends of the academic year traveling to tournaments where they faced stiff competition in Seattle, Denver, Chicago, San Francisco, and Phoenix. Each member of the team is to be commended for his or her hours of preparation and outstanding performance. Those individuals who participated in and won the national finals deserve special recognition—Paul Boylan, Fran Smallsom, Rich Simon, Gina Liudzius, Tracy Lait, Jeff Jacobson, and Steve Stollenwerk.

The difficult and challenging competition these students faced extends far beyond a "club" activity. They have studied in depth a timely topic of global importance—Human Rights and U.S. Foreign Policy. They learned the pros and cons of the issue and mastered the art of public discussion. Fair and free debate is the key to our representative form of government. Each day in the House Chamber men and women from diverse areas of the country and backgrounds debate legislation which will best meet the needs and provide the most security for every American. The freedom always provides a far better understanding of any issue. I am sure that the San Fernando Valley communities share in the

Matadors great moment of pride. I extend to the team my heartiest congratulations and wish them continued success in the future. ●

ANTINUCLEAR HYSTERIA

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, recently, I received a letter from Mr. Walter P. Peoples, Jr., President of Gulf Nuclear, Inc., of Houston, Tex.

Amid all the antinuclear hysteria, Mr. Peoples is a voice of reason.

I would like to bring excerpts from his excellent letter to my colleagues attention, by inserting it in the RECORD:

ANTINUCLEAR HYSTERIA

Nuclear power is a remarkable scientific achievement brought on by necessity in an energy hungry environment. . . . Our Congress should approach the issue in a very sane and logical manner, looking at facts and attempting to avoid fiction.

The highly skilled scientific community has always worked very diligently to develop its charged responsibility, carefully weighing the basic effects of its results. Nuclear power has become a political issue because our leaders have permitted it to become a political issue, and like most of our citizens, have failed in their responsibility to understand why it is that we must have power alternatives. In sifting through responsible publications and carefully avoiding fiction, it appears that in nuclear power we have achieved the utmost in technological advancement. To fail to recognize its worth because a clear minority feel that this valuable tool is a possible health hazard, seems to say the least, irresponsible.

We speak of generating power by controlling a nuclear reaction, something entirely different than the nuclear weapon that was dropped to stop a war in 1945. As a citizen and a scientist, I feel that this country should be proud of its achievement in the overall harnessing of nuclear power. . . . Besides, you do not equate nuclear power with nuclear weapons. If you fail to understand the difference, then Congress should be educated by those who understand and carry proper credentials. Should Congress fail to educate itself in gaining understanding, then Congress alone will bear the responsibility for making America a second rate nation. . . .

Far too many arguments are decided by biased news reporting that assumes a know-it-all posture for almost everything presented to mankind. The Three Mile Island incident has brought this issue of nuclear power to a premature problem because of the timing with Hollywood fiction, that, of course, the "China Syndrome". We are now to assume that Jane Fonda is a tried and true experienced scientist that knows everything about nuclear power. . . . Accuracy in Media shows beyond a reasonable doubt that not only can the news media be caught in a lie, but that they refuse to refute the lies they're caught in.

We, the people, have succumbed to a power that is not elected nor is it even attached to our federal government. This power, when wrong, will try to hide behind the freedom of the press. They run our government and if permitted, guide our attitudes. These people, the news media, for whatever their reasons, are far more concerned with sensationalism and their per-

sonal causes, which are not press or news, but personal political convictions. . . .

Concerning nuclear control, it would appear that Congress would pay attention to appointees in the Commissioner's group to be sure that each and every member of that group had proper credentials to qualify a safe and educated decision if a problem should occur.

The original movements to strengthen reactor safety were certainly organized by qualified people and the intent was a very good one. Unfortunately, information such as that provided by the original group is seized upon to make politics out of worthy ventures.

I am sure that our Congress is blessed with enough good sense to listen to factual information, inspect the credentials of their witnesses, and understand that subversion by far left groups controlled by foreign governments that realize industrial nations like ours are brought to a standstill without energy.

This, of course, brings me to my credentials. I hold a Bachelor of Science degree in chemistry with minors in physical science and mathematics. I have also had extensive work toward advanced degrees in chemistry. I have been actively employed in the field of science for twenty-five years, a great deal of that time engaged in industrial research. For over nineteen years, I have been employed in the nuclear field.

My primary efforts have been in manufacturing and developing radiolabels for oil field applications. Other efforts include the manufacture of all types of sealed radioactive sources for gauging devices, industrial radiography, space orientation and medical efforts. I have, through a former employer, had a great deal of experience in reactor safety, primarily as related to the U.S. Navy Submarine program and with the N.S. Savannah. I do not present myself as a power reactor expert, but I feel that I have a basic fundamental understanding of radioactive materials. I am a member of the Health Physics Society, American Nuclear Society, American Society for Testing and Materials, American Society of Non Destructive Testing, formerly two term President and presently a board member of the Non Destructive Testing Management Association and a member of the International Radiation Protection Association.

I have served as an active Health Physicist (Radiation Safety Officer) for more than sixteen years.

In closing, I feel it is imperative to point out that in all of U.S. Industry, the most astounding safety record is held by the Nuclear Industry. This record belongs to the efforts of NRC and its predecessor, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. My interest, like those of all of us, is to see an energy independent nation with the safest possible protection for our citizens. I feel that nuclear is a positive approach and within our scope. I only ask that you, the Congress, make your own decisions based on fact and not let the news media make your decisions for you. ●

SIMON C. PADILLA—A GREAT AMERICAN

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to pay tribute to a great American from my district in New Mexico who passed away a few days ago at the age of 90. His name was Simon

C. Padilla. He never built great structures or wrote great words. Never was his voice heard in great halls, but in his own quiet way, he moved mountains.

Mr. Padilla was born in Silver City, N. Mex., the son of Mexican immigrant parents. He worked as a cook and waiter at an Albuquerque hotel until the coming of World War I, when he enlisted in the U.S. Army. Then came his finest and proudest hour. In the service of his beloved country he suffered injuries that were to limit his activities for the rest of his life.

Physically disabled, but spiritually unquenchable, he spent the rest of his days extolling the virtues of his country. He was a proud citizen, a fine man, a great American. And finally, may we mark him down as a man who loved his God. ●

BIAGGI ENDORSES H.R. 4015

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as a ranking member of the House Select Committee on Aging I wish to lend my full support to H.R. 4015 which the House is voting on today. It is legislation which gives long overdue recognition to the rapidly aging veterans population in this Nation and the need to have the VA medical system adapt itself by expansion of geriatric medical programs and services.

For the past 18 months the Subcommittee on Human Services which I chair has been conducting foresight hearings into the greying America and nowhere do the demographics that we have accumulated show a more dramatic increase than among the veteran population of this Nation. Today there are 6 million veterans over the age of 60. By 1985 we will be looking at at least 9 million and then jump to over 11 million by the end of the century. The World War I veteran population in this Nation is 650,000 many of whom are over the age of 75.

The legislation establishes a geriatrics and extended care task force within the Veterans' Administration. The purpose will be to elevate geriatric medicine into a position of higher visibility within the VA.

The VA medical system has come up fire in recent years in a host of areas ranging from poor pay of its medical personnel to a lack of sufficient nursing beds. Traditionally, the VA medical system has been unable to keep up with the demands of the service population. The reality of aging among veterans is very clear. How the VA is able to cope with this situation is not so clear. H.R. 4035 is an important step. Let us demonstrate a little foresight in our planning. Let our policies reflect reasoning and not belated reactions to crises.

The House Select Committee on Aging believes it is in our Nation's best interest to plan ahead for the future. The future will see the senior boom replace the baby boom. Our policies should reflect the transition. ●

RECREATIONAL BOATING SAFETY AND FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1979

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the Recreational Boating Safety and Facilities Improvement Act of 1979—similar to H.R. 13911 considered in the last Congress. It represents the first significant benchmark in recreational boating law since the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971 (Public Law 92-75). It reflects the continuing evolution of Federal and State roles in recreational boating safety and promotion—in response to changing patterns of recreational boating activity and in increasing recreational use of the Nation's waterways.

Contrary to public belief, recreational boating is not a rich man's pastime. For example, a recent survey—taken in my home State of New York—indicates that the average boater is 46 years old—makes just over \$18,000 a year—and owns a 16-foot outboard, using it on an average of 40 days annually—typically on an inland lake or navigable waterway.

The recreational boating population has grown and changed significantly in numbers and character since 1900 when privately owned boats in the United States numbered only 15,000. Fifty million Americans now take to the 25 million miles of waterways in the United States, in over 14 million private boats. Eight million of these are numbered under the Federal Boat Safety Act—either by the States or, in some instances, by the Coast Guard.

The States began to legislate on the subject of recreational boating in 1910, but it was not until 1940—with the passage of the Motorboat Act—that the Federal Government, through the Coast Guard, became directly involved in boating safety through the promulgation of safety equipment standards for motorboats.

In 1958, Congress passed the Federal Boating Act—the first comprehensive legislation involving the States in boating safety through the authorization and encouragement of State vessel numbering systems. The focus of this legislation was the skill of the vessel operator, traditionally the cause of one-half of boating accidents.

In 1971, in response to increasing public concern over public safety, the most significant piece of boating safety legislation to date was passed—the Federal Boat Safety Act. In enacting this legislation, superseding the 1958 act, Congress established specific policy objectives with respect to recreational boating.

The objectives of the 1971 act are:

To reduce recreational boating fatalities and accidents by encouraging boating safety, and to foster greater use and enjoyment of the Nation's waterways.

The mechanism for achieving these objectives was the fostering of a Fed-

in national boating safety. This in-eral and State cooperative partnership cluded the expansion of Coast Guard authority to set construction and performance standards for new boats and associated equipment—and the establishment of a Federal assistance program to States to encourage them to assume greater responsibility for boating safety programs, including assistance, education, and enforcement efforts; and to undertake State vessel numbering systems.

By any measure, the accomplishments of that program have been singularly successful. They reflect an evolution in emphasis in the Coast Guard's approach to recreational boating safety by focusing, for the first time, upon the safety of boat and equipment manufacturing and construction.

This shift in approach reflects the dramatic growth of the recreational boating industry. Recreational boating today is big business. The 2,500-odd boat and equipment manufacturing companies—employing some 550,000 persons—generate \$6.5 billion in sales through the manufacture of over 600,000 boats annually.

The joint Federal and State complementary role in boating safety education, enforcement, and assistance grows proportionately with that of the boating public. Boating accidents now account for over 76 percent of all search and rescue cases nationally—including all of the steady 6 percent annual rise in SAR incidents—94 percent of these incidents occur within 25 miles of the U.S. coastline.

Through these combined Federal and State efforts initiated by the Federal Boat Safety Act, the actual number of boating fatalities annually has been reduced from 1,582 in 1971 to only 1,321 in 1978. More importantly, the fatality rate per number of vessels has actually decreased by more than half during the same period. It is estimated that only 4 to 10 percent of nonfatal accidents are reported to the Coast Guard. Still, in 1978, 6,529 accidents were reported—resulting in \$12.3 million in property damage.

Despite the continuing and increasing need for Coast Guard boating safety efforts, the administration's austere 1980 budget contains no additional resources for Coast Guard boating safety programs.

The need for a mixed strategy of insuring the safety of boats and equipment through the promulgation of Coast Guard standards—enforced through Coast Guard factory visits—as well as for additional boating safety education and enforcement efforts is well documented. Analysis of boating safety accident statistics reveals that approximately one-half of those accidents were attributable to operational error and, of those, only 12 percent of the operators involved on the average have had formal boating safety education—and many of the remaining incidents were caused by manufacturing defects or mechanical failure.

The landmark program of Federal assistance to States has been the primary

means of facilitating and encouraging States to assume greater responsibility for boating safety. This program has been similarly successful in leveraging Federal boating safety resources and efforts.

In 1971, only 20 States had organized boating safety programs. By 1978, 51 of 55 eligible jurisdictions had, with Federal assistance, implemented boating safety programs. Thus, the relatively modest expenditure of Federal funds has been multiplied many times over in both tangible accomplishments in the reduction of boating accidents—and in stimulating the increased expenditure of comparable State funds for boating safety education and marine law enforcement efforts.

The grants to States program—the central feature of the 1971 act—will terminate in fiscal year 1980. Anticipating this event—and concurring with the administration's position that the objectives of the original Federal Boat Safety Act to encourage the development of State boating safety programs have been accomplished—I embarked upon a search for a suitable successor program to continue and expand upon the existing Federal/State partnership in promoting boating safety. I sought an approach that properly reflects the national interests in boating safety and in promoting the use and enjoyment of all the waters of the Nation—and one that recognizes other Coast Guard national priorities and responsibilities—and the requisite need for uniformity and consistency in State boating safety efforts.

For these reasons I introduced H.R. 13911 for comment in the last Congress.

Since that time, I have heard from the Governors of the States of Missouri and Alabama—urban and rural city mayors—the National Association of State Parks Directors—local yacht clubs—members of the boating public—representatives of the boating and marine insurance industries—and from a number of my colleagues in the Congress, supporting this legislation.

In addition, resolutions of support have been received from State boating councils—marine trade associations—the National Association of State Boating Law Administrators—the National Boating Federation—and the National Boating Safety Advisory Committee. The Virginia House of Delegates has recently memorialized the Congress to pass legislation similar to H.R. 13911.

During this period of exploration of alternative mechanisms to continue and further the broad objectives of the original Boating Safety Act, it became apparent to me that the phenomenal numerical increase in recreational boats plying our Nation's waterways—now estimated to exceed 14 million, more than double the number in 1971—has led to significant overcrowding and congestion of those waterways—particularly in urban and coastal waters. There is now 1 privately owned boat in the United States for every 10 automobiles, buses, and trucks on the Nation's highways.

Recent surveys of the boating public indicate that their greatest complaints and concerns—and corresponding pri-

orities for the expenditure of public funds—are for:

Additional boat launching sites and dockage space, despite the existence of nearly 5,000 marinas and 1,300 private yacht clubs in the United States;

Education and licensing programs for boat owners and operators; and

Better policing of the Nation's waterways.

A major factor affecting the congestion of recreational waters is the critical and growing shortfall in the availability and distribution of safe, adequate boating facilities—including ancillary safety-related facilities.

The Highway Revenue Act of 1956 was designed to promote safe, efficient surface transportation. This example was emulated in the equally successful airport and Airway Development act of 1970 enacted to insure the promotion and development of safe, adequate facilities in support of aviation.

The Recreational Boating Safety and Facilities Improvement Act of 1979, which I am introducing today, is designed in similar fashion to promote the safety and development objectives of the original Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971.

Utilizing the existing Federal/State partnership in the promotion of boating safety, it perpetuates those earlier efforts while promoting the safe use and enjoyment of the Nation's waterways by encompassing the provision of safe, adequate boating facilities as well.

It takes a further evolutionary step in a systematic approach to recreational boating safety that now includes the concept of the safety of the medium itself—the Nation's waterways. This is analogous to the systematic approach taken by Congress with respect to commercial vessel safety in the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972.

The proven mechanism I have chosen to accomplish these objectives is adopted from the revolving trust fund concept utilized so successfully in both surface and air transportation settings. It is predicated upon the equitable principal that only those who benefit from a particular service should pay for the cost of providing that service in proportion to their participation in that activity. In this instance, as with ground and air transportation, individual contribution is in proportion to fuel consumption.

Until Public Law 95-618 was enacted by the Congress last year, one-half of the 4-cent-per-gallon marine fuels tax paid by boats was susceptible to being rebated to them by the U.S. Treasury. Now, in the interest of conservation, that option has been terminated. Despite this, surveys have shown that two-thirds of recreational boaters will continue to participate in that activity—notwithstanding the national energy crisis—fuel availability permitting.

The central feature of this bill is, therefore, the returning of Federal marine fuels tax revenue to the States on a matching basis—to be utilized by States for recreational boating safety and facilities improvement programs.

Already over 50 States have adopted a similar provision in their law, earmark-

ing State marine fuels tax revenue for these purposes. Some States, like Washington, have even anticipated the eventual adoption of a like provision in Federal law by providing that State-collected marine fuels tax revenue will be utilized on a matching basis with Federal revenue for the conduct of State recreational boating safety and facilities improvement programs.

Hopefully, with the enactment of this legislation, well before the end of its first decade of implementation, all 55 eligible jurisdictions will initiate comprehensive recreational boating safety and facilities improvement programs—in financial and operational partnership with the Coast Guard.

Given the experience of that Agency in implementing the original Federal Boat Safety Act, the Coast Guard is the logical entity to undertake this expanded program. As envisioned in the proposed legislation, no additional effort will be required by the Coast Guard to be expended in the review and acceptance of State programs beyond those mechanisms already in place by virtue of the implementation of the original Federal assistance to States program.

Moreover, this program will permit the Coast Guard—already overburdened by a plethora of requirements and responsibilities thrust upon it during the past decade—but whose manpower complement has not increased proportionately to these added responsibilities—to commit its resources most efficiently and effectively in insuring the safety of recreational boats and equipment. This will be accomplished by permitting the States to assume a still greater share of the burden of the development and administration of boating safety education, assistance, and enforcement programs, with a degree of financial security previously nonexistent.

Under the provisions of this bill, \$30 million is provided annually on a matching basis with the States in proportion to the nationwide distribution of numbered vessels. A third of the funds available from the fund established in this bill will be allocated and distributed to States for conducting boating safety programs, while the remaining two-thirds of the funds will be devoted to boating facilities improvement.

In proposing this national program of recreational boating safety and facilities improvement, I hope to provide new impetus to the momentum generated by the original Federal Boat Safety Act in 1971. I believe a unique opportunity exists to replicate the demonstrated success of that act, resulting in a remarkable record of accomplishment, given the modest expenditure of public funds for this purpose.

Most importantly, I want to insure the safety of the boating public by educating operators and improving their skills—by maintaining and improving boating safety enforcement and assistance efforts—and by providing safe, adequate facilities to alleviate the increasing congestion of the Nation's waterways.

I want to make 1979 another watershed year for recreational boating—and

I invite your support and cosponsorship of this effort.●

WHAT HAPPENED IN CALIFORNIA GASOLINE SHORTAGE?

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, during all this recent outcry over California's gasoline problems, together with the attendant finger-pointing and scapegoating, I have not read anything that expresses the root cause of my State's gas crunch as succinctly and accurately as the following editorial from the May 16 Wall Street Journal. A short summary of the editorial is, as Pogo said, "We have met the enemy and he is us." I commend it to my colleagues as at last a reasonable answer to the question, "What happened?"

The editorial follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 16, 1979]

ECONOMIC ACUPUNCTURE

Conceive, if you can, the great Rhode Island apple shortage. One fine morning everyone in Providence wakes up, decides to buy a dozen apples and joins the growing lines at the apple stands. As supplies dwindle, enterprising apple merchants discover they can boost the price of premium apples to 50 cents from 25 cents. Apple wholesalers in Brockton, Mass., quickly learn of this lush price and ship their apples to Providence. In Boston, where the supplies otherwise would have gone, the price of premium apples rises to 35 cents, drawing apple supplies from New York, where the price rises to 30 cents, drawing apples from Philadelphia. As the Brockton apples flood into Providence, the price there starts to fall. By the end of the day, East Coast premium apples cost 26 cents, an infinitesimal number of consumers everywhere has decided to buy oranges instead, and everyone in Providence has his dozen apples. Which is why, dear reader, you have never heard of the great Rhode Island apple shortage.

You have heard of the great California gasoline shortage. Through some kind of economic acupuncture, the symptoms of a revolution in Iran have broken out along the San Andreas fault. If you can't have a shortage of apples just in Rhode Island, how come you can have a shortage of gasoline just in California? Indeed, we hear of Californians driving to Tijuana, to tank up on diesel fuel provided by efficient Mexicans, or planning their transcontinental motoring vacation along the Canadian route. Why is it that only the United States has a gasoline shortage? The answer seems to be that only the United States has the Department of Energy.

California itself has about 66,500 oil wells. But about 23,000 of them are closed down. The problem is that California oil is heavy crude, which takes more expensive equipment to refine, and therefore needs to sell at a lower price to compete with lighter imported crudes. These price calculations were once made smoothly and routinely, but the Department of Energy and its forebears have been fiddling with the "gravity differential" issue since 1973 and still can't get it right. So if a well is sanded in or a pump breaks down, it's often not worthwhile to put the well back in operation. The California independents estimate that 15,000 of the closed down wells could be quickly redrilled or

fixed if only DOE went away and let the price mechanism work.

The heavy crude problem was exacerbated when Alaskan crude started flowing into California, creating a "glut" of at least certain types of oil. This is relatively high sulphur crude that also requires special refinery equipment. Much of California's refinery capacity was built to handle sweet crudes from Indonesia and other foreign sources. The Alaskan crude would work very nicely in Japanese refineries, and one solution would be to sell Alaskan crude to Japan and use the proceeds to buy crude more suitable to California refineries. But Congress in its wisdom has outlawed the sale of Alaskan crude abroad.

Alternatively, another solution would be to build new or remodeled refineries in California to handle the available crudes. But if you build a refinery you have to pay for it, and DOE has rules on how this must be done. You must pass through capital costs evenly across your product mix. So if you invest in new gasoline equipment, you have to raise your price for fuel oil, even if fuel oil is a drag on the market and consumers are crying for gasoline. Naturally, few refineries were built under these rules. A few months ago DOE figured this might be a problem and introduced something called the "tilt" rule to cure it. It takes more than a few months to build a refinery, but the tilt rule is an open admission by DOE that for six years it has inhibited modernization of refineries in California. Chiefly due to the mismatch of crudes and refineries, refineries in California have been operating at about 80% of capacity during the great gasoline shortage.

Now, back to the subject of why DOE is to blame for the California gasoline lines. Forget the closed down wells and the unusable refineries, gasoline itself is still under DOE's price control thumb. As with the tilt rule on refineries, DOE itself has made furtive moves toward ending gasoline price controls.

But gasoline decontrol has been overruled at the White House because it would be a (yet another) public-relations black eye for the administration's price controllers. Only yesterday DOE said it wanted to fiddle more trying to get the "right" mark-up for gasoline retailers, and also "consider" ways to simplify the entire price control system.

The net effect is that while DOE doesn't change, it in effect admits it is administering a destructive policy. And little wonder, with price controls a gasoline dealer in California can't capitalize on and solve the current shortage by going to Phoenix and bidding away a little of its supply. It is against the law for the guy in Phoenix to take a bid that exceeds the price DOE's rules say he should receive.

Worse, if you have price controls you have to figure out who gets to buy how much at the controlled price. So you have gasoline "allocations." A seller is required to supply his list of dealers certain amounts at a certain price. The guy in Phoenix cannot sell in California unless he can first fill his allocations in Phoenix. For many years his list was whoever bought from him in 1972. Now this has been updated to last year. This makes the pattern more up-to-date but also reduces the spot market that consisted of the 1972 allocations for dealers who had closed. So there is less flexibility to meet changing conditions.

California has been enjoying an economic boom, perhaps due to the passage of Proposition 13 last year. Economic booms take more gasoline. California also has especially stringent air pollution requirements, which add perhaps 6 percent to gasoline demand in the

state. Since the base period on which the allocations depend, California's gasoline consumption has expanded at about twice the national average of 3.9 percent. Within California, the urban areas have expanded faster than rural ones. And one fine morning everyone in Los Angeles woke up and decided to buy a tank of gasoline, setting off a pattern of panic buying.

Even given that bit of luck, it was not easy to stage a one-state shortage. But with DOE anything's possible. ●

SALUTE TO CONNECTICUT FALCONS

HON. WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask my colleagues to join me in saluting a major achievement by a group of American women both in the world of sport and the world of diplomacy.

On May 14, the Women's professional softball league champion Connecticut Falcons embarked on an historical trip to the People's Republic of China. This was the first time that an American professional sport team had been invited to the mainland. It represented one of the first steps in the major commitment made by both nations, in the wake of U.S. recognition, to greatly expand trade and cultural ties. That our team members were received so warmly is a testament to the worth of such exchanges, and the increasingly open relations between two great nations.

I am especially proud of this group, Mr. Speaker, because they represent the city of Meriden in my congressional district. During the six-game tour, the Falcons consistently played before sold-out stadium crowds of 20 to 30,000 people each game. This team completed its highly successful undefeated tour with a dazzling no-hit performance by team captain and pitcher Joan Joyce.

In the many years that I have known Joan, I have always found her athletic ability and leadership qualities of the highest caliber. A native of Waterbury, Conn., Joan had coached at Mattatuck Community College prior to her great career with the reknown Stratford Raybestos Brakettes, the many-time world champion women's amateur softball team. Since that time, Joan has led the Falcons on to great achievement which has done so much for the city of Meriden and for women's sports.

Special recognition must also be given to league administrator and Falcon general manager, John Salerno. In just 6 weeks time, John successfully organized this 26 person journey, which covered 28,000 miles in just 14 days. John has been the athletic director at Mattatuck Community College in Waterbury for 11 years, and has made a great contribution to the success of the league for which we are all grateful.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of this team and its organization, and certainly look forward to the continued expansion of cultural exchanges that so enrich these two nations. Thank you. ●

IMPORTANT AMENDMENT TO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, in a short time, the House of Representatives will take up H.R. 2444, the Department of Education Organization Act.

At that time, I intend to offer two amendments to H.R. 2444, one of which would delete a provision which seriously troubles me, a provision which has serious implications for the programs in the proposed Department of Education.

Specifically, section 439 of H.R. 2444 would give the Secretary of Education discretionary authority to waive Federal statutory requirements mandating State and local organization structures for programs administered by the new department.

Mr. Speaker, section 439 has broad application. It infringes on the policy of scores of programs. Indeed, a survey prepared for me recently by the Library of Congress identifies some 60 programs which would potentially be affected by this provision. For example, the impact of section 439 would reach the three largest formula grant programs in education—basic grants for the education of low-income children, impact aid, and State grants for the education of handicapped children. Section 439 would affect, too, the basic State grant program in vocational rehabilitation. It would mean, in essence, a lack of identity for categorical programs at the State and local level.

The House report accompanying H.R. 2444 attempts to rationalize section 439 by claiming that, without the waiver, State and local education agencies would not be able to consolidate authority over their vocational education and vocational rehabilitation programs. This is inaccurate and shows a serious lack of understanding. As pointed out by the Senate report accompanying a companion bill, a significant number of States already operate their vocational rehabilitation programs out of their education agencies.

In fact, section 439 is intended to provide relief to a specific State, Florida, whose organizational structure for vocational rehabilitation is in violation of Federal law. Indeed, in April of this year, the U.S. Supreme Court denied review of a lower court's decision that Florida's plan for vocational rehabilitation is not in compliance with Federal requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to accommodating the Florida plan through the waiver authority proposed by section 439, and my opposition is bolstered by the findings of a recent audit prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The audit shows that, since the Florida plan took effect, the vocational rehabilitation program has decreased significantly in the relative number compared to other States of clients accepted and rehabilitated, that

vocational rehabilitation funds were channeled to other programs, that unobligated funds were not properly recorded or reported, and that services to clients in some districts in Florida were reduced or restricted.

Because of the potential for abuse and the broad implications of section 439, I believe that such a proposal should have been the subject of hearings, as was not the case here, and should not be a part of the legislation to organize a Department of Education. I believe strongly that the waiver authority provided by section 439 would be particularly harmful to handicapped people. I am entering in the RECORD a list of national organizations of disabled individuals opposed to section 439. I hope that my colleagues in the House of Representatives will join with them to support my amendment to delete section 439 from the Department of Education Act.

Mr. Speaker, I am also inserting at this point in the RECORD a summary of the preliminary findings of the audit conducted by the HEW Inspector General on the vocational rehabilitation program in Florida:

ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING SECTION 439 OF H.R. 2444

American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation.
American Association of Workers for the Blind.
American Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities.
American Congress of Rehabilitation Medicine.
American Council of the Blind.
American Deafness and Rehabilitation Association.
American Foundation for the Blind.
Conference of American Instructors for the Deaf.
Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf.
Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation.
Council for Exceptional Children.
Gallaudet College.
Goodwill Industries.
International Association of Parents of the Deaf.
National Association of the Deaf.
National Association of Retarded Citizens.
National Council of State Agencies for the Blind.
National Easter Seal Society.
National Multiple Sclerosis Society.
National Rehabilitation Association.

PRELIMINARY AUDIT FINDINGS

Following are some of the preliminary findings of the audit of the vocational rehabilitation program in Florida conducted by the Office of the Inspector General, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

The VR program in Florida has decreased significantly in the number of clients accepted and rehabilitated. Florida ranks 44th in these two categories where prior to reorganization they ranked 20th and 29th respectively.

Financial deficiencies confirmed those reported by the Florida Auditor General in FY 1977. Almost 10% of VR funds were temporarily used for other purposes. Two examples:

Salary costs of \$1.9 million were charged to VR even though the employees worked on other programs (this was subsequently adjusted).

Disability Determination program expenses of \$33,000 and other improperly coded ex-

penses of \$221,000 were incorrectly charged (not yet adjusted).

Lack of a centralized financial management system prevented fund transfers among districts to meet program objectives; thus, services to clients in some districts were reduced or restricted.

Refunds, credits and third-party reimbursements have not been accounted for properly. More than \$357,000 have not been credited to the Federal government for fiscal years 1977 and 1978.

Unliquidated obligations were not properly recorded and reported, as a result, Florida had remaining balances of \$800,000 in FY 1977 and \$1.1 million in FY 1978 even though they reported these funds obligated.●

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN
JOSEPH L. FISHER ON PRESERVING
SHORT HILL IN LOUDOUN
COUNTY, VA.

HON. JOSEPH L. FISHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today that will enlarge the boundary of Harpers Ferry National Historical Park to include Short Hill in Loudoun County, Va. Short Hill is one of several properties which the National Park Service wants to protect in the area around the existing park. The main part of the park is in West Virginia, but the boundary already extends into neighboring Virginia.

Visitors to Harpers Ferry Park are already familiar with Short Hill if they have climbed to Jefferson Rock to survey the famous view. Thomas Jefferson is said to have called the view from that point "stupendous" and "worth a voyage across the Atlantic." Looking downriver from the rock, one sees Short Hill as a prominent part of the panorama. Short Hill is also part of the backdrop to the C. & O. Canal National Historic Park and the Appalachian Trail.

The Short Hill property that will be within the Harpers Ferry boundary has about 2 miles of Potomac River frontage. The 475-acre tract extends back from the river in a wedge shape, rising to a 1,200-foot elevation. The woods on the ridgetop are typical of the Piedmont region, broken by a quartz outcropping called White Rock and a granite cliff known as Buzzard Rock, both of which afford a magnificent view upstream to Harpers Ferry. Lower down the hill one finds an old lime kiln, the remains of a mill and the miller's house, as well as an old still.

On a recent Saturday afternoon I explored Short Hill, which is located in my congressional district. The hill offers a delightful hike. At several points along the ridge, I suddenly found myself in the clear with a magnificent vista opening before me. Looking up the Potomac toward the town of Harpers Ferry in one direction and across the river to the hills of Maryland in the other, and with the sunlight sparkling off the river, I found the view quite impressive.

The need for preserving the Short Hill property, both for its importance to the view from Harpers Ferry and for its po-

tential as an unspoiled hiking and nature area is clear. The National Park Service wants the property and the owner is willing to sell it for a park or similar purpose that would preserve its natural state. This conjunction of willing seller and interested buyer should not be lost. I hope that the boundary of Harpers Ferry National Historical Park can be expanded to accommodate the preservation of Short Hill.●

POPE JOHN PAUL II RETURNS TO
HIS BELOVED POLAND AND EN-
COURAGES RELIGIOUS FREEDOM
FOR EASTERN AND CENTRAL
EUROPEANS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the world are riveted on Pope John Paul II's triumphal return to Poland, his native land which he has not seen since 111 Cardinals of the Roman Catholic Church elected him to be the successor of Peter last October 16.

Since his election, John Paul has been world leader for east and west. A brilliant scholar with a deep devotion to the church combined with a strong love for children and the oppressed peoples of the world, John Paul has quickly developed into one of the world's foremost leaders.

But the thing that arrested the world's attention was that, for the first time, the Pope was a native of Communist Poland.

As Karol Cardinal Wojtyla, Pope John Paul II had led his nation of 35 million Poles, 90 percent of whom are Roman Catholics, in a strong devotion to their faith in spite of the official Polish Government policy of atheism. Despite numerous official Communist roadblocks, Cardinal Wojtyla succeeded in building a major new church for the Polish people before he came to Rome.

When Cardinal Wojtyla was elected Pope, millions of Catholics around the world wondered whether he would continue in his fight against Communist tyranny from the Vatican. This week, their questions have been answered.

Greeted by an estimated quarter of a million people along the streets of Warsaw and in Warsaw's Victory Square where the Pope said his first Mass of the journey, Pope John Paul II departed from the prepared text of his homily to declare, "Christ cannot be kept out of the history of man in any part of the globe." His words touched off chants of "We want God," which reports said "resounded in the cavernous square."

Later, in a face-to-face meeting with Polish Communist Party leader Edward Gierek, the Pope said the task of the church is "to make people more confident, more courageous, conscious of their rights and duties, socially responsible, creative and useful. . . . For this activity the church does not desire privileges but only an exclusively what is essential to the accomplishment of her mission."

The bluntness of his confrontation with official Communist Party anti-Catholicism has taken the Polish Government off guard. Having already delayed the prelate's trip to avoid any coincidence with the 900th anniversary of the death of Saint Stanislaw, the Polish Government has been forced to allow the Polish Pope to visit the country with all the pomp and circumstance of a visiting head of state. The Washington Post acknowledged the impact of the Pope's visit with these words, "What is happening now in Poland is fantastic. Pope John Paul II, conducting a 'religious pilgrimage' to his native land, is demonstrating a command of the loyalties of the people which in a democratic country would entitle him to be their secular as well as their religious leader." The lesson on the Eastern Communist bloc nations has not been lost, and party leaders are understandably nervous about this turn of events.

The Polish people have waited many long years for the world to remember that they have suffered under tyranny and religious oppression since their country was divided up at the beginning in World War II.

Pope John Paul II has brought with him a direct challenge to that tyranny and spiritual oppression. The prayers of all the free people in the world are with him as he continues this delicate mission.●

MEDAL TO NEW MEXICO
BALLOONISTS

HON. HAROLD RUNNELS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

I would like to speak in behalf of S. 348, a bill to authorize the President to present on behalf of the Congress a specially struck gold medal to Ben Abruzzo, Maxie Anderson, and Larry Newman.

These three men from New Mexico captured the imagination of the world last fall when they became the first persons, and so far the only persons, to cross the Atlantic Ocean by balloon. Ben Abruzzo, Maxie Anderson, and Larry Newman became heroes in the Lindbergh tradition, and have brought recognition and prestige to their hometown of Albuquerque, the State of New Mexico, and the United States.

After their successful crossing from Presque Isle, Maine, to Miserey, France, the men explained their flight better than anyone else can. Abruzzo said:

I believe that unless frontiers are challenged and men try the impossible—and flying the Atlantic borders on the impossible—if these challenges are not met from time to time, then we are not moving forward as a society.

Anderson added,

What we've accomplished is really not to make history, but to complete it. Ballooning started in France in 1783 and since 1873 men have tried to fly the Atlantic. With

good luck and good fortune, we've managed to finish that story.

Newman, the youngest, who joined Abruzzo and Anderson after their first trans-Atlantic balloon crossing ended in failure, was the briefest. "We did it, we did it," was his jubilant cry that said it all.

Although the three balloonists are not constituents of mine, all of us in New Mexico felt a special kinship with them during their flight and are very proud of them. I urge support of the measure to recognize their grand achievement. ●

REASONED OPPOSITION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● **Mr. ASHBROOK.** Mr. Speaker, according to all surveys there are still about 50 or 60 undecided among my colleagues in the House on the issue of the Department of Education, H.R. 2444. This is an issue that has been lurking in the wings of this Chamber for almost 2 years. About all that can be said about DOE II has been said in the numerous editorials and dear colleagues that have poured into our offices. Before this House considers the DOE bill and all its implications I want to share one set of thoughts on this issue. Dr. David W. Breneman, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institute, testified before the House Government Operations Committee on DOE earlier this year. His remarks, which are opposed to the Department, provide an excellent critique of many of the concerns those of us in opposition have to creating a new national educational agency.

I have never been much of a supporter of the Brookings Institute, but the fact that such a solid commentary on education can come out of its staff goes to show that there is still hope for reason to win out on this vitally important issue.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF DAVID W. BRENEMAN

(The views expressed herein are solely those of the author and should not be attributed to the trustees, officers, or staff members of the Institution)

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this Subcommittee as the members consider legislation to create a federal Department of Education.

Last year as the public discussion of the Department of Education progressed, it became clear that the issues receiving most attention concerned which agencies would be folded into the new department and which would be left out. While such debate was of interest to a Washington audience, it did not come to grips with the more fundamental issue of a cabinet department's likely impact on the governance of education in this country. In order to raise that issue, Noel Epstein and I argued in a Washington Post article last summer that creating a department was a backdoor way of expanding the federal government's influence over education. (A copy of that article is attached, together with the text of a debate on the topic held at the Brookings Institute in December.)

We hoped that our article would redirect debate to the important questions surrounding the federal role in education, and would prompt those who propose this legislation to explain more clearly why a federal department of education is needed. In my view, a convincing justification has not yet been made.

In recent testimony before this committee, James T. McIntyre, Jr., Director of the Office of Management and Budget, argued that improved management of federal education programs was the primary goal of the legislation. There is no doubt that the organization of HEW's Education Division needs to be improved; the functions now split between the Assistant Secretary of Education and the Commissioner of Education should be lodged in a single office. That step would clarify who is in charge of the Education Division, and would eliminate several of the overlapping or redundant functions outlined in the testimony. Eliminating the separate checks currently provided by the Office of the Secretary would not be a clear gain, however; legislative and budgetary proposals initiated in the Education Division are often improved by the reviews of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation and other central staffs. My main point, however, is not to disagree with the views that better management is needed, but to question the assumption that a cabinet-level department is required to achieve it. Before that significant and essentially irreversible step is taken, it would be more prudent to allow Secretary Joseph Califano and Under Secretary Hale Champion to reorganize the Education Division in the obvious ways, reserving a decision on more drastic action until the effectiveness of those reforms can be judged.

If the management case for a department is, at best, debatable, then what of the argument for coordinating the hundreds of "education" programs scattered throughout the federal government? The presumed need to bring together many of these programs was the principal justification given last year for creating a new department. That argument, however, has become something of an embarrassment for departmental advocates, for if last year's debate settled nothing else, it at least made clear that a politically acceptable department would amount to little more than HEW's Education Division elevated to cabinet status. The reorganizers discovered that there are good and compelling reasons for leaving most of the programs that impinge on education in the various agencies where they are currently housed. Most of these programs were not created primarily for educational reasons, but rather were designed to use the educational system to achieve more fundamental federal purposes, such as reducing poverty, securing civil rights, strengthening national defense, or pursuing full employment. What is left of the coordination rationale, therefore, is Section 211 of the bill, the Interdepartmental Education Coordinating Committee. While noble in purpose, it is hardly worth creating a department in order to gain the services of this committee.

The remaining argument is the alleged need to elevate the status of educational issues and concerns in Washington. Much is made of the symbolic importance of having an education secretary at the Cabinet table. Vice President Mondale noted recently that the United States is the only major industrial democracy that does not have a Department or Ministry of Education. Others have pointed out that the Commissioner of Education lacks the clout to be seen regularly on Meet the Press or to be recognized by security guards at the White House.

Although it would be tempting to dismiss some of these concerns as unworthy of serious discussion, that would be a mistake, for they get at the fundamental issue that concerns many of us who oppose the depart-

ment. Do we want education to become more of a federal responsibility? Do we want students, teachers, parents, administrators, local school board members, and state officials turning more and more to Washington for leadership and guidance—not to mention increased financial support—for education? Do we want to risk diluting the federal emphasis on aid to the poor and disadvantaged by broadening the areas of federal concern for education? Do we want to politicize education at the national level by creating an office that will become the focal point for partisan efforts, with the ideological course shifting with every change of Presidents? Regardless of the qualifying and limiting language built into the legislation, a vote for the department is to answer each of these questions implicitly with a "Yes".

I should hasten to add that I do not believe that the administration and those members of Congress who support the bill intend to expand federal influence or control over education. Indeed, it is but another of the ironies of this legislation that so little change is seemingly intended. If creating a department does not herald a substantial increase in federal financing of education, nor a decisive shift in the purposes for which current expenditures are made, then exactly what purpose is being served? For so little benefit, why run the risk of misleading people? For it is inevitable that creating a federal Department of Education and a full-time Education Secretary will lead to sharply increased pressures for expanded federal aid to education, and perhaps for the direct involvement in educational content that one associates with an education ministry. To arouse such expectations (or such fears) through the symbolic act of reorganization seems to me a positive disservice to education, for efforts and energy that are better spent at the state, local, and private levels will be deflected to Washington, attracted by the potential for larger sums of money and by the visibility and prominence that a Cabinet Secretary will have.

The contradictions inherent in this legislation are so numerous the alleged benefits so marginal, and the risks so substantial, that I urge you to weigh your vote with the utmost care and to reject this proposal decisively.

Thank you. ●

PHIL BARDOS—A GREAT SERVANT OF THE PUBLIC

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● **Mr. GOLDWATER.** Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I take this opportunity to salute Phillip G. Bardos, a retiring member of the school board for the city of Los Angeles. His service to the education community and the people of Los Angeles is deserving of our recognition for his many contributions to the board.

Phil Bardos was first elected to the board of education for the city of Los Angeles in 1971. He was reelected in 1975 and had the distinction of serving as board president in 1973 and 1974. Mr. Bardos will retire from the board at the end of the month, and he will be missed by the many who have had the privilege of working with him.

A graduate of West Point, a combat veteran of the Korean conflict, and presently a lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Army Reserves, Phil has demonstrated

his citizenship in a variety of ways. He has been affiliated with the Boy Scouts of America and served as president of the Great Western Council. In 1976, he received the coveted Silver Beaver Award.

As an honorary life member of the Parent-Teachers Association, an active member of the Association of California Urban School Districts, the Recreation and Youth Services Planning Council, and the Red Cross, Phil Bardos is worthy of our tribute for his commitment to these many worthwhile activities.

The California State Legislature is soon expected to pass a resolution commending Phillip G. Bardos for a job well done. We wish him every success for the future. On behalf of my colleagues in this House, I would like to extend to Phil a very special thank you. ●

NO WINDOWDRESSING FOR THE PEACE CORPS

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, the administration has recently released an Executive order which would leave the Peace Corps in ACTION, with what is being called "greater autonomy." A careful reading of the Executive order reveals it to be merely a cosmetic solution to the persistent problems of the Peace Corps/ACTION alliance.

The plan which the House passed by an overwhelming margin—276 to 116 on April 9—is not being taken seriously by the administration. The fact of the matter is that only the protection of law, or the work of the Congress, will preserve the Peace Corps' autonomy over time. Without that protection the Peace Corps will continue to be vulnerable to the whims of future administrations, facing the prospect of Executive orders like the one which lumped it into ACTION, or total dissolution altogether.

I would invite my colleagues to consider the excellent letter to the editor of the Washington Post on the subject of Peace Corps independence. I think it puts the political gerrymandering of the administration in its proper perspective.

The letter follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 17, 1979]

WILL THE PEACE CORPS SURVIVE?

I would like to comment on the May 5 editorial that likened the Peace Corps to a "rare bird that deserves and needs a special kind of open cage." As a former volunteer who has followed Peace Corps matters closely over the past 18 years, I had expected that The Post would give a clearer and more serious recommendation on an important public-administration issue that may well decide whether the Peace Corps survives during the 1980s.

The facts of the situation are as follows:

1) The Nixon administration placed the Peace Corps under ACTION in a deliberate attempt to reduce the visibility and feisty independence that had been the key to its success during the Kennedy and Johnson years.

2) The Carter administration did nothing to undo this damage, despite the urgings of

many of its own supporters who were close to the Peace Corps in its early days.

3) The administration proposal to place the Peace Corps in an "open cage" within ACTION is essentially a non-proposal. That idea was jerry-built at the last moment to save face for ACTION officials after the House voted overwhelmingly to take the Peace Corps out of ACTION.

4) The House has held two years of hearings on the future of the Peace Corps during which ACTION officials staunchly defended the status quo—the closed cage.

5) The House Bill (HR 3324) creates the Peace Corps as an autonomous entity with complete policy and budgetary control residing in a board of directors. The Peace Corps will not be a box on any organization chart (as it now is).

The best hope for the long-term political survival and public visibility of the Peace Corps—and for its chance to pursue its idealistic goals—lies in the process of public hearings and public law, which is now at work. Short-term political solutions by the administration and strange and confused images about cages for the Peace Corps by The Post are of no help.

THOMAS J. SCANLON.

WASHINGTON ●

THE LEGACY OF ALICE AUSTEN, PHOTOGRAPHER

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, America's first important woman photographer was born, as I was, on Staten Island, N.Y., and she devoted her entire lifetime to the chronicling of the people and lifestyles of that unique borough of the city of New York. Her very special home, "Clear Comfort," overlooking the Narrows at the end of Staten Island's Hylan Boulevard, was saved from demolition about 12 years ago, and presented to the city of New York. In turn, the Friends of Alice Austen House have devoted themselves to the preservation and development of the house as a museum dedicated to the life and work of Miss Austen.

Alice Austen, born to affluence and social standing on New York's Staten Island, began her lifelong devotion to the camera at the age of 10, in 1876. Though within the confines of the Victorian era, her early life was not entirely consistent with the stereotype of the age. There is more than a hint of her own feelings toward prevailing prim rigidity in the amusing mockery to be found in many of the pictures. Alice was energetic, intelligent, and well-traveled, always surrounded by friends and family in a seemingly endless, carefree pursuit of good times.

We see the parties, the jolly picnics and the beginning of tennis in America. From her special vantage point of the family home at the edge of Staten Island, we watch the grand parade of passenger, cargo and naval shipping in and out of New York harbor. She has captured the street vendors, policemen and early taxis of Manhattan. There are also views from frequent travels well beyond New York that are further evidence of an ac-

tive, inquisitive life that might seemingly go on forever.

This era, however, did not last for Alice Austen or for America. Progressively more destitute and helpless after the crash of 1929, Miss Austen spent the latter part of her life far from the comforts and joyful vitality that had characterized her youth.

A year before her death in 1952, the first of Alice's photographs to be seen by modern contemporaries were published in the New York News through the efforts of the Staten Island Historical Society, which had rescued, housed and valued her magnificent collection of over 4,000 glass negatives. When Oliver Jensen, now a senior executive at American Heritage, discovered the collection in the course of his own research for a book, he dedicated his efforts to having many pages of her photographs published in Life, Holiday and other magazines. Funds were raised from these sales, and Alice Austen, an inmate of the City Farm Colony at the age of 84, was rescued from obscurity and poverty for 1 last year of dignity and acclaim.

Her house, "Clear Comfort," is a property of the Department of Parks and Recreation of the city of New York, and is a registered national historic landmark.

From the front lawn a visitor will see the southern tip of Manhattan Island to the north and the soaring towers of the Verrazano Narrows Bridge to the south. Brooklyn Bay Bridge is opposite—and the shipping moving between New York's City's lower harbor and upper bay provides a constantly changing aspect on the Narrows in front of the property. The building stands on a 6-acre plot at No. 2 Hylan Boulevard. Presently horses are allowed to graze on the surrounding land and a second structure, the former New York Yacht Club, also known as the Bredt House also stands on the acreage, the last open piece of Narrows shorefront between St. George and Fort Wadsworth.

Alice's grandfather, John H. Austen, purchased the original farmhouse in 1844 for the sum of \$2,500. A portion of the structure is believed to date from the late 17th century. However, the place reached its picturesque apex when the house was remodelled into a Victorian Gothic cottage set into handsomely landscaped surroundings by the time of Alice's childhood. That the remodeled Austen House was one of the sights of its day is revealed in the letters of John Austen.

In June of 1867 he wrote his wife from London:

I shall never forget the day I passed out of the narrows how lovely the old cottage looked. It was much admired by the passengers who stood near me. The Captain ordered the ship to run close to our side when I told him I wished to make a signal to you.

An American tourist, whom he met while traveling through Switzerland, told him that it was "without any exception the most lovely place on the Island."

Alice and her mother moved into the Austen house around 1868 and Alice remained there until the mid-1940's. Because she lost almost all of her money

in the stock market crash, she was forced to mortgage her home and to auction off many of her heirlooms. When the money ran out in the early 1940's she and a close friend, Gertrude Tate, opened a restaurant at the old home called "The Tea Room." This was but a temporary help, however, and finally, in 1945, after the mortgage had been foreclosed, Alice Austen sold her remaining possessions and left the old home forever. When she revisited the place, shortly before her death, Alfred Eisenstadt of Life took her picture in front of the sadly deteriorated building. And she took a picture of Mr. Eisenstadt—her last photograph.

The house has suffered continuous decay since then. A blizzard has destroyed a portion of the north end of the house dating from the 1880's. This year a large section of the living room ceiling fell due to the leaky roof. In the fall of 1978 the city determined that emergency repairs would be required to enable the house to survive another winter. However, even this plan has been delayed as the property has been transferred from the Department of Real Estate to the Department of Housing Preservation and Development.

That the building stands at all is the result of a citizen effort mounted in 1968 to prevent razing of the house by an apartment development scheme. Many prominent citizens from Staten Island and greater New York came to the aid of the cause. However, the organization was never incorporated after accomplishing its task and the friends were not active until after the 1976 Bicentennial brought renewed interest in historic structures. In addition a television documentary produced and written by Stuart Hersh for WNET/13 and a biography of Alice Austen written by Ann Novotny have helped to call attention to the house and to the accomplishments of Alice Austen's photography.

THE GARDEN AT "CLEAR COMFORT"

When "Clear Comfort" was remodeled from modest farmhouse into elegant cottage of Gothic revival style, probably in the 1870's, the grounds and gardens around the house were also landscaped in high, Victorian style. By 1890 the house and grounds were made to compliment one another with exquisite charm and beauty. With the record of Alice Austen's own photographs, it is possible to restore—with precise detail—the exterior surroundings as they appeared. It is the goal of the "Friends of Alice Austen House" both to restore the home and to recreate the gardens and landscape.

The restoration of the grounds is attainable with but one major adjustment. What had once been a gracious sweep of lawn, slope, rocks and beach has slowly eroded so that today only about two-thirds of the front lawn remains of the 30 or so yards that existed in 1890. To preserve this the shoreline must be stabilized by building a substantial riprapped seawall across the property's waterfront and by providing stone jetties perpendicular to the shore to reduce the destructive effects of violent winter storms and hurricanes. Between this seawall and the restored front lawn a

pedestrian esplanade and bikeway is planned which, ultimately, will connect with the boardwalk at South Beach.

As the esplanade passes in front of the Austen house it should be depressed sufficiently to permit a clear view of the Narrows from the piazza of the house. This view is essential to recreate the mood of the 1890's.

The garden's layout in 1890 began with a straight, wide walk of crushed seashells extended the axis of the main floor hallway to steps which led down to a small gate in a low picket fence. Through this gate one descended to the rocky "shingle" beach strewn with granite boulders. Flanking the top of the steps were two identical cast iron urns planted with Spanish bayonet plants. The depressed ground between the lawn and the picket fence was densely planted with low shrubbery (probably Weigela or Forsythia). At the end of the front lawn stood one large specimen tree, a honeylocust, approximately 20 feet north of the axial walk, supported on the oceanside by a stone retaining wall. Several of Miss Austen's photographs show her grandfather and others sitting on the circular bench which surrounded the base of the tree. The seat gave a good view of the shipping in the Narrows.

In the tradition of the 19th century style, "Clear Comfort's" 4 acres held many of the incongruous elements traditional to Victorian practices. There was chinoiserie to be found in the enameled bases which Alice's Uncle Oscar had brought back from his Far Eastern travels. These were scattered about the lawn in the shade of the sugar maple on the north side of the house. Also typical were narrow gravel walks and an elaborate entrance gate of rustic cedar. Extending from the gateway along the north property line was a solid board-and-batten fence, faced on the garden side with hedging plants and a perennial border. Outside stood a cast-iron hitching post near the bluestone sidewalk.

At the rear corner of the house grew an ancient Wisteria which spread its garlands of purple flowers over the brick walk to the back door. Climbing up the front piazza roof supports was a series of vines, including Dutchmen's-pipe, bittersweet, Boston ivy and honeysuckle vine. Mockorange, Canterbury-bells, iris, and tulips also grew around "Clear Comfort." Alice's grandfather was an ardent gardener, developing and maintaining not only his own grounds but also those of the yacht club next door. After John Austen's death Alice continued the care of the gardens, and in 1914 she was instrumental in establishing the Staten Island Garden Club.

Staten Island has the unique distinction of having been home to two outstanding Victorian-era photographers: Alice Austen and Timothy O'Sullivan.

The latter was the principal field photographer for Matthew Brady, whose organization provides the outstanding source of photographs of the Civil War in America. That Staten Island produced two individuals in the same era with major photographic talent (and the technical skills to manage the cumbersome

set-plate technology) is in itself unusual.

Of course, Mr. O'Sullivan worked as a recognized and paid professional, whereas Ms. Austen worked as an unrecognized and little-known amateur. Alice Austen simply took remarkable photographs as a matter of course without ever realizing that she was producing a unique body of work, a sweeping portrait of her contemporary society.

This legacy of her work, together with the house, affords modern visitors a unique glimpse of life in close proximity to Manhattan during the period of enormous social and technical change.

Ms. Austen's photographs of dog-carts and Queen Anne style houses show us an exurban lifestyle that was in transition; her pictures of early automobiles, steam ferries, and burgeoning city streets illustrate the suburban way of life that was beginning its rise throughout the first decades of the 20th century.

Alice Austen's work was a true product of her times. Before her lifetime the science of photography was not available to document life in America and because of the social period in which she lived her talent was well guarded from bursting into public attention—exhibitions of the work of lady photographers were simply unheard of at the time.

Therefore the fame that will doubtless continue to redound to Alice Austen was preordained to be posthumous, to be a legacy for the next generations, from its very beginnings. ●

SALT AND THE MASS TV MEDIA

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I came across an article in TV Guide, the largest single mass circulation magazine in the world. The article was authored by Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupé, diplomat and scholar, and one of the leading authorities among academic specialists on international relations and SALT. What an interesting combination. Strausz-Hupé and TV Guide. A natural team and what is more, the most powerful single medium in the world should carry his critically important message. Millions of Americans in the television audience ought to have the opportunity to learn about the details of the most important international agreement that the United States has ever faced in our history of international law. SALT is a matter for scholars, legislators, arms specialists, and diplomats. But, more than that, it is a matter of life and death for every American citizen: Life and death issue for millions of television viewers from coast to coast. An issue for prime time.

I submit this brief but excellent article by Dr. Strausz-Hupé, "Television Should Alert Us to the Perils of SALT," for the edification of my colleagues:

TELEVISION SHOULD ALERT US TO THE PERILS OF SALT

(By Robert Strausz-Hupé)

According to published statements of the Carter Administration, it is the purpose of the ongoing Strategic Arms Limitation Talks to achieve a treaty that will stabilize the balance of U.S.-Soviet strategic forces and open the way to future progress in strategic-arms control. The Administration has also implied that the treaty it seeks will further its goal of keeping nuclear weapons out of the hands of states other than those now possessing them (nuclear nonproliferation), and for improving U.S.-Soviet relations.

Here, I do not propose to judge the logic of the expectation that the Administration avowedly pins on a SALT II treaty—as to whether, for example, it will make our strategic future more predictable and, hence, safer, or relax U.S.-Soviet tensions. Suffice it to say here that, during the long years of the SALT negotiations, the international political and strategic climate has changed so drastically as to render any now likely SALT treaty, at best, a marginal contribution to international stability and, at worst, another step on the road to disaster paved by the Western democracies' abiding susceptibility to wishful thinking.

Chairman Brezhnev's vocal insistence on a SALT treaty now—never mind the mounting U.S.-Soviet tensions that he has done so much to exacerbate!—allows for a good many explanations. None of them can be advanced confidently, the Kremlin playing its cards face down, except for one: Chairman Brezhnev deems the present strategic balance to be to the Soviet Union's advantage, its immense effort to overtake the U.S. in quantity and quality of weaponry having paid off. In brief, he expects the SALT II treaty to cement in that advantage.

For the Kremlin, it would be out of character not to view the SALT negotiations as a means of conditioning the psychology of the Western democracies, ever hopeful for peace and none too eager to pay the price of peace—that is, to pay for an adequate defense. Does anyone seriously expect that a SALT II treaty will increase the sense of urgency with which Western governments and publics will contemplate the requirements of national defense? For a certainty, the Soviet leaders, well briefed on the trends of Western public opinion, expect nothing of the kind. Indeed, the protracted SALT negotiations have already slowed down our defense effort. While the Administration has canceled or stretched out several weapons programs—the B-1 supersonic bomber, the MX missiles, the cruise missiles and the enhanced-radiation bomb—these conciliatory gestures have apparently not been rewarded by commensurate Soviet concessions. All the while, the Soviet armament effort has been going full blast, widening the gap between U.S. and Soviet strategic as well as conventional capabilities. Thus, negotiation itself has been a "weapon" that the Soviets have wielded with damaging effect against us.

Exploiting the bilateralism of "the SALT"—a U.S.-Soviet huddle from which all allies are excluded—Soviet diplomacy and propaganda have been fueling our NATO allies' fears and doubts about the reliability of the U.S. commitment to European defense. Indeed, Chairman Brezhnev, stepping up his campaign against the solidarity of the Atlantic Alliance, has issued a series of warnings, addressed directly to our European allies—and, obliquely, to us. Having hectoring the U.K. about the unseemliness of selling military aircraft to China, Chairman Brezhnev admonished the Federal Republic of Germany not to station American-built rockets, designed to partially offset the Soviet Union's long-standing massive superiority in medium-range missiles zeroed in on Western Europe, on German soil.

Even if we disregard the insolence of these interventions in the internal affairs of the Alliance and the national sovereignty of the U.K. and the German Federal Republic, we cannot pass over their implications for those future arms-control agreements that, so the Administration hopes, will issue from a SALT II treaty and limit precisely those "gray area" weapons such as the SS-20, the new MIRVed Soviet "intermediate" rocket capable of hitting any target in Europe and well beyond. It is as if the Soviet player means to sweep the opposing pawns from the chessboard even before he sits down to the next game.

The Soviet Union's unflagging attempts at meddling in the internal affairs of the Atlantic Alliance and its member states have been enlivened by the Soviet Union's deepening concern about the Washington-Peking connection. This concern is real—as real as the Russian people's age-old fear of the threat from the Mongol East. Now, this fear is compounded by the dread of "encirclement," to wit, a simultaneous attack from the East and the West. We might be easy in our conscience that we will never play the "China Card" in such an aggressive way, and we might contend, quite rightly, that the Soviets are seeking to encircle us by their interventions in Asia and Africa and by deployment of the world's largest navy. But the Soviet rulers have been haunted by the specter of a two-front war ever since the founding of the Bolshevik state when the Red Army fought off, to the East and to the West, counterrevolutionary forces backed by Western troops.

The U.S. recognition of Peking is now history. It must suffice to say here that it has given another push to an increasingly unstable world order. Even the best imaginable arms-control agreements—equitable for both the U.S. and the Soviet Union—cannot glue together an international system that is plainly falling apart. U.S. foreign and security policies need to be adjusted to new realities nearly all of them fraught with great uncertainties and risks. These adjustments will not come cheap. They will call for heavy national sacrifices. These will be brought only at the behest of purposeful and candid leadership and with the support of an informed public. With respect to the latter, American TV has a job cut out for itself: to lay out for its public the problems of the U.S. in the world and seek to explain their meaning, however troubling. ●

REPRESENTATIVE CORCORAN COMMENTS ON POSTAL SITUATION

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, recently the Chicago Sun-Times carried an article by our respected colleague TOM CORCORAN about Postal Service.

While I do not agree with TOM CORCORAN on all matters in connection with the Postal Service, he has been one of those who has recognized the problem and has been willing to come to grips with it in realistic terms.

One of the considerations, as we approach the Postal Service legislation, has to be the question of inflation that my colleague from Illinois, TOM CORCORAN, touches on. Rather than restraining inflation the Postal Service is a cause of inflation. That has to change. The U.S. Government can hardly ask the private sector to restrain price hikes when the

No. 1 commodity we sell, postage, increases its prices twice as fast as the Consumer Price Index.

I commend my colleague for the initiative and leadership he has taken and I hope that my colleagues in the House and Senate will take the time to read the article I am inserting in the RECORD:

LET'S MAKE POSTAL SERVICE REALLY FIRST-CLASS

(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, 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, the concern goes deeper.

Since 1971, first-class rates have risen 150 per cent, compared with an 87.5 per cent 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 per cent. Considering that labor costs are 85 per cent of the postal budget, 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 cents) keep rising at the present rate, another eight years like the last eight will lead to a 38-cent first-class stamp. However, unless Congress changes the law beginning in fiscal 1980, the subsidy starts dropping 10 per cent a year, thus leading more likely to a 50-cent stamp by 1987.

Second, how will postal services to the public fare? As I mentioned, the Postal Service is a labor-intensive industry, with 85 per cent of its cost 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.

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 last 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. Now is the time to raise the ques-

tion of whether we really need good universal mail service for every American at reasonable rates. 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 1979, 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. ●

THE GRAIN BOARD BILL

HON. RICHARD NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, today, the House Agriculture Subcommittees on Livestock and Grains and Operations and Oversight held joint hearings on H.R. 4237—the Grain Board bill introduced by Congressman WEAVER. I have cosponsored H.R. 4237 as a means to raise farm income and to improve our trade balance.

During the past decade, the volume of agricultural exports has increased by about two-thirds. For this year's crop, according to projections, 64 percent of the wheat produced domestically will be exported, as will 26 percent of the feed grains, 42 percent of the soybeans, and 48 percent of the rice. In 1978, the value of farm exports exceeded the value of farm imports by \$13 billion, which helped offset the U.S. trade deficit of more than \$43 billion—a trade deficit which continues to grow because of high means little, however, unless the value priced imported oil.

The high volume of farm exports at which agricultural commodities are exported also is considered. Unfortunately, the current volume of farm exports has been achieved at the expense of U.S. farmers and the Nation's balance of payments.

In order to make up the shortfalls in grain production in other countries in 1972 and 1973, U.S. farmers were encouraged by the Government to expand their production. But the new export markets were not sustained at a level sufficient to absorb our increased production. Since the United States did not have an adequate grain reserve or commodity loan program, the prices received by farmers dropped below production costs, creating economic havoc in grain

producing regions of the country. The unstable prices also threw the cattle cycle out of kilter as the livestock industry was confronted by wide swings in feeding costs.

The United States now has experienced several years of low farm commodity prices. Net farm income in 1976 and 1977 dropped to the lowest point since the Depression. Although higher, last year's net farm income, when expressed in real purchasing power, was nearly 40 percent less than in 1973 and thus has not begun to make up for the lean years.

The low price levels mean that we are still exporting our grain for less than it costs to produce it. The low prices led farmers to mine their soil in order to increase their volume of production and marginal returns. But productivity has its limits and commodity prices have failed to keep pace with inflation, particularly as energy costs continue to skyrocket. As Agriculture Secretary Bergland said, it takes about 80 gallons of fuel (directly and indirectly) to work an acre of land, and fuel costs keep going up and up. When farmers cannot recover their production costs for their commodities, they are forced to sell at a loss and to export their equity abroad.

Since the United States is the dominant exporter of agricultural commodities in the world, world grain prices generally follow U.S. prices. The low price supports for U.S. grain forces other exporting nations to lower their grain export prices, thus weakening their farmers and their economies as well. For developing nations, low or fluctuating world prices mean economic instability which will inhibit agricultural development and reduce the incentive for farmers to increase food production. Clearly, the recent history of low or widely fluctuating prices for U.S. grain exports have threatened economic stability and the ability to sustain food production at home and abroad.

Existing U.S. farm and agricultural trade policies are not adequate to raise and stabilize the price of grain. U.S. farmers, therefore, are in a more vulnerable position than ever before. They must depend on the uncertain availability of export markets in order to sustain their income. As the General Accounting Office has pointed out:

The increased role of agriculture in foreign trade adds to the uncertainties with which the farmer must contend. In addition to the uncontrollable factors which normally affect farming, the farmers now must deal with the unexpected, changing trends of other countries' agricultural sectors, due to natural causes as well as political manipulations.

Instead of formulating a trade policy to raise and stabilize farm income, the White House (and the grain trade) still embrace the romantic notion that we live in a world of free markets and free trade. Nothing could be further from the truth. It has been estimated that over 80 percent of U.S. wheat exports are purchased by state trading corporations of the importing countries. In addition, imports of U.S. farm commodities often are subjected to levies which exceed the original cost of the product itself. The

income generated by such import "taxes" does not go to U.S. farmers but to the importing countries which will use the revenue to subsidize their economies and exports.

Free trade obviously is a myth insofar as the trade of grain is concerned. Prof. Willard Cochrane of the University of Minnesota has noted the danger in continuing to believe such a myth. In a world dominated by state trading, Cochrane stated:

The unilateral adoption of a free-market, free-trade policy by the United States would have resulted in considerable damage to the agricultural industry from increased imports and produced few, if any, benefits in the way of increased exports.

The Russian wheat deal of the early 1970's vividly demonstrated the competitive advantage state traders enjoy over private grain traders in the world commodity market. From the perspective of international commerce, U.S. grain exporting firms represent an atomized industry whose bargaining power and resources are inferior to those of state traders (whether U.S.S.R., European Community, Japan, and so forth).

The structure of the grain trade in the United States also belies any notion that free markets or free trade exist. According to the Department of Agriculture, the four companies with the largest amounts of grain sales between 1974 and 1977 accounted for nearly 50 percent of the total sales reported. The next leading four companies accounted for an additional 20 percent of the sales. According to Business Week, Cargill alone accounts for 25 percent of the grain trading business and Continental is next with about 20 percent. Competition among a few big firms which dominate the grain trade, "oligopoly" in the economist's words, is a far cry from free trade.

Farmers, therefore, have two strikes against them as long as the private grain trade dominates our exporting of grain. First, the grain companies are interested in buying grain as cheaply as possible. There is no incentive to share profits of the trade with farmers. And, since the top grain trading companies are privately held, little information exists regarding their profits and methods of operation. Second, the private grain traders do not have a competitive market advantage in a world where our agricultural exports are bought primarily by state traders. What little competition there is among the few big grain traders would lead to bidding prices down in order to obtain sales. The cheap exports have eroded both farm income and the Nation's balance of payments.

Neither U.S. farmers nor the Nation can afford our current grain exporting policy—particularly as imported oil costs continue to rise. By increasing the value of our grain exports our agricultural trade surplus will vastly exceed the 1978 surplus of \$13 billion—which is a meager amount when compared to what it should be. It is time for the United States to recognize economic reality and to establish a grain export policy which will substantially increase the grain export prices. I believe the Grain Board authorized under H.R. 4237 is the best means to carry out such a policy.

Congressman WEAVER's proposal for a Grain Board may not be perfect, but it establishes a framework for exporting our grain in a manner which better serves the economic interests of the United States rather than the interests of the private grain trade.

Although the Grain Board bill establishes minimum export prices equal to the current target prices, I believe the minimum export price should not be less than the cost of production. Since the target prices now on the books do not adequately cover production costs my suggestion would, in effect, raise the minimum export prices above the target prices. In determining the price at which U.S. grain may be exported to a particular country, the Grain Board also should take into account the price support levels in the country purchasing our grain and the price at which imported grain typically has been sold to millers in that country.

While the Grain Board proposal has many opponents among free trade economists, administration officials and the grain trade, I believe the momentum in favor of the Board is increasing as more people become aware of what is at stake and what the Grain Board will be able to achieve.

First. The Grain Board will increase substantially the value of our grain exports. While prophets of doom and gloom cry that we will lose our export markets if prices are raised, they fail to understand that exporting grain at less than it costs to produce it is foolish and destructive. The volume of our grain exports could be cut in half before our export earnings would be diminished. The prospect of halving our grain exports is not realistic, but it indicates that with a substantial increase in the value of our exports we could afford to reduce the volume of our exports.

Second. Other grain exporting countries including Canada, Australia, and Argentina will raise their grain export prices when the United States does so. They have been forced to cut their export prices in order to compete with the low U.S. prices. The discussions which Senators MCGOVERN, BELLMON, and MELCHER have had with representatives from the other grain exporting countries make it clear that the others are willing to follow the U.S. lead in raising their grain export prices.

Third. The establishment of a Grain Board will increase the leverage of the United States in the grain export market, thus providing a positive incentive for reopening negotiations for an International Wheat Agreement and for establishing an international cooperative marketing arrangement in the world trade of grains.

Fourth. Although the Grain Board would increase the export price of U.S. grain (and lead to a similar increase in grain prices by other exporting nations), this will not lead to a massive increase in the price of grain for consumers in other nations. The prevalence of import levies and taxes already have pegged consumer prices in other countries well above current world prices. Wheat sells for over \$6 per bushel in the European Commun-

ity and for around \$11 per bushel in Japan.

Fifth. Developing nations which rely on grain imports but do not have the money to purchase their requirements, even at today's depressed prices, would still have access to grain through the donation and concessional sales programs under Public Law 480. Higher grain prices actually will reduce the dependence of developing nations on imported grain because their farmers at last will have the financial incentive to grow their own food. The United States cannot feed the world and increased self-sufficiency or self-reliance in developing nations is necessary in order to feed larger populations.

Sixth. Finally, by raising and stabilizing the export price of grains, the Board will substantially improve farm income above the current depressed levels. Whatever modest increase in U.S. consumer food prices might be attributable to higher grain export prices would be more than offset by reducing our trade deficit and by easing inflation.

The economic case for the Grain Board is a strong one. Almost all of us are aware that current farm policy has been a dismal failure. Most recently, Agriculture Secretary Bergland and Senate Agriculture Committee Chairman TALMADGE have joined in urging a sweeping evaluation of U.S. farm policy. Any such endeavor must include an analysis of our agricultural export policy. More of us are becoming aware that our grain export policy not only has sold out our farmers but also is making our trade deficit worse. The Grain Board offers farmers, consumers and taxpayers a way out of our inflationary economic shambles. I urge my colleagues to give the Grain Board the serious attention it deserves. ●

COLD FINISHED STEEL BAR LEGISLATION

HON. ADAM BENJAMIN, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. BENJAMIN. Mr. Speaker, for several years, the cold finished steel bar industry has been grappling with a problem caused by an anomaly in our Tariff Schedules. Briefly, this anomaly has resulted in the misclassification of about 20-25 percent of our total imports of cold finished steel bars (CFSB). Instead of properly being classified as "bar," these products are considered as "wire." In addition to the distortion of our import statistics, the anomaly results in a substantial loss of revenue to the United States, since the products in question are dutied at \$6 per ton as against the over \$40 per ton ordinarily applicable to CFSB imports.

The Tariff Schedules of the United States do not now adequately differentiate between cold finished bars and wire. Other Government entities have already corrected the anomaly. The Commerce Department has modified the export schedule B so that the definition of "wire" is limited to coiled products. In

addition, representatives of the European Communities and the Government of Japan have proposed a similar limitation to the definition of "wire" in the Brussels Tariff Nomenclature.

Today, we ask for the support of our colleagues, Representatives JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, JOHN BUCHANAN, BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, DAN QUAYLE, RALPH S. REGULA, and this Member are introducing a bill which would eliminate the present anomaly by making clear that "wire" is a product sold in coil form only. Any drawn product otherwise meeting the definitional requirement of "bar" would be considered a cold finished steel bar. ●

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY IN EDUCATION

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to establish a national commission to study the scientific and technological implications of information technology in education. There are two major reasons for this action:

First, our Nation must critically assess how it will prepare our young people for a developing information-based society—a future society where computer literacy may be as critical as reading literacy is today.

Second, we must take full advantage of the marvelous potential being offered by what is termed the microelectronic revolution in the computer industry. This revolution will make computers affordable by every school and virtually every home. The educational potential of this occurrence cannot go ignored.

The idea behind this commission and the specific tasks it should undertake grew out of a 6-day oversight review of House Science and Technology Subcommittee during the fall of 1977. Witnesses at those hearings were convinced by the subcommittee that such a commission is necessary to put our country on the correct course of computer usage.

Specific tasks assigned to this commission will lay the groundwork for an appropriate national policy on computers in education. Items to be addressed include:

First. A forecast of changes in information technology during the period from 1981 to 2000, with emphasis on the effect of such technology on education and lifestyles;

Second. A forecast of the need for individuals with computer skills during the period from 1981 to 2000, with emphasis on the need in the service sector of the Nation's economy for individuals skilled in information processing;

Third. A forecast of the effect of increased use of computers in education on school financing and local taxation during the period from 1981 to 2000;

Fourth. An investigation of incentives for increasing private sector involvement in the research and development,

demonstration, dissemination, and utilization of computers for education purposes;

Fifth. An investigation of the costs and benefits of alternative methods of training teachers in the use and application of information technologies and computer-based instructional materials;

Sixth. An investigation of the status and effectiveness of existing computer-based instructional techniques;

Seventh. An investigation of research in the application of cognitive psychology and artificial intelligence to computer-based learning; and

Eighth. An investigation of institutional mechanisms for development of exemplary computer-based learning techniques.

To assure proper understanding of these collected bodies of information, the Commission will be composed of individuals who are critically affected by, as well as critically affecting, our Nation's technological progress in this field.

The Commission shall consist of 12 members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

At least one member of the Commission shall be appointed from each of the following three categories:

First. Individuals who are engaged in the professions of teaching, education administration, or education research.

Second. Individuals who are nationally recognized technical experts in computer-based instructional materials and computer equipment.

Third. Individuals who are enrolled in school or parents of such individuals.

Not more than three members of the Commission shall be officers or employees of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this act. In looking at the use of computers in improving our Nation's educational system, we can see that "the problems loom large, but the promise is great." ●

YOSEF MENDELEVICH, PRISONER OF CONSCIENCE

HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, as part of our continuing effort to let citizens around the world enjoy internationally recognized human rights, I would like to take this opportunity to inform my distinguished colleagues of the plight of Yosef Mendeleovich. Mr. Mendeleovich is a young Soviet Jewish engineer presently incarcerated in a Moscow prison suffering severe hardship and extremely poor health.

Following repeated denials of his requests for permission to emigrate to Israel, Mr. Mendeleovich was arrested in 1970 for allegedly attempting to hijack a Soviet airliner and was sentenced to 12 years in prison. His original sentence has been extended 3 additional years for his observance of the Jewish faith, which has been termed "a defiance of orders and having a bad influence on others" by Soviet authorities.

In recent days, seven of Mr. Mendeleovich's codefendants have been pardoned, released from confinement and allowed to leave the Soviet Union. Those released included Eduard Kuznetsov and Mark Dymshits, leaders of the alleged hijacking group who had originally been sentenced to death and whose commuted sentences of 15 years were more severe than the 12-year sentence given to Mendeleovich. Why should the Soviet Union release prisoners with more severe sentences than Mr. Mendeleovich? The explanation, I believe, as do members of his family, is because he insists on observing his religious beliefs vigorously.

Since Mr. Mendeleovich has not yet been released, my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. DRINAN, and I, along with 55 other Members of Congress, have cosigned letters to General Secretary Brezhnev and President Carter asking them to expedite the release of Yosef Mendeleovich. For the benefit of my colleagues, I commend the following to their attention:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1979.

HON. JIMMY CARTER
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Our request is one which we, as members of the United States Congress, regard as a matter of paramount importance. We urge you to expedite the release and free immigration to Israel of Yosef Mendeleovich.

Currently, Mr. Mendeleovich is incarcerated at Camp Christophol, Uchr. 5110/1-UE 148-CT/4 Moscow, in very poor health. Following repeated denials of his requests for permission to emigrate to Israel, Mr. Mendeleovich was arrested in 1970 for allegedly attempting to hijack a Soviet airliner and was sentenced to twelve years in prison. His original sentence has been extended three additional years for his observance of the Jewish faith, which has been termed a "defiance of orders and having a bad influence on others" by Soviet authorities.

As you may know, seven of Mr. Mendeleovich's co-defendants with more severe sentences have been pardoned, released from confinement, and allowed to leave the Soviet Union. Why then hasn't Yosef Mendeleovich been released? We believe, as do members of his family, it is because of his insistence upon practicing his religion faithfully.

As a signatory of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and a party to the Helsinki Agreement of 1975, the Soviet Union has advised the world of its commitment to let Soviet citizens enjoy internationally recognized human rights. However, the recent events concerning Yosef Mendeleovich indicate that the provisions of the Helsinki Agreement continue to be violated everyday by the Soviet Union.

Thus, we ask you, Mr. President, to do all in your power to secure the release and free emigration to Israel of Yosef Mendeleovich.

With kind regards,
Sincerely,

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1979.

His Excellency, LEONID BREZHNEV,
General Secretary of the Central Committee
of the Communist Party of the Soviet
Union, The Kremlin, Moscow, U.S.S.R.

DEAR MR. GENERAL SECRETARY: Our request is one which we, as members of the United States Congress, regard as a matter of para-

mount importance. We urge you to expedite the release and free emigration to Israel of Yosef Mendeleovich.

Currently, Mr. Mendeleovich is incarcerated at Camp Christophol, Uchr. 5110/1-UE 148-CT/4 Moscow, in very poor health. His original twelve year sentence has been extended three additional years for his observance of his faith, which has been termed by your government as a "defiance of orders and having a bad influence on others."

As you may know, seven of Mr. Mendeleovich's co-defendants with more severe sentences have been pardoned, released from confinement, and allowed to leave the Soviet Union. We would therefore appreciate any update on the condition of Yosef Mendeleovich and on the proceedings that will lead to his release. The future of this young man is of the utmost importance to us.

As a signatory of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and as a party to the Helsinki Agreement of 1975, the Soviet Union has advised the world of its commitment to let Soviet citizens enjoy internationally recognized human rights. The world's regard for Soviet attitudes on human rights can only be hurt by the unjust imprisonment of Yosef Mendeleovich. In the spirit of these important agreements, it is our sincere hope that Yosef Mendeleovich will be accorded the rights he so desperately deserves.

Sincerely,

Leo C. Zeferetti, Antonio Borja Won Pat, William Lehman, Jerome A. Ambro, Norman F. Lent, Bill Frenzel, Henry A. Waxman, Raymond F. Lederer, Baltasar Corrada, Ted Weiss, Joe Moakley, Howard Wolpe, Martin Frost, Melvin H. Evans, Norman Y. Mineta, Joseph P. Addabbo, Jack F. Kemp, Jonathan B. Bingham, John W. Wylder, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Parren J. Mitchell, Frederick W. Richmond, James H. Scheuer, Richard L. Ottinger, James J. Blanchard, Don Edwards, Harold C. Hollenbeck, Silvio Conte, Hamilton Fish, Jr., Robert F. Drinan, Christopher J. Dodd, William M. Brodhead, Peter A. Peyster, Clarence D. Long, Claude Pepper, Michael D. Barnes, William J. Hughes, Elizabeth Holtzman, Andrew Maguire, Michael O. Myers, Paul Simon, Frank Thompson, Jr., David E. Bonior, Allen E. Ertel, Robert J. Lagomarsino, Benjamin A. Gilman, Millicent Fenwick, Austin J. Murphy, Stephen J. Solarz, John M. Murphy, Robert W. Edgar, Thomas J. Downey, Robert Garcia, Sidney R. Yates, William R. Cotter, Tom Harkin, Dan Glickman. ●

RUSSIA DEFIES RHODESIA TRADE BOYCOTT

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, to no one's great surprise, the London Daily Telegraph of Sunday, May 27, 1979 revealed that not only has the Soviet Union been buying Rhodesian chrome and reselling it at a profit to the West, but it has also been buying Rhodesian tobacco and reselling it in order to turn a fast buck. Of course, the Soviet Union is not the only country that engaged in trade with Rhodesia in violation of the U.N. sanctions, but it does show how futile U.S. policy has been in this regard. By observing the sanctions, we not only

strengthened the Soviet economy but we indirectly backed the forces of terrorism and Marxism at work in Africa. Just whose side are we on State Department? The article from the Daily Telegraph follows:

RUSSIA DEFIES RHODESIA TRADE BOYCOTT
(By Norman Kirkham)

Russia has been buying chrome and tobacco worth many millions of pounds from Rhodesia in contravention of United Nations sanctions, while arming and financing the guerrilla war against the Salisbury Government.

A report compiled from Western diplomatic sources for the United Nations Sanctions Committee says clandestine trade between Salisbury and Moscow is being conducted through Swiss "front" companies.

Much high-grade chrome supplied to Russia has been resold at a handsome profit to America. Secret chemical tests have given evidence of its origins.

GUNS FOR GUERRILLAS

According to the well-documented report, Russia first began dealing with the Smith Government in Salisbury at least eight years ago. The trade has remained consistent in recent times.

While shipments of chrome, tobacco and maize have continued to flow to Europe from Southern Africa, Russia has poured guns, ammunition and missiles into Zambia for Mr. Joshua Nkomo's 10,000-strong Rhodesian guerrilla army.

More weapons from Russia and Eastern Europe have gone to Mozambique to equip Mr. Robert Mugabe's forces, and Russian aid here is now increasing rapidly.

The report says that the captain of one Soviet cargo ship, asked in Mozambique how he reconciled the secret trade with his country's ideology, replied: "Russia is interested only in doing business."

Many of the exports to Russia were channelled through Mozambique in the earlier years of the economic blockade of Rhodesia. More recently, ports in South Africa are believed to have been used.

Rhodesian exports have gone to Rumania, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia also in the last few years.

The report says that as long ago as 1970, Rhodesian chrome ore was being sold to Moscow and then passed on to America at a profit.

CHEMICAL TESTS

Colt Industries of Pittsburgh who carried out chemical tests on "Russian" chrome had informed the American State Department that their results suggested strongly that some of the ore had come from Rhodesia.

The report to the United Nations gives information on exports of tobacco and maize through Mozambique to Russia which continued even after President Machel closed his frontier with Rhodesia.

On March 23, 1976 the 6,555-ton Soviet vessel Mikhail Kedrov loaded 2,100 tons of Rhodesian tobacco at Maputo. The ship sailed on April 1 just after the border was closed.

Later, that year more tobacco and maize from Salisbury were loaded on Russian ships at Maputo, and the freighter Grekov became a regular caller there. Agents in Maputo were acting for the Russian Besta Line.

The sanctions breaking traffic was not handled at the usual cargo berth in Maputo. Pontoons at nearby Matola were used.

TOBACCO SALES

Representatives of a Swiss company acting for Rhodesian exporters are reported to have visited Sofia and Moscow in 1977 to arrange the sale of tobacco to Bulgartabac, the Bulgarian State monopoly, and Razndexport, the Soviet Corporation.

The revelations of the continuing Russian trade with Rhodesia will fuel calls in Britain and America for an early end to the United Nations blockade.

The report will also embarrass African countries which turn to Moscow for military support while criticising British policy on Rhodesia. ●

PELHAM PARKWAY J.W.V. OUTRAGED OVER IRANIAN EXECUTIONS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the recent execution of Habib Elghanian, an Iranian Jew, must be protested by free men and women everywhere. On May 16th I, along with Representatives SOLARZ, ROSENTHAL, WOLFF, and FENWICK, introduced House Concurrent Resolution 121, which condemns the execution and calls on the Iranian Government to protect all minorities in Iran. The resolution also urges the President to vigorously apply his human rights policy to Iran and to work with other nations to "insure the rights and survival" of religious minorities in that country. I hope that the Congress will move swiftly in approving this measure as a demonstration of concern and outrage by the people of the United States of America.

One group which has expressed concern to me over developments in Iran is the Jewish War Veterans of America. I have been contacted by Commander Al Levine of Pelham Parkway Post No. 769 in the Bronx. Commander Levine expresses the views of all the members of the Pelham Parkway Post in a letter I would like to share with my colleagues. I have also been contacted by Lillian Perl and Grace Rapkin Pap of the Pelham Parkway Ladies Auxiliary No. 769 and would like to share their letter as well.

The letters follow:

PELHAM PARKWAY POST No. 769,
Bronx, N.Y., May 12, 1979.

HON. JONATHAN BINGHAM,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JONATHAN BINGHAM: The members of Pelham Parkway Post No. 769, Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A., numbering over 200 members, are outraged at the recent execution of Habib Elghanian, Iranian Jewish philanthropist.

He was executed because he was a Zionist, because of his love and help for Jewish people and for his aid to the State of Israel.

The new Iranian Government of Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini and the revolutionary courts have vowed to continue their "cleansing of society".

This action by the Iranian Government cannot and should not be tolerated by a democratic society. Must we wait for another Holocaust where Jews and other minorities will be executed for their religious beliefs before any protest is made?

We urge the United States Government and the rest of the "silent world" to raise their voices and speak out in protest against this regime of blood and murder so that the human rights of the Iranian Jewish people will not be violated merely because they are of the Jewish faith.

Respectfully yours,

AL LEVINE, Commander.

PELHAM PARKWAY
LADIES AUXILIARY No. 769,
Bronx, N.Y., May 12, 1979.

HON. JONATHAN BINGHAM,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JONATHAN BINGHAM: We, the members of the Pelham Parkway Ladies Auxiliary No. 769, Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. are outraged at the recent execution of Iranian Jewish philanthropist Habib Elghanian.

He was executed because he was a Zionist, because of his love and help for Jewish people and for his aid to the State of Israel.

The new Iranian Government and the revolutionary courts have vowed to continue their "cleansing of society". This action by the Iranian Government cannot and should not be tolerated by a democratic society. Must we wait for another Holocaust where Jews and other minorities will be executed for their religious beliefs before any protest is made?

We urge the United States Government and the rest of the "Silent World" to raise their voices and speak out in protest against this regime of blood and murder so that the human rights of the Iranian Jewish people will not be violated merely because they are of the Jewish faith.

Respectfully yours,

LILLIAN PERL, President. ●

ENERGY, COAL, AND OUR ENVIRONMENT

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, fortunately for the State of Illinois and the entire United States, the Environmental Protection Agency announced on May 25, that it would not institute the sulfur dioxide emission ceiling of 0.55 pounds per million Btu as it had originally recommended. This proposed standard, which I ardently opposed along with Illinois Gov. James Thompson and my Illinois colleague EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, would have locked out up to 81 percent of Illinois coal and 20 percent of the Nation's coal. We can only speculate as to the adverse economic impact this proposed regulation would have had on the \$15 billion a year U.S. coal industry, of which Illinois alone accounts for nearly \$1 billion. In turn, thousands of Illinois' approximately 17,000 coal industry employees and additional thousands of the over 200,000 employees across the United States would have been in danger of losing their jobs. This does not even take into account the damage this regressive standard would have meant for our diminishing fuel supplies at a time when coal shows much promise of being a crucial part of the answer to many of our problems.

My strong support for the future of coal as a major fuel source does not mean I have forgotten our environment. We have all heard the horror stories of what the unrestricted burning of coal once did to our air, land, and water. It is, therefore, necessary that we couple this abundant fuel with our modern technology in order to free ourselves from the tightening grip of the OPEC nations in a clean, safe manner.

This ideal is entirely feasible today.

The new EPA regulations call for the use of scrubbers in all new plants to reduce uncontrollable sulfur emissions by 70 to 90 percent. In plants where uncontrolled emissions are more than 0.6 pounds of sulfur dioxide per million Btu, the 90 percent standard will apply. Those plants with a controlled emission level of 0.6 pounds or less may reduce sulfur dioxide by a minimum 70 percent. Monitoring of these emissions will be carried on continuously. Nationwide, this will mean a sulfur dioxide emission reduction of 50 percent of the current emission level standards.

In addition, particulate emissions from new plants will be reduced to only one-third of the level allowed by the current standards. Nitrogen oxide emissions will also be reduced by 20 percent.

Scrubbers are not the only technology being employed in this promising energy field. Illinois is quickly becoming the leader in coal gasification. This process removes the harmful pollutants in coal and turns it into clean-burning methane, the main component of natural gas. With slightly different steps, coal can even be made into high-octane gasoline.

Already the Institute of Gas Technology, located in Illinois, has produced Hygas, an economically feasible home heating fuel. By 1982, another coal gasification plant is expected to be in operation at the Illinois Power Co.'s Wood River generating station. This plant will utilize a new development of the Illinois-based Allis-Chalmers Corp. called "Kiln-Gas." In Perry County, Ill., a coal gasification project is only awaiting the go-ahead from the U.S. Department of Energy.

Along with gasification, Illinois is also supporting the development of fluidized-bed combustion. This process is less expensive and more efficient than scrubbers in preventing the release of pollutants. At the Great Lakes Naval Base near Waukegan, Ill., a boiler is being installed which will use this process to heat the medical center, houses, and other buildings on the base.

Scrubbers, coal gasification, and fluidized-bed combustion are all promising developments in making coal a clean, safe fuel source. With a national coal reserve of over 438 billion tons, or in other words approximately 300 years worth of energy, we must now push even harder toward the utilization of this secure source of fuel.

The research of the Southern Illinois University Coal Extraction and Utilization Research Center and the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment is furthering our knowledge in this field and helping us to achieve energy independence. We simply must work toward homogeneously integrating the use of coal with our environment.

With this in mind, I would like to insert for the benefit of my colleagues a related editorial from the May 30 Washington Post:

MORE COAL, CLEANER AIR

That was a good balance the Environmental Protection Agency struck in its rules for new power plants, though you wouldn't know it from the uproar. The rules, culminating six months of heated debate, are crucial to the expanded use of coal in this country through the rest of the century.

Coal smoke is highly toxic and, in the absence of strict regulation, wider reliance on coal would represent a reckless threat to public health. A number of environmental organizations have attacked the EPA's decision as a sell-out to narrow industrial interests.

That's an adversary's view of the choice. The most dangerous of the pollutants in coal's sulfur, and two-thirds of the sulfur in the atmosphere comes from the utilities' huge coal-fired generators. The ideal way to reduce these sulfur emissions is to do it directly, setting a limit at the smokestack and leaving it up to the utilities to get down under that limit. But that, Congress feared, would shift the utilities onto low-sulfur Western coal and create unemployment in the Eastern mines where sulfur content runs much higher. To protect jobs, Congress decreed that all new plants must have sulfur-removal devices called scrubbers. It left to the EPA the next question—whether to require utilities to remove a uniform 90 percent of sulfur regardless of any other circumstances or, alternatively, to build some flexibility into the system. Environmental organizations argued for a flat 90 percent requirement.

Instead, EPA administrator Douglas Costle wisely chose a sliding scale. If a plant can get its emissions down below a certain level by any other means, it will be required to scrub only 70 percent of the sulfur out of the smoke.

Mr. Costle's decision gives utilities an incentive to use clean coal. As for the Eastern miners, they don't have to fear for their jobs; the soaring costs of transporting coal will protect them from Western competition. Even more important, the decision encourages utilities to introduce new technologies that, with time and further development, may prove more effective than the present scrubbing equipment. And then there is the matter of obsolescence. These rules apply only to plants built in the future. If they were to make new plants unnecessarily expensive, utilities would have reason to delay them and to keep patching up and nursing along the older plants to which only a looser and cheaper pollution standard applies.

The principle of government regulation is not currently fashionable. But EPA's new power-plant rules are an example of intelligent policy in a field where regulation is essential to protect the public health. ●

NEED FOR SYNTHETIC FUELS

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, for too long, the Federal Government's approach to the energy problem has been characterized by inept bungling.

The policy of oil price controls has been matched by platitudes about conservation, and any sane person knows they are contradictory.

The enormous and complicated regulatory maze affecting production, price, and distribution has produced a dismal swamp of paperwork and litigation, but no energy.

The situation is such that people begin to wonder whether the Federal Government could run even a three-car funeral without creating a traffic jam.

We slide toward energy shortages that could cripple the economy and our national defenses. The long-term outlook is for depletion of world reserves of crude oil, but we face a more immediate

threat—the interruption of oil imports on which we rely much too heavily.

We import almost half the oil we consume, and much of that supply comes from politically unstable regions of the world. There is doubt about how much new oil can be discovered in the United States and our offshore territory.

We are extremely vulnerable to pressures from foreign oil-producing nations; we are risking potential catastrophe through a cutoff of supply from those regions. The situation can be described in terms of both immediate and long-term threat to our national security.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I endorse the approach set forth in H.R. 3930, which would promote the production of synthetic fuels to reduce our dependence on crude oil.

The cost of producing synthetic fuels from coal, shale, lignite, peat, solid waste, and organic materials is currently too high for these substitutes to compete with crude oil in the market place. In the years ahead, the price of crude oil is likely to rise so rapidly that the synthetic fuels will become competitive, but we dare not wait.

However, I believe that national security requires that we get a head start on the production of synthetic fuels, and I am pleased that the House Banking Committee has recognized the critical need by approving H.R. 3930.

This legislation authorizes the Government to purchase synthetic fuels for defense needs, even though the prices of such fuels are higher than the prices of crude oil and its products. The financial incentive is price guarantees through contracts that should encourage development of synthetic fuel production plants. The authorized appropriations for this purpose would be \$2 billion spread over several years.

The legislation directs the President to attempt to achieve a national production goal of at least 500,000 barrels per day of synthetic fuels and synthetic chemical feedstocks within 5 years.

It is reasoned that this production for defense needs would relieve the shortage of fuels for civilian needs. Even more importantly, the Government would be simulating the development of a whole new industry that we critically need, and it would become economically competitive and self-supporting at the time when crude oil prices rise to their expected heights.

The legislation also has very important provisions to enable us to cope with the crisis caused by international problems. The President is given standby authority to order the construction of Government-owned plants which would be leased to and operated by private industry to produce synthetic fuels and chemical feedstocks. Congress would have one-House veto power over this authority to prevent abuse.

The very idea of Government-owned industry is repugnant to me, but this particular kind of Government venture may become necessary in some future national emergency. I hope this authority is never needed and never used.

The House Banking Committee correctly asserts that "assured and reliable domestic energy supplies are just as im-

portant to a strong national defense as the ability to produce armaments."

It is time for all of us and all Americans to realize that our struggle to cope with the energy problem is really a struggle for national survival. A great industrial nation can collapse for want of energy.

We must make whatever sacrifices are necessary today to insure the future of America. ●

STRONG GRASSROOTS SUPPORT FOR U.N.

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a common misconception

among Members of Congress that the American people do not support the work of the United Nations and that they would prefer the United States to become less involved in United Nations matters.

I would ask my colleagues to consider the results of three respected public opinion polls which reveal not only significant public interest in the affairs of the U.N., but illustrate strong support for strengthening the U.N. system.

In a Gallup poll, conducted in November 1978, 78 percent of those interviewed felt that strengthening the U.N. was either very important or somewhat important, while only 13 percent felt it was not important. Interestingly, of national leaders asked the same question, 74 percent answered that strengthening the U.N. was either very important or somewhat important.

In another poll, conducted by the Foreign Policy Association, 69 percent of re-

spondents felt that the U.N. should be strengthened and made a major instrument of U.S. foreign policy. Only 19 percent felt that it should not, and 12 percent had no response.

In a 1974 Harris poll, respondents overwhelmingly supported an increased role for the U.N. in solving major global problems.

The results of these polls are compelling: the American people not only support the work of the U.N., they would like to see the U.N.'s presence as an international arbiter and problem solver expanded, even if those expanded powers were to impinge upon our sovereign prerogatives.

The message the American people are giving us should not go unheeded; we need the U.N. as much as it needs us, and only through strengthening and reforming it, will it better solve the problems of our planet.

NOVEMBER 1978 POLL BY GALLUP ORGANIZATION OF 1,546 AMERICAN MEN AND WOMEN FOR CHICAGO COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

[In percent]

	Public				Leaders			
	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Not sure	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Not sure
1. Keeping up the value of the dollar.....	86	8	2	4	73	25	2
2. Securing adequate supplies of energy.....	78	15	2	5	88	12
3. Protecting jobs of American workers.....	78	15	3	4	34	57	7	2
4. Worldwide arms control.....	64	23	5	8	81	16	3
5. Containing Communism.....	60	24	10	6	45	47	8	1
6. Combating world hunger.....	59	32	5	5	66	31	2
7. Defending our allies' security.....	50	35	7	8	77	21	1	1
8. Strengthening the U.N.....	47	31	13	8	25	49	25
9. Protecting interests of American business abroad.....	45	40	9	6	27	64	9	1
10. Promoting and defending human rights in other countries.....	39	40	14	7	36	56	8	1
11. Helping to improve the standard of living in less developed countries.....	35	47	12	6	64	33	3
12. Protecting weaker nations against foreign aggression.....	34	47	10	9	30	63	5	1
13. Helping to bring democratic forms of government to other nations.....	26	44	21	9	15	62	23	2

BALLOTS FROM PARTICIPANTS GREAT DECISIONS PROGRAM OF FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION, 1976
TOPIC 8.—RETHINKING U.S. FOREIGN POLICY
[Total number of ballots: 5,128]

	Pro	Con	No response
(a) Continue to pursue the administration's policy of detente with the Soviet Union.....	3,627	807	694
(b) Maintain present commitments to NATO.....	3,395	835	898
(c) Press European allies to work for a united Western Europe.....	3,395	746	987
(d) Seek to strengthen the U.N. and make it a major instrument of U.S. foreign policy.....	3,535	953	640
(e) Downgrade the U.N. as an instrument of U.S. foreign policy.....	694	3,147	1,287
(f) In order to resolve specific global problems like nuclear proliferation, be willing, where necessary, to surrender limited amounts of sovereignty:			
1. Temporarily.....	2,258	1,212	1,658
2. Permanently.....	1,126	1,902	2,100
(g) Strive for supranational world government as only effective way of dealing with global problems.....	2,106	1,898	1,124

THE HARRIS SURVEY, RELEASED JULY 1974

MANDATE FOR U.N. ACTIVITY

	More	Less	About same	Not sure
Solving the world food supply problem.....	71	7	16	6
Setting up peace keeping forces.....	68	5	21	6
Solving world's energy problem.....	68	7	17	8
Helping clean up air and water pollution in the world.....	67	7	19	7
Providing aid to developing nations.....	54	15	22	9

Note: It is evident from these results that the American people would like to vest more authority and responsibility in the United Nations. Yet, the U.N., most feel, must first learn to do its current job better, especially in the area of keeping the peace. ●

COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, the House Subcommittee on Communications, chaired by the able Mr. VAN DEERLIN, is presently working on redrafting the Communications Act of 1934. This act was written 45 years ago, when telecommunications as we know it today was but an infant industry. At that time the common carrier industry (telephones) was characterized by the familiar voice of the operator ("Central"), radio had just become national in its coverage, and television was but a gleam in the eye of a few professors.

Since 1934 the communications industry has exploded: Universal television, cable, satellite communications, the computer revolution are all now familiar to all Americans. And the revolution in telecommunications continues unabated.

I recommend to my colleagues the following article on digital circuits, a new technology that is further accelerating the pace of change in information handling. This is but another of the exciting developments that further emphasizes the need for the country to develop policy and legislation as modern and forward looking as the technology itself.

DIGITAL CIRCUITS HERALD GOLDEN AGE OF ELECTRONICS

(By Liz Roman Gallese)

Picture the surreal products of tomorrow. At home, your telephone will dial numbers at the touch of a single button, your stereo will play music of concert-hall quality, your television set will flash pictures of lifelike color. In your automobile, the engine will automatically keep emissions of pollutants to a minimum and fuel economy to a maximum. Your dashboard will spew forth facts and figures about how long it will take to reach your destination. At work, your telephone will keep your appointments, and your facsimile machine will transmit documents in seconds rather than in minutes.

Products such as these, some of them already appearing on the market, will be the staples of the future because of an important change in electronic technology: A change to what engineers call digital circuits from analog circuits.

Digital circuits, which use on-off pulses of electricity, are the heart of modern computers. Most other electronic devices, such as radios and television sets, rely on the other type of circuit, analog, in which electricity varies continuously in strength and amount. As the computer-type circuits become cheaper and smaller—some are about the size of a thumbnail and cost less than \$1—they are beginning to invade many aspects of the electronics world that, at first, wouldn't seem to involve much computing.

Indeed, electronics is going digital in "a tidal wave that will have a momentous impact on many industries," says Herbert Kleiman, managing consultant at Booz, Allen & Hamilton Inc., the consulting company. "What's happening now is peanuts compared with what will happen in the next decade," he says.

In the last five years, sales of digital circuits have risen by about \$275 million a year—three times the sales growth of analog circuits. Last year digital-circuits sales to-

taled \$2.5 billion, more than half the amount for all solid-state circuits, says the Semiconductor Industry Association, a trade group.

By 1987, sales of products using one type of digital circuit, the microprocessor, or so-called computer on a chip, will surpass \$30 billion annually, says Arthur D. Little Inc., another consulting concern. That will be a fivefold increase in 10 years.

The company also says that besides turning up in the telephones, typewriters, cars and factory equipment counted in its sales estimate, the microprocessor will be used in another 380 million items—about 10 times today's number. The dollar value of those sales can't even be estimated, Little says. What's more, scientists now are developing extremely powerful circuits, known as "superchips," which promise a wide new range of applications.

This conversion from analog to digital is technological change. Analog circuits will be around for a long time to come, largely because so much analog-based communications equipment is already in place. Some 91 percent of American Telephone & Telegraph Co.'s \$39 billion investment in its giant network is in analog equipment.

"It will be at least the year 2000 before communications even approaches an all-digital world," says Harvey Poppel, a senior vice president of Booz, Allen & Hamilton. Already, though, the change is starting to transform the communications, automotive and consumer-goods industries. It also is placing a growing share of the electronics business on the books of the semiconductor companies that make digital circuits—including Texas Instruments Inc., National Semiconductor Corp., Intel Corp., Mostek Corp. and Motorola Inc.

Circuits are paths through which electricity travels, and the arrangement and the design of circuits are what allow electronic devices to do many things. Digital and analog circuits, however, are quite different.

Digital circuits are switches. They turn electricity on and off. Analog circuits are amplifiers. They modify electricity, making a current either greater or smaller. Digital circuits send or store information by the presence or absence of electric pulses. Analog circuits, in contrast, convey information not through the presence or absence of current, but through its variations.

Consider, for example, the difference between an analog and a digital telephone. In the standard telephone, which is analog, a microphone converts the sound wave of the voice into a wavering electrical current that is sent to a receiver, where a small speaker changes it again into sound.

A digital telephone, however, involves two more steps. In it, the current from the microphone is sampled, or measured, many times a second. Then these measurements, not the current itself, are sent to the receiver in a code-like series of pulses. At the receiver, the pulses are decoded before being converted into sound.

As the telephone example illustrates, analog circuits can do the same things that digital circuits can do. In fact, because analog circuits don't encode and decode, they generally require fewer parts than digital circuits do the same job.

But analog circuits depend on parts—such

as capacitors, resistors and inductors—that are expensive and nearly impossible to build in the form of compact integrated circuits. So when manufacturing costs and design efficiencies are taken into account, digital circuits have a decided advantage for many uses. Digital circuits also are more reliable than analog circuits because, by sending and storing information in coded form, they eliminate imperfections in transmission.

Their low cost and reliability make digital circuits particularly attractive to the communications industry. AT&T installed its first digital equipment in 1962. More recently, the company has been gradually installing more solid-state digital circuits to replace the electromechanical switches that now do most routing of phone calls. Northern Telecom Inc., the Nashville-based subsidiary of Northern Telecom Ltd., has begun installing digital switches for routing local calls for its customers, which are independent telephone companies.

Eventually, the lower cost of digital equipment should show up in consumers' telephone bills. "Digital switches do the job cheaper, so they will help keep down the cost of telephone calls," says John Seaholtz, AT&T's director of systems design.

Sending voice digitally is crucial to the large, private communications networks planned by several companies, including Xerox Corp. and International Business Machines Corp. IBM's planned system, a joint venture with two other concerns, will offer such futuristic services as electronic mail, ultra-high-speed copying and the ability of computers to talk to one another via satellite. But the economic success of the venture will depend on the ability to use the same equipment to carry both the exotic traffic and ordinary conversations, which will pay most of the bill.

Those networks won't be operating for another few years, but already digital circuits are promising to make the telephone a hot consumer gadget instead of the hohum home appliance. Many companies are at work on telephones that replace the electromechanical insides of standard phones with solid-state computers.

These tiny computers are opening the door to lightweight, fairly inexpensive telephones that offer convenience once found only on much larger, costly systems designed for business use. Some phones can remember dozens of frequently called numbers and dial any one of them at the touch of a single button. Others alert the user that a number that was busy when called now is free.

Last January, General Telephone & Electronics Corp. introduced a \$59.95 telephone with a digital circuit for dialing. Called the Flip-Phone, it weighs less than the handset of conventional telephones and features, among other things, push-button dialing even in areas where the service isn't available. GTE expects consumer telephones with digital circuits to bring in sales of \$100 million by 1983.

Some other digital consumer products already are at hand. Last year, Texas Instruments Inc. introduced Speak & Spell, a \$55 spelling-aid toy that talks. Unlike other talking toys, Speak & Spell hasn't any moving parts. It stores its vocabulary of about 200 commonly misspelled words in a solid-state memory.

The machine picks words at random. "Spell 'yolk' as in egg," it might say. If the child spells the word "y-o-k-e" by pressing keys on the machine, the toy says, "Wrong. Try again." Such toys couldn't be made at a mass-market price without digital technology, Texas Instruments says.

Digital circuits also are giving rise to improved versions of products that have used analog circuits. General Electric Co. introduced in 1976 a color-television set with a digital part that permits the color of the home set to correspond exactly to that transmitted by the local television station. Industry experts say GE's so-called VIR sets have more lifelike color than TV sets without that feature. Television Digest, a trade journal, says other TV makers are starting to build such circuits into their sets.

"We could have done this technically with analog circuits," says Albert Belle Isle, a manager of GE's electronics-laboratory division. "But the sets would have been so expensive we couldn't have put them on the market." The company adds that digital technology now is affecting many of its products.

Even the family car is going digital. General Motors Corp. will put under the hood of most 1981 models digital engine-control equipment that makes the engine emit the least amount of pollutants and conserve the most amount of fuel. The equipment will permit the company to meet tougher air-pollution standards for the 1980s, standards that wouldn't have been met at acceptable prices with conventional analog equipment, says Martin Caserio, a GM vice president.

Although automotive experts say most car manufacturers in the near future will incorporate similar digital devices, the switch to computer technology in this and other fields won't happen overnight.

One reason is that some of the most glamorous applications are still far too expensive, because digital technology is still fairly new. Several companies, for example, are working on a digital recording technique known as pulse-code modulation, or PCM, that will all but eliminate the distortion common to records and home stereos today. But one typical prototype, made by Sony Corp., costs \$4,000.

Price also is a barrier to acceptance of the so-called trip computer a \$920 option on the Cadillac Seville. It permits motorists to compute such information as the time it will take to reach a certain destination driving at varying speeds. Someday, the dashboard computer may do a host of other things such as spit forth road maps, play games with restless children and control seat positions. But it isn't yet possible to produce such a computer at a feasible price, says GM's Caserio.

Whatever the timetable, the switch to digital circuits will have a substantial effect on the companies that make them. Benjamin M. Rosen, electronics analyst with the investment firm of Morgan Stanley & Co., sees major growth during the next decade for companies that make advanced digital circuits, such as microprocessors. Digital circuits, he says, "will make the 1980s the golden age of electronics."●

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 6, 1979

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Right Reverend Ross Sydney Hook, bishop of Bradford, West Yorkshire, England, offered the following prayer:

O God, the Father of mankind, we pray Thee for all nations and men, that Thou wouldest be pleased to make Thy ways known unto them; and grant that we, setting aside all partial affections

and prejudice, may have Thee always in remembrance.

O Christ, the Master Carpenter, wield well Thy tools among the workshop of mankind, that we who come rough hewn

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House Proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

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