

"(a) include a statement of goals, priorities, and plans for the Department which are consistent with the purposes of the Department as specified in section 102;

"(b) contain an assessment of the progress made during that fiscal year and anticipated future progress toward the attainment of—

"(1) the goals, priorities, and plans for the Department specified pursuant to paragraph (a);

"(2) the effective, efficient and economical management of the Department; and

"(3) the coordination of the functions of the Department; and

"(c) include an estimate of the extent of the non-Federal personnel employed pursuant to contracts entered into by the Department under section 425 or under any other authority (including any subcontract thereunder), the number of such contracts and subcontracts pursuant to which non-Federal personnel are employed, and the total cost of those contracts and subcontracts."

—On page 89, in line 21, after the period, insert: "Such report shall also include a description of any actions taken by the Secretary pursuant to section 423 of this Act, and an explanation of why each such action was taken."

—On page 89, in line 21, after the period, insert: "Such report shall also include a description of any actions taken by the Secretary pursuant to section 429 of this Act, and an explanation of why each such action was taken."

—On page 105, in line 14, after "Sec. 510", insert "(a)"; and

After line 21, insert the following:

"(b) The authority provided to the Secretary in subsection (a) of this section shall expire on the 180th day after the effective date of this Act."

—On page 106, in line 25, strike out "one hundred eighty days" and insert in its place "ninety days".

—In the following places, strike the word "Services" and insert in its place "Resources":

On page 98, in lines 14 and 22;

On page 99, in line 16;

On page 100, in lines 8, 14, and 19;

On page 101, in lines 6, 9, 16 and 17, and 24;

On page 102, in lines 4 and 5, and 8 and 9;

On page 103, in line 17;

On page 104, in lines 18 and 22; and

On page 105, in lines 2, 9, and 10.

H.R. 2462

By Mr. SNYDER:

—On page 3, line 4, after "Defense" insert: "Provided further, That an operator receiving funds under this paragraph may elect, for all or a portion of its ships, to suspend its operating differential subsidy contract with all attendant statutory and contractual restrictions, except as to those pertaining to the domestic intercoastal or coastwise service, including any agreement providing for the replacement of vessels, if:

"(a) the vessel is less than ten years of age,

"(b) the suspension period is not less than twelve months, and

"(c) the operator's financial condition is

maintained at a level acceptable to the Secretary of Commerce.

Any operator making such an election is entitled to full reinstatement of the suspended contract on request until October 1, 1984. The Secretary of Commerce may prescribe rules and regulations consistent with the purpose of this provision."

—On page 4, after line 5, insert:

Sec. 5. Section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended, 46 U.S.C. §883, is hereby further amended by adding the following new clause at the end thereof: "Provided further, That until October 1, 1984, and notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any vessel documented under the laws of the United States and owned by persons who are citizens of the United States may, when operated upon a voyage in foreign trade, transport merchandise in cargo vans, lift vans, and shipping tanks between points embraced within the coastwise laws for transfer to or when transferred from another vessel or vessels, so documented and owned, of the same operator when the merchandise movement has either a foreign origin or a foreign destination."

H.R. 4388

By Mr. KOSTMAYER:

—On page 27, line 23, strike the period and insert: "Provided further, That 731 personnel positions shall be allocated exclusively to the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation to carry out those responsibilities authorized by law."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LAYING THE BLAME

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I was asked today to provide to the Membership of the House an explanation of the fuel shortages which are currently plaguing this country. I regret to say that this is not possible to do without consuming far more time than would be available to me.

In the course of the debate, I referred to an excellent article appearing in the Wall Street Journal, explaining some of the problems, and the reactions to these problems on the part of the public. In the belief that this article will be of interest and value to my colleagues, I insert the article to be reprinted at this time.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 13, 1979]

LAYING THE BLAME—WHY A GAS SHORTAGE?
IRAN, OIL-FIRM ERRORS, FEDERAL BUNGLING
CITED

(By Walter S. Mossberg and Rich Jaroslovsky)

WASHINGTON.—Comedian Johnny Carson claims he recently spotted a sign in front of a California gasoline station. "Temporarily out of phony excuses," it read.

The gag amused Mr. Carson's television audience. But it also reflects a serious side of the gasoline shortage: Nobody can quite agree on why it's happening, and the public doesn't believe the official explanations.

Theories abound. Everybody puts some blame on the closing of Iran's oil fields early

this year. But the Energy Department also faults wasteful American motorists. Oil companies blast the Energy Department and its complicated regulations. And the public, according to opinion surveys, suspects an oil-industry plot.

"There is an abundance of fault in this thing," declares Rep. John Dingell, a Michigan Democrat who heads a House energy subcommittee.

BASIC REASONS

But a close look at reasons for the shortage clarifies the picture a bit. While Iran's revolution served as the immediate trigger, the chief underlying cause seems to have been the oil companies' miscalculation of the near-term prospects for supply and demand. Ranking close behind as a cause of trouble was the government's uncertain and contradictory energy policy.

Interviews with private and government analysts indicate that the oil companies last year followed a risky strategy of draining inventories and thus left the country with uncomfortably low supplies of crude oil and gasoline. At the same time, slow-moving and confusing federal policies were discouraging fuel production and distorting markets, while failing to curb rising prices.

As a result, the U.S. couldn't cope with three unexpected events. First came a surge in driving last fall, then a particularly cold winter, and finally the Ayatollah Khomeini's revolution, which interrupted Iranian oil exports and pushed up world oil prices.

When these problems arose, the industry was gripped with uncertainty, and the government unleashed a flurry of policy changes that added to their confusion. Companies husbanded their reserves of crude oil, and U.S. refineries continued to produce only limited amounts of gasoline well into 1979, despite growing shortages.

CRITICS' CHARGES

Critics contend that the industry deliberately withheld crude oil from its refineries

to worsen the crisis for economic and political reasons. But the industry and the Energy Department reject those charges: they say conserving crude oil in the face of turmoil was only prudent.

To understand how the U.S. got into its present fix, it's necessary to go back to late 1977. At the time, world oil production was outrunning demand, but the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries—the price-fixing cartel—was nonetheless considering a new price rise for January 1978. And Saudi Arabia, OPEC's biggest producer, was talking about cutting production to ensure that such a rise would stick.

To beat the increase, U.S. oil companies in late 1977 built their stocks of crude oil and petroleum products, such as gasoline, to unusually high levels. By January 1978, U.S. crude-oil inventories stood at 340 million barrels, up from 294 million a year earlier. Gasoline stocks were 7.8 percent above 1977 levels.

But the expected price increase didn't come that January, nor at another OPEC meeting in May. So oil companies, uncomfortable with their bulging inventories, began reducing them. Imports of crude fell sharply in early 1978 as the industry used stocks on hand. And to hold down big inventories of refined products, U.S. refineries were run for much of the year at rates below the 1976 and 1977 levels.

CUT IN INVENTORIES

In 1978, the industry "went from a position of abnormally high inventories to normal inventories," explains Theodore Eck, chief economist for Standard Oil Co. (Indiana). Actually, government figures show stocks of crude oil and gasoline below normal by year-end.

Then came the crunch. Spurred by mild autumn weather, motorists continued to burn up large amounts of gasoline even after Labor Day, in defiance of normal driving patterns. When the weather finally turned wintry, it did so with a vengeance; the un-

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

usual cold boosted the need for heating oil. "Demand in 1978 was a big surprise to all of us," says Annon Card, a Texaco Inc. vice president.

Meanwhile, Iran was sinking into chaos. Revolutionaries began disrupting oil production in October; by Dec. 26, exports were halted. When resumed in March, they were at about half the prerevolutionary rate.

"In retrospect, we screwed up," Indiana Standard's Mr. Eck says. "if we'd seen the Iranian situation coming, we should have kept abnormally high inventories all year."

The Iranian shutoff hurt the U.S. in two ways. First, after Iran's oil stopped flowing, U.S. supplies fell 500,000 barrels a day below projected demand. Light crude oil, best suited to make gasoline, was especially scarce. Such oil already had been thrown into tight supply by an earlier move in Saudi Arabia to restrict production of its lighter grades.

And perhaps just as serious as the actual shortage was the uncertainty spawned by the crisis. In the oil industry, "nobody knew when Iran was coming back," a top U.S. energy official says. The uncertainty, along with another pending OPEC price increase, spurred a world-wide grab for crude oil and a spurt in U.S. imports, starting late last year.

But instead of refining all the oil they could get, the skittish oil companies have carefully conserved their crude stocks. Besides feeling uncertain about future supplies of crude, the companies have been unsure which refined products would be needed most. In the first four months of 1979, U.S. refineries ran at only about 85% of capacity, close to the low 1978 pace. Gasoline and heating-oil production fell.

Similar fears for the future, government officials believe, have prompted many businesses and plain speculators to buy up and hoard fuel. Similarly, drivers in auto-dependent California began a panicky rush to fill their tanks.

Despite a glut of oil from Alaska, California was hardest hit for several reasons. Many of California's refineries aren't equipped to handle the heavy crude produced in Alaska. Oil companies complain that lack of capital and tough environmental rules have discouraged them from expanding their West Coast operations; so, much of the Alaskan crude is shipped to Gulf Coast refineries. And it's difficult to supply California from the East or South because of a lack of major East-West pipelines.

While the refiners' gasoline supplies were drying up, government policies seemed to make things worse. They "were a disaster from beginning to end," contends Jack Blum, who represents independent gasoline stations and frequently criticizes the big oil companies and the government.

GOVERNMENT'S ACTIONS

Among other things, the government:

—Hinted it would decontrol gasoline prices but never did for fear of a congressional backlash. Refiners, waiting for higher prices, held off expanding their production capacity.

—In effect, rewarded refiners for holding down gasoline production. By creating a sellers' market in 1978, the companies were able to impose certain price-rises approved in earlier years by federal price controllers; the government had let companies defer the increases until market conditions allowed higher prices.

—Pressed efforts to get the lead out of gasoline, and at the same time, banned the use of MMT, an octane-boosting substitute. These moves meant refiners were forced to use more crude oil, on average, for each gallon of gasoline.

This year, as the fuel situation worsened, the government tried to ease it with a rapid-fire series of new moves that seemed only to increase confusion in the industry.

PRICES INCREASED

In January, the Energy Department sought to spur gasoline production by loosening its price controls to let quotas rise further. But while consumers griped, refiners complained that the higher prices weren't adequate to encourage more gasoline-making.

In February, the department updated its rules under which companies divide gasoline supplies among dealers in order to reflect regional changes in population and fuel consumption. But the change was made with just a week's notice and caused unexpected disruptions in supplies. Two months later, the agency found it necessary to change the rules yet again.

In March, despite the beginnings of shortages in the U.S., the department quietly told refiners to stay out of the high-priced world spot market for crude oil and refined products. But last month, after the gasoline crunch hit California, the department reversed itself.

In April, the department began urging refiners to build up heating-oil stocks for next winter, even at the cost of gasoline shortages this summer. But a month later, after gas-station lines began sprouting, the agency lowered its heating-oil targets to allow greater gasoline production.

ANOTHER CHANGE SLATED

Just lately, the department has been preparing still another major change: It wants to scrap the existing gasoline price-control system in favor of a new, completely different formula.

Says Mr. Blum of the gasoline-dealers group: "The very act of trying to solve the crisis has only made the crisis worse."

Deputy Energy Secretary John O'Leary rejects such arguments. He concedes that some government actions have created market "distortions," but he says he would repeat most of them anyway. The updating of allocation rules, Mr. O'Leary asserts, was long overdue. The ban on spot-market purchases, he says, may have cut world prices by \$2 a barrel. And he insists that heating oil must take precedence over gasoline.

But many others don't put the blame solely on government actions. Indeed, some analysts—and 77% of the public, according to a recent Gallup Poll—believe that the gasoline shortage springs not from bungling or bad luck but from a plot by the oil industry.

CRITICS' REPORT

In a 15-page, statistics-studded report, a Washington-based anti-oil-industry group called Energy Action argues that in running down inventories last year, the companies left the U.S. "extremely vulnerable" to foreign shortages. Then, the group contends, the companies deliberately kept production low early this year by unnecessarily withholding oil from their refineries.

The report asserts that, despite Iran's cutbacks, world oil supplies actually exceeded 1978 levels because of increased production elsewhere. Thus, the group contends, the oil companies could have produced adequate supplies of gasoline, but didn't. The industry's major motive, Energy Action argues, was to exaggerate the Iranian shortage and scare President Carter into decontrolling oil prices in hopes of raising domestic production.

The group's report contends that the government, eager to encourage fuel conservation, helped contrive the shortage. Energy Action argues that the Energy Department overstated the amount and importance of the loss of Iranian oil and the growth in U.S. demand and that it let industry inventories dwindle so that stiff conservation measures would be needed.

"Rationing by inconvenience is one way of bludgeoning the public into cutting back on automobile usage," the group says.

Some congressional analysts agree with the Energy Action view. And a high official of the

Federal Trade Commission has publicly suggested that certain statistics show "the current gasoline shortage may be contrived."

EXXON OFFICIAL'S REPLY

Oil executives naturally bristle at such charges. "What's happened is that we've lost all that oil; we can't make it up," insists C. C. Garvin Jr., chairman of Exxon Corp. "We're running the refineries with all of the crude that we have."

Analyzing the situation, the American Petroleum Institute, the main industry group, says companies are merely being prudent by conserving their oil stocks to avoid costly stopping and restarting of refineries. The institute adds that government controls have interfered with even distribution of supplies and have deprived companies of the capital needed to expand unleaded-gasoline capacity; it takes more crude oil and special equipment to produce unleaded.

But the companies say they lately have been running their refineries at much higher rates than earlier in the year. Energy Secretary James Schlesinger says that under federal prodding average refinery operating rates have climbed to about 87 percent of capacity in recent weeks. Even if a company makes about as much gasoline as last year, however, shortages persist at the pump because demand this year is stronger and because federal rules require big chunks of fuel to be set aside for priority users, such as farmers. The result: Less than 100 percent of 1978 supplies are left for general sale.

Both industry executives and federal officials insist that there is a real world oil shortage. "It's as plain as mashed potatoes," says Mr. Schlesinger, who estimates world oil supplies are running about 1.5 million barrels daily below demand. Government and industry men say comparisons with 1978, such as those offered by Energy Action, indicate little because production in 1978 was abnormally low.

RIISING DEMAND STRESSED

But government analysts put much more stress than industry officials on rising demand as a cause of the problem. Mr. O'Leary says gasoline consumption grew 4 percent nationally, and 7 percent in California during this year's first quarter. "There isn't a gasoline shortage," he cracks. "There's a driving surplus."

Mr. Schlesinger conceded recently that the oil companies may have been "unduly conservative" in holding onto crude-oil stocks early this year. But he says their behavior is "understandable, perhaps, in light of the uncertainty regarding crude-oil supplies." And Deputy Secretary O'Leary says this conservatism doesn't "add up to a conspiracy either to create an artificial shortage of gasoline or rouse the price up."

However, Mr. Schlesinger says the oil industry's conduct isn't "necessarily a reflection of the best national policy." Another federal energy expert puts it this way: "What the companies have done is perfectly rational, even sensible from a business point of view. It isn't sinister or evil. But that doesn't mean it's in the national interest."

TRIBUTE TO ARTHUR FIEDLER

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

• Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the fact that Arthur Fiedler, the magnificent maestro of the Boston Pops, has been hospitalized after a mild heart attack. It is my feeling that Fiedler brings classical music to a large audience be-

cause he continues to play the most popular pieces.

Fiedler decided music was in his blood at a very early age, by the time he was 17 he had led a concert. Later Fiedler became the second fiddle in the Boston Orchestra, fulfilling an earlier prophecy that "a Fiedler is a fiddler." In 1930 he became the conductor of the Boston Pops, and a few years later he gave the first open-air concert in Boston.

Fiedler, who is now 84, had just begun his 50th year as a conductor of the Boston Pops. Now, it seems, he will be unable to return to the podium at least for the remainder of the year because of his illness. This is a great loss to the State of Massachusetts as well as the Nation.

I know my colleagues will support me in wishing a speedy recovery of this magnificent conductor. ●

INTRODUCTION OF YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1979

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act was enacted in the 94th Congress to test a variety of approaches to alleviate high youth unemployment, a problem which is both chronic and acute in nature. Although this effort has impacted on over two hundred thousand youth, the sheer magnitude of the problem, the increased labor market entry of young people, and the present alarming downturn in the economy have maintained unconscionably high levels of unemployment among a generation of young people who must assume the positions in industry, science, education, commerce, and government in the next decade.

The disproportionate rate of unemployment, especially among minority youth, has been festering for over three decades. Youth unemployment adversely affects our productivity, fuels inflation, and poses a major threat to our society. Crime, alcohol and drug abuse, mental illness, increased transfer payments, and other costly results of unemployment combined to produce a \$15 to \$20 billion price tag for every 1 percent of unemployment. Youth account for nearly half of the unemployed.

Based on the experience of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act, which expires next year, I have proposed a major initiative which combines immediate remedies and long term systemic and structural changes in the institutions and programs serving youth.

The bill I am introducing today provides an expansion of the youth incentive entitlement program to all poverty areas. This program guarantees part-time employment to impoverished youth on the condition that they return to or remain in school.

The bill also doubles the number of opportunities in the comprehensive youth employment and training program which provides a broad variety of

services to both in-school and out-of-school youth.

The initiative includes the expansion of opportunities in nonresidential, institutional skill centers in areas of high unemployment, providing not only skill development but basic education, counseling and supportive services. These activities could be sponsored by schools, community organizations, or private corporations.

The authorization for title VII private sector opportunities for the economically disadvantaged is extended for 2 years with a provision to coordinate title VII activities with youth programs under title VII.

The bill further expands opportunities for disadvantaged youth in the private sector by coordinating on-the-job training programs with the targeted jobs tax credit.

The proposal establishes a special fund to increase employment and training opportunities for young welfare mothers under the WIN program, improves the delivery of services to youth by the U.S. Employment Service, expands apprenticeship programs to emerging and non-traditional trades such as service industries, and authorizes the employment of youth in Federal agencies and special Federal projects.

The bill would also establish an inter-agency committee to reduce institutional barriers and to promote coordination at the Federal level.

The Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities has begun hearings this week on the program experience under the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act and will continue hearings on June 20, 26, 27, and July 19 on the current programs and on the initiative which I am introducing today.

I commend the administration's efforts, through the Vice President's task force on youth employment, to assess our current efforts and determine approaches which hold out the promise of increasing employment opportunities for youth. I will be working closely with the Department of Labor and the Vice President's task force in the coming months to promote strategies to reduce the alarmingly high rate of youth unemployment.

The initiatives that I propose will implement provisions of the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, which require the improvement and expansion of youth employment programs to reach full employment among our Nation's youth. The Full Employment Act mandates reduction of unemployment to 4 percent by 1983 and a reduction of the differential between youth and adult unemployment. A reduction of this differential is necessary if we are to reach that goal.

This problem, however, cannot be dealt with in piecemeal fashion. Structural programs alone cannot be effective unless macroeconomic policies are coordinated to promote balanced growth. Economic expansion is required if youth are to be assimilated into the labor force. Temporary, federally funded employment is a means to improve employability. Basic education and skills training

are needed and must be provided, but there must be jobs available in the economy for these young people after completion of such programs. We cannot afford to train youth if there will be no jobs for them after completion of training.

In April, the index of economic indicators fell 3.3 percent, the greatest drop on record. We are moving into a recession which will put currently employed people out of work. Unemployment may very well reach 8 percent before this time next year. The Congressional Budget Office recently updated its forecasts to reflect recent changes in the economy. CBO's predictions in July may be even more pessimistic. Our fiscal and monetary policies, in fact even our congressional budget process, are pushing us into an economic downturn. In the face of these trends, can we expect the private economy to place the hundreds of thousands of unskilled, disadvantaged youth when older, skilled workers are on layoff?

Robert Kennedy once said that "Our Nation's youth are our last best hope." As we fail them, we fail their future and our own. As we leave them unprepared, we leave our Nation unprepared, and we leave a generation in despair due to our unwillingness to make an investment in our Nation's future.

If you look into our inner cities, America's heart of darkness, you will find them: Young people becoming even more deeply estranged from a society which seems to ignore their needs. You will also find them in our Nation's towns and suburbs, roving aimlessly through shopping centers and residential areas. They also languish in the vast remote rural areas of our Nation.

They may have failed in school, or perhaps school failed them. Whatever their past or present problems, we must provide them with ample opportunities to become productive members of society.

A summary of the provisions of the Youth Employment Act of 1979 follows:
SUMMARY OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1979

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE IV OF CETA

The Youth Incentive Entitlement Program would be expanded to guarantee part-time employment or part-time employment and training to economically disadvantaged youth residing in urban or rural poverty areas who resume or maintain attendance in secondary schools or in a high school equivalency program. Such sums as may be necessary are authorized for fiscal year 1981 and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years. It is estimated that this expansion would serve approximately 300,000 eligible youth.

The Youth Employment and Training Program, which provides a broad variety of comprehensive youth employment, training and support service programs, would be doubled in size to provide approximately 200,000 additional opportunities for both in-school and out-of-school youth. A personalized employability development plan would be required for each youth served and as assessment of the appropriate services to be provided would be made for each youth upon entrance to the program. Income eligibility would be reduced from 85 percent to 70 percent of the BLS lower family income standard, but 20 percent of the funds could be utilized for youth who do not meet that criteria but face other barriers to employment. There would be author-

ized for appropriation \$2,400,000,000 for fiscal year 1981 and such sums as may be necessary for each of three succeeding fiscal years.

The Job Corps program under part B of title IV is amended to authorize additional funds to provide opportunities for youth residing in areas of high unemployment in non-residential institutional skill centers. There would be authorized to be appropriated \$80,000,000 for fiscal year 1981 and such sums as may be necessary thereafter. It is estimated that this would provide an additional 10,000 opportunities. These centers would provide basic education, skill development, and support services as presently provided in the Job Corps.

A new part D to title IV would be established to provide employment opportunities for disadvantaged youth in federal agencies to accomplish presently authorized agency activities. Additionally, funds would be provided to federal agencies sponsoring special youth employment projects. The present provisions applicable to public service employment under CETA would apply to this program.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VII OF CETA

The bill would reauthorize the Private Sector Initiative Program under title VII of CETA for fiscal years 1981 and 1982 and establish better linkages between this program and the youth programs under title IV. The Private Industry Councils would be directed to develop specific employment and training programs in the private sector for youth. Assistance would also be made available through demonstration grants to private employers to hire disadvantaged youth on special employment projects of benefit to the community with any profits derived to be contributed to the continuation or expansion of the project. \$50,000,000 would be authorized for each year for the demonstration community service projects.

The bill would expand opportunities for disadvantaged youth in the private sector by coordinating the on-the-job training provisions of CETA with the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit program, thus allowing private employers to take advantage of both programs and ensuring an incentive for private sector employers to hire and train disadvantaged youth.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE IV OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, THE WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAM (WIN)

The bill would authorize a special fund to provide additional work and training opportunities to welfare parents under 22 who volunteer to participate without regard to present non-federal matching requirements. There are authorized to be appropriated \$400,000,000 for fiscal year 1981 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the succeeding fiscal years. It is estimated that this could provide up to 50,000 new opportunities for these clients.

TITLE IV—THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INTER-AGENCY COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND PROGRAMS OF CO-OPERATIVE PROJECTS BETWEEN FEDERAL AGENCIES

The legislation would establish an Inter-agency Coordinating Committee for youth employment to coordinate the policies and programs of federal agencies involved in youth education, training and employment. The Committee would be composed of the following officials or their designees: the Secretaries of Agriculture, Defense, Health, Education and Welfare, the Interior, Labor, the Attorney General, and the Directors of ACTION, the Community Services Administration and the Office of Management and Budget who shall chair the meetings. The Committee would have an Executive Director appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate who shall review proposed rules, regulations and guide-

lines which affect or impair coordination of programs, consult with State and local governments and private groups, report and make recommendations to the Committee and the Congress on obstacles to proper coordination.

The Director would also administer a grant program which would provide additional funds to cooperative projects between agencies. There would be authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1981 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the two succeeding fiscal years for the cooperative grant program, but in no event would the incentive funds for any project exceed 20% of the federal funds involved or 10% of the total estimated project cost whichever is less.

TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO THE WAGNER-PEYSEY ACT (U.S. EMPLOYMENT SERVICE)

The bill would establish a youth employment component within the Employment Service to orient youth to labor market conditions and requirements, including job search workshops; provide referral to support services; promote the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit; and provide on-the-job training and placement services. The bill also authorizes in-school services including the dissemination of labor market information, vocational aptitude testing and the promotion of the consultation of school systems with private employers in the development of curricula. There would be authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 1981 and such sums as may be necessary thereafter. These funds would be allocated among the States as follows: 50% on the basis of the number of youth age 16-21 inclusive residing in the State, 25% on the basis of such youth who are unemployed and 25% on the basis of such youth who are economically disadvantaged.

TITLE VI—EXPANSION OF APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS

The National Apprenticeship Act would be amended by requiring the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with representatives of labor and management and the general public to designate shortage occupations that are suitable for apprenticeship and occupations in which apprenticeship is underutilized. Upon designation of such occupations, the Secretary shall provide for reimbursement for the costs of training of any apprentice in a registered program for such occupation. There would be authorized for appropriation \$60,000,000 for fiscal year 1981 and such sums as may be necessary thereafter.

The bill would also require any contract for the procurement of personal property or non-personal services or both with the federal government to include a provision requiring that the party contracting with the federal government shall employ a certain ratio of apprentices to craft persons.

The Secretary shall also, in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management, promote the establishment of apprenticeship in federal agencies.●

IN COMMEMORATION OF LITHUANIA

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the date June 15 marks a tragic anniversary in the history of the Lithuanian people. On June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union forcibly invaded the country of Lithuania mark-

ing the beginning of a, thus far, 39-year reign of oppression. Conscientious efforts to obtain their rightful liberty have resulted in hardships of undue proportion. The situation, not unfamiliar to many parts of our troubled world, draws outrage in the mind of the rational individual.

In this era of delicate diplomacy, attempts at action in the struggle for human rights are frowned upon as threatening to the tranquillity of the world which seems to sit on a precarious balance. In the midst of consequent apathy, Lithuanian-Americans here in the United States have spent much time and effort in attempting to aid their oppressed brethren in the fatherland.

I am taking this opportunity to recognize and commend the efforts of the Lithuanian people in their struggle for human rights in their homeland. Their diligent efforts can be admired as exemplary. The age-old struggle for human rights cannot end with the attainment of those rights by a select few. The Lithuanian people who have immigrated and escaped the tyranny of the reigning Communist government have not forgotten those they have left behind. They seek support from the United States in our leadership role in the free world. Our moral obligation to that role requires that we answer that call for assistance.

In fulfilling this obligation we denounce Soviet repression and recognize key dissidents. It is the very least we can do to take part in this people's quest for freedom—a quest which we have so long advocated achievement of for all peoples.

Highly deserving of recognition for their tireless efforts are Balys Gajauskas and Viktoras Petkus; they have suffered much for their cause at the hands of the Soviet KGB. Both men have been nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize by the congressional Members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. They have also been designated as "Prisoners of Conscience" by Amnesty International. Viktor Petkus today shares a prison cell with Anatoly Shcharansky, another victim of the Soviet system. Balys Gajausky, meanwhile, will celebrate, on July 28, his first wedding anniversary in the prison where he was married. I think that you, my colleagues, will agree that these men cannot be forgotten.

On this note I will close with a request for sympathetic support of Lithuanian self-determination. I hope that you will join with me in advocacy of liberation for any and all nations deprived of the basic human rights inherent to man's nature.●

RIP-OFFS IN MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I share

with my colleagues the following report by Herman Spector of Baltimore, Md. Mr. Spector writes vividly of the rip-offs perpetrated in our medicare and medicaid programs.

The report follows:

WHO IS REALLY RIPPING OFF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID?

Most people would instinctively say, "Doctors!"

Further, there are many people who still think that those doctors who do, are the only ones who are cheating. Unfortunately, these notions are misconceptions. The myth that doctors—as a group—are frauds, started around 1965, and continued over the years to develop into what many people view today as an accepted truth.

Congress deliberated long and hard before it passed the Medicare and Medicaid laws in 1965. Leaders in the medical community opposed the concept of federally financed health care, warning that such laws would lead to socialized medicine. The American Medical Association launched one of its most intensive and costly lobbying campaigns to block the passage of the health insurance bills. Notwithstanding, Congress enacted them into law.

With regard to Medicare, the government, in compliance with the law, adopted the third party payor system to avoid having direct contact with any person or facility involved in providing medical or health services to Medicare beneficiaries. Since that system (operated primarily by Blue Cross and Blue Shield and to a less extent by other insurance companies) had already been in existence in this country for a number of years, the federal government contracted with those carriers to administer the Medicare program. Through an arrangement of letters of credit, the government reimburses them for the money they pay out on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries, as well as for their administrative costs.

These companies had been in the same business covering their own subscribers for generations prior to Medicare; therefore, little concern was expressed over the possibilities of fraud or abuse in that new program.

But, soon, complaints were registered and patterns were observed. It became clear that unscrupulous individuals were deliberately circumventing the law to exploit Medicare for personal gain. Most of the complaints were against doctors. There was a reason why doctors acquired this type of prominence. From the beginning, the public had a convenient device to detect Medicare irregularities involving doctors. Every month, Medicare beneficiaries receive a form called EOMB (Explanation of Medicare Benefits), showing the type of service performed by the doctor, the date, the amount billed, and other pertinent data. Thus, the beneficiaries can report discrepancies if they detect them. Once reported, the situations are investigated, and if the discrepancies are the result of error or misunderstanding, they are discreetly closed out. But, if there is evidence of fraud or abuse, the investigators probe deeper, and when appropriate, refer cases to the Department of Justice for prosecution.

Publicity on an indictment is the first communication to the public that a particular doctor is involved in Medicare fraud. Then, when the doctor is arraigned before the court to enter his plea, another press release usually goes out. When the trial begins, another, and if any significant developments occur during the trial, yet another. Of course, when the jury retires to deliberate, another press release is in order, and when the jury returns with a verdict, which usually is "guilty", a more elaborate one is issued. And, ultimately, when the convicted doctor

appears before the court for sentencing, that bit of news is of headline dimension.

The national wire services frequently pick up all such releases. The stories often find themselves as sensational news items in newspapers and magazines throughout the country. That is the pattern of publicity on one doctor, in one case. All that, compounded with the many hundreds of Medicare convictions against doctors since 1969, makes it clear how the public has been inundated with a negative image of doctors. That image stuck.

But, the truth is that among the hundreds of thousands of doctors in the United States, the vast majority of them are honest, and conduct themselves with the highest degree of integrity. However, as in other professions or groups, there is a certain percentage of dishonest individuals in the medical profession who deliberately abuse, exploit, or defraud the health care programs.

Specifically, how do they rip off Medicare and Medicaid? Their methods vary. Generally, they bill for services they never rendered. And, they perform services that are not necessary. For example, one doctor billed for treatment he claimed he gave his patients on the same days that evidence proved he was out of the country. Another submitted bills for X-rays and medical treatments to his patient's feet, but an investigation revealed that the patient's legs had been amputated years before. Another doctor prescribed laboratory tests and various X-rays on all his patients, routinely, at practically every visit. A review by the Medical Society disclosed that most of the procedures were unnecessary, and were performed only to fatten the doctor's wallet.

While the public was thus stereotyping doctors as a group, there were other classifications of rip off artists who also were ripping off Medicare and Medicaid.

But they never attained notoriety as a group. For example, the vendors and suppliers of medical equipment and services, do a tremendous business through Medicare and Medicaid. So do druggists, laboratories, nursing home owners, home health agencies, and others. A certain percentage of them also are unscrupulous. In fact, throughout the same years, they have been the subjects of thousands of investigations. Some of the investigations led to prosecutions and convictions. And there were opportunities for repeated press releases on them, as well. But, they just don't make the headlines the way doctors do. They lack "sex appeal". (A term in the prosecutive world to indicate a case with exciting characteristics that would capture the imagination of a jury).

Although Congress passed the Medicare and Medicaid laws at the same time—as for Medicaid, Congress instructed the states, each to administer its own program in the manner it saw fit. The states, in varying degrees, already were allocating sums of money to provide health care for their poor. But, as an aid to the states, the Medicaid law provides for federal funding to match the states' costs. The amounts are based on a per capita formula and other criteria, for each state. Each is autonomous. Each determines its own extent of coverage, like medical services, hospitals, nursing homes, prosthetic equipment, drugs, and others. However, in contrast, Medicare is a federal program. Medicare is uniform in coverage, policy, and procedures throughout the country.

Now, most states did not show much concern over fraud or abuse in Medicaid. Some claimed that such activities were non-existent within their borders. Many were lax, and didn't implement any kind of detecting or investigating mechanism. A few, however, did, and showed good results from the outset.

Because the controls in Medicaid were so loose, and in many cases altogether absent, the cheaters became bolder. They were milk-

ing Medicaid to the tune of millions, and some say, even billions.

Among the crooks, are Medicaid recipients themselves. Ironically, they are the very people for whose benefit the program was initiated. Sometimes, they sell or lease their Medicaid cards to other people who are not entitled to Medicaid, but contrive to get free medical treatment. Then, there are those who falsify material facts, like not having any income when, in fact, they do. Or, if they tell the truth initially that they are penniless, and subsequently acquire income or resources, a fact they are legally obligated to report, but don't, they can thus continue to receive medical care, illegally. This type of fraud—recipient fraud—is so prevalent that Secretary Califano has declared war on it.

While the administrators of Medicare and Medicaid continued with their missions in the health care industry, the investigators and prosecutors continued with theirs, in bringing the perpetrators to justice. The investigators handled many thousands of cases. They referred many hundreds to the U.S. Attorneys for prosecution. The government recovered many millions of dollars from the frauds and the abusers.

As the years went by the confrontations between the government and the exploiters seemed to settle into a state of routine combat within a continuous war. The climate became relatively tranquil. That is, until 1975.

That year proved to be a milestone in health care in the United States. Stunning incidents occurred that revealed to the public there was yet another dimension to cheating in Medicare and Medicaid.

Nursing Homes. The scandals in New York shocked the people. The government was indignant. The entire country was outraged in realizing that the exposures of the past were only nibbles at the tip of a very deep iceberg.

Investigations revealed that corruption in the nursing home industry had been flourishing all along, unharnessed. The media columnists like Jack Anderson, and presentations like 60-Minutes sensationalized the unholy mess. The public outcry was so great, Congress had to act.

At that time, Senator Frank Moss was the chairman of the Sub-committee on Long Term Care. Senator Moss was not satisfied with reading reports, or just listening to witnesses testifying before his committee. He and members of his staff posed as Medicaid recipients, making over 200 visits to clinics located in New York, California, Michigan and New Jersey. The purpose of these visits was to gather firsthand information about the quality of care, and possible abuses in "Medicaid mills".

The Senate issued a news release on Senator Moss' report. It said, in part:

"After having examined fraud and abuse among (with more than 27 hearings) clinical laboratories, some home health agencies, a few hospitals that specialize in welfare patients, and now having taken an extensive look at Medicaid mills, Senator Moss and the committee staff concluded Medicaid fraud is massive. 'The 8 percent estimate given by HEW is too low. Fraud is at least 10 percent (\$1.5 billion out of \$15 billion total): more likely it is about 12 percent (\$1.8 billion)', said Senator Moss. 'Adding overutilization, we may be talking about 25 percent on the entire program.'"

In the wake of the Moss investigations, the government flexed its muscles, and acted. Three events took place in quick succession.

Congress gave to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare its own Inspector General, with the mandate to curb crime in all the Department's programs. They include Medicare and Medicaid.

Then, HEW was partially reorganized. A new agency was created, the Health Care Financing Administration. It became the parent organization of both Medicare and Medicaid. This arrangement was designed to reduce fraud, abuse, and waste in the two programs.

And, Congress passed a new law designated as H.R. 3. Its title is "Medicare-Medicaid Anti-Fraud and Abuse Amendments". Among the 23 sections of H.R. 3 are provisions elevating fraud in Medicare and Medicaid from misdemeanors to felonies. Each count is now punishable by a \$25,000 fine, 5-year imprisonment, or both. Also, health care facilities are required to disclose ownership information, and physicians who repeatedly charge patients in excess of their assignment agreements are now guilty of misdemeanors, punishable by a \$2,000 fine, 6-month imprisonment, or both. Previously, such acts were not even prosecutable.

But, Congress's big thrust in the H.R. 3 legislation, is Section 17. There, the federal government offers to each state a funding arrangement to cover 90 percent of the state's costs to develop and maintain an ongoing Medicaid Fraud Control Unit. The Fraud Unit, to be formed independently by each state, consists usually of lawyers, investigators, accountants, and support staff and equipment—all geared to attack the criminals who are ripping off Medicaid. About 25 states already have been certified by the federal government for their Fraud Control Units. More applications are being processed. As the Units become operational, the Administration, Congress, and the public will be scrutinizing their progress very closely.

A pause, at this point. Many changes are noted. Changes that evolved with the passage of time. Actions and reactions had their impacts.

The rip off artists were becoming more cunning. The doctor who billed for services on patients he never saw, or for treatment to feet that were previously amputated, although those types of fraud are still being perpetrated—in today's climate, such techniques seem primitive.

A new generation of manipulators emerged. They are sophisticated and elusive.

The new generation of the public is more knowledgeable. Yet, paradoxically, more apathetic in not sharing some responsibility with the investigators.

The new generation of investigators and prosecutors seem more determined than ever. They are frustrated in not having kept pace with their adversaries.

Evidence of these changes can be found in the types of cases that are handled today. They are quite different from some of those that were investigated in previous years.

For example, a carrier reported that the "X" company was overpaid \$98,000 for accelerated depreciation. The president of a Family and Children Services company pleaded guilty to defrauding Medicaid for \$750,000. A nursing home proprietor was caught running expenses of his tavern through his nursing home Medicaid reimbursement process. Investigations disclosed the operation of chain rental schemes involving a banker who collected, illegally, more than \$100,000 through Medicaid.

A recent report said that "Health Care is one of the fastest growing industries in the United States." . . . "It is now the nation's third largest."

Medicare and Medicaid have arrived. They are now—Big Business.

Fantastic discoveries of cheating are being made in all parts of the country. The discoveries are related to one of the latest innovations in the American economy. Diversification. For example, a food company buys

a real estate company, and a few nursing homes. That group then could be bought by a different conglomerate which already had diversified interests in entirely different fields, owning perhaps a construction company, a computer company, and a few banks. All the subsidiaries pyramid up to a home office which, at any time, could merge its entire empire with yet another chain . . . But, what has all this to do with ripping off Medicare and Medicaid?

Here is what is happening in the chain organizations. The owners know that the law requires the government to reimburse facilities like nursing homes, hospitals, and home health agencies, the costs they incur to provide "patient care" to Medicare beneficiaries and Medicaid recipients. Reimbursement for patient care includes not only room, board, and medical attention in a facility, but also the costs to maintain that facility, like utilities, management, interest on loans, expansion costs, administrative services, and others. So that, if a hospital shows that Medicaid patients occupied, for example, 40% of its beds during a fiscal year, the government will reimburse that facility 40% of the costs to maintain the entire facility during the year.

Now, if that hospital is a subsidiary organization within a chain, and the home office decides to add a new wing to that hospital, the government will pay 40% of the expansion costs, assuming the 40% ratio continues. At the market rate, it would have cost, say, about \$1 million to build that wing. But, the chain awarded the contract to the "Y" Construction Company to build it for \$3 million. The difference between 40% of \$1 million and \$3 million is \$800,000, a sum used in the formula for reimbursement from the government. The hidden fact here is the "Y" Construction Company is also a subsidiary, within the same chain. It is a related organization. Costs resulting from transactions between related organizations are not reimbursable.

Although all nursing homes, hospitals, home health agencies, and others are required to prepare Cost Reports to claim reimbursements from Medicare and Medicaid—within the mazes of line items on the numerous pages of the Cost Report forms, there are varieties of opportunities for manipulators to reap lucrative benefits. Some may be abusive but within the law, while others may be deliberate in violation of the law. In either case, the actions result in excess moneys having been paid out. They should be recovered and returned to the government. And where there is intent to defraud, the perpetrators should be criminally prosecuted. But, rhetoric alone is not an effective deterrent. Manipulators quickly identify areas in which they can flourish.

For example, all facilities that provide Medicare and Medicaid patient care are required to follow the prudent buyer concept. That is, the costs they report for purchases of material, supplies, equipment, services, etc., must conform to the fair market prices prevailing at the time. Now, if the auditors don't probe deeply enough, no one will ever know the extent of excessive amounts of money the government is paying for drugs, food, and for all the other reimbursable items.

True, Cost Reports are reviewed by auditors to verify the costs. But, the reviews range from perfunctory to extensive audits. The more extensive the audit the greater the yield, but also the greater the cost to the government. However, experience has shown that the savings ratio in Cost Report auditing is about 3 to 1.

Unfortunately, though, the government is not at this time allocating the time, nor the money, to investigate the multitude of transactions that constantly take place within the bowels of the chain organizations. Only those situations that the auditors

stumble across, are reported and investigated. But, the bulk of the fraud and abuse continues, silently, undetected. The extent is unknown. The operators go about their scheming business, unrestrained.

They are advised by experts, among them the smartest brains in law, accounting, and business. Complex matters such as good will, historical and current bases for depreciation, allocations of equity capital, transactions between related organizations—all these and other sophisticated machinations can mean millions, and some reports claim even billions of dollars of excess costs flowing from Medicare and Medicaid into the coffers of those who are ripping off those two programs.

Although the passage of time has brought about many changes, the government's posture and policy regarding Cost Report auditing has undergone little change and are as placid today as they were when they were first initiated 15 years ago; however, studies and appraisals are being conducted in that area. And no doubt, recommendations will be forthcoming. But implementing recommendations in government always cost money. And to obtain money to do a job in government is not easy. Those forces which have the responsibility of authorizing such expenditures are "cost effective" oriented. The other forces which are responsible to ferret out crime and impropriety in their programs, insist that although they are willing and able to do their job, they are rendered impotent because of inadequate manpower and resources. An impasse ensues.

In the meantime, the thieves gleefully take note of the bureaucratic internal conflicts, and become even more defiant. The situation is tantamount to the government extending invitations to steal—to the many individuals who are crooked, unscrupulous, unethical, fraudulent, abusive, and who happen to be in positions to capitalize on the weaknesses of the government.

So, now then, back to the original question: Who is really ripping off Medicare and Medicaid?

Doctors? Yes, the unscrupulous, the crooked doctors.

But, they have lots of company: druggists, therapists, laboratories, patients, relatives of patients, corporation officers, medical equipment vendors, hospital administrators, accountants, ambulance companies, executives, lawyers, nursing home proprietors, clerks, nurses, secretaries, government employees, computer operators, insurance company employees . . .

. . . and the yet unmasked ones.

Mr. Herman Spector wishes to note that no official support or endorsement by the Health Care Financing Administration or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is intended or should be inferred by him.●

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 38th anniversary of a tragic event: the deportation of countless thousands of innocent Lithuanians by the Soviets to certain death in Siberia. This is a fitting occasion to call attention once again to the valiant, heroic, and constantly continuing struggle of the Lithuanian people to regain their historic independence.

The Lithuanians have a history as a free people which dates back more than 700 years and their ceaseless struggle to maintain that freedom is a model to all people who cherish the right of self-determination and dignity.

I wish to express my admiration, Mr. Speaker, to all Lithuanians and their descendants for their courage in the face of such tragedies as we observe today. Also, I congratulate all Americans of Lithuanian origin for the invaluable contributions that they have made to America. Let us hope and pray that the events we recall today may never recur and that the Lithuanian people's struggle for freedom and independence may one day culminate in their joining the American people in enjoying the well-earned blessings of human liberty. ●

HONOR AMERICA DAY MERITS NATIONAL SUPPORT

HON. RONNIE G. FLIPPO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Speaker, the people of Huntsville, Ala. have initiated an event which merits adoption in every community throughout the country. To encourage the observance of Honor America Day representatives from each of the 50 States have been invited to Huntsville to observe this unique celebration on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving.

People from all parts of the Nation, from all walks of life, regardless of their background are asked to share in the celebration of Honor America Day. This day can express the commitment of every man, woman, and child in every State to freedom, liberty, and justice in our great land. Many events commemorate past deeds, Honor America Day looks to the future. Americans young and old can share in a belief in American ideals and a love for this country.

Honor America Day is not a holiday, rather it is an active day devoted to expressions by individuals and groups in our community. Honor America Day emerged from the plans of a high school to do something special to celebrate the American Revolution Bicentennial. It did turn into something special. This 200th national birthday party by students in American history at Grissom High School in Huntsville, Ala. was the beginning of this Honor America Day observance. Their actions were encouraged by their teacher George Newby and believed in by Superintendent D. Shelby Counce and members of the Huntsville City Board of Education.

Honor America Day is truly a grassroots celebration with its genesis in a Huntsville, Ala. classroom among students who wanted to make a contribution to the positive aspects of our Nation. This celebration has grown beyond a classroom or a Bicentennial year. Honor America Day is an ongoing program which has meaning for all Alabamians and for all Americans.

The Governor of Alabama has proclaimed Wednesday, November 21, 1979, and the Wednesday before Thanksgiving in every year thereafter as Honor America Day in Alabama. Gov. Fob James has joined in inviting students, parents, teachers, public officials, and concerned Americans from across the Nation to participate in the activities in Huntsville or to sponsor and participate in observance in their own community or State.

Americans are a people who celebrate both their shared heritage and diverse backgrounds; Americans join together to commemorate the important events of a proud history. Combining this pride in the past with a commitment to the future of our great Nation, based on the democratic principles of liberty and justice for all, is the celebration of Honor America Day. This is a day on which Americans can look back on great accomplishments of the past, but can join together in honoring the promise this Nation has for the future of all Americans.

As the Representative from the Fifth Congressional District, I add my voice to those of officials in Alabama and students in the Huntsville schools in asking all Americans to join with the citizens of Huntsville and the State of Alabama in this celebration to honor America. ●

MANIPULATING OIL PRICES

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, recently it was reported in the U.S. press and media that OPEC chairman and oil minister for Abu Dhabi and the United Arab Emirates Mani ibn Said al-Utaybah had been interviewed by the Hamburg publication Die Zeit and stated that he will suggest at the forthcoming June 26 OPEC meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, that OPEC return to a unitary—standard—base price and that OPEC increase this price from the present \$14.54 to \$20 per barrel or roughly a 37-percent increase. The interview was in the form of questions and answers. I believe the following questions and answers in this interview story are also meaningful in what they disclose.

In the oil glut period of late 1977 through most of 1978 Abu Dhabi cut its production and exports by 200,000 barrels a day, from 2 million to 1.8 million barrels. In refusing to contract spot market sales at a rate of \$40 per barrel Abu Dhabi's oil minister stated "unfortunately, it is not the final consumers who profit from their moderation but the intermediaries, the oil companies and refineries." The national oil company of the United Arab Emirates sold only to refineries which must refine, not store, crude and made direct sales to nations such as India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and others at the official OPEC price. Saudi Arabia, too, has now increased its oil extraction by roughly 1 million barrels to

nearly 10 million a day so as "to cool down the feverishly hot oil market."

By manipulating the spot market prices to \$40 and over a barrel, the multinational companies have effectively barred independent refiners from utilizing this market as a source of obtaining crude oil. It further forces the independents to obtain their crude from the multinational who may or may not provide them with any. The disclosure also shows the increasing tendency of oil producing nations to sell their oil on a nation-to-nation sales basis.

I believe these facts and trends further disclose the need for a Federal non-profit corporation to purchase all imported petroleum and petroleum products as provided for by H.R. 3604. It will help assure that small and medium sized independent domestic refiners will be assured of obtaining crude in sufficient quantity and at reasonable prices to help meet distillate shortages due to marketing dislocation.

The facts and trend also point out the obsolescence of the disguised foreign tax credit—royalty—claimed by U.S. petroleum companies operating abroad. This so-called credit does not help the U.S. consumer, does not assure a continued supply, inhibits domestic exploration and essentially provides a rip-off of billions per year from the U.S. Treasury.

The questions and answers follow:

Zeit: Does current OPEC strategy not boil down to a harmful, systematic oil shortage and price increase? You in Abu Dhabi, too, in 1978 decreased your production and your exports by nearly 10 percent.

Al-Utaybah: By 200,000 barrels a day, from 2 million to 1.8 million barrels, that is correct. We thereby intend to make our oil reserves last longer. After all, the problem of how we are to survive without oil some day is more important than the question of how the Western industrial states can get by with slightly less oil. We are planning to refine and process a large portion of our oil by building industries of our own. We in the United Arab Emirates are adapting to another 50 oil years at the present output level, to be followed by 50 gas years. The West and the rest of the world may reckon with a supply of 1.5 million barrels of oil a day for at least 50 years. Even more, if necessary. For 1979, at any rate, no further reductions have been envisaged. Saudi Arabia, too, has now increased its oil extraction by roughly 1 million barrels to nearly 10 million a day so as to cool down the feverishly hot oil market. After all, this is no destructive attitude.

Zeit: But even the formerly moderate OPEC state such as Saudi Arabia or the United Arab Emirates helped fan the oil-price fever and upped their prices through special surcharges.

Al-Utaybah: Our oil is very light and, consequently, the demand is very large. The market analyses justify high bonuses for our light oils. And Abu Dhabi still is over \$2 per barrel lower than the \$21 prices of Algeria, Libya, Nigeria and the North-Sea producers, who surely are not modest. We continue to decelerate and endeavor to stick to a reasonable price, above all else to the official OPEC price. This is why I refused to contract sales at a rate of \$40 per barrel on the spectacular "spot" market. Unfortunately, it is not the final consumers who profit from our moderation but the intermediaries, the oil companies and the refineries.

Zeit: What do you suggest be done to eliminate the existing oil-price chaos?

Al-Utaybah: The whole profiteering of extra prices, surcharges or special quality

bonuses must be abolished as quickly as possible. I do not think much of the introduction of two, three or four different oil-price categories. There should be only one price for each kind of oil, and if we want to increase it, then we should not seek excuses and nicely sounding forms of camouflage but call the price hikes what they are.

Zeit: The national oil companies of the different OPEC member states are putting aside increasing quantities of oil to market them on their own. Does this not promote the speculative individual transactions which foul up the whole OPEC structure?

Al-Utaybah: This does not apply to the United Arab Emirates. Our national oil company is selling only to refineries which use up everything they receive, and to a constantly growing degree to developing countries such as India, Pakistan, Bangladesh at the official OPEC rate. I am selling my oil on a free market, and I shall submit to the market forces alone. Any interventionism will lead to distorted, artificial price structures, to the deplorable state of affairs which are now too much for us in OPEC. With all determination, I am against transactions on the "spot" market.

Yet the Western industrial states, their governments and mineral oil companies likewise must cease going along with such hectic hoarding actions at record rates and for the sake of replenishing their oil reserves. ●

NUTRITION: A RIGHT OR A LUXURY?

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, during the past 10 years, our Nation has taken a giant step forward in assuring that no one—regardless of income or social status—goes hungry.

While one decade ago, it was a fact of life that 10 to 15 million Americans were suffering from hunger or malnutrition, today we can see the positive results of the many food assistance programs which have been initiated during the past 10 years.

The food stamp program, the women, infants and children (WIC) program, the Commodity supplemental food program, and school feeding programs—all can be hailed as successful contributors toward our national goal of a healthy America.

Yet, despite the documented success of these and other programs, the budget-cutting atmosphere sweeping this country threatens the survival of many important programs, and indeed threatens the very livelihood of millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an outstanding, concise article summarizing the current status of food assistance programs, which was written by Barbara Bode, president of our Nation's oldest antihunger advocacy organization, the Children's Foundation.

Earlier this month, the foundation brought together more than 1,000 people to participate in its second annual WIC symposium in Washington, D.C. WIC program participants, program administrators, community advocates, government leaders, administration officials, health officials and others were afforded the opportunity to discuss and analyze

the many perplexing food and hunger-related issues facing our Nation today.

Ms. Bode's article, "Nutrition: A Right or a Luxury?" should serve as a reminder to every Member of Congress as we consider the future funding of our many vital food assistance programs.

The article follows:

NUTRITION A RIGHT OR A LUXURY?

(By Barbara Bode)

Popular mythology has it that every welfare family is fat and happy, every food stamp recipient eats steaks and drives a Cadillac, every child who receives a free lunch throws it in the trash and eats ice cream.

The reality is that 17½ million children under the age of 18 live in dire poverty in the United States.

We are ranked 12th in international infant mortality tables.

Over eight million children go to school inadequately fed each day.

Infants and young children of eight million low-income and pregnant women face the danger of brain damage and death from malnutrition.

Someone once said the only reason Thomas Jefferson did not include food as an inalienable right in the Bill of Rights was that food was so plentiful in his lifetime, he could not foresee the need. It is time the United States decides food is indeed a "right," not a privilege, for all humans. It is time we give formal recognition, not just in our words but in our hearts, to hunger in America. It is time for a national commitment to the poor, not just when our economy is booming and we have some extra cash on hand, but when money is tight. It is time that we were proud of our food programs, not ashamed and resentful.

The years 1978 and 1979 conjure countless comparisons with 1968 and 1969. We are replete with retrospectives, satiated by correlations, numb from analogies, stark with contrasts. But we are still haunted by the unanswered questions raised a decade ago.

As we approach the tenth anniversary of Richard Nixon's White House Conference on Hunger, Americans still must ask, "Is food a right or a luxury?" Ten years later, we still refuse to admit there is hunger in America. Ten years later, the nation's first major cut in social welfare legislation—a reduction in food stamp benefits—is close to becoming a reality. The years since 1969 have seen progress—despite attempts by Nixon, and later by Ford, to cut social welfare programs. Federal food assistance programs, authorized by Congress and administered by the Department of Agriculture, have expanded until today they number seven:

In the last decade, the WIC Program was created to supplement the diets of malnourished pregnant women, infants and children. The School Breakfast Program was made a permanent, entitled program in 1975. The Child Care Food Program (CCFP) was developed to provide food to children in day care. The reforms of the 1977 Food Stamp Act made that program newly responsive to the needs of the poor.

The federal food assistance programs have also grown in effectiveness. In a special Senate hearing on April 30 of this year, "Hunger in America—Ten Years Later," testimony from a follow-up study by the Field Foundation, which conducted its first study in 1977, indicated:

Food Stamps are going where they are needed and practically all go to the people who need them the most;

Annual food aid expenditures per person in the "hunger counties" have increased from \$26 per person to \$127;

There are far fewer grossly malnourished people in this country today than there were ten years ago. Malnutrition has become a subtler problem;

"There was a sharp contrast between the bright-eyed, happy and alert little ones we see in Head Start Centers (where the children benefit from CCFP) and the dull, listless infants and children who did not participate;"

The WIC Program was called one of the "most dramatic" successes. Several studies indicate that this program is reducing the proportion of low birth-weight babies born to low-income women, hence lowering the infant mortality rates.

Ironically, as the hearing on hunger is convened, the Food Stamp Program, our major food assistance program, faces debilitating cutbacks at the hands of a Proposition 13-happy Congress. It seems to make sense to many on Capitol Hill, on the one hand, to make food stamps available to those who are too poor to buy them by eliminating the purchase requirement. On the other hand, they wish to put a ceiling on the food stamp appropriation.

The elimination of the purchase requirement (EPR), fought for by antihunger advocates for many years and effected by January 1, 1979, in all states, has brought millions of new participants into the Food Stamp Program—mostly elderly poor and rural poor.

But all Food Stamp Program participants face a severe reduction of benefits this summer if the 96th Congress refuses to lift the \$6.159 billion ceiling for FY 79 placed on the program by the 95th Congress. While House and Senate Budget Committees and the Administration have recommended that the top be raised to at least \$7.1 billion for FY 80, a bitter floor fight is promised when the issue hits the House and Senate this spring or summer.

Unfortunately, congressional staffers report very little pro-food stamp mail to date. Anti-hunger advocates appear to be focusing on local implementation problems instead of generating the mail which is needed to save the program.

Not only is the Food Stamp Program in danger. The Carter Administration has recommended several substantial cuts in the Child Nutrition Program appropriations. Among the recommended cuts is a proposal to reduce the National School Lunch Program expenditure by approximately \$300 million. As many as four million children would lose program eligibility if these cuts were implemented. It is hard to believe that Congress would curtail benefits to so many children in order to effect a savings that amounts to a mere 18 hours of military spending in 1980. Yet they seem well on their way to doing so.

The progress that we have made is being by a national mind-set, the push/pull of our desire to cover up hunger and simultaneously do something about it. We'll give the poor and hungry some social welfare programs, but we will not respect them if they use the benefits. It's un-American to be hungry.

As Congress debates the food stamp cap, Congress debates our commitment to food assistance for the next decade. In this, a country to which the Chair of the White House Conference said ten years ago, "We will feed the hungry children and it will cost what it will cost," Americans cannot afford to respond today, "poor people need not apply." ●

LETTER FROM JIMMY ANTONIO

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, among the mounds of mail normally received in con-

gressional offices, certain letters inevitably stand out for their unique warmth, sincerity, and genuine concern for segments of our society. This week I received such a letter from Jimmy Antonio, a 13-year-old, 7th-grade constituent of mine, who is a Star Scout in Boy Scout Troop 54 in Los Angeles. Jimmy's concern is about senior citizens, and particularly the problems they face in food, income, and housing. He writes with unusual concern and compassion, and his letter does much to reverse the notion of apathy among our Nation's young.

I hope each of my colleagues will read Jimmy's letter, and will, during the course of our deliberations this session, keep his concerns in mind.

The text of the letter follows:

JUNE 6, 1979.

HON. JULIAN DIXON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JULIAN DIXON: Please let me introduce myself. I am Jimmy Antonio, age 13 years, and I will be finishing seventh grade this month. Although I am not yet a registered voter I am writing to you as one of your constituents.

Presently energy problems and inflation are in the limelight projected by the news media affecting the life of every American. There is another problem though not important as other people and the news media think that must merit the attention of our Federal Legislative Body. The problem is one affecting the lives of our elderly.

I have seen old people past their retirement age working to supplement their social security pensions in order to live decently as possible. If you could see old people talk to each other in the super market how they wish they could afford to buy the prime meat they wanted your feelings will surely be touched. In their eyes I can see feeling of want and in their faces the expression of resignation.

Food prices are high as well as rent. Something must be done to help our older citizens. They have contributed so much of their time and efforts to make United States a better place to live in. Perhaps the government can build more low rental units for the elderly and special programs where they can buy good, adequate and nourishing food they can afford be made available to them.

I will pray that your office with great determination will exert efforts along these endeavors to give our elderly the best of life they deserved.

Very truly yours,

JIMMY M. ANTONIO.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL
GUARD OFFICER CANDIDATE
SCHOOL GRADUATES 18

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that on Sunday, June 3, 1979, the District of Columbia National Guard commissioned as second lieutenants, the graduates of Officer Candidate School Class XXII.

The District of Columbia Army National Guard Officer Candidate School commanded by Lt. Col. M. Michael

Berger was founded in March of 1958 by Cunningham C. Bryant, who is now the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard. This graduation marks the successful completion of a rigorous 14-month program of training in leadership and advanced military skills.

I know you will join me in welcoming the graduates of Class XXII as commissioned officers serving our Nation and the District of Columbia in the Army National Guard and the Army Reserves:

The Distinguished Graduate: Anthony R. Garrett, 2LT, Infantry.

The Graduates of Class XXII:

William M. Bailey, 2LT, Military Police Corps.

Colin E. Baird, 2LT, Ordnance Corps.

Dennis A. Baird, 2LT, Military Police Corps.

Eugene Bowers, 2LT, Transportation Corps.

Patricia A. Campbell, 2LT, Adjutant General's Corps.

Hattie P. Cox, 2LT, Adjutant General's Corps.

George H. Day, 2LT, Ordnance Corps.

Robert A. Faulkner, 2LT, Military Police Corps.

Charles M. Forbes, 2LT, Military Police Corps.

Kevin R. Glenn, 2LT, Transportation Corps.

Eric M. Hediger, 2LT, Corps of Engineers.

Michael E. Holland, 2LT, Military Police Corps.

Samuel J. Howard, 2LT, Military Police Corps.

Melvin S. Phillips, 2LT, Military Police Corps.

Dorothy A. Roberts, 2LT, Finance Corps.

Errol R. Schwartz, 2LT, Ordnance Corps.

Gregory F. Tyler, 2LT, Transportation Corps. ●

THE SMITH-MASON GALLERY OF ART IN WASHINGTON, D.C., A CENTER FOR BLACK AMERICAN ART

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the Smith-Mason Gallery of Art, located at 1207 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. in the city of Washington, D.C., was the first gallery of fine art in the capital established to exhibit and advance the works of black artists. In its 12 years the gallery has distinguished itself not only as a leading center of black American art but also as a major community institution for communication, study, and development among black artists.

When the gallery opened in April 1967, black artists in the Nation's capital had no public space in which to exhibit their works. Because creative expression cannot be stilled, Washington's black artists found private homes and churches to show their works. They lacked, however, the public space and a meetingplace that are so vital to the full flowering of the arts. The Smith-Mason Gallery transformed this artistic isolation into a creative community, and made available the support, the resources, and the broader contacts within the art world that helped launch the careers of many fine artists.

One of the high-points in the gallery's

life came in 1971 when it organized, along with the Smithsonian Institution, the National Bank of Washington, and Washington's artistic community the most extensive exhibition of black artists that had been assembled up to that time. The National Exhibition of Black Artists attracted artists from more than 40 States. It was a major creative event that gave tremendous impetus to black American artists. Throughout its career the gallery has arranged for the exhibition of black art in America's embassies throughout the world, in the White House and at the Library of Congress, and in leading universities such as Harvard, Boston University, and Howard University. It has made possible the purchase by, and placing of art works in, distinguished private collections and galleries throughout the Nation.

The Smith-Mason Gallery of Art could not have come into existence without the loving care and commitment of two wonderful human beings, Helen Smith Mason and James Mason. They have written that their purpose in founding the gallery was "to bring to the community the beauty and joy of art" that had so long been denied to it. They have succeeded beyond what they dreamed could happen. Having labored for years to build and then to strengthen this center of black American art, without any compensation, they have made possible a flowering of the arts in Washington. In the Smith-Mason Gallery of Art, Helen and James Mason built an environment of beauty for the community, a center for the recognition and development of black artists, and a place where young people can learn and broaden their lives.

I urge my colleagues and the public to take advantage of the experience the Smith-Mason Gallery offers in the four-story Victorian house at 1207 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. The following article on the gallery, written by Jo Ann Lewis in the Washington Post, April 28, 1979, furnishes an excellent historical account of the gallery. The article follows.

GALLERIES

(By Jo Ann Lewis)

"When we opened in 1967 there was nowhere for black artists to show except in private homes or churches or on the White House fence. We were racially aware, and felt that something needed to be done, so we did it."

Now 74, James Mason stands proudly among the paintings and sculpture that cover every inch of wall space in the four-story Victorian house at 1207 Rhode Island Ave. N.W. It was here, not far from Logan Circle, that he and his wife of 40 years, artist Helen Smith Mason, opened the nonprofit Smith-Mason Gallery 12 years ago, and have lovingly kept it going ever since.

"There had been one gallery for black artists, called Barnett-Aden," recalls Helen Mason. "Art had been my whole life, and I thought, how sad that there is nothing in the capital city. I hate these differentiations—an artist is an artist after all—but you know how people are. So we began having shows and classes and trying to help striving artists along. We had no children, you see, so this was our way of perpetuating the name Smith-Mason."

Before opening the gallery, Helen Mason had taught in the D.C. public schools, while

her husband, who has a degree in theology from American University, went into real estate. Together, they started a magazine in the '40s called "Pulse," designed as a national general-interest publication concerned with blacks. "But we started about the same time as Ebony, and they were smarter than we were," he recalls with a chuckle. "In any case, I did well, sold some property in Anacostia and bought this building for the gallery."

Since then there have been dozens of shows, the most important of which was a national Exhibition of Black Artists in 1971, a show which later traveled to the New Jersey State Museum in Trenton.

The current 12th Anniversary Show seems to have been chosen more out of love than out of any tough, objective criteria. There are some highly professional works, foremost among them a joyful new print in the entranceway by Washington artist James L. Wells, and several abstract marble sculptures by Edna Koonce. Bill Taylor has made a charming sleeping cat in metal, curled up in front of one of seven carved marble mantles, and Baltimore illustrator Jerry Prettyman is showing several good drawings.

The best paintings are the semiabstract landscapes by Delliha Pierce and portraits by LeRoy Gaskin. At the other end of the spectrum is a painting of Amy Carter doing a dance routine with her former classmates at the Stevens School, their tutus made of real seashells which have been glued to the canvas.

Given the changes that have taken place in the art world, as well as American society in general over the past decade, the question of whether such a gallery is still needed must inevitably be asked. "We feel there is still a need," says Helen Mason. "We have requests from black artists all over the world, from the Caribbean and as far away as Africa. When people find out there's a gallery for black artists they come."

The Masons are now setting up a foundation to perpetuate the Smith-Mason Gallery, the oldest of a group of Washington galleries devoted to black art. It has a house, but no major permanent collection.

Smith-Mason hours are Tuesday through Friday, 12:30 to 4, Saturdays 10 to 4 and Sundays 2 to 5. The exhibition continues through mid-May. ●

COMMUNITY CONTROL AND SELF-DETERMINATION: KEYS TO SUCCESS IN INDIAN EDUCATION

HON. MICHAEL E. LOWRY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. LOWRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak today in support of an amendment which will be offered to the Department of Education bill. This amendment, sponsored by Congressman FOLEY and Congressman KILDEE, would delete the transfer of Bureau of Indian Affairs programs from the proposed Department of Education bill.

There is a unique relationship between Indian tribes and the Federal Government; a relationship which has long been recognized by the Congress and the Court. In 1974, the Congress reevaluated that relationship, and pronounced, through the Indian Self-Determination Act, that self-determination and community control by the Indian tribes over

Federal programs would be the best course of action. The history of Indian affairs has shown that Federal domination over Indian matters has served to retard, rather than enhance, the progress of Indian people and their communities. At that time, the Congress declared its commitment to the maintenance of the Federal Government's unique and continuing relationship with and responsibility to the Indian people, and stated that effective and meaningful participation by the tribes was necessary. This participation was to extend to the planning and administration of those programs and services.

Since that act was passed, Indian tribes have contracted to operate over 30 schools which were previously operated by the Bureau. Indian parent committees have been formed to work with public school boards when Indian children are attending the public schools. Indian parents now recognize that they can make an impact on their child's education by becoming involved in the decision-making process of his school. For the Indian people, control over the education of their children means assuring that Indian culture will be encouraged within the school system; that the Indian language and instruction will be available to the child; and that the school administration will recognize the special needs and sensitivities of Indian youth.

The tribes feel, with some justification, that the control which they are currently exercising would be lost, and that the academic progress being made by their children would be lost should the BIA education program become a part of the proposed Department of Education.

I will vote for the Foley-Kildee amendment, and hope that my colleagues will do likewise. ●

WORKPLACE FACILITIES

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, milling or grain storage operations are responsible for death or injury to many workers in this Nation. These fatalities occur primarily as the result of suffocation of workers who have fallen into the storage bins or through fires and explosions of the highly combustible material surrounding these operations. At this point, I would like to give some examples that demonstrate the need for continuation and expansion of the monitoring of these hazardous industries and the use of frequent and strict inspections to pinpoint and remove the most serious hazards.

First. On February 14, 1979, a 26-year-old Cincinnati, Ohio, man suffocated when he fell into a silo of corn at a grain company.

Second. On March 28, 1979, a 20-year-old Waconia, Minn., man died of suffocation after falling into a grain storage bin. OSHA regulations require that workers in these types of operations wear

safety harnesses. But frequently this regulation is not complied with.

Third. On April 10, 1979, a grain dust explosion and flash fire injured six workers, three critically, at a milling company in North Kansas City, Mo. The accident was the third grain dust explosion in 15 months in the Kansas City area. In one of these earlier explosions on January 19, 1978, at a nearby milling company, 2 workers were killed and 34 others injured.

Must we wait for more serious explosions as occurred in late 1977 and early 1978, which claimed the lives of 63 persons and injured 55 others, before we realize the need for closer adherence to safety regulations in these industries? Following these 1977-78 explosions, OSHA substantially increased its inspection activities in these industries. But recently, due to manpower constraints, OSHA has been forced to cut back in the number of these inspections. This cutback places greater responsibility on the employer to closely monitor the work environment in order to guard against similar catastrophes. ●

THE CASE FOR VOLUNTARY SERVICE

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, who owns the lives of American citizens? The Federal Government or the individuals themselves? When we strip away all the rhetoric for reinstituting the military draft or establishing compulsory national service, this is the bedrock issue.

The 13th amendment to the Constitution states:

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude . . . shall exist within the United States, or in any place subject to their jurisdiction.

But we have approved the enslavement of society's producers to the nonproducers and to the special-interest groups who look for and receive Government favoritism for their economic activities. We have allowed the enslavement of minorities and the poor through dependency on the welfare state. And we have sought protection through the draft.

INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE

Through regulation and forced redistribution of private property, Government answers the demands of certain segments of big business and traditional welfare recipients for the services and wealth of others. The producers become the slaves of the nonproducers and the pseudo-producers, those skilled in using Government to their own economic benefit.

The poor and the middle class—despite the promises that they will share in the bounty—are brutalized by the inflation brought on to finance the special-interest Government programs.

THE NEW SLAVERY

The false promises to the poor have created a new enslavement, a dependency on Government not wholly differ-

ent, economically, or psychologically, from the old slavery. Legal restraints on free movement may have been removed, but the chains of economic limitations prevent free, upward movement for minority group members.

Self-respect and self-reliance—the characteristics of free people—cannot be achieved under any form of slavery, including today's policies of interventionism. They remain an elusive dream for many Americans, especially those who belong to racial and ethnic minorities. The Government interference in the lives of its citizens for the past half century, no matter how well intended, has only hindered these sought-after goals.

CONSCRIPTION

Since we have created an economic system based on one group involuntarily serving another, despite the clear mandate of our Constitution, we are doomed to chaos in economic and foreign affairs, characterized by a fierce battle as every special interest group fights to steal more for itself. The personal unhappiness we see all around us today is an inevitable result of this conflict. So perhaps it is not surprising that many of our leaders are willing to resort to one more form of involuntary servitude—conscription, with prison sentences for those who do not comply, in an attempt to "preserve the Nation."

These leaders not only ignore the moral question—by what right does Government enslave its citizens? and the constitutional question—is the 13th amendment obsolete? but they ignore the pragmatic issue as well—Can a free society be preserved by the use of force if its citizens are not willing to defend it voluntarily? I believe that any degree of involuntary servitude, whether it is the draft, social enslavement through the welfare state, or wealth confiscation by Government inflation or direct taxation, inevitably establishes the foundation on which tyranny can be built.

In reality, the voluntary method is the only ethical way to provide for the national defense. And it has an added benefit; it gives the people veto power over illicit military adventures. Senseless no-win wars like Korea and Vietnam probably could not have been fought without the draft.

Minus the "leadership" that drew us into Korea and Vietnam, we are now being asked to entrust the lives of our young men and women to Carter, Vance, Brzezinski, and Andrew Young. How could Congress even think of permitting these men to decide the futures of our young people? Some of our leaders are even promoting compulsory national service, with a choice of serving a civilian bureaucracy instead of the Armed Forces. Says the Committee for the Study of National Service—

... need to have their "apathy or self-centeredness" cured by working in a "socially desirable" area.

Is it Government's right to cure "apathy or self-centeredness" through involuntary servitude? Who knows what the Government's definition might be? By what authority does the Government reject or respect any psychological at-

titude? This is a power unknown to the Constitution and a frightening one for the future of our country. Once we grant the Government the authority to take 2 years of our lives for what it sees as socially desirable reasons, why not 3 or 30? Even 1 day is too much. The lives of our people do not belong to Washington. I trust our young men and women to exercise their God-given free will and serve their country in times of need. The draft is a reflection of a morally weak nation, not a strong one, as some have suggested.

Is it any coincidence that marihuana and heroin use first became widespread in an Army of unhappy draftees?

In very practical terms, the draft would be a disaster. After Vietnam, the lawbreakers were rewarded with amnesty. Many law abiders had been killed or crippled.

This has led to an untenable situation. Our no-win wars and foolish foreign policy have created an atmosphere of no-confidence in our Government. If the draft were reinstituted, defiance would run rampant. Draftees might abide by the rules until war erupted; but if our security were not really threatened, patriotic motives would not apply. If the war were to suppress Rhodesia or South Africa, the Right would rebel; if it were to prevent a Communist takeover of Taiwan, the Left would protest.

In principle, regardless of seemingly noble reasons, all military adventures other than to protect our national security should be rejected. Without the draft, senseless interventions into the affairs of other nations would be much more difficult.

THE SOLUTION

Our defenses do need to be strengthened and Government spending also needs to be cut. These goals can be achieved without slave labor. First, we should stop paying for the defense of other countries. Japan and West Germany, for instance, with economies far stronger than ours, are well able to pay their own military bills.

Second, we should transfer military bases to the United States from overseas to strengthen our own defenses and aid the balance of payments. We have progressed technologically to the point where we can know what the Soviets are doing without sitting on their borders. Recent State Department reports have indicated that even our Iranian listening stations—now overrun by Marxist guerrillas—were unnecessary in today's world—unlike the 1950's.

Third, we should promote the weapons of the future—nuclear submarines, ICBM's, laser ABM's, and cruise missiles—instead of archaic bombers, tanks, and infantry. Fourth, with the money saved from the above, we should dramatically raise the salaries of the highly qualified military technicians who would make up our smaller, voluntary Armed Forces.

The draft and its blood brother, national service, are wrong morally, pragmatically, economically, militarily, and constitutionally. Congress must not give them its approval.

Milton Friedman, "An Economist Protests"—"A military draft is undesirable and unnecessary. We can and should man our Armed Forces with volunteers—as the United States has traditionally done except in major wars.

"My interest (in the draft) has been on two grounds. First, and most obvious, because conscription is such a blatant and serious restriction on individual freedom, the most extreme form of compulsory servitude now practiced in the United States. Second, because public acceptance of a strong armed force seems to me essential to maintain the freedom of the United States. Conscription undermines that acceptance and has played a major role in bringing the military into the low public estate to which it has fallen.

"In the course of my involvement in this issue, I have come into contact with many other persons concerned with the draft—both in favor of it and opposed to it. I have observed many persons initially in favor of the draft change their opinions as they have looked into the arguments and studied the evidence. I have never observed anyone who was initially in favor of a volunteer force reverse his position on the basis of further study. This greatly enhances my confidence in the validity of the position I have taken."

TRIBUTE TO LEO D'OR

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, today I ask that my colleagues join with me in paying tribute to an individual who has truly devoted his life to tireless service for his neighbors, his community, his State and our Nation. Mr. Leo d'Or, my friend and constituent, is the man in question and, on June 21, the San Joaquin, Calif., chapter of the American Red Cross will honor Leo at its annual meeting and awards dinner. He is assuredly more than worthy of this recognition.

Leo d'Or exemplifies the selfless and devoted citizen whose voluntary efforts have made the Red Cross the valuable and effective organization which it is. For 32 years he has enhanced the San Joaquin County chapter's efforts with his able endeavor, and 20 of those years have seen his guidance as a member of the board of directors. Over the years, he has demonstrated his leadership and capability by taking on numerous chairmanships; surely he is most deserving of the recognition he is about to receive.

Mr. d'Or's civic service has not been limited to the Red Cross, however. His sincere concern for the field of education has prompted him to assume various voluntary roles, including trustees and board clerk of the Waverly School District. An original member of the first elected San Joaquin County board of education, he served as that organization's chairman for 5 years, and also offered his services as treasurer of the San Joaquin County School Boards Association. Leo's gifts to education have earned him the prestigious Golden Apple Award from the San Joaquin CTA Coordinating Council, as well as the Golden Apple Certificate from the California

Elementary School Administrator's Association in 1961.

A founder of the Waterloo-Morada Fire Protection District, he also served as trustee and secretary for 12 years.

The awards and honors accorded to Mr. d'Or are many and varied, and considered together they provide a graphic dramatization of his diverse contributions: a commendation resolution from the California State Assembly for community involvement and education; another such resolution from the board of supervisors for his service on the San Joaquin Board of Education; and the American Advertising Federation Silver Medal Award for achievements in advertising and civic betterment.

This latter award was duly earned: Leo headed the advertising department of the Stockton Record for many years, having commenced his career at the newspaper as a salesman. He rose to the post of advertising manager, and then to advertising director, retiring from the newspaper in 1969.

Leo also found time to be instrumental with the committee which formed the new San Joaquin Delta College District, and was elected to serve on its first board of trustees.

Mr. d'Or has just recently retired from his role with the Red Cross board of director; however, he has hardly retired from civic contribution. He serves presently as chairman of the board of trustees of St. Joseph's Hospital; as a member of the board of Delta-Stockton Humane Society; as a member of the San Joaquin County Board of Retirement; as an associate member of the Stockton Chamber of Commerce, and as an honorary member of the Stockton Rotary Club. Additionally, he has just completed two terms on the board of directors of Catholic Charities.

Virtually no area of endeavor has been ignored by Leo d'Or's civic-minded eye and giving spirit. He represents the type of citizen involvement, commitment, and caring which I for one wish many, many others would emulate. I am both pleased and proud to recognize his many accomplishments today, and I am also very honored to have him as my friend and constituent.

I know that my colleagues will share my admiration for this outstanding American.●

LEGISLATION TO MAKE IMPROVEMENTS IN MEDICARE AND MEDICAID PROGRAMS

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining my colleague, the Honorable CHARLES RANGEL, chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Ways and Means Committee to introduce legislation proposed by the administration to make certain changes and improvements in medicare and medicaid.

Many of the proposals contained in this legislation were included in the President's budget. The administration estimates they could result in savings of as much as \$181 million in fiscal year 1980. Clearly these are provisions which are worthy of the serious consideration of the Congress.

I would say frankly, however, that I do not support all of the changes suggested in this bill. I have particular concern with several of the provisions relating to PSRO's for example, and I could not support them. Further, I am disappointed that several legislative changes which I believe have administration support, such as the so-called swing-bed provision which allows hospitals to use empty beds for long-term care without designating a wing of the building as a skilled nursing facility, are not included in this bill. I am confident, however, they will be included when we report legislation to the Congress.●

THE NEED TO RESPOND TO JAPAN'S TECHNOLOGY DRIVE NO. 2

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is likely that our recent trade problems with Japan will appear minor compared to the trade problems of the future. The reason is that Japan has a long-range plan for the improvement of its industries and the application of new technologies. The United States, on the other hand, has no such plan, no such vision, no such commitment to industrial technological progress. We continue to talk about the need to invigorate our research, development, and innovation procedures—but there is no action. For a year, the Department of Commerce worked on plans on ways to improve U.S. corporate innovativeness—but to date, nothing seems to be coming of that report.

In the interim, the Japanese continue to work for major breakthroughs (technological superiority) in fields such as aircraft, computers, advanced electronics and industrial processes. I have commented on the future trade problems being created by America's failure to respond to Japanese technological initiatives in a statement in the RECORD on May 24. Today, I would like to include another article from the Japan Economic Journal (Nihon Keizai) of June 5, 1979. The article, entitled, "New Drive Is Planned for New Basic Industry Technology," should make sobering reading for Americans concerned about the international competitiveness of our economy.

The article follows:

NEW DRIVE IS PLANNED FOR NEW BASIC INDUSTRY TECH

The Ministry of International Trade & Industry (MITI) recently disclosed that it is planning to break a long-standing stalemate in new technology development in Japan's key industries, including steel, aluminum producing, petrochemical, chemical and nonferrous metal mining-smelting.

To attain its new aim, MITI intends to make the most of the Large-scale Industrial Technology Research & Development System to promote important industrial technological studies through governmental financial and research cooperation by MITI's Agency of Industrial Science & Technology, inaugurated in 1966, and MITI's Moonlight Project, an energy-saving counterpart of its 1974-2000 Sunshine Project to develop various non-oil energy sources by the start of the next century.

MITI's forthcoming Operation Breakthrough has been motivated by the fact that compared with many international level technological achievements seen among other Japanese industries including electronic and communications equipment, little really innovative technology has been developed in recent years in the domestic basic or primary industries.

The situation has been worrying MITI because such a stalemate in Japan's most important industrial areas would discourage growth of new full-fledged industrial capital expenditure drives in such industries and make their managerial policies defensive. That leads to Japan's lag in strong international competitiveness in such vital industries.

According to MITI, the current new direct pig iron-making and new olefin producing research in the steel and petrochemical industries, already being governmentally aided under the Large-scale Industrial Technology Research & Development System will be accelerated by the new drive.

In addition, at least three other kinds of industrial research will be placed under the system to quicken their development. They are the chemical industry's development of functionally innovative types of plastic materials, the steel industry's super-high temperature resistant metal material development and the nonferrous metal mining-smelting industry's super-high temperature resistant alloy material development. MITI plans to name such studies for subsidization, and, if necessary, also governmental technological cooperation.●

FLAG DAY

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the adoption of the American flag. We Americans have a need, in these times of economic uncertainty and energy shortages, to display our pride for this great Nation. Mr. Speaker, what better means to honor our country than to take time to praise the symbol of the United States of America, the Stars and Stripes?

In 1895 it was decided that June 14 would become a day each year when American citizens would take time to reaffirm their pride in the flag and the country. Let us then raise our voice as one and, as a Nation, pledge allegiance to the flag. Our flag has flown over a country which has changed much since January 1, 1777, when the first flag of the United States was raised by George Washington at Somerville, Mass. Let us, today, honor our Nation's past and pledge our duty and responsibility to our country's future, a future when the Stars and Stripes will continue to be raised over a free and glorious land.●

NORMAN W. BULLY IS HONORED UPON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE UAW

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the recent retirement of Norman W. Bully from the United Auto Workers Union. I was honored to be able to attend a retirement dinner for him recently in Flint, Mich., and to be among those extending tributes to him for his long record of service to the UAW and the rest of the labor movement. His retirement will mark the first time in 42 years that he has not held an official position within the UAW.

I would like to share the brief description of his career that appeared in the program issued for the dinner honoring him that was held May 26 in the hall of UAW Local 599, of which he has been a member since 1937.

The tribute reads:

Norman William Bully started work at the Buick Motor Division in 1929 at the youthful age of 16 years. He worked several months, then returned to school and continued working periodically until seniority was established on June 9, 1930.

The first record of his union affiliation was with Buick Federal Local No. 12, which preceded Buick Local No. 156, AFL-CIO. Union meetings were announced by a member standing on a table in the aisle of the old Buick Heat Treat and calling out the time and date! The Union Hall was a one room, ramshackle building on Industrial Avenue.

Norm relates with laughter a time when the members bought black cloth hats and with white print stamped the word union on the front. They paid a nickel for the hats, sold them for a dime and kept their five cent profit to defray expenses. The leaky roof, and the next rain soon ended their business venture!

In 1939 when Local No. 599 was chartered, Norm was elected to the Seven Man Board (as Shop Committee or Top Committee) was then called. (He held every bargaining position in his local: Deputy Steward, Chief Steward, Committeeman, Shop Committeeman, then Chairman of Shop Committee). He joined the International Union, GM Department, and spent two years on the National Negotiating Committee, then was elected President of the Greater Flint CIO Council.

In conjunction with these positions, he served on numerous community agency boards but his greatest pride comes from having served his local union on standing committees and the other offices mentioned. He also states proudly that his name appears on the first Pension Agreement negotiated by the UAW.

His unionism is family oriented . . . his Father, Norman W. Bully, Sr. worked at Buick in 1906 for its predecessor, the Patterson Carriage Company. His Mother, Mary Bully, was a staunch advocate of unionism and women's rights long before "Lib" was fashionable . . . she just never thought there was another way except equal pay for equal work performed!

Brothers Earl and Leo were also Buick Committeemen, and to this day, the family name carries on the tradition of Bully's building Buicks, with nephew Doug (Earl's son) who is a Buick employee.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Norm's wife, Millie, is affectionately remembered as the secretary to the Shop Committee at Local No. 599 from 1941 until retirement fifteen years later.

Norman Bully can indeed be called "Mr. Union". His jovial laughter resounds as he fondly recalls incidents with people who (many of them gone) helped build the foundation of our great union.

As Norm is honored this day, he shares the tributes with his family and his many union brothers and sisters whose foresightedness and courage made Unionism a way of life for their community and for our nation. ●

SOCIAL ENGINEERING FAILS AGAIN

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, for 40 years the Federal Government has been engaged in social engineering, attempting—through large-scale centralized programs and massive infusions of funds—to change the social and economic face of America. For 40 years, the programs and the spending have repeatedly failed.

There are several reasons for this failure. One is that the people and the problems are out in the States and localities, not in Washington where the social planners and regulators dwell. Another reason is that social change often cannot be forced. It will not happen until the public is willing to accept it.

Someone once said that in every cliché there is a germ of truth. A couple of appropriate ones come to mind. "You can lead a horse to water, but you can't make him drink," for instance. Or, "You can't legislate the way a person thinks." There is more truth to these statements than the social planners would care to admit. They have their own vision of America, and America will conform to that vision whether it likes it or not.

Unfortunately for the social planners, the real world does not operate that way. The big programs and the big spending, for the reasons I have mentioned and others, often not only fail to correct problems or achieve goals, but frequently they make matters worse.

A good example of this was described in a Washington Star column by Richard Reeves on June 11. In it, Mr. Reeves describes the debacle inflicted upon the city of Detroit by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Housing Act of 1968. An attempt to turn deteriorating neighborhoods into modern urban housing for the poor, not only failed, but also literally and figuratively destroyed much of the city's available housing. No thanks to the Federal Government, Detroit is now beginning to recover.

I would like to share Mr. Reeves' column with my colleagues. I hope it will be food for thought as Congress considers expansion of the food stamp program, the welfare program, national health insurance, and a host of other programs to facilitate continued Federal social planning.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Star, June 11, 1979]
LIBERAL BLUNDERS AND KENNEDY'S HESITANCE

(By Richard Reeves)

DETROIT.—Douglas Fraser, president of the United Automobile Workers (UAW), is a proudly unreconstructed New Deal liberal who would very much like to see Edward Kennedy run for president in 1980. But he doubts that will happen—and the reason may be down the street from Fraser's office on Jefferson Avenue.

If you go three miles east along Jefferson, you come to Chalmers Street. There are 29 boarded-up houses and 20 vacant lots along the six blocks on either side of Jefferson—on Chalmers, Marlborough, Philip, Manistique, Ashland and Alter Streets. They were once good houses, solid two-story brick buildings on tree-lined streets a few hundred yards from the wealthy gentility of Grosse Pointe Park.

Those 49 houses and more than 16,000 others like them were destroyed by the United States government—by well-meaning liberals. Around here it's known as "The HUD Scandal." In its way, the scandal is far worse than Watergate—it robbed the taxpayers of almost \$1 billion and damn near destroyed the city of Detroit.

This is, very briefly, what happened:

The Housing Act of 1968, one of the last achievements of the Johnson administration, established programs under which poor people could buy inner-city homes with down payments as low as \$200. The Department of Housing and Urban Development, through the Federal Housing Administration, guaranteed the mortgages.

In 1969, the former governor of Michigan, liberal Republican George Romney, became secretary of HUD and he decided to use the program to rebuild his hometown. HUD acquired thousands and thousands of homes in changing neighborhoods, hired local contractors and agencies to fix them up and sold them with the FHA mortgages.

The troubles began when contractors began bribing HUD inspectors and faking the repair of many of the houses—there have been more than 200 convictions and indictments in the scandal over the past eight years. Then it turned out that the new owners were unwilling or unable to maintain the houses or pay the mortgages.

Banks began foreclosing—with HUD paying the bills and getting the houses back. The government then tried new owners and the same thing happened again. Finally, in embarrassment, HUD began razing the houses by the thousands.

Today, 11 per cent of Detroit's former housing stock is vacant lots—and the 29 houses I saw in Jefferson-Chalmers—some of them had to be worth \$75,000—are boarded up, waiting for the wreckers.

"We were wrong about a lot of things and we're paying a price," says Doug Fraser, of American liberalism. "The HUD scandal is an example. We just were wrong about government's capability and the ability of poor people to adjust to a modern urban environment even when they were given good homes."

Part of the price that liberals are paying is the reluctance of Ted Kennedy who could be their savior, to run in 1980.

The senator from Massachusetts may hesitate because it wouldn't be nice to bump Jimmy Carter or because he's afraid of new public exposure of his tattered personal life, but there is a more compelling reason: Given liberalism's recent failures, it may be impossible for a real liberal to govern the nation in the early 1980s.

The rise of conservatism, or "the swing to the right," in American politics, is essentially a reaction to the grand mistakes of liberalism—busing, opposing "law and order," blundering attempts to elevate the poor. Detroit has survived—the city is surprisingly vital these days—but the evidence of what

happened to it is still visible on Chalmers Street.

But some time may have to pass before America is ready to try more New Deal government. That's why Kennedy wants to wait until 1984—after conservatives have had a few failures of their own.●

SAWYER URGES DAVIS-BACON REPEAL

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, today I had the privilege to testify before the distinguished Subcommittee on Labor Standards of the House Committee on Education and Labor, chaired by the very able gentleman from Rhode Island, Congressman EDWARD BEARD, during its oversight hearing on the Davis-Bacon Act. As I indicated in my testimony, this should not be considered a prolabor or probusiness issue, but pro-Government efficiency and elimination of laws that have outlived their usefulness to the point they have become counterproductive.

My bill, H.R. 3116, would repeal the Davis-Bacon Act as it exists today. Believe me, however, I would be the first to support an effort to reinstate this act if it in any way brought about severe repercussions to the working people of this country.

I commend the subcommittee for its attempt to shed light on this important issue and I include a copy of my remarks before the subcommittee for the attention of my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN
HAROLD S. SAWYER

I am pleased to have this opportunity to appear before this distinguished Subcommittee during its review of the Federal prevailing wage law, known as the Davis-Bacon Act.

At the outset, let me commend this Subcommittee for taking a fair and responsible approach to this difficult and important issue. I certainly share the Chairman's desire to ensure fair treatment for individuals engaged in construction work on federal projects. I firmly believe we must encourage workers, through collective bargaining, to obtain improvements in wages, hours and working conditions. I am committed to this goal, and it is in this spirit that I come before you today.

The Davis-Bacon Act is little known to the general public, yet it has sparked heated controversy in recent years. As we all know, the Act was born in 1931 and establishes wage rates for workers on federal and federally assisted construction contracts in excess of \$2,000. The original purpose of the law was to prevent itinerant contractors from underbidding local contractors through the use of low cost imported labor.

A necessary part of the legislative process requires that the Congress conduct a systematic oversight procedure in an effort to increase government accountability and determine if the merits of a program or law justify its continuation rather than termination. This year, when we have been dubbed the "oversight Congress", I feel it is even more imperative that Congressional Committees undertake a comprehensive review of the Davis-Bacon Act and carefully scrutinize its efficiency and effectiveness.

After having completed my own study of this issue, I believe there have been significant changes in economic conditions since 1931 and the enactment of other wage protection laws that make the Davis-Bacon Act wasteful, counterproductive and generally unnecessary today.

This Committee is very familiar with the comprehensive report submitted to the Congress by the distinguished Comptroller General of the United States Elmer B. Staats on April 29, 1979. In my opinion, the GAO report is one of the most thorough evaluations of the Davis-Bacon Act done in recent years. The GAO is an independent arm of the Congress and makes its recommendations without the expected bias that has often surrounded this issue on both sides. We would be fools not to heed our own counsel. Therefore, it is especially noteworthy that in its recommendation to the Congress Davis-Bacon is described as "obsolete", "inflationary", and "it should be repealed."

Rather than outline all of the reasons which the GAO has clearly identified that support repeal of Davis-Bacon, I want to take this opportunity to make this Committee aware of some of the serious deficiencies that exist in the Davis-Bacon Act today.

By requiring payment of the "prevailing wage" on federally funded projects of \$2,000 or more, we are spending \$715 million in unnecessary public construction and administrative costs. What this means is that taxpayers are shortchanged in what Uncle Sam buys with their tax dollars.

The use of prevailing wage has been particularly wasteful in my home area of Grand Rapids where nearly 90 percent of all construction is nonunion. Additional problems have been encountered because workers expect a higher wage after completing a federal project. Often, a small subcontractor is required to rotate his employees to give all workers the benefit of the higher federal prevailing wage. Not only does this breed discontent among workers, but you lose continuity in completion of a project and productivity is lost in shifting employees between jobs. Employees are even less happy when they must return to a lower pay scale after completing a federal job because they are doing the identical work for less pay. This spillover impact on local construction wages paid on private work is perhaps the most serious effect of the Davis-Bacon Act, and it indicates to me something is drastically wrong with the system.

Other problems exist. I am appalled at the cost to administer Davis-Bacon. A tremendous amount of time, which is money, is spent by the Federal government. In 1977, the Labor Department determined high on about 40% of the projects, increasing wages by \$500 million and adding another \$215 million in administrative costs to the Federal government's expenditures for construction.

In a practical sense, Davis-Bacon has forced many cost-conscious communities to turn down the use of federal funds for important local projects. In one instance, at the Bellrocton Community Center in Belding, Michigan, local officials wanted to use federal revenue sharing monies to repair a badly leaking roof. Local contractors estimated the job could be done for \$7,500.

But federal money triggered Davis-Bacon, and the construction workers were required to be paid "prevailing wage." As a result, the lowest bid, and the only bid, was for \$14,900, nearly double the expected amount. Consequently, the project was aborted, and the roof still leaks. In another instance, a project to erect a small concession stand and restrooms at a local park, a simple concrete building, cost \$28,000 with Davis-Bacon, when without the cost would be \$18,000.

The effects of "prevailing wage" are even more widespread. A school district in my

Congressional District took bids on a complex to store and repair school buses. When the bids were opened, costs were escalated from 12-16 percent. Even more serious according to one school board member, "the number of bidders was limited simply because most contractors stated they could not pay one wage to one crew and another hourly rate to crews on non-prevailing wage jobs. This simply would cause an employee relations problem they could not handle."

Throughout these examples, I am afraid the federal government has effectively eliminated the incentive work ethic. This argument is especially true for all piece workers in the construction industry. For example, drywall installers are paid by the square foot installed, throughout the construction industry. Prior to drywall installation, the workmen must stock the units. This labor cost is covered by their square footage rate which will be paid after the installation of materials. The Davis-Bacon Act requires that these workmen be paid an hourly wage for this labor, duplicating the cost of installation.

The same overage occurs at the end of the drywall installation when workers must clean up.

Also, carpet layers are paid by the square yard. Typically, they prefer to work 10-12 hour work days, allowing them additional free time at the end of the work week. The high wages required by the Davis-Bacon Act and the overtime requirements make it impossible for an employer to allow anything but a regular eight hour work day. Many employees submit false time cards so that they may work the hours of their choice.

Permit me just one more flagrant example of why we need to reform Davis-Bacon. Take a look at the A. J. Nydam Company, a small company located in Grand Rapids, Michigan. It has been around for a long time and has no desire to get much larger than twelve to eighteen men and six trucks. They do some boiler work, but their strong point is air—air for heating, cooling and/or ventilating. They are a proud company, and rightly so. Few of their competitors can offer a better place to work and few, if any, pay as well. Normally, they work with two-man crews, a mechanic, and a helper. Qualified men are hard to find, so the sooner a helper grows into a mechanic the better off they are. Their current mechanics has been with them an average of 19 years and have never been laid off.

A. J. Nydam recently completed a job at the new Eaton County Courthouse, located in Charlotte, Michigan. It is a two story courthouse with a connecting single story county office. The two total 60,000 square feet, requiring 200 tons of cooling. The figures below show the impact of Davis-Bacon on the project cost.

Normal rate merit shop.....	\$50,390.76
Department of Labor interpretation	81,736.48

An intolerable 62 percent increase because of the controversial Davis-Bacon Act.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on. The important point is that we have an opportunity to correct this situation in a way which would save taxpayer money, and reduce inflationary pressure without sacrificing the rights of workers who at one time were in great need of the protection which Davis-Bacon was created for. I suggest, however, in light of the facts and the GAO report, we have our heads in the sand if we fail to eliminate this artificial wage-support legislation.

I urge this Committee to take prompt action in repealing this totally useless and wasteful law.

Thank you. ●

ANIMAL CRUELTY BILL

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation aimed at protecting animals from the needless cruelty and suffering they experience in laboratory research and testing. Millions of animals are subjected annually to inhumane suffering either because research facilities are not aware of, or do not have access to, alternative methods to the use of live animals in their research, or because laboratories duplicate experiments and thereby expose more animals to pain. Accordingly, my bill would establish a Commission to Protect Animals in Research and I believe it would aid in eliminating the senseless pain animals experience in the laboratory. This bill, in conjunction with legislation which has been introduced by Representative DRINAN, which I am pleased to cosponsor, would further secure the welfare of animals used in laboratory research.

The legislation introduced today would create a Commission responsible for studying and recommending viable alternatives to current research procedures that use live animals and to evaluate the effectiveness of developing alternative methods. Inherent in this responsibility would be the Commission's duties to investigate and evaluate what adequate substitutes to live animals are available for laboratory experiments and to research and recommend ways to halt the duplication of experiments whose effectiveness rely totally on the utilization of live animals. I believe this bill would successfully supplement other pending legislation by offering researchers much of the information necessary to develop and use alternative research, consequently ending the pain and suffering of animals in research.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this animal protection measure.

A copy of the bill is printed below:

H.R. —

A bill to establish a commission to study alternative methods to the use of live animals in laboratory research and testing

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Protection of Animals in Research Act".

ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 2. There is established a commission to be known as the Commission for the Protection of Animals in Research (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

DUTIES OF COMMISSION

SEC. 3. The Commission shall study and recommend alternatives to current procedures in which live animals are used experimentally in laboratory research and testing and shall evaluate the effectiveness of laboratory research and testing using such alternatives.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 4. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of 11 members as follows:

(1) 6 individuals appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(2) 5 individuals appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Appointments made under this subsection shall be from among individuals who are not officers or employees of any government and who will represent the views of animal welfare and humane societies, of medical schools, of individuals engaged in professions involving zoology or wildlife biology, of individuals engaged in the practice of veterinary medicine, and of individuals who have demonstrated administrative or judicial abilities. Appointments shall be made no later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act. A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(b) TERMS.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(c) BASIC PAY.—Members of the Commission shall each be paid at a rate not to exceed the maximum rate of basic pay payable for GS-18 of the General Schedule.

(d) QUORUM.—Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(e) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson of the Commission shall be elected by the members of the Commission. The term of office of the Chairperson shall be for the life of the Commission.

(f) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairperson or a majority of its members.

STAFF OF COMMISSION; EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS

SEC. 5. (a) STAFF.—The Commission may appoint and fix the pay of such personnel as it considers appropriate.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.—The staff of the Commission shall be appointed subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(c) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5 of the United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the daily equivalent of the maximum annual rate of basic pay payable for GS-18 of the General Schedule.

(d) STAFF OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon request of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties under this Act.

POWERS OF COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence, as the Commission considers appropriate. The Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before it.

(b) POWERS OF MEMBERS AND AGENTS.—Any member or agent of the Commission may, if so authorized by the Commission, take any action which the Commission is authorized to take by this section.

(c) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chairperson of the Commission, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

(d) GIFTS.—The Commission may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations or services or property.

(e) MAILS.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(f) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

REPORT

SEC. 7. The Commission shall transmit to the President and to each House of the Congress reports at least annually and shall transmit a final report to the President and to each House of the Congress before the termination of the Commission under section 8. Such reports shall contain a detailed statement of the activities, findings, and conclusions of the Commission, together with its recommendations for such legislative and administrative actions as it considers appropriate.

TERMINATION

SEC. 8. The Commission shall cease to exist 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 9. There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act not to exceed \$750,000 for each of the fiscal years ending on September 30, 1981, September 30, 1982, September 30, 1983, September 30, 1984, and September 30, 1985. ●

THE 38TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN GENOCIDE

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House today to raise to attention that this month marks the 38th anniversary when the Soviet Union brutally deported thousands of Lithuanians to certain death in Russian labor camps. As our Nation approaches its 203d year of national independence, I believe that we should pause to reflect on the courageous people of Lithuania who have been denied both freedom and self-determination at the hands of Soviet military and Communist party machinery.

The deportation of thousands of Lithuanians 38 years ago began a continuing Soviet oppression of this once independent and prosperous Baltic State and its industrious people. The nearly four decades of Soviet occupation of Lithuania have resulted in the unrelenting oppression of basic human rights in that nation. With the introduction of the Soviet economic system, Lithuania's once growing economy is now dependent upon raw material sources and markets controlled by Moscow government bureaus. The Soviet directed disposition of all private property in Lithuania and the collectivization of all Lithuanian farms have now reduced the standard of living in that nation to the level imposed throughout the Soviet Union.

Today Lithuanians see their children educated in Russian and their native tongue rebuffed by Soviet policy decisions. Most positions of prominence and influence are barred from Lithuanians and held in reserve for non-nationals. Lithuanians who attempt to practice

their religious beliefs or who speak in nationalist tones are made examples of through "show" trials and harsh sentences.

Kazys Jankunas, chairman of the Lithuanian American Community, Inc., of New Jersey, recently wrote to me pointing out that while such Lithuanian "prisoners of conscience" number in the thousands, very few of their names ever reach the West.

However, Viktoras Petkus and Balys Gajauskas, two Lithuanian patriots now serving severe prison terms for protesting human rights violations, are known to Members of this House. I urge my colleagues to join me in writing to Soviet officials and request their immediate release.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must continue to protest in the strongest possible terms the illegal annexation of Lithuania and the deprivation of basic human rights to the Lithuanian people. This small Baltic State has kept alive a spark of freedom in the very face of Soviet oppression. Our Nation must morally commit its strength to assist the Lithuanian people in this struggle. ●

MOTHERS' AID 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BENNETT M. STEWART

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, the following remarks were delivered by Mrs. Roslyn S. Simon, president of Mothers' Aid of Chicago Lying-In Hospital. The Mothers' Aid Hospital celebrated its 75th anniversary during the month of May.

Many institutions are not as long lived as this one, and I am particularly proud to have the Mothers' Aid Hospital, at its grand old age, located within the congressional district which I represent.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS BY ROSLYN S. SIMON

Seventy-five years of help to mothers and babies is an impressive record. Chicago in 1904, then as it is now, was a city of contrasts. Great mansions and wealth along the lakefront contrasted painfully with teeming tenements filled with new immigrants, especially on the crowded near-west side. That is where Dr. Joseph Bolivar De Lee established his first clinic at Maxwell and Newberry Streets. The needs of that dispensary and the first Lying-In Hospital on Ashland Boulevard brought Mothers' Aid into the world.

The years from 1904 to 1979 are a long survival span for a service organization in this city where human needs are constantly shifting. Many groups vie for attention and each, representing a good cause, is deserving of compassion. Why we survived is perhaps explained by some aspects of our history.

Our 75-year history has been illustrious. We have supported the progress and expanded research in obstetrics and gynecology pioneered by the world-famous Joseph Bolivar De Lee, and especially his regard for childbirth as a human event which calls for the application of the highest skills of the medical profession.

Our 75-year history has been a humanitarian one. Our work is dedicated to life and the continuity of life.

Our 75-year history has fostered warm

friendships and family participation. In our membership over the years we have had mothers, daughters, granddaughters, and even great granddaughters.

Our 75-year history is unique. We have contributed large sums to the Hospital—without the traditional fund-raising methods of benefits, ad books, raffles, fund-raising dinners, or major charitable solicitations. How have we done it? Primarily through the three businesses our volunteers operate—the exciting shop at the Hospital, the fabulous gift shop in Glencoe, and our famous and best-selling baby record book, "Our Baby's First Seven Years." They provide most of our funds.

Our 75-year history is rich in significant accomplishments. They are described in the program you found at your table. But, on our Diamond Anniversary, we look to the future as well as our past. We are proud to commit ourselves to the largest pledge Mothers' Aid has ever made to Lying-In Hospital, a pledge to be used for the Mothers' Aid Research Center in the recently announced new University of Chicago Lying-In Hospital. This pledge is to be completed by 1986 and the amount we pledge is One Million Dollars.

Not only do we pledge this amount, but we mark our Diamond Jubilee by making the first payment on this commitment. This contribution is made possible by one year's earnings from the Hospital shop amounting to \$22,000, from the Glencoe shop \$40,000 and \$59,000 from the baby book. These impressive earnings are supplemented by interest on our invested capital and donations to the special charitable funds we maintain.

In proof to all that Mothers' Aid, like the diamond in our anniversary, never loses its luster or value, the first installment of our million dollar pledge is the largest amount that Mothers' Aid has ever contributed to the Hospital in one year. The amount is \$140,000.

It gives me great honor to present this check for \$140,000 and introduce the head of Chicago Lying-In Hospital, the Joseph Bolivar De Lee Professor of Gynecology and Obstetrics at the University of Chicago and chairman of that department in its Medical School, our friend and leader, Dr. Arthur Lee Herbst. ●

FREEDOM FOR SOVIET JEWS A VITAL ISSUE—V

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the Vienna summit, when both Russians and Americans look forward to a future of increasing international cooperation, we must not forget those unfortunate citizens of the U.S.S.R. who continue to be denied fundamental human rights. Three months ago I called the attention of the House of Representatives to the plight of Dr. Gregory and Natasha Rosenstein, and their two sons. Today, I remind you of their sufferings, and of the continuing obduracy of the Soviet authorities.

The Rosensteins are among more than 2,000 Soviet "refusniks," who have been denied exit visas for 5 years or more. Although I am encouraged by the apparent easing of emigration restrictions in recent months, we must not allow progress on one front to obscure the unremitting persecution of those who still are

denied permission to leave. It is appalling that the relaxation of restrictions on emigration has been accompanied by a stepped-up anti-Semitic campaign on the part of Soviet authorities. Increasing numbers of anti-Semitic articles are appearing in the official press, and frequent acts of intimidation are performed against "refusniks." Many more Jewish families are being compelled now to leave their homeland, because they feel that "there is no future for our children" in Russia. The "refusniks" endure such persecution bravely, and they dare to practice the Jewish faith openly, in defiance of strict religious restrictions.

Those of us in the United States who take freedom of conscience and freedom of movement for granted should not forget the courageous efforts of individuals who must struggle for basic human dignity. Secretary of State Vance presented the Soviets with a list of 200 "refusniks" in Moscow last year, including the Rosensteins, but little progress has been forthcoming. We must keep up a constant pressure on the Russians to live up to their pledges in the Helsinki Accords and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Five years ago the Rosensteins applied for exit visas to Israel, and Dr. Rosenstein was subsequently fired from his position at a medical institute. The Soviets have denied Dr. Rosenstein a visa, because they claim that 14 years ago he was shown a classified document, and thus he poses a security risk to the country. This wearisome pretext is absurd, since Dr. Rosenstein has devoted his career to the study of epilepsy, and the results of his research have been published in scientific journals here and in the U.S.S.R.

Dr. Rosenstein is now forced to do menial work to support his family, and even that is sometimes unavailable. Representations to Soviet authorities on his behalf have resulted only in an intensified level of harassment against the man and his family. Stock charges of "parasitism" have been leveled against them, and they have been warned not to persist in their religious activities.

I will close by inserting a letter to me from Dr. Rosenstein which was passed on to me by my friend and colleague Congressman WIRTH, who recently visited the Soviet Union. There follows a letter from Mrs. Rosenstein's mother in Israel:

DEAR SIR: Thank you very much for your letter dated March 15, 1979. It gave my family and me a new hope on our long way to Israel.

Let me inform you about our latest news. On Feb. 13, 1979 officials revealed to me the reason why I've been refused during all these long years: In 1965 (14 years ago) I had a look at a classified document (I was not said and I cannot recall myself which document particularly) still considered classified and I'll be a refusnik during an unpredictable long period of time until (if ever) the document is declassified. The information came to me after my wife and my son Efraim (9) demonstrated on Jan. 9, 1979 in front of the Research Institute where I was employed more than 7 years ago. As I understand, now, dear Sir, your appeal to Soviet officials on my behalf was an important part of the struggle for that very important though cruel revelation. It's the first case,

when we can learn the real way of how the authorities make decisions on a refusenik's destiny.

The concrete reason of the refusal given now to me is absurd, because the classified document mentioned above may deal with computing and computers only. But it is well known that two new generations of computers were born and died in last 15 years. It means that nothing in the field could remain unchanged up till now. I'm sure that it may be proved in a short time for each concrete point in the field. However the additional feature of my situation giving to it some salt is that I don't remember even the fact of looking through the document to which the destiny of my family and me is attached now by the officials. And the officials refuse to give me the concrete information about the document so to say "known" to me because as they claim it is a secret too. It's important to underline that I've never signed security commitments. Seems only Kafka may think such collision out.

As you know, all of my scientific articles deal with the problem of modeling of brain disorders, they were published openly in this country and abroad having nothing to do with state secrets.

To crown it all, last month my wife and I were "promised" to be killed "as Jews and Zionists" (loco citato) by plainclothesmen in the street at our house. On June 3, 1979 (it was our Saint Shabat) a 20-meter long slogan "Jews into coffins" was written on the sidewalk in front of our windows.

I ask you to inform me about what could be done by you in my case. Your support is of the highest value in the current situation.

Yours,

GREGORY ROSENSTEIN.

DEAR SIR: My friends in the U.S. kindly sent me copies of your letters to Secretary Vance and to Colonel Obidin (U.S.S.R.) concerning the difficulties Dr. Gregory Rosenstein and his family are having emigrating from the Soviet Union.

I am Natasha Rosenstein's mother. I should like to thank you for your constant concern for their struggle and would be grateful if you passed on my deep and sincere gratitude to Secretary Vance. I know that Mr. Vance was in Moscow in September 1978. He presented the Soviet authorities a list of 200 families of "refuseniks," among them my family. I am sure that the presentation of such long list of "refuseniks" is not effective because it gives the Soviet authorities a good opportunity of avoiding the discussing of specific families who have been waiting for visas for many years like the Rosenstein family. I believe it is necessary to concentrate all our efforts to include this family in a list of "refuseniks" like the list Senator Kennedy personally presented to Mr. Brezhnev not long ago. I do hope you might help us to put the Rosenstein family on a list like this. The fact is Dr. Rosenstein's oldest son Mikhail will turn 18 in January 1980 and be eligible for the draft. If that happens the Soviet authorities will have a good reason for many future refusals. Awaiting your reply and with many thanks,

Yours sincerely,

ASYA PLOSHANSKAYA. ●

HONOR AMERICA

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure my colleagues realize, the period

beginning with Flag Day and ending with our Independence Day celebration on July 4th is set aside as a 21-day salute to our great Nation; it is a period during which we are called upon to honor America. At this time, I would like to ask my colleagues to share with me as I commence this observance, and also to commend the American Historic and Cultural Society for publicizing this patriotic celebration.

I trust that all those whom I am privileged to represent in the Congress, as well as all Americans, will take a few moments to reflect on the many aspects of our rich heritage during this period of time: Our cultural inheritance, our proud history, our cooperative national effort, and our goals as a Nation. Additionally, I believe we should each attempt to learn just a little more about the American constitutional Government, and to share our knowledge and concern with our neighbors and friends.

Being an American is not just a privilege—it carries obligation. I believe that it is insufficient to sit quietly back and reap the benefits of our many freedoms; we must recognize that responsibility accompanies opportunity. Perhaps no form of government requires greater citizen responsibility than one as free as ours, for freedom must be understood, defended, and protected; it must also be cherished and revered.

During this 21-day span, let us truly honor America, her greatness, her potential, her past achievement, and her many freedoms which are ours to defend. Let us also make a commitment to carry that spirit of honor over into the following months, and to insure that we pass it along to younger generations as a major part of their legacy. ●

NATIONAL PRIORITIES: A NEED FOR A NONFUEL MINERALS POLICY

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, an editorial that appeared in the June 6, 1979, edition of the Denver Post provides some food for thought as it relates to real world economics and the national need for a nonfuel minerals policy.

The molybdenum deposit referred to in the editorial was discovered in Colorado, but the broader implication is one of national interest.

The editorial takes issue with the environmental lobby that asked whether the molybdenum to be mined is a national priority or whether it is for "corporate profit"—something, I suppose, that is other than honorable. It cites an environmental report that charges that Colorado molybdenum is exported to Germany and Japan, "and some even finds its way to Czechoslovakia."

The editorial does not say that molybdenum is an important alloying metal used to improve the hardening ability, strength, toughness, and corrosion resistance in the production of iron cast-

ings, steel, tool steel, and other alloys required for the manufacture of agriculture, mining, and electrical machinery and tools. It is used in a variety of ways in oil refining, food processing, and electrical power generation.

The editorial also does not say that the United States is the largest exporter of molybdenum, supplying 50 to 60 percent of the industrial needs of the rest of the world. Annually, these exports are now returning to the United States about \$350 to \$400 million on the plus side against the ever-enlarging minus side of our export-import scales. It is a major mineral by which we can benefit through exports, and other industrialized countries are vitally concerned that we maintain our shipments.

I believe my colleagues will enjoy this commonsense editorial:

PROFIT AND HYPOCRISY

The environmental lobby appears to be spawning its own international economic theories. From what we've seen so far, however, Milton Friedman and Walter Heller need not fear the competition.

At first, we thought it was a mistake. After a recent Denver hearing on the proposed AMAX molybdenum mine near Crested Butte, this sentence appeared in a press account:

"Questions from the audience centered on whether the molybdenum to be mined is a national priority, or is being developed for corporate profit."

Wow! What is a national priority? Apparently it is good—and profit is bad. Is it a national priority to create more jobs? Is it in the national interest to export so we may import?

To abandon the concept of profit is, quite simply, either pie-in-the-sky socialism or a return to primitive barter, with recession in between. So maybe the environmentalists were misquoted. After all, the country operates on the profit system.

No such luck. The latest Wilderness Society publication arrived from Washington and it, too, is not sure a corporation should expand.

In echoing the Denver attack on AMAX, the national society charges that: "... 60 percent of the Colorado (molybdenum) supply is exported to Germany and Japan, and some even finds its way to Czechoslovakia."

Ah, those sneaky Czechs. The society then goes on to say that AMAX has no reason to open a new mine other than to "expand its operation."

Evidently the environmental economic ethic now requires that natural resource development be subjected to a test of the "national interest." Wouldn't you hate to see these environmental brain-trusters standing between your car and the gas pump?

The trouble arises in defending "national interest." A machine-tool maker who knows that large mines take a decade to develop may think AMAX is planning its expansion none too soon.

A minority college graduate planning a career with AMAX next month may think corporate growth is pretty good, maybe even in the national interest.

An engine-maker in Tokyo may see the national interests of both the United States and Japan served by growth and "corporate profit." If there isn't going to be corporate profit then why have international trade? Many might even ask: why go to work tomorrow morning?

We are, frankly, baffled by a world without economics. Possibly our readers will join us in awaiting clarification. If the millennium has arrived we should be informed.

The Wilderness Society is just the agency for such research. Leafing through its publi-

cation one discovers a list of some 60 individuals and foundations which have contributed more than \$1,000 each to the society. We'll place a small bet that a few of those donors got their money from that horrid source called "corporate profit." ●

YOU GET WHAT YOU ASK FOR

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lyle W. Talbott, manager, Delamar Silver Mine, gave a speech entitled "You Get What You Ask For," to the Malheur County Livestock Association's spring meeting in Jordan Valley, Oreg. It has some timely comments about our bureaucratic lawmakers that are worth noting:

Close your eyes and let your minds take leave of your present world. Disconnect yourself from the press and care of today, escape with me from the frantic hassle through the pages of Mike Hanley's book "Owyhee Trails" to the year 1867.

"We are just north of the settlement of Hollis, Oklahoma. It is early spring to us, but already summer has set in, in this hot dry prairie country. We are glad to be drifting North and here on the Texas border we sigh a relief to be out of Texas. Around us are bellowing, bawling critters; spotted, brindled, nearly solid colors, but lots of white on them; raw boned with ribs darned near through their hides and horns; you never saw such horns, some six feet spreads. Longhorns they called them, turned loose to run the country by Spaniards about 200 to 300 years ago. Hell, I hope those damned gophers can eat them up at Silver City cause we're sure eating a lot of dust, and you can't hold them, just drift them. Con Shea has got to be a wild man, we won't get half of them to Idaho. Oh, well, it's been run, boy did we get to see some real fights. Hey, Con, we ought to back and help kick hell out of those sod busters. You're right, it's their fight. I sure like that little song: 'I'm Going to Leave Old Texas Now, They Got No Use for the Longhorn Cow.' They've plowed my grass and they've fenced my range, and the people there are all so strange. You're right Con, there's no chance they'll bother us."

This was five years before my Great-Granddad's brother made the first silver strike in Nevada near Austin. West of the Rockies was wild, free and unsettled, but an era was closing as the sea of civilization called "sod busters" with barbed wire, cities and factories slowly flowed over the land. In that rising sea the "forgotten corner" was left somewhat like an island, because you couldn't plow it.

A few years things remained pretty constant, "good" land was farmed, then irrigation cut out more, what was left was grazed. In the sea began a process of evaluation called names like "progress," "sophistication," and "public trust." Creatures called bureaucrats crawled out of the sea onto the islands and since they wanted to grow, get fat, and multiply, they began to nibble at the islands. Now these were just little creatures who wanted to get away from the big ones in the sea, they really didn't do much damage, what the heck, BLM's they called them, and USFS. Thus began the close of another era, and you and I stood on this island with the waves lapping closer to our feet, our hands in our pocket, eyes closed and mute.

One third of the 2.2 billion acres of this "Land of the Free" is Federal land. It belongs to the people, the people are the landlord. There are 755 million acres under the

U.S. Forest Service and U.S. Department of Interior jurisdiction. These vast acreages have been withdrawn by administrative fiat or executive order from uses to which it might be put by reasonable tax producing people.

The Wilderness Act of 1964, but translations of the law by the bureaucrats made it into something not intended in the original bill. Wilderness doesn't mean the same thing today as it did when the act was written in 1964. A longtime friend of mine, Wayne Aspinall of Colorado, who was for a number of years Chairman of the House Insular Affairs Committee, has pointed this out many times.

The present problems that business has with government is not so much with legislators as with the bureaucrats. Elected officials aren't restricting business with laws, but bureaucrats are with rules. These creatures out of the sea are just as sincere as anyone. They gain security by empire building and are convinced they know what is best for the country. Like most humans they must have some feeling of accomplishment through activity. Since they lack the incentive provided by an income generating business to make a decision on judgment they simply respond to the loudest outcry, lest they get canned. There is no profit motive to force responsible decision making, they can't go broke. Do not deceive yourself, these are intelligent, sincere people who react to their own human needs.

Congress passes general laws, wide sweeping, ambiguous, general laws, then the bureaucrats sit down, interpret, and reinterpret the general laws into regulations which become the "law of the land."

In the past eight years as many rules and regulations have been made as there were passed between 1899 and 1970, a period of 81 years. Bureaucrats make the decisions you and I must live by.

This brings me to the real message. You get what you ask for. Under our democratic process there are only two ways to get what you want done. 1. Elect someone to represent you who shares your philosophies, and, 2. Petition your elected officials to cut off funds to the agencies who do not respond to you or act against your best interest. Our opposition knows and uses these techniques.

You and I are getting what we ask for, we get what we deserve. Here we stand, the sea nearly to our boot tops. My friends, it is too late, we will not stem this tide of wilderness withdrawal in the "Forgotten Corner." How many letters have you written to your elected representatives so he knew your position? How many elections have you voted in? Do you know your officials? Did you ever attend a precinct meeting? A political convention? Even a town meeting? How many dollars have you given to get responsible government? Is your politics like your religion, some concept you cannot really remember? Covered with cobwebs. Are you just a freeloader?

You and I have stood here basking in ignorance and inaction while a small very active minority has taken the reins and drivers' seat by positive support of their belief. Will we continue as we have, or shall we try to salvage what is left?

Let us stop blaming others, stop cursing the bureaucrats, and recognize them for what they are and how they respond. Let's take a leaf out of the oppositions book and get busy. Let's get off our ass and get something done. Let's be honest with ourselves, put the blame where it belongs—we have done nothing, we've dropped the ball. We are getting what we deserve, we are getting just what we asked for. We have spent our energy complaining and even fighting those with a common interest. We have abdicated our voice in government in preference to beer drinking, Sunday afternoon ball games, and the trash of TV. We have left it all up to someone else and THEY, sure as hell, have done it. Now we don't like it. You get what you ask for! Only you as an individual can seam the

tide, it requires individual effort as a part of a total program. There is absolutely no substitute. You can not leave it to the association or someone else—you must participate. This is no place for lazy people, because the opposition works hard. Become informed, read your trade papers, learn what is happening, ask questions. Give a little of your time and money. Become active in politics, learn the issues and what officials stand for. Inform them of your views. Sit down tomorrow and write a letter, send it to your Governor, your Congressman and Senators. Next, have your wife, children and hired hands do the same, help them express themselves. In this game it is numbers, not common sense that counts.

Let us put aside our differences spawned by a lack of understanding and poor communications. Miners and Cattlemen have a great deal in common, they were early comers. We are one half of those who produce new wealth; fisheries, timber, agriculture, and mining. We both are natural resource developers. You and I have no control over our markets as we do not interface the consumer, yet without us those markets will decline and die. We have much in common. We have been, and are the backbone of America. Become active in your association, and through that great Association of Cattlemen, join with us, the Mining Association, that together we may develop programs for positive action for the national good which will bring results. Let us tell our story that people are informed, and give their support.

It isn't easy, you really have to work at it, and you'll get what you ask for. ●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN WAYNE

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday morning we received very sad news of the passing of the great actor, John Wayne. I would like to share my comments with my colleagues in the House in tribute to this fine American.

The Duke, as he came to be known, was a very special type of person. He was a large man, tall in stature, with a slow humble voice, an outdoorsman, rugged with a kind heart, seeming boyish at times, but always tough and proud to be a man. Even in his last days he seemed powerful in his cancer diminishing frame. It must have to do with the way we remember him in "True Grit" and "The Green Beret" as a hero who always rises again after he falls.

This year during the Academy Awards the Duke received a standing ovation as he plodded out to announce the best movie of the year. One could almost see him blush as he shifted from foot to foot as the crowd applauded him. After the crowd settled into their seats again, the Duke responded in his old familiar voice that—

I'll beat this thing . . . I'll slug it out.

You could feel and appreciate his courage and almost felt like he could do it through some type of miracle, but still you knew the inevitability of his death.

The Duke was surely a great man. The enthusiasm he brought to the screen will always be remembered. You could feel his self-content and strength of discipline. There are not many men like him—there never will be. He reached the

hearts of many, both young and old, giving us the feeling that we can rise and meet this world's problems face to face. Truly this was a great man and I know all Americans grieve as I do over the death of the Duke.●

CATHERINE CALVO—SENIOR OUTSTANDING STUDENT ON GUAM

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to announce that Miss Catherine Calvo has been named as the Senior Outstanding Student on Guam for the 1979 Youth Week in the territory.

The daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Felix V. Calvo, Jr., of Agaña Heights, Guam, Ms. Calvo is an outstanding student by any standards. Her record of accomplishments are as long as they are impressive. And she has won the hearts and respect of her peers and her elders in Guam because of her dedication to the excellent principles of scholastic achievement.

Recently, Ms. Calvo became the recipient of the 1979 annual Youth Week award as the Senior Outstanding Student and was feted by the 15th Guam Legislature for her accomplishments.

The award was granted only after a rigid island-wide competition in which Catherine was chosen on the basis of her scholastic achievements, active participation in her many school activities, her citizenship and on the merits of an essay she wrote.

In this day and age when so many question the motivation of our young people, it is truly refreshing to see the pride that Ms. Calvo takes in her work. She deserves the acclaim she is now receiving, and quite frankly, so do her parents who can be truly proud of their daughter and the outstanding job they did in raising a beautiful and charming young woman who is a living tribute to their love and affection as parents.

In the area of scholastic achievements, Catherine is truly without peers as the following list of her record shows:

SCHOLARSHIPS, HONORS, AWARDS

Honor roll student—all through grade school and up to the present time (12th grade).

Hugh O'Brien Seminar Representative for outstanding sophomore (Cathy was chosen by faculty and principal for Notre Dame High School—first quarter).

Scholastic Achievement Award of Excellence, 1974.

Governor's Award for Outstanding Student—7th grade.

National Junior Honor Society—7th, 8th and 9th grades.

National Honor Society—10th, 11th and 12th grades.

1979 Outstanding Youth Islandwide—senior division.

Fifteenth Guam Legislature Resolution No. 143 relative to commending Catherine Calvo for being named Senior Outstanding Student For Youth Week 1979.

Gifted and Exceptional Children, 1978. Scholarship award in recognition of outstanding academic achievement and leadership by the administration and faculty of Notre Dame High School, 1977 and 1979.

Certificate of award for academic achievement, 1978.

Yearbook Excellence Award, 1979.

1979 Outstanding Student from Notre Dame High School.

Who's Who Among American High School Students, 1979.

Catherine is more than a first-rate student, however. She is a well rounded young person who apparently achieves at anything she sets her heart on.

Not content with the highest scholastic honors, Catherine is the holder of the Presidential Physical Fitness Award, has played varsity tennis in her high school, and is an avid golf player. I understand that Catherine is also a wonderful pianist, having participated in recitals at the Guam Academy of Music and Arts, and a composer of the class song which won second place during her sophomore year at Notre Dame High School.

Catherine's activities have also embraced a wide number of civic and community minded functions and she is active in her local church affairs as well.

As noted earlier, to win the coveted Outstanding Senior Award for Guam, Catherine was required to submit an essay titled "What I Think an Outstanding Student Should Be." I would like to request that the text of her essay now be included in the RECORD in the thought that it is a wonderful reflection on her character and dedication to excellence. The essay follows:

WHAT I THINK AN OUTSTANDING STUDENT SHOULD BE

(By Catherine Calvo)

Every individual on this earth, from the Proconsul and Ramapithecus (possible ancestors of men), to the baby born this second, has been or will be the product of some type of learning experience. As a result, we can safely say that each person (even the dumbest fool) from the past, present, or even future, can be called a student.

A student is not one who studies, but rather one who learns. She is like a sponge—always ready for the complete absorption of a liquid. Her total environment serves as this liquid and, because of the never-ending cycle of life, is constantly replenished, constantly ready for absorption.

The early stages of learning are the most important ones. It is at these stages that one adopts life-time habits that eventually form one's character.

A student soon discovers that learning means making choices. She must either accept or reject the new experiences she encounters. The choice she makes, whatever it may be will help mold her into the person she is to be in the future. (The sponge once soaked, should be either squeezed out to be re-absorbed later or left soaked.)

The problem of being a student lies within this system of choice-making. It is not easy for a student to make the right choice—one that will lead her to develop a better life for herself and eventually, for others. Students who have learned to make the right choice are considered outstanding by the society.

It is the outstanding student who paves the harsh and rocky road of life so that others may follow more smoothly behind. An outstanding student therefore, should pos-

sess, first of all, the initiative to want to choose for herself; character to respect herself; service to help her fellow students; common sense to make the right choice; determination to see that her correct choice is thorough and finally, and most importantly, leadership to guide others in the right direction.

Learning for the outstanding student not only means reading or studying the essential subjects needed for a good education, it also means meeting, working, and living with people. It is important that the outstanding student learn how to relate to people, for it is basically people who provide the choices to be made in life. Once she has acquired some knowledge of, or from, people she uses that knowledge to help herself. She knows that this self-help will eventually lead her to help others help themselves—which is primarily the meaning of every individual's existence.

A student is one who learns. An outstanding student is one who learns how to learn.●

TRIBUTE TO MRS. S. M. (MAE) TAYLOR

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. S. M. (Mae) Taylor of Tompkinsville gave this address at the Tompkinsville Elementary Kindergarten graduation on the evening of May 18, 1979. Mrs. Taylor is a retired teacher. Her enjoyment of teaching, her love for children, and her taste for literature are quite well known throughout the area.

She happens to be the sister of Representative TIM LEE CARTER.

The address follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

(By Mrs. S. M. (Mae) Taylor)

"In this, 'The Year of the Child' I wish to state that children are a blessing and that I heartily approve of kindergarten for the prechildren. The word kindergarten is German in origin and means children's garden. It was designed as an educational supplement to elementary schools intended to accommodate children between the ages of four and six years. Leaders in this movement were Robert Owen of Great Britain, J. R. Pestalozzi in Switzerland and Marie Montessori in Italy. First known as infant schools, the name kindergarten was first applied by Froebel who wished to convey the idea that because of proper environment children grew freely like plants, in a garden. The Montessori method of teaching stressed the spiritual and emotional nature of the child encouraging self understanding through play activities and greater freedom rather than restriction. Do rather than don't."

"Sad to say, to many youngsters, the first day of elementary school is a frightening experience if they have not had previous kindergarten training. To illustrate: A friend and connection of my family was getting his son ready for his first day in elementary school when to his dismay the little boy started crying loudly and saying that he did not want to go to school. This upset the father and he asked, 'Why don't you want to go to school?' 'because', the little boy sobbed, 'the teacher will whip me, and I don't know nary thing!'

"If this bright child had had previous kindergarten training this scene might well have been avoided. He would have approached the first day of school with eagerness and confidence."

"So many things are learned in kindergarten, in the friendly, relaxed homelike atmosphere, such as acceptable patterns of behavior, how to get along with others, the little courtesies like, thank you, may I, please, beg your pardon, I'm sorry. Very important is the fact that they learn to listen to Bible stories, fairy stories and stories with a moral. These stories when dramatized help children to overcome shyness, increases their vocabularies, and makes them more able to communicate with others. Children having difficulty counting to 10 can be aided by counting rhymes as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, I caught a hare alive, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, I let him go again. The alphabet may be learned by singing the Alphabet along with the record player. Color recognition is important and since traffic safety is a must children learn that Red is for Stop. Yellow means Slow. Wait for the Green. Then we go.

"Most enjoyable to the children is the 'Show and Tell' program where each child on different occasions brings something to show and tell about. It may be a piece of coral from the seashore or a sea shell that when you hold it to your ear you can hear the sea roar, or a parrot or parakeet, an Indian head dress, or tomahawk, or anything out of the ordinary.

"Children love color and here they learn to use crayons, finger paint, cut & paste pictures and work with modeling clay. An activity that I have found that children like is to place one hand on a large piece of white paper, then take a pencil and carefully trace round the fingers. Next cut out and paste on a large sheet of construction paper with this printed verse on it. 'Here is my hand. So tiny so small, For you to hang. Upon the wall, For you to watch, As years go by, How we grow. My hand and I.'

"In conclusion I will say that if you train up a child in the way he should go when he is old he will not depart from it.

"I am truly thankful for the competent, compassionate, and dedicated kindergarten teachers that we have in Monroe County and strongly advocate the inclusion of kindergarten in our Elementary Schools."●

PERSECUTION OF BALKAN NATIONS

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the quest for decency in the treatment of human beings around the world is a never-ending task. Particularly is this the case in the persecution of citizens of the Balkan nations by the forces of Soviet Communism.

The Lithuanian-American community has called to the world's attention the harsh treatment of Viktoras Petkus and Balys Gajauskas, who are languishing in Soviet prisons after being charged with political activity. Their plight emphasizes that communism is not communal living, sharing, or a joint venture in government, it is rule by terror and force. It is injustice personified.

The people of Lithuanian descent in America have seen their homeland destroyed by Soviet terrorism and forced migration. They are pleading for world attention, for the rights of human beings to express themselves.

Incarceration of dissidents is the Soviet answer to free speech, an example

to the world that communism cannot tolerate discussion, or examination of its totalitarian operations.

I join my colleagues in expressing our sympathies to these men who have been victimized by Soviet communism, and our backing for their supporters in this Nation who seek justice in the only forum available, the court of world opinion.●

"THE DECLINE-AND-FALL MOOD," AN ESSAY BY ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, JR.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a most thoughtful essay by the distinguished historian, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.

Mr. Schlesinger's article, "The Decline-and-Fall Mood," was published in the Wall Street Journal of June 5, 1979.

Mr. Schlesinger is Albert Schweitzer professor of the humanities at the City University of New York, winner of Pulitzer Prizes in history and biography and a member of the Board of Contributors of the Wall Street Journal.

His essay follows:

THE DECLINE-AND-FALL MOOD

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

Spring finds the American periodical press in one of its decline-and-fall moods. "Americans have drifted into a condition of spoiled purposelessness," Lance Morrow, the house philosopher, tells us in Time. "... A damaging slackness, a widespread fecklessness have grown evident not only in American leadership and corporations but in U.S. society at large." The American people, according to Margaret Chase Smith in U.S. News & World Report, "have lost their will." "INNOVATION," Newsweek asks on its cover: "HAS AMERICA LOST ITS EDGE?" Inside Meg Greenfield solemnly concludes a column on the Carter presidency: "Last week in Washington, the whole thing seemed about to go under." The President himself talks gloomily about "a failure of will and the political process."

Now things are bad, but honestly they are not that bad. Adam Smith used to say, "There is a lot of ruin in a country." We have been through much rougher times than this over the last half century and have emerged safely on the other side. The onset of the age of high-cost energy, the persistence of inflation, the decline in productivity—these are tough problems. But, for all their long-range implications, they are not really as urgently tough as the Great Depression or Pearl Harbor or even the Vietnam war. So let us not get unduly rattled at a moment when we need a certain coolness and detachment to prepare ourselves for the long haul.

Our basic trouble is plain enough: we have the problems, but we don't have the solutions. Or rather the solutions at hand don't work. In his new book "The Nature of Mass Poverty," John Kenneth Galbraith propounds a very important law of social policy—a law that may be summarized as: *remedy prescribes diagnosis*. Faced with a difficult question and a need for action, we tend, Professor Galbraith persuasively suggests, to shape our diagnosis according to the weapons that are easiest to use. "Diagnosis proceeds from the available remedy."

HOOVER'S REMEDY

This was our approach in the early years of the Great Depression. No one knew what caused the economic collapse or what would cure it. But Herbert Hoover, constrained to apply the most convenient remedy, persuaded himself that, if he could only reduce government spending and protect the private market against mandatory government intervention, he could solve the depression. His intellectual heirs today suppose for the same reasons of convenience that cutting government spending and protecting the private market against mandatory government controls will now solve inflation.

Allowing the availability of remedy to dictate diagnosis results in the gross oversimplification of deeply-rooted problems. Does any one really believe that federal deficits are the single cause of inflation? As Herbert Stein has reminded us in this space, "Deficits don't cause inflation all the time. We have had deficits almost all the time since 1929, and haven't had inflation all that time." Or that decontrol of oil is not going to make inflation worse? Or that decontrol will relieve the oil shortage? Robert Baldwin of Gulf said the other day that "there's no way, for any amount of money, that you can reverse the decline curves on crude oil production in the United States." Or that cutting the capital gains tax will end the decline in productivity? Thoughtful students of the problem, like Professor F. M. Scherer, wonder whether the postwar technological boom is not coming to its natural end and speculate that we may be entering a Schumpeterian phase of technological maturity, from which we can be rescued only by a new cluster of technological innovations.

No doubt we will continue for a time, given the devotion of both the administration and the opposition to hallowed dogma, to act as if the private market can solve our perplexities. We will continue to try and fight inflation by inducing an economic slowdown and throwing millions of people out of work—a policy that places the burden of the war against inflation on those least equipped to bear it. We will continue to try and fight the gasoline shortage by discouraging consumption through decontrol and price increases—a policy that places the burden of the energy war on those least equipped to bear it. If supply falls so far short of demand that rationing becomes inevitable, then rationing by price is surely the most unfair form a ration system can possibly take. These everyman-for-himself, devil-take-the-hindmost solutions exact a fearful social and political price and won't work in the end.

The current gloom may well be due to the gradual, perhaps still unconscious, realization that the problems we face are not amenable to the remedies conveniently at hand. Our political and our business leaders are really quite devoid of ideas but cannot afford to admit it; so when the private market fails to solve their problems for them, they blame the failure, not on the intellectual inadequacy of their remedies, but on the moral delinquency of their fellow citizens. In fact, the crisis is considerably more intellectual and analytical than it is moral and spiritual. The people are looking for a leader. Their so-called leaders have nothing convincing to say to them.

When existing theory fails, the older American way was experimentation. The Republic began as an experiment. It has grown and prospered through its capacity for invention and innovation. "No facts are to me sacred," said Emerson; "none are profane; I simply experiment, an endless seeker, with no Past at my back." Franklin Roosevelt's great contribution lay not in theory but in audacity. "The country needs," he said in 1932, "... bold persistent experimentation. It is com-

mon sense to take a method and try it: If it fails, admit it frankly and try another. But, above all, try something."

Except for the part about admitting failure frankly, this is pretty much what the New Deal was all about. Eventually experimentation led to new theory; but that is after all not a bad way to arrive at theory.

PERSISTENT EXPERIMENTATION NEEDED

Our country is once again confronted by problems that baffle the conventional wisdom, and bold, persistent experimentation is what we need today. Now I know that the appeal for experiment may seem hollow at a time when, we are authoritatively assured, the national mood is one of conservatism. Yet, as I have noted in this space before, history records an inherent cyclical rhythm in our public affairs. In the periodic swing between activism and exhaustion, we are for the moment in the quiescent phase of the cycle. We will not be in that phase forever.

The issue is evidently not so much conservatism vs. liberalism as it is fatigue vs. vitality. When the dam breaks again in the 1980s, as it has broken every thirty years or so during this century, we will stop proclaiming our inability to do anything about our problems and stop luxuriating in our conviction of public impotence. Our current idea that the private market can take care of problems like spiralling prices and dwindling energy sources is escapism into fantasy—a fantasy that serves to rationalize a condition of intellectual bankruptcy. What we need today is not sanctimonious exhortation but detailed investigation and hard thought. For, when the new age of experimentation comes, it would be useful if we had some good experiments to try. ●

THE BOSTON HARBOR NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● **Mr. MOAKLEY.** Mr. Speaker, it has been said that "the only means of conservation is innovation"; and conservation is today a somber synonym for survival. It was with this in mind that I recently introduced a bill to establish Boston Harbor as a National Recreation Area. This legislation, which has been introduced in the Senate by EDWARD M. KENNEDY, seeks to preserve the unique scenic, historic, and recreational values and resources of Boston Harbor for present and future generations.

There is a definite and pronounced need for such legislation. Pollution of the harbor is as bad as ever, always threatening to close the few existing beaches, endangering expanded boating activity, and continuing to be an aesthetic nuisance. Access to the harbor islands and public ferry services is limited and confusing; the terminals are in deplorable condition. Moreover, high rents and restrictions on pedestrian access threaten to exclude the general public from large segments of the waterfront.

Present State, regional, and local authority and funding capabilities have proven inadequate to solve these problems and to insure the preservation and enhancement of this area. Thus, the key to more effective use and conservation of the singular resources of the Boston Har-

bor area, including the Boston Harbor Islands, is a program which would coordinate action by Federal and State governments to assist the local units of government in the administration, management, and development of the area. I am confident that this legislation will provide such a program.

Within 1 year after enactment, the Secretary of the Interior would establish a commission for the purpose of preparing a plan for development and management of the area. This commission would be composed of not more than 27 members, appointed by the Secretary with the Governor of Massachusetts' recommendations, and the chief executive officers of local units of government which have jurisdiction over the area. Upon approval of the commission's plan, the Secretary would make grants to the State or local units of government identified as having responsibility for implementing its provisions.

I cannot emphasize enough the necessity of this legislation, not merely for the people of Boston, or the residents of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, but for all citizens of the Republic. Boston Harbor is a precious national asset which requires preservation. Through our efforts, this great natural and economic resource can be protected, and the Boston Harbor Islands can be reclaimed from over 30 years of abuse and neglect.

The public deserves a harbor whose natural assets are well managed, developed to meet a variety of economic, social, and recreational needs, and secured for the years to come. Let it not be said of us what T. S. Eliot said of his fictional society:

Those were a decent people. Their only monument: the asphalt road and a thousand lost golf balls.

A text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to establish the Boston Harbor National Recreation Area, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the Boston Harbor area, including the Boston Harbor Islands, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, possesses unique scenic, natural, cultural, historic, and recreational values and resources;

(2) there is a national interest in preserving and enhancing these unique values and resources for the present and future well-being of the Nation and for present and future generations;

(3) the present State, regional, and local authority and funding capabilities are inadequate to insure the preservation and enhancement of the values and resources of the Boston Harbor area, and it is in the national interest to establish a new system to assist the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, regional agencies, and local governments to preserve and manage the values and resources of the area;

(4) the key to more effective recreation and conservation of the unique resources and values of the Boston Harbor area, including the Boston Harbor Islands, is a program encouraging coordinated action by the Federal and State Governments to assist lo-

cal governments to administer sound management policies regulating and guiding development in the Boston Harbor area and on the Boston Harbor Islands;

(5) such a new system for the protection and management of the values and resources of the Boston Harbor area requires the establishment by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of a Boston Harbor Commission to give effect to the trust relationship; and

(6) because expanded access to the Boston Harbor Islands is crucial to the development of the Boston Harbor area as a recreational area for the Nation, any plan for the development of the Boston Harbor National Recreation Area must include provisions for expanded access to and between the Boston Harbor Islands, including such shoreline, island, and water facilities as are needed to encourage public visitation of the Islands.

Sec. 2. The purposes of this Act are (1) to provide for the preservation of the outstanding natural, historic, aesthetic, and cultural features and the land and water resources of the Boston Harbor area including the Boston Harbor Islands, and (2) to provide adequate recreation facilities for the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the Nation.

Sec. 3. There is hereby established the Boston Harbor National Recreation Area (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "recreation area"). The boundaries of the recreation area shall be Boston Harbor to the mean low water line, from Winthrop to Hull, Massachusetts and the Harbor Islands.

Sec. 4. (a) Within one year after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall establish a Commission for the purpose of preparing a plan for the development, maintenance, and management of the recreation area (hereinafter in this Act referred to as "Commission").

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed \$200,000 for each fiscal year to prepare a plan for the development, maintenance, and management of the Boston Harbor Recreation Area.

(c) The Commission shall be composed of not more than twenty-seven members appointed by the Secretary from recommendations of the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Governor") and the chief executive officers of such local units of government, including counties and municipalities which have jurisdiction over the recreation area. The Commission shall consist of the following persons or their designees:

(1) Three members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives recommended by the Speaker;

(2) Two Massachusetts State Senators recommended by the President of the Senate;

(3) One representative from each of the following cities: Chelsea, Quincy, Everett, and Revere who shall be recommended by the mayor of each city;

(4) One representative each from the towns of Winthrop, Weymouth, Hingham, and Hull who shall be recommended by the board of selectmen of each town named;

(5) Three representatives from the City of Boston who shall be recommended by the Mayor of the City of Boston. At least one of these persons shall represent the neighborhoods bordering the Boston Harbor;

(6) The executive director of Massachusetts Port Authority;

(7) The commissioner of the Metropolitan District Commission;

(8) The Secretary of the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Affairs;

(9) The Secretary of the Massachusetts Executive Office of Transportation and Construction;

(10) The Director of the Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management;

(11) Six persons recommended by the Governor. The Governor shall designate a member of the Commission to serve as Chairman.

(d) The Governor shall recommend for membership on the Commission at least three persons from recognized groups or organizations whose primary purpose is in the areas of conservation and historic preservation. All persons recommended shall have interests consistent with Section 2 of this Act.

(e) The function of the Commission shall be to prepare a plan for the development, maintenance, and management of the Boston Harbor National Recreation Area (hereinafter in this Act referred to as "the plan").

(f) The plan shall include, but need not be limited to:

(1) recommendations for the development of public recreational facilities, including but not limited to visitor centers, picnic, beach, swimming, and camping facilities;

(2) provision for the preservation, conservation, and interpretation of significant natural and historic resource areas;

(3) provision for expanded water access to and between the Boston Harbor Islands for the public, including plans for such shoreline, islands, and water facilities as may be necessary to provide frequent and inexpensive access to the Islands; and

(4) identification of the units of State or local government which will be responsible for implementing the plan.

This plan may not propose an expenditure of Federal funds greater than \$20,000.00 (exclusive of funds available under any existing Federal programs) to implement the plan.

(g) The Secretary and the heads of other Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Commission in the formulation of the plan upon the request of the Commission and to the extent of available funds.

(h) (1) Members of the Commission who are employees of government shall serve without additional compensation as such. All other members may, if the Commission so votes, receive \$50 per diem when actually engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

(2) The Secretary shall allow the reimbursement of all Commission members for necessary travel and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

(i) Financial and administrative services (including those related to payment of compensation, budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) shall be provided by the Secretary from the funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(j) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such additional personnel, including experts and professional, and for such temporary and intermittent services as may be necessary to carry out their duties, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, and they shall have the power to hold hearings and administer oaths.

(k) The Commission shall act by affirmative vote of a majority thereof. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(1) The Commission, within 1 year of the date on which it is established, shall submit its plan to the Secretary.

Sec. 5. (a) The Secretary shall within one hundred and twenty days of the date the plan is received by him either approve or disapprove the plan.

(b) The Secretary shall approve the plan if he finds that—

(1) the Commission has afforded adequate opportunity for public comment on the plan, and such comment was received and considered in the plan or revision as presented to him;

(2) State and local units of government identified in the plan as responsible for implementing any portion of its provisions have the necessary legislative authority to do so, and the chief executive officers of the State and local units of government have indicated their commitment to utilize such authority in accordance with the program established by the Commission;

(3) the plan will preserve the unique scenic, natural, cultural, historic, and recreational values of the Boston Harbor area including the Boston Harbor Islands; and

(4) the plan includes adequate provisions for expanded and sufficient public access to and between the Boston Harbor Islands.

(c) If the Secretary disapproves the plan, he shall advise the Commission of the reasons therefor and convey his recommendations for revision. The revision may be resubmitted to the Secretary for his approval.

(d) Upon approval of the plan, the Secretary shall publish a notice thereof in the Federal Register and shall transmit copies of the plan together with his comments to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(e) No substantial revision to the plan may be made without the approval of the Secretary.

Sec. 6. Upon approval of the plan, the Secretary shall make grants to the State or local units of government identified in the approved plan for the recreation area as having responsibility for implementing its provisions. Such grants shall be made upon application of such State or local units of government, shall be supplemental to any other Federal financial assistance for any purpose, and shall be subject to such reasonable terms and conditions as the Secretary deems necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 7. There is hereby established a special account in the Treasury of the United States for the purpose of holding moneys to be used for grants, pursuant to section 6 of this Act, to the State or local units of government. There shall be covered into such special account \$20,000,000 from revenues due and payable to the United States under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act or under the Act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 813), or under both such Acts, which would be otherwise credited to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. Moneys covered into the account shall be used only for grants made pursuant to section 6 of this Act and shall be available for expenditure only when appropriated therefor.

BLANCA M. HERMOSILLO—ONE OF
LULAC'S FINEST

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, this week the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) will be holding their annual convention in Houston, Tex. As part of the regular conference program, LULAC will be presenting its annual Woman of the Year Award. I am proud to announce that the California nominee for the honor is a resident of my home district, the widely respected resident of San Pedro, Mrs. Blanca M. Hermosillo. Her constant and dedicated concern for those who are less fortunate and her total commitment to the ideals of the LULAC organization

make her a perfect candidate for the award.

At this time, I would like to share with you a brief review of her many civic associations and past and current good works. They clearly illustrate why she is truly one of LULAC's finest.

This woman began in earnest her lifelong devotion to her cause at an early age. At 17 she was already interpreting and explaining legal documents for those who had not yet learned how to read and write English. Without her help many of these people could have been easy targets for consumer fraud.

Later, her proficiency in translation allowed her to become one of the first English-Spanish interpreters and translators for the Los Angeles County Superior Court.

Mrs. Hermosillo's heavy involvement in government is also especially noteworthy. For many years, she has urged responsible citizenship through more active participation. She has personally made Latin-American citizens more familiar with the electoral process so that they could more fully participate in our democratic society.

She has been active in the Mexican American Political Association and numerous election campaigns. Many know her as someone always willing to provide a ride to the voting polls for those without transportation.

Her familiarity with government and ability to work with people has made her a highly sought after community leader. Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley asked her to serve on the city's Zoning Commission, however, Mrs. Hermosillo's commitment to other concerns forced her to respectfully decline. Local elected officials were fortunate enough to have her join their San Pedro Area Community Endeavors, Inc.

Mrs. Hermosillo was instrumental in reactivating LULAC's No. 37 Council in San Pedro. The respect and admiration she instilled in her peers, led to her election as the organization's president. To this day she remains a dedicated member and participant in all major LULAC events.

My wife, Lee, and I have always been impressed by the personal commitment of this woman. Like few others in our local community, she has been a positive force and inspiration for the benefit of all. We congratulate her on being named Woman of the Year by the California LULAC organization and hope she wins the similar national recognition.

We would also like to send to her and her son and daughter, Xavier and Laura, our best wishes for many future years of success and happiness.

305th "CAN DO" AIR REFUELING
WING

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 8, I had the opportunity to visit

Grissom Air Force Base located within my district in Indiana. Grissom is the home of the 305th "Can Do" Air Refueling Wing. The 305th AREFW is the largest air refueling wing in the Strategic Air Command (SAC) today. Using the KC-135 tanker, the wing provides support for SAC and other military units on a worldwide basis.

Although the KC-135 was originally designed to support the U.S. nuclear bomber force in reaching targets located deep within the Soviet Union, its role has expanded over the years. The KC-135 can now be used to also refuel tactical fighter aircraft. This refueling capability enables the United States to station forces here in the United States and still respond to nonnuclear confrontations anywhere in the world.

Over the last several years, U.S. military overseas forces have been reduced. However, our military capabilities have not been reduced because through use of the KC-135, U.S.-based forces can readily respond to any contingency. If it were not for the KC-135, we would have to increase our military forces in order to cover all potential areas of conflict.

The KC-135 has proved to be an excellent tanker and should continue to serve our Air Force for a number of years. However, new engines need to be added to the aircraft if we are to realize its full potential. New engines will give the tanker increased strategic, tactical, and airlift capabilities. Further, new engines will allow the tanker to take off with a much greater gross weight. The combination of these two factors will increase our ability to meet our logistic requirements.

We are presently short of tankers. Should the United States be forced into a major NATO/Warsaw conflict, our refueling capabilities will determine our ability to adequately respond. While reengining will not eliminate the shortage, it is one of the most economical methods of reducing it. Through reengining, a single KC-135 will be able to refuel more planes, thus increasing our response capabilities.

With new engines, the KC-135 will be able to operate from shorter runways thus increasing and dispersing the bases where it can be stationed. Many European bases have shorter runways than U.S. bases. Consequently, the KC-135's role in NATO is severely limited with the present J-57 engines. With reengining, the KC-135 will be capable of using almost all civil and military airfields in Europe. By using the additional airfields which are only available through reengining, the KC-135 will give strategic and tactical aircraft much greater range.

Col. Richard S. Wallace is the 305th's wing commander. Although he only recently took over the wing, he has already established the goal of training every KC-135 crew to both off-load and receive fuel. The receiver-tanker KC-135 is capable of receiving as well as off-loading fuel.

This capability allows these aircrafts to extend their range tremendously. Further, it allows the aircraft to avoid having to land and refuel on ground

which is extremely energy inefficient due to the additional fuel necessary to get the aircraft off the ground and back with a fleet of receiver aircraft.

Later, I had the opportunity to fly with Colonel Wallace on a typical peacetime KC-135 mission. However, our flight was delayed due to a hydraulic line failure in one of the aircraft's engines. I witnessed several young and highly qualified airmen repair the engine while the plane remained on the runway. The efficiency of the repair operation was very impressive and the delay was only about a half an hour. This situation illustrated the age of the engines. Fortunately, the weather was warm and the repair job was not hampered. However, there are times when the airmen are forced to work in subdegree weather to repair the J-57 engines.

During the flight our aircraft both received and off-loaded fuel. The perfection involved in these maneuvers can only be truly appreciated when witnessed first hand. The aircrafts must fly within only a few feet of each other and in perfect coordination if the refueling is to be successful.

It was obvious to me that the men of the 305th AREFW were well trained and dedicated professionals. The entire crew of our plane demonstrated the highest degree of professionalism and flying skills in performing the mission. I believe the quality of our military personnel is second to none in the world and allows the United States to remain the world superpower that it is today.

Grissom is also the home of the 931st Air Refueling Group Air Force Reserve which is composed of the 72d Air Refueling Squadron and supporting elements. The 931st would be placed under the command of the 305th AREFW in cases of national emergency. The abilities of the 931st were highly praised by Colonel Wallace.

In closing, I would like to publicly thank everyone involved at Grissom for the opportunity to visit with them. Colonel Wallace presented me a plaque in commemoration of our flight. On the plaque are the words Peace is our Profession. It is through men such as those with the 305th AREFW that the United States can preserve world peace and protect the idealisms of freedom wherever they are threatened.●

WITH THE MX, WHO NEEDS SALT?

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the President has announced his decision to build the MX-missile system. It will be the most powerful weapon in America's arsenal, planted in 20-mile long trenches, deep in the ground in the Southwest, and the missiles will be moved along tracks so that the Russians, presumably, will have a hard time discovering their location. The MX will

cost, according to official estimates, \$30 billion. Recognizing the built-in tendency of the Department of Defense to underestimate the cost of the weapons it buys, I consulted a leading independent defense analyst, Dr. Earl Ravenel of the Institute for Policy Studies, who told me the more likely cost will be in the range of \$60 billion.

Even accepting the official estimate of \$30 billion, the MX will cost as much as the total budget of the Federal Government in 1980 for education, job, and vocational training, employment programs, social and community service programs, and social services for senior citizens. And \$30 billion would also be enough to raise the incomes of all Americans who now earn less than \$6,700, the so-called "poverty line," or finance a full employment program, or a comprehensive national health insurance system.

The President's decision to build the MX was made, it should be recalled, in the name of slowing down the nuclear arms race. Its immediate impact was to win support from reluctant, conservative Senators who have had reservations about the SALT II Treaty. The decision was tantamount to ransom, or to put it more charitably, an insurance policy to improve chances of Senate ratification of SALT II. One wonders when the day will come when a President announces a decision to spend \$30 billion to create full employment or to rebuild the cities, and as a means of winning over conservative opposition, throws in an additional few billion as sweeteners in the form of home-town projects, that will be too irresistible for these Members to reject.

The MX system will accelerate, rather than slow down, the nuclear arms race. It will force the Russians to follow suit, and since the SALT II Treaty places no ceiling on the number of nuclear warheads, merely on the number of delivery systems, it will encourage both sides to arm existing bombs and missiles with an even greater number of warheads. Like most other decisions involving the Defense Department, this one also had a touch of humor, if not absurdity, the Pentagon announced that it will not make a final decision on whether to leave open or enclose the missile trenches until it has consulted with local officials and environmentalists in New Mexico, Utah, and Nevada to get their opinions on ways to minimize environmental hazards. Apparently, it has not occurred to the Pentagon that the mere presence of these weapons poses the most extreme risk and hazard to the citizens and communities surrounding the missile sites.

Tom Wicker of the New York Times (June 12, 1979) presents a reasonable case for the rejection of the MX. I urge my colleagues to read his commentary, "Who Needs the MX," that follows:

[From the New York Times, June 12, 1979]

WHO NEEDS THE MX?

(By Tom Wicker)

After telling the National Security Council the other day that he would approve full-scale development of the MX mobile intercontinental ballistic missile, President Carter is reported to have said, "I feel confident with this decision."

Not everyone will. As Mr. Carter had just been told in a letter from several nuclear arms authorities: "\$80 billion seems an exorbitant price to pay for a system that adds so little to American security and promises to end by decreasing it."

And for the same money over the same years, Mr. Carter could underwrite a Manhattan Project to cope with an energy crisis far more threatening to American security than the likelihood of a Soviet nuclear attack.

The case for the MX is weak enough, in fact, to arouse suspicion that Mr. Carter is approving its development only to win the ratification votes of senators who now fear that the SALT II treaty would weaken American security, and to keep the Joint Chiefs of Staff from denouncing the treaty.

But if Mr. Carter's decision is taken at face value—as at the moment it must be—supporting the MX still requires several dubious leaps of faith. First among them is a conviction that the Soviet Union does indeed pose and intend a threat to the United States' nuclear deterrent.

It appears to be true that by the mid-1980's, Soviet missilery will have been so improved in accuracy and equipped with multiple, independently targeted warheads (MIRV's) that its use in a surprise attack might wipe out the present American land-based missile force. Is such an attack conceivable?

To consider it so, you have to believe the Soviets would make the attack knowing that even if it also took out the two-thirds of the American bomber force not kept on alert, the United States still would have 800 nuclear warheads aloft in one-third of its bombers and 3,000 nuclear warheads aloft in two-thirds of its submarines (the number normally kept at sea).

These figures do not include the more than 2,000 nuclear warheads to be installed in the 10 new Trident submarines already approved (one already launched). A Soviet attack in the teeth of such an assured second-strike force seems suicidal—particularly for nothing more than the destruction of an ICBM force that contains only about 25 percent of American nuclear warheads.

The Soviets seem far more vulnerable to us. All their 1,400 land-based missiles, all their 150 bombers and 85 percent of their submarines (the number normally in port) would be at least theoretically vulnerable to an American attack, leaving them only about 200 submarine-based warheads with which to retaliate. If 200 Soviet warheads are a sufficient second-strike capacity to deter the United States from a first strike, why aren't 3,800 American second-strike warheads sufficient to deter the Soviets?

But if you nevertheless accept the Soviet threat as real, you still have to convince yourself that the MX mobile missile is the right response. The Carter Administration, for example, apparently narrowed the options to two—a land-based MX and further submarine missile development. Then Mr. Carter chose the MX, which on the face of it seems more expensive and less secure from attack. It will entail more development risks and costs than the submarine weaponry already in being or in the works, and it's bound to encounter severe environmental and political resistance.

What state is going to want a huge number of MX missiles, each in a 20-mile trench studded with protective shelters and lined with railroad track, over which a single missile with the destructive power of 200 Hiroshima-type bombs will be shunted back and forth in an effort to keep the Soviets from knowing where it is? How can this clumsy, costly, environmentally destructive apparatus, eating up the landscape over several states, be preferable to swift and silent submarines?

But even if you accept the threat and the MX as the best response, you must further convince yourself that the mobile missile will not be destabilizing to the balance of nuclear deterrents. The history of the strategic arms race is that if one side leaps momentarily ahead, the other follows. The American decision to deploy MIRV's, for example, prevented the possibility of agreeing with the Soviets to ban such weapons; now the inevitable development of Soviet MIRV's has largely produced that very threat to American ICBM's cited as the necessity for building the MX.

Won't MX development cause the Soviets to see their land-based missile force (on which they rely far more heavily than we do on ours) as inferior? Won't that cause them to develop their own MX, hence making their land-based force less vulnerable to attack from us? And won't that lead both sides to target more warheads on more different sites where the other might possibly have hidden a missile?

If strategic weapons history has any relevance, that is exactly what will happen, thus raising costs and lowering security on both sides. And what about verification, a vital component of deterrence? More on this and other questions in another article.●

SOVIET ECONOMIC THREAT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the administration is seeking to add Red China and Soviet Russia to the "non-market" economies that are subsidized by the American people. My bill, H.R. 3408, would halt all such taxpayer subsidies to our enemies.

Recently, strategic analyst Brian Crozier wrote about the Soviet threat in *National Review*. Since what he has to say is relevant to H.R. 3408, I would like to draw it to my colleagues' attention.

ROLLBACK, MARK II—THE PROTRACTED CONFLICT

(By Brian Crozier)

I shall resist the temptation to cover the British elections all over again, but I cannot refrain from indicating some areas in which Margaret Thatcher's famous victory is directly relevant to this space. The master area, if I may so put it, is of course the Soviet Union and what it is up to the world over. The sub-areas are therefore numerous, and include Europe, SALT II, Africa, the Far East, and all the seas and oceans. They also comprise technology and the capitalist system, including international banking credit. Is there, indeed, anything anywhere that is not a "sub-area"?

In office, as distinct from opposition, even the most glowing of conservative hopes faces sobering pressures—from more timid colleagues, from the nasties of the trade unions, from the immobilizing hand of the Civil Service. Still, there can be no harm in stating some of the expectations legitimately aroused by the presence in 10 Downing Street of the holder of an Order not, to my knowledge, previously awarded by the USSR: the Order of the "Iron Lady," holder the Rt. Hon. Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, MP.

To live up to that title in the fullest sense, Britain's Prime Minister will have to act on the awareness that the strengthening of her country's run-down defenses, although a necessary first commitment, is not in itself enough for an Iron Lady. In addition (and since she alone among Western leaders has

publicly manifested a true perception of the Soviet threat), she will have to take major initiatives and set an international example in dealing with the whole range of hostile activities which collectively constitute World War III: terrorism, subversion (including propaganda and agitation, disinformation and psychological warfare), the use of surrogate forces, the global marine threat to supplies of energy and vital raw materials, and of course espionage and the recruiting of agents of influence.

Even if the Thatcher administration took defensive action in all these fields, it still would not be enough to protect us adequately against an ultimate Soviet take-over. Ahead of all these measures in priority is a fundamental decision and irrevocable commitment (not necessarily, of course, to be publicly announced) to turn the tables of "peaceful co-existence" and carry the fight into the enemy's camp.

A NEW FORWARD POLICY

Containment having yielded (as James Burnham foresaw) to appeasement, the logic of survival in World War III is a New Forward Policy, the ultimate aim of which can be nothing less than the destabilization and, in time, the collapse of the Soviet empire, including the system itself: a kind of Rollback, Mark II.

In one of the first of these interim columns (*NR*, January 5, 1979), I looked critically at the Shulman-Vance brand of inertia politics. If the mere enumeration of the inherent weaknesses of the Soviet empire is held to justify a policy of passivity and inaction, then there is nothing more to be said. But if it is perceived that the weaknesses themselves act as a powerful spur to the U.S.S.R.'s drive for world hegemony (to use Peking's favorite word), then it is evident that the weaknesses, contradictions, and tensions in the last surviving empire will have to be exploited and exacerbated for all we are worth if the crumbling giant is to crumble before we have all gone under.

In one sense, I am deeply in the debt of Professor Marshall Shulman, for it was his exposition of these weaknesses and of the superfluity of action on our side that impelled me to convene an international conference on this theme. The conference, held near Oxford and jointly sponsored by the Institute for the Study of Conflict (London) and the National Strategy Information Center (New York), brought together leading Western strategists and Sovietologists and will yield (but not until the late summer) a major report, the findings of which I sketchily anticipate here.

There was broad agreement on the propositions that:

The Soviet empire is now perilously extended: it includes not just Eastern Europe, but Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Angola, Mozambique, and Cuba.

China is a thorn of growing dimensions, not to be ignored.

Eurocommunism is a fraud, but also constitutes a problem for the Soviets.

Although Marxism-Leninism permeates all aspects of Soviet life and provides the only legitimization of the regime and all its works, it is dead as an inspiring force.

Religious and ethnic dissent are real problems, as are the exploding demographic pressure of the Muslim areas and unrest in Eastern Europe.

The Soviet economic system is a spectacular failure; it cannot feed its people without grain from America and other Western countries.

So weak is the system's international earning capacity that it needs Western credits to buy the grain and technology without which the system itself, and its fearsome armory, would be endangered.

SQUEEZING THEIR CREDIT

It will be seen that, quite apart from defense budgets, the Western powers and Japan already have the means readily at hand to face the Soviet leaders with the starkest of choices: either depress living standards still further, or drop out of the arms race.

This is the situation. And now comes the rub: how does one make the voters aware of it, and how does one make the elected governments act upon that awareness? The difficulties are formidable. For years, the great capitalist institutions have been encouraged by their governments to "sell" technology to the U.S.S.R. (The quotation marks are necessary, for the Soviets don't actually buy anything. They undertake to repay loans or credits—without which the transactions could not occur in the first place—at low rates of interest, which, at a time when the inflation rate exceeds them, amount to a partial giveaway; or in the form of products, including oil and gas, which Western or Japanese know-how has made it possible to extract. This "payment in kind" assumes Soviet good will, which can hardly be taken for granted.) Who will make the first move in this fraught situation? Could it be the "Iron Lady"? ●

INTERVENTIONIST PHILOSOPHY OF ENERGY DEPARTMENT COM- POUNDING ENERGY CRISIS

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, there is a definite tendency in Washington to over-react to difficult circumstances.

The President, the bureaucrats and many liberal Members of Congress are forever seeking to "initiate new policies," "move forward aggressively," and "consolidate programs"—all under the auspices of reorganizing Government to become more efficient and responsive to the American people. Action, no matter how misplaced, is inevitably preferred to inaction. Yet sadly this speedy activist philosophy encourages premature decisions, many of which turn out to be terribly regrettable.

In my view, one such ill-advised decision was made 2 years ago when Congress passed legislation establishing a new Cabinet-level Department of Energy. The rhetoric flowed fast and furious in both the House and Senate on the merits of consolidating the scattered Federal regulatory agencies which dealt with energy-related matters.

Congress succumbed to the temptation to demonstrate symbolic concern, as if the public is deceived by such shenanigans, and established with great fanfare a Department of Energy, complete with an energy czar, to lord over us all and regulate energy.

Little attention was given, and rarely is, to the possibility that less, rather than more, Government was the real answer to some of our problems.

Congress was somehow convinced that if we could just spend enough money and hire enough regulators our problems would be solved. Experience has shown on more than one occasion that the more

likely consequences of such policies are increased problems.

While this result is usually unintentional, it is almost always the inevitable consequence of Government intervention.

GOVERNMENT-INDUCED CRISIS

The Department of Energy has made absolutely no progress in improving our energy situation. Its principal distinction thus far has been the unprecedented speed with which it has mushroomed as a bureaucracy—today employing close to 20,000 people at an annual cost to the taxpayers of \$10.8 billion.

Yet those 20,000 employees have not produced, nor been responsible for producing, one barrel of oil, not one gallon of gasoline, not one unit of energy of any kind.

Indeed, if anything should have become obvious since 1977, it is that rather than being the answer to our energy problems, the new Department of Energy is compounding our energy problems.

The DOE's consistent intervention in the free enterprise system has been perhaps the major cause for the deteriorating supply of energy, and especially of domestically produced energy.

Of course, such intervention was almost inherent once the Department was established. For the direction in which our national policy needed to move in 1977, and needs to move in 1979, is toward more concentration on the production of energy which can and will be achieved only through the mechanics—the invisible hand, if you will—of the free enterprise system.

Nobel prize winning economist Milton Friedman recently summarized quite accurately that our Nation is enduring an energy crisis "because the government has decreed that there shall be one."

Decontrol and deregulation are badly needed in all areas of energy production. Only then can we really hope to have adequate supplies at fair market values to meet the needs of our people.

Yet the demagogic rhetoric of the Department of Energy attempts to persuade the American people that the real villains of the energy crisis are either the oil and gas companies or the "overly consumptive" American people themselves. No interpretation could be more inconsistent with the facts.

ADMINISTERING A SHORTAGE

The Department of Energy repeatedly develops rules, regulations, guidelines, and a plethora of other requirements that invariably impede the production of energy and thereby raise the price to the consumer. OPEC, while a serious problem indeed, has been inadvertently aided by the regulators at DOE whose policies have caused, and will continue to cause, both high energy prices and short supplies.

The regulators at the Department of Energy are more interested in managing the energy crisis than in solving it. For after all, if there were plenty of oil and gas, there would be no need for a Department of Energy, its \$10.8 billion annual budget, or its 20,000 employees.

The Department's programs are

geared toward allocating shortages and planning contingencies, not for improved circumstances, but for worse ones complete with mammoth bureaucratic plans for energy rationing, coupons, enforcement, and so forth. Thus the incentives at work in the Department of Energy are in the direction of continued shortages and high prices which will perpetuate the bureaucracy.

THE TRUE COST OF ENERGY

To be sure, the Department of Energy does not reveal its indirect complicity in these higher prices. Dr. Friedman points out, however, that in addition to the price of gasoline at the pump, the "true" cost of a fill-up should include the \$10.8 billion annual budget of the Department of Energy which he calculates to be around 9 cents per gallon of gasoline. That charge is collected every April 15 through the Federal income tax and daily through the inflation which is the result of such big spending programs.

When the Department of Energy was considered by the House, my distinguished friend from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL) offered an amendment to "sunset" the Department of Energy for 5 years and thereby force a congressional review before the department could be extended.

While the House wisely adopted that amendment 202 to 126, it was subsequently eliminated during the conference with the Senate and replaced by lukewarm language requiring Presidential review of the Department.

I am pleased to join with my colleague from Virginia (Mr. WHITEHURST) in supporting legislation which would reinstitute the "sunset" provision which was eliminated from the 1977 bill.

It has become obvious to me that Congress needs to thoroughly reevaluate not only the Department of Energy, but also the larger, antifree market philosophy on which it was established. Indeed, a 5-year review, given the rapidly deteriorating energy situation, may well be too long of a wait.

I maintain that a Federal Department of Energy is not the answer to our problems, and I am pleased to say that I do not regret having opposed the Department from its inception in 1977. Fundamentally, it is the wrong approach.

I would like to call to my colleagues' attention Milton Friedman's excellent critique of the present energy crisis, and the DOE's complicity in it, from the June 4 issue of Newsweek magazine. I request that the article, "Blaming the Obstetrician," be printed at this point in the RECORD:

BLAMING THE OBSTETRICIAN

(By Milton Friedman)

The explanations of the energy crisis and gasoline shortage that gush forth from government officials, newspaper reporters and TV commentators are tantamount to blaming the obstetrician for the baby.

A rapacious oil industry did not produce the gasoline shortage. Wasteful consumers did not produce the gasoline shortage. Hard winter did not produce the gasoline shortage. Not even Arab sheiks produced the gasoline shortage.

After all, the oil industry has been around for a long time—and has always been rapacious. Consumers have not suddenly become

wasteful. We have had hard winters before. Arab sheikhs have desired wealth as far back as human memory runs.

Why now? The subtle and sophisticated people who fill the newspaper columns and the airwaves with such silly explanations of the gasoline shortage seem never to have asked themselves the obvious question: why is it that for a century and more before 1971, there were no energy crises, no gasoline shortages, no problems about fuel oil—except during World War II?

There is an energy crisis, there are gasoline lines, for one reason and one reason only. Because government has decreed that there shall be. Of course, government has not done so openly. The President never sent a message to Congress asking it to legislate an energy crisis and long gasoline lines. But he who says A must say B. The government, beginning with President Nixon on Aug. 15, 1971, imposed maximum prices on crude oil, gasoline at retail and other petroleum products. And, unfortunately, the quadrupling of crude-oil prices by the OPEC cartel in 1973 prevented those maximum prices from being abolished when all others were. Maximum legal prices for petroleum products—that is the key element common both to World War II and the period since 1971.

Economists may not know much. But we know one thing very well; how to produce surpluses and shortages.

Do you want a surplus? Have the government legislate a *minimum* price that is *above* the price that would otherwise prevail. That is what we have done at one time or another to produce surpluses of wheat, of sugar, of butter, of many other commodities, and, most tragically, of teen-age labor. The minimum wage is a legislated price above the price that would otherwise prevail for the labor of many teen-agers. Like every minimum price, it enhances the amount supplied and reduces the amount demanded, and so produces a surplus, in this case of unemployed teen-agers.

Do you want a shortage? Have the government legislate a *maximum* price that is *below* the price that would otherwise prevail. That is what New York City and, more recently, other cities have done for rental dwellings, and that is why they all suffer or will soon suffer from housing shortages. That is why there were so many shortages during World War II. That is why there is an energy crisis and a gasoline shortage.

There is one simple way to end the energy crisis and the gasoline shortage tomorrow—and I mean tomorrow and not six months from now, not six years from now. Eliminate all controls on the prices of crude oil and other petroleum products. The gasoline lines would melt faster than the snows of winter.

Other misguided policies of government and the monopolistic behavior of the OPEC cartel might keep petroleum products expensive, but they would not produce the disorganization, chaos and confusion that we now confront.

Gas Would Cost Less: And, perhaps surprisingly, this solution would reduce the cost of gasoline to the consumer—the *true* cost. Prices at the pump might go up a few cents a gallon, but the cost of gasoline today includes the time and gasoline wasted standing in line, and hunting for a gas station with gas, *plus* the \$10.8 billion annual budget of the Department of Energy, which amounts to around 9 cents per gallon of gasoline.

Why has this simple and foolproof solution not been adopted? So far as I can see, for two basic reasons—one, general, the other, specific. To the despair of every economist, it seems almost impossible for most people other than trained economists to comprehend how a price system works. Reporters and TV commentators seem especially resistant to the elementary principles they supposedly imbibed in freshman economics. Second, re-

moving price controls would reveal that the emperor is naked—it would show how useless, indeed harmful, are the activities of James Schlesinger and his 20,000 employees. It might even occur to someone how much better off we were before we had a Department of Energy. ●

PANAMA CANAL SUBCOMMITTEE QUESTIONS STABILITY OF RE- PUBLIC OF PANAMA

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this body have once again witnessed the reluctance of the administration in bringing the Panama Canal Implementing Legislation to the House floor for a vote. The bill has been delayed for over 2½ months now. Such delaying tactics speak for themselves—the American public remains overwhelmingly opposed to the Panama Canal treaties and a majority of their representatives in Congress are upholding their wishes.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week our colleagues CARROLL HUBBARD and ROBERT BAUMAN distributed a letter announcing the findings of last week's hearings into Panamanian gunrunning to Sandinista guerrillas in Nicaragua. For the benefit of interested Americans everywhere I include that letter for the RECORD:

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Last week, the Panama Canal Subcommittee concluded hearings to investigate charges that the Government of Panama is actively supporting guerilla operations directed against the Government of Nicaragua, a fellow Member of the Organization of American States (OAS) and a long standing ally of the United States. Specifically, it was charged that the Panamanian Government was, in effect, acting as a conduit, or middleman, in a gun smuggling operation that began in the United States and ended in the hills of Nicaragua 60 meters north of the Costa Rican border.

Reasonable men can conclude on the basis of the facts adduced at our hearings—that the salient points of which follow—that the Government of Panama has knowingly and systematically undertaken to authorize and underwrite provocative acts of indirect aggression against the Government of Nicaragua. As the OAS Charter indicates, this is clearly a violation of international law and calls into question the political judgment and reliability of the Panamanian Government.

Further, in our judgment such acts have already violated the letter if not the spirit of the neutrality treaty recently signed between the United States and Panama.

The evidence at last week's hearings was both shocking and compelling. Among the findings and admissions elicited at the proceedings were the following:

U.S. Treasury enforcement officials in Miami have concluded a detailed investigation which has resulted in the indictment of several individual including one Antonio Alvarez, the air cargo manager of Air Panama;

—An affidavit filed in the Federal District Court of Miami by Agent Kimbler with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms states that the former Panamanian Consul in Miami, Edgardo Lopez, was also involved in the conspiracy to purchase weapons and illegally export them.

—Air Panama allegedly involved in the transshipment of the smuggled guns, has been determined to be 70 percent owned by Bank Cofina, the Panamanian Central Bank. The remaining 30 percent is owned by five individuals, one of whom was recently assassinated under mysterious circumstances and another of whom was the former Charge d'Affaires of the Panamanian Embassy in Washington;

—According to the Kimbler affidavit, Edgardo Lopez admitted that he was acting on orders of Panamanian intelligence in carrying out his part in the conspiracy. After making these admissions, Lopez has disappeared.

—According to documents provided by human rights groups in Panama, past payrolls of the Panamanian G2, or intelligence apparatus, indicate that in 1975 Edgardo Lopez was an employee of Panamanian G2;

—As at least one of the shipments to Panama was made pursuant to a duly issued export license from the State Department's Office of Munitions Control, which was recorded as it left the country by U.S. Customs Officials, it is possible to trace many of the weapons forwarded from Miami. A serial number cross check has revealed that weapons shipped from Miami, have, in fact, found their way to the Sandinista guerrillas;

—Nicaragua Customs authorities seized M1 Carabines being clandestinely smuggled from Costa Rica into Nicaragua soon after the shipment of carabines from Miami to Panama. Found under false floors in two small vans, the weapons were the very ones purchased by Panamanian citizens in Miami.

—According to the testimony of two senior retired military officers—Lt. Gen. Gordon Sumner, former Chairman of the Inter-American Defense Board (USA Retired) and Colonel Joseph Thomas (USAF Retired), both of whom held senior posts concerned with Latin American affairs in the Defense Department—Panamanian systematic involvement in gun smuggling is a well known reality.

General Sumner had personal conversations with Panamanian strong man Omar Torrijos, in which Torrijos admitted to him his intent to aid and abet the Sandinista movement with military arms. Furthermore, Colonel Thomas testified that intelligence reports were available within the Administration on a daily basis chronicling the involvement of the Government of Cuba and Panama in international arms smuggling;

When asked to confirm the complicity of Panamanian and Cuban gunrunning in the Sumner-Thomas testimony, Lt. Gen. Dennis P. McAuliffe, presently the Commander of the U.S. Southern Command, affirmed the existence of such reports and indicated that although they are classified, "I have seen intelligence reports about . . . pertaining to members of the government, . . ."

We would point out to members that under Article 15 of the OAS Charter,

"No State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements." (Emphasis added.)

In view of the above, we ask that members take into account the question of the stability and motives of the Government of Panama when it invites military retaliation by supporting subversion and insurrection in neighboring nations.

Sincerely,

CARROLL HUBBARD,
Chairman,
Panama Canal Subcommittee.
ROBERT BAUMAN,
Ranking Minority Member,
Panama Canal Subcommittee. ●

AMENDMENTS TO AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing with my colleague from California, Mr. WAXMAN, two amendments today to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act. I believe that this legislation is necessary to clarify ambiguities left by the 1978 amendments (P.L. 95-256) and a recent Supreme Court interpretation that runs contrary to congressional intent.

The first amendment, to section 15 would insure that Federal employees who are covered by the act have the same right to a jury trial as nonfederal employees. While it was never our intent to exclude Government workers in the 1978 amendments, Federal defendants have argued that Congress withheld this right. Although no Federal employee has, as of now, been denied a jury trial, I believe that the intent of the act must be clarified to preclude such a possibility.

The second amendment permits individual complainants to bypass State remedies and file directly in Federal court. The Supreme Court ruled last month in *Oscar Mayer & Co. against Evans* that in States where such remedies are available, resort to them is mandatory and not optional. Now after an individual files charges with a State agency, a 60-day waiting period must be observed before Federal action can be commenced.

At the very least, complainants will be delayed 60 days. And there is of course the possibility that plaintiffs who are unfamiliar with this requirement could jeopardize their entire suit. I believe that complainants should not have to defer their Federal action in favor of State procedures unless they voluntarily choose to do so. Such a process is contrary to the purpose of the act which provides that disputes be rapidly adjudicated. By restating our intent more clearly we can insure that older workers will at least have their complaints heard on the merits quickly and not sidetracked or dismissed on procedural technicality.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that these amendments will successfully address any ambiguities in the 1978 amendments which are a result of drafting language, rather than congressional intent. I hope that our colleagues will join Mr. WAXMAN and me in support of this legislation.

A copy of the bill is printed below:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 14(b) of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 633(b)) is amended by striking out "no suit may be" and all that follows through "Provided, That such" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "any person who desires to bring a suit under section 7 of this Act may bring such suit without regard to whether any proceedings have been commenced by or on behalf of such person

CXXV—950—Part 12

under the State law. If such person commences any proceeding under the State law before bringing a suit under section 7 of this Act, then such person may not bring any such suit under section 7 of this Act before the end of the period of sixty days following the commencement of proceedings under the State law, unless such proceedings have been earlier terminated. Such".

SEC. 2. Section 15(c) of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 633a(c)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The provisions of section 7(c)(2) of this Act shall apply in the case of any action brought under this subsection."●

ENERGY CRISIS AND THE DRAFT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD a copy of a recent column by Paul Harvey that appeared in the Colorado Springs Sun on May 23. Perhaps there is some connection between the energy crisis and the draft after all.

AMERICAN TROOPS TO THE MIDEAST?

Is this why there is agitation in the Pentagon to start drafting American youth again? Defense Secretary says that it might call for U.S. military force if the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty breaks down.

Brown and Secretary of State Cyrus Vance talk of the "possibility" of American supplies and ships and planes;—they do not mention American troops yet. However, Brown has gone ahead and ordered \$10 billion worth of \$10 million dollar tanks so apparently the Pentagon still intends to fight the next war with the weapons which lost the last two.

Prime Minister Menachem Begin and Israel's Defense Minister Moshe Dayan have insisted that they neither want nor need U.S. troops. But that prospect is still being used by infantry-oriented American generals as leverage for more foot soldier mobilization.

Begin told our Congress, "Israel will never ask America boys to fight its wars."

Yet Press Secretary Jody Powell confirms that President Carter on at least one instance has considered stationing American troops on the West Bank.

Now our House Foreign Affairs Committee hears that there is a "memorandum of understanding" between the United States and Israel which promises that in a shootout we will supply weapons and that we will "show" our ships and planes in the area. Nobody imagines that we could go that far without getting in the way of some bullets.

What troubles pragmatic military strategists is the evidence that we seem to learn nothing from our past wars. Contrast the tedious one-man-at-a-time invasion of Europe with the way President Truman ended the Pacific war with two big bangs. . . and it is inconceivable that we would revert to fighting future wars with bayonets.

Yet in Korea and in Vietnam we did and we lost. And here we go again! Today we have big weapons—loaded for bear—and we can't wait to sign an agreement with Soviets not to use them! Little wonder the Soviets celebrate the SALT II agreement. If we will agree to fight future wars with manpower, they have more of that than anybody.

In mid-March our secretary of state and our defense secretary were also promising to use U.S. armed forces if necessary to protect the oil fields of Saudi Arabia. Though now they say they are having second thoughts about that.●

ANNIVERSARY OF BALTIC STATES' GENOCIDE DAY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the first meeting of President Carter and Soviet leader Brezhnev at the Vienna summit on SALT, I believe it is especially important for us to keep in mind the history of the Soviet's political and strategic intentions. Thirty-eight years ago today, on June 14, 1941, the Soviet Union began to execute its policy of genocide in the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

This forcible occupation and incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R., and the subsequent deportation of hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians to Siberian concentration camps, remains a constant reminder of the true attitude of the Soviet Union toward basic human rights.

Before the conquest of these three nations, there was a short yet great moment of free government in these lands. After World War I, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia all declared their independence and enjoyed democratic governments until 1949. With the advent of the Second World War, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania lost their freedom when they were, in accord with a Nazi-Soviet pact, allocated to the U.S.S.R.

Tens of thousands of the Baltic peoples were killed and over a million were deported to slave labor camps. Many others were removed from their homelands because of their resistance to the subjugation or because of their political and religious views. As the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians were deported, they were replaced by peoples from other areas of the Soviet empire. This exchange of population has substantially altered the ethnic composition of the Baltic nations. In this way, the Russian rulers hope to destroy the national identity of the Baltic people.

Throughout the free world, the peoples of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian origin have maintained their traditional civic, cultural, and church organizations and bravely continued their efforts on behalf of their enslaved compatriots held captive within the U.S.S.R.

The Soviet Union has blatantly ignored the human rights provisions of its own constitution; the provisions of human rights in the United Nations Charter; and most recently, it has ignored the implementation of the provisions of the Final Act of the Helsinki Accords and the Belgrade Conference.

As a nation, we stand for freedom and the right of self-determination. I believe that this is a universal principle and not one that should be applied selectively. As this is not the case for those held captive of communism, it is important for us to bring global attention to their plight.

In past Congresses, we have recorded our denunciation of the Soviet annexation of the Baltic areas in the passage of resolutions expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in nonrecognition of the Soviet Union's forcible annexation of the Baltic nations. Therefore, it is necessary for the policy of the United States to continue to be that of nonrecognition; and further to demand the release of political prisoners of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian nationality from Soviet incarceration; and return the right of self-determination and territorial integrity to the Baltic nations.

As we draw attention to this tragic anniversary, we must recognize that it is the duty of the United States to support the cause of freedom for these Baltic peoples. Only with the end of political repression, religious persecution and cultural genocide in these nations, the legitimate aspirations of the Baltic peoples will be fulfilled. ●

THE 38TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN CAPTIVITY

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today marks the tragic anniversary when 38 years ago, thousands of innocent Lithuanians were deported by the Soviets to certain death in Siberia. Since the military forces of the Soviet Union moved swiftly and brutally in their illegal occupation of Lithuania, the issues of Russification and human rights have been at the heart of the "captive cause" in that Baltic nation.

Throughout modern history, we have been reminded of the tyranny of Russification in Lithuania. We have witnessed the terror of the Soviet's extermination practices and the grim exile of Lithuanian people to Siberia. More recently, we have followed the arrest and the "trial" of the Lithuanian dissident, Viktoras Petkus, who was sentenced to a prison term of 15 years. His crime was that he was a member of a Lithuanian citizen group to monitor violations of the Helsinki Accords. These kinds of Soviet activities are but a few examples of the continuing Communist policy of outrageous persecution and humiliating harassment of the Lithuanian people.

Despite the decades of Soviet suppression, however, the people of Lithuania have persevered in their struggle for freedom and self-determination. Entrapped by communism, they have continued to fight for the most important

human values in life including the freedoms of speech and worship.

Although conditions in Lithuania remain disturbing—they are not without hope. The captive people of Lithuania continue their struggle against oppression while Lithuanian Americans nourish and maintain the spirit of a free and democratic Lithuania. Knowing full well that there is not struggle without sacrifice, I hope that all Lithuanian people will continue the fight for their individual rights until, as the Lithuanian poet Maironis stated: "The painful chains will fall away and a bright new sky will dawn for our children." ●

TIME TO PREVENT MID-AIR COLLISIONS

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that by now our colleagues in the House are alarmed by the continuing plague of aircraft near misses in the skies over America. These unsafe conditions were dramatically illustrated in some recent tragedies.

In the widely remembered September 1978 mid-air collision in San Diego, Calif., 135 passengers and crew flying aboard a Boeing 727 went to their deaths after colliding with a Cessna just before its scheduled landing at Lindbergh Field. Two died aboard the Cessna and 7 more on the ground. In March, the pilot of a supersonic Concorde jetliner carrying 66 passengers was required to take evasive action suddenly over Long Island, N.Y., avoiding a mid-air collision with yet another Cessna 172. Both airplanes were shown on the traffic controller's radar on the ground at the time of their "close encounter of the worst kind."

If we, the Congress, can within our power guarantee airline passengers better safety and protection from deadly mid-air collisions and terrifying near misses, then there is an immediate need to investigate, analyze and correct the problem as fast as is humanly possible.

The need for an improved system of collision avoidance has been made clearly evident. I know it would please the flying public of your district, Mr. Speaker, and of our colleagues' districts, if the House were to scrutinize the Federal Aviation Administrations' current collision avoidance program more closely than it has. I firmly believe that technology already exists which, if installed aboard civil and military aircraft, would greatly reduce the instances of mid-air collisions at a reasonable cost to the airlines and to general aviation pilots.

To this very important end, Mr. FASCELL and I have introduced H.R. 3004, directing the Secretary of Transportation to promulgate a national aviation standard for adoption of an airborne

collision avoidance system (ACAS) aboard both civil and military aircraft in the United States. Keep in mind that the FAA has promised Congress on a number of occasions that it would develop such an ACAS system for use aboard aircraft, but as of this late date, we have seen only words and little or no action.

A recent Time magazine edition noted the dangerous situation in the skies around our Nation's airports by quoting in part from a NASA document currently being circulated in industry and government circles for comment. The draft report said:

A way must be found to resolve this (near misses) very real dilemma.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly have no argument with that statement of warning which should be heeded by every man and woman who serves in this Chamber.

Responding to the San Diego collision, the FAA has decided to proceed toward the implementation of a beacon-based collision avoidance system (BCAS). Serious allegations have been made that BCAS, the knee-jerk reaction to San Diego, will be prohibitively expensive and, at most only 50 percent effective—averaged over all reasonable encounter situations. One of my grave concerns, Mr. Speaker, is that it has been suggested that the FAA has indeed conducted flight testing for which a report has been published showing, for example, antenna shielding which would have precluded a BCAS equipped air carrier from "seeing"—electronically—the Cessna at San Diego.

I do not understand why we allow the FAA's questionable judgment in this matter to go unchallenged. Sufficient evidence exists which casts a dark light on the BCAS concept of air collision avoidance. And yet, it seems that this system is bound for implementation, a system which will impose a heavy burden on pilots and which will not provide the greatest amount of protection.

I would like our colleagues in the House to pay particular attention to the scholarly comments of Mr. David H. Scott, writing for the June 1979 edition of Sport Aviation magazine. As a member of the Experimental Aircraft Association, his words, which follow, will help put in perspective a very complex, technical matter for the benefit of each Member. I hope all Members, Mr. Speaker, will take the time to involve themselves in the issue of air safety, and will pay particular attention to the advantages of an Airborne Collision Avoidance System (ACAS) for use aboard civil and military aircraft.

Here is what Mr. Scott has to say:

COLLISION AVOIDANCE SYSTEMS

(By David H. Scott)

It has been five years since this column covered the subject of Collision Avoidance Systems (CAS). The reason for this omission was the FAA's decision to adopt a Beacon Collision Avoidance System (BCAS) which made any discussion of alternative systems academic.

Nevertheless two things have happened during the last few months that has stimulated the debate in Washington as to whether the BCAS system was the best after all. The San Diego collision pointed to the fact that a back up system for air traffic separation was essential. The second factor initiating further debate was the FAA announcement that BCAS, if it could be developed, would be only a temporary expedient until the Discreet Address Beacons System (DABS) with Automated Traffic Advisory and Resolution Service (ATARS) could be put in operation around 1985.

With these two developments experts in air traffic control have decided to have another look at a promising alternative to BCAS which is an Airborne Collision Avoidance System (ACAS). Various forms of ACAS were worked on by McDonnell Douglas, TCA and Honeywell starting in the 1960's. Of the three systems Honeywell's AVOID II as originally developed for the Army at Ft. Rucker in Alabama in 1971 and 1972 is the most promising of the three and this is the system that will be discussed here as an alternative to BCAS.

How do BCAS and ACAS differ?

BCAS operates on radar interrogations from conventional transponders with automatic Mode C altitude reporting capability. Ground stations or airborne stations with BCAS interrogation capability can pick up altitude, range and heading from any other aircraft that has a Mode C transponder. A display on the instrument panel warns a pilot of an impending collision. A BCAS airborne interrogator can be either "Passive" or "active" or a combination of both. In the passive mode it does not interrogate other transponders but only listens in on them. In the active mode it interrogates other transponders.

BCAS operates on the same radar frequencies used for air traffic control. In a sense it is a back up to the present ATC system but not an independent system because it depends upon the same radars and computers as the present ATC system.

Another feature of BCAS is that an aircraft that is BCAS equipped will warn its pilot of other intruding aircraft even if they are equipped with only a Mode C transponder. Since all airline and most executive aircraft would be expected to install BCAS systems they would be given protection from each other. But general aviation aircraft with no airborne BCAS equipment would get no protection from each other.

ACAS is a cooperative system and works only with other aircraft that have compatible equipment. It operates on frequencies different from those used by the ATC system and thereby is a truly independent system. It was fully developed in 1971-1972, for collision problems in busy terminal areas where it is most needed. About five years ago when ACAS was being considered a general aviation unit was expected to sell for about \$1,100. This would include a Mode C altitude reporting capability that could be hooked in to any conventional transponder. This compares with an estimate at the same time of \$25,000 for the least expensive BCAS system for general aviation while a BCAS unit for airlines might run up to as much as \$75,000 per unit. Inflation, of course, has changed these price estimates but ACAS is definitely less expensive than BCAS.

FAA favored BCAS because they say it can use the existing airborne transponders. But remember that any general aviation aircraft without a BCAS unit receives no protection from other non BCAS aircraft. Also the onus for avoidance is on the aircraft that has a BCAS unit even though it may be the heavier and less maneuverable aircraft.

BCAS development has been long and costly mostly due to the problem of synchronous garble or overlapping radar signals in busy terminal areas. To illustrate this problem we all remember the situation a few years ago when pilots were told to turn their transponders to "stand by". The FAA worked out a partial fix for this problem by surveying the 600 ground radars in use and reducing the power of those to avoid synchronous garble. One can imagine the radar interference problem if the number of radars in the system is increased by some 50,000 units. One possible solution for this problem with BCAS is to turn it off in busy terminal areas but this is where it is most needed.

The arguments in favor of ACAS are impressive. It was developed over 7 years ago and needs no further funding. If it had been adopted by the FAA as the standard CAS system and both aircraft in the San Diego collision had been equipped with ACAS no doubt the collision would never have occurred. After exhaustive tests ACAS showed no false alarms in busy traffic areas and this is borne out by its success at Ft. Rucker with Army helicopters. ACAS is less expensive than BCAS not only from the standpoint of unit cost but when the whole system to support BCAS is included it works out to some five times the cost of ACAS.

One strong reason for FAA's opposition to ACAS is that it would make DABS unnecessary at least for the rest of the century. FAA is committed to DABS as it is a ground based controller system and perpetuates the existing manpower and system set up.

ACAS could initially be introduced on a voluntary basis with perhaps a follow up requirement for entry into Group 1 TCAS. Obviously such operations as agricultural flying, soaring, aerobatics, pipeline patrol and fish spotting would not need a CAS system. Like the transponder, it should be made available and those who want it would determine the market. No doubt airline aircraft, executive aircraft, business aircraft and those used for personal flying would choose ACAS especially if they operated in busy terminal areas.

It is probably that the debate over ACAS and BCAS will be stimulated during the coming months. Legislation (H.R. 3004) has been introduced in the House of Representatives that would direct the FAA to write a national standard for an airborne collision avoidance system within one year. ●

DISTINGUISHED PRESIDENT OF WHITTIER COLLEGE RETIRES

HON. WAYNE GRISHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. GRISHAM. Mr. Speaker, this summer will mark the end of an era to a small college in my district in southern California. Dr. W. Roy Newsom, President of Whittier College, is to retire from his post after 40 years of service to my alma mater.

Dr. Newsom, himself an alumnus of Whittier College, finished his graduate work in chemistry at the University of Southern California. He returned to Whittier to become a member of the faculty, then Dean, Vice President, and finally President of the college.

In his years at Whittier, Dr. Newsom emphasized the interaction between faculty and students as the key to education. His efforts were honored at commencement this year with an honorary degree and the establishment of a Chemistry Scholarship Fund in his and his wife's name, by the trustees, alumni, and friends who had raised \$120,000 for the endowment.

This show of affection is typical of the feelings shared by all who have come to know W. Roy Newsom and is a tribute to his leadership and perseverance as a teacher and administrator. ●

BOAT PEOPLE

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, the outflow of refugees in Indochina has now reached crisis proportions, with 60,000 Vietnamese men, women, and children arriving by small boat in the month of May to the countries of first asylum in South East Asia.

The tragedy is of course that many more thousands have lost their lives at sea in their desperate attempts to flee Vietnam.

In Thailand, a government overwhelmed by the influx of over 80,000 Cambodian refugees, has now begun the forcible repatriation of those refugees back into war-torn Cambodia. It is widely feared that thousands of these Khmer refugees will die—either at the hands of Pol Pot's forces or from hunger and starvation.

Two poignant articles depicting the horrors of the refugee situation in South East Asia appeared in Tuesday's New York Times. Mr. Speaker, I insert these articles into the RECORD, so that Members, who might not have seen them, would have the opportunity to read them:

THAIS DEPORT 30,000 CAMBODIANS WHILE
OTHERS CONTINUE TO ARRIVE
(By Henry Kamm)

BANGKOK, THAILAND.—Thirty thousand Cambodian refugees have been forcibly returned to their homeland by Thai military authorities in the past four days, and 50,000 more will be sent back to Cambodia as soon as possible, according to Government and United Nations refugee sources in Thailand.

"There is no question we are going to ship them all out," said a well-placed Thai military source. He indicated that the 50,000 still to be forced back had been encamped for several weeks around Aranyaprathet in Thailand.

In addition to the 80,000 that are being forced back, 30,000 other Cambodians largely under the control of the heavily armed troops of former Prime Minister Pol Pot are encamped on the Thai side of the border south of Aranyaprathet. The Thais hope that the monsoon rains, which have begun, will bring a retrenchment of Vietnamese forces, leaving some border areas free, and that the Pol Pot

forces will return to Cambodia on their own, taking the largely unwilling civilians with them.

For the fourth day today, a long column of buses was moving along the Thai side of the Cambodian border from the area of Aranyaprathet northeast to the spot where the temple of Preah Vihear dominates the landscape on the Cambodian side.

The buses were crammed with Cambodians who had been told they were being moved to another refugee camp. They assembled at a spot near the border until darkness had fallen over the deserted region, which is flat and rocky on the Thai side and rises sharply into the Dangrek Mountains in Cambodia.

Then the passengers, far more of them women and children than men, were ordered to alight. They were surrounded by Thai soldiers and trooped into a narrow mountain pass. On the border they were ordered to keep walking. Those who stalled or wanted to turn back were threatened with being shot.

A United Nations official said many of the refugees were seriously ill. "If they have to walk for days, many will die," he said. He reported that Thai soldiers were distributing small amounts of food before forcing the Cambodians across the border.

Bus drivers who are ferrying the refugees are reported to have said they have heard shots from the Cambodian side after groups of refugees walked into the dark.

MORE REFUGEES ARRIVING

While the forced repatriation is under way, the flow of Cambodians seeking safety, food and medical attention outside their devastated country continues. About 1,200 who made their way across the border at one place yesterday were put on buses back to Cambodia today. At another place, 854 who arrived this morning were instantly loaded on the buses.

A number of foreign and international organizations, notably the American Embassy, are trying to persuade Thailand not to repatriate the Cambodians. The United Nations refugee agency and a number of embassies are receiving anguished cables and telephone calls from relatives of the Cambodians, who, after getting the first word in more than four years that their relatives were still alive and had managed to escape, now learn that they are being pushed back. A number of relatives have arrived here, mainly from France, to plead to no avail for their parents, children, brothers and sisters.

The American Embassy gathered about 25,000 names of refugees and information on their relatives in other countries. It has, together with France, given Thai authorities a number of lists of refugees who would be admitted for immigration. About 1,500 were sent to refugee transit centers before the forced return began. American and French officials here and the United Nations agency have learned, however, that most of the people on the lists have been returned to Cambodia anyway.

The Thai military officer said Thailand was repatriating the Cambodians because the Western countries had shown by their relative inaction that they were not prepared to accept enough Cambodians quickly enough to relieve Thailand of what it sees as a serious threat to its security.

DANGERS IN FORCED RETURN

The officer said the refugees were being returned to Preah Vihear Province because it offered the best chance for their survival. He conceded that mines and booby traps would cause casualties among the refugees.

During the four years the Pol Pot regime was in power, Cambodia's borders were studded not only with explosive devices but also with masses of pointed bamboo sticks.

In the absence of medicine, the painful wounds caused when people step on them lead to infections, gangrene and death, particularly in the present rainy season.

The Thai military source said that Preah Vihear was under the control of Vietnamese troops, although he said there were not a lot of them. It is generally conceded that Vietnamese troops are less likely than Pol Pot's soldiers to kill the refugees as traitors for having fled. On the other hand, the majority of the refugees are ethnic Chinese who not only strove hard to escape but also found themselves urged by the Vietnamese to leave.

The expectation of both Thai and foreign officials is that the refugees who survive their re-entry into Cambodia will attempt as soon as possible to make their way through dangerous terrain back into Thailand.

"If they do, we will look for another area to push them back out," the Thai officer said.

HANOI REGIME REPORTED RESOLVED TO OUST NEARLY ALL ETHNIC CHINESE

(By Fox Butterfield)

HONG KONG.—Vietnam appears determined to expel virtually all the members of its ethnic Chinese minority and is exactly hundreds of millions of dollars from them before their departure, much of it to repay refugees and intelligence sources here.

Despite denials by Vietnamese officials, there is growing evidence that the exodus is being organized by the Government. The regime regards the Chinese as of doubtful loyalty and as unproductive city dwellers who are an obstacle to plans for rural development.

A Vietnamese official who is in charge of emigration in Ho Chi Minh City recently told the representative of a foreign relief agency that the Government wanted to expel the Chinese as quickly as possible and asked for his help. The Vietnamese officials, Vu Hoang, the head of the consular department of the Foreign Ministry, said there were still 800,000 to 1.2 million Chinese in southern Vietnam following the departure of 300,000 Chinese during the last year.

Roughly 200,000 others have been expelled or have fled from northern Vietnam in the last 12 months, leaving 50,000 there, by the count of a Western diplomat in Hanoi. Since Vietnam's border war with China in February, the number of departures has speeded up, with 3,000 a day leaving from north and south in the last few weeks, refugee officials say.

SUBJECTED TO HARASSMENT

To encourage the Chinese to depart, they have been subjected to harassment, including loss of jobs, closure of schools, curfews, intimidation by the police and the creation of detention camps.

An International Red Cross official who has worked in Vietnam believes that, as more refugees are putting out to sea, the likelihood of their reaching a foreign shore has been declining. From talks with leaders of the Chinese community in Ho Chi Minh City, the official calculates that the number who are drowning or dying of exposure, hunger and thirst at sea has risen to 70 percent, from 50 percent. The reason, he believes, is that fewer seaworthy boats are being used.

The traffic in human beings has a double advantage for the Vietnamese Government since the police have been collecting 10 taels of gold, or over \$3,000, from each adult leaving southern Vietnam. The diplomat in Hanoi estimates that these funds make up the largest single export commodity of Vietnam's threadbare economy, replacing its traditional leading export, coal.

An intelligence report reaching here contends that the Vietnamese have used some of this gold to make a down payment of \$100 million to the Soviet Union for its aid and arms sales. Soviet aid to Vietnam runs \$1 million to \$2 million a day this year, the diplomat says.

The gold collected from the refugees is melted down in the Bank of Vietnam in Ho Chi Minh City and shipped to the Bank of Foreign Trade in Hanoi before transport to Moscow, refugees report. Some gold still bearing Vietnamese Government markings has shown up in Soviet gold sales in Europe, according to the intelligence report.

In addition, international banking sources here say, overseas Chinese eager to help their relatives in Vietnam remitted \$242 million to the Bank of Vietnam in Ho Chi Minh City in April, the last month for which figures are available. Most of the money is thought to be designed to pay for boat passages.

Such an amount, in one month, is more than half of Vietnam's total estimated exports for all of 1978, \$416 million. This year, because of the disruption caused by Vietnam's incursion into Cambodia in support of the new government there and because of the border war with China, regular exports are expected to be lower.

CHANGE IN COMPOSITION OF EXODUS

The refugees leaving now differ from the earlier small groups of boat people who escaped after the Indochina war ended in 1975. The earlier refugees were largely ethnic Vietnamese leaving clandestinely. About 80 percent of the present flow consists of ethnic Chinese and is arranged by the Vietnamese Government.

According to refugees arriving here, the Government is so eager to keep control of the flow, and evidently wring all possible profit from it, that some refugees planning to leave surreptitiously are being approached by police officials and are urged to arrange their departure openly through them.

In another case, according to refugees who arrived here on the freighter Sen On, Vietnamese security forces opened fire last Christmas on a boatload of 220 people who tried to leave without clearance. Only 18 people were said to have survived.

The descriptions by refugees of their experiences differ only in slight detail whether they are from north or south.

Tran Van Hong is a 44-year-old former printer from Halphong, the port city. Last winter he was dismissed from his job without cause, he said in an interview here. He said he was repeatedly detained and interrogated by the security police and threatened with death if he did not either leave the country or report to one of the new rural resettlement zones.

Then his two children's Chinese school was closed and they were forbidden to attend regular Vietnamese schools, he said. His wife lost her job in a garage, and a curfew during hours of darkness was imposed on an entire Chinese neighborhood. Vietnamese friends came to say that they could no longer remain in contact. The rice ration, a little over two pounds a month, was cut off, Mr. Hong said.

Finally, a policeman put him in touch with the captain of a fishing boat that was to leave for Hong Kong. For the equivalent of \$650 a person, which he paid to the policeman, passage was arranged. "We had to sell all of our furniture and our clothes," Mr. Hong said. "When we got aboard the boat, the police searched us and took the little jewelry we had hidden."

To insure that the emigration plan works, the Vietnamese have reportedly set up two camps in the north for Chinese who balk at the choice of risking their lives at sea or of

moving to a resettlement zone. The camps, described by refugees as concentration camps, are at Vinh Hoa, near Haiphong, and at Nghe An.

In the south, the authorities have set up two transit camps near the port of Vung Tau to process the refugees, according to some people who arrived on the Sen On. The refugees are brought to the camps by bus from Ho Chi Minh City and are then taken to their boats on other buses.

CHINESE CONNECTIONS ARE CRUCIAL

Evidently few people with Chinese connections are exempt. Nguyen Van Minh, 31 years old, a Soviet-trained civil engineer from Hanoi and a party member. Two months ago, he says, he was called in by the police and questioned.

"You have always been a loyal Communist, but isn't your grandmother a Chinese?" the police were said to have asked. When Mr. Minh said she was, he was given the choice of a boat ride or a resettlement area.

In like fashion, Nguyen Van Tri, a 30-year-old postal clerk from Haiphong, was called in by the police. He is an ethnic Vietnamese, and his wife is Chinese. "Either you divorce her or you leave with her," he was told.

Even a former Vietcong provincial propaganda official from the Mekong Delta found himself condemned because one of his ancestors was Chinese. "I expected more, after 11 years of fighting for the motherland," he remarked in his new refugee camp home. He declined to give his name, having left his family behind.

Other refugees reported a new development in the Vietnamese Government's involvement. They said that after the police had put them aboard their boat and confiscated their belongings, they were ordered to sign the following declaration:

"I am very happy to give all this property to the Vietnamese Government. This government is very good to give us the opportunity to see our families again." ●

RECALLING LITHUANIAN OCCUPATION

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, 39 years ago today, Lithuania was forcibly invaded by the Soviet Union, and over 300,000 Lithuanians were deported to Siberia. Since that terrible event 39 years ago, the people of Lithuania have been denied certain basic human rights. The people of Lithuania, however, continue to struggle for freedom from the oppression they face. In order to recognize these brave human beings, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to an abbreviated translation of an article which appeared in the underground Lithuanian press. I include this article in the text at this point:

THE FREE LITHUANIANS IN A SUBJUGATED FATHERLAND

Is it not a new paradox in our controversial and peculiar world, where quarrels, litigations and murders occur for the most negligible causes, that the fight for the most important human values: freedom, integrity and well-being is avoided?

However, this should not be considered as

a paradox. Free people exist not only in the free world, protected by democratic constitutions, but also in countries where any desire for freedom is squelched with bullets, jails, psychiatric hospitals. A slave is only he who accepts his servitude, who does not feel the chains which bind him. A man who is afraid is already defeated. He easily succumbs to the economic and political exploitation of the enslaver. Self-respecting man has to overcome innate fear, to rise above natural inclinations, to prove that there are aspirations which are more valuable than life itself.

Free is everyone who resists the efforts of the enslaver to make him godless, to dehumanize, to denationalize him. This rule can also be applied to entire nations. Every nation which struggles against the oppressor is free, notwithstanding the fact that its territory may be occupied. Such a nation even though it has lost its external freedom, has preserved its internal, spiritual independence. The history of the Lithuanian nation during the last decades (not speaking about the entire period from the loss of its independence) has proven this very convincingly.

After the rebellion of 1863 which was cruelly crushed, for several decades there was no active resistance in Lithuania. However, underground newspapers "Ausra" (The Dawn), "Varpas" (The Bell) came to being announcing the spiritual rebirth of the Lithuanian nation. The 1944 rebellion, which lasted for 10 years, was even more ruthlessly suppressed. It seemed as if it would be necessary to wait a few more decades until new resistance forces matured. However, before the guns of the freedom fighters were silenced, on All Souls Day, 1956, in the cemetery of Kaunas, the tricolor flag of free Lithuania was raised. Students, intelligentia, former prisoners who had returned from concentration camps in the Soviet Union, with tears in their eyes sang the Lithuanian national anthem and the religious hymn, "Mary, Mary lighten our servitude. . . ." The crowd repeatedly shouted, "Freedom for Lithuania," "Begone Russian intruders". Stones were hurled at the members of the NKGB. In Vilnius, that same evening, masses of young people poured out of the Rasos cemetery singing patriotic songs. They flooded the streets and stopped traffic for several hours.

After that demonstration hundreds of young people, students and former prisoners, were taken in steel-barred trains to the same concentration camps where more than one thousand Lithuanian freedom fighters, underground resisters, were still being tortured. Great numbers of young Lithuanians were drafted into the Soviet army.

In the autumn of 1970, Pranas and Algirdas Brazinskas; father and son, escaped to the West, informing the entire world about the desire for freedom burning in the hearts of Lithuanians. One month later, Simas Kudirka who was turned over to the Soviets, beaten, reminded the Western world about the indifference of the westerners to their self-asserted moral ideals.

In March, 1972, "The Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania" began to inform the world about the persecution of believers and their priests in Lithuania. On May 14th of that same year, in the garden of the Drama Theatre in Kaunas, where 32 years earlier a disgusting mockery of the independence of Lithuania and the free state system had been perpetrated, the self-immolation of Romas Kalanta (who died shouting "Freedom for Lithuania") took place. His body perished but his spirit remains alive forever in the hearts of the nation, continuously rapping at our conscience and fostering the desire for freedom.

Romas Kalanta, born in slavery, became free. His sacrifice dispelled the myth of the oppressors that the younger generation, continually brainwashed by a stream of beautiful words and promises, will obey their coercion and will melt into the flood of colonization, forgetting the spirit of the Lithuanian nation. Today the younger generation has already taken up the banner of the fight for freedom. Although born in slavery, they have inherited the yearning for freedom from their parents.

Let these pages speak out about the inextinguishable yearning for freedom, about the efforts of those people who under the most impossible conditions continue the traditions of the free Lithuanians.

FREE LITHUANIANS. ●

IMPACT (?) AID

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, initiated in 1950, impact aid was the first major Federal elementary and secondary education program. The impact aid program provides funds to compensate school districts for the cost of educating children when enrollment and availability of revenues from local sources are adversely affected by Federal activities. Over the years the impact aid program has been the object of much debate, several major studies, and numerous legislative proposals and amendments.

Even the strongest critics of impact aid acknowledge that "A" children whose parents live and work on nontaxable Federal property are associated with a clear tax loss to the school districts. However, no such consensus exists regarding "B" payments for children whose parents live or work on Federal property.

Since much of the rhetoric on Capitol Hill lately has focused on fiscal responsibility, I thought it might be useful to explore the justification for a certain category of impact aid payments.

Mr. Speaker, it might be useful to recall that in 1974, Congress eliminated or reduced entitlements for some "B" children. For example, "B" children whose parents work outside the State in which the local education agency is located were eliminated as eligible federally connected children, although the 90 percent hold harmless provision effectively limited this reform. Similarly, entitlements were lowered for "B" children whose parents work outside the county in which the local education agency is located. These changes were based on the argument that because the parents of these children pay residential property taxes, and because the tax loss from the nonresidential property occurs outside the county or State of the local education agency receiving the impact aid money, there is little or no burden on the local school district. In many instances, the Federal presence has stimulated more economic activity and has led to the creation of more taxable property than

otherwise would have existed. The argument has been made that in a majority of cases, the Federal presence resulted in an expansion of commercial activities, employment, and the local private residential tax base.

Another longstanding criticism of the impact aid "B" payments is that it results in the distribution of large payments to affluent school districts which may have actually benefited from Federal activity and which could easily support a high level of educational expenditure without impact aid. If one agrees that a major purpose of the impact aid program is to provide an "in-lieu-of tax" payment for school districts which have suffered some tax revenue loss through Federal presence, logic alone leads one to question the appropriateness of providing payments for "B" children whose parents work outside the jurisdiction of the school system in which the child attends school. This is especially true in light of the fact that residential property values are often inflated as a result of the demand for property created by the Federal presence. Those people who argue that the tax loss created by the nontaxable status of the Federal installation in their area usually display their ambivalence when anyone threatens to remove that Federal activity to another area of the Nation.

We must have the courage to recognize that there is absolutely no way to accomplish meaningful reform and simultaneously maintain these open-ended payments. We should not lose sight of the fact that the impact aid "Federal payment" is, in reality, a euphemism for the redistribution of citizens' tax dollars from one geographic area to another. The irony is that in many instances, money is taken from poorer areas and redistributed to wealthier ones. How can this be justified?

I am planning to introduce legislation similar to that which I offered for consideration during the last Congress. This legislation offers a reasonable approach to phasing in more justifiable and equitable system of impact aid distribution. The President's proposal to eliminate all "B" payments, regardless of its intrinsic merits, is too drastic and would create havoc within many of our Nation's schools.

As a former school administrator, I recognize the need for reasonable continuity for effective planning and budgeting. Therefore, I intend to offer a reasonable reform which would permit Congress to eliminate certain aspects of the current inequitable distribution formula. This could be done without unduly penalizing those districts in which elimination of Federal impact aid would create an undue hardship. Specifically, I am proposing a gradual 6-year phaseout of the "B" payments—one-sixth per year until complete—to school districts in which "B" category children represent less than 25 percent of the total student population. This compromise solution permits heavily impacted school districts—where "B" students constitute 25

percent or more of the student body—to receive funding. In addition, the gradual one-sixth per year "absorption" of "B" students by the lightly impacted school districts will permit us to phaseout the inequitable portion of this program without undue disruption for local administrators.

As the Battelle study concluded some years ago, "there is no feasible way to design a perfect procedure for impact aid that accurately measures the net burden of Federal installations." However imperfect our attempts, we must have the courage to cut money that flows into our congressional districts if the rationale underpinning that process is no longer valid.●

FRED WEATHERS TRIBUTE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, recently, an event was held in the St. Louis community to pay tribute to an outstanding St. Louisan, the Honorable Frederick N. Weathers, for nearly 50 years of distinguished civic, business, civil rights, and political leadership to his community. One of our colleagues from St. Louis, BILL CLAY, had the privilege of hosting the tribute to honor Mr. Weathers for his dedicated, courageous, and tireless service to the St. Louis community. I would like to take this opportunity to share with all of my colleagues the text of Congressman CLAY's toast to Mrs. Frederick N. Weathers in honor of this occasion.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. CLAY

If you read the program, you know that at this point, I am to present a special tribute. According to Webster's International Dictionary, "special" is defined as possessing a quality, character or identity out of the ordinary or conspicuously unusual. My privilege, therefore is special, inasmuch as the honor has been bestowed upon me to present a tribute to a person who truly possesses quality, character and identity unique in any society.

Each of us present tonight knows Fred Weathers in his or her own way. Of course and perhaps the whole story of his life will never be told in concert by all of us. But if anyone knows the whole story, it would have to be a person who lived and breathed and experienced the totality of that story. Such a person we pay tribute to tonight.

Frederick N. Weathers has held center-stage in this community for 40 odd years. The spotlight never left him. Doris Weathers, the other half of the team never sought the limelight, but because of her understanding, her generosity, her charity, made it possible for Fred to be a harbor light in a community beset by storms and raging waters.

Doris Weathers has shared the great memories in the life of the man we honor tonight. The joys, the pleasures, the satisfactions are all hers. But no life is totally void of pain, suffering, struggle and setbacks. And surely during those times, Doris was there to comfort, to encourage, to inspire, to advise. In a sense Doris Weathers made it possible for this community to benefit from the talents of Fred Weathers.

Doris, we in the community know you and know your contributions, we know you through the media of art. Constantly songwriters are dedicating their artistic abilities to portray your life in music. Even if Fred's life had not been filled with so many milestones, he would not have to look back anxiously for something to justify the time spent. He had a woman with both dignity and depth; charm and charisma; devotion and dedication, sincerity and strength. He had a woman all those glorious years who possessed a special dimension and told her own story with a message and a viewpoint. That story is entitled beauty and even the greats have not been able to define beauty, so I won't attempt. What I will do is to use the music of some of the greats and describe what they thought of you, Doris Weathers. Dinah Washington said in a song—"What a Difference a Doris Made;" the Temptations said, "She's My Girl;" Mahalia Jackson said, "Fred's Got the Whole World in His Hands;" Duke Ellington called you the Sophisticated Lady—but perhaps your greatest tribute was paid by the Commodores when they said, Doris Weathers, "You are Once, Twice, Three Times a Lady."●

PROMOTING NATIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit to the RECORD a letter written by Mr. James Howell, chief economist and senior vice president of the National Bank of Boston and addressed to Representative WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization of the House Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs Committee. The letter concerns pending legislation to reauthorize the Economic Development Administration.

My colleagues will no doubt encounter conflicting viewpoints on aspects of this legislation in the coming weeks. I should like to refer them to Mr. Howell's letter, which provides a strong case for the use of various development finance tools to assist local economic development efforts in distressed areas of the Nation.

The letter offers an excellent summary of issues which are of concern to all of us, including the targeting of economic development funds, the need to provide equity financing to small firms, and the need for increased leveraging of public funds to stimulate private sector economic development.

The letter follows:

THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF BOSTON,
Boston, Mass., May 22, 1979.

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOORHEAD: I am writing to express my views on the EDA reauthorization legislation, HR 4099 and 4100, now before the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization. This legislation is of particular concern to me in my capacity as Chief Economist of the First National Bank of Boston, the largest bank in New England. From this special vantage, I have witnessed first-hand—and documented through nu-

merous empirical surveys—the economic problems of our older industrialized cities, specifically the sharp decline in manufacturing capital spending. Moreover, during the past five years, I have taken part in several task forces which have examined business development financing in the context of local economic development and regional capital market needs.

In my view, the issues raised in the legislation under consideration by your subcommittee are national, not regional in scope. Let me briefly explain why. A study entitled *Urban Fiscal Stress*, released by the Bank and Touche Ross and Co. in March, showed quite dramatically that older industrially aged cities are most likely to be fiscally stressed. The root cause appears to be stagnation in the local economy.

The study further revealed that industrially maturing cities are found in significant numbers in all regions, and that the potential for economic stagnation is not a unique feature of one region. I emphasize this point because the need for improved business development financing tools to strengthen stagnating local economies—the heart of the debate over this year's EDA reauthorization legislation—should not be seen exclusively, or even largely, as a regional issue.

Before turning to my specific comments on the legislation, I would like to state emphatically that, in my view, EDA is the appropriate agency to administer the new financing provisions set forth in both bills. The legislation provides for a consolidation and better coordination of existing programs with which EDA has had considerable experience, while avoiding the government layering and likelihood of greater inefficiency in capital markets that would arise from the creation of a National Development Bank. I might add that EDA loan programs are well known among businessmen in the Northeast as having the fastest turn around time among Federal loan programs and the least cumbersome regulations.

In the remainder of this letter I want to raise five points of special concern pertaining to the EDA reauthorization legislation.

First, geographic targeting is of paramount importance if the array of business financing tools in H.R. 4099 and 4100 are to benefit areas experiencing decline as a result of disinvestment. Ironically, legislation which seeks to hasten economic growth could be detrimental to distressed areas if the eligibility net is spread too broadly. For example, if 90 percent of the country were deemed eligible for assistance—as in the version of the bill voted by the House Public Works Committee, H.R. 2063—businesses might well make use of the loans, loan guarantees and other financing provisions of the legislation to locate out of older cities in favor of those growing areas which are also eligible. Similarly, there would be little incentive for start-ups to take place in areas encountering long-term distress if the new capital development tool could be utilized elsewhere.

In short, I am arguing for refinements in the spatial targeting under the legislation. I support the EDA statutory criteria which would encompass roughly 60 percent of the country, and am hopeful that refinements via administrative guidelines would provide further adjustments in targeting to distressed urban areas. To be sure, a politically appealing program is often one which maximizes eligibility. Nonetheless, in terms of program effectiveness the more targeted criteria are clearly preferable.

Second, there is another dimension to the concept of targeting which goes beyond the spatial allocation of capital. Namely, new business development financing mechanisms must also respond to identifiable gaps

in capital markets. HR 4099 and 4100 meet one of two distinct capital gaps identified by our research at the Bank: the nonavailability of long-term debt financing for small- to medium-sized business firms. These are firms that do not have access to the bond market because of a lack of recognition and shorter track record. Traditional sources of financing, such as insurance companies, show little interest in financing these firms because of the costs involved in packaging and servicing their smaller capital needs. Moreover, banks often view these firms as nonbankable because of a banker's preference for short-term lending.

The EDA reauthorization legislation would make long-term financing more readily available to these firms. The direct loans will help meet the financing needs of small- and medium-sized firms, while the loan guarantees will encourage lending facilities to give longer-term loans to less established business firms.

Third, HR 4099 and 4100 only indirectly recognize what we have identified as a second important capital gap: the shortage of equity funds for new business start-ups. In the past decade, there has been a prolonged weakness in the equity market which has all but closed off the new issue market for small firms. As a result, venture capitalists have been frozen into their start-ups, unable to recycle their money and engage in new start-ups.

Congressman Robert Edgar has sought to require EDA to use a portion of the R&D money authorized in the legislation for experiments in equity financing. The EDA reauthorization legislation passed by the House Public Works Committee, HR 2063, as you know, allows but does not require EDA to engage in such experimentation. Whether through statutory language or administrative action, I would strongly encourage EDA to use a sizeable portion of its R&D funds for innovative uses of equity financing. I personally believe that the payoff for small- and medium-sized businesses would be substantial.

Fourth, this legislation would be particularly helpful to small businesses, the very firms which have proven to be the greatest source of job growth in the central cities during the '70's. Recent studies have shown that fast-growing small firms are more likely to be influenced by capital incentive in their location decisions than other kinds of firms.

These new small firms initially undergo a difficult survival period and the rate of failure is remarkably high. Their need for capital is great and while all firms look for the same advantages in locational decisions, these rapidly growing firms cannot afford to scatter production facilities. Consequently, they depend heavily on supporting infrastructure and services already in place, typically found in the more highly-agglomerated cities.

Both HR 4099 and 4100 are far more geared to the needs of these small businesses than was the National Development Bank legislation introduced during the 95th Congress. In particular, the sums authorized for direct loans, the higher loan guarantees, and direct technical assistance are especially attractive to small, less well established firms.

Moreover, working capital is provided in both bills, another improvement over earlier development banking legislation which included only capital for fixed assets. HR 4100 is more closely targeted to small businesses, although its substantially lower funding levels would make less capital available in the aggregate to these firms than would HR 4099.

Finally, I would like to call special attention to those components of the legislation which facilitate the leveraging of public capital to increase private investment. The provision of development grants to localities to help defray the cost of a private investment project—through land acquisition, site preparation, development of commercial or industrial facilities, or infrastructure improvements—necessitates a close working relationship between the private and public sectors.

My recent experience studying the economic development process in eleven older industrialized New England cities—and the role of the commercial banker in particular—demonstrates that in those communities where revitalization efforts have been successful, there is a strong public-private sector partnership. This partnership has effectively exploited opportunities to maximize private capital investment through leveraging governmental funds and packaging a variety of loan and grant programs available to both municipalities and businesses. The opportunities for leveraging and packaging funds in the program design of the business development financing provisions are a unique strength of this legislation.

A number of additional issues and proposed changes have been raised during the deliberations of the Senate Banking Committee and The House Public Works Committee. I hope, however, that timely enactment of the EDA reauthorization legislation, largely along the lines of the Administration bill, will be the outcome. In this connection, I am well aware of the concern voiced over the needs for more information on the capital requirements of small-to-medium-sized businesses, as well as the importance of capital as a factor in business locational decisions.

To this end, the Economics Department of The First National Bank of Boston in conjunction with The First National Bank of Minneapolis and Continental Bank of Chicago, has launched a mail-out/mail-back survey of approximately 20,000 manufacturing and non-manufacturing firms in the Northeast and Midwest. The survey results will yield new insights into the pattern of spatial location, capital availability and the asset structure and financing needs of businesses throughout the country. This information could be used by EDA in implementing the new business development financing provisions of the reauthorization legislation.

Nonetheless, the compelling issue today is the passage of this legislation. Distressed areas, especially older central cities, in all parts of the country, sorely need fresh business investment. Small- to medium-sized businesses have a clear need for the kinds of incentives provided in this legislation, and we should not overlook the possibility that passage of this legislation will help to restore the momentum towards a national urban policy.

In closing, I look forward to furnishing you and members of your Subcommittee with additional information, as your deliberations on this important legislation continue.

Sincerely,

JAMES HOWELL.●

A GRIM REMINDER

HON. HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, June 15 marked a day of sober reflection

for Lithuanians throughout the world. On this day in 1940, in the midst of a world conflagration, Lithuania ceded its independence. Oppressed for centuries, because of their vulnerable geographic location, Lithuanians have suffered invasions from the East by the Russians and from the West by the Teutonic knights. They have demonstrated incredible spiritual and ethnic fortitude by surviving these repeated onslaughts.

Ever since this gallant Baltic country was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union by the Russians, the Lithuanians have struggled to cast off the chains of their oppressors. Thousands of these freedom fighters have sacrificed their lives in an attempt to secure freedom and liberty for their beleaguered country. From 1944 to 1952 alone, some 50,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters gave their lives as part of a grassroots resistance movement. However, the cessation of armed guerrilla warfare has not resulted in the end of resistance against Soviet domination. Rather it has fostered the introduction of nonviolent protest on a massive scale.

Even today, Lithuanians are risking their lives in outright defiance of the Communist regime. The protests of the Lithuanian people against the denial of their right to national self-determination and religious and political freedom continues despite Soviet oppression. With this in mind, we must attempt to match the courage of Lithuania by redoubling our efforts to secure self-determination and human rights for all.

The yearly followup conference of the 1975 Helsinki Accords represents the perfect setting for the implementation of this goal. It is our duty to confront the Soviet Government with the fact that despite being cosigners of the accords, they have willfully ignored many of the provisions guaranteeing basic human rights. We must continue to speak out against the infringement of human rights and not succumb to any temptation to condone the inhumane treatment of those less fortunate throughout the world. Instead, we should continue to fight vigorously for the inalienable rights of all mankind.

June 15 marked a grim reminder for all of us that there are people in the world who do not possess even the most basic of human rights. We must extend whatever support we can to the people of Lithuania and their dreams of freedom. Let us hope for the day when our Lithuanian friends can celebrate their renewed independence, rather than commemorate the day of their homeland's invasion. ●

WINDFALL PROFITS TAX

HON. MARC L. MARKS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. MARKS. Mr. Speaker, although I do not necessarily agree with all that

he states, Ira G. Corn has in his statement on windfall profits tax, published by the New York Times on May 11, 1979, given us food for thought. Ira Corn is a concerned patriotic citizen whose views, though sometimes controversial are worth considering. I therefore ask to include his remarks in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, May 11, 1979]

NO TAX ON WINDFALL PROFITS, PLEASE . . .

(By Ira G. Corn)

DALLAS.—A few years ago, then-President Ford proposed taxation of so-called "excess profits" by the nation's oil companies. Despite a change in Administration from Republican to Democratic, politicians still are demanding that oil producers be punished for "windfall profits."

At the time of President Ford's proposal it was obvious that businessmen were not speaking out against it. As the current Administration continues the "anti-profit" campaign, it is even more important to be aware of the damage that the current proposed tax would cause.

Our entire economic system could be harmed if the principle of levying a special peacetime "profit-removal tax" on a single industry is approved.

The oil companies did not invent the phenomenon of windfall profits. In the past, however, opinion-makers and politicians have never descended with vengeance upon the beneficiaries of unexpected fortune.

Farmers who have struck oil have found themselves enjoying windfall profits. City residents who obtained rural land that was later crossed by an expressway have also found profit in a windfall.

One can see the similarity between these experiences and those of the oil industry.

Oilmen who saw their industry decline from the 1950's found themselves benefiting from the 1973 energy crisis, an event over which they had little control. The energy crisis reversed a long-term downward trend of manpower, profits and potential for domestic petroleum producers.

The recovery was dampened, however, by a hodgepodge of controls and regulations on American petroleum producers and refiners. These hampered attempts by the industry to make a maximum contribution toward making the nation less dependent upon foreign oil. Further, no one mentions that depletion as an oil-industry tax reduction was lowered in 1969 and virtually eliminated in 1975. All the so-called excess profits could not equal 50 percent of the incentive advantage of the depletion allowance. Should the excess-profits tax pass, the depletion allowances should be restored to provide greater incentive to private investors.

Profits come and go in cycles in all business ventures and must be evaluated in proportion to risk and size of investment. This reasoning is ignored when the oil industry is discussed because facts are not allowed to hinder the search for political advantage.

If Congress sets a precedent and taxes so-called windfall profits of the oil industry, it will be beset with similar demands. Who decides what is a windfall profit and what is not? If such a profit is wrong in one area of the economy, would it not be just as punishable in another?

If Congress removes windfall profits from equity owners, should it not also remove windfall losses? This would open the way for countless claims because losses far exceed profits. Who will determine how windfall profits and losses are calculated? As night follows day, the next step would be a campaign for "reasonable" profits for all indus-

try. What a nightmare of administrative folly and how destructive that would be to our independent economic system!

During the 1973-74 energy crisis, which benefited the oil industry, there were thousands of examples of windfall losses. Over 100 manufacturers in the recreational-vehicle industry alone closed their doors because they received no orders. Resort operators and vacation-oriented businesses also sustained severe losses. Thousands of service stations went out of business.

If Congress passes a windfall-profits tax on oil, a clamor will arise for legislation providing for a hedge against other windfall losses or profits. That would then eliminate the rigid market discipline imposed on individuals who risk loss when they make economic investment decisions, both good and bad.

Windfall profits for the oil industry will be temporary. They are always cut by competition, accelerated capital-reinvestment requirements, and the high-risk factor inherent to the oil industry. But any windfall tax will hang on forever.

Just as the risk belongs to the investor, any gain is legally and morally his. It makes no difference how much gain or how much loss, and it should make no difference if it is the oil industry.

If we who are not part of the oil industry allow Congress to crucify the oil industry, we should only whimper softly when it is our turn to feel Big Daddy's stick. We will have gotten what we deserve. ●

COMMEMORATIVE SALUTE TO THE VALIANT PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA, ESTONIA, AND LATVIA ON THE 39TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOVIET ANNEXATION OF THE BALTIC STATES

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to participate in today's commemorative salute to the oppressed people of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia and join with all Americans, and particularly the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian communities throughout our Nation, in observance of a most solemn occasion, the 39th anniversary of the forcible occupation and incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R. and the subsequent deportation of hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians to Siberian concentration camps.

Mr. Speaker, I along with many of our colleagues have received several communications requesting our participation in today's congressional commemoration in observance of this most dispicable act of tyranny.

As you know, the Congress has recorded our denunciation of the Soviet annexation of the Baltic area in the adoption of House resolutions over these many years. The unanimous vote on December 2, 1975, of 407 members of the House with no one dissenting strongly affirmed our agreement for the adoption of this resolution on behalf of the just cause of the Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians in the U.S.S.R.

The enactment into Public Law 94-304 on June 3, 1975, of the legislative measure which I also sponsored establishing a Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe to monitor international compliance with the Helsinki accord also reaffirms our fullest dedication to seeking international communion and international understanding of the plight of these oppressed people to help restore their basic human rights to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion.

Many of us have joined in an exchange of communications with the Soviet leaders for the safety and release of dissidents in the U.S.S.R. We have made some strides in our search for remedial action but there is still much to be done.

Hopefully, the viable force of world opinion that we are attempting to muster in achieving global agreement on basic human rights principles will eliminate government controls that dominate the personal freedoms of the individual to live and worship in the land of his or her choice. I trust that our congressional recognition of the seriousness of their plight will help to provide human justice essential to the solution that will remove governmental domination, unjust treatment, discrimination and oppression of the human rights of the individual and achieve national sovereignty for the states of these courageous people and insure their rightful place in international communion with all nations and all peoples throughout the world.●

COUPLE CELEBRATE 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, today, Friday, June 15, 1979, two fine residents of New Jersey's First Congressional District will be celebrating their 50th wedding anniversary, and I am happy to join in congratulating Mr. and Mrs. Allie Eaise.

A native of Beirut, Lebanon, Mr. Eaise married the Philadelphia-born Mary McKenna in Media, Pa., in 1929. The two moved to Audubon, N.J., in 1949 and have lived at 345 West Graisbury Avenue for more than 30 years.

They are the parents of five sons, Edward A., James, Norman, Donald, and Kenneth. Edward, Norman, and Donald all reside in their parents' hometown of Audubon, while James lives in Youngsville, Pa., and Kenneth makes his home in Birmingham, Ala.

In addition to their sons, the Eaise's are the proud grandparents of 19, and have four great-grandchildren.

Prior to his retirement, Mr. Eaise was a government employee working as a general superintendent in the Federal Court House Building at Ninth and Market Streets in Philadelphia. A veteran of the U.S. Navy, Mr. Eaise also served for several years as the Borough of Audu-

bon's zoning enforcement officer from 1973 to 1979.

Mr. and Mrs. Eaise's family is hosting a party to mark this golden wedding anniversary on Friday evening at the home of their son, Donald. Many of their friends and relatives have been invited to join them in honoring their parents. I and all who have come to know Allie and Mary Eaise give them sincere congratulations on this wonderful occasion, with best wishes for many more anniversaries to come.●

NON-NONFUEL MINERALS POLICY REVIEW

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, the following statement by Chairman JAMES D. SANTINI will provide my colleagues some insight into an apparent total lack of interest by the Department of the Interior in carrying out President Carter's Cabinet-level Nonfuel Minerals Policy Review. To be brutally frank, it should be called "Non-Nonfuel Minerals Policy Review."

I believe that Chairman SANTINI's opening statement at the June 12, 1979, hearing of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining explains why so many members of the subcommittee are so exasperated by what has gone on, or really what has not gone on, in this Presidential review.

The Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970 placed squarely on the shoulders of the Secretary of the Interior the responsibility to examine the very problems that we are now having so much difficulty in getting the Department to at least acknowledge. I honestly question if the Department has the foresight to understand their significance.

The statement follows:

NONFUEL MINERALS POLICY REVIEW

This morning we would like to first discuss a recent General Accounting Office report that relates directly to the subject of this hearing, the Nonfuel Minerals Policy Review. The title of GAO's report, like its subject, is grim: "The Declining U.S. Mining and Minerals Processing Industry: An Analysis of Trends, Causes and Implications".

GAO's report will document the consequences of Government's apparent total lack of appreciation of how the minerals industry functions in the real world of domestic and international minerals markets.

We will learn this morning how actions by our Government, piece by piece, are whittling away at the strength of our industry, and its very ability to stay in business. It sometimes looks like there is almost a deliberate attempt to weaken this vital segment of our economy.

Maybe this generalization is too strong, but when an objective observer considers that nothing is being done to correct some of the overzealous regulations, and then compares the U.S.A. with the other governments in the world that are doing all they reasonably can to assist their industries or to assure long

term foreign mineral supplies, while we are still proceeding in the opposite direction, I, like the title to GAO's report, become grim. I think it's time that all interested agencies and persons recognize our self-distractive governmental course and do whatever they can to reverse the deterioration of our national minerals posture.

What disturbs me most is that Congress in its deliberations preceding the enactment of the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970, saw the problems developing. We have only to read the Congressional reports that relate to that Act. Members of Congress and others in Government, as well as the private sector, pointed out in testimony what the Executive Branch must watch for down the road to carry out the Act's broad directives. The Senate report that accompanied the Act recognized how the problems and solutions crosscut Federal agencies. It stated, and I quote:

"The functions of a number of agencies of the Federal Government affect minerals and mining directly or indirectly, including international relations, foreign trade, taxation, and air and water pollution, to name a few. Yet there is no stated policy or overall set of guidelines by which their actions can be coordinated."

Built into the 1970 Act, therefore, was the recognition that many Federal actions, then and later, forewarned a worsening cumulative impact on the domestic industry. So Congress provided unmistakably for coordination by Federal agencies with respect to other laws. The report goes on and I quote:

"There are myriad Federal laws that affect the mining and minerals industry, but each was passed to meet a particular problem or purpose, and usually, the overview of the direction of the minerals industry was not considered. As a result, some of the actions taken were counterproductive of the objectives of this measure. (This Act) would give clear direction to the executive branch of Government in its implementation and coordination of these laws."

This, to me, says unmistakably that Congress directed that implementation of other Federal laws are to be balanced to a reasonable degree with the purpose intended in the 1970 Act. I want to cite a little more from this report where it says, and I quote:

"A national mining and minerals policy would serve as a statement of fundamental principles or objectives against which the executive branch can measure proposed action and against which the Congress can measure legislation."

The intent here is clear. Congress provided the flexibility to achieve balance by executive or legislative action to carry out this intention.

The report then lists a number of proposed action areas that are of "critical importance" to the mining industry like environmental quality, public lands, stockpiling, tax policy, mine finance, and foreign trade. This too is clear. With the responsibility placed on the shoulders of the Secretary of the Interior, the report reads that in his annual report to the Congress, the Secretary will make:

"... recommendations for legislative action necessary to make effective the policy of the act."

What could be clearer? How could it be better said? Why wasn't this understood?

We have come a long way from the explicit instructions that are embodied in the purpose of the 1970 Law. We have come a long way—but it's all been downhill. I want the record to show unequivocally that the Department of the Interior, with almost no exception, has never carried out the intent of the law, and, from what I can learn, has never given it serious consideration.

GAO in its 1976 report, "Need to Develop a National Nonfuel Mineral Policy," recommended that the Secretary of the Interior: Identify and evaluate laws and agency programs that affect maintaining and developing a sound and stable domestic mining and minerals industry.

Weigh trade-offs between the purposes of such laws and the Mining and Minerals Policy Act, and

Advise the National Commission on Supplies and Shortages, the Administration and the Congress, of changes in the regulations and/or pertinent legislation believed needed to strengthen development of a coherent national minerals policy.

To me, it is manifestly evident that Congress in the late 1960's foresaw the effects of what is happening now in the decline of the U.S. industry. Congress provided the warning and a way for remedy. It legislated a broad legal foundation from which to work. It directed the Executive Branch, with the lead responsibility squarely in the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, to analyze the problems, to coordinate their solutions, and to respond by action. If Congressional attention was needed, it provided for that. Everything was there in one neat package.

But Congress at that time assumed incorrectly that we would have reasonable men, men who cared and were willing to make hard decisions, in the Office of the Secretary.

Congress assumed that the Secretary of the Interior would at least be interested in the national good of a strong economy, a healthy, functioning domestic minerals industry, and secure sources of mineral raw materials for national security.

Congress did not tell the Secretary of the Treasury that he had a responsibility under the 1970 Act relative to the tax code. Nor did it tell the Secretary of State that he had responsibilities relative to trade policies and international commodity stockpiles. This was left to the Secretary of the Interior. It is his responsibility to look at the total picture and together with other agencies to work out reasonable solutions keeping in mind the very brief but declarative language in the Act.

Let me quote a few sentences from the July 9, 1969, letter from the Secretary of the Interior to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs urging enactment of the Mining and Minerals Policy Act. I quote:

"This legislation does not provide any new authority. We believe, however, it is desirable to establish such a national policy and to carry it out."

"... the Government has a variety of obligations and a significant supporting role as our security and overall economic well-being depend upon the continued availability and an adequate and dependable flow of mineral raw materials."

"No overall single solution applies to the national problem of mineral supply, but generally accepted positions exist on essentially every facet of this complex subject. ... The principal and most important element is recognition of minerals as being critical and essential to the nation's economy and security. ... It seems safe to assume that this position will continue to prevail and to gain in significance."

The Secretary of the Interior did not tell the Congress the job couldn't be done. He said that it is desirable to establish such a national policy and to carry it out. He said that a national position on minerals being critical and essential to our economy and security will continue to prevail. Then why haven't we at least tried to implement that policy if it is of such importance to the U.S.?

This is why I find it so inexcusable when in spite of numerous other blue-ribbon commissions having identified the problems facing the minerals industry, in spite of the directives of Congress in the 1970 Act, the Department of the Interior after 18 months has yet to come up with the Phase I Problem Analysis for the Nonfuel Minerals Policy Review.

On several different occasions we have gone along with extensions of deadlines. The last extension was on April 9 when the Secretary promised us five times in open hearing that the Problem Analysis would be out in no more than 6-8 weeks. Nine weeks have elapsed, and we understand now that the Department of the Interior is just starting its 50-page rewrite ("synthesis" as described by Assistant Secretary Davenport on May 8, 1979) of the 250-page preliminary draft. But, the Assistant Secretary on May 8 promised us that if the Department went the 50-page route, the 250-page report, after extensive revision, would be sent to Congress by mid-June. We are now only three days away from that deadline. Will this deadline be missed too?

But, my concerns go deeper than the failure of the Department of the Interior to keep its own time table. A fundamental question is raised by all of the delays and the deficient content of the 250-page preliminary draft. Does the Department of the Interior have the professional capability or disposition to accurately and honestly identify the problems. The basic question will be answered in part by the quality and content of the Phase I report.

Regardless, I want to make it clear that we cannot wait another 10 years as we have since Congress last deliberated on the Mining and Minerals Policy Act. The problems in our minerals industry and their national impacts are too eminent to excuse the delinquency in time and content that we have experienced with the Phase I report. This country has got to wake up to the grim realities of our deteriorating minerals posture.

President Carter's Nonfuel Minerals Policy Review affords a tangible opportunity to redirect and refocus this nation's mineral course and future. With the mandate of Chairman Udall, it will remain the paramount commitment of this Committee to insure that at this critical juncture in America's materials future this review is not turned into a government whitewash. We must not allow the Nonfuel Minerals Policy Review to be interred in the bureaucratic burial ground of the past.

It is a sizable challenge. I believe our nation's future economic stability and national security hinge in part on a substantive and honest response to that challenge.

SALT II: A BAD DEAL FOR AMERICA

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

• Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SALT II: A BAD DEAL FOR AMERICA

Over the past decade, the Soviet Union has engaged in the greatest military build-up in history, while American preparedness has declined.

All this was made possible by the first Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, SALT I, negotiated by Nixon and Kissinger. Now Carter and Brzezinski have presented us with

SALT II, a treaty that would give the U.S.S.R. permanent military superiority.

SALT II allows the Soviets 308 heavy missiles; the U.S. gets zero.

Even our aging B-52s in mothballs are counted in our bomber totals; the powerful, new Soviet Backfire bomber is not counted in theirs.

Cruise missiles, our last area of substantial technological advantage, are limited to a range of 373 miles, so they pose no threat to the Soviet homeland.

If SALT II is ratified by the Senate—and these disadvantages I've listed only scratch the surface of this complicated treaty—our country could be vulnerable to Soviet aggression.

Some sober military experts say that by 1981, given the power and accuracy of Soviet missiles, our land-based Minutemen missiles could be wiped out in a first strike that would still leave the U.S.S.R. with two-thirds of its missiles.

That would give an American president the choice of destroying Soviet cities, which would already have been evacuated, and having ours destroyed in turn, or negotiating a semi-satellite role for the United States in a world ruled by the Communists.

The SALT II treaty is anchored on Soviet promises. In other words, it is based on nothing.

There is no way we can verify the range of their cruise missiles, how many warheads they have on their heavy missiles, and how many missiles they have in storage for each silo our satellites can see.

And even if we could trust the Russians, the SALT treaty would still put us in second place.

The Senate should defeat SALT II, and we should immediately undertake a defense build-up to ensure that the American people can never be subjected to nuclear blackmail.

Attack and defense satellites, cruise missiles, nuclear submarines, anti-missile weapons, lasers: the technological superiority of our system should be exploited to the hilt, not bargained away.

To avoid more taxes and inflation for our people, we should evaluate the need for massive numbers of ground troops in the 1980s, and whether we should be spending billions defending Japan's trade routes in the Pacific. In my recent survey, 96 percent of the people of the 22nd District said well-to-do allies should pay for their own national defense.

The United States must never be less than number one; the world is too dangerous for anything else.

SALE ON NEW SHIPS: THREE FOR THE PRICE OF ONE

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

• Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, when the House considers the maritime authorization bill, H.R. 2462, we will begin what I hope will be a great and wide-ranging debate on the direction of maritime policy in the United States for the coming decades. As background for this opening debate, I wish to insert into the RECORD the following background memorandum, which was prepared by the minority staff of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee:

SALE ON NEW SHIPS: THREE FOR THE PRICE OF ONE

That's right: for what it costs to buy one American-built commercial ship today, you could buy three similar ships built abroad. This single fact explains why the U.S. shipbuilding subsidy program does not work and should be ended.

Foreign ships are such a bargain mainly because there is now a huge surplus of shipyards in the world, building more ships than anyone wants to buy. (It's also because, unfortunately, most U.S. shipyards are not efficient or productive enough to match foreign competition.) Because of this glut, foreign ship prices are being cut drastically, usually with the builders looking to their governments to make up the resulting losses.

One outcome of this situation is that a smart shipbuyer can build a merchant fleet very cheaply. China, for instance, has done just that: in the last eighteen months, it has purchased 228 ships, totalling millions of tons of cargo capacity, for a mere one billion dollars (an amount that would buy no more than 20 U.S. ships). That makes its merchant fleet suddenly bigger than ours; and because of its lower costs, China will likely soon become a strong competitor on the world's seafarers.

You'd think that the capitalist U.S. merchant marine would be taking advantage of these bargains too. Certainly we need new merchant ships; much of our fleet is old, slow and small. And a few U.S. shipowners are: Malcom McLean, a pioneer in the field, recently ordered twelve big new ships from South Korea, at \$33 million apiece. Business Week, reporting on the deal, quoted a shipping expert as saying that "At the top of the market, people paid two and one-half times that for ships with one-third less capacity." That's a shrewd buy even the socialist Chinese would appreciate!

But McLean is an exception among U.S.-flag shipowners. That's because he does not receive (or seek) any federal subsidies. Most U.S. shipping companies do receive such aid, both directly as operating subsidies, and indirectly, as a result of protectionist policies which require that certain cargoes (i.e., food aid shipments, military supplies) be carried on U.S.-flag ships at higher rates. With these subsidies, naturally, have come federal regulations; the most onerous of which is that these subsidized shipowners must buy U.S.-built ships.

That, in a nutshell, is why the U.S. merchant marine is not able to compete effectively with other fleets. When a U.S.-flag shipowner must pay at least two and one-half times as much for a ship one-third smaller than Malcom McLean's, and wait an extra year or two for it to be delivered to boot, the subsidized owner is saddled with such high fixed capital costs that he can't compete, either with McLean, or with foreign fleets such as the Chinese. Even substantial recent increases in the productivity of U.S. seamen aren't enough to make up the difference.

As a result, it's not surprising to learn that last year two of the ten subsidized U.S. shipping companies went bankrupt. House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee Chairman John Murphy predicts three more could go broke this year. And the profit margins of the other five are nothing for Peking to worry about.

Actually it isn't news that U.S. shipbuilding is more expensive than foreign; nor, unfortunately, that the American merchant marine is in decline. Both have been in bad shape ever since the Civil War, except for brief periods after the World Wars, when the government built huge fleets and then

sold them as surplus to civilian operators for peanuts, while much of the competition had been sunk in combat. Both times, however, the U.S. merchant marine soon fell steadily behind as foreign fleets were rebuilt and upgraded.

Because of these war experiences, our shipbuilding base has been considered an important national defense resource, and Congress has tried to bridge this longstanding cost gap through the shipbuilding subsidy program. This program was supposed to make U.S.-built ships competitive in price with foreign ships, by paying the difference in cost between U.S.-built and foreign-built to the U.S. shipyards. The theory was, if the cost to U.S. shipbuyers was equalized, our fleet could expand and compete, and the shipyards would be preserved and their efficiency upgraded.

But the program hasn't worked. U.S. shipyards, by and large, are less efficient than their foreign competitors and are plagued by production delays that add to costs. Furthermore, the voluminous federal regulations that the program has made necessary have further increased costs and sapped the shipowners' flexibility and initiative. If that weren't enough, the subsidies, which are limited by law to no more than 50 percent of the purchase price, are simply inadequate in today's market. That is because the actual cost differential between U.S. and foreign shipyards is now closer to 65 percent.

We have spent over \$3 billion on shipbuilding subsidies since 1936—half of that since 1970—but the share of America's foreign trade that is carried in U.S.-flag ships has been steadily decreasing, to the point where it is currently an embarrassing, dismal four percent of the total.

These subsidies should be ended, as should the associated "build U.S." requirement for subsidized U.S. shipowners. The subsidy program just has not worked: it is poorly planned and executed; in its place, naval construction plus other civilian shipbuilding and repair work can support as many shipyards as are necessary for national defense purposes. Perhaps the most important consideration, however, is that subsidized U.S. shipowners could expand their fleet rapidly and cheaply, if they were not tied to a policy of protecting inefficient U.S. shipyards and could instead get in on the bargains now available on the world market, as the Chinese have so astutely done. A bigger, leaner U.S. merchant fleet could make a real contribution to the U.S. economy, and would also be a genuine national defense resource.●

PHILANTHROPIC SUPPORT ACT

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Kentucky, Dr. TIM LEE CARTER, has long been an advocate of improved programs for the health of our people.

Recently he has begun an ancillary campaign, the protection, and encouragement of voluntarism and philanthropy in the hospitals of the Nation.

Dr. CARTER recently introduced the Voluntary Hospital Philanthropic Support Act which will give added strength to this important segment of our society. The intent of the act is to see that voluntarism and philanthropy are en-

couraged, rather than discouraged, by Government actions.

Recently Dr. CARTER was honored by two organizations for this work. The National Association for Hospital Development awarded him its Outstanding Achievement Award, and the Kentucky Hospital Association granted its Special Appreciation Award. In order that my colleagues can become better aware of his efforts, and these symbols of appreciation, I ask that the awards statements be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The statement of I. Brewster Terry, past president of the National Association for Hospital Development and director of development of the Washington Hospital Center, follows:

STATEMENTS BY I. BREWSTER TERRY AND EUGENE J. HUNCKLER

Congressman Carter, thank you for attending this opening reception of the National Association for Hospital Development's Second Annual Government Affairs Conference. I also wish to welcome Mrs. Carter.

All of us in tonight's audience, including myself, work on behalf of hospitals, medical centers and medical schools across the Nation. Therefore, Sir—with no demeaning of your high public office—for the balance of this ceremony, I would like to address you by the title you earned as a graduate physician and which draws us even closer to you.

It is my privilege, Dr. Carter, to present to you the Association's 1978 Achievement Award. Since the award was officially announced during my term as president of the NAHD, I thank my successor President Jack Herman for allowing me this distinction.

Doctor, we were indeed sorry Mrs. Carter and you could not be with us at our Annual Conference in San Diego last November. However, we readily understood via your thoughtful telegram your explanation that President Carter had accorded you the high honor of leading a special delegation to Mainland China to observe health care measures and procedures in that country.

Hence, we are gathered this evening to personally thank you and express our deep appreciation for your awareness, sensitivity and leadership on behalf of a cause. The cause is the reason for which we earn our daily bread but above and beyond it is a cause about which we are deeply concerned.

I refer to the vital importance of philanthropic giving to further and improve the quality of patient care in this Nation by the several thousand voluntary non-profit health care facilities who benefit from philanthropic gifts.

We thank you, Doctor, for having introduced yesterday (February 27th) in the House of Representatives H.R. 2445 "The Voluntary Hospital Philanthropic Support Act."

As you know only too well, Doctor Carter, the medical profession is noted for its jargon by using initials, abbreviations and so forth. We hospital development officers also have our special phrases. The one which is most significant and meaningful to us is made up of two words—Donor Recognition.

It is exactly in that context we determined last year to honor you. We are recognizing you as a donor. Your gift to all hospitals is your demonstrated concern for preserving a climate that will enhance health care by making certain individuals and organizations can continue to provide support through philanthropic giving.

Accordingly, Doctor on behalf of the more than 1,000 women and men hospital development officers, I present you with this plaque symbolizing our Achievement Award.

I would like to read the text—

"The 1978 National Association for Hospital Development outstanding achievement award to the Honorable Tim Lee Carter of Kentucky for his awareness and constant vigil in the Federal Congress protecting the American way of life and its foundations—voluntarism and philanthropy—for the hospitals of the Nation. San Diego, California, November 13, 1978."

Doctor Carter thank you so very much for your support and leadership.

Also, Mr. Eugene J. Hunckler, Director of Medical Center Development at the University of Kentucky delivered the following greetings to the Congressman from Kentucky, Dr. Tim Lee Carter, on the occasion of his receiving the National Association of Hospital Development's Legislative Service Award.

Congressman and Mrs. Carter, Mr. Chairman and Fellow members of the National Association of Hospital Development—as a fellow Kentuckian it is a three-fold honor for me today to congratulate you on this meaningful occasion. From the University of Kentucky Medical Center and on behalf of the Kentucky Hospital Development Officers and the Kentucky Hospital Association we extend grateful recognition for your continuing years of devoted and untiring service to the health and well being of the people of the Nation in general and the citizens of our Commonwealth, in particular. It is also with great pride that we present the Kentucky Hospital Association Special Appreciation Award along with our heartfelt congratulations and unending gratitude for your congressional leadership for legislation in support of philanthropic giving to hospitals and medical centers.

REJECTION OF HEW HOME HEALTH SERVICES REPORT

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the absence of a comprehensive home health care system is a subject of increasing concern to our elderly and homebound citizens, and thus to the Congress. Gaps and inadequacies in services are glaring. Equally alarming are the myriad of confusing and overlapping jurisdictions, regulations, and entitlements governing in-home programs. These deficiencies seriously thwart efforts to improve and expand such services. In view of the critical nature of these problems, and the importance of finding enforceable and appropriate solutions, Congress turned to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In an amendment to the Medicare/Medicaid Fraud and Abuse Act of 1977, I requested that the Department submit a report. "... analyzing, evaluating, and making recommendations with respect to ... the delivery of in-home services."

That report was just delivered. After reading it, Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER, chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging and I introduced a resolution, H.R. 280, to reject that report. I am annoyed that a document submitted to Congress half a year after the requested date, costing the taxpayer many

thousands of dollars, could include this statement, "The Department makes no legislative recommendations in this report, primarily because of budget considerations . . ."

In my view, this report is nothing more than a compendium of existing in-home programs, coupled with Department musings. It shows cavalier disregard for the intent of Congress by not addressing itself to the specific guidance Congress had requested.

Countless hours of testimony have been devoted to describing the difficulties with home health programs; many people have personally brought witness to the suffering caused by lacks in the community. We are not in need of any more such documentation. What we do need, what we requested, are proposals from the Department for legislative and administrative changes in home health programs.

H.R. 280 which we are now advocating rejects this inadequate and unresponsive document, returns it to its author and demands it be resubmitted to comply with congressional intent by September 1 of this year. I intend to bring this matter before the entire Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee so the Congress can forcefully convey its deep concern to the Department about home health care, and its insistence upon receiving an adequate response to its longstanding, legitimate request.

Until the Congress refuses to accept work ordered by it which does not meet the minimum standards of acceptability, we will not be taken seriously when we request reports of this importance.●

COMMEMORATING THE 38TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FORCED DEPORTATION OF LITHUANIANS

HON. JOHN J. CAVANAUGH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. CAVANAUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is 38 years, this week, since the Soviet authorities initiated a vast and brutal campaign of deporting Lithuanians to Siberia, aimed at destroying their continuing resistance to the previous year's forced annexation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. In the years since that first blatant attempt to uproot tens of thousands of Lithuanians from their homeland, Soviet policy has remained—at times more subtly, but often with typical Soviet heavy-handedness—targeted on destroying all that is Western, Catholic, and non-Russian in Lithuania. It is clear that they have failed.

It is particularly timely to pay tribute to the Lithuanians' determination to preserve their values, religion, language and culture in the face of the overwhelming power of the Soviet state. We have just witnessed in Poland that tenacity of religious spirit which permits a nation and a church to resist a generation of hostile propaganda, intimidat-

tion and repression and not only to survive, but to flourish. I have every reason to believe that the Lithuanian people are also firmly—if quietly—resisting Soviet attempts to strip them of their spiritual and national values. I want them to know that we have not forgotten the tragic events of June 1941, and that we are aware of their continuing struggle to preserve their national identity.●

JOHN WAYNE—THE PASSING OF AN AMERICAN HERO

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday, our country lost a truly great American—John Wayne—known to his friends as "the Duke," whose extraordinary film career spanned more than 50 years.

John Wayne's films served as an inspiration to millions of people, for the heroes he portrayed on the screen embodied the genuine strength, singular determination, and fundamental goodness that served to make this country great.

More importantly, this was the real John Wayne as well, not just a fictional character, who stood out as a singular hero and leader during a period of our Nation's history when such stature among American public figures was most needed.

John Wayne contributed greatly to our national character, and as such, deserved to become a permanent part of the fabric of our national heritage.

His life serves as a reminder that courage, patriotism, and loyalty to one's country and its heritage are not forgotten virtues in America, for he nobly embodied those characteristics in both his film career and his private life.

In the days prior to his death, he displayed the same courage and fight as the heroes he played on the screen. America will miss him greatly, as will those of us in Arizona's Fourth Congressional District, where he owned a cattle ranch at Stanfield that produces some of the finest livestock in the Southwest and was the site of his famous annual cattle auction.

A good tribute to John Wayne appeared this week in the Wall Street Journal, and I would like to include it at this point in the RECORD:

JOHN WAYNE: THE PASSING OF AN AMERICAN HERO

(By Bruce Cook)

John Wayne was for so long a large and important figure in American mythology that it was hard to think of him as having a life apart from the grand one he lived projected 30 feet high on the nation's movie screens. That's why it came as such a shock when his life away from the movies—that of the flesh-and-blood man—came to an end. Not that we

hadn't been given fair warning. There was the grueling nine-hour "gall bladder operation" earlier this year that ended only after surgery on his cancerous stomach and the discovery of cancer in his lymph nodes. With anybody else, death would then have seemed certain, but hadn't John Wayne beaten cancer once before? Hadn't he had a lung removed in 1965 and announced boldly to the world, "I licked the big C"? He then came back to appear in more movies, including "True Grit." It brought him his only Academy Award in 1969.

There seemed something utterly indestructible about the man. After all, he had made nearly 200 motion pictures beginning back in 1930. Fresh from the Rose Bowl, where he had played tackle for the University of Southern California, he got a job in the prop department of 20th Century-Fox and caught the attention of director Raoul Walsh. Walsh liked the young fellow's looks and asked to use him in his coming film, "The Big Trail." It was all right with the studio, but they said he would have to have a new name; the one he was born with back in Winterset, Iowa, in 1907—Marion Morrison—simply wouldn't do. Walsh had been reading a book about Mad Anthony Wayne, the Revolutionary War hero, and suggested they call him that, dropping the adjective, of course. Fox met Walsh halfway, and John Wayne he became.

It is more than slightly significant that Wayne's first film was a Western, for he was to become, along with Gary Cooper, the Western hero par excellence—big broad-shouldered, slow-talking, menacing in what he didn't say rather than in what he did. Cooper may have had greater box-office impact while he was around (he died in 1961), but it was John Wayne who played in the classics of the Western genre. For John Ford, who directed him in the original 1939 production of "Stagecoach," and for Howard Hawks, who starred him in what may well have been the definitive Western of all time, "Red River," Wayne embodied something basic, something essential about the American West. And Howard Hawks always insisted that the Duke (as he was known to Hawks and the rest of his friends) could really act: "I think that unless he is working with a damn good actor, he's going to blow them right off the screen. Not intentionally, just because he—he does it." Wayne himself was modest in that regard: "I play John Wayne in every part regardless of the character, and I've been doing okay, haven't I?"

But it was not, strictly speaking, as an actor that he will be remembered—nor should he be. He was one of America's great mythological heroes. It was not only true that his audience saw him in this way. He himself accepted this status as his rightful one. That surely was why he took on the role of superpatriot in the 1960s: He knew who he was and what he stood for, and he must have felt it his duty, as a hero, to provide leadership at that hour—to show America's young people the value of those old-fashioned virtues of patriotism and bravery and moral toughness that his movies had always extolled. He let everybody know where he stood on Vietnam, and he defended the military's mission there in "The Green Berets." People said he was out of touch. What people said about him never bothered John Wayne.

Not even now, when he is being eulogized and elegized left and right, would Wayne be much moved by these tributes. For in a way, he left his own most eloquent elegy in a movie, one of his last, "The Shootist," which was released in 1976. Appropriately, it was a Western. He was an aging gunfighter, dying of cancer, gone back to the old hometown to settle accounts. This film did not end with him striding off into the sunset with

that famous "Hondo" walk of his, but rather dying suddenly on a barroom floor, the victim of a sneak shot. Better to die that way than from the death sentence the movie's doctor had handed him. It was the way out that the flesh-and-blood John Wayne would have preferred. ●

SHATTER THE SILENCE VIGIL

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment and turn our attention to the persecution of a courageous Soviet dissident, Ida Nudel, the only woman dissident in exile.

I met Ida Nudel in Moscow last year and was moved by her courageous struggle on behalf of prisoners of Soviet labor camps and in exile. For 7 years, Ida brought the plight of many prisoners to the attention of the outside world, people who had simply vanished from friends and relatives. There are many prisoners who quite literally owe her their lives.

Ida would collect information about such cases, contact families of prisoners, "adopt" the victims, and do everything possible to lift their spirits. One former prisoner, David Chernogla, who was nursed back to health by Ida after years of imprisonment, writes:

There is no person in this world who has done more for Jewish prisoners. Her constant care and attention is the only factor which kept their morale high. It is for her efforts on their behalf that she is lovingly referred to as "The Guardian Angel of Prisoners of Conscience."

On June 2, 1978, while protesting the incarceration of fellow activist Vladimir Slepak, who is now free in this country, Ida was arrested and accused of "malicious hooliganism." Three weeks later she was sentenced to 4 years of exile in Siberia. During her sentencing, Ida proclaimed:

I am being tried for the previous seven years. The most beautiful years of my life. . . . During these years I learned to hold my head high with pride, as a human being and as a Jewess, and every time I succeeded in saving the life of another victim, my head was filled with an incomparable uplifting feeling. Even if all the rest of my life will be gray and monotonous, these seven years will warm my soul vouchsafe that my life was not in vain.

Today Ida Nudel is deteriorating in the filth of a Siberian labor camp. Ida has a very weak heart and her health is failing. The ultimate tragedy is that this tiny woman who has saved so many prisoners before her now finds herself alone and brutally treated.

Three months ago, Ida had a rare chance to speak to the outside world and humbly pleaded:

I so want to believe that sometime I will rise up the board of an El Al aircraft, and my suffering and tears will remain in my memory only, and my heart will be full of triumph and victory. And God grant that it will be soon!

As I was about to say goodbye to Ida, she looked at me one last time and said: Please don't forget us . . . Please.

We must keep her dream alive. To forget Ida's plea is to ignore her plight. We cannot forget. ●

WHITHER CONNECTICUT'S GAS?

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, we New Englanders are getting used to being at the dry end of this Nation's energy distribution system. For example, I have been trying for 3 years to lure some of Alaska's North Slope oil eastward and still we have no West-to-East pipelines and no additional refinery capacity to handle that higher sulphur crude. But now Connecticut is suffering what I consider more than our share of the current gasoline shortfall, and the lack of adequate information to explain the situation only feeds public fear and scepticism. For this reason, I have joined my colleague BILL NELSON, Democrat of Florida, in calling for an independent audit of crude oil and refined product stock levels. Without this information, conservation efforts will be badly undermined by a public numb to the Department of Energy's obsolete data and equivocation.

Today, Connecticut motorists are the unfortunate victims of DOE's failure to collect, analyze, and disseminate relevant energy data. For the past 2 weeks I have been trying to determine why the State's projected May volume of gasoline, 87 percent of 1978 sales, was the lowest in New England. DOE projected deliveries would total 96 percent of 1978 volume in Maine, 97 percent in Massachusetts, 95 percent in New Hampshire, 95 percent in Rhode Island, and 93 percent in Vermont. After speaking with DOE officials in Washington and Boston, as well as State energy representatives, I had only contradictory information and bare guesses to explain the shortage.

First, I was told the volume projections in some cases had to be "best guesstimates" due to a lack of company data. Then I was told that the shortfall was only about 5 percent anyway, and that is too little to worry the Department. Finally, I was told that the closing of a major independent chain of gas retailers, Gasland, representing 75 outlets and 5 percent of total sales last year, might account for the closed stations and long lines appearing throughout the State. However, other DOE officials claimed that Gasland's gas was still coming to the State, but no one knew where it was, who had it or whether or not it was finding its way into the retail market.

Most recently, it was explained to me that an unfortunate combination of circumstances explained the situation and there was really nothing anyone could do. I was told that the significant portion of Connecticut's gas market served

by independent wholesalers and jobbers was, of course, hard-hit by the supply shortfall. Also, the major companies serving our market happened to be especially short. So, three or four of those major retailers, who account for 35 to 40 percent of gasoline sales in 1978, were all on allocation fractions of 75 percent or less. This was small consolation given the previous claims of inaccurate data, for on the heels of persistent promises that better data and better days were coming in June, even lower allocations were announced for this month. Connecticut's June allocation is 82 percent, again the lowest in New England.

From all this it is clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Energy is not equipped to manage even this "limited crisis." Still, we must have the hard information to convince people of the need to conserve and to persuade them that the world oil shortage is very real and extremely dangerous. Believe me, I do not raise this issue lightly, nor do I wish to join in the politically popular howls against the Department of Energy. However, heating oil stocks for next winter are precariously low and that is a situation which must be managed well, for the lives of the poor and elderly will be at stake. With adequate information concerning primary, secondary, and end-use storage levels, constrained demand through insulation and conservation and a public confident in the effectiveness of both, we can survive the winter of 1979 while avoiding \$1 per gallon heating oil. Without those tools, today's gas lines will be joined by tomorrow's winter energy nightmare.

Finally, I endorse Connecticut Gov. Ella Grasso's appeal to the Department of Energy to exercise its statutory authority to equalize gasoline supplies. The Department's allocation growth adjustments do not sufficiently reflect the loss of Gasland. In addition, I suggest that Department officials continue their investigation into the legal entitlement to Gasland product which might permit a DOE order redistributing those supplies throughout the State.

The text of Governor Grasso's letter to Energy Secretary Schlesinger follows:
JUNE 7, 1979.

HON. JAMES R. SCHLESINGER,
Secretary for Energy,
U.S. Department of Energy,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: This is to request that the Department of Energy redirect motor gasoline supply to the State of Connecticut under the authority of Section 211.14 (a) of the Mandatory Petroleum Allocation Regulations to eliminate the supply imbalance for the month of June which exists between the State of Connecticut and other states and regions of the country.

Our data, and data supplied by the Department of Energy indicate that available supplies for Connecticut for the month of June are approximately 82 percent of the actual deliveries received in June for 1978, while data supplied by your department indicates that the national ratio is expected to be 89 percent. We believe the above difference results in an unreasonable portion of the burden of the current gasoline shortage being borne by Connecticut citizens.

This situation may be influenced by such factors as:

Withdrawal of Good Hope Industries (Gasland) from the Connecticut retail market. The limited ability of the Department of Energy's growth adjustment procedure to accommodate a relatively dispersed redistribution of the demand previously met by Gasland, and;

Yet explained, but significant reductions in the supply obligations of some companies when compared to actual deliveries in 1978.

Attached is a list of Gasland Stations—the vicinity of which was checked to establish neighboring and competing gasoline retailers. The 13 locations yielded 33 competing stations, checks with the management at these stations reveal that only two stations received adjustment in base period under the Department of Energy's growth adjustment. We believe the situation is indicative of Gasland's entire market area, and of the fact that the Gasland volume will not be reflected in June adjustments.

Also attached is data indicating that normal seasonal variations result in the months of May, June and July exceeding the average of the five months used in the Department of Energy's adjustment procedure by about 5 percent.

This represents an impediment to the successful adjustment of retail station volumes that would be necessary to reflect the redistribution of the Gasland served demand. An additional impediment is found in the fact that Gasland showed fairly strong sales until their shutdown on November 15, 1978, more than one-fourth of the way through the period used for adjustment purposes.

On the basis of the above, I respectfully request that you use one or more of the mechanisms available to you to increase the gasoline supply to the State of Connecticut for the month of June to a level approximately that being experienced by the nation as a whole.

With best wishes,
Cordially,

ELLA GRASSO,
Governor. ●

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN WAYNE

HON. THOMAS B. EVANS, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

Mr. EVANS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of loss and sadness that I rise to comment on the death of John Wayne who was truly a legend in his lifetime.

"Good men must die, but death cannot kill their names," is a proverbial statement that could not be more apropos in this instance, for John Wayne the hero will live in our hearts forever.

John Wayne dedicated his life to America and she embraced him wholeheartedly. He was admired by people from all walks of life regardless of political persuasion. His career included more than 200 films, spanning four decades of filmmaking, during which time his popularity never waned.

His feet were planted in America, but his heart went out to all people as he was known and respected throughout the world. John Wayne had a universal appeal. He was tough, self-reliant, fair, and concerned—a rather unique combination of qualities that lent a sense of rugged individualism to all of his movies.

On the screen he won all of his battles without falling back on senseless brutality and everyone found themselves rallying behind his great fighting spirit.

In real life John Wayne's personal courage, pride, and drive uplifted all of us and he will continue to share a special place in our hearts.

The name "John Wayne" connotes "patriotism." That is, a patriotism that comes from deep within us and a feeling that mere words could never describe. All who believe in America and what she represents, found John Wayne, the man, the actor, to be the personification of that American spirit and those ideals which have gone to make our country great.

Samuel Johnson once said:

He who praises everybody, praises nobody.

Thus all countries find the need for very special types of praise. Recognizing this, Congress recently chose to honor John Wayne by authorizing the President of the United States to present to John Wayne, on behalf of the Congress, a specially struck gold medal. The gold medal is the highest honor that the United States can bestow on a private citizen. By honoring John Wayne with such a tribute, Congress honors a great country.

We will be able to share in this commemoration since Congress also authorized the Department of the Treasury to produce bronze replicas of the John Wayne gold medal for sale to the public.

MS. GLENDA LEE PROVINCE WINS KATHY WHITE ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. RICHARD C. WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, when my beloved wife Katherine Huffman White was taken from me and my family in 1972 in a tragic accident, many friends joined me in establishing an educational trust in her memory. This trust each year bestows the Kathy White Achievement Award—a cash award intended to help defray the costs of higher education—on a graduating senior of one of the high schools in El Paso County in my district in west Texas. The award is competitive and the winner is selected by an independent panel on the basis of overall academic excellence throughout his or her high school career and an assigned essay. All of the past winners have been exceptionally accomplished young people, and this year's winner continues that tradition. She is Ms. Glenda Lee Province who has just graduated at the head of her class from Clint High School in Clint, Tex. Her essay on "What Kind of America Do I Expect in the 1980's" reflects a maturity and wisdom not often found in persons of her few years, and I should like to share her fine concepts and encouraging conclusions with my colleagues:

WHAT KIND OF AMERICA DO I EXPECT IN THE 1980's

(By Glenda Lee Province)

America is on the threshold of a new decade. The country is like a young child growing, exploring, learning, and hopefully facing a bright future. What changes will she see in the next 10 years? What problems will she face and solve? There is a growing concern in the United States about what will happen to the traditional American family. Another major concern is that of the energy crisis and its effects on society. In the 1980's, the family will probably suffer from various affecting factors, and an unsolved energy crisis will play a major role in the decay of the American family.

America was built around the family; however, if the high inflation and divorce rates continue throughout the next decade, the traditional family will experience some very serious problems. Inflation will force the family to curtail vacations, recreation, and the expenses of everyday living. However, while it is possible to reduce vacation and recreational expenses, living expenses continue. This constant concern over money will have a dangerous mental effect on the family to curtail vacations, recreation, and a breakdown of family unity and divorce. In fact, to avoid these problems, the attitude of many people toward marriage seems to be one of "just living together." In Dear Abby recently, a woman suggested the marriage vows should be changed to "till something better comes along" from "till death do us part." Something must be done in the next decade to help lower the inflation and divorce rates in an attempt to save the family.

Energy is a major problem facing America and her families. Fossil fuels are running out, and even though these fuels will be available in the 1980's, they must be conserved. The OPEC nations will continue to raise their prices for oil; this country cannot pay exorbitant prices forever. The only solution is to develop alternate energy sources. As in the past, using American ingenuity, Americans will develop alternate energy sources. Solar energy will begin to be used commonly throughout the United States. Wind power is another potential energy producer which can be utilized in numerous areas of the country. Even nuclear power will be used in the 1980's. America has many energy alternatives to fossil fuels which she can and will use to help solve the energy crisis.

Yes—America can have just as bright a future as her heritage; however, her people will have to unite together to solve their problems. This country will see a myriad of changes in the next decade not only in the family and energy, but in hundreds of fields. There will be new crises and problems arising; nevertheless, America will rise above these problems and emerge again as an important world figure. I see no reason why America cannot remain throughout the next decade the "land of the free and home of the brave." ●

MSGR. BASIL SEREDOWYCH

HON. GARY A. LEE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and privileged to call to your attention, and to that of my distinguished colleagues, a significant and holy event which will take place in Syracuse, N.Y.,

on Sunday, June 24, when members of St. John the Baptist Ukrainian Catholic Church will celebrate the investiture of their pastor, Msgr. Basil Seredowych, as Mitrat Archpriest. His elevation to this rank of eminence comes after 27 years of service to his parish, and to the Ukrainian-Americans of Syracuse and Central New York.

The investiture ceremony, one of solemn beauty and traditional majesty, will be conducted at the church by His Excellency, Most Rev. Basil Losten, Bishop of Stamford. It is to be followed by a banquet and dance of joyous celebration at Hotel Syracuse.

I am honored to share with you, and with members of the St. John the Baptist Ukrainian Catholic Church family, their pride and congratulations to Monsignor Seredowych. ●

BLAMING THE OBSTETRICIAN

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I got some hot scoop that a gasoline station up on Pennsylvania Avenue was going to be open at certain hours. Being invited or at least being told when a certain gasoline station was going to open was like receiving an invitation to visit the Queen of England. Rest assured that I thought that this was a great chance to beat the stations at their own game, and everybody else for that matter. I would arrive at the station in advance of the time they were to open, in fact, I left 45 minutes before they were to open. Well when I arrived at the station it seemed everyone else had the same idea and apparently I was not privy to special information. Needless to say I waited in line for over an hour and a half. Then just as I could smell gas fumes—I was only four cars away—they closed the pumps. Frustration came bursting forth. I conjured up pictures of officials at the Department of Energy watching out of their windows, laughing and enjoying other people's misery. Suddenly, I felt the wheel take hold of my body, my car advanced to the Department of Energy building—why? Because the Government is responsible for this gasoline situation.

My good friend, Milton Friedman, has explained the situation in an interesting way:

BLAMING THE OBSTETRICIAN

(By Milton Friedman)

The explanations of the energy crisis and gasoline shortage that gush forth from government officials, newspaper reporters and TV commentators are tantamount to blaming the obstetrician for the baby.

A rapacious oil industry did not produce the gasoline shortage. Wasteful consumers did not produce the gasoline shortage. Hard winter did not produce the gasoline shortage. Not even Arab sheiks produced the gasoline shortage.

After all, the oil industry has been around for a long time—and has always been rap-

acious. Consumers have not suddenly become wasteful. We have had hard winters before. Arab sheiks have desired wealth as far back as human memory runs.

Why now? The subtle and sophisticated people who fill the newspaper columns and the airwaves with such silly explanations of the gasoline shortage seem never to have asked themselves the obvious question: why is it that for a century and more before 1971, there were no energy crises, no gasoline shortages, no problems about fuel oil—except during World War II?

There is an energy crisis, there are gasoline lines, for one reason and one reason only. Because government has decreed that there shall be. Of course, government has not done so openly. The President never sent a message to Congress asking it to legislate an energy crisis and long gasoline lines. But he who says A must say B. The government, beginning with President Nixon on Aug. 15, 1971, imposed maximum prices on crude oil, gasoline at retail and other petroleum products. And, unfortunately, the quadrupling of crude-oil prices by the OPEC cartel in 1973 prevented those maximum prices from being abolished when all others were. Maximum legal prices for petroleum products—that is the key element common both to World War II and the period since 1971.

Economists may not know much. But we know one thing very well: how to produce surpluses and shortages.

Do you want a surplus? Have the government legislate a minimum price that is above the price that would otherwise prevail. That is what we have done at one time or another to produce surpluses of wheat, of sugar, of butter, of many other commodities, and, most tragically, of teen-age labor. The minimum wage is a legislated price above the price that would otherwise prevail for the labor of many teen-agers. Like every minimum price, it enhances the amount supplied and reduces the amount demanded, and so produces a surplus, in this case of unemployed teen-agers.

Do you want a shortage? Have the government legislate a maximum price that is below the price that would otherwise prevail. That is what New York City and, more recently, other cities have done for rental dwellings, and that is why they all suffer or will soon suffer from housing shortages. That is why there were so many shortages during World War II. That is why there is an energy crisis and a gasoline shortage.

There is one simple way to end the energy crisis and the gasoline shortage tomorrow—and I mean tomorrow and not six months from now, not six years from now. Eliminate all controls on the prices of crude oil and other petroleum products. The gasoline lines would melt faster than the snows of winter.

Other misguided policies of government and the monopolistic behavior of the OPEC cartel might keep petroleum products expensive, but they would not produce the disorganization, chaos and confusion that we now confront.

Gas would cost less: And, perhaps surprisingly, this solution would reduce the cost of gasoline to the consumer—the true cost. Prices at the pump might go up a few cents a gallon, but the cost of gasoline today includes the time and gasoline wasted standing in line, and hunting for a gas station with gas, plus the \$10.8 billion annual budget of the Department of Energy, which amounts to around 9 cents per gallon of gasoline.

Why has this simple and foolproof solution not been adopted? So far as I can see, for two basic reasons—one, general, the other, specific. To the despair of every economist, it seems almost impossible for most people other than trained economists to comprehend how a price system works.

Reporters and TV commentators seem especially resistant to the elementary principles they supposedly imbibed in freshman economics. Second, removing price controls would reveal that the emperor is naked—it would show how useless, indeed harmful, are the activities of James Schlesinger and his 20,000 employees. It might even occur to someone how much better off we were before we had a Department of Energy. ●

IT IS TIME TO BLOW THE WHISTLE

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor of being invited to address the Santa Rosa Stock and Bond Club in Santa Rosa, Calif. My remarks centered on an issue of much concern to all of us, the current energy crisis. So that my colleagues may have the opportunity to review my comments on this very serious subject, I am submitting for the RECORD a copy of my remarks:

IT IS TIME TO BLOW THE WHISTLE

Someone once said that the time to repair the roof is when the sun shines. I believe even with the present storm clouds, that the time to get our energy house in order is NOW. I have always been a confirmed optimist. I do not agree with those who would liken such energy action to rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic. Rather, it can best be described as a short term energy shortage but, in the long term, we have a great energy potential.

Many of you as well as other Americans seriously question what one hears today about a so-called energy crisis. There are many Congressmen like myself in that number. It is for this reason we are closely monitoring the efforts of the Department of Energy. They have the responsibility to monitor refineries, the oil industry and the inventory factors associated with our overall energy programs.

It now appears that President Carter is moving in the direction of lifting price controls on domestic oil production. It is regrettable that he didn't take this action two years ago when many of us urged him to do so. Had he taken action at that time, the price of gasoline was expected to rise only about two or three cents a gallon. The plain facts are that the tug of war between the President and the Congress has cost us two years. We are paying a stiff price for the President's intransigence, ambivalence and lack of understanding of both our total energy situation and the legislative process and people of the Congress.

The June 11th issue of Business Week featured an editorial entitled "Where the Blame Belongs" which comments on the Administration's assertion that the American people refuse to accept the fact that "we have an energy crisis and an oil shortage." The editorial states:

"While the level of energy consumption is higher in the U.S. than in the rest of the world, that is largely attributable to the predominance of single-family housing and the low population density that makes for longer-distance driving.

"If the President wants to distribute blame, he can reserve a substantial portion for himself and his advisers. They have not only fumbled on the development of a long-term energy program, but they also have

complicated the simple matter of decontrolling oil prices. Phasing out controls instead of ending them now has kept new oil from coming to market. In the meantime, the Administration told U.S. companies not to buy crude in the open market. As a result, foreign users have grabbed up all available oil, and the U.S. is absorbing most of the current world shortage."

There is much concern that the so-called energy shortage may be contrived by the oil companies. The Departments of Energy and Justice have identified 109 cases of possible fraud in the oil industry. These cases include possible "daisy chaining", illegal price manipulations and false reporting to our Federal Government. The FBI has assured Congress there is no coverup within DOE per se. It simply points out the need for enormous specialization and training to review oil industry actions.

The Department of Energy is developing an investigative and monitoring capability within our domestic energy industry, but is still pretty dependent on outside sources to collect and evaluate data about oil production in foreign countries. And while many are critical of DOE's track record to date we must keep in mind that traditionally Americans have felt that government should not be needlessly poking into every business transaction in the private sector.

What really should be the subject of our concern is the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, better known as "OPEC". As you are aware, OPEC has scheduled a meeting later this month in Geneva, Switzerland to review its pricing structure. It appears OPEC will increase their price by at least 15%. If domestic and world consumption continues to increase prior to the OPEC meeting, we may see an even greater price increase. Sheik Yamani, the Oil Minister of Saudi Arabia, believes it is time the United States increases oil production of Alaska's North Slope and establish a domestic energy distribution network. Until such time as these events occur, he believes there is a signal the United States will accept a rise in the price of foreign crude. Until recently, Saudi Arabia has attempted to hold OPEC prices down. However, last week, Saudi Arabia joined Iran in raising the price of oil.

The situation in Iran and the so-called "peace agreement" in the Middle East is anything but settled. It appears that, as in 1973, Saudi Arabia feels compelled to join with her more radical Arab neighbors to penalize the United States for its involvement in the Egyptian-Israeli talks. This action is being taken to avoid incurring the resentment of her neighbors.

The present Administration through Treasury Secretary Blumenthal has indicated how essential it is for the world's industrial Nations to work together with OPEC "to get their cooperation to keep up production and to help us get some order into this chaotic price situation." What many people do not understand is with the exception of Saudi Arabia, Iran and Kuwait, all OPEC members have reached production capacity. Therefore, they are maximizing their return on an exhaustible resource.

Presently, the world shortfall of oil is fluctuating between 1.5 and 2 million bpd. World oil stocks need to be rebuilt at approximately 3 million barrels per day. Presently, world oil stocks are being rebuilt on the order of 1½ to 2 million barrels per day. OPEC oil or "contract oil" has been priced at between \$14.50 and \$17.00 a barrel. Last week, spot prices (non-contract oil) reached \$36.00 a barrel. Given this event, OPEC in all probability will raise the price of contract oil substantially.

Having mentioned Sheik Yamani's observations on the need for a U.S. domestic energy distribution network, I'd like to say

how disappointed many of us in the Congress were with the SOHIO decision to cancel attempts to build a pipeline from Long Beach to Midland, Texas. While we'd never believe it from the lines at the filling stations, the West Coast has technically been awash in a "glut" of sour crude oil. The problem is that we have insufficient refining capability on the West Coast to remove the large amount of sulfur from the Alaska crude oil. As a result, we're shipping Alaskan oil to Gulf and East Coast ports via the Panama Canal, a pretty expensive proposition.

The beauty of the SOHIO pipeline project was that it would use a large amount of existing pipeline thereby lowering costs and shortening the construction timetable. From an area point of view it would have meant that Kaiser Steel employees in Napa would have benefited by way of increased steel production.

Just recently I learned that efforts are underway to construct a refinery in Valdez, Alaska which would process the State of Alaska's share of the crude oil, approximately 150,000 barrels a day. The principal market for the lead-free gasoline and jet fuel derived from this operation is California.

ENERGY ALTERNATIVES

Before coming to Congress, I used to referee basketball games. There's one basic lesson I learned from this experience. How well the game was played and how honest were the players often was determined by how fast or slow the Ref blew the whistle.

I believe it's time to blow the whistle! The message from the Iranian oil situation was loud and clear. The present domestic situation in Iran is volatile and tenuous. How much more do we Americans need to see a foul? We must immediately take steps to decrease our dependence upon foreign source of energy. We must increase production of the Alaska North Slope, establish better seaports and domestic energy distribution networks, develop our potential reserves and move toward conversion in areas such as coal, natural gas, geothermal and oil shale. At the same time, we must embark upon a program to develop our solar and wind technology as well as the synthetic fuels industry.

America has always pulled together in a crunch and we certainly have one NOW. Americans have always allocated resources toward goals and programs which would make our country strong and secure and to achieve goals often times thought to be impossible. Two projects come to mind when thinking of vast sums of human and economic resources—the Manhattan Project and NASA. The first helped us gain independence and security. The latter helped us place a man on the moon and return him safely to Earth. With this event, great technological innovations were achieved which have been translated into everyday use by all citizens of these United States.

To put this all in perspective, I am told by DOE officials that if we could come up with a funding mechanism that would yield revenues in an amount of 10 to 15 billion dollars a year, the United States could be energy self-sufficient by 1990.

Some are suggesting a government sponsored corporation, to involve the private sector, for synthetic fuels development comparable to that which was required during World War II when we had a shortage of natural rubber for tires, aluminum and other shortages.

Personally, I prefer a tax incentive equivalency with a clear directive to industry to accelerate the energy production business to move us toward self-sufficiency. We have the technology, we must break down the barriers for the rapid development of synthetic fuels from coal.

GEOTHERMAL

On another front, my Interior Committee is holding hearings on our legislation to increase the amount of Federal land an individual or company may lease from the Federal Government for geothermal development. Beneath the lands owned by the citizens of this country there are pools of geothermal heat with an energy equivalent of 1.2 trillion barrels of oil or about 162 years of current oil use.

OIL SHALE

Not far from here lies a region known as the Overthrust Belt. It runs from Utah through Wyoming, Idaho and Montana. It is a region now estimated to contain 800 billion barrels of oil and 20 to 100 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. The oil is primarily found in rock shale. Up to this time there has never been too much interest in it because extraction was not economically feasible. However, as the price of oil on the world market increases, this disadvantage becomes reduced. Some experts predict that if the price of crude rises to \$24 to \$26 a barrel, shale oil will be cost effective and able to compete in the marketplace. We should review a balanced research and development program of this region keeping in mind appropriate environmental concerns.

I believe an active energy independence program will also serve as a stimulus to our domestic capital markets. Capital will be attracted to new technological approaches of energy development and management. The more energy efficient goals established by the United States government should see capital intensive opportunities in energy related technologies.

Arthur D. Bond, Jr., a managing partner of Massachusetts Financial Services, Inc. has expressed an interest in the areas as follows:

"A broad area of interest for us could be categorized as problem solving companies. These include producers and savers of energy, firms that can increase production and relieve bottlenecks and the general category of companies that increase productivity."

With respect to decontrol of oil prices and the impact on oil company investment, the Washington Analysis Corp. has said:

"... Despite the higher cost of leases, decontrol will raise the after-tax return on investment in the U.S. drilling to more than 19 percent, from the present level of approximately 13 percent."

This would attract investment capital.

Recently, we have seen a particular group of stocks yielding nearly as much as some bonds. This yield is naturally related to risks and is directed toward electric utilities who have placed much of their investment in nuclear power. Government regulatory practices, spiraling construction costs and the recent Three Mile Island event have in many ways dampened investor interests. However, many American investors are often positioned to tolerate risks. Electric utilities may be an area for such an investor.

NUCLEAR

Let me share a few thoughts with you on the subject of nuclear power.

In 1978, nuclear power plants produced 13 percent of all electricity consumed in the United States. This same energy production by fossil energy sources would have required 470 million barrels of residual crude oil or 135 million tons of coal.

To put these figures into perspective, total coal production last year was 691 million tons and current oil imports are at a level of 8 million barrels per day. To import the annual nuclear energy production in equivalent barrels of oil at mid-May OPEC prices would add more than 6 billion dollars to our trade deficit.

A 1,000 megawatt nuclear power plant at full power can supply the electrical energy needs of one million people. This represents

an energy equivalent of 10,000 tons per day of coal or 40,000 barrels per day of oil.

Since its birth, the growth of commercial nuclear power has been influenced by safety considerations. Over the past twenty-five years there has been a large number of studies directed toward assessing the probability of mishaps and their associated consequences. The incident at Three Mile Island nuclear plant presents a serious challenge to the previous safety record of operating nuclear power plants. We must have guaranteed safeguards and an assured ability to handle the nuclear waste if nuclear energy is to remain as a viable energy alternative.

I believe this must be proven in the next three years.

INFLATION AND TAX REFORM

Inflation also continues to be a major problem. Inflationary monetary policy devalues the real income of all Americans, especially those on fixed incomes and those who cannot keep up with the cost of living. Progressive tax codes increase taxes on those who do receive cost-of-living adjustments, by pushing them into higher tax brackets. Higher and higher spending for federal programs results in higher taxes and more inflation. One of the primary causes of rising taxes and inflation is the rapid growth rate of Federal spending over the past two decades. This "spend and tax" approach has given the American people a shrinking tax base with higher and higher tax rates and galloping inflation. Inflation is the most insidious of all taxes because it not only reduces the purchasing power of working people, but also pushes them into higher tax brackets. The primary beneficiary of inflation is Government. The real losers are the taxpayers.

I believe this continual tax-rate increase caused by the devaluation of the dollar and our outdated tax laws has contributed directly to the decline in American productivity. This drop in productivity means a lower standard of living for all Americans. Rising tax rates have also contributed directly to increasing unemployment and the demand for social welfare programs, while reducing the economy's ability to pay for them.

The increasing tax burden on Americans has become counter-productive, creating disincentives for work, saving, investment and production. It is time to enact across-the-board permanent reductions in tax rates to broaden the tax base and permit gradual reform of the tax system.

I have co-sponsored the Kemp-Roth Tax Reduction and Spending Limitation Acts which will return taxpayers to tax rate levels which are fair and compensate them for inflation caused tax increases. The Kemp-Roth proposals would cut individual income taxes by 10% annually over a 3-year period, beginning January 1, 1980, by adjusting the marginal tax rates on which individuals are taxed. Tax rates would be reduced from the current range of 14 to 70%, to 10 to 50%. The Kemp-Roth bills would combine these across-the-board tax rate reductions with a limitation on federal spending to a declining percentage of the gross national product (GNP).

We must subject all governments to some measure of expenditure control and budget discipline in order to break the "inflation psychology" that is so prevalent today.

Government spending as a share of GNP has been above 22% for the past five years—a historically unprecedented peacetime level.

The spending limitation we would impose would be linked to our gross national product. We would suggest a phasing down of 1% per year—FY 80-21%, FY 81-20%, FY 82-19%, FY 83-18%—and level at 10% thereafter.

If the tax laws remain unchanged inflation and real growth will push individuals into higher tax brackets. In other words, the

burden of taxation automatically rises. Our tax laws should be amended to insure that inflation will not cause taxes to rise automatically in the future. The Kemp-Roth bill contains an "indexing" provision which ties individual income tax rates to the consumer price index. This feature would provide equity for taxpayers during periods of inflation with no resulting loss of real income. It would end the unlegislated tax windfall to the U.S. Treasury and release the inflationary tax back into the economy.

In closing, let me reiterate, I have always been a confirmed optimist. Granted there are rough times ahead, but Americans have always been known to group in the face of adversity and move ahead triumphantly. A challenge for energy independence and control of inflation is at hand. It is time for us to move forward together.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED FOR UNRESOLVED ISSUES IN THE CALIFORNIA-NEVADA DESERT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1979

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills, by request, which deal with important unresolved issues in the desert of California and Nevada. They are legislation to create a Mojave National Park, and legislation to establish the Desert Pupfish National Monument. While these bills are not strictly related to each other, and each has been introduced before, I find some similarity between them. The main similarity is that neither bill would be necessary if the Department of the Interior practiced the type of stewardship of our Nation's natural resources that they should. I have not been totally convinced by the numerous groups and individuals which support this legislation that only new legislation will accomplish the goals of this legislation. I have been convinced that only the threat of new legislation will move the Department of the Interior in the direction this legislation requires.

The bill to create a Mojave National Park was introduced in the last Congress by myself at the request of numerous conservation and environmental groups which are concerned with the California desert. Since that legislation was introduced, it has helped focus the discussion on the California desert plan, which was required to be prepared by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. I am reintroducing this legislation to make it clear to all parties involved that I want this discussion and process to evaluate the California desert conservation area to include park values, and a Mojave National Park in particular. A more thorough discussion of this bill can be found in the June 26, 1978 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 19041.

Briefly, the Mojave National Park bill would create a park in the eastern Mojave Desert. It would encompass an area rich in natural, archeological, and historical features. In addition, there are

botanical and zoological resources that further enhance this area. Among the highlights are 32 volcanic cinder cones, the second highest sand dune system in North America, outstanding and irreplaceable petroglyphs, remains of 19th century military and mining outposts, as well as hundreds of plant and animal species, including several endangered species.

The Desert Pupfish National Monument legislation is a companion measure to a bill Senator ALAN CRANSTON has been supporting for some time. Needless to say, the Desert Pupfish is an endangered species, which lives in a very fragile habitat. While the Endangered Species Act and other powers at the disposal of the administration could be used to protect the Desert Pupfish in the Ash Meadows area, I am concerned that this is not being done. The area where this species is most in danger is at Ash Meadows, Nev. For a variety of reasons, it appears that this legislation by Senator CRANSTON is both prudent and necessary to provide a comprehensive solution to the crisis now facing the pupfish.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to carefully consider both of these bills, and the situation which makes their introduction necessary.●

LIVABLE CITIES

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, 1979 the House Appropriations marked up the fiscal year 1980 HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations bill. Based on a serious misunderstanding of the distinct roles of both the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), this committee provided no funding for the livable cities program. HUD requested a meager \$5 million for this activity which was authorized at \$10 million for fiscal year 1980 by the Livable Cities Act of 1978.

According to the authorizing legislation, the primary purpose of the livable cities program is to:

assist the efforts of States, local governments, neighborhood and other organizations to provide a more suitable living environment, expand cultural opportunities, and to the extent practicable, stimulate economic opportunities, primarily for the low and moderate income residents of communities and neighborhoods in need of conservation and revitalization, design or development of artistic, cultural, or historic resources.

The legislation provides that eligible projects must be related to a conservation or revitalization strategy and must directly benefit the residents of low- or moderate-income neighborhoods.

The unique feature of the livable cities program is that it proposes to use the arts as a tool to stimulate economic and community revitalization efforts. Livable cities is designed to fund specific projects that develop artistic, cultural and histori-

cal resources that contribute to the revitalization of cities and neighborhoods. This program would serve as a catalyst for community identity, spirit and pride, and would bring within the reach of the disadvantaged, minorities and the elderly, opportunities to develop and enjoy the artistic and cultural resources of their own communities. Revitalization is the end and the arts are a means to achieve that end.

The major point of contention at subcommittee markup concerned the issues of which is the appropriate agency to administer the livable cities program (HUD or NEA) and whether similar activities are already being funded at NEA, HUD, or other Federal agencies. The subcommittee report states that programs now administered by NEA should be—

... expanded or modified to promote the livable cities concept rather than establish a new program within the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

While nearly everyone agrees about the need for an innovative program like livable cities as a means to breathe life into some of our most bleak and blighted urban communities, there is considerable confusion over what the distinct roles of both HUD and NEA would be (and should be) in administering this program. In my reading of the authorizing legislation, it is clear that the Congress intended that the livable cities program be jointly administered by HUD and NEA. Indeed, neither HUD nor NEA functioning alone is an appropriate mechanism to administer the livable cities program. While a primary focus of HUD is to stimulate the development and revitalization of urban communities, HUD has traditionally emphasized the buildings in cities, not the people who live in them. The livable cities program is not simply a bricks and mortar program but involves certain intangible elements that give some meaning to those buildings.

On the other hand, NEA is competent to judge artistic matters but its major goal is to advance professionalism in the arts by supporting professional opera and dance companies and other groups which are trying to establish themselves as professional arts organizations. Livable cities is a community development program; its intent is to reach out and strengthen neighborhood groups and activities in low- and moderate-income areas. NEA lacks the expertise to advance community development, should not be in the business of revitalizing neighborhoods, and is not interested in administering these activities.

The second issue raised at markup concerned whether NEA and HUD are currently involved in activities similar to those that would be undertaken under the livable cities program, and whether these activities could be funded under other existing Federal programs such as HUD's community development block grant (CDBG) program. NEA has two small-scale programs that reach the community level, expansion arts and a program also named "Livable Cities." These programs focus, however, on experimental projects and the application of innovative design techniques in neigh-

borhoods and communities. Hundreds of applications are turned down that could be funded under the livable cities program.

In addition, the array of activities eligible for funding under the livable cities program is much broader than those that could be funded under existing programs, such as the CDBG program. Moreover, competition for CDBG funding is so keen that small cultural and artistic proposals frequently are squeezed out.

In conclusion, the Congress intended that the livable cities program be a joint endeavor between HUD and NEA that brings together the resources of both agencies for the purpose of reaching out to and including in the redevelopment process neighborhood groups whose views have too often been overlooked. I believe, therefore, that due to HUD's commitment to neighborhood revitalization—the primary focus of livable cities—and because of the organizational arrangement necessary to implement this innovative approach to community development, it is entirely appropriate that the livable cities program be funded under HUD, with input from NEA on artistic matters.●

MESSAGE TO THE PRESIDENT

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as the situation in Central America takes an ever more serious turn, it is well to note that the administration's attitude of cold hostility toward the friendly Government of Nicaragua does not reflect the views of a very large portion of this Congress. The following letter has been sent to President Carter, signed by 125 Members:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 13 1979.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You can end the hardship and suffering being inflicted on the Nicaraguan people by your action now. Your continued inaction and lack of support for the Nicaraguan people and their legal government headed by President Somoza would condemn them to the same systematic totalitarianism which has denied the Cuban people their basic human rights for two decades.

The United States Government's silence and lack of support for its traditional ally, Nicaragua, has been interpreted by the Soviet and Cuban Communist leaders as American indifference toward the fate of the peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean. The result has been greatly increased terrorist activities in Central America and disturbing political developments in a number of Caribbean nations.

As the Nicaraguan revolutionaries have themselves pointed out, Nicaragua is the strategic keystone to Central America. If the United States takes no action to thwart encroachment by Soviet surrogates in Central America, we will shortly find that the Soviet Union will control an area bordering on two oceans stretching from Panama to the

vast oil reserves of Mexico. And at that point this nation will bitterly regret the day it lacked the resolve and forcefulness to take proper action in support of President Somoza.

Therefore we urge you to:

Stop the influx of weapons and logistical support to the Nicaraguan revolutionaries from Cuba and Panama;

Stop the use of Costa Rican territory as a staging area for Nicaraguan revolutionary terrorists; and

As a signal to the Free World that the United States continues to support its allies against Soviet-backed aggression, restore U.S. military aid programs to Nicaragua.

Sincerely,

John M. Murphy, Kent Hance, Clair W. Burgener, Charles Wilson, Bill Chappell, Chuck Grassley, Robert J. Lagomarsino, Ron Paul, Dan Marriott, Gerald B. H. Solomon, Philip M. Crane, Robert K. Dornan, Bill Nichols, David E. Satterfield, Larry P. McDonald, Bob Bauman, John Ashbrook, Richard Kelly, J. K. Robinson, L. H. Fountain, Jerry Lewis, G. V. Montgomery, Daniel B. Crane, Dan Daniel, William Dickinson, Richard Ichord, Hal Sawyer, John Paul Hammerschmidt, Eldon Rudd, Bob Stump, Carroll Hubbard, Gene Taylor, Don Young, Marjorie Holt, Jim Jeffries, Marvin Leath, Sam Devine, Mickey Edwards, James Collins, John Rousselot, Ed Derwinski, and Sam B. Hall.

Manuel Lujan, Richard Shelby, George Hansen, Earl Hutto, Bo Ginn, Donald Mitchell, Carroll Campbell, Bill Goodling, Robin Beard, Floyd Spence, Dan Quayle, Charles H. Wilson, Jim Martin, Carlos Moorhead, Larry Winn, Jr., James H. Quillen, James Abdnor, Gene Snyder, John J. Duncan, Sam Stratton, Tom Bevill, Benjamin Gilman, Steve Symms, Bob Walker, Paul S. Trible, Jr., William Carney, Richard T. Schulze, Robert W. Daniel, Jr., Keith G. Sebelius, Jim Sensenbrenner, John Breaux, John Myers, Dan Lungren, M. Caldwell Butler, Delbert Latta, Bud Shuster, William Whitehurst, Harold Runnels, Bill Young, Bob Livingston, Norman Shumway, Tennyson Guyer, George O'Brien, Tim Lee Carter, Billy Evans, Bob Badham, Bill Wampler, Newt Gingrich, Walter B. Jones, Barry Goldwater, Jr., Bob McEwen, Buddy Leach, William E. Dannemeyer, Thomas N. Kindness, Doug Barnard, Trent Lott, and Virginia Smith.

Marilyn L. Bouquard, Tom Hagedorn, Ron Mottl, Jack E. Edwards, Don Clausen, Ralph Regula, John Buchanan, Gary A. Lee, Tom Loeffler, Bud Shuster, Phil Gramm, W. G. Hefner, Mendel Davis, Jack Kemp, Edward R. Madigan, Ed Bethune, Joel Deckard, Toby Roth, Arian vice Alan Stangeland, Larry D. Hopkins, Mark Andrews, David F. Emery, Doug Bereuter, Clarence Miller, Wayne Grisham, and Joe Wyatt, Jr.

Some of our colleagues on the Senate side have also taken time from a busy schedule to join the House in this effort. The following letter expresses their concern about the course of American policy in the Caribbean:

WASHINGTON, D.C.
June 13, 1979.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We find it difficult to understand the attitude of this administration toward the deteriorating situation in Nicaragua.

That the armed invaders identify themselves as "Marxist-Leninists" and seek to im-

pose a Cuban-style regime in Nicaragua is beyond question. That the present government of Nicaragua has been unfailingly friendly and cooperative toward the United States is also beyond question.

Surely it cannot be considered in the national interest to acquiesce in the imposition of Communist dictatorships in Nicaragua and the neighboring states under similar intense pressure.

Yet we find that the attitude of our government is one of cold hostility toward our friends. Our government has, for example, worked for many months to obstruct normal financial transactions between the government of Nicaragua and the International Monetary Fund. Since this activity has no other effect than to weaken the Nicaraguan people, it amounts to an indirect support of the guerrillas.

Is this in fact the policy of our government? And if so why?

Sincerely,

GORDON HUMPHREY,
STROM THURMOND,
JESSE HELMS,
ORRIN G. HATCH,
ROGER W. JEPSEN. ●

THE CUP: A GOOD INVESTMENT

HON. DAN MARRIOTT

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. MARRIOTT. Mr. Speaker, not much water falls from the sky during the summer months in Utah. And it cannot be squeezed from the rocks. Fortunately, however, Utah receives a fairly significant snowfall in its mountains during the winter months. The melting runoff during the spring and summer provides the State with many streams and a few significant rivers. Since 1847, when the pioneers entered the area, Utahans have learned to capture and store that runoff water in dams and reservoirs. The Central Utah project is a continuation of Utah's ingenuity in maximizing the use of its precious but limited resources of water.

I. DESCRIPTION

The Central Utah Project (CUP) is a farsighted plan to construct: first, new dams; second, reservoirs; third, aqueducts; fourth, pumps; and fifth, tunnels—to distribute Colorado River Basin water from eastern Utah into the dry and arid Great Basin, where the majority of Utah's 1.1 million people reside along the front of the Wasatch Mountains.

To make planning easier, the Central Utah project is spoken of in terms of six separate units—each representing a series of construction projects in a specific geographic area within Utah. The units are: first, Bonneville unit; second, Jensen unit; third, Upalco unit; fourth, Vernal unit; fifth, Uintah unit; and sixth, Ute Indian unit.

The Bonneville unit is by far the major unit within the CUP project. It accounts for 83 percent of the total CUP funding. It will serve the major Salt Lake City urban area and other populated areas, as well as the Provo-Orem area. It involves the construction of 10 new reservoirs; 140 miles of aqueducts, tunnels, and canals; 9 pumping plants; 200 miles of pipe drains; and 3 new hydroelectric powerplants.

The Bonneville unit will deliver about 99,000 acre-feet of municipal and industrial water, and 207,500 acre-feet of irrigation water to the majority of Utah's population.

II. HISTORY

By act of Congress and subsequent signature of the President on April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 105), the Secretary of the Interior was authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and its subprojects, including the first four units of the Central Utah project: first, the Bonneville unit; second, the Jensen unit; third, the Upalco unit; and fourth, the Vernal unit.

A fifth unit, Uintah unit, was authorized in 1968. A sixth unit, Ute Indian unit, has actually not yet been authorized, but a feasibility study was approved in 1968.

III. FISCAL YEAR 1980 AUTHORIZATION

H.R. 4388, the energy and water appropriations bill, fiscal year 1980, provides funding for the Central Utah project as follows:

CUP unit and subproject	Appropriated amount	Purpose
(1) Bonneville:		
Strawberry collection system.....	\$16,232,000	(1)
Jordan Aqueduct (complete section 3 from 5800 South Street to 2100 South Street, Salt Lake City, and continue construction of section 4 from Utah County Treatment Plant to Point of the Mountain at the edge of Salt Lake County).....	13,322,000	(1)
Upper Stillwater Dam.....	6,320,000	(1)
Jordanville Reservoir.....	4,956,000	(1)
Duchesne Canal.....	1,297,000	(1)
Miscellaneous.....	2,337,000	(1)
Subtotal for Bonneville unit.....	44,466,000	
(2) Jensen.....	6,002,000	(1)
(3) Upalco.....	2,200,000	(1)
(4) Uintah.....	2,000,000	(1)
Total.....	54,666,000	

¹ Construction.
² Planning.

Thus H.R. 4388 calls for a total of \$54,666,000 for CUP units. An additional \$6,340,000 is provided for federally owned facilities related to recreation, fish and wildlife, and highways associated with CUP construction. That brings the total appropriation for CUP-related activities in H.R. 4388 to \$61,006,000.

IV. CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT VS. ALTERNATIVES

Opponents of the Central Utah project have said that it is unnecessary, considering what they call some other viable alternatives. They claim those alternatives are:

Use of ground water: Opponents of the Central Utah project, and specifically the Bonneville unit, have contended that an additional 74,000 acre-feet of ground water can be developed in Salt Lake County. But they are ignoring the environmental impacts demonstrated by a U.S. Geological Survey study. That study shows that only 150,000 acre-feet of high quality ground water can be taken from the aquifers of Salt Lake County without significant environmental impact. Current withdrawals from the aquifers in Salt Lake County have been as follows:

	Acre-feet
1973	128,000
1974	130,000
1975	125,000
1976	135,000

Adding 74,000 acre-feet to the figures for any one of the years listed above demonstrates a significant overwithdrawal beyond the 150,000 acre-feet recommended by the U.S. geological study. This analysis hardly leaves much room for enthusiasm concerning withdrawal of ground water related to project population growth.

The U.S. geological study shows that overwithdrawal would have the following adverse effects: First, depletion of the base flow of the Jordan River to the amount of 50,000 acre-feet per year; second, reduction in ground water supplies for wildlife areas to the amount of 40,000 acre-feet per year; third, reduction in present flowing wells to the amount of 15,000 acre-feet per year; and fourth, deterioration of the quality of water in existing wells due to increased mineral content inflow through reduced aquifer pressures.

Use of other surface water: Alternative surface water sources to service the urban areas (mainly Salt Lake County) along the Wasatch Front would be limited primarily to the Bear River. Only about 37,800 acre-feet of smaller streams in Salt Lake County are not presently used. But most of that 37,800 acre-feet is in the form of high spring flood flows and cannot be economically captured—and additionally should be left in the stream beds to recharge the underground water supplies.

The Bear River, through construction of transfer facilities, could produce about 100,000 acre-feet of water annually to the Wasatch Front. But transfer of such water would merely be a tradeoff for the transfer of water through the Bonneville unit of the Central Utah project. The two alternatives would accomplish the same thing with about the same difficulty and cost. At this point, development of the Bear River water is not feasible because of the time requirements to meet the expanding population—and the legal problems that would be related to ultimate clearance of the project. In effect, we would be starting over.

Desalting brackish water: This is no alternative because of the extreme cost. A desalting plant would be required to make the waters of the Bear, Weber, and Jordan Rivers as they enter the Great Salt Lake suitable for municipal use. Such a process would include the necessity of screening, flocculation, sedimentation, filtration, ozonation, carbon filtration, desalinization, and chlorination. The process would involve large uses of energy. The estimated cost would be \$300 per acre-foot. That is simply not competitive with the use of quality surface water or ground water.

V. BENEFITS DERIVED FROM THE CUP

1. IRRIGATION

The Bonneville unit will provide a full water supply for 29,400 new acres of irrigated lands. In addition, the Bonneville unit will supplement to the desired level 213,100 acres of present underirrigated lands.

Thirty-five hundred farm operators will receive irrigation water from the Bonneville unit. This represents a total farm population of about 14,000 people. The increased production of food will provide for an additional 51,000 off-farm people. Including those serving the farmers, some 163,000 people will benefit directly and indirectly from the irrigation made possible by the Bonneville unit.

The lands to be served by the Bonneville unit water are among the highest developed and most productive in Utah, but hold even greater potential if water needs are met. A large part of the Bonneville unit area has suffered from a shortage of irrigation water during the late months of the growing season. This has meant that only hay and grain could be raised, whereas sugar beets, canning crops, and fruit would be produced if there were sufficient water in the late growing season.

2. ELECTRICAL POWER GENERATION

The Bonneville unit will include the construction of the Diamond Fork power system. This system will be made up of the Syar, Sixth Water, and Dyne powerplants, with a total installed capacity of 133,500 kilowatts—estimated to generate an average of 320 million kilowatt hours of energy annually. The total installed generating capacity could be increased to 400,000 kilowatts or a total energy output of 630 million kilowatt hours annually. Considering pumping requirements for the Bonneville unit facilities, 118 million kilowatt hours of energy would be left over for sale on the commercial market. Studies show that sales of that generated power will result in an annual income of about \$31,500,000.

It should be added that this is clean hydropower. These three powerplants of the Bonneville unit will be a valuable asset in producing clean energy for Utah's expanding population.

3. MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL WATER

The Bonneville unit will deliver about 99,000 acre-feet of municipal and industrial water to the Wasatch Front. It will deliver 207,500 acre-feet of irrigation water to the Wasatch Front.

By the year 2000, population along the Wasatch Front will double to 1.2 million people. Utah water authorities tell us that even with the CUP, Utah's water needs will only be satisfied a little beyond the year 2000.

The new Jordanelle Reservoir will be a key part of the Bonneville unit. It will provide water for West Salt Lake Valley, where the greatest Salt Lake County growth is taking place.

But looking at Salt Lake City alone, and not looking beyond its borders into Salt Lake County, the city has approximately 130,000 acre-feet of available water in a normal year. It is estimated that the population served by the Salt Lake City Department of Water will reach 550,000 people by the year 2000. Assuming that the current water use pattern in Salt Lake City will continue (each person consumes 0.26 acre-feet per year), then Salt Lake City alone will use all of its annual average supply, including Deer Creek Reservoir water, by the year 2000. This leaves no water for expanding Salt Lake County—and it is

estimated that by the year 2000, nearly three-quarters of a million persons will reside in Salt Lake County outside the Salt Lake City borders.

4. ECONOMIC BENEFIT

Housing, industrial, and other construction for expanding Salt Lake County will be impossible without Bonneville unit water. Future jobs will depend upon the availability of water in Salt Lake County. The necessity of adequate supplies of water for municipal and industrial use speaks for itself. Where there is no water, there will be no economic expansion. The economic benefit to agriculture in the State of Utah will be impressive. A recent study made by the University of Nebraska measured the impact of irrigation water upon the economy of the State. Their findings showed that for each \$1 increase in crop production due to irrigation, a total of \$6.68 in new business activity was generated in nonagricultural areas of the State. Studies show that Bonneville unit water will increase gross crop output on irrigated lands to the level of \$26 per acre. Using the multiplier of \$6.68 for each \$1 increase, the per acre effect upon lands receiving Bonneville unit water would be \$175. With an estimated 242,500 acres receiving Bonneville unit water, the total influence upon the economy of the State would be about \$42 million dollars per year.

5. FLOOD CONTROL, FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE, AND RECREATION FACILITIES

Flood control is an important design factor in all of the CUP units. The advantages to municipalities as well as agricultural areas through these reclamation projects are proven fact.

In regard to fisheries, either stream inundation or stream depletion through construction of the CUP will result in an estimated loss of about 108,000 man-days of stream fishing per year. However, construction of reservoirs will provide about 234,000 man-days of fishing—this means a net gain of 126,000 man-days of fishing per year in the State.

In regard to recreation, these projects are much needed for the expanding Utah population. Present recreation facilities related to water skiing, boating, swimming, and reservoir fishing are becoming crowded and showing signs of overuse.

As to wildlife, construction of the Bonneville unit will cause unavoidable habitat losses as follows:

Mule deer: 4,400 acres of winter range and 13,000 acres of summer range;
Moose: 810 acres;
Beaver: 810 acres;
Sage grouse: 15,500 acres; and
Pheasant: 8,000 acres.

It should be noted, however, that loss of acreage for this wildlife is negligible when considered with the total of 3,200,000 acres of similar habitat available in the State of Utah to the same wildlife species.

6. FEDERAL REIMBURSEMENT

The Central Utah project is being built by the Bureau of Reclamation. Eighty-six percent of the total costs of building the Central Utah Project will be paid back to the Federal Government. The 14 percent that will not be paid back represents the costs of Federal highways, Fed-

eral fish and wildlife facilities, and Federal recreation facilities constructed on Federal lands related to the Central Utah project.

Eighty-six percent of the total cost of constructing the Central Utah project will be paid back to the Federal Government in the following manner:

CUP construction cost to deliver irrigation water	
	Percent
Sale of generated power.....	11
Ad valorem tax.....	11
Water user fees.....	78
Total	100
CUP construction cost to deliver municipal and industrial water	
	Percent
Ad valorem tax.....	34
Water user fees.....	66
Total	100

Studies of the cost-benefit ratio for the Central Utah project have shown that taking into account only direct benefits, the cost-benefit ratio for the CUP is 1.3 to 1. This means that each year the benefits exceed the costs by about one-third. Many businesses in Utah would be pleased to have an annual profit of 30 percent. This cost-benefit ratio is figured upon an interest rate of 3.125 percent.

Opponents of the Central Utah project have argued that the cost-benefit ratio must be figured with an interest rate of 6½ percent. Even using that figure, the cost-benefit ratio of the Central Utah project is still 1.09 to 1.00. This represents a profit margin of 9 percent.

VI. INFLATION AND ACCELERATION

Inflation has had a significant impact upon the cost of the Central Utah project. (Nevertheless, the cost-benefit ratio as discussed above was determined using the inflated costs of construction.) The impact of inflation has been as follows:

CUP unit	Original projected cost	Cost due to inflation	Funds expended thus far
Bonneville.....	\$325,000,000	\$902,606,000	\$197,206,60
Utah.....	44,000,000	108,768,000	2,238,221
Upalco.....	19,000,000	49,544,000	2,782,562
Jensen.....	11,000,000	40,299,000	22,569,494
Vernal.....	9,000,000	10,302,695	(¹)
Ute Indian.....	(²)	(²)	(²)

¹ Completed.

² Not yet authorized.

If construction were accelerated and the Central Utah project were completed in the next 8 to 9 years, rather than over the next 22 years, studies show that more than \$700 million would be saved from inflated construction costs.

Such a plan to nullify the effects of inflation would require that we appropriate \$100 million for the Bonneville unit (and proportionate sums for the other units) for each of the fiscal years 1981 through 1986. Our final 1987 funding level would then be about \$80 million—and the project would be complete—saving at least \$700 million in inflated construction costs.

CONCLUSION

Water is the lifeblood of Utah. Utah is an arid State. We have no alternative but to be farsighted and plan for our

future water needs—not only for present Utahans but for our children—and their children.

The Central Utah project has been studied, restudied, evaluated, reevaluated, and scrutinized by a multitude of experts—and found to be a good investment under any criteria.●

THE SPECIAL OLYMPICS: SPECIAL EFFORTS FOR VERY SPECIAL PEOPLE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the special Olympic games, to be held in mid-August in Brockport, N.Y., is an example of true athletic achievement on behalf of a very special cause.

Over 1 million gifted individuals have overcome serious physical handicaps to excel in areas demanding the ultimate in athletic performance. The courage and determination displayed by these athletes should serve as examples for all of us.

The overall success of this unparalleled event is attributed to the proficiency and tireless effort of Eunice Kennedy Shriver. Her unselfish devotion to less fortunate individuals has created a new dimension of self-esteem and pride for these athletes and their families. However, to have the opportunity to be a member of the Eunice Kennedy Shriver team, these competitors should hardly be considered less fortunate.

I would like to share with you an article which appeared in the May 23, 1979 issue of the Washington Post. This article by Colman McCarthy commends the accomplishments not only of the mentally retarded children and adults who compete in the special Olympic games, but also the coordinators and volunteers behind the scenes.

I have participated in the western New York special Olympics effort in the past, and as the father of four children I want to say how proud I am of the tremendous competitive nature of all children when given the opportunity. All of us should do more to enhance this aspect of young American lives.

The article follows:

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 exposé 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. ●

OIL FROM COAL—IN A HURRY

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD an editorial from today's Washington Post entitled "Oil From Coal—in a Hurry."

It is imperative that we seek alternative sources of making oil and gas available in order to combat the latest surge in oil prices and to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. I welcome the Post editorial and submit it for printing in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

OIL FROM COAL—IN A HURRY

With the latest surge in oil prices, the case for a large-scale effort to make oil and gas out of coal has become overwhelming. Nobody knows exactly what it would cost to make gasoline from coal. But the country needs to find out—and quickly. It's obvious that the only real limit on the price of oil is the cost of substitute fuels. The only plausible substitute is synthetic oil manufactured from coal.

The country's most readily available defenses against steadily rising oil prices are conservation, of course, and solar energy. But it is evident that they cannot reduce the need for oil fast enough to avoid the need for synthetics. That will be true even if all of the oil-exporting nations continue their present production. But the Iranian revolution is a warning not to count on stability, peace and harmony in the Persian Gulf.

The technology is already available to make oil and gas from coal. One argument against proceeding with it is the cost. The plants would be extremely expensive. The Carter administration is reluctant to speed up federal spending at a time when it's trying to balance the budget. Private industry thinks that the risks are too great. But past experience with joint public-private enterprises suggests many possible solutions. The most promising would require private investment, with federal price guarantees.

As for the environmental dangers, they are real but no greater than those incurred by any large mining or industrial operation. These plans would contribute to public health protection by removing from coal the pollutants that make its smoke toxic.

The Carter administration has several coal-oil and coal-gas projects in one stage or another of development. It is now imperative to force the pace, make decisions and greatly expand the plans for construction. Even with the greatest pressure for speed, it takes four or five years to move a plant from blueprint into operation.

The risks in the present slow progress are not entirely economic. The indecision at the White House on energy policy, and the incessant wrangling with Congress, are fueling the presidential campaigns of candidates who promise the opposite extreme—the most dramatic of whom is John B. Connally. It is easy to imagine the possibility next winter of a severe recession caused by high oil prices, plus continuing lines at the filling stations,

plus more quarreling and uncertainty over energy policy, all adding up to victories for Mr. Connally in one party's primaries and defeats for Mr. Carter in the other's.

What are Mr. Carter and his administration to do? They are going to have to respond, and show that they are responding, to a deepening oil shortage. One endeavor on which they can embark immediately, visibly and most usefully, is to demonstrate the promise of coal technology. ●

FREE LITHUANIANS IN A SUBJUGATED FATHERLAND

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 38th anniversary of an event which surely is one of the most tragic occurrences in modern history.

On June 15, 1940, the Soviet Communists forcibly invaded Lithuania and subsequently deported more than 300,000 Lithuanians to Siberia. To this day, the people of Lithuania have been denied the basic freedoms that we in America so often take for granted.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all my colleagues pause for a moment to reflect on the following statement, which is translated from an underground Lithuanian newspaper.

THE FREE LITHUANIANS IN A SUBJUGATED FATHERLAND

(This article is taken from the underground paper "Ausrele" (Young Dawn) circulated in occupied Lithuania on February 16, 1978.)

It is not a new paradox in our controversial and peculiar world, where quarrels, litigations and murders occur for the most negligible causes, that the fight for the most important human values: freedom, integrity and well-being is avoided?

However, this should not be considered as a paradox. Free people exist not only in the free world, protected by democratic constitutions, but also in countries where any desire for freedom is squelched with bullets, jails, psychiatric hospitals. A slave is only he who accepts his servitude, who does not feel the chains which bind him. A man who is afraid is already defeated. He easily succumbs to the economic and political exploitation of the enslaver. Self-respecting man has to overcome innate fear, to rise above natural inclinations, to prove that there are aspirations which are more valuable than life itself.

Free is everyone who resists the efforts of the enslaver to make him godless, to dehumanize, to denationalize him. This rule can also be applied to entire nations. Every nation which struggles against the oppressor is free, notwithstanding the fact that its territory may be occupied. Such a nation even though it has lost its external freedom, has preserved its internal, spiritual independence. The history of the Lithuanian nation during the last decades (not speaking about the entire period from the loss of its independence) has proven this very convincingly.

After the rebellion of 1863 which was cruelly crushed, for several decades there was no active resistance in Lithuania. However, underground newspapers "Aušra" (The Dawn), "Varpas" (The Bell) came to being

announcing the spiritual rebirth of the Lithuanian nation. The 1944 rebellion, which lasted for 10 years, was even more ruthlessly suppressed. It seemed as if it would be necessary to wait a few more decades until new resistance forces matured.

However, before the guns of the freedom fighters were silenced, on All Souls Day, 1956, in the cemetery of Kaunas, the tricolor flag of free Lithuania was raised. Students, intelligentsia, former prisoners who had returned from concentration camps in the Soviet Union, with tears in their eyes sang the Lithuanian national anthem and the religious hymn, "Mary, Mary lighten our servitude . . ." The crowd repeatedly shouted, "Freedom for Lithuania!", "Begone Russian intruders!"

Stones were hurled at the members of the NKGB. In Vilnius, that same evening, masses of young people poured out of the Rasos cemetery singing patriotic songs. They flooded the streets and stopped traffic for several hours.

After that demonstration hundreds of young people, students and former prisoners, were taken in steel-barred trains to the same concentration camps where more than one thousand Lithuanian freedom fighters, underground resisters, were still being tortured. Great numbers of young Lithuanians were drafted into the Soviet army.

In the autumn of 1970, Pranas and Algirdas Brazinskas, father and son, escaped to the West, informing the entire world about the desire for freedom burning in the hearts of Lithuanians. One month later, Simas Kudirka who was turned over to the Soviets, beaten, reminded the Western world about the indifference of the westerners to their self-asserted moral ideals.

In March, 1972, "The Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania" began to inform the world about the persecution of believers and their priests in Lithuania. On May 14th of that same year, in the garden of the Drama Theatre in Kaunas, where 32 years earlier a disgusting mockery of the independence of Lithuania and the free state system had been perpetrated, the self-immolation of Romas Kalanta (who died shouting "Freedom for Lithuania") took place. His body perished but his spirit remains alive forever in the hearts of the nation, continuously rapping at our conscience and fostering the desire for freedom.

Romas Kalanta, born in slavery, became free. His sacrifice dispelled the myth of the oppressors that the younger generation, continually brainwashed by a stream of beautiful words and promises, will obey their coercion and will melt into the flood of colonization, forgetting the spirit of the Lithuanian nation. Today the younger generation has already taken up the banner of the fight for freedom. Although born in slavery, they have inherited the yearning for freedom from their parents.

Thirty-seven years ago as a result of a secret pact between brutal dictators, Lithuania lost its independence. For a paltry sum the red Eastern feudal lord bought Lithuania from the Western plunderer. The Lithuanian nation, left to its fate by the democratic nations, did not bow its head. The Eastern tyrant required several years to achieve physical conquest, but he will never achieve spiritual conquest!

Knowing that there is no struggle without sacrifice, we believe that no sacrifice, especially a sacrifice of blood and suffering will be in vain, but will encourage and obligate us to fight until, as the poet Maironis stated, "the painful chains will fall away and a bright new sky will dawn for our children."

Therefore, we, together with free Lithuanians are publishing "Lietuviu Kataliku

Baznycios Kronika" (Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania), "Ausra" (The Dawn), "Dievas ir Tėvyne" (God and Country), "Varpas" (The Bell), "Lietuvos Balsas" (The Voice of Lithuania) and other underground papers. We bid defiance to the only colonial empire left in the world (the Soviet Union), before whose military power almost the entire world trembles. We are once again appealing to the democracies of the non-communistic world, to those who declare the principles of freedom but who are deaf to the laments of the subjugated nations.

Let these pages speak out about the inextinguishable yearning for freedom, about the efforts of those people who under the most impossible conditions continue the traditions of the free Lithuanians.●

RETIREMENT OF PROF. KENNETH RAPER FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 17, the Departments of Bacteriology and Botany of the University of Wisconsin will honor Prof. and Mrs. Kenneth B. Raper on the occasion of his retirement. I am happy to join Professor and Mrs. Raper's academic colleagues; present and former undergraduate, graduate and postdoctoral students; and the residents of the State of Wisconsin in congratulating them. Dr. and Mrs. Raper have contributed substantially to the Madison, Wis. community through both academic and volunteer activities since they moved to Madison in 1953.

I commend Professor Raper's contributions to the advancement of scientific knowledge. Professor Raper has an international reputation for his pioneering taxonomic research and publications on the aspergilli, penicillia, and dictyostelia. At the University of Wisconsin, Professor Raper has developed a unique bridge between the botanical and microbiological sciences through his formal teaching and research endeavors. His continuing research on the cellular slime molds has demonstrated a simple, yet elegant tool for advancing our knowledge in developmental biology.

In Dr. Raper's research from 1929 through 1953 with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, he elucidated fascinating morphological and cultural characteristics and the intricate taxonomic relationships of many fungi, particularly the aspergilli and the penicillia. His basic research on the penicillia at the Northern Regional Research Laboratory contributed significantly to the national and international development of the antibiotic penicillin—cooperative efforts so crucial to saving lives during and after World War II. Dr. Raper is now working on a monograph, "The Biology of the Dictyostelids."

Mr. Speaker, I wish the Rapers the best in their third career in research at a more leisurely pace.●

MEMORIAL DAY CEREMONY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day of this year I had the pleasure of participating in the traditional ceremony in the town of East Williston, N.Y. The fine program was an inspiration to everyone present, and I would like to commend the efforts of the members of the East Williston Memorial Day Committee—Mayor Ronald G. McKay, Joseph P. Leary, and Nicholas S. Siciliano. Because of their careful planning, this ceremony was a huge success I offer the text of my address for the RECORD.

This is not the first time I've been with you on Memorial Day. It means a lot to me to be able to share this day with you when together we honor those who have given their lives in our country's wars, so that we may live in freedom. No greater love can we tender those who have given their lives for us than to preserve those ideals they died to protect. Throughout this nation, this week, Americans pause in remembrance of men and women who made the supreme sacrifice.

Let us pause, let our thoughts go back, far into our history, to those who fought in our initial war—the American Revolution. In our prayers today, let us remember them and the great gift of freedom they passed on to us. Sometimes, we take this gift for granted. All too often, we fail to appreciate the concept of democracy and its implementation until it is threatened. Then, unfailingly, this nation unites in a great cause—the cause of freedom.

Let us remember today the veterans of our Civil War, of World War I, of World War II, of the Korean War, and finally, those gallant boys who fought an unpopular war in Vietnam.

Again, today, this nation is threatened. It is threatened just as seriously as it was in the past. We are, in fact, a nation under attack. Today, however, it's an economic war whose results could be just as disastrous as any military attack. By the OPEC nations—the oil barons—you see the results every single day at gas lines throughout our country, and in dwindling paychecks caused by energy based inflation.

Well, it's time long since past that we respond to this attack. Those desert sands produce no food, no grain, no agricultural products. They and others need our food.

Six years ago a bushel of wheat cost about \$3.00 and a barrel of oil cost \$3.00. This month our wheat is still about \$3.00 but oil is \$17 to \$30 a barrel. I say, we should impose export taxes on our wheat sold to OPEC and others—our adversaries, Russia, China—just as we pay taxes on their oil. We should take this money and pass it on to you to reduce your increased costs of energy and the taxes now paid by us on gasoline.

Let's unite again in this cause—the cause of the survival of our nation. Let those nations of the world who threaten us be reminded there exists in this nation men and women who will still lay down their lives to preserve the ideal of America. Let us remember too our unknown dead whose bodies lie in hallowed ground with the simple marker "unknown".

Let us renew our pledges to our veterans who survived our wars, made to them by a grateful nation: Earned by them, by their

service, by their courage, by the years of their youth, and in many instances, by their blood.

It distresses me today as the only New York state member of the Veterans Affairs Committee, to tell you that serious attacks are being made on our veterans programs under the guise of "economy". Veterans preference is under attack in the guise of "equality". There are those who would emasculate our entire veterans programs—but not while I'm around.

I have no intention of making this a long speech, but on this Memorial Day, I want to solemnly reaffirm to you my recognition of our obligation—my dedication to our veterans is unabated, continuing now and will continue in the future.

In our Memorial Day ceremony, let us not forget our Missing in Action. The tragic war in Vietnam has left us the terrible doubts as to the fate of many American boys. I have the honor to chair the Viet Nam MIA Committee in the Congress. Last year we passed a resolution designating July 18, 1979 as National POW-MIA Recognition Day. The President issued the Proclamation mandated by the Resolution.

A few weeks ago, I discovered that no federal level ceremony was planned to commemorate the spirit of that proclamation. I wrote to the President asking him to lead a Commemorative Service on July 18 at the National Cathedral in Washington.

We must rededicate ourselves to the continuing effort to account for each and every prisoner of war and missing in action American. Until everyone is accounted for, I, as chairman of the Committee on Asian Affairs, will do everything in my power to block normal relations with Vietnam. I want to commend the village fathers, the clergy, our veteran organizations and each and every one of you who is participating in these ceremonies.

I want to thank you for letting me share in this Memorial Service. And to you young people, you are a credit to your family, to your church, to your school and your country. You are this nation's greatest asset. As you grow older, the honor will be yours to continue this ceremony.

I know you will do it well, so that the honored dead of our country will never be forgotten.

I would like to once again thank the town of East Williston for allowing me to participate in their moving program. I would like to take this opportunity to commend East Williston Mayor Ronald G. McKay, and village trustees Anthony J. Casella, Kenneth G. Adgate, Donald W. Smith, and Rita M. Doyle for their leadership in supporting this fine Memorial Day ceremony.●

MCDONALD HUGHES HONORED

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of Congress, I would like to take a moment to pay homage to McDonald Hughes, an educator from my hometown of Tuscaloosa, Ala., who was recently honored there by the dedication of a community center in his name.

Joining in the dedication of the "McDonald Hughes Community Center" were many local officials, including Mayor

Ernest "Rainy" Collins, director of the City Community Planning Department Al DuPont; Tuscaloosa County Park and Recreation Department chairman, Dr. William F. Clipson; and city commissioner Dave Adnes.

I would have also been there to pay tribute to my friend Mr. Hughes had I not had a previous commitment elsewhere in the Seventh District.

Mr. Hughes is a Wetumpka native who was principal at Druid High School for 32 years and was chairman of the committee that worked so tirelessly for so long to make the community center a reality.

Mr. Hughes has long been a leader in both the educational and community life of our center and it makes me proud to honor him today. ●

EDITORIAL SUPPORT FOR SYNTHETIC FUELS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post, in its lead editorial today, strongly supports the development of a domestic synthetic fuel industry as contemplated in my legislation H.R. 3930.

I welcome the support of the Post and I am very pleased to report that Secretary Schlesinger, speaking for the Carter administration, communicated his support yesterday for the legislation.

A "Dear Colleague" letter seeking ad-cosponsors of the synthetic fuel legislation has been sent to all House Members.

I wish to point out to my colleagues that this legislation, which already has been approved by the House Banking Committee by a vote of 39 to 1, need only be considered by one committee in the Senate before it can be sent to the President for his signature. This type of prompt, efficient consideration not only will be a strong sign of assurance to the American people but it will be a signal to the OPEC ministers, meeting later this month, that this Nation is determined to recover control of its energy destiny.

I urge all Members to consider adding their name to the growing list of cosponsors who view this bill as I do, that is, as the very important first step in assuring a steady supply of synthetic petroleum products to our Nation, supply that is not subject to the whim and fancy of a foreign oil cartel.

In addition the Posts very positive comments the Washington Star came out for the bill earlier this week, as did the Scripps-Howard chain, in an editorial appearing in the Pittsburgh Press.

I would like to put all three editorials into the Record at this time.

[From the Washington Post, June 15, 1979]

OIL FROM COAL—IN A HURRY

With the latest surge in oil prices, the case for a large-scale effort to make oil and gas out of coal has become overwhelming. No-

body knows exactly what it would cost to make gasoline from coal. But the country needs to find out—and quickly. It's obvious that the only real limit on the price of oil is the cost of substitute fuels. The only plausible substitute is synthetic oil manufactured from coal.

The country's most readily available defenses against steadily rising oil prices are conservation, of course, and solar energy. But it is evident that they cannot reduce the need for oil fast enough to avoid the need for synthetics. That will be true even if all of the oil-exporting nations continue their present production. But the Iranian revolution is a warning not to count on stability, peace and harmony in the Persian Gulf.

The technology is already available to make oil and gas from coal. One argument against proceeding with it is the cost. The plants would be extremely expensive. The Carter administration is reluctant to speed up federal spending at a time when it's trying to balance the budget. Private industry thinks that the risks are too great. But past experience with joint public-private enterprises suggests many possible solutions. The most promising would require private investment, with federal price guarantees.

As for the environmental dangers, they are real but not greater than those incurred by any large mining or industrial operation. These plants would contribute to public health protection by removing from coal the pollutants that make its smoke toxic.

The Carter administration has several coal-oil and coal-gas projects in one stage or another of development. It is now imperative to force the pace, make decisions and greatly expand the plans for construction. Even with the greatest pressure for speed, it takes four or five years to make a plant from blueprint into operation.

The risks in the present slow progress are not entirely economic. The indecision at the White House on energy policy, and the incessant wrangling with Congress, are fueling the presidential campaigns of candidates who promise the opposite extreme—the most dramatic of whom is John B. Connally. It is easy to imagine the possibility next winter of a severe recession caused by high oil prices, plus continuing lines at the filling stations, plus more quarreling and uncertainty over energy policy, all adding up to victories for Mr. Connally in one party's primaries and defeats for Mr. Carter in the other's.

What are Mr. Carter and his administration to do? They are going to have to respond, and show that they are responding, to a deepening oil shortage. One endeavor on which they can embark immediately, visibly and most usefully, is to demonstrate the promise of coal technology.

[From the Washington Star, June 13, 1979]

A SYNTHETIC SOLUTION?

Proposals for meeting the energy crisis are focusing on the idea of a massive national commitment to synthetic fuel production. This is not routine stuff. There are major bills along these lines, with important backing, in both chambers of Congress. After the endless months of inaction and quibbling over details of President Carter's energy program, the legislators are at last moving swiftly.

The House leadership is behind a package of measures to devote billions in federal guarantees and subsidies to spur the creation of plants to produce fuel from plentiful resources like coal. Because of high costs and the uncertainties of competition with petroleum, the government would assume risks in the effort. A market would be assured by a requirement that the Defense Department buy 500,000 barrels a day by 1984.

In the Senate, a bipartisan group led by Chairman Jackson of the Energy Committee is pushing a new energy development program aimed at reducing the need for energy imports by as much as 6.2 million barrels a day by 1990. (We now import about eight million barrels.) One section of the measure would authorize nearly \$5 billion for 15 synthetic fuel demonstration projects. The bill would force a speedup of Energy Department plans for promoting alternative energy sources, including solar and geothermal, power, coal gasification and waste conversion.

A well-publicized chorus outside the government is making the case for a crash program to produce synthetic fuels quickly and in huge quantities to end the stranglehold on the nation's economy by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries. These appeals evoke the successes of the Manhattan Project, the Apollo missions to the moon, and the World War II conversion to synthetic rubber when the Japanese seized almost all natural supplies. Though the development of alternative sources has been a regular part of the energy litany for years, mostly in viewing a distant and hazy future, the present talk is urgent, and responsible commentators are taking it seriously.

There are reasons for this. The reappearance of the gasoline queues has made everyone ponder the future more soberly. A half-hour wait at the pump is worth 100 presidential admonitions. The international petroleum supply seems ever more precarious, subject to the ayatollah's whim, the next Mideast flare-up and such blackmail as Nigeria's warning about U.S. Rhodesian policy. A bit of scarcity brings out the greediest instincts of the OPEC hawks—the cartel price is headed for the clouds.

OPEC pricing, though, is the best friend the synthetic-fuel drive could have. The expensive conversion processes gain in economic feasibility with each boost in the price of ordinary crude.

It is possible to be skeptical of the sudden upsurge in congressional interest. The congressmen collectively have shown little courage in the past in making hard decisions on energy. They as well as the administration are under fire now by a public worried about where the next gallon of gasoline or heating oil is coming from, and what it will cost. The Hill is under great pressure to act.

There are dangers, of course, in doing something on as large a scale as is now contemplated. A great deal of taxpayers' money could be wasted. The pork barrel will be passed around—so much for West Virginia, so much for Kentucky coal conversion projects. But the ultimate test is the extent to which the drive for synthetic fuels can free the nation from the debilitating dependence on foreign oil. At the moment it appears to be one of the brighter hopes in a dismal energy picture.

What's needed mostly is President Carter's leadership in this area. A House delegation led by Speaker O'Neill and Majority Leader Wright met with him on it last week, and found him sympathetic but non-committal. The administration's plans on synthetics and other alternative sources of energy are more modest and of longer range. The president is thinking about the budget impact, and proposals for energy cooperation at the upcoming Western economic summit in Tokyo.

The congressmen, though, have their eyes on the people in the gas queues. The plan to stress new production using American ingenuity has undeniable political appeal.

If Mr. Carter wishes to be the nation's leader in energy policy, he needs to take a fresh look at this aspect of the game.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, June 10, 1979]

RX: SYNTHETIC OIL

After Japan cut off America's supply of natural rubber in World War II, the U.S. government and private industry went into partnership to build synthetic-rubber plants. The first rubber flowed from factories 287 days after that decision was made.

During the Korean War, the government gave price guarantees to induce the building of new aluminum, copper and nickel facilities. It soon received the metals critically needed for the war effort.

In both cases the job got done—and at little real cost to the public.

The synthetic-rubber plants later were sold to private owners at fair market prices. The metals that the government stored to prop up prices eventually were resold for more than it had paid.

Contrast those two examples of meeting a challenge head on with the weak, confused, stumbling and ineffective way the Carter administration (as well as the previous one) has met the OPEC oil cartel's price gouging and its power to cripple our economy by shutting off our oil.

It can be argued that the first two examples came during wartime, when decisive action is possible, and now we are at peace.

But that argument doesn't hold water. Since 1973 the actions of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries on the pricing and supply fronts have verged on economic warfare, which can be as dangerous as most military threats.

Last year alone the United States had to pay out \$43 billion for imported oil. As OPEC members merrily play leapfrog with their prices, our financial hemorrhage this year is due to add up to \$65 billion—pushing the nation toward recession and even worse inflation.

How much will the gouge be next year? \$80 billion? \$100 billion?

Can we afford it?

No.

Are we doing anything effective to protect ourselves?

No.

While the White House appears paralyzed, some lawyers, historians, businessmen and congressmen have pointed to the best and surest way for our country to go—the massive development of synthetic oil from coal, shale, tar sands, heavy oils and farm crops.

Of all the methods, synthetic oil and gas from coal would be the fastest to bring on stream. We already have the technology, resources, manpower and money to start turning out coal-based synthetic plants. All we lack is leadership.

It has been suggested that the goal should be synthetic plants capable of producing the equivalent of five-million barrels of oil a day. The cost would be about \$100 billion, but the taxpayers themselves would pay far less.

Private industry cannot risk building such plants. They would be vulnerable to price cuts by OPEC, which could put the synthetic industry out of business.

However, with government loan guarantees and tax incentives, private capital could be raised for synthetic plants—and a new strategic industry developed at relatively little cost to the public.

We now import about eight billion barrels of crude a day, giving OPEC a stranglehold on America's economy and diplomacy.

If we increased our own oil production by five million barrels a day through synthetics, we could crack OPEC's pricing monopoly and regain control of our own destiny.

A bill to start a synthetic-oil industry has been introduced by Rep. William Moorhead of Pittsburgh, and it has been approved by the House Banking Committee by a vote of 39 to 1.

But it is stalled for lack of sufficient support from the White House. What appalling shortsightedness and timidity.

Let's get going! ●

ERA HONOR ROLL

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, on August 15, 1978, 233 of my House colleagues voted to extend the time limit for the ratification of the equal rights amendment (ERA)—219 of those colleagues were men. In honor of Father's Day, I would like to thank the 219 men who cast a "yea" vote in favor of the ERA time extension—a vote their daughters, mothers, and sisters will long remember. Now if we can get the 219 who are on the ERA honor roll to channel their energy into getting the ERA ratified in three more States, we will be in great shape.

These are the names of the men that voted for ERA:

Messrs. Addabbo, Akaka, Ambro, Ammerman, Anderson of California, Anderson of Illinois, Annunzio, Ashley, Aspin, AuCoin, Baldus, Baucus, Beard of Rhode Island, Bedell, Bellenson, Benjamin, Biaggi.

Messrs. Bingham, Blanchard, Blouin, Bolland, Bolling, Bonior, Bonker, Brademas, Brodhead, Broomfield, Brown of California, Buchanan, Burke of Massachusetts, John Burton, Phillip Burton, Byron.

Messrs. Carney, Carr, Carter, Cavanaugh, Don H. Clausen, Clay, Cohen, Conable, Conte, Conyers, Corman, Cornell, Cornwell, Cotter, Coughlin, D'Amours, Danielson, Delums, Dent, Derrick.

Messrs. Dicks, Diggs, Dodd, Downey, Drinan, Early, Edgar, Edwards of California, Ellberg, Emery, Ertel, Evans of Colorado, Evans of Indiana, Fary, Fascell, Findley, Fish, Fisher, Flood, Florio, Foley, Ford of Michigan, Ford of Tennessee, Forsythe, Fowler, Fraser, Frenzel, Gammage.

Messrs. Garcia, Gaydos, Gialmo, Gilman, Glickman, Gonzalez, Goodling, Green, Gudger, Hanley, Hannaford, Harkin, Harrington, Harris, Hawkins, Hefel, Hollenbeck, Howard, Hughes, Jacobs, Jeffords, Jenrette, Johnson of Colorado, Kastenmeier, Kildee.

Messrs. Kostmayer, Krebs, Krueger, Leach, Lederer, Leggett, Lehman, Levitas, Lloyd of California, Long of Louisiana, Lundine, McCloskey, McCormack, McFall, McKinney, Maguire, Markey, Marks, Mattox, Meeds, Metcalfe, Mikva, Milford, Miller of California, Mineta, Minish.

Messrs. Mitchell of Maryland, Moakley, Moffett, Mollohan, Moorhead of Pennsylvania, Moss, Murphy of Illinois, Murphy of New York, Murphy of Pennsylvania, Michael Myers, Natcher, Neal, Nix, Nolan, Nowak, Oberstar, Ottinger, Panetta, Patten, Patterson, Pattison, Pease, Pepper, Perkins, Pettis, Pressler, Preyer, Price, Pritchard, Pursell.

Messrs. Rahall, Rangel, Reuss, Richmond, Rinaldo, Rodino, Roe, Rogers, Roncalio, Rooney, Rose, Rosenthal, Rostenkowski, Roybal, Ruppe, Russo, Ryan, Sarasin, Sawyer, Scheuer.

Messrs. Seiberling, Sharp, Simon, Smith of Iowa, Solarz, Stark, Steers, Stockman, Stokes, Stratton, Studs, Thompson, Thornton, Traxler, Tsongas, Udall, Ullman.

Messrs. Vander Jagt, Vanik, Vento, Walgren, Waxman, Weaver, Weiss, Whalen,

White, Bob Wilson, C. H. Wilson, Wilson of Texas, Wirth, Wolff, Wright, Yates, Yatron, Young of Texas. ●

ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY BAND

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, when talking to my constituents about their visits to our Nation's Capital, many tell me how much they enjoyed the concerts given by the military bands on the steps of the Capitol. For many it is reminiscent of the summers long ago when community bands would perform at the local park on Sunday afternoons. Unfortunately, due to the development of alternative entertainment and recreational opportunities, the popularity of these concerts has declined and community bands nearly became extinct. This decline meant the loss of a unique American experience.

Recent years have witnessed a revival in this important segment of American culture and music. Americans are taking a renewed interest in their local community and the community band is making a resurgence. My district is fortunate enough to have such a band, the Roseville Community Band.

This group, composed of 70 members, aged 18 through 70, have spread the joy of music throughout the St. Paul-Minneapolis metropolitan area and the State. Under the direction of Robert Lancette, this band has performed in public concerts and in small ensembles in nursing homes and other shut-in facilities.

The music of the Roseville Community Band is the type of cultural achievement of which we should be most proud. This band has made a positive contribution to the people of Roseville and that community has responded to the band through their continued support. I applaud this successful band-community relationship and am certain that the band will provide Minnesotans with many more hours of listening pleasure.

Today the band is leaving for an international community band festival in Dublin. Soon the Roseville Community Band will be entertaining Dubliners with the stirring music of John Philip Sousa. I wish them a safe and successful journey. I am certain that their efforts will be warmly appreciated and that the Roseville Community Band will win many new supporters.

Mr. Chairman, the members of the Roseville Community Band have spent many long hours and have sacrificed much to make this band so successful. At this time, I would like to draw my colleagues attention to those dedicated members of the Roseville Community Band:

THE ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY TOUR BAND

Robert W. Lancette, Director.

Flutes: Alice Marks, Pat Lancaster, Ruth Rose, Janice Anthony, Gayle Lancette, Sue Gabel, and Sandy Zoerb.

Oboes: Horace Davis and Bob Pearson.
 Clarinets: Mary Leonard, Carol Rosdahl, Marian Milbridge, Leon Titus, Linda Rasmussen, Wallace Wells, Rita Potratz, Jim Poppe, Paul Husby, Bonnie Jamieson, Dale Hively, and Sam Harvey.

Bass clarinet: Marty Johnson.
 Alto clarinet: Laura Youngren.
 Alto saxophone: Darlene Rask, Jan Phinney, Neil Yaeger, and Jan Savelkoul.
 Tenor saxophone: Richard Leisen and Gerry Gulbranson.

Baritone saxophone: Kay Pearson and Jim Ruff.

Bassoon: Jim Foster.
 French horns: Sam Marks, Terry Scott, Helene Johnson, and Steve Nelson.

Trumpets: Ed Hemauer, Bob Jones, Marty Marentic, Sister Janis Haustein, Reynold Christensen, Polly Peterson, Carolyn Bayerkoller, Steve Youlan, Dan Lozinski, Don Becker, Ralph Searles, and Al Pesha.

Tubas: Dick Tedrow, Bob Sjolund, and Warren Mitchell.

Baritones: John Thorsell, David Hanson, Barry Bridges, Paul Warner, and Gloria Peterson.

Trombones: Larry Perry, Harlan Hohenstein, Tom Martin, Roger Lundberg, Phil Florine, and Ray Wirth.

Percussion: Carol Caunders, Carol Hansen, Carol Ann Zell, Connie Erickson, Glenn Schuler, Roxanne Grilz, and Joan Ashton.●

PETITION BY NERVE GAS TASK FORCE

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, an extremely important but oft-overlooked issue is the storage and disposal of our nerve gas and binary weapons stockpiles. I am taking the liberty of calling the attention of my colleagues to a petition to President Carter by the Nerve Gas Task Force in Oregon, calling for a Presidential unilateral ban on all forms of gas. This petition, which I endorse, follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Whereas gas weaponry is inimical to the continued evolution of a humane and civilized world and our country has ratified an International Protocol promising never to be the first to use poison gas in time of war, yet in thirteen depots, eleven in this country, one in West Germany and one on Johnston Island, we are storing many million pounds of deadly nerve and other gases whose sole purpose is genocide.

Many of these munitions have already deteriorated and some have leaked. Any movement for any purpose could inflict unspeakable harm.

Our NATO allies have destroyed their own stocks and refuse to store ours. Stockpiles of nerve and war gas increase international tension, thereby threatening our national security.

We urge you to declare a Presidential Unilateral Ban, prohibiting production, instruction, stockpiling, and use of all forms of gas, including the Binary Weapon, as was done with Germ Warfare in 1969, instituting steps for immediate detoxification and destruction on site, using methods monitored and approved by the Environmental Protection Agency; destruction should be witnessed and

continuously inspected by a verification team of United Nations origin.

I would hope my colleagues will join me in supporting the spirit of this resolution.●

GEORGE SHIRLEY HONORED

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

○ Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, I rise today to pay special tribute to my good friend and fellow Tuscaloosan, George S. Shirley.

Mr. Shirley, president of the First National Bank of Tuscaloosa, was elected last month President of the Alabama Bankers Association at the concluding session of that organization's 86th annual convention in Hilton Head, S.C.

The honor was richly deserved and continued the distinguished service Tuscaloosa residents and presidents of the First National have provided the Alabama bankers. Indeed, Mr. Shirley was the seventh Tuscaloosan so honored by his peers in the State organization.

Other ABA presidents from Tuscaloosa were:

Frank H. Fitts (1890), Frank Sims Moody (1895), Frank Maxwell Moody (1911), Gordon Palmer (1945), Frank McCorkle Moody (1967), and George A. LeMaistre (1971).

Mr. Shirley was the fifth chief executive officer of the First National Bank to become ABA president since the association was organized in 1890.

A native of Tuscaloosa and graduate of the University of Alabama, Shirley has been president of First National since 1970. He has been active in ABA affairs for a number of years and has served on various committees and as an officer since 1977.

He is also active in the American Bankers Association, currently serving as regional director and is a member of the board of the Birmingham Branch of the Federal Reserve Board of Atlanta.

Active in Tuscaloosa civic affairs, Shirley has served as president of the United Way, Junior Chamber of Commerce, Tuscaloosa Exchange Club, the Young Men's Christian Association of Metropolitan Tuscaloosa, and the Greater Tuscaloosa Chamber of Commerce.

He was named "Citizen of the Year" in Tuscaloosa in 1971.

The Alabama Bankers Association, which so honored Mr. Shirley, is the trade association of the State's banking industry and includes 312 of the State's 314 full-service commercial banks in its membership. The banks have combined assets of more than \$15 billion.

The 86th annual convention in Hilton Head was attended by 740 bankers and associates and I would like to take this opportunity to join them in honoring my good friend, George Shirley.●

STRUGGLE FOR BALTIC STATES' INDEPENDENCE

HON. MARTY RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the tragic anniversary of the forced incorporation of the independent States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union on June 14-15, 1940, and the deportation of 100,000 Baltic nationals to Siberia a year later. Americans commemorate this sad occasion not only to honor our many citizens of Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian descent, but also, as a reminder that our national endowment of liberty and independence should not be taken for granted.

Since 1940, the Soviet Union has not been content merely to exercise military and political control over the Baltic nations. Successive Soviet Governments have waged a ruthless campaign to deprive the people not only of their sovereignty, but also of their national, cultural, and religious identity. With the apparent aim of turning the Baltic people into minorities in their own countries, Soviet authorities deported hundreds of thousands of Baltic nationals between 1941 and 1949. At the same time, they colonized the Baltic homelands with Russians. Today, even after the Helsinki and Belgrade conferences, show trials and harsh sentences are used to intimidate and silence the widespread nationalistic and religious movements in those Baltic nations.

Although officially the church in Lithuania has been separated from the state, the authorities indulge in wholesale interference in church affairs. The government declared in a 1976 decree that it seeks to "paralyze completely" religious activity. An effort is underway to take over the finances of the church, religious press is forbidden, and over 600 Lithuanian priests have served time in the Soviet Union's prisons and camps.

The Soviet Union, however, has not been successful, nor will it ever be, in extinguishing the desire for freedom among the Lithuanian people. Despite Soviet efforts, approximately 70 to 75 percent of the population—90 percent in the countryside—still believe in the Catholic Church. Certainly, Pope John Paul's recent visit to Poland has shown has strong the religious sentiment can remain under the repressive Soviet regime. The power of an idea—like faith or freedom—is always greater than repressive force.

I ask my fellow colleagues and Americans today to reaffirm their support of the Baltic nations' right to self-determination as independent national entities, and to call upon the Soviet Union to abide by the terms of the Helsinki Accord of 1975. I would like to cite a short passage from the final act of that agreement:

The participating states will respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, without distinction as to race, sex, or religion.

The struggle for Lithuanian independence goes on, and will continue as long as the Soviet Union continues to deprive Lithuanians of their fundamental human rights as guaranteed in the Helsinki Accord. Let us proclaim again our support of the Lithuanian people in their struggle for the very freedoms we enjoy in the United States. Only in this way can we remain true to our American political ideals.●

IMPACT OF NAZI HOLOCAUST BROUGHT TO TORRANCE YOUTH

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it seems hard to believe that mankind could ever forget the terrible holocaust that marked the brief rise of the Nazis to power in the 1930's and 1940's. I have long maintained that if anything positive could ever grow out of those terrible years, it was simply that we would be spared from having to live through anything remotely similar ever again.

The presupposition was that we would learn from experience, and that those events would somehow be branded into the subconscious of our species, just as concentration camp numbers were tattooed into the flesh of their inhabitants; indelibly and never to be removed.

But today we are seeing the growth of an entire generation that is unfamiliar, or entirely unknowing of those catastrophic horrors. How this can be, I do not really know. I only know that we must not let it be.

The Simon Wiesenthal Center for Holocaust Studies opened its doors recently in Los Angeles. One of its aims is to make sure that mankind will have learned something from the brutal deaths of 11 million of its people. To make any sense of their deaths, we must know, we must, be certain, that others will not die similarly in the future. The Wiesenthal Center wants to assure us of this, and so has prepared a program that is brought to area schools to show our young people what can happen when men and women stray from the basic humanity that should be the ruling force in our lives.

Rabbi Cooper and all the people at the Wiesenthal Center are to be commended for their work on this needed program.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD an article that appeared in the Los Angeles Jewish Community Bulletin, so that our colleagues might learn more about the program.

The article follows:

IMPACT OF NAZI HOLOCAUST BROUGHT TO TORRANCE YOUTH

Some of the 16- and 17-year-old students let out a sigh of relief. Some murmured to each other. Some continued to stare at the blank screen after the auditorium lights went on.

"I can't believe such a horrible thing happened," remarked a girl from Torrance High School to her classmate, wiping away the tears from her face. "I mean, I've heard that a lot of people were murdered by the Nazis, including a lot of Jewish people—but not like this! So many, so horrible... those scenes in that film... that part where skeletons are being thrown into a pit. Those were human beings!" Another student, with a trace of a southern California Chicano accent, mentioned to his friend, "How come we never heard anything about this in classes? Don't our teachers know about it?" At Torrance's North High, a 14- or 15-year-old Japanese-American girl whispered to another, "I wonder if my mom and dad (who were sent to 'relocation' camps in California) faced any of that." "Let's go up afterward and talk to the lady," responded the friend referring to the concentration-camp survivor who spoke following the film showing.

The response of these young people was to the 1½ hour presentation of the award-winning, 30-minute, classic French documentary film, *Night and Fog* as part of a program on the Holocaust at three Torrance High Schools by Rabbi Abraham Cooper of the Simon Wiesenthal Center for Holocaust Studies. Rabbi Cooper was accompanied by a concentration camp survivor.

"I've brought this presentation to many high schools in the Los Angeles area," Rabbi Cooper said, "some public, some Catholic, but mostly in non-Jewish communities. The impact is always strong."

All three programs were after school and voluntary and were brought to them in their own language so they feel it, he continued. They must know, too, that "it didn't just happen to Jews. Eleven million were killed—five million were not Jewish."

Rabbi Cooper was able to bring home to the students the essence of the Holocaust on a meaningful, personalized level they could relate to. He drew parallels between the "boat people" being refused by countries in Asia and drowning by the hundreds, and Jewish refugees being turned away by the Allies. He talked about the Japanese relocation camps, racist attacks on blacks, etc., and that of the eleven million murdered by the Nazis, five million were not Jews.

When Rabbi Cooper introduced Mrs. Bass, a survivor, "She lived through that?" gasped one young girl in the back of the room. The questions came, one after the other. They held her 30 minutes after the program. They want to know more. For most of them, anything was more than they had known before.

"There's hardly a line in our kids' history books about the genocide of six million Jews," noted Judy Gralnik, chairwoman of the School's Committee, a subcommittee of the Community Relations Committee and Southern Area Council. "Are the teachers saying anything about this? Are they discussing the moral questions raised by the Holocaust? Are they drawing parallels to the massacres in Cambodia and Uganda, where the world looked the other way, again, as it did like 35 years ago?"

"It was a cooperative enterprise," said Southern Area CRC director Jerry Friedman-Habush. "The Wiesenthal Center did the program and the CRC's Torrance Schools Committee set it up with the schools, convinced them it was educationally sound and

that it raised vital moral issues for the students."

Friedman-Habush and Southern Area CRC Chairman Irwin Levin—both former teachers themselves—helped the schools with curriculum suggestions for the teachers. The Committee has offered to arrange tours of the Martyrs' Memorial exhibit at 6505 Wilshire or the Wiesenthal Center's new Holocaust exhibit at their Yeshiva University facility.●

REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL INTRO- DUCES ENERGY SUPPLY BILLS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced two comprehensive energy supply bills to deal with matters of synthetic fuels acceleration and coordination of licenses, and so forth, for energy projects, the development of a gasohol industry in the United States, proposals providing for wheeling of electric power for conservation and other purposes, proposals for solar information and wind energy programs, as well as a number of other proposals. These bills are essentially the same package of provisions that Senator Jackson and other Senators introduced this week to improve energy supplies. I have added to the package provisions concerning synthetic fuels which is identical to H.R. 4474 which I introduced yesterday. I have made a number of technical changes in the proposals to raise additional issues and to eliminate provisions that I have concern about. There are other such provisions that I question but I have not tried to correct them at this time.

I introduce these bills in order to begin a dialog in the House aimed at developing a comprehensive energy supply package for enactment in this Congress. I do not necessarily support all of the proposals or even some of the provisions in the proposals I tend to favor. I introduced them only to get them before the House. I commend Senator Jackson for taking the time and effort to get together this package.

I specifically excluded from this package proposals for fuel switching from petroleum to natural gas or coal. Congress enacted in 1978 the coal conversion legislation as part of the National Energy Act. The whole objective of that legislation is to encourage and require in some cases the switching of oil and natural gas to coal. I cannot now endorse the switching of oil to natural gas, particularly when the proposal would appear to amend, indirectly at least, a number of provisions of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 and the Natural Gas Act. Those amendments would be quite contrary to the policy adopted by the Congress last year. It would also amend the Coal Conversion Act of last year and the Clean Air Act in such a way as would be objectionable to me and I am sure to many of my col-

leagues on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee who labored many days to develop this legislation.

I have already announced hearings on the synthetic fuels portions of the package which is quite similar to the purchase authority proposed by my distinguished colleague, Congressman Moorhead of Pennsylvania who deserves great credit for his imaginative approach to developing this industry. These hearings which will complement his effort will be on June 22 and 25, 1979. I plan additional hearings on the other features of the bill later. I might add that I have divided the package in recognition of the jurisdictional claims of other committees and because I believe it would be too unwieldy to consider all of the proposals as one legislative package. Again, I want to commend Senator JACKSON for his leadership in introducing these bills. While I do not necessarily support them all, I believe they should be before the House for consideration in the forthcoming weeks and months.

A REMEDY FOR SEVERANCE PAY

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was very disturbed to recently discover that severance pay is not available to enlisted members of our Armed Forces, but only to officers, and I am introducing legislation to remedy this situation.

Unlike civil service employees, members of the U.S. Armed Forces are not vested in a retirement system until completion of 20 years of active duty, and we all know that the majority of those who serve in the military do not remain in long enough to become vested. In fact, the statistics show that only 11 percent of the enlisted men and 29 percent of the officers stay until retirement.

The obvious inequity of treatment between the enlisted man and the officer in regards to severance pay is quite disturbing. For example, regular Navy ensigns and Marine Corps second lieutenants who are in the O-1 pay grade failing promotion to the next higher grade because of a lack of professional qualifications are entitled to severance pay. Their service at the time would be no more than 3 years. On the other hand, enlisted members may be promoted to as high a grade as E-9, having 5, 10, 15 or even 19 years of active duty and not be entitled to any remuneration if discharged for any reason.

Severance pay is generally given to all employees in many lines of work when they are involuntarily terminated from their jobs. This severance pay is provided to the employee as compensation for their past service to the employer as well as to ease the burden of their finding new employment and the disruption this termination has in their life and that of their family. Yet in our Armed Forces we do not offer this compensation to those enlisted personnel who have served the

Government, many almost long enough to qualify for retirement.

Mr. Speaker, this is inequitable and unfair and Congress should take immediate action to remedy this situation. The 1978 GAO report on severance pay programs in the Federal Government argues for severance pay for enlisted personnel. The report states—

Military nondisability severance pay is available only to officers, not to enlisted members.

Enlisted members are rarely separated involuntarily. However, since they are subject to such separation it would seem appropriate to provide them with the same benefits accorded officers separated for the same reasons.

The GAO study is not the only one to support severance pay for enlisted personnel. The President's Commission on Military Compensation reported that severance pay should be extended to enlisted personnel, as well as the 1976 report from the Defense Manpower Commission.

We currently have a situation where a civil service employee whose position was abolished after 12 years of service would receive severance pay, but an enlisted man serving the same length of time and denied reenlistment would not be eligible for any type of special payment.

Not only do we have reports that indicate the system is not fair and should be changed, but a number of prominent people are urging that the system be amended. Among those are U.S. Army Chief of Staff, General Bernard W. Rogers and Air Force Secretary Stetson both support severance pay for enlisted personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that everyone who reviews this situation would agree that it is unfair and inequitable and that we are treating enlisted military personnel unjustly. On the one hand the Department of Defense supports severance pay for its many civilian employees as well as its indirect hire and associated foreign national employees plus its uniformed commissioned officers, but denies this pay to those enlisted.

I urge my colleagues to support my efforts and I would hope that immediate action could be taken to resolve this injustice.●

THE 38TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INVASION

HON. CHARLES F. DOUGHERTY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, beginning on June 14, 1941, Soviet authorities began the deportation of over 45,000 Lithuanians to Siberia in the face of a massive invasion by Nazi forces.

This action was not intended as a humanitarian act. Of those 45,000 persons, 5,000 were executed. This week marks the 38th anniversary of that tragic event in which thousands of others died in Siberia or became separated from their families.

The Lithuanian people have a long history of rebellion against both Czarist and Soviet attempts to subjugate and denationalize them. Today, Lithuanians desire their independence, cultural, and human rights. I support them in their desires and call for the withdrawal of all Soviet occupation forces in Lithuania.

I hope that their aspirations for freedom will soon be realized.●

THE ADMINISTRATION'S SUPERFUND: NEEDS IMPROVEMENT BUT A POSITIVE STEP FORWARD

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, I introduced in the House of Representatives two bills, the Toxic Waste and Tort Act and the Hazardous Materials and Compensation Act. Both of these bills attempt to provide a national comprehensive policy and program to protect the public and the environment from the deleterious effects of improper disposal of hazardous wastes.

On Wednesday, June 13, the Carter administration unveiled its version of a comprehensive policy for dealing with the hazardous waste disposal problems. Although the administration's bill and mine have many similarities such as a "superfund" funding mechanism there are differences between the administration's proposal and mine.

Two basic differences entail the composition and the "superfund" and the types of assistance to be offered under the superfund. My bills offer a financing mechanism which include a fee system based on volume and the toxicity of hazardous wastes to be disposed as well as fees to be imposed on the production of oil and natural gas—two materials which serve as the feedstocks of most hazardous wastes. The administration bases its fees on the amount of oil and gas produced as well as the amount of these two materials used as feedstock for the production of chemicals.

This difference between our bills I believe to be negotiable. However, one item which I do not believe to be negotiable is the compensation of innocent victims—such as the residents of the Love Canal area in my congressional district—for personal injury due to exposure to toxic wastes. The administration's bill provides no program of this sort.

I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of an editorial from today's Buffalo Evening News which I want to share with my colleagues. The tragedy which has occurred in Niagara Falls as a result of indiscriminate dumping of hazardous waste is not only environmental in nature. People have suffered ill health effects and it was for this reason that the Commissioner of Health for the State of New York issued his order last August which led to the President's declaring the area an emergency. It is the human horror story which has caused the Federal Government to act and put forth its superfund bill. To not include compensa-

tion for victims for personal injury is irresponsible.

I laud the administration's efforts to come up with a comprehensive bill. However, as the editorial states, it does not go far enough. Congress will be holding hearings on this bill in the weeks and months ahead. I hope that my colleagues will actively participate in the debate, give this bill their full consideration, and work with me and the administration to come up with the best possible program to prevent future Love Canals and its effects on the public's health and welfare from ever occurring again.

The editorial follows:

STRENGTHEN WASTE-AID FUND

The "superfund" proposed by President Carter for preventing future Love Canals represents an important step in reducing the risks of toxic waste deposits to public health and the environment.

It is disappointing, however, that in significant respects it falls substantially short of the comprehensive approach needed in dealing with the threat from the nation's many abandoned waste sites. The task of correcting the defects in the administration's bill now falls to Congress.

Under the White House plan, a \$1.6 billion fund would be accumulated over four years, in part from fees levied on oil and raw materials used to produce hazardous chemicals. These would provide 80 percent of the fund, with the remainder contributed by the federal and state governments.

In principle, the fund would provide the means for prompt emergency assistance in cleaning up oil spills and poisonous waste eruptions. Key provisions would strengthen federal standards for the handling of hazardous substances.

Although the financing mechanism and pollution restrictions are good as far as they go, they fail to provide adequate funds for either the victims of hazardous waste losses or for costly remedial cleanup of existing or further abandoned waste sites.

Thus it is ironic that the president cites Love Canal as an example of the need for a huge cleanup effort, since the legislation would provide neither retroactive reimbursement for state remedial costs incurred at Love Canal before the bill became law nor compensation for the victims of hazardous waste exposure.

Once enacted, the measure would ensure some federal emergency assistance for further drainage work that might be required at Love Canal beyond the limited federal aid now authorized for remedial expenses incurred by the state. But neither Love Canal nor any other abandoned dump site would be eligible for more than \$300,000 for emergency cleanup. This is a grossly inadequate amount, in contrast with the cost of the Love Canal cleanup operations.

A fundamental defect in the administration's package is its omission of any provision for compensating individuals for personal injuries and economic damages. The approach provided in the Toxic Waste and Tort Act, co-sponsored by Rep. John J. LaFalce and Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, is clearly superior in this respect. It would help innocent victims of toxic exposure to cope with the present legal hurdles in proving liabilities and establishing damages.

Moreover, the LaFalce-Moynihan financing mechanism offers a sounder allocation of fees; these would be levied, not on the overall production of oil or chemicals, but rather on the volume and toxicity of waste deposits as an effective incentive for conservation safeguards.

Despite these shortcomings, the government has taken a welcome initiative. While this is a complex area that will need careful legal defining to ensure effective solutions

for waste hazards, any prolonged delay by Congress in giving these effect would risk foot-dragging by states or localities ineligible for recovery of emergency outlays made before the bill becomes a law. ●

FARMERS, ALCOHOL AND ENERGY SELF-SUFFICIENCY

HON. RICHARD NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to alert my colleagues to an article appearing in the Wall Street Journal which demonstrates how small, decentralized energy systems can facilitate energy self-sufficiency on the farm.

The article concerns a Minnesota farmer, Alan Zeithamer who, through ingenuity and hard work, has built an alcohol still on his farm which converts corn to alcohol. The alcohol is mixed with gasoline and provides Mr. Zeithamer with all his fuel requirements and leaves him with some corn as feed.

Clearly, the time has come to re-evaluate our historic reliance on huge energy production and transportation systems and focus on systems which are less expensive, more reliable, and which utilize renewable energy sources.

Once again our family farm system is a leader in providing solutions to the difficult problems our Nation faces. I commend this article to my colleagues.

The article follows:

SOME FARMERS FIND NEW SOURCE OF FUEL TO PLANT THEIR CORN (By Lawrence Rout)

ALEXANDRIA, MINN.—Alan Zeithamer has a backyard still, but he isn't your typical country moonshiner.

You won't hear him touting the mind-numbing qualities of his 160-proof spirits. What gets fired up on Mr. Zeithamer's alcohol is his tractor, along with his combine, trucks and other farm vehicles. And next winter the alcohol distilled from corn he and his father, Archie, grow on their farm, will be warming Mr. Zeithamer's home.

"We want to be completely energy self-sufficient," the 25-year-old farmer explains, "and not have to rely on OPEC, oil companies or anybody else."

Mr. Zeithamer's still has created a stir in farm country. He has been besieged by thousands of visits and countless calls and letters from people who also want to know how to grow their own energy. So many, in fact, that he has begun charging \$100 a visit to hold down the traffic.

But he may not remain an anomaly for long. The current shortage of diesel fuel and uncertainty over future prices and supplies are worrying farmers all across the plains states. So far this year the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms has given out some 800 permits for alcohol-fuel plants, mostly to individual farmers. Last year it issued 18.

MIXING IT UP

Farmers, of course, aren't the only ones interested in alcohol fuels. Gasohol, a mixture of 90% gasoline and 10% ethyl alcohol, has been getting a lot of attention lately. The federal government has waived the four-cent-a-gallon federal excise tax on the blend, and motorists are filling up with it in a dozen states. "It's highly accepted in urban areas as well as among the farm population," says Mary Holz-Clause of the Iowa Development Commission.

But farmers are less interested in buying gasohol than in making fuel at home. "Farmers just have to have some control over their own fuel supply," says William Scheller, professor of chemical engineering at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln. "When you need the fuel in farming, it has to be there. If it comes two weeks later, it may be too late."

Mr. Zeithamer feels the same way, so two years ago he decided he needed a still. It had to be larger than the typical bootlegger's version, but smaller than industrial models. It also had to be cheap and, therefore, homemade.

His initial efforts were discouraging. "We went to the university people and the industry people, and they all said it couldn't be done," he recalls. But after spending weeks with an old Alabama bootlegger and poring over books in the Library of Congress in Washington, Mr. Zeithamer began putting his still together in a barn.

TANKS AND PIPES

The contraption doesn't give the impression of being a technological marvel. In the middle of the barn, which is littered with old tires, hoses and shovels, stands a black, 4,000-gallon cooker. Corn, water and enzymes are mixed here and heated by a furnace that burns wood and cornstalks. Three smaller tanks surround the cooker, with a cinder-block chimney and a steel distilling column rising 22 feet in back of it. Besides a few valves, gauges and electric pumps, that's about all there is to it.

So far, Mr. Zeithamer has been mixing the alcohol he produces with gasoline or diesel fuel. But when he gets the still up to its capacity of 750 gallons a week this fall, he plans to burn the alcohol straight in farm machines, after making a few engine adjustments. "Alcohol burns more efficiently than gasoline or diesel fuel; it burns cleaner and cooler," he says.

In addition, burning straight alcohol eliminates the need to redistill it several times to remove the last of the water, as is necessary if the alcohol is to be blended with gasoline.

What is left of the corn put through the still is a high-protein, nonalcoholic slush known as distiller's grain. Mr. Zeithamer's 100 head of cattle gobble it up. "A lot of that corn was going to feed the cattle anyway," he says. "Now we can get an extra use out of it."

Mr. Zeithamer says he gets about 2½ gallons of alcohol from a bushel of corn and also distills some potatoes. Considering that he has no transportation costs and can use what is left over of the corn as feed, he figures he can produce a gallon of fuel for less than 50 cents. Diesel fuel, by contrast, runs about 87 cents a gallon in his area. Mr. Zeithamer expects to recoup his \$16,000 investment in the still in 2½ years.

The Agriculture Department is a good deal more cautious about such projects. "The homework hasn't been done," says Donald Fink, energy-policy analyst for Secretary Bob Bergland. "We don't know what the various technological options are, what the minimum capital requirements are. We don't want to see a lot of farmers, who are already in debt up to their eyeballs, getting in farther for something that may not work for them."

The department is studying alcohol fuel, Mr. Fink says, and by the end of the summer it should be ready to make policy recommendations on such matters as research grants and tax incentives.

One reason for the caution is the cost of stills. Most observers doubt that many farmers could build one as cheaply as Mr. Zeithamer did, suggesting \$40,000 as a more likely price. Indeed, Donald Smith, of Colby, Kans., has formed a company called Alternative Energy Ltd. that plans to sell stills for up to \$50,000. But as one farm-state Congressman, Democrat Berkley Bedell of Iowa,

notes, nowadays "that's just a little more than a tractor's cost."

For farmers without livestock, the protein byproduct also could be a problem. Distiller's grain rots in about five days unless it is dried out, but "drying could easily double the production costs," says Dennis Vander Griend, a South Dakota State University engineering student who has built an experimental still as a school project.

Whether energy is saved by the process is a matter of debate. "If you're using grain, you have to fertilize, plant, collect, separate and prepare it," all processes that consume energy, notes S. M. Harris, chief of the Energy Department's "biomass energy systems" branch. As a result, he says, making alcohol on the farm probably uses either a little or a lot more energy than it yields, "depending on what expert you talk to." But he concedes that when alcohol is burned straight and isn't redistilled, the energy balance "could be a little positive."

Proponents of the stills like to point out that the grain distilled in them is, in a way, a solar-energy collector. In addition, many farmers say those who claim that stills are uneconomical have their figures wrong.

"They're looking at plants that make drinkable booze, where everything has to be ultra-fine, pure and redistilled again and again," say Lance Crombie, a Webster, Minn., farmer who holds a Ph.D. in microbiology and has built his own still. "With fuel, you can use it cheap and dirty," he adds.

Mr. Crombie contends that he can make alcohol fuel for as little as 30 cents a gallon, a proposition so attractive it has caught the eye of some backwoods veterans of the technology. "They're interested in switching to making fuel; there isn't that kind of profit in moonshining," Mr. Crombie says.

Meanwhile, at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, officials doubt that all of their new permit-holders are pouring 100 percent of their output into tractors. "I'm sure that some are drinking it," says William Foster, a tax specialist at the bureau. But given the rudimentary stills that most farmers have, he sees little cause for concern. "We don't feel they are getting something very many would want to drink," Mr. Foster says. "It just would taste pretty raunchy."●

GUISEPPE LUCCHETTI, 1896-1979

HON. DON BAILEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of the death on Friday, June 8, of Guiseppe Lucchetti, a resident of New Kensington, Pa., in my district, for more than 66 years.

Mr. Lucchetti, who was 83, is survived by 6 children, 17 grandchildren, and 13 great grandchildren.

Mr. Lucchetti, who was well known in the Italian-American community of New Kensington, emigrated to the United States from his birthplace, Cacciano, Italy, in 1913.

He married, raised a large family and was employed for more than 20 years by the American Window Glass Co., Arnold, Pa. Guiseppe Lucchetti was a life-long member of Mount St. Peter's Roman Catholic Church.

I wish to extend my sincere condolences to Mr. Lucchetti's family.●

SYNTHETIC FUELS AND DEFENSE: DISSENTING VIEWS ON H.R. 3930

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, a blatant attempt to scare Congress into funding a massive synthetic fuels program is underway. Synfuel bills have been before this House in years past, but they all have failed. Now, however, the catchwords "defense" and "national security" are being used to pressure and frighten Members into supporting this foolish and unnecessary legislation.

Because the issue is of more than passing significance, I would like to place my dissenting views on H.R. 3930 in the RECORD for all Members to read:

DISSENTING VIEWS OF RON PAUL ON H.R. 3930

I am opposed to this bill for many reasons, each of which I will take up in order.

THE RED HERRING OF DEFENSE

The Congress has been attempting to enact a synthetic fuels bill for years, and it has repeatedly failed. When I was a member of the Banking Committee in 1976, we reported H.R. 12112, to amend the Federal Non-Nuclear Energy Research and Development Act of 1974. That bill failed, as did a similar bill in December of 1975. This year, however, the proponents of synthetic fuels apparently believe that if a synthetic fuels bill can't be sold under its own name, it will surely sell as a defense bill. So this year, a synthetic fuels program becomes the "Defense Production Act Amendments of 1979."

Merely calling a bill a defense bill does not make it so, however. The fact that this bill was reported by the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and not the Committee on the Armed Services indicates the non-defense nature and purposes of this bill. The fact that H.R. 3930 was handled by the Economic Stabilization Subcommittee of the Banking Committee should alert one to the fact that its purposes are economic, not military, in nature.

This shift in strategy (from calling the synthetic fuels bill by its own name to calling it by the name of defense production) by the proponents of a government-subsidized synthetic fuels industry concerns me for several reasons. First, it blurs the distinction between defense and non-defense issues. People, both liberals and conservatives, are more inclined to support a measure if it is labeled "necessary for defense." The temptation to mislabel legislation in order to win support must be stubbornly resisted, for it will lead to our being unable to distinguish between defense and non-defense programs, policies, and legislation. This blurring has already occurred in the Department of Energy, which already handles a number of "defense-related" programs. Unless we can keep the distinction clear, eventually every bill that goes through this House, from highway funds to education for the handicapped, will become a "defense" or "security" measure.

Second, the blurring of the distinction between military and non-military legislation seems to indicate a growing garrison state mentality in the federal government and in this Congress. There is, need I point out, growing interest both within and without Congress in a revival of conscription, registration, and national service. This interest in using war power during peacetime is a corollary of the blurring of the distinction between military and non-military matters.

The confusion of war and peace, military and non-military, defense and non-defense,

indicates to me that we are well on our way toward the confusion of thought so vividly portrayed in George Orwell's 1984. As a devotee of logic and a strong military, I vigorously object to the selling of synthetic fuel programs in the name of defense.

Saying this, however, does not exhaust the issue. H.R. 3930, by extending the Defense Production Act for one year, incorporates by reference the language of the 1950 Act. I quote from it for the benefit of those who may not have read it:

In view of the present international situation and in order to provide for the national defense and national security, our mobilization effort continues to require some diversion of certain materials and facilities from civilian use to military and related purposes.

This language may have been appropriate in September of 1950 when the nation was involved in a war in Korea; it is not appropriate during peacetime.

THE POWERS EXTENDED BY H.R. 3930

Passage of this bill will extend for 1 year the following powers originally granted to the President in 1950 during the Korean War and for the purpose of promoting the "mobilization effort":

1. To require that performance under contracts or orders (other than contracts of employment) which the President deems necessary or appropriate to promote the national defense shall take priority over performance under any other contract or order.

2. To require acceptance and performance of such contracts or orders in preference to other contracts or orders by any person the President finds to be capable of their performance.

3. To allocate materials and facilities in such manner, upon such conditions, and to such extent as the President shall deem necessary or appropriate to promote the national defense.

4. To control the general distribution of any material in the civilian market if the President finds that such material is a scarce and critical material essential to the national defense and that the requirements for defense cannot otherwise be met.

5. To require the allocation of, or the priority performance under contracts or orders (other than contracts of employment) relating to, supplies of materials and equipment in order to maximize domestic energy supplies, if the President finds that such supplies be scarce, critical, and essential to maintain or further exploration, production, refining, transportation, or conservation of such supplies, or for the construction and maintenance of energy facilities.

6. To prohibit, under penalty of imprisonment and fine, the accumulation by any person of any materials which have been designated by the President as scarce materials or materials the supply of which would be threatened by such accumulation.

7. To authorize any government agency the President may designate to guarantee in whole or in part any public or private financing institution (including any Federal Reserve Bank), by commitment to purchase agreement to share losses or otherwise against loss of principal or interest on any loan, discount, or advance, or on any commitment in connection therewith, which may be made by such financing institution for the purpose of financing any contractor, subcontractor or other person in connection with the performance of any contract or other operation deemed by the guaranteeing agency to be necessary.

8. To extend unlimited funds ("all such funds as may be necessary") to enable any fiscal agent designated by the President to carry out any loan guarantee.

9. To make loans unlimited in the aggregate to private business enterprises for the expansion of capacity, the development of technological processes, or the production of essential materials, including the exploration

tion, development, and mining of strategic and critical metals and minerals, and manufacture of newsprint, subject to a one-House veto by the Congress.

10. To purchase or make commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials for Government use or resale.

11. To "encourage" exploration, development, and mining of critical and strategic minerals and metals.

12. To subsidize the production of any such domestically produced material other than an agricultural commodity in such amounts and in such manner and on such terms and conditions as the President determines to be necessary.

13. To transport, store, and have processed and refined any materials procured.

14. To install additional equipment, facilities, processes, or improvements to plants, factories, and other industrial facilities owned by the United States Government, and to install Government-owned equipment in plants, factories, and other industrial facilities owned by private persons.

15. To make provision for the development of substitutes for such strategic and critical materials.

This list of powers granted to the President is extraordinary. Nowhere in the Act is the President required to declare a national emergency. In certain isolated cases, the Congress may veto specific actions of the President, but there is no necessity to seek any prior permission from the Congress at all. By extending this Act for another year, the House will be approving (1) standby rationing authority (number 4 above), which it overwhelmingly rejected on May 10; (2) standby allocation authority (numbers 3 and 5 above); (3) assumption of the risks taken by banks and other lending institutions (numbers 7 and 8 above); (4) unlimited loans to private corporations (number 9 above); (5) the prohibition, with criminal penalties, of "hoarding," whatever that means (number 6 above); (7) forcing private persons to accept contracts and then to perform them (numbers 1 and 2 above); (8) making subsidy payments to corporations (numbers 11 and 12 above); (9) operating transportation, storage, processing, and refining (number 13 above); (10) installing government-owned equipment in privately-owned business (number 14 above); and (11) developing ersatz materials (number 15 above).

Whatever the worth of these powers during wartime, they are not necessary during peacetime. They create far too great a concentration of power in the imperial presidency. All of them should be allowed to expire this year before they are used to transform the economy into a total corporate state.

THE NEW POWERS ADDED BY H.R. 3930

In addition to the powers extended by the bill, H.R. 3930 grants more powers to the President. Among these are the following:

1. To make individual loan guarantees up to \$38,000,000 to banking and financial institutions, subject to a one-House veto. (The present limit is \$20,000,000; the aggregate amount is unlimited.)

2. To make loans and guarantees of loans to private business enterprises for the production of energy. (The present \$25,000,000 individual loan limit is increased to \$48,000,000; no aggregate limit is imposed.)

3. To "encourage" production of critical and strategic materials.

4. To purchase and make commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and materials without regard to the limitations of existing law in such quantities, and on such terms and conditions as the President may decide, until September 30, 1995 (presently 1985).

5. To develop ersatz materials based upon his own judgment. (Present law requires certification by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior that a particular material is likely to be in short supply in time of war or other national emergency.)

6. To achieve a "national production goal" of at least 500,000 barrels a day crude oil equivalent of synthetic fuels and synthetic chemical feedstocks by October 1, 1984.

7. To require fuel and chemical feedstock suppliers to provide synthetic fuels and chemicals feedstocks if the President deems it practicable and necessary.

8. To purchase or make commitments to purchase synthetic fuels and chemical feedstocks "without regard to the limitations of existing law."

9. To "encourage" the development and production of synthetic fuels and chemical feedstocks.

10. To transport, store, process, and refine synthetic fuels and chemical feedstocks.

11. To install additional equipment, facilities, processes, or improvements to plants, factories, and other industrial facilities owned by the United States Government, or to install Government-owned equipment in plants, factories, and other industrial facilities owned by private persons.

12. To organize corporations, subject to a one-House veto, for purposes of achieving the goal of producing 500,000 barrels per day crude oil equivalent of synthetic fuels and chemical feedstocks.

The major new powers all relate to the crash synthetic fuels program this bill compels the President to undertake. This program, as we shall see, promises to be as well thought out and operated as the Strategic Petroleum Reserve Program mandated by Congress in the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975.

THE COSTS OF H.R. 3930

The only specific sum mentioned in the bill (aside from increases in the loan guarantee levels) is the \$2,000,000,000 authorization in section 4. This authorization is merely the tip of the iceberg, however, for the bill mandates a crash synthetic fuels program to achieve a goal of 500,000 barrels per day in crude oil equivalence. Section 305 (d) (4) prevents the President, however, from contracting for or purchasing synthetic fuels or feedstocks in an amount in excess of 100,000 barrels per day crude oil equivalent from any one person. This means that there will need to be at least five synthetic fuel producers and at least five synthetic fuel plants. The costs—which will be borne by the government, that is, the taxpayers—of developing this capacity has been estimated to be from \$1,000,000,000 to \$2,000,000,000 per plant. Assuming in these inflationary times that the higher figure is more nearly correct, the total authorization amounts to at least \$12,000,000,000.

Even that is not the whole story. H.R. 3930 continues the open-ended authorizations contained in the 1950 Act. The unavoidable conclusion is that this is a multi-billion dollar crash program whose economic benefits are unknown and perhaps nonexistent. Even the unlimited loan guarantee authority is costly, perhaps not so much to the government, but to the economy as a whole. Professor Henry Jacoby of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology testified on loan guarantees before the House Committee on Science and Technology on April 6, 1976.

The problem with loan guarantees is that they tend to hide the true cost of the technology that is being demonstrated. Loan guarantees give the illusion of bearing no cost, since no immediate budgetary expense is involved, and it is often assumed—we don't know correctly—that the costs of default will not arise. In fact, loan guarantees do involve a cost to the economy as a whole, for they subsidize the flow of capital

into the guaranteed investment. . . . Thus the guarantee carries a hidden subsidy which masks the real economic cost of the energy produced—or saved—and clouds the issue of what the "commercial" status of the technology would be without the guarantee.

The defaults on such loan guarantees could add billions to the cost of this bill. It is impossible to know the true cost of H.R. 3930, for it opens the public purse to unlimited raids by the banks and corporations.

THE CORPORATE STATE

As a proponent of free enterprise capitalism, I find it quite disturbing that we are continuing on a course of subsidizing private corporations and creating government corporations to achieve the goals of the Defense Production Act. In view of the fact that the government, that is, the American taxpayer, is assuming the risks of both the lending institutions and the corporations themselves, this bill might better be called the "Corporation Welfare Rights Act of 1979." Not only loan guarantees, but outright subsidies and installations of equipment are promised by the bill. Beside H.R. 3930, the bailouts of Lockheed and the Penn Central pale into insignificance. What we see in H.R. 3930 is a blueprint for the combination and collusion of big government and big business to exploit the American middle class, the American taxpayers. This is antithetical to the limited, Constitutional government established in this country in 1788. It is a type of collectivism, not capitalism. Its emergence and unchecked growth will mean the end of capitalism and of individual freedom. If that occurs, then there will be nothing left to defend, thanks in part to the Defense Production Act. I do not believe the forced subsidy of large corporations by the American people to be either wise, necessary, or moral.

Those who hope to make profits on synthetic fuels should assume the risks involved. That is the nature of free enterprise capitalism: self-responsibility. The forced assumption of these risks by the taxpayers is unwarranted and unjustifiable. In times past, as well as in this bill, Congress has assumed that it can favorably affect the marketplace so as to achieve a result efficiently that free men could not have achieved. Why government believes it has this godlike ability, I do not know. I do know that it is mistaken in its belief, for its attempts to manipulate the market merely distort the market, and its attempts to control the market destroy the market. H.R. 3930 will wreak havoc if it is enacted into law. It will be a giant step forward for government, and a giant step backward for mankind.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

Some of the reasons that prompted the Banking Committee to report this bill undoubtedly involved the notion that we must "do something!" to prepare for another interruption in our supply of imported oil. I entirely agree that we should do something, but deciding upon the proper thing to do involves analyzing the reasons for our present dependence.

The OPEC nations are not forcing us to buy their oil. This Congress—through the laws it has passed, the agencies and departments it has created, and the regulations they in turn have decreed—is forcing us to buy OPEC oil. Before Project Independence, before the Federal Energy Office and the Federal Energy Administration, before the Environmental Protection Agency, and before the Department of Energy, we were much less dependent on imported oil than we are now. The cause of our oil dependency is this Congress own actions. The way to remove that dependency is to reverse those actions, not to institute a program of corporate welfare. Indeed, we must "do something!" We must deregulate, decontrol, and de-tax our domes-

tic fuel producers. Nothing more is needed. Nothing less will do. The costs involved, if there are any at all, will be far less than those that will be incurred as a result of this crash synthetic fuels programs.

A FINAL WORD ABOUT DEFENSE

Not only would the crash synthetic fuels programs mandated by H.R. 3930 be economically disastrous, it would be militarily debilitating. Far from strengthening our potential for mounting an adequate defense, it would weaken our military capabilities if Congress enacts it rather than providing for deregulation and decontrol of domestic oil producers. From a military point of view, it is folly to hamper the production of fuels needed for an adequate defense with one hand while creating a crash program to produce costly synthetic fuels with the other, when we are not even sure that the engines used by our defense forces can operate properly and efficiently on the hypothetical synthetic fuels that would be produced under this program. Those engines were not designed to use synthetic fuels, and their performance using synthetic fuels is unknown at this time.

The only conclusion to be reached is that this is an economic, not a military bill, and that conclusion is reinforced by the definition of "national defense" as it is rewritten by H.R. 3930:

The term "national defense" means, programs for military and energy production or construction, military assistance to any foreign nation, stockpiling, space, and directly related activity.

National defense, in pursuit of which the President is granted authority to straitjacket the economy, is so broadly defined as to include energy production, military foreign aid, space activities, and "directly related" activities. In the name of defense, the President will receive powers that would, if he chooses to exercise them (and the decision is entirely his), destroy the free society for which the defense is needed. I do not trust any man with power of this magnitude, especially when its purpose is less for reasons of defense than it is for economic reasons.

SYNTHETIC FUELS AND DEFENSE: ARE SYNTHETIC FUELS NECESSARY?

It has been claimed by some of the proponents of a massive government-subsidized synthetic fuels program that these costly fuels are needed for our national defense and security. I wish to quote a statement made by Dale W. Church, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering before the Banking Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, March 13:

"At the present time, and in the projected future, if we examined Defense Department needs from a direct defense standpoint, there is a domestic base that is adequate to fulfill the needs of defense."

Mr. Church was speaking of a domestic base of natural, not synthetic, fuel (since there is no domestic base of synthetic fuel, anyway) as is made clear from the context, particularly from the reply of the Committee member who queried him:

"But it seems to me that somehow we have to reconcile the fact that synfuels have an 8-year leadtime in order to be developed. They are not developed now, and do they have a role, I guess, with regards to our defense posture. And the answer I seem to be getting back from you is no, we are going to fill those through other means."

One can only conclude from this exchange that the present natural fuels are adequate for our defense.

SYNTHETIC FUELS AND DEFENSE: IS H.R. 3930 REALISTIC?

H.R. 3930 requires the President to create a synthetic fuels industry capable of producing within five years the equivalent of 500,000 barrels of crude oil per day, more

than the entire amount consumed by the Defense Department in 1978. Is that goal realistic? The Defense Department's own witnesses testified: No.

Commander Larry Lukers on March 13 stated:

"I would only add, Dr. Davis, that to reach a production goal of 500,000 barrels a day in 5 years would be an extremely ambitious program, one that might likely be hampered, not so much in terms of technological developments, but in terms of the availability of the necessary resources, in terms of the capital equipment items, pressure vessels, mining engineers, things of this nature, and the transportation sector. That might make it quite difficult to reach that level."

Dr. Ruth M. Davis, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Advanced Technology, testified on the same day:

"Chairman Moorhead. I gathered your testimony, Dr. Davis, supported by Lieutenant Commander Lukens, is that our proposed schedule of trying to get the 500,000 barrels of synthetic fuels per day is too ambitious; is that your testimony Dr. Davis?"

"Dr. Davis. In terms of quantity, yes. . . . Getting on line 5,000 barrels-a-day pilot plants, is certainly quite feasible within that time frame."

Unfortunately, H.R. 3930 does not contemplate 5,000 barrels per day pilot plants, but 100,000 barrels per day commercial size plants. These plants as the Department of Defense witnesses stated, are unrealistic.●

MRS. JULIA EPSEY HONORED

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, my fellow House colleagues, I want to take this opportunity to pay homage to a very special lady in my hometown of Tuscaloosa, Ala.

The lady's name is Mrs. Julia Epsey and last month she received the highest honor given by the Tuscaloosa Veterans' Administration Medical Center for her untiring and unstinting service to the patients at the institution.

One hundred and forty individuals and 60 organizations were honored at the annual volunteer recognition ceremony, but there was something special about Mrs. Epsey's honor.

Mrs. Epsey received a silver bowl from the institution in recognition of 10,000 hours of devoted volunteer service to our veterans.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I ask you to contemplate the enormity of her service. Ten thousand hours represents a full 250 weeks—or nearly 5 full years—of strictly voluntary service to her fellow man.

Why would someone give of themselves so unselfishly? Obviously, because she loves it and is a great and kind woman.

Mrs. Epsey is an 84-years-young volunteer who comes to the center 3 days a week. She has been active in the volunteer program at the institution since 1950.

Presently Mrs. Epsey serves in occupational therapy in the nursing home care unit and at the intermediate care unit. For many years she has been on the Voluntary Service Advisory Committee representing the American Legion Auxiliary.

I think Robert Dawson, Jr., the director of the Medical Center, perhaps put it best when he said of Mrs. Epsey that she "is an inspiration to patients, staff, and other volunteers. Needless to say, she is a great asset to this center."

To that I can only add my own congratulations and thanks to this remarkable woman.●

THE POPE RETURNS TO HIS NATIVE POLAND

HON. JOHN G. FARY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, one of the last things Pope John Paul II saw as his helicopter lifted off from Victory Square in Warsaw, was a sea of crosses. The Pope had just met with a group of young people who sang, "We want God in our schools and in our books," and who waved crosses to be blessed instead of flags that would have identified them with a particular nation or political party.

A Western observer noted that Stalin would not have believed his eyes had he seen the crowds and heard them greeting the Pope with the words of another song, a traditional hymn: "We are a choir of knights under Mary's standard. Bless us, Christ, as we prepare for battle." Stalin had derisively dismissed the papacy as a world power during the Second World War when he asked Churchill, "How many divisions does the Pope have?" During the past 2 weeks, Stalin's successors to power in Moscow saw that this Pope has many. The millions of Poles who walked, drove, and rode for miles to see John Paul II came as knights had in ancient times, to offer their services to their ruler. Today, their Queen is Mary, the Madonna of Czestochowa who the Poles call their Mother and Queen. John Paul is her general and, thus, the moral and spiritual leader of her people.

As we all know, the Pope used his influence to advocate a personal, internal, spiritual rebirth in each of his countrymen and women. He is not interested in fomenting outright rebellion against the government or Moscow. The Pope and Cardinal Wyszynski, the primate of Poland, believe that moral force is stronger than physical force; that the spiritual strength of a people will allow them to overcome the physical constraints that any temporal, earthly regime can impose.

During his visit to Poland, the Pope repeatedly asked that respect for human rights should be the first and foremost concern of both the government and the people. Through foreign media coverage of the last 2 weeks, the whole world has been able to see and know that the rights of Polish people are not respected by the present government. Although about one-fifth of the entire population of the country probably saw the Pope in person, those who were unable to take some time off from work or to find transportation to one of the cities where he stopped,

were unable to see very much on the television. Coverage by the Polish media was limited to short flashes of the day's events on the evening news. Many Western journalists remarked that the vast, enthusiastic crowds were not shown on local TV. Even this limited coverage could be seen only in areas where the Pope actually stopped and not in outlying regions where the people would have been most interested in such coverage. The people were forced to rely on radio transmissions by the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and the BBC for news of the Pope's activities.

Several minor incidents occurred that only hinted at the suppression of free speech that is the usual state of affairs in Poland. A police van with loudspeakers drove down the streets of Warsaw that were lined with people waiting for the Pope's motorcade to drive by. From it, a voice blared out:

Do not sing nationalistic songs. Only religious hymns are allowed.

The police did not reckon with the fact that proclaiming oneself part of Mary, the Mother of God's army, can be an even more forceful rejection of the officially atheistic government than an outright protest. Such opposition is affirmative rather than just a call to anarchy.

In Czestochowa, many people who had driven for miles were forced to turn back by the police who claimed that parking permits were necessary. The police did not reckon with people so determined to see the Pope that they left their cars in nearby fields and walked for 5 or 10 miles to reach the city.

The worst violation of human rights that took place during the papal visit occurred when Jacek Kuron and Adam Michnik, two leaders of the movement for human rights, were detained by the police on the eve of the Pope's arrival in his homeland. These two had been severely beaten earlier this year for their championship of human rights and participation in the underground university. It was obvious that the government took this most recent action in order to prevent them from causing any trouble. However, the Poles had no difficulty maintaining order and the only demonstration of force was that of the moral and spiritual strength of the church in Poland.

Outside Poland herself, Czechoslovaks, Ukrainians, Hungarians, and other Slavs, were unable to participate in the festivities surrounding the Polish Pope's return home. The borders were closed and only a few managed to make their way into Poland although many gathered at the borders hoping to make the pilgrimage or at least see Polish television's coverage of the events. There was almost no media coverage in any of the other Eastern European countries.

I had the pleasure and distinction of meeting his holiness several years ago when he visited Chicago. Even then, he had a celestial aura of deep spirituality. The tremendous crowds of people who cheered the pontiff when he returned home were also aware of this quality. The Italians greeted him in St. Peter's square upon his return to Rome, because

of this spiritual quality that attracts all who see him.

Whether we feel associated with these events or not, we are inevitably in the minds of the people who greeted the Pope last week. Just as he represents the great spiritual power that is inherent in the church, for the people of Eastern Europe, we represent the freedom that is democracy. As a result, there is a moral burden on all of us to defend freedom and liberty here in the United States and to do all that we can to serve as a constant reminder to Moscow that we have not forgotten those who depend on us to insure that human rights are valued everywhere. We should always remember the tremendous crowds that cheered John Paul II as a spiritual leader and a defender of man's basic rights and aspire to always work towards those same goals. ●

BARTLEY'S COGENT EXPOSITION ON THE ASPECTS OF SALT II

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Congressional Delegation to the SALT II negotiations and the Appropriations' Subcommittee on Defense, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues in both bodies of the Congress an exceptional article which appeared today in the Wall Street Journal. It comes at a most appropriate time because President Carter is now in Vienna to conclude a SALT II agreement with Soviet President Leonid I. Brezhnev.

Written by Mr. Robert L. Bartley, the editor of the Journal and a veteran observer and chronicler of strategic affairs, I find this article most cogent. It speaks for itself.

At this time, I insert Mr. Bartley's exposition into the RECORD.

The article follows:

SALT: A BANKRUPT PROCESS

(By Robert L. Bartley)

In the strategic arms negotiations, the present moment is heavy with *deja vu*. Isn't this where I came in ten years ago?

Just before winging off for today's summit with Soviet Chairman Brezhnev, President Carter approved development of the MX missile. The new \$30 billion system is intended to solve the problem of "Minuteman vulnerability." With high yields and improving accuracies, by about 1982 Soviet missiles will be able to conduct a first strike destroying all of our land-based Minuteman missiles.

As Defense Secretary Brown puts it, "The Soviets continue with a policy of building forces that could be used in a preemptive counterforce mode." The new MX missiles are to be based in a 20-mile trench so the Soviets won't know precisely where to attack, and the administration believes they will lick the "Minuteman vulnerability" problem when they are deployed in 1989.

Back in 1969, the big concern of strategic planners was something then called "Minuteman vulnerability." The huge size of Soviet missiles suggested that Minuteman would eventually become vulnerable. As Defense Secretary Laird put it in a then-controversial statement, "With their large tonnage warheads, they are going for a first-

strike capability—there is no question about that." As a response President Nixon proposed the \$10.3 billion Safeguard system, an anti-missile system designed to shoot down incoming ballistic missiles around Minuteman sites.

Intended for deployment in 1977 or 1978, Safeguard squeaked through the Senate by a 50-50 tie vote in August 1969. That November American and Soviet diplomats clinked champagne glasses in Helsinki at the first Strategic Arms Limitations Talks, opening an era of negotiation President Nixon proclaimed "most momentous."

Ten years of SALT, then, have done nothing to solve our most pressing strategic weapons concern. Indeed, SALT has prevented the response that was approved and funded back in 1969 and that would have been available today. While not emerging quite as soon as some pessimists predicted, the Minuteman vulnerability problem was correctly identified by ABM proponents ten years ago. Now the administration proposes to solve it with a system that—if you choose to believe Mr. Carter's MX, unlike Mr. Nixon's Safeguard, will in the end actually be built—will be available in 1989, ten years from now and seven or so years after Minuteman becomes vulnerable.

PERIOD OF ARMS BUILD-UPS

On the Soviet side, meanwhile, the SALT era has become one of history's great arms build-ups. Between 1969 and 1978, U.S. strategic force levels were static at 1,054 land-based missiles and 656 submarine-launched missiles—though more multiple warheads were installed on these launchers. Over the same time, the Soviets increased their land-based force to 1,400 from 1,028, and their sea-based launchers to 1,015 from 196. In conventional arms, U.S. manpower shrank, while the Soviets expanded their armies and supplied them with large numbers of tanks, artillery tubes and other arms.

This increased military clout already seems to be casting a political shadow. The Czech coup took place in 1948 and the Nationalist Chinese collapsed in 1949; until the fall of Saigon in 1975, the only successful Communist expansion were the victories of Ho Chi Minh in North Vietnam and Fidel Castro in Cuba. In the last four years, Soviet-allied Marxist governments have been established by force of arms in seven nations: South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Angola, Ethiopia, Afghanistan and South Yemen.

Little wonder that new skepticism abounds about both SALT and detente; Tuesday night Senator Henry Jackson went so far as to charge a policy of "appeasement." Some caveats of course have to be made: American strategic forces have been improved by both the multiple warheads and the new Trident submarine. And the military and diplomatic weaknesses of the last decade can be traced to the general post-Vietnam disillusionment.

Clearly, though, the high hopes of SALT have been dashed. The agreements have not slowed the Soviet build-up in any perceptible way; certainly we have not been able to find a negotiated solution to Minuteman vulnerability. By contrast, there is plenty of reason to believe that the SALT process has subtly but effectively curtailed American strategic programs. The dynamic is this: arms control mutilates the best options, and the Budget Bureau moves in to kill off the cripples.

This can perhaps be best grasped through the Minuteman vulnerability issue. In military history there are a limited number of ways to deal with vulnerabilities. You can plan an active defense—in this case an ABM. You can fortify—but missile silos have already been hardened about as much as they can be. Or you can conceal—as in the MX trench.

Active defense of missile sites should not in theory interfere with disarmament efforts; by reducing the advantages of a first-strike

it promotes "strategic stability" and reduces the likelihood of war. But the ABM was an anathema to arms control advocates because they feared it would be expanded to defend cities as well as missiles. This would interfere with mutual assured destruction (MAD), a doctrine that holds that war can be prevented by making sure that if it happens both societies would be destroyed.

Between the influence of the MAD doctrine on the U.S. side and the understandable Soviet desire to curtail American advantages in anti-missile technology, SALT I sharply restricted ABMs. It did bow to the logic of active defense of missiles by allowing each side one ABM site for missile defense. However, to prevent expansion, this system was limited to 100 interceptor missiles. So American budget guardians asked what was the sense of spending a lot of money on a system that could be defeated simply by sending 101 Soviet warheads. The U.S. ABM site in Grand Forks, N. Dak., was opened in 1975 and closed one month later.

Perhaps worse, U.S. research on active defense has slowed drastically; SALT I bans not-yet invented ABMs based on "exotic physical principles." Ironically, information-processing technology now makes it possible to envision ABMs without nuclear warheads. A proposed Porcupine system, for example, would attack incoming missiles with a shot-gun burst of one-pound metal darts. But no one pushes this system vigorously, because while it does not clearly violate the disarmament treaty someone will charge that it does.

With active defense ruled out by the interaction of arms control and the Budget Bureau, and with the possibilities of hardening about exhausted, you are left with concealment. But easily concealed mobile missiles are an arms control problem; the other side can't count them to check for cheating, or "verify" the treaty. Indeed, this concern led the U.S. to issue a "unilateral declaration" against deployment of mobile missiles when SALT I was signed. This did not stop Soviet development of the mobile SS-16, but it did inhibit U.S. thinking about mobility. It also guaranteed Soviet planners the U.S. would have neither active defense nor concealment, making a sure thing out of heavy investment in first-strike missiles.

With such Soviet missiles coming on line, U.S. planners are trying to square the circle with a mobile missile that (1) can be concealed to avoid attack, (2) can be seen to permit verification and (3) will pass budget muster. Not surprisingly, the options look like something from Rube Goldberg.

The Air Force wanted the "shell game," a series of vertical shelters with one real missile and several dummies, which had to have the same shape, weight and radiation characteristics as the real one. This was deemed unverifiable.

So Mr. Carter opted for the MX in the "trench." The notion was to move the missile up and down a trench; the Soviets could see there was only one, but would not know where it was at any minute. Unhappily, it was discovered that a trench is an excellent conductor of blast waves, so that a hit anywhere on a 20 mile trench would get the missile wherever it was.

SERIES OF SHELTERS

So the MX trench will have a series of shelters, or hard points, with the missile shuffled among them. But will shelters work if they're uncovered? And if you cover them how do you allow verification? This issue has been "deferred" in Mr. Carter's "decision" to proceed with "development." Also, the MX will weigh 95 tons, and moving it will create significant seismic effects theoretically subject to detection.

In all, Mr. Carter's MX proposal does not look like the kind of a system that will withstand the cost-effectiveness scrutiny that killed the one-site Safeguard, the B-1

bomber, the B-70 before it, and earlier versions of the MX that would have been available sooner. And despite the SALT-II provision explicitly allowing one new missile on each side, the Soviets have already started a propaganda campaign against the MX like the one against the neutron bomb.

The arms control-Budget Bureau dynamic is certain to continue as SALT-III is negotiated. Any money spent on MX may be "wasted" if SALT-III terms ban mobile missiles in an extension of the three-year protocol in SALT-II. Even more importantly, the same ambiguity will cloud the U.S. cruise missile, where the U.S. holds a technological lead comparable to its ABM lead in 1969.

In fact, the dynamic has already delayed deployment of ground and sea launched versions of the cruise missile by two years. President Carter killed funds to buy these weapons in fiscal 1979 after reading Budget Bureau advice: "Defer 1979 procurement of both the anti-ship and land-attack sea-launched cruise missile in view of (a) uncertainty as to how SALT protocol provision affecting these systems will be reflected in future agreements. . . ." Also, provisions of the treaty Mr. Carter signs Monday will effectively preclude air-based cruise missiles on short take-off and landing aircraft, a promising basing mode in Europe.

From the Soviet viewpoint, SALT must seem an excellent way to delay, grind down and eventually kill the most promising U.S. weapons developments. It has kept the U.S. from exploiting its strong card of technology, while the Soviets have rolled along with their strong card of churning out masses of weapons. It has been a lever through which they have manipulated our procurement decisions.

Few people, of course, would want to give up even exploring the possibilities of sound arms agreements. But it should be clear by now that we are in a dynamic never contemplated back in 1969. Experience suggests that it is not easy, and may not ultimately be possible, to arrive at sound agreements with a nation that is totalitarian, a closed society and interested enough in armies to spend a seventh of its entire output on them. Without some kind of new start to break the current dynamic, the SALT process seems to result in one-sided restraint.

Anyone who thinks that the current process reduces the chance of war ought to think a bit about what will in the end probably be done about Minuteman vulnerability. Within the past few weeks, Secretary Brown said that in any attack on Minuteman the Russians "would face a considerable risk that we could launch all or part of our ICBMs before they could be destroyed." Secretary of State Vance echoed the idea: "One should not make the assumption that if such an attack were coming in, and we could pick that up very clearly, that we would leave the missile in the hole."

'LAUNCH ON WARNING'

In strategic jargon this is called "launch on warning." We have 15 to 30 minutes warning of incoming missiles, and systems could be built to fire the Minuteman in that interval. It does not take much reflection to see that such a doctrine would vastly increase the chances of a nuclear exchange by accident or misunderstanding, and most analysts have envisioned it as the ultimate in unstable strategic environments. Yet to judge by the latest statements, it is probably where we are headed after 1982.

We would not be talking about launch on warning if Safeguard or some evolutionary descendant of it were now being deployed. Without the guarantees of American vulnerability in SALT-I, it is even conceivable that the Soviets would have concluded that a big fleet of first-strike missiles was not worth the money. Without SALT the Minuteman vulnerability problem would not

exist, and we would not be headed toward a hairtrigger nuclear environment by 1982. If the champagne glasses had never clinked at Helsinki, the world would be a safer place.●

TRIBUTE TO MRS. JOY WOODRUFF

HON. CHARLES F. DOUGHERTY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I believe that from time to time it is important to recognize positive contributions made by men and women in our society. One of these women is Mrs. Joy Woodruff. Mrs. Woodruff has been teaching in the Philadelphia Public School System for the past 21 years. She has taught at the Crossan Elementary School in the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania for 20 years. Mrs. Woodruff has taught more than 760 students during her career in education. These students have been given a firm education background to get them started on the road to life through her influence. It should also be noted that Mrs. Woodruff also wrote the words and music to the Crossan School song.

Mrs. Woodruff has made a significant contribution to her community and Nation by preparing these young people to eventually enter the working world with a strong academic background. Mrs. Woodruff retires from her years of teaching this month and so I offer this tribute to her for a job well done.●

CONGRATULATIONS, BUT . . .

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1979

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Lenny Wilkens, the coach of the new world champion Seattle Supersonics, was honored in festivities on Capitol Hill for his achievements and contributions in major league sports. Last season, Wilkens took over as coach of the Supersonics when their record was 5 and 17 (5 wins, 17 losses) and some were writing them off as serious contenders. Wilkens transformed the team into winners by leading them to two consecutive Western Conference Championships, the NBA finals twice and the NBA Championship this year.

At yesterday's press conference, Wilkens was cited as "an example of leadership for young people." However, in the March 1979, issue of *Ebony* magazine, he was described as "anti-ERA and says equalizing pay for men and women is a step toward socialism." I think the public deserves clarification of these remarks regarding women because I would hate to assume that such an attitude is reflective of any kind of leadership, be it black or white.

This is the kind of sentiment which our leaders should be dispelling, not advocating.●