

munity Services Administration, State economic opportunity offices, and the General Accounting Office."

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

—Page 45, line 19, strike out "term." and insert in lieu thereof "term or where the mother or father has, or is a carrier of, muscular dystrophy."

—Page 45, line 19, strike out "term." and insert in lieu thereof "term or where the mother has multiple sclerosis."

By Mr. PEPPER:

—Page 15, line 5, strike out "\$931,158,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$981,458,000."

By Mr. PRITCHARD:

—Page 45, line 17, strike out all that follows "except" through line 19 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "in cases in which the life of a pregnant woman would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in cases in which such woman has or has had cancer."

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

—On page 45, line 19, strike the period at the end of the sentence and insert in lieu thereof the following: "or where the mother has or has had epilepsy or any other type of seizure disorder."

By Mr. SIMON:

—Page 28, line 3, strike out "\$1,045,325,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,047,650,000".

Page 28, add at the end of line 6 the following: "\$57,700,000 of the amount appropriated under this paragraph shall be used for purposes of development of special education personnel."

—Page 38, line 15, strike out "\$2,515,436,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,518,436,000".

Page 38, line 15, insert after "of which" the following: "\$31,500,000 shall be for research programs in rehabilitation services; \$30,000,000 shall be for training programs in rehabilitation services;"

By Mr. WEAVER:

—To amend title II, section 209, beginning on page 45, line 17, strike: "except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term.", and insert

"except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term, or in cases of ectopic fetal gestation, or where the mother suffers from any one of the following medical disorders: erythroblastosis, chronic renal disease, rheumatic heart disease, or diabetes."

H.R. 4394

By Mr. KEMP:

—On page 38, after line 19, insert the following new section:

Sec. 409. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to implement regulations contained in the Federal Register volume 44, number 74, April 16, 1979, 24 CFR Part 200, entitled "Increases in Thermal Requirements for HUD Minimum Property Standards."

H.R. 4440

By Mr. HOWARD:

—Page 10, strike out line 19.

Page 10, after the period on line 22, insert the following: "For necessary expenses in carrying out section 131 of title 23, United States Code, \$9,000,000."

—Page 12, line 8, strike out "\$35,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$75,000,000".

—Page 13, after line 17, insert the following:

CARPOOLS AND VANPOOLS

For necessary expenses in carrying out section 126(d) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-599), \$1,000,000 to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and for necessary expenses in carrying out section 126(e) of such Act, \$3,000,000 to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund.

—Page 14, after line 11, insert the following:

NATIONAL MAXIMUM SPEED LIMIT

For necessary expenses in carrying out section 154 of title 23, United States Code (other than subsection (1)), \$20,000,000 to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund. Funds appropriated pursuant to this para-

graph shall not be subject to the obligatory limitation set forth in section 304 of this Act.

—Page 14, after line 11, insert the following:

INNOVATIVE PROJECT GRANTS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of section 407 of title 23, United States Code, \$2,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund.

—Page 14, after line 11, insert the following:

HIGHWAY SAFETY EDUCATION AND INFORMATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out section 209 of the Highway Safety Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-599), \$1,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund, which shall remain available until extended.

—Page 19, line 8, strike out "\$63,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$64,500,000".

—Page 19, line 11, after "training" insert the following: "pursuant to section 11(a) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, \$1,000,000 shall be available for establishing and operating transportation centers at nonprofit institutions of higher learning pursuant to section 11(b) of said Act."

—Page 19, line 19, strike out "\$1,280,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,310,000,000".

—Page 20, line 10, strike out "\$650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$670,000,000".

—Page 21, after line 18, insert the following:

TERMINAL DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses in carrying out section 21 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, \$15,000,000.

—Page 21, after line 18, insert the following:

INTERCITY BUS SERVICE

For necessary expenses in carrying out section 22 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, \$10,000,000.

—Page 28, line 15, strike out "\$175,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$195,000,000".

—Page 28, line 19, strike out the colon and all that follows down through and including the period on line 22 and insert in lieu thereof a period.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EDUCATIONAL HELP FOR CHILDREN

HON. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, we in the House are aware of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which provides financial help to students having difficulty in reading and math. The program's goal, designed to aid local school districts, is to produce a more positive student selfworth in turn aiding these students to do work successfully in the regular classroom.

On December 1, 1978, I had the opportunity to visit the title I program currently implemented in the Waterloo, Iowa, community schools. I met with each of the three integral parts of the program: the administrators, the Parent Advisory Council and a title I site itself at St. Mary's School involving both the students and teachers in the program. Many aspects of the program impressed me. I wish to share some of these educational pluses I found as a result of my visit.

Statistically, I was impressed that on a budget of \$698,602, almost 1,100 students, in 14 public and 4 nonpublic schools with 33 title I teachers, were receiving skills instruction. Beyond the program itself, two-thirds of the title I teachers were illustrating their belief education is an ongoing process by taking short courses or university courses, plus all attending a one-half day inservice each month to help them to have up-to-date information and materials. Teachers used commercially prepared materials, but I found most importantly, supplemented such with teacher written math and reading materials, tests and puzzles to individualize instruction for each student. One teacher was even called upon to give a presentation to a regional title I meeting in Kansas City concerning summer parent advisory councils.

The Waterloo schools, like most title I schools, use diagnostic testing to pinpoint the child's deficiencies and followup with a skills remediation process to improve those skill deficiencies in reading and math. By using standardized testing in the fall and spring, growth in these areas can be measured. The school was aiming at a growth of 1.0 years after 8 months

of instruction. Waterloo schools, however, can be proud of their efforts, for by the standardized testing the average Waterloo title I gains were 1.06 years in reading and 1.49 years in math.

Finally, the thing that impressed me the most about my visit to Waterloo's program was what the kids thought, the children being taught under title I. When asked if they thought these title I classes had helped them to be a better reader or helped them in math, 96-100 percent of the students said "Yes." Of the parents, 95 percent felt the same way.

Such support, results, and goal accomplishment that I witnessed from my visit will certainly be kept in mind down the road when title I comes up for extension in September of 1983. ●

HON. CARL ALBERT REVIEWS
"SPEAK, MR. SPEAKER"

HON. SAM B. HALL, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to insert in the Con-

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

GRESSIONAL RECORD the review of "Speak, Mr. Speaker", by the Honorable Carl Albert, former Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives. This book is a collection of writing, speeches, and interviews of Sam Rayburn, edited and arranged by Mr. H. G. Dulaney, Dr. Edward H. Phillips, and Mr. MacPhelan Reese, to approximate an autobiography of the late, great Speaker, Sam Rayburn. "Speak, Mr. Speaker" is available from the Sam Rayburn Library in Bonham, Tex., and is a nonprofit publication of the Sam Rayburn Foundation.

The review by Carl Albert follows:

REVIEW OF "SPEAK MR. SPEAKER"

Mr. H. G. Dulaney, Dr. Edward H. Phillips and Mr. MacPhelan Reese have written a magnificent treatise on the life and service of Speaker Sam Rayburn. So far as I know, this book, "Speak, Mr. Speaker" is unique in biographical literature. Having known and served closely with Mr. Rayburn in the House of Representatives for many years, I do not believe that any book could have told the Rayburn story so well. It is far superior to any biography or autobiography of any Speaker that I have ever read.

When I read the book, I had the feeling that it was a masterpiece of both biography and autobiography with the accent on autobiography. It is not just the story of the life of Speaker Rayburn. For the most part it is the Speaker's philosophy in his own words. The authors use their own language mainly to introduce various statements of Mr. Rayburn and to correlate them into a unified whole. Frankly, I was amazed when I read the book, and yet it dawned on me all at once that it could not have been written in any other manner. There simply can be no way to tell the Rayburn story except in his own words. Nobody could possibly understand the total Rayburn by writing his own impressions of his life and words. To attempt to do so would be like rewriting the autobiography of Benjamin Franklin.

The authors were able to accomplish their task by reading thousands of letters by Mr. Rayburn and hundreds of his speeches recorded in the Congressional Record. I congratulate them on the magnificent job they did. So far as I am concerned they told me about our greatest Speaker, that rare human task by reading thousands of letters by Mr. Rayburn that I knew so well and loved so much. No biography of Sam Rayburn will ever be written that will begin to tell the story as Mr. Dulaney, Dr. Phillips and Mr. Reese have told it in "Speak, Mr. Speaker." ●

STUDY SHOWS OSHA REDUCES INJURY RATES

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, critics of the much maligned Occupational Safety and Health Administration have argued that the Agency has not provided much protection for the Nation's workforce. But there is now strong evidence that demonstrates OSHA inspections have had a significant impact in reducing workplace injuries, especially in small establishments. It is clear that with more enforcement personnel, OSHA could have a greater impact on injuries.

In a study published in the most recent edition of the Journal of Human

Resources, Dr. Robert Smith of the Cornell University School of Industrial and Labor Relations concludes that OSHA inspections may reduce injury rates by as much as 16 percent among firms that have been inspected. Furthermore, the largest inspection-related reductions in injury rates occurred among high hazard and small businesses.

The study also indicates that the time lag between an inspection and a noticeable reduction in injury rates is only about 3 months. Thus, it is evident that OSHA has been pursuing an effective strategy by focusing on the most hazardous industries. The study also suggests that OSHA should be inspecting more small businesses rather than exempting them as some Members of Congress have recently proposed.

This study is particularly significant because it is one of the first studies to examine the effects of OSHA inspections independent of other factors. Other studies of OSHA have focused on aggregate data, but such studies are of limited value because the aggregate data include industry sectors not covered by OSHA, and most previous studies have made no attempt to control for growth in the economy and changes in the industrial mix. In addition, the Smith study notes that OSHA's resources are too limited to have a significant impact on the overall injury rate despite the impact of OSHA on firms inspected.

During the period of the study, the impact on the overall injury rate was probably only about 1 percent. It is difficult to measure accurately such small effects in aggregate data over a short period of time.

Clearly, the critics of OSHA have been misguided. The only reason that we have not seen more dramatic decreases in the Nation's overall injury rate is that there are so few resources available to the agency. OSHA's appropriations for fiscal year 1980, which will soon be considered by the House of Representatives, amount to only \$2.50 per worker covered by the OSH Act. This is a shameful expression of our commitment to the health and well-being of 65 million working men and women. If we are truly committed to protecting our workers, who are the backbone of our economy and our most valuable resource, we should seek to significantly increase OSHA's budget in the coming years. ●

TRIBUTE TO MARY CAROTENUTO

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give recognition to one of my constituents, Mary Carotenuto, 3159 Westfield Avenue, Camden, N.J.

Better known as Aunt Mary, she is a fine example of the unselfish volunteer convinced that serving mankind brings its own reward. Her work spans a 45-year period—a period in which she has brought laughter and joy to countless shut-ins. She has extended innumerable kindnesses to the needy, the handi-

capped, and retarded. Dressed in costumes which she makes herself, she has appeared as Betsy Ross, Mrs. Santa Claus, Mrs. Peter Rabbit, and other storybook characters to the delight of audiences of all ages.

Founder of the Rays of Sunshine Club, she has succeeded in imbuing other members of the organization with her enthusiasm and energy. Her deep commitment is evidenced by her determination to continue her work despite the scarcity of funds and, at times, poor health. One of the many activities for which the club is known is their involvement in National Shut-in Day. Along with publicizing the day in local newspapers, the club encourages the public to visit individuals confined to homes and hospitals.

Included among the organizations that have given recognition for her tireless efforts in helping the disabled and less fortunate are the American Legion, Camden County Office on Aging, American Red Cross, and the Salvation Army. To commemorate her 25th year of volunteering, the Chapel of Four Chaplains of Philadelphia, Pa., awarded her a certificate for her "service to all people regardless of race or faith."

It gives me pleasure to pay tribute to her for her outstanding contribution to her community and to realize that the spirit of volunteerism, as personified by Mary Carotenuto, is still alive and well in Camden County. ●

PRESIDENT CARTER AND HIS COMPETITION

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of great concern to me that many of those with whom I usually agree are shooting with U-shaped gun barrels as we approach the 1980 election. Opposition to Mr. Carter among the progressive wing of the Democratic Party ignores the many substantial achievements of the present administration; in effect, it constitutes a quest for perfection that can only have perfectly horrible consequences. I discussed this 2 days ago in a speech in Sturgis, Mich., which I now insert in the RECORD:

You honored me with your invitation to be your keynote speaker and with the kind attention you've given to the details of my visit.

I grew up myself in a small town, and I always have a sensation when I visit this area, that I'm "coming home." The lovely, tree-lined picturesque towns and the flourishing farmland of southern Michigan are spiritual "homes" to many more Americans than those who are actually fortunate enough to live there.

Visits like this for a politician like myself are the oasis of reality from the desert of Washington life—where reality is more often a mirage and someone is always kicking sand in your face.

Don't get me wrong—I like my work in Washington on behalf of the more than 500,000 people of my district and the people of the State of Michigan. I'm proud of the

trusted position that I hold—even if my mother continues to ask: "What kind of work do you do?"

However, I did not come all the way from Washington to this beautiful civic center in Sturgis, Michigan to entertain you with the incongruities of the greatest deliberative body in the world, nor to make a foolish attempt to impress you with my knowledge of things with which you were more knowledgeable. I do wish to spend our time together talking about the Presidency of Jimmy Carter, and what we ought to do about it as our party faces the uncertainty of the coming presidential election year.

In the past two and one half years I have had abundant occasions to look critically down Pennsylvania Avenue toward the White House. What I saw was a time of promise marred by confusion, newness, occasional but severely damaging political ineptness, and a general lack of understanding about how government—Washington style—operates. There were mistakes—unpardonable faux pas such as canceling a water project in the Vice President's state and letting him learn about it in the newspaper, months of slighting congressional egos, the display of more loyalty to Bert Lance than to the ideal of a government whose ethics must be beyond reproach. And more, much more.

I personally have been greatly disappointed that my President failed to keep his pledge to trim military spending by 5 billion dollars. In fact, he's presented us with a budget to increase the military share while at the same time holding the line on spending for human needs. He has also just decided to produce a first strike, destabilizing, 40 billion dollar weapons system called MX. This missile system will be transported back and forth on train tracks . . . and yet we still don't have a sensible system of mass transit. There are threats that in a time of fuel crisis, trains for people will be cut so that we can have trains for missiles!

As another example, after a strong beginning the Administration failed at good follow-through on a national energy policy, letting it get ripped to shreds in the Senate and contributing to the fix we are in today.

I'm not the only one who has reservations about some of the President's actions. Some of my closest friends in the Congress—Rick Nolan of Minnesota, Dick Ottinger of New York, Pete Stark of California—are part of a dump Carter/draft Kennedy effort. Members of the Michigan delegation to Congress—with whom I have a close relationship both professionally and socially—have quietly, if not openly, given comfort to that idea. They have gone about the country side and told everyone who would listen of their disappointments with Carter. I was asked to join this movement. Without a moment's hesitation, I declined. Let me tell you why.

Edward Kennedy is, beyond a doubt, one of the most distinguished persons in government today. To those who say he is coasting on the Kennedy name, I say the opposite is true: He works hard, he has an excellent staff, he knows his nuts and bolts, and his dedication on the issues is firm and unwavering. It would have been easy for him to go along, relying on his name and enjoying the prerogatives of his office. He didn't have to get out in front on every major issue of the day: health, arms control, racial equality, you name it. But he has done so, and he's done it with ability and dedication. He deserves exceptional respect.

But to now regard him as a non-controversial shoo-in for the Presidency, as many seem to do, is wrong. Dead wrong.

As a Senator, as a maybe-maybe not presidential candidate, Senator Kennedy

gets great press. He can do no wrong. That's all very nice.

But just let him become a candidate for the Democratic nomination.

It would tear our party apart and the only winner would be the Republican candidate. And in the aftermath of such an intraparty battle the Republican presidential virtues would most probably leap to pick Senator Kennedy's bones dry with a hate campaign to destroy him by unfairly raising the many personal tragedies of the Kennedy family, and at very least deny him support in Southern states.

The memory of 1968 is fresh in my mind. The Republicans did not win the White House, the Democrats lost it. When I think of what some well intentioned Democrats did to Hubert Humphrey, I fear that some are poised to do it again to President Carter.

Notwithstanding some obvious mistakes and blunders—to which none of us are immune, including Kennedy or ourselves, and, I'm sure, to which the President would admit, President Carter's presidency has been some great surprises and some incredible accomplishments.

Who could have predicted that a graduate of Annapolis and a protege of Admiral Rickover would have vetoed, for the first time in our entire history, a complete defense authorization bill? Carter did that because he wasn't willing to see our money wasted on a nuclear carrier we don't need.

Who could have foreseen the immense personal skill and diplomatic ability required to get Mideast peace treaty signed—a treaty that is our best chance ever to end centuries of hate.

Who would have expected a Georgia peanut farmer to become the best environmentalist President since Teddy Roosevelt?

I didn't expect these things of Carter, so despite some of my fundamental disagreements with him over military spending and energy policy, I respect him as a man—and a leader—capable of surprise and capable of producing results.

He has managed to walk the fine line necessary to keep a Democrat in the White House during a time when the main priorities for many voters are balancing the budget and cutting federal spending.

And, unless the predicted recession later this year is worse than expected, next January the President will propose to Congress a balanced budget. He will thus deprive the Republicans of the one string which they harp, the one political goal they offer the American people. That is no mean achievement for a man who has also supported:

- Increases in the minimum wage.
- Hospital cost containment.
- National health insurance.
- Progressive tax reform.
- Strong environmental legislation.
- Aid to the cities.
- An extension of the deadline for the Equal Rights Amendment.

- The Agency for Consumer Protection.
- The Labor Law Reform Bill.
- Repeal of the Hatch Act.
- Major progressive welfare reform.

Carter has not accomplished all of these goals. He has, for example, run into stiff opposition from the Congress on tax and welfare reform, but he has demonstrated his commitment to them. We can be sure he will be back on Capitol Hill with every one of the programs he couldn't get through Congress in the past session.

Recall the really "bad old days" of the past two Republican administrations. Compare, for example, our present economic situation—for all its uncertainties—to that presented to the American people by Presidents Nixon and Ford, whose one-two punch resulted in negative growth for 3 of 8 years. President Nixon's carefully engineered recession threw millions of people out of work

and pumped unemployment to an unbelievable annual rate of 8.5 percent in 1975—a Republican accomplishment President Carter has been undoing ever since he took office. 8 million jobs have been created since 1977. And in the last year, unemployment has been held under 6 percent. The growth rate has been 4.5 percent. There has been annual growth of 9 percent in investments in the last year. The rate during the Nixon-Ford years was 1 percent.

Inflation has proved an intractable problem for the President—as it has for Congress. But Carter has met the problem head-on and has taken almost every step possible short of wage and price controls. His real wage insurance proposal and his hospital cost-containment proposals were shot down by Congress. His wage-price guidelines have come in for their share of criticism, but they have also been taken seriously—which is more than can be said for Gerald Ford's silly campaign to hand out WIN buttons.

And we also must not forget that Jimmy Carter is managing an economy that scarcely resembles the national economy of 25 years ago. Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson presided over an American economy that was clearly in the international driver's seat. The world economy was the American economy. Europe and Japan were recovering, with assistance from the United States, after the world war. The U.S. was producing nearly all of its energy needs and sending its goods to eager foreign buyers. Inflation and recession were localized, American problems, solved solely by American institutions.

But now we and Jimmy Carter are faced with an economy that is no longer as controllable, because it is now part of a truly international and interdependent world economy. Inflation is no longer vulnerable to the same weapons, because it is no longer an isolated phenomenon. OPEC energy pricing, competition from Japan and Western Europe, and negative trade balances that were unheard of 25 years ago—all these are factors beyond our sole control and beyond the single control of our President. It is irrational to react to these changes by merely pointing to the President and saying "he's not a leader."

The fact is, he is a leader—this becomes evident if we look over his foreign policy accomplishments.

Carter's accomplishments in foreign policy are remarkable, and though they have engendered howls of Republican protest, many of his triumphs represent the successful achievement of goals sought, but not attained, by his Republican predecessors: the Panama Canal, SALT II, the normalization of relations with China, and the successful negotiation of peace between Israel and Egypt.

Perhaps more important, President Carter has avoided the foreign policy disasters that plagued every one of his predecessors, Republicans and Democrats alike. Two years into their presidencies, Eisenhower had approved CIA-supported coups in Iran and Guatemala; Kennedy had suffered the Bay of Pigs Disaster, which invited the Berlin crisis and the Cuban missile showdown; Johnson had committed American lives in Vietnam; Nixon had widened that war to Cambodia and Laos; and Ford had lost 40 Marines invading the wrong island to rescue 38 American crewmen on the Mayaguez who had already been released. Under President Carter, we have undertaken no simplistic military "solutions" to complex foreign problems. We have successfully avoided the temptation to demonstrate our stupidity by throwing around our military weight. Courage and strength—as we all learned from our parents and try to teach our children—are different from bullying and shouting. There is more to courage than going into a rough situation with your guns

blazing. You may recall John Connally said he would not journey to the Mideast in the quest for peace unless success were assured in advance. Jimmy Carter risked failure and the humiliation that failure would have meant—by going himself to Jerusalem and Cairo to do everything he could to insure a peace agreement. And he succeeded. The President has demonstrated a mature capacity for courage and strength, and he deserves our respect for it.

Yet Conally, who gave us the decade's most graphic demonstration of "no guts, no glory," is regarded by the media as a "strong" leader, while the conventional media wisdom regards Carter as a "weak" leader. You sure can fool some of the people all of the time.

Mr. Carter has achieved—by any measure—a substantial record of accomplishments—which I defy any Member of Congress to try to match. The trouble is that we expect the President to be perfect.

Citizens in monarchies build palaces to show the reverence they have for their hereditary leaders. They wrap those leaders in velvet and ermine and surround them with gold. The hope we have in our President does not show itself in tangible or material ways. We build dreams, not palaces, and we surround our President with all most cherished ideals. It's hard for a man to live up to the expectations engendered by regal trappings, but it's harder still to live up to dreams and visions of a perfect world. As Jim Wright, House Majority Leader, has said, "We expect our President to be more than human and condemn him when he is not. But we would despise him if he were."

Our Presidents have always been aware of the contradictions and impossibilities of their position. Thomas Jefferson called the presidency a "splendid misery." Teddy Roosevelt found it a "bully pulpit." Abraham Lincoln was most struck with its loneliness. Harry Truman, the person we honor here tonight, laid it right on the line when he said, "The buck stops here."

Recall what the media said when Truman inherited the Presidency. The pundits told the nation he was too small a man for the job, and Dewey would mop the floor with him. They were proven wrong on both counts, of course, but it's interesting to ask why Truman was so severely underrated at the time. He was underrated because he was compared, not merely with the reality of FDR, who in many respects was the greatest President in our national history, but with the glowing memory of FDR, which was even more formidable than reality.

Now many of us are comparing Carter with an even more formidable standard. We compare him not with JFK, nor even with the memory of JFK, but with perfection itself. We think about what our ideal President would do in any given circumstance, and when Carter falls short of our ideal, we condemn him for it.

My friends, let's get back to reality. We don't have a choice between Carter and perfection. We have a choice between Carter and John Connally.

We all have our dreams—what we don't have is the responsibility to make them real. Jimmy Carter does. Of course, he will disappoint us—every last one of us. It is not possible to be President—to be the repository of all our deepest ideals—and not fail. That is the reason that Presidents age so noticeably in office. Sure, they work hard, but hard work never killed anybody. What is deadly is the responsibility and the pressure we place on our Presidents to give us what we so unrealistically desire—to turn all our dreams into realities.

Jimmy Carter has not given us all we want. He hasn't, because he can't. No president can. He has, however, as much as any man can, measured up to the office. He has demonstrated himself to be a man of vision, cour-

age, compassion, energy, and accomplishment. He is, however, only going to be as good a President as he is strong. He is only as strong as we make him by our support. It is our responsibility to dissent when necessary, but we must never forget that those are our dreams on the President's shoulders. When we disparage him, we disparage ourselves and our dreams. President Carter has proved himself to us. He has earned our support. He has mine. I call upon Senator Kennedy to give him his—immediately, unequivocally, publicly. The national interest—and the Democratic party interest—requires nothing less—from him and from all of us. ●

STATEMENT OF INTRODUCTION— SPOUSAL IRA BILL OF 1979

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce a bill (H.R. 4547) which will provide long needed equality in the tax incentives we provide to encourage retirement savings—the Spousal IRA bill of 1979. In 1974, we first approved the IRA—Individual Retirement Account—concept for workers who are not covered under a pension plan. We allow these workers to contribute the lesser of \$1,500 or 15 percent of compensation to an IRA account tax free—the amount contributed is deductible and the annual interest earnings are tax exempt.

But we made a grievous error when it came to defining eligible "workers" as only those who earn compensation, and we compounded the error when we made the contribution amount dependent upon the amount of compensation. Those factors excluded from IRA participation a significant segment of our workers—those who work in the home or as volunteers—and severely limited the amount of tax-favored savings for another large group—those who work only part time or for low wages.

Belatedly, we came to realize that these workers have an even greater need for their own retirement savings. We have not acted to meet this need however. We have but thrown a kernel of corn their way by enacting the Spousal IRA in 1976 which provided that the maximum contribution could be increased to \$1,750 if this amount were equally divided between the worker and spouse. I submit that this provision of present law is an insult rather than an incentive. It takes a lot away from one spouse to give to the other and provides a measly \$250 additional tax-favored savings for the couple.

The time has come and gone to correct this mistake of earlier days. We can no longer ignore the basic inequality inherent in a large number of Government programs where both the equal need and the equal contribution made by those who work at home, in volunteer posts, or in part time or lowly-paid jobs have been ignored. Slowly this inequality is being recognized and corrected. This bill will further that trend by addressing one of

the most fundamental needs of any person—dependent retirement savings.

H.R. 4547, the Spousal IRA bill of 1979, would allow all those who are not covered by a pension plan to establish an IRA in their own names and without regard to whether the other spouse is also eligible for an IRA. The contribution amount would be based on half of the earnings of the couple—fully recognizing the equal contribution made by the nonworking or lower paid spouse. To protect those who presently have IRA's and to take into account the increasing number of families where both have earnings, the bill would also allow either spouse to base their contributions solely on their own earnings if this method would allow a higher contribution.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that the retirement savings of one spouse are not sufficient to carry a retired couple through retirement years and those who become widowed or divorced in midlife often end up with no retirement savings or income at all. Many women in our society are further disadvantaged as they are more apt to leave and reenter the paid work force, disrupting coverage under pension plans. We must recognize these realities by providing adequate incentives for greater individual retirement savings. To ignore these realities now on the basis of excessive revenue loss will but insure higher costs later when the Government will be faced with the full costs of support for those having no independent means.

I believe the approach of this bill is an eminently fair and reasonable one. It is not as generous nor as costly as some that have been proposed but it will not come cheap either. I urge your support for this move to full equality in providing tax incentive for independent retirement savings for all. ●

JOHN GREEN—TORRANCE LEADER

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Torrance Chamber of Commerce will hold its annual officer installation dinner next week. This will be a special occasion since, in addition to welcoming the organization's new office holders, it will be a time to honor and thank John Green, the chamber's departing president. I want to join his associates and many friends in applauding him for the dedication he has displayed as chamber president and as a community leader.

John Green, joined the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., in 1936 the same year he received his A.B. degree in economics from Stanford University. He started as an automotive finishes salesman for PPG. He moved steadily upward to becoming a plant manager for the PPG Coating & Resins Plant in Torrance, the position he retired from in 1977. During his 40 years with PPG, he held a wide variety of supervisory assignments. As an example, he was general manager for the company's Pacific coast operations, be-

ing responsible for activities in seven Western States, including Alaska and Hawaii.

An eager readiness to contribute and a sincere commitment to community betterment have been the traits of his involvement in civil affairs. His work with the chamber has been most notable. The direction he gave as president made the 2 years of his tenure exciting and productive times. Membership doubled; innovative programs were introduced, and existing services were expanded and improved.

Through his efforts, the South Bay International Trade Association was formed to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas on how to deal with import-export trade problems. Community involvement was stepped up, making chamber members more familiar with the local government, and making city officials more aware of the business community's concerns. And, in due course, the Torrance Small Business Council was founded to meet the needs of the small business community.

John Green's involvement in civic affairs has extended way beyond the Torrance chamber's activities. He has been an active member of the United Way of Los Angeles County, serving on that organization's corporate and regional boards. He is also one of the most valued trustees of the Torrance Memorial Hospital. During his service as chairman of the hospital fund development committee, his personal efforts netted the hospital over \$1 million.

Mr. Speaker, few citizens can claim to have done as much for their community as John has done for Torrance. In all his endeavors, including his career with PPG Industries and his involvement in civic affairs, he has proven himself to be an able and generous leader. For his good works, my wife, Lee, and I extend our thanks and congratulations. We also extend our sincere hopes for a happy and rewarding future to him, his wife, Mary, and their sons, Bill and Jim. ●

A TRIBUTE TO MRS. EDNA NEBLETT
LEDBETTER

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives an outstanding lady of the Eighth Congressional district of Tennessee.

The lady I make reference to is Mrs. Edna Neblett Ledbetter. Mrs. Ledbetter has always been active in church and community activities. On June 12, 1979, she was named to the "Senior Adult Hall of Fame" at Central Church in Memphis, Tenn. She has taught a children's Sunday school class for 45 years, and has been a member of the order of the East-ern Star for 50 years.

In addition to her dedicated service to her church and community, Mrs. Ledbetter, who has been a widow since 1947,

has raised and educated three fine children. Her son, Orelle, was executive director of the Memphis Housing Authority until his retirement 4 years ago, another son, Donald, is the president of the National Association of Postal Supervisors; and her daughter, Edna Gene, is the wife of a Cumberland Presbyterian minister in Tulsa, Okla. Mrs. Ledbetter proudly claims four grandchildren and nine great grandchildren.

Rarely do we find a woman so unselfish of her time and energies. She reminds me of the proverb which says a "virtuous woman is worth far more than rubies."

Indeed, Mrs. Edna Neblett Ledbetter is a fine American deserving of acknowledgement and praise. I am extremely pleased that she is a member of my constituency. ●

BANKS BOLSTER JAMAICA'S
MARXIST REGIME

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in recent meetings of the Organization of American States (OAS), the Government of Jamaica, assisted by the new Castroite revolutionary regime of Grenada, acted as the political stalking horse, the surrogate, if you will, for the Cuban Communist regime in battling against any OAS intervention in Nicaragua that would interfere with the military buildup of Cuban-backed revolutionary effort there.

Jamaican Prime Minister Michael Manley's intimacy with the Cubans, of course, is nothing new. During the period of the 1976 electoral campaign increasing numbers of Cuban "technicians" arrived to help Prime Minister Manley who declared a "state of emergency" that ran from June 1976 through the December election to May 1977. Another "technician" of sorts from the Cuban Communist camp brought in was CIA turncoat Philip Agee who cooked up material for Manley's propaganda machine.

Manley's Marxist rule in Jamaica has bankrupted the island's economy. In the normal course of events, one might expect that the Jamaican voters, should elections continue to be held, of course, would reject Manley and his People's National Party as the authors of their economic chaos. But who is coming to Manley's rescue to shore up his Marxist sand castle? The International Financial Institutions (IFI's) with the full endorsement of the U.S. Government and our U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young. At present, the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) had agreed to give Jamaica credit totaling nearly \$500 million.

For the details of the growing collaboration of the Government of Jamaica Prime Minister Manley with the Cubans, and the economic bailout of Jamaica's Marxist economy funded in part by the American taxpayers through U.S. contributions to these International

Financial Institutions, I recommend the following editorial commentary by Barron's editor Robert M. Bleiberg.

The article follows:

SOW THE WIND

IN JAMAICA, THE UNITED STATES MAY REAP A
WHIRLWIND

(By Robert M. Bleiberg)

The *Daily Gleaner*, published in Kingston, Jamaica, since 1834, may not rank among the world's greatest newspapers, but it's surely one of the gutsiest. Since 1972, when the People's National Party, headed by Democratic Socialist Michael Manley, took office, the publication has waged an increasingly difficult and lonely struggle to keep alive what's left on the island of freedom of the press. Since coming into power, the Manley government has taken over Jamaica's radio and television stations, in the process turning them into organs of propaganda. It encouraged and helped to finance (via the Jamaican Development Bank) the launching of a rival daily. Last fall, in a speech to the party faithful (punctiliously reported on the *Gleaner's* front page), the Prime Minister denounced his journalistic critic as a "call girl" and "harlot," and its publishers and editors as "pimps for imperialism." Government advertising has dried up, official readership has dwindled, and, from time to time, the socialist bureaucracy threatens to cut off the supply of scarce imported newsprint. Covering Washington for *Barron's*, we used to cry, is like covering Capetown for *Ebony*, but no longer. The *Gleaner* makes such small concerns seem downright un-Manley.

In the past week or so, the *Gleaner* has acquired an unusually sharp cutting edge. Under the banner headline "KGB, DGI agents all over Jamaica—Seaga," the courageous paper recently carried a front-page story featuring allegations by Edward Seaga, leader of the Opposition, that both Cuba and the Soviet Union have stepped up their infiltration of the island. Specifically, Seaga, who urged the Governor-General to launch an inquiry, charged that 5,000 Cubans are freely "operating in and out of Jamaica, and that enough stores were housed in a Cuban school project to feed a small army." He added that a number of Jamaican police had received special training in Havana, and that the People's National Party was recruiting a home guard with the clear-cut capability of political coercion, as well as the power of arrest.

Prime Minister Manley promptly shrugged off the charges as a "lot of yakkety-yak." There are only 449 Cubans on the island, chimed in the Minister for National Security, all of them busy at socially approved tasks in the countryside comparable to those of the U.S. Peace Corps. The *Gleaner* found the official rejoinders wanting. Echoing the call for a probe by the Governor-General, it went on to editorialize: "Unfortunately the Government has so far failed to reply responsibly to the grave charges." Its outspoken columnists went much further. According to one, the new Cuban ambassador, who is due to arrive in Kingston next month, currently heads the bureau which furnishes clandestine support to revolutionary groups throughout Latin America. Weighing the credibility of charges and denials, respectively, a second minced no words: "I have wracked my memory," wrote Wilnot Perkins with an acerbity worthy of H. L. Mencken, "but I cannot remember a single occasion on which it was demonstrated, or even plausibly made out, that Mr. Seaga had deliberately lied to the country. The same, alas, I cannot say for our Prime Minister. . . . The Manley Government lies habitually, excessively, and, as with all else that it does, incompetently."

Never do business, said J.P. Morgan, with a man you can't trust. With respect to Jamaica, the private sector, both at home and abroad, by and large has heeded this sage advice. Since the early 'Seventies, investment

in productive enterprise has plummeted, while capital flight, spurred by punitive taxation, outbursts of lawlessness and political unrest, has accelerated. Trapped by previous commitments, the huge and largely U.S.-owned bauxite industry has sought to make what accommodation it could, up to and including the sale to the government of its landholdings and mineral rights; yet since the pressure started a half-decade or so ago, it has quietly curtailed expansion and shifted resources to more hospitable climes. Small wonder that in a good year, inflation runs at an annual rate of 20 percent or more, that one quarter of the labor force is idle and that Kingston, when it's flush, boasts foreign exchange enough to keep the island above water for four-to-six weeks.

J. P. Morgan was always bigger on Wall Street than in Washington, where somebody once perched a midget on his knee. These days his wise strictures evidently count for little. For with the hearty encouragement of the U.S. government—Michael Manley, proclaimed our roving goodwill ambassador Andrew Young, is my kind of guy—one global lending institution after another has been lavishing resources on his regime. At latest reckoning, the Inter-American Development Bank, has advanced Jamaica \$53 million, the World Bank, more than twice as much. Last week, the International Monetary Fund, so to speak, went for broke: despite Jamaica's shaky past and doubtful future, it agreed to lend the island \$330 million, half again as much as Kingston already owes the IMF and a staggering sum for so small a place. The credit, explained a spokesman for the Fund, is designed to tide the country over its balance of payments difficulties. What it will do is help to finance the ruinous economic policies of an openly Socialist, quasi-totalitarian state, as well as foster the spread of anti-American bias throughout the Caribbean. Sow the wind, the Gleaner in effect has warned, reap the whirlwind.

These days, in any case, it's an ill wind from Jamaica. As our colleague, James Grant, reported in mid-January: "People died in Jamaica last week because the price of gasoline went up 12 cents a gallon. At last count, six were dead, including three policemen; the streets of Kingston were littered with barricades and stalled cars." Crowds poured through the streets crying: "The poor can't take no more," and they had a point. According to S. J. Rundt & Associates, consultants on international business, the rise in consumer prices last year more than tripled, to 35 percent. Unemployment is rampant, with some 24 percent of the labor force out of work. Owing to the perennial devaluation of the Jamaican dollar, and an "incomes policy" which clamps a lid of 15 percent on wage increases, those lucky enough to have a job have suffered a relentless decline in their standard of living. As of March 31, the country's international monetary assets totalled \$77.6 million, enough to cover only three weeks of imports. Exporters to the island—at least prior to the IMF bail-out—rated its credit "poor," a distinction shared in this hemisphere only by near-bankrupt Peru.

For the rapid progress of poverty throughout Jamaica, the Manley government is largely to blame. Back in 1974, in utter disregard of its obligation to submit such disputes to international arbitration, Kingston unilaterally moved to raise its levy on production of bauxite. In consequence, so a leading financial daily reported last month: "Aluminum producers have been cutting back their bauxite mining and refining operations in Jamaica while stepping up these activities in other countries, such as Australia and Surinam." Other investors, both at home and abroad have been channeling resources elsewhere. As the Daily Gleaner recently observed: "The unpalatable fact is that since 1974 there has been a growing decline in the level of private foreign and

domestic investment in Jamaica; according to official statistics, in 1977, the decline in net investment reached a disconcerting 83 percent. This staggering erosion in capital formation is a graphic indication of the reaction of major investors to politically generated uncertainties here. . . ."

As for the Manley government, its extreme leftist leanings are unmistakable. The Prime Minister's ruling People's National Party, though denying direct links with the island's Communists, on a number of issues lately has made common cause with them. Manley, Fidel Castro's personal friend, obsessively speaks in a kind of Marxist pidgin: "Imperialism" recurs in his speech like a four-letter word in a sailor's. Furthermore, for a professed democrat, Manley has shown himself all too willing to suspend civil liberties. He did so from June 1976 to May 1977, invoking a "state of emergency" much like martial law, which, the Opposition has convincingly alleged, was concocted to rig the December elections. Despite official demurrers, that home guard looks increasingly ominous. And Jamaica, so the Opposition Party leader now charges, has become a privileged sanctuary for Cuban and Soviet Reds. Subversives, as the country seems destined to learn the hard way, can be as dangerous as the missiles over which the U.S. and U.S.S.R. once went eyeball-to-eyeball.

Today, however, it's Washington that's blinking. Ambassador Young has called Michael Manley "one of the most intelligent and independent leaders in the world." Last week, even as the IMF announced its outrageous transaction, Congressman Henry S. Reuss (D., Wis.), whose judgment on virtually every public issue (see last weeks' Barron's) seems fatally flawed, was bitterly complaining to the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury over a much smaller loan to Nicaragua, which, whatever its other shortcomings, happens to be an American ally and poses a threat to nobody but its own Communist-supported enemies. If this country's influence in the world is waning, one needn't look far for the cause. ●

HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE EARLY WARNING REPORT, WEEK OF JUNE 25, 1979

HON. BILL NELSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, in order to inform the House of the relationship of appropriations and other spending bills to amounts targeted in the first budget resolution for fiscal year 1980, the Budget Committee places in the Monday RECORD materials on the spending bills anticipated for floor action during the upcoming week. This week's package includes summaries of the HUD-independent agencies appropriations bill; transportation appropriations bill; Labor-HEW appropriations bill; Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill; State-Justice appropriations bill; and three bills with revenue impact.

The material follows:

H.R. 4394—HUD-INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1980 (H. REPT. 96-249)

Committee: Appropriations.
Subcommittee: HUD-Independent Agencies.

Chairman: Mr. Boland (Massachusetts).
Ranking Minority Member: Mr. Coughlin (Pennsylvania).

Scheduled: Tuesday, June 26, 1979.

I. DESCRIPTION OF BILL

This bill funds the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Veterans Administration, the Office of State and Local Assistance in the Department of Treasury, and 19 other independent agencies. It provides \$72,216 million in budget authority and \$31,116 million in outlays.

II. COMPARISON WITH SPENDING TARGET

This bill, combined with spendouts from prior appropriations and amounts assigned to the subcommittee but not yet considered exceeds the Subcommittee targets by \$556 million in budget authority and \$790 million in outlays.

Explanation of Problem: This bill exceeds its target for two reasons. First, the bill provides \$6,855 in budget authority and outlays, the full amount authorized, for the General Revenue Sharing program. The House assumptions behind the 1st Budget Resolution contain a reduction of \$684 million, a legislative savings that will require action by the Government Operations Committee to be effected. Second, the bill redirects funds from long-lead-time programs such as EPA construction grants, towards items with faster spendouts. This results in higher FY 1980 outlays, and lower outlays in the out-years.

III. SUMMARY TABLE

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
1. Amount in bill	72,216	31,116
2. Prior action		17,581
3. Action to date	72,216	48,698
4. Target	72,175	48,377
5. Over	41	320
6. Under		
7. Action to date	72,216	48,698
8. Amount assumed but not yet reported	+515	+469
9. Possible total	72,731	49,167
10. Target	72,175	48,377
11. Over	556	790
12. Under		

a. Explanation of Difference From Target. The bill provides \$684 million above the House assumptions for Revenue Sharing. The bill provides \$469 million in budget authority below amounts assumed in the Resolution for Environmental Protection Agency programs, primarily EPA Construction grants (\$400 million). The bill also provides amounts above those assumed in the Resolution for NASA programs (\$122 million), and assisted housing programs (\$193 million).
b. Amounts Assumed in Budget Resolution but not yet Considered.

Amounts assumed in the Budget Resolution but not yet considered total \$517 million in budget authority and \$471 million in outlays. These amounts are for the proposed targeted fiscal assistance program and for a number of Veterans Administration initiatives and savings for which legislation has not yet been enacted.

IV. BUDGETARY FLOOR AMENDMENTS

None known at this time.

V. COMPARISON WITH PRESIDENT

This bill provides budget authority of \$72,216 million, \$507 million below the total requested in the President's budget. Major reductions occur in funds available for the National Credit Union Administration central liquidity facility (\$-200 million) and the EPA (\$-468 million). Significant additions would be provided for housing programs (\$+195 million) and Veterans programs (\$+71 million).

H.R. 4440—TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1980 (H. REPT. 96-272)

Committee: Appropriations.
Subcommittee: Transportation.

Chairman: Mr. Duncan (Oregon).
Ranking Minority Member: Mr. Conte
(Massachusetts).

Scheduled: Thursday, June 28, 1979.

I. DESCRIPTION OF BILL

This bill funds the Department of Transportation and related agencies. It provides \$9,523 million in budget authority (of which \$425 million is advance appropriations for urban mass transit in 1981 and \$9,098 million for fiscal year 1980) and \$5,846 million in outlays.

II. COMPARISON WITH 1ST BUDGET RESOLUTION SPENDING TARGET

This appropriations bill, combined with spendouts from prior appropriations and amounts assigned to the subcommittee but not yet considered, is below the subcommittee targets by \$490 million in budget authority and \$2 million in outlays.

Explanation of Problem: No major budget problem with the bill as reported.

Explanation of Potential Problem: The potential problem with this bill is that floor amendments are very likely, and if passed will cause the possible total to exceed the Transportation subcommittee outlay target (see III. Summary Table). Further, the Function 400 targets may be breached as well (see VI. Functional Projection).

III. SUMMARY TABLE

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
1. Amount in bill.....	9,098	5,846
2. Prior action.....		11,655
3. Action to date.....	9,098	17,501
4. Target.....	9,771	17,677
5. Over.....		
6. Under.....	673	176
7. Action to date.....	9,098	17,501
8. Amount assumed but not yet reported.....	183	174
9. Possible total.....	9,281	17,675
10. Target.....	9,771	17,677
11. Over.....		
12. Under.....	490	2

a. Explanation of Difference from Target (line 12 above).

The possible total is under the target by \$490 million in budget authority. Of that, \$98 million represents real program reductions. The remainder results from a financing approach which affects budget authority, but which is consistent with the program level and outlays assumed in the Resolution. It is explained as follows: The President's Budget and the Budget Resolution both assume a funding level of \$700 million for the Interstate Transfer Grant program. That \$700 million consists of \$320 million in new budget authority and \$380 million in unobligated balances of contract authority. However, the Transportation bill proposes the direct appropriation of the requested \$700 million, offset by the rescission of all carryover balances of contract authority (totaling \$713 million). By rescinding \$713 million of unobligated balances of contract authority, the reported bill permits funding

of a \$700 million interstate program with a net reduction of \$13 million in budget authority and makes unnecessary utilization of \$380 million provided in the budget resolution.

b. Amounts Assumed in Budget Resolution but not yet Considered (Line 8 above).

The bill provides for the Panama Canal Commission on a six-month basis and is \$157 million in budget authority and \$149 million in outlays below the amounts assumed in the Resolution for full-year operation of the Commission. The bill does not reflect \$25 million in budget authority and outlays for proposed legislation involving establishment of an oil pollution liability and compensation fund.

IV. BUDGETARY FLOOR AMENDMENTS

Specific amendments have not been announced as yet. Amendments were offered in Subcommittee regarding mass transit and highways. Floor amendments are anticipated on Amtrak, highways, and mass transit (including additional operating aid and bus subsidy programs).

V. COMPARISON WITH PRESIDENT

This bill provides budget authority of \$9,098 million, \$170 million below the total requested in the President's budget. It provides \$280 million more in budget authority for the Panama Canal, \$347 million less for mass transportation, \$150 million less for rail rehabilitation initiatives and miscellaneous increases of \$47 million. The prior and new outlays associated with the bill total \$17,501 million, \$337 million above the President's budget. Additional outlays of \$249 million are projected for the Panama Canal, \$80 million for urban mass transportation programs, and \$8 million miscellaneous.

VI. FUNCTIONAL PROJECTION

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
1. Amount in bill (function 400).....	9,094	5,832
2. Prior action.....	9,196	11,068
3. Other reported bills.....	877	1,123
4. Amounts assumed but not yet considered:		
Unfunded portion of Panama Canal Commission.....	157	149
Rescission of highway trust fund budget authority.....	-250	
5. Possible total.....	19,064	18,172
6. Function 400 target.....	19,450	18,200
7. Over.....		
8. Under.....	386	28

Prior action (line 2 above) includes permanent (mostly highway trust fund amounts), outlays from prior-year appropriations, and receipts attributable to the Panama Canal bill.

Other reported bills (line 3 above) include the HUD and State-Justice Appropriations bills, and the Air Noise bill.

Amounts assumed but not yet considered (line 4 above) include \$157 million in budget authority and \$149 million in outlays for the unfunded portion of the Panama Canal Commission, and also a reduction of \$250 million through the rescission of Highway Trust Fund budget authority. If this rescission, included in the budget resolution assumptions,

is not effected, then the amount remaining in this function is significantly decreased.

H.R. 4389, LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1980 (H. REPT. 96-244)

Committee: Appropriations.
Subcommittee: Labor-HEW.
Chairman: Mr. Natcher (Kentucky).
Ranking Minority Member: Mr. Michel (Illinois).

Scheduled: Wednesday, June 27, 1979.

I. DESCRIPTION OF BILL

The bill funds the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and 13 other independent agencies. It provides \$73,395 million in budget authority and \$54,802 million in outlays for Fiscal Year 1980. The bill also provides \$172 million in budget authority and outlays as an advance appropriation for Fiscal Year 1982 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

II. COMPARISON WITH 1ST BUDGET RESOLUTION SPENDING TARGET

The Labor-HEW Appropriations bill, combined with budget authority from advance appropriations available in Fiscal Year 1980 and spendouts from prior appropriations as well as amounts assigned to the Subcommittee but not yet considered, is under the Subcommittee targets by \$53 million in budget authority and \$228 million in outlays.

Explanation of Potential Problem: The amounts assumed in the Resolution but not yet considered by the HEW-Labor Subcommittee include legislative savings totaling \$629 million in budget authority and outlays. These entitlements have been funded in the bill at the full current-law level. The proposed savings include reductions of \$293 million for AFDC and SSI payments and savings for Title XX state and local training grants (all within the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee). They also include savings in the Medicaid program related to Hospital Cost Containment and other reforms (Ways and Means, Interstate and Foreign Commerce). They also include elimination of the indexing of vocational rehabilitation state grants (Education and Labor). None of these reforms has yet been reported out by the legislative committees. If they are not enacted, while the other not-considered items are eventually funded, then the targets could be substantially exceeded.

III. SUMMARY TABLE

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
1. Amount in bill.....	73,395	54,802
2. Prior action.....	152	23,560
3. Action to date.....	73,547	78,362
4. Target.....	75,644	80,037
5. Over.....		
6. Under.....	2,097	1,675
7. Action to date.....	73,547	78,362
8. Amount assumed but not yet reported.....	2,044	1,447
9. Possible total.....	75,591	79,809
10. Target.....	75,644	80,037
11. Over.....		
12. Under.....	53	228

a. Explanation of Difference from Target (line 12 above).

Function	Subcommittee target		Labor-HEW bill		Difference	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
500: Education, training, employment and social services.....	29,104	29,520	28,413	29,227	-691	-293
550: Health.....	28,485	28,610	27,420	28,158	-1,065	-452
600: Income security.....	17,960	21,819	17,631	20,892	-329	-927
Other functions.....	95	88	83	85	-12	-3
Subtotal.....	75,644	80,037	73,547	78,362	-2,097	-1,675
Less: Amounts in resolution not yet considered.....	2,044	1,447			+2,044	+1,447
Total.....	73,600	78,590	73,547	78,362	-53	-228

¹ Amount in bill plus actions to date.

b. Amounts assumed in Budget Resolution but not yet considered. (line 8. above).

The amounts assumed in the First Budget Resolution but not considered in the Committee bill consist of (a) existing programs not authorized under current law, (b) proposed legislation assumed in the Resolution, not yet enacted, and (c) estimated differences. These categories total \$2.044 million in budget authority and \$1,447 in outlays, as follows:

[In millions of dollars]		
	Budget authority	Outlays
(a) Programs not authorized under current law:		
Discretionary health programs	743	273
Indochinese refugee assistance	149	149
ACTION, domestic programs	98	59
Subtotal	990	481
(b) Proposed legislation assumed in resolution, not yet enacted:		
Medicaid—grants to States (net)	74	74
Social services (title XX) and child welfare	534	509
AFDC, SSI, and trade adjustment (net)	42	42
Pay increase for Social Security Administration (trust fund limitation)		62
Subtotal	650	687
(c) Anticipated supplementals under existing law:		
Medicaid—Grants to States	178	178
AFDC—Grants to States	226	101
Subtotal	404	279
Total, assumed in resolution not considered	2,044	1,447

IV. BUDGETARY FLOOR AMENDMENTS

Mr. Early of Massachusetts indicated his intention to increase NIH research funding by \$47 million.

Mr. Dodd of Connecticut may offer an amendment to increase education for the handicapped by \$150 million. He may also offer an amendment adding \$180 million for the emergency fuel assistance program.

An amendment may be offered to increase nutrition programs for the elderly by a minimum of \$75 million.

V. COMPARISON WITH PRESIDENT

The Labor-HEW bill provides budget authority of \$73,395 million, \$204 million below the total requested in the President's budget for the programs considered in the bill. The net reduction results from a decrease in Department of Labor appropriations totaling \$882 million (largely CETA) below the President's budget estimates offset by increases above the President's budget in HEW health, education, and social services programs.

H.R. 4393—TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1980 (H. REP. 96-248)
 Committee: Appropriations.
 Subcommittee: Treasury, Postal Service, General Government.
 Chairman: Mr. Steed (Oklahoma).
 Ranking Minority Member: Mr. Miller (Ohio).

Scheduled: Friday, June 29, 1979.

I. DESCRIPTION OF BILL

The bill provides \$8,819 million in budget authority and \$8,424 million in outlays to fund the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President and ten other independent agencies.

II. COMPARISON WITH 1ST BUDGET RESOLUTION SPENDING TARGET

This Appropriations bill combined with spendouts from prior appropriations is above the Subcommittee target by \$124 million in budget authority and by \$112 million in outlays.

Explanation of Problem: The bill is very

close to the Budget Resolution assumptions. It is over its target only because the Appropriations Committee provided a target that is more than \$100 million below the Resolution assumptions. The Appropriations Committee did not specify where the reductions should occur.

III. SUMMARY TABLE

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
1. Amount in bill	8,819	8,424
2. Prior action		326
3. Action to date	8,819	8,750
4. Target	9,151	9,079
5. Over		
6. Under	332	329
7. Action to date	8,819	8,750
8. Amount assumed but not yet reported	456	441
9. Possible total	9,275	9,191
10. Target	9,151	9,079
11. Over	124	112
12. Under		

a. Explanation of Difference From Target (line 11. above).

The bill totals are above the Subcommittee target by \$124 million in budget authority and by \$112 million in outlays. The bill is consistent with the Resolution but the Appropriations Committee set a target more than \$100 million below those assumptions.

b. Amounts Assumed in Budget Resolution but not yet Considered (line 8. above).

The bill does not include \$177 million in budget authority and \$162 million in outlays assumed in the Budget Resolution to fund the Strategic Materials Stockpile. Legislation is pending which would significantly alter the current concept of stockpile operations; therefore the appropriation was deferred without prejudice. The bill also excludes \$279 million in budget authority and outlays for payments to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund. That amount is estimated by CBO to be required as a later supplemental, and was assumed in the Budget Resolution.

IV. BUDGETARY FLOOR AMENDMENTS

None known at this time.

V. COMPARISON WITH PRESIDENT

The bill provides budget authority of \$8,819 million, \$186 million below amounts requested in the President's budget. The major difference occurs in amounts provided for stockpile operations and other Federal property resources activities in GSA (-\$179 million). Smaller reductions would occur for the Internal Revenue Service (-\$7 million) and the Executive Office of the President (-\$2 million).

H.R. 3919—CRUDE OIL WINDFALL PROFIT TAX OF 1979 (H. REPT.—N.A. ON JUNE 22, 1979)
 Committee: Ways and Means.
 Chairman: Mr. Ullman (Oregon).
 Ranking Minority Member: Mr. Conable (N.Y.).

Scheduled: Thursday, June 28, 1979.

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE BILL

The Crude Oil Windfall Profits Tax Act of 1979 was originally proposed by the President to offset a portion of the increased profits which will fall to the oil industry simply as a result of the Administration's decision to decontrol the price of domestic oil. Decontrol would let oil prices rise in stages to prevailing world prices. A portion would be left with the industry hopefully to encourage further exploration and development; the portion flowing to the Federal government would be earmarked for an energy trust fund to be used to encourage development of alternative energy sources, alleviate the burden of the price increases on

particularly hard-hit segments of society and conservation incentives to such sectors as mass transit.

The bill as reported by Ways and Means significantly increased the short-term revenues to be received by the Federal government over the Administration's proposal principally by substituting a 70 percent excise tax on already-discovered oil, for the President's proposed 50 percent rate; by retaining the tax permanently; and by taxing already-discovered Alaskan oil.

While the bill provides for the creation of an Energy Trust Fund for the revenues realized through the imposition of the new tax, it makes no determination as to the disposition of the funds. Thus a major concern of this committee has to be the ultimate fate of this fund, particularly since in addition to authorizing new spending programs funded by the permanent authority of the funds, Congress is likely to adopt new tax credits which will result in revenue losses. Should the total new spending and new revenue reductions exceed the amount to be raised by the new tax, the budgetary impact could be a cause of concern. As reported, the bill will raise a combined total of \$28.1 billion through fiscal year 1984.

II. COMPARISON WITH FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION REVENUE ASSUMPTIONS

This bill was not assumed in the First Budget Resolution for FY 1980.

III. EFFECT ON REVENUES

Revenue Effect

[In millions of dollars]

1. Current law revenue estimate	\$509,000
2. Amount passed by House this year	
3. Amount reported but not yet passed	-22
4. Amount in H.R. 3919	+1,900
5. Possible total	510,878
6. Target	509,000
7. Over	1,878
8. Under	

IV. BUDGETARY FLOOR AMENDMENTS

In addition to the usual minority motion to recommit with instructions to rewrite, the modified open rule being requested by Ways and Means will provide for one amendment reducing the tax bite on the grounds it will encourage more production and another amendment stiffening the tax to further reduce the profitability of decontrol for the oil industry.

V. COMPARISON WITH PRESIDENT

This proposal was not included in the President's Budget for FY 1980.

H.R. 7—MONETARY CONTROL ACT OF 1979 (H. REPT. 96-263)

Committee: Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

Chairman: Mr. Reuss (Wis.).
 Ranking Minority Member: Mr. Stanton (Ohio).

Scheduled: Friday, June 29, 1979.

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to prevent continuing erosion of Federal Reserve membership. The bill levies reserve requirements against non-members as well as members of the Federal Reserve System. Fees are levied not only on banks but on savings and loan institutions and credit unions.

The reserve requirements are reduced and standardized on transaction accounts. This includes checking accounts with reserve requirements set at 11 percent. The bill also eliminates reserve requirements for many small banks by exempting the first \$35 million of demand deposits and the first \$10 million to time deposits. The bill also enables the Fed to charge banks for services such as check clearing.

II. COMPARISON WITH FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION REVENUE ASSUMPTIONS

This bill was not assumed in the First Budget Resolution for FY 1980. It is expected to result in a revenue loss of hundreds of millions in the outyears.

III. EFFECT ON REVENUES (In millions of dollars)

	Revenue effect
1. Current law revenue estimate...	\$509,000
2. Amount passed by the House this year.....	-----
3. Amount reported but not yet passed.....	+1,808
4. Amount in H.R. 7.....	-20
5. Possible total.....	510,878
6. Target.....	509,000
7. Over.....	1,878
8. Under.....	-----

IV. BUDGETARY FLOOR AMENDMENTS

None expected.

V. COMPARISON WITH PRESIDENT

This proposal was not in the President's budget for FY 1980.

STATE-JUSTICE-COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1980 (H. REPT. 96-247)

Committee: Appropriations.
Subcommittee: State-Justice-Commerce.
Chairman: Mr. Slack (West Virginia).
Ranking Minority Member: Mr. O'Brien (Illinois).
Scheduled: Friday, June 29, 1979.

I. DESCRIPTION OF BILL

This bill funds the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and related independent agencies; it also funds the Judiciary. It provides \$7,647 million in budget authority and \$6,022 million in outlays.

II. COMPARISON WITH 1ST BUDGET RESOLUTION SPENDING TARGET

This appropriations bill, combined with spendouts from prior appropriations and amounts assigned to the Subcommittee and not yet considered, is below the subcommittee targets by \$153 million in budget authority and \$256 million in outlays.

Explanation of Problem: No major budget problem with the bill as reported.

III. SUMMARY TABLE

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays
1. Amount in bill.....	7,647	6,022
2. Prior action.....	-----	3,945
3. Action to date.....	7,647	9,967
4. Target.....	9,906	10,560
5. Over.....	-----	-----
6. Under.....	2,259	593
7. Action to date.....	7,647	9,967
8. Amount assumed but not yet reported.....	2,106	337
9. Possible total.....	9,753	10,304
10. Target.....	9,906	10,560
11. Over.....	-----	-----
12. Under.....	153	256

a. Explanation of Difference From Target (line 12. above).

The reported bill makes reductions in a large number of appropriation accounts, most relatively small in dollar amount. The estimate of outlays from prior-year appropriations has been revised, primarily reflecting slower spending in regular EDA programs than been assumed in the First Budget resolution.

b. Amounts Assumed in Budget Resolution but not yet Considered (line 8. above).

Amounts assumed in the Budget Resolution but not yet considered total \$2,106 million in budget authority and \$337 million in outlays. These amounts include funds for a number of programs which are not yet authorized for FY 1980, including (1) Federal Trade Commission, \$69 million; (2) EDA regular programs, \$609 million; (3) National Development Bank replacement, \$500 million; (4) Regional Action Planning Commissions, \$74 million; and (5) Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, \$440 million. SBA disaster-loan supplementals of \$413 million are also assumed in the budget resolution.

IV. BUDGETARY FLOOR AMENDMENTS

No major amendment known at this time.

V. COMPARISON WITH PRESIDENT

This bill provides budget authority of \$7,647 million, \$321 million below the total requested in the President's budget for comparable items. Major reductions include contributions to international organizations (\$41 million), NOAA operations, research and facilities (\$30 million), and ship construction (\$69 million).

H.R. 3575—FLEXIBILITY IN IMPOSITION OF MARKETING PENALTIES FOR PEANUTS (H. REPT. 96-213)

Committee: Agriculture.
Subcommittee: Oilseeds and rice.
Chairman: Mr. Foley (Wash.).
Ranking Minority Member: Mr. Wampler (Va.).
Scheduled: Monday, June 25, 1979.

I. DESCRIPTION OF BILL

This bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce penalties assessed for violation in the marketing of peanuts, when such violations are determined to be unintentional or inadvertent through the 1981 marketing year.

II. COMPARISON WITH FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION REVENUE ASSUMPTIONS

This bill was not assumed in the First Budget Resolution for FY 1980.

III. EFFECT ON REVENUES (In millions of dollars)

	Revenue effect
1. Current law revenue estimate...	\$509,000
2. Amount passed by the House this year.....	-----
3. Amount reported but not yet passed.....	+1,880
4. Amount in H.R. 3575.....	-2
5. Possible total.....	510,878
6. Target.....	509,000
7. Over.....	1,878
8. Under.....	-----

FRANK J. MORIARITY

HON. GERALDINE A. FERRARO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor an outstanding citizen of the Ninth Congressional District, Mr. Frank J. Moriarity. He is an active and effective community member who has given selflessly of himself as a friend, fellow worker, and neighbor. For 60 years Mr. Moriarity has lived in Woodside and his contributions to that community have earned him the title of "The Mayor of Woodside"—just one way in which his neighbors have come to express their appreciation and

love for this fine citizen. The people of Woodside are fortunate to have Mr. Moriarity in their community. He is a credit to Woodside, and I might add, to this country.

It is with much pleasure that I include with this statement the New York State Senate Resolution (No. 136) properly commending Mr. Moriarity for his dedication and involvement. The resolution follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION No. 136

Whereas, Frank J. Moriarity of Woodside, Long Island, New York has been a vital force in his community for over sixty years as a sponsor and manager of athletic and recreational activities, a primary fund raiser for various charitable organizations and needy individuals and perhaps most notably as a civil leader; and

Whereas, This dynamic and patriotic gentleman, who celebrated his eighty-fifth birthday on December second, nineteen hundred seventy-seven, is an original member of the Queens Borough President's Community Planning Board No. 2; and

Whereas, This distinguished veteran has served the Blissville Post of the American Legion with untiring dedication, working as Chairman of the Americanization Committee and Graves Registration Committee and is a life Member of John V. Daniels Post 2813, Veterans of Foreign Wars; and

Whereas, Frank Moriarity's boundless energy and unlimited enthusiasm have seen him active and effective on local, county and state levels in the various veteran, civic, political and religious organizations with which he has been associated during his residency in Woodside/Sunnyside since 1921; and

Whereas, An electrician and longstanding active member of Electrical Worker's Local 3, I.B. of E.W., Frank Moriarity has not only literally helped in the physical construction of his city, but has worked in his spare time building its spirit and tending its development in numberless ways such as being a member of the Board of Governors of the Sunnyside Chamber of Commerce, of the one hundred eighth Police Precinct Community Council and of the Coordinating Council of the Queens Vocational High School, among many other varied and diverse organizations which he not only has supported, but also in which he has, in his uniquely effective way, actively participated; and

Whereas, In 1968, Frank J. Moriarity appeared before the United States Secretary of State in Washington, D.C. as a member of the "Free the U.S. Pueblo" Committee, which contributed importantly to the release of the entire crew of the *Pueblo*; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Legislative Body commends Frank J. Moriarity and expresses its most heartfelt gratitude for his wide-ranging, dedicated and untiring service to his community in so many ways while giving unstintingly of his vision and his energy to his fellow citizens, their goals, aspirations and organizations; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted to Frank J. Moriarity in Woodside, Queens County. ●

EXPLOSIVES TAGGANTS LEAD TO HOMICIDE SUSPECT

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, far too little credit is given to the Bureau of Al-

cohol, Tobacco and Firearms (BATF) in its service directed against the interstate trafficking in explosives. The Bureau effectively supports the investigation and prosecution of violators who cause death and destruction throughout our land every year.

Recently the BATF, under its capable Director, G. R. "Bob" Dickerson, has been supporting legislation to authorize the insertion of taggants, or tiny color-coded, wafflelike, plastic particles in dynamite which can assist BATF agents in determining when and by whom the tagged explosive was manufactured.

The fluorescent bits of material, called microtaggants, for which BATF has asked authority to insert in explosive materials, including dynamite, can be detected by using a magnet or ultraviolet light. Thereafter, determining where an explosive was manufactured, the agents can trace the progress of such materials through a commercial chain, ending in its final utilization.

Mr. Speaker, recently taggants were added to explosives used as a part of a national pilot program established in 1977 and aimed at combating terrorist bombings. As a result of this program taggants placed in explosive materials led last week to the arrest of a suspect in the May 10 bombing death of Nathan A. Allen, Sr. of Baltimore.

Allen died of injuries when a dynamite blast demolished his pickup truck. The taggants contained in the explosive which killed Allen were traced by BATF to the suspect, James L. McFillin of Baltimore, who was arrested last week in Martinsburg, W. Va.

Mr. Speaker, this recent incident establishes without question the effectiveness of inserting taggants in explosive materials, thereby enabling law enforcement officials to apprehend and prosecute individuals suspected of crimes committed when explosives are employed.

Mr. Speaker, under pending legislation, BATF would be authorized to insert taggants in all explosives manufactured in the United States. As the arrest of James L. McFillin demonstrates, this practice could provide immeasurable assistance to the law enforcement community and could lead to the apprehension and prosecution of some of the most vicious criminals in our land, who resort to the manufacture and use of deadly explosives which maim and kill many others just as Nathan A. Allen, Sr., was killed. I am confident that if such legislative authority is provided for the insertion of taggants in explosive materials, the number of felonious and terrorist bombings can be reduced substantially.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, G. R. "Bob" Dickerson, and I urge upon my colleagues their active support of H.R. 2441, which will permit the continued and more widespread utilization of taggants in explosive materials which, in turn, can lead to a reduction of terrorist crimes in America and the more certain apprehension and prosecution of those who perpetrate such hideous crimes. ●

DR. WALTER B. WAETJEN'S VIEWS ON THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF THIS COUNTRY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to the RECORD an article by Walter B. Waetjen, president of Cleveland State University. This article, which recently appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, focuses on the educational system of this country and certain problems which beset it. Dr. Waetjen, who is a professional in the field of educational and child psychology, has been working in higher education, both as a professor and as an administrator, for over 30 years. As such, he has a particularly relevant and unique background which qualifies him to speak out on education and to propose solutions designed to improve the system's ability to address and meet the needs of students in our society.

The article follows:

Education is big business in the United States. Usually things to which people commit a lot of dollars get a lot of public attention. There are two exceptions: government and education.

We pour billions of dollars into government at local, state and federal levels, but the small turnout for elections suggests that we're not really all that interested in government.

The same may be said for education. If this seems to be the usual gripe from one who has a vested interest, it is not, because education is an investment in human capital. Our investment is secured by our active involvement in matters of education, by our insistence on quality, and by our commitment of funds.

Just about every person and organization has been negligent with respect to what has gone on in education for the last 20 years. That includes all levels of education from kindergarten through the graduate school.

Rather than ferreting out culprits, it's time we addressed ourselves to solution of the problem. What is to follow, then, is a call to action, a description of the actions that must be taken in the next five years.

First, we must emphasize once again the extreme importance of learning the basic academic skills that have to do with reading with comprehension, writing with unity and coherence, and being able to use numbers.

Those are the skills that undergird all other learning, and each in its own right is a "language." These skills ultimately make it possible for citizens to enjoy a better quality of life because they can use the languages of letters and numbers to communicate intelligently and effectively.

Second, we must rid ourselves of the belief that elementary and secondary education can be separated from education in community colleges, technical colleges and universities. They are all parts of a system.

For much too long, we have tinkered with one part of the system without realizing its impact on the other parts. Examples abound, but two will suffice: the discontinuance of collegiate foreign language requirements and its impact on the high schools, and the discontinuity between high school mathematics requirements and those of the colleges.

This piecemeal approach is carried to its extreme when legislators declare their in-

tention to increase significantly the funding of elementary and secondary schools while giving universities and community colleges only nominal budget increases.

The reason we do not become more concerned is that the piecemeal approach and its ultimate deterioration of our educational system occur so slowly—and usually under the banner of economy.

Third, there will have to be increased emphasis on science education, scientific research and technology.

How can this be, when in the not-too-distant past we placed a man on the moon? The answer is that we have done little to enrich our science education programs in the last decade. That in contrast to the 1960's when curricula in math, physics, biology and chemistry were revamped extensively.

Bodies of scientific knowledge are constantly changing, because of research findings, and curricula need to be revised periodically.

All right, you say, let's get to it. We've done the research, now let's follow through. Sadly, we have not had all that much research, because it costs money and the research dollars are in ever-declining supply from the federal government. Inflation has eroded purchasing power to the point where current expenditures of the National Science Foundation for science education represent a 79 percent reduction in purchasing power from 1968.

Without a strong national commitment to science and technology, it is clear that scientific research in universities will lag and that science programs in elementary and secondary schools will not flourish.

It could well be that the entire scientific posture of this country is back where it was in the early 1950's. But there is a very real need to maintain leadership in science and technology since our domestic economy is built on it.

Fourth, the matter of energy will have to be addressed at all levels of our educational system. The frontier attitude that energy sources are unlimited must be dispelled. Solutions to the problem are long-range and deserve consideration in curricula of elementary, secondary and post-secondary schools.

Even young children can learn to understand, for example, that excessive importing of foreign oil drains our national economy and hurts every family by causing unemployment and feeding inflationary pressures.

The research capabilities of universities can be brought to bear on this problem, too. Research is needed on additional energy sources such as geothermal steam, burning of waste, nuclear reaction, shale, coal, solar rays and wind.

Fifth is the problem of our cities. People have to be educated about the forces that give rise to cities, their changing nature, the role and functions of city governments, the diversity of life-styles in urban centers and the problems confronting cities.

Almost every national problem has its emphasis in and focus on urban centers: housing, education, transportation, changing population trends, air and water pollution, declining tax base and crime.

Merely living in a city does not give a citizen the insights necessary to help preserve it. Such insights will have to be developed in classrooms. In addition, we desperately need research and demonstration projects to help solve urban problems.

An anomaly of our state government is that funds are not specifically earmarked in the budget for solution of urban problems. In contrast, money for agricultural research is identified.

The budget of the state of Ohio provides \$30 million for agricultural research—and it is needed. No dollars are budgeted for

urban research, even though many Ohio cities are in serious trouble.

Urban universities could help, since they have a wealth of faculty talent. Can our state and nation afford not to do something about our cities?

People usually regard war as a significant and colorful enterprise. We deny that it is, but we symbolize the glamour and importance war holds for us. In somber, morning-after moods, we periodically swear off war. When war comes we put our lives, our fortunes and sacred honor into the fray. In dice-player's idiom, we shoot the works.

People's attitude toward education has been the reverse of their attitude toward war. We proclaim that education is the ultimate of all human tasks, that its impacts on the happiness and prosperity of a society are monumental and that its values transcend all others.

Then we proceed cautiously to confine education to a little book learning and dole it out in bargain lots to groups privileged in certain economic and social ways.

We serve education timidly. We do not shoot the works as we do in war. We shoot four bits and then gripe that our winnings are small.

We really don't have to shoot the works on education, but we should do better than four bits. Better, that is, if we want to achieve the agenda for education described above. ●

SAVING MONEY IN SCOTTSDALE, ARIZ.

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, a recent newspaper article featured the pragmatic cost-savings approach of the city of Scottsdale, Ariz., in my congressional district. The city has found that it does not need massive Government to provide services, and that contracting them out is cost effective.

When we see the huge problems, the vast cost overruns, and the poor service that have become endemic in our major metropolitan areas, it is encouraging that cities are now investigating privatization of city services, with resulting improvements in efficiency and savings to the taxpayers who support city functions.

I urge my colleagues to read this article, written by Frank Aleskire, city manager of Scottsdale, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of June 20, 1979.

Text of the article is as follows:

When a lime-green fire truck pulls up to a house in Scottsdale, Arizona, you know this is a city with a difference. The fact that Scottsdale taxpayers spend one-half to one-third the national average for fire protection is reason enough to wonder how they do it.

Since incorporation in 1951 Scottsdale has contracted with a private company to manage and operate the fire department. In years past the Scottsdale plan has been treated as a novelty by other cities and as a potential disaster by the fire fighters' union. But today, beleaguered city officials across the land are taking a second look at any measure which promises to cut the cost of government.

Maybe the most positive thing that can be

said about Proposition 13—California's voter-mandated tax-cutting measure—is that it has definitely triggered a change in public opinion. And because of that mayors and managers from New York to California are taking renewed interest in tax reduction, productivity improvement, and shrink management.

Scottsdale has a reputation as an innovative city. Besides a private fire department the city has pioneered "Godzilla," the mechanized one-man refuse truck. The city has also developed, with the Corps of Engineers, a nonstructural approach to flood control—Indian Bend Wash, a seven-mile greenbelt. These well-publicized innovations are only possible because the city council over the years has promoted a "risk taking philosophy." Councilmen have actively supported efforts to find better ways to do things. One example of a difference in approach is that Scottsdale believes in contracting for services instead of always "doing it yourself."

The city has 450 contracts with other agencies and with private firms and individuals to provide services to citizens. These services cover everything the city does from security guards at the airport to TV cameras in the sewers. The city contracts for grounds maintenance, custodial services, computerized library catalogs, auditing, consignment purchasing, pothole patching, radio maintenance, and many other programs.

Contracting for services certainly is not a new idea. Back in 1954 the Lakewood plan was born in Los Angeles County. Cities learned to contract with the county for services and found that the cost of government could be reduced by eliminating duplication and overhead.

Out of that experience grew the realization that cities could contract with each other and with school districts and with private companies. Whatever works best for the citizen—the taxpayer—is the way it ought to be.

Scottsdale has a close working relationship with its local school district. Three years ago the city and the school district entered into an agreement to time-share a Honeywell 6023 computer. The taxpayers saved over \$100,000 a year in computer costs. The city and schools also share parks, community buildings, swimming pools, and ballfields on a formal contractual basis thereby saving thousands of dollars yearly. Currently the city is negotiating to lease two schools which are scheduled to be closed because of declining enrollment. This will postpone a multimillion-dollar city building program and provide lease income for the schools.

If contracting or "privatization" is such a good idea, how come more cities don't try it? The fact is more cities are trying it—especially in California where the tax reduction movement is placing increasing pressure on city hall to spend less. Last month Long Beach State University had an all-day seminar for city managers to exchange ideas on how to contract for services. The standing-room-only turnout shows how California managers are thinking.

Successful contracting depends upon two essential ingredients. First, the elected officials (city council) must really want to explore alternative ways of doing the job. They must require staff people to provide information on which to base decisions, and they must be willing to provide the leadership in the community to try something new. Sometimes they have to take some "flak" from vested interests.

The second essential ingredient for successful contracting is good management. Many people think that when you contract a service you transfer the responsibility to someone else. Not so. In many respects it is more difficult to manage contracts than it is to direct your own people. Good contract management requires: (1) a clear statement

of what is to be done; (2) regular monitoring of performance, and (3) evaluation of results.

By and large government managers haven't been trained in contract administration. Government administrators are heavy on "body counting"—personnel management and supervision—but they are weak on results-oriented management. This points to a need for more training in MBO (management by objectives) and better measurement techniques for improving efficiency and effectiveness at city hall.

"Privatization" or contracting for city services is an idea whose time has come. Local government is in the best position of any level of government to get "more bang for the buck" for the overburdened taxpayer, and thereby help to improve the overall productivity of this country. ●

PRISONERS NEED CETA, TOO

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 27, when the House begins its consideration of H.R. 4389, the Departments of Labor/HEW appropriations bill, an amendment may be offered to reverse the earlier action taken by the Appropriations Committee to bar incarcerated offenders from receiving 1980 Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) funds.

The Appropriations Committee took its action after learning that 27 prisoners at the Washington, D.C., Lorton Reformatory had been paid Federal job-training funds, and that some of these prisoners were not eligible for release until after the year 2000. The Department of Labor has initiated an investigation into these alleged abuses at the Lorton Reformatory, and it is my understanding their final investigation will be concluded in a few days.

In my judgment, the action of the Appropriations Committee is overbroad. It would punish all prisoners who are working in CETA programs rather than focusing on the few governments (prime sponsors) which may be misapplying CETA funds. The Secretary of Labor has the authority to require the repayment of misspent funds, and the Department of Labor is proposing strengthened regulations which would further restrict payments to prisoners, thus obviating the need for further legislation in this area. Moreover, no evidence has been shown to indicate a national problem. It is premature to enact broad Federal legislation to remedy a single incident of abuse in the District of Columbia without knowing the precise extent and nature of the problem.

It is estimated that approximately 150,000 prisoners will be barred from participating in CETA programs as a result of the Appropriations Committee action, and it should be noted that of a national civilian labor force of 100 million persons, fully 25 million meet DOL's definition of offender. Job training and employment upon release is the single most effective way of reducing re-

cidivism. Depriving prisoners of an opportunity to rehabilitate themselves by obtaining useful skills and job opportunities will only compound the problems of the revolving door of the Criminal Justice System.

Offenders are not a priority to the majority of employers. These persons are in special need of employment and training programs, and I would urge my colleagues to support this action to delete the committee provision.

Comment from DOL Secretary Ray Marshall has been received on the "prisoner restriction," and the Department of Labor is opposed to the committee action. At this point, I have inserted the full text of the Secretary's letter to me for review and consideration by my colleagues.

The letter follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., June 22, 1979.

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CONYERS: This letter is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Labor on an amendment to the Labor Department's Appropriation bill that would prohibit the use of funds for paying "prisoners for work performed during their incarceration." The Department is opposed to the amendment.

Prisoners nearing release from prison participate in programs run by prime sponsors throughout the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). They also participate in programs funded pursuant to the statutory requirement for offenders programs under title III of CETA.

The amendment would appear to eliminate work experience and public service employment programs for all prisoners, although training programs would seem not to be affected because there is no "pay for work" in such a case. Less clear, however, is what is meant by "incarceration." A broad reading of the term would mean that prisoners eligible for parole, those eligible for work-release programs, and those in halfway houses and like situations could not participate in public service employment or work experience programs.

We are opposed to limiting the participation of prisoners near release. The transition into society after release from prison is difficult. We believe job experience can substantially ease this transition. Clearly, concern with the high unemployment among those released from prison was one of the reasons Congress adopted the title III offenders program.

We understand that the amendment is a result of reports of prisoners who are not near release from prison participating in CETA job programs at high wages. If this is the situation that the amendment was intended to eliminate, the amendment is both unnecessary and overbroad.

The new CETA law and regulations emphasize that the purpose of CETA jobs programs is to transition persons into regular employment and to enhance self-sufficiency. We do not believe that prisoners who are not near release are intended to be served. In order to make clear that this type of prisoner is not eligible for CETA programs, the Department will issue proposed regulations allowing the inclusion in CETA programs only of prisoners who are within 18 months of potential release. We also would point out that most of the prisoners in CETA programs are receiving only the minimum wage since the new CETA law provides strict wage limitations.

We feel any question about prisoner eligibility for CETA programs will be clarified by the proposed regulatory change. Therefore, we believe no legislative change is necessary to limit prisoner eligibility. We urge that the amendment be deleted from the Appropriations bill.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

RAY MARSHALL,
Secretary of Labor. ●

WEAPON SYSTEMS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon has approved production of a \$3.7 billion weapon system, even though top Army officials say that other weapons can do the same job at significantly lower cost.

I am talking about the Roland missile, manufactured by Hughes Aircraft and Boeing. It was designed as a surface-to-air missile for defending air bases and other critical assets in the rear areas of Western Europe in the event of a NATO/Warsaw Pact war.

All analyses indicate that Roland is far from the best system available. The Army leadership, in fact, was told by its air defense experts that no compelling justification has been found for fielding Roland or for continuing its development.

This conclusion was reached by studies completed last February and April by the Army's Training and Doctrine Command, the Defense Audit Service, and was confirmed by an independent evaluation group at Department of Army Headquarters.

All these studies show that improved versions of the Hawk and Chaparral missiles—which are already fielded—would provide equal or better defense, and at significantly lower cost.

The program cost for Roland is estimated by the Defense Audit Service to be \$3.7 billion. By contrast, the Improved Hawk will cost somewhat less than \$2.3 billion. The Improved Chaparral with a forward-looking infrared (FLIR) device and a post seeker will cost about \$1.2 billion.

Dr. William Perry, Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, has testified in support of Roland, but has also stated that he would not favor buying the missile if it were \$1 billion more expensive than any of its alternatives. Before the Senate Armed Services Committee last May 10, Dr. Perry said:

"I would not be willing to pay the \$1 billion differential . . .

I would not be testifying this way if I thought that there was a \$1 billion difference in the cost of the system.

Mr. Speaker, Roland exceeds Improved Hawk by \$1.4 billion and Improved Chaparral by about \$2.5 billion. Putting these figures alongside Dr. Perry's testi-

mony, I can only conclude that Roland should not be purchased, that the funding for this system should stop at once.

Still, the Pentagon approved a production go-ahead on May 31.

Roland appears to be a totally unnecessary weapon that has stayed alive only due to corporate collusion and misleading claims about NATO politics.

It is the final dubious item in the notorious legacy of Malcolm Currie. Many of you will remember that Dr. Currie was Director of Defense Research and Engineering during the Nixon-Ford years. A vice president for R. & D. at Hughes Aircraft before coming to the Pentagon, he returned to the post of vice president for policy at Hughes after leaving "public service." During his tenure at the Pentagon, he was accused of numerous conflict-of-interest activities, most notably on the Rockwell-Hughes Condor missile, a totally worthless system that was written about in numerous publications and finally, sensibly, killed by Congress in the fall of 1976.

Roland may turn out to be a bigger scandal than Condor. It seems that Dr. Currie was chiefly responsible for getting Roland underway, as well, and in a very deceptive fashion. According to a study by the Defense Audit Service, the first Defense System Acquisition Review Council (DSARC) considering Roland, held in 1974, failed to provide the decisionmakers with relevant information. Specifically, the DSARC did not receive adequate assurance that alternative approaches to satisfying the mission needs were evaluated; that optimum balance in cost, performance, and schedule was achieved; that technical and product risks were identified and practicable solutions were prepared. In fact, none of these things had been assured. The Defense Audit Service goes on to say:

"In our opinion, these and other shortcomings in the DSARC process were traceable to a joint decision made by the Director, Defense Research and Engineering—"

That is, by Dr. Malcolm Currie:

"and Department of Army officials to restrict access to . . . selection information to a very select few people."

It seems that Dr. Currie and some Army officials laid it out like this: Either buy Roland or forget about the short-range air defense (SHORAD) mission altogether. No alternatives to Roland were offered, the pros and cons of various systems were not discussed. It was a sneaky and dishonest business all around.

Since this time, Roland has been justified as part of the "NATO Standardization" policy. Roland was originally a German-French missile that the United States agreed to purchase as part of a growing "two-way street" policy in NATO weapons procurement.

Roland's defenders say that if we do not buy Roland, the Europeans might not buy Patriot, an American missile needed for NATO flank defense.

There are two problems with this argument. First, the Europeans have not yet agreed to buy Patriot, and they may not look at it as part of a Roland trade-off.

Second, and I think this is funda-

mental, the whole purpose of standardization is to strengthen the common NATO defense. Yet the U.S. Army will be weakened if it procures the costly Roland, because it will have to divert scarce funds from other programs that are more effective.

I am all in favor of sensible standardization and interoperability of weapons systems. But this sort of pursuit of standardization for its own sake will result in our spending more money for less capability in NATO.

Tests on Roland, furthermore, indicate that it does not even work very well. Its range falls short of specifications, its electrical system and environmental control unit break down frequently, it is vulnerable to numerous countermeasures, and it may not be effective against certain kinds of targets.

The cost overruns on this missile have been staggering. From fiscal year 1977 to the present, its program cost estimate has skyrocketed from \$942 million to \$3.7 billion—a 300-percent increase in 3 years. Congress has been so disturbed by these overruns that in fiscal year 1978, we imposed a \$265 million ceiling on Roland's development costs.

The project managers for Roland may have found a tricky way around this ceiling, however. One line item in the procurement account for Roland, "Engineering Services," has climbed from \$70.8 million to \$307.9 million since 1975. Nobody I have consulted can tell me just what "Engineering Services" means, or why something this obscure should cost \$307.9 million. It may very well be that these are really development costs, and that they have been put in the accounting books as part of "procurement" as a way of evading the congressionally imposed ceiling. This is perhaps a matter for investigation by the GAO.

I might note that the House Armed Services Committee voted against Roland last May. The committee deleted the administration's full request of \$296.9 million for procurement and \$11.3 million for R. & D. from the fiscal year 1980 budget. This vote to kill Roland was an overwhelming 31 to 12. The reason, as stated in the committee's report:

... for every mission where Roland could be considered a candidate system, alternative systems are available that provide comparable defense capability at significantly less cost.

The Senate Armed Services Committee originally voted against Roland, as well. But the record clearly shows that a special meeting was called the next day—after a busy night on the telephone for Hughes and Boeing lobbyists—and the vote was reversed.

It is all up to the conference now, but the problem is that the three delegates from the House Procurement Subcommittee all voted in favor of Roland, and may push their own sentiments, despite the overwhelming mandate of the full committee.

It is apparent that Roland is almost a classic case of a weapon that should have been killed from the very beginning. For the U.S. Army's and the taxpayer's sake, I hope it is killed now.●

"DOC" GODDARD, ENVIRONMENTALIST

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, recently, a testimonial dinner was held for a man who has been a true giant in his field, a legend in his own time, a man who will always be remembered for his dedication to government and public service. I speak of former Pennsylvania Secretary of Environmental Resources, Maurice K. Goddard.

When I served in the State legislature for 5 years I had a chance to work personally with Dr. Goddard. In the years before and after my own service in Harrisburg, I had a chance to watch in Pennsylvania the development of a truly remarkable record. Dr. Goddard served Pennsylvanians for 25 years, under five different Governors, and compiled a record second to none in the conservation field.

Please let me list some of the accomplishments of that quarter century of service:

Under his leadership in Pennsylvania 45 parks totaling 129,588 acres in 35 counties were added to the State Park System. Dr. Goddard wanted a park within 25 miles of every resident of the Commonwealth, and citizens for centuries to come will benefit from his effort.

As a result of his commitment, Pennsylvania was the first State to have a forest management plan for each of its forests, and was also the first State in the East to use aircraft for forest fire control.

Dr. Goddard has been a great advocate of the water basin commission approach to area water problems, and because of his leadership the quantity and quality of water available throughout the Northeast was greatly enhanced.

A point often overlooked is that for 25 years Dr. Goddard attracted top-quality personnel to State government. He had an extremely effective enforcement staff, he took the department of forests and waters out of politics and placed its employees under civil service, and, in this time of corruption, it should be noted that in 25 years of government service not one accusation of unethical behavior or illegal activity ever touched Dr. Goddard.

He presided over the implementation of Pennsylvania's pioneer strip mining law.

He gained national recognition for his work in pollution control and abatement, particularly with acid mine drainage. He was appointed by the President to serve on the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board and the National Advisory Environmental Health Committee.

I also want to add that it is significant that at a recent testimonial dinner for Dr. Goddard there were representatives of labor management, mining, steel, industrial leaders, environmental organizations, hunters, fishermen, academicians, and Federal and State Government officials. I point that out to show that Dr. Goddard always worked for the programs and policies that were positive for all of

the Commonwealth. He worked to be fair, and to do what was best for all the citizens of Pennsylvania.

As he made his decisions and worked for solutions, not everyone always agreed with the final decision, but no one could help but admire his accessibility, candor, fairness, courage, and integrity.

I am glad to note that in his retirement from State government, Dr. Goddard will continue to serve on the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, and other groups where he can continue to contribute to the environmental progress of the Nation.

In the past when people have talked about the great environmental leaders associated with Pennsylvania, the name that always came to mind was Gifford Pinchot. I have no doubt that he is now joined by a second name, and I add my congratulations to the outstanding record of Maurice "Doc" Goddard.●

LITHUANIAN 39TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, June 15 marked the 39th anniversary of the Soviet Union's invasion of Lithuania. Since that day so long ago, the freedom-loving Lithuanian people have remained virtual slaves in their own country. Many, in fact, have been forced to leave their homes, exiled to Siberia, or condemned to death in barbarous slave labor camps.

Actually, the events since 1940 mark only the most recent chapter in the long history of Russian occupation of Lithuania. Prior to 1918, the Baltic nation had for centuries been a province of Czarist Russia. After less than a quarter century of independence, Lithuania was again occupied, through the infamous pact between Hitler and Stalin, which divided Poland and the Baltic States, sounding the death knell for freedom throughout the region.

The Russians assumed that, in time, the Lithuanians would lose all sense of themselves as a people, that the younger generations, raised under communism, would become model Soviet citizens, meekly following their master's orders. In fact, the Lithuanian people have never given up their strong desire for freedom. Even now, the resistance movement lives, despite the systematic torture and imprisonment of its leaders, and many of their followers.

Two of these leaders, living examples of Lithuanian resistance, are Viktoras Petkus and Balys Gajauskas. These two brave men are currently serving lengthy sentences in Soviet concentration camps. Their "crimes" are that they wish to live as free men, and not grovel as slaves. Activists for the most basic human rights, they represented a serious threat to the Russian totalitarian state, and have, as a result, been sentenced to 10 years apiece in prison, followed by 5 years of exile from Lithuania.

Viktoras Petkus and Balys Gajauskas

are far from criminals. They are, in truth, worthy heroes for freedom-loving people everywhere. I call upon the Soviet Union to fulfill the terms of the Helsinki accords, and permit them to emigrate to the West, where they may live a life free of tyranny and oppression. ●

ELDERLY HOMEOWNERS' RELIEF ACT

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce the Elderly Homeowners' Relief Act. This legislation authorizes the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to permit federally chartered savings and loan associations to offer a unique and innovative financial instrument to our Nation's elderly, the reverse annuity mortgage (RAM).

I am sure my colleagues in the House of Representatives are all familiar with elderly couples or individuals in their districts who, after working hard all their lives to own their own homes free and clear, now are faced with the gloomy and heart-wrenching prospect of selling their residence due to their inability to meet skyrocketing property taxes and housing maintenance costs. Even more common are the elderly who must put their every extra penny of income into meeting the costs of home maintenance, and thus deny themselves the pleasures of retirement years they have anticipated for so long.

The startling fact, Mr. Speaker, is that elderly Americans have some \$90 billion in assets frozen in the equity they have built up in their homes. For many, there is no way of utilizing these assets except by selling the home, a step few are emotionally prepared to take and one that does not, in these inflationary times, insure a secure future.

The bill I am introducing today, Mr. Speaker, encourages the accessibility of a much-needed alternative for the elderly, the reverse annuity mortgage. A reverse annuity mortgage is an agreement between a lending institution and a borrower which provides for the liquefaction of the assets frozen in the home into a lump sum or a monthly stream of payments to the homeowner. The RAM may be structured in numerous ways to provide for repayment of the loan, following death of the borrower or spouse, from the estate. The amount of the loan would be equal to a percentage of the total value of the home at a margin which allows for a controlling interest in the equity of the home by the borrower, and which allows for the home's bequest at death. The security of the loan would be based on the value of the property, rather than is customary on the income of the homeowner.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I believe we in Congress have sought to relieve the housing plight of many elderly Americans, after the fact, after they are forced to sell their home. While I com-

mend and join my colleagues in efforts to improve and make available low-income rental housing to older Americans, I also urge my colleagues to join with me in addressing themselves to the "Catch-22" situation faced by the 75 percent of the elderly who continue to reside in their own homes—that is, the only way they can afford to live their remaining years in their home, is to sell it. With the steadily increasing aging of the population, the time for reverse annuity mortgages is long overdue. ●

SALT II

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the signing of the SALT II treaty last week was an important achievement in the long and torturous arms control negotiating process.

It provides us with greater hope for the future, and sends a message to all the world that we have resolved to prevent the horrors of nuclear war.

Although the treaty permits both sides to possess huge arsenals of destruction, we cannot forget that SALT is a continuing process. It is a process that must continue if future generations are to have a chance of survival.

A recent editorial in the Miami Herald discussed what SALT II means in the context of long-range arms control goals. I believe my colleagues will find the following editorial of interest:

SALT IS GRANDFATHER'S GIFT OF HOPE TO NEW GENERATIONS

It is somehow fitting that two grandfathers—James Earl Carter, 55, and Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, 72—wrote the 16 signatures that commit the United States and the Soviet Union to a series of ceilings on nuclear weapons. These agreements, the latest stage in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, may let the world relax a bit, but it will take a great deal more work, more tough negotiating, before the grandchildren of Mr. Carter and Mr. Brezhnev can enjoy true arms control.

That's a cold-blooded thought to inject into these days of hugs, and kisses, and champagne toasts, and good feeling, but it must be remembered: This SALT agreement is only one more step on a long highway. Both Washington and Moscow deserve the world's praise for conducting this long process of negotiations, but the struggle is not over yet.

There is a parallel between SALT and the worldwide naval conference held in Washington in 1921. At that meeting, the major naval powers agreed to what now are considered oversimplified limits on battleships. Those very decisions forced the development of aircraft carriers—even deadlier weapons.

The SALT negotiators have, until now, focused on the weapon that provides the greatest chance for destroying the world: the long-range, high-accuracy, land-based missile. The treaty, if ratified, will control numbers, size, weight, fuel loadings, and numbers of warheads of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

But in their efforts to control missiles, the U.S. negotiators have indirectly encouraged the Soviet Union to build missile-firing sub-

marines because they believed that the U.S. Navy's sub-detection and killing capabilities were superior. The Soviet diplomats, in the same way, nudged the Pentagon toward air-launched cruise missiles because the Kremlin has confidence in Soviet air defenses.

SALT is less arms control and more efforts to channel competition. With one avenue limited, scientists push their efforts into new directions; the Soviets now have faster submarines that fire MIRVed missiles; the United States has a cruise-missile guidance system that can read an electronic map. Both sides are pursuing research that could lead to a war in outer space.

Seen in these terms, SALT is just a different type of treadmill. But it has its advantages. Spending money on new designs of limited weapons is infinitely better than spending money on unlimited numbers of weapons. And both sides make some progress each time they decide on new limits.

SALT III is the next phase, and the problems here will be even greater. There may be some way to achieve substantial reductions in the numbers of heavy missiles; there must be controls on weapons of shorter range that now can be used in Europe; and both sides may be able to find ways to prevent some technologies, such as lasers, from becoming agents of war instead of peace.

The ceremony in the grand ballroom of the Hofburg Palace was another plateau. Opponents of SALT in the United States are threatening to change the treaty during Senate debate. No one knows who will succeed the ailing Mr. Brezhnev.

But Americans and Russians must commit themselves to reducing the chances of nuclear war even though both sides will compete in other areas. If they do, the chances will increase that the grandchildren of Mr. Carter and Mr. Brezhnev—and the future peoples of the world—will have a better chance for peace. ●

ELKHART TRUTH URGES PASSAGE OF SYNTHETIC FUELS BILL

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, this week the House of Representatives will consider legislation to substantially increase the production of synthetic fuels in the United States.

I insert at this point in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Elkhart (Ind.) Truth, of June 12, 1979, strongly endorsing this congressional initiative.

The editorial follows:

ENCOURAGE SYNTHETICS

One of the consequences of paying more for oil, we've been told, is that at some point the going price will be high enough to make it pay to produce synthetic fuel or oil from unusual sources. Some of the possibilities are alcohol from grain or natural wastes, various synthetics derived from coal, and oil extracted from shale deposits.

Fuel from these sources would be made in the United States and give this country some leverage against the oil manipulations of the OPEC cartel. The question is, when can large-scale production of these fuels start?

An oil company executive said recently that the price of gasoline will have to reach \$1.50 a gallon before it is economical for a company to invest in one of these new fuel sources. By then, the world price of oil would be disastrously high. Moreover, the Arab countries already are showing unmis-

takable signs of using their hold on supplies to gain political advantage. Still-higher world oil prices and greater dependence on imports threaten both our economic security and the independence of our foreign policy.

These threats represent an emergency that can be compared to the emergency of war. We can reach back to World War II for an example of how the United States once met such a challenge.

In 1941, the technical process for making synthetic rubber was well known, but there wasn't reason to produce it in large quantities until the war threatened our supplies of natural rubber from overseas. Then, in one of those heroic industrial efforts that war calls forth, it took exactly 287 days to design, build and begin operating the first plant. By the end of the war the United States had 51 plants capable of producing more synthetic rubber than the amount of natural rubber the country was using when the war started.

Could a similar effort today help us break the OPEC grip on our energy supply? The wartime synthetic rubber plants were financed by government and operated on a fee basis by rubber and petrochemical companies. After the war, the companies bought most of the plants. Today, a push for synthetic fuels could be undertaken with the government playing only a financial role.

The government itself is a huge customer for fuel. The Defense Department alone uses about 500,000 barrels a day. The Defense Department could be made a prime customer for synthetic fuel, with payment guaranteed by Congress. This would create the beginning of a market, to be expanded into other areas. Production companies would have incentive in assured sales to build facilities. The Defense Department, in turn, would be certain of a fuel alternative that could not be manipulated by foreign interests.

A national policy of encouraging production of synthetic fuel also could take the form of guaranteed loans for construction of production facilities. Financing could easily be found in the new revenue the government stands to earn from decontrol of oil prices. The government will gain \$13.3 billion in new revenue from oil company profits in the next seven years under current corporate income tax rates. If the proposed windfall profits tax is imposed, the figure would rise to \$29.7 billion.

The partnership of government and industry in energy research is already longstanding. Expanding into joint financing of the production of alternative fuels would lower the price-threshold that must be crossed before those fuels become competitive with oil and gas. The plan could call for recovery of the government investment over the long run.

The Carter administration has seen almost every one of its energy proposals so far defeated. Band-Aid measures trying to save a little energy here and there aren't convincing. A big-scale effort to produce synthetic fuels and lessen the power of our foreign suppliers would appeal to the country's desire to accomplish something. It would win support, because it is an answer to the country's crying need to produce more fuel. ●

CONTAINER DEPOSITS ARE NO PANACEA

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, for several years now I have followed with

keen interest the public debate on whether or not mandatory deposits should be placed on beverage containers. Various benefits have been cited as resulting from such action. Litter will disappear. Energy will be saved. Jobs will be created. Consumer costs will be lower. Scarce resources will be preserved. Proponents would have the unsuspecting belief that heaven would be the end result of imposing mandatory deposits. But we all know that there are two sides to every story, and it is no different on this issue. There is indeed another side to the mandatory deposit question, one that calls into serious question—and in some instances, downright refutes—claims made for this concept. It is the other side of this issue that I would like to outline for the consideration of my colleagues.

LITTER REDUCTION

Listening to the rhetoric about the positive benefits of mandatory deposits on litter control, one would think that beverage containers are the prime cause of our litter problem. That is simply not the case, nor will mandatory deposits result in an appreciable decrease in the overall amount of litter in our society. Consider the following:

First, beverage litter makes up only about 20 percent of rural highway litter and 5 percent of city street litter, by item count. So even if all beverage cans, bottles, caps, and pull tabs were eliminated, 80 percent of the litter would still be there.

Second, over 93 percent of canned beverages are consumed indoors, on private property, or at sporting arenas, so they are not even candidates to become litter.

Third, in Oregon, the first State to adopt mandatory deposit legislation, overall litter was reduced by 10.6 percent at the end of 1 year. That is not significant, of course. But wait: At the end of 5 years, litter reduction was only 3 percent. The Oregon experience proves that mandatory deposits aren't going to provide dramatic reductions in litter because bottles and cans simply do not make up that much of the litter problem. Paper and paper products, which our friends at the prodeposit Washington Post are loathe to admit, make up more than 60 percent of the litter problem. Beverage deposit legislation is not going to do a darned thing to solve that overwhelming part of the problem.

Fourth, before the Michigan deposit law went into effect, the Institute for Applied Research conducted a litter survey there, at the request of the State legislature. The institute reported that beverage bottles and cans constituted only 12.2 percent of the visual roadside litter. The institute calculated that even if litter from beverage containers was completely eradicated in Michigan, highway litter removal costs would be reduced only 7.9 percent, from the \$69.20 per mile to \$64.58 per mile. So much for the trumpet call that mandatory deposit legislation will result in significantly lower litter collection costs.

Quite simply, to worship mandatory deposit legislation as a miracle solution

to the litter problem is to worship a false god.

ENERGY SAVINGS

Mandatory deposit proponents contend that by moving to a system of refillable containers we will save energy. But consider this:

First, a nationwide system of all-refillable containers would consume 11 trillion more BTU's of petroleum every year than an all-can system. That is 2 million actual barrels of oil.

Second, conversion to an all-refillable system could use up an additional 8.5 million actual barrels of petroleum in conversion alone.

One environmental specialist has reviewed all the data on energy consumption comparisons between returnables and no-deposit containers. His conclusion: "It is time to stop the simplistic claim that 'return to returnables' will save vast amounts of our national energy. It won't."

THE JOB IMPACT

Those who support mandatory deposit legislation contend it will create more jobs. They are right. But what kind of jobs? Ah, that is the catch. We would be trading high-paying, skilled jobs for low-paying unskilled jobs. We would be asking steelworkers and glass industry workers to give up good paying jobs to stack bottles in grocery stores and wash bottles in breweries and soft drink bottling plants. Consider the following:

First, the Department of Commerce has concluded that mandatory deposit legislation would cost tens of thousands of jobs in the can and glass industries (not to mention in the basic steel industry). The average lost wage would be \$17,000 per year plus benefits.

Second, the Department of Commerce calculates that tens of thousands of replacement jobs would be created all right, but not necessarily in the same geographic areas and certainly not at the same wages. Most of the jobs would be bottle handlers and sorters and would pay \$2.65 to \$3.50 per hour. A great many of them would be part-time jobs.

Third, even the Environmental Protection Agency, long a prime backer of mandatory deposit legislation, admits that the loss of skilled jobs "would be an important social cost of deposit legislation." In Michigan, 250 persons have already lost jobs and the deposit law there is only 6 months old.

We talk constantly and with good reason about the import pressures on American jobs. We have a trigger price mechanism to protect our steel industry from unfair foreign competition. And, in the same breath, some would impose internally an arbitrary domestic policy like mandatory deposits that would do every bit as much damage to the American steelworker as unfair competition from foreign steel. Now that does not make too much sense to the man or woman in the steel plant who would bear this "social cost" about which EPA benignly talks.

SAVINGS TO CONSUMERS

Several years ago, proponents of mandatory deposit legislation touted it as

a savings to consumers. They said beverages would cost less and that Americans were paying more for the convenience (which they clearly prefer) of buying beverages in no-deposit containers. We have not heard much about that lately, and for a good reason. Experience in States that have enacted mandatory deposit legislation has shot that theory to smithereens. Consider the following:

First, whenever bottle bills have gone into effect, prices of affected beverages generally have gone up.

Second, in Maine, where a mandatory deposit law went into effect in 1978, the price of a six-pack of beer increased from \$1.80 to \$2.20 plus a 30-cent deposit—a 22-percent increase not counting the deposit.

Third, in Oregon, prices of most soft drinks have climbed 12 percent to 17 percent, compared with a 1-percent increase nationally over the same time period.

Fourth, in Michigan, where a deposit law went into effect in December, beer and soft drink prices have shot up 10 percent to 25 percent.

Fifth, deposit legislation affects the price not only of "national brands" but also raises the price and lowers the availability of "private brands," according to recent surveys. In nine "non-deposit" States, 71 percent of the stores surveyed offered "private brands" of soft drinks at an average price of \$1.12 a six-pack. In four "deposit" States, however, only 54 percent of the stores surveyed offered "private brands" and at a much higher cost—\$1.41 a six-pack—nearly 30 cents higher.

The idea that mandatory deposit legislation is going to save the consumer money is bunk.

CONSUMER ATTITUDES

Proponents contend that consumers share their enthusiasm for mandatory deposit legislation. The facts tell a different story, as the following underscores:

First, four mandatory deposit proposals were on the 1978 election ballot in the States of Alaska and Nebraska and in the communities of Howard County, Md., and Stevens Point, Alaska. All were soundly rejected.

Second, in Fairfax County, Va., which has a soft drink container ordinance, 45 percent of the residents still buy sodas only in no-deposit containers even though they have to drive out of the county to find them. That is called "voting with your feet" and demonstrates a strong preference for no-deposit beverages in a county generally recognized as being among the most sophisticated in the country.

Third, the Department of Defense tried mandatory deposits on 10 military installations to determine whether or not to implement mandatory deposits throughout the military. The yearlong experiment was a bust. Sales dropped. Costs were high. DOD wisely recommended against implementing the policy throughout the military.

Most decisions we make in this country are based on the "bottom line." How do surpluses and the minuses stack up?

What are the benefits to the costs? If we ask those questions about mandatory deposit legislation—if we look at the bottom line—it is clear to me that mandatory deposit legislation cannot be justified. The bottom line is "red" and the costs far outweigh any benefits. Mandatory deposit legislation simply is not a viable proposal.

Proponents, well aware that Congress justifiably has been unresponsive to this concept, are now pushing for adoption of mandatory deposit legislation in the States and at the local level. However, I am confident that when State and local leaders across the country evaluate both sides of the issue they will find, as many of us in the Congress have, that mandatory deposit legislation is no panacea. ●

H.R. 3930

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1979

● Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, throughout the debate leading up to today's consideration of H.R. 3930, there has been claim and counterclaim regarding whether or not the administration supports H.R. 3930. So that my colleagues may know that President Carter has personally announced his support of my bill, H.R. 3930, and that the administration believes it would be a useful vehicle to encourage commercial development of synthetic fuels, and an important element of an overall synthetic fuels program, I ask that the testimony of Deputy Secretary John F. O'Leary, of the Department of Energy and speaking for the administration before the Subcommittee on Energy and Power on June 22, be made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. O'Leary's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN F. O'LEARY

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you this morning to discuss HR 3930 and HR 4474, both directed toward the commercial development of synthetic fuels. It is a most important subject. Encouraging the development and production of synthetic fuels now may well prove to be vital to the Nation's energy security in the 1980's and beyond.

Without hydrocarbon fuels, many aspects of today's lifestyle would become uneconomical or cease to exist. The need for liquid fuels is particularly clear in transportation. Liquids, gases and clean fuels also play key roles as feedstocks for the Nation's petrochemical industry, as fuel for generating electricity, and as sources of energy throughout the economy. Our Nation's defense is also tied to an assured supply of aviation and transportation fuels.

Recent events underscore the absolute necessity for this Nation to move quickly to establish a substantial synthetic fuel capacity, one based on our abundant supplies of coal, oil shale, agricultural and forest products, heavy oils, and carbonaceous wastes. This necessity is widely perceived within the Administration, by leaders in both parties in both Houses of Congress, by our allies and trading partners abroad, and by the American people. The American people and the Administration share the view that bold

and sustained actions are needed to develop alternate energy sources now.

The Administration's strategy for encouraging the development of synthetic fuels incorporates the following mutually supportive elements:

Ensuring that the market place reflects the replacement cost of fuels, so that market decisions can be made based on appropriate opportunity costs and values;

Providing regulatory and financial incentives that will encourage investors to take actions that are in the national interest, by helping to make investments in existing synthetic fuels technologies competitive;

Conducting research, development and demonstration to:

Reduce critical uncertainties about the cost and environmental performance of technologies already in development, to accelerate and improve the private sector's ability to put into use the most promising newer technologies;

Significantly improve the cost and environmental performance of synthetic fuels production by developing advanced technologies notably better than those now available;

Develop technologies that can use important resources that we cannot now tap effectively or economically.

Several technologies are now ready to be put into commercial use on a relatively wide scale. These include the production of medium-Btu gas from coal, the conversion of medium-Btu synthesis gas into methanol and into Fischer-Tropsch liquids (as in the SASOL plants in South Africa), oil shale, production of ethanol from biomass, and the conversion of heavy oils and tar sands into clean and useful products. We would expect to see these technologies dominate synthetic fuels developments in the 1980's. Not far behind these are newer technologies that the Department of Energy has under active development: the production of high-Btu gas from coal; solvent refined coal; catalytic liquefaction of coal (such as the H-Coal process); medium-Btu gas and methanol from biomass; and modified in-situ retorting of oil shale. We would expect to see initial commercial facilities using these technologies developed in the late 1980's, and significant production from them in the 1990's.

It is important to note here the time lags inherent in beginning anything new, such as the commercial development of synthetic fuels. If a corporation were to decide this very day to construct a major synthetic fuels plant, it could begin immediately applying for the dozens of needed Federal, State, and local permits and approvals. Experience with other, similar facilities indicates that under current laws and practices, with much good fortune, a firm might be able to start construction in about 4 years—say, mid-1983. Construction would take perhaps three and a half years, if the firm were confident enough of proceeding that it had ordered long lead-time items early on. The first barrels of synthetic fuels from this plant could begin flowing by early 1987. The much smaller facilities (20 to 50 million gallons per year, or 1,000 to 3,000 barrels per day) that would be built for biomass ethanol could be built more rapidly, but even these would take several years from decision to operation.

The buildup thus may be slower than many would desire, and achieving even 500,000 barrels per day will not, by itself, assure national security. But it is essential to realize that no one technology or set of technologies can be the solution to our Nation's energy needs; we must gain contributions from them all. And it is critical to begin, and begin now. Each year we delay extends by a year or more the date at which synthetic fuels do contribute substantially to national security.

Perhaps foremost among the reasons for moving ahead with synthetic fuels now is security, or reliability of supply. Domestic oil and gas production have not kept pace with the increase in domestic demand. Indeed, even with the conservation induced by rising energy prices and EPCA. EPCA, the National Energy Act, and other laws, the increase in wood use and in nuclear energy production, and the increased emphasis on coal, the United States depends much more on imported oil today than it did in 1973. We will continue to need major contributions from conservation and from all domestic energy sources—including solar energy and synthetic fuels. Continuing to rely as heavily as we do on imports, and failing to achieve rapid commercial development of synthetic fuels could be seriously destabilizing economically and politically if oil supplies were not available on acceptable terms.

If imports were to be interrupted during a period of military activity, the consequences for the civilian economy of both doing without imports and having to meet major sustained defense needs solely from domestic oil supplies are not pleasant to contemplate. A far, far smaller shortage today has already created substantial discomfort.

Another reason is economic. Although synthetic fuels cost more to produce than the current price of imported oil, several appear as if they may be more economic than imported oil in the late 1980's and the 1990's, when significant synthetic fuels production could be achieved. By encouraging commercial development now—using tools such as those provided in the bills under discussion—the worst the Nation can do is to make the investments somewhat earlier than simple economics might have indicated.

Before the end of this century, given recent trends in international events, synthetic liquid and gas supplies will be required. The choice is between incurring the extra costs of possibly being too early with synthetic fuel plants, or risking the potential economic, political, and strategic consequences of being too late. On behalf of the Administration, Mr. Chairman, I think the Nation must be and is willing to pay the premium to have this insurance.

Perhaps it would be helpful to put the costs of this insurance premium into perspective. Some have noted that building 500,000 barrels per day of synthetic fuels capacity might run \$10 to \$15 billion, even perhaps as much as \$18 to \$20 billion, depending on the technologies developed. But it is not really so much per gallon of fuel ultimately produced.

The investment for each barrel per day is roughly \$20,000 to \$30,000 by our estimates. Let us here accept for illustration \$30,000 (which yields a \$15 billion total for 500,000 barrels per day). Over a typical plant life of 30 years, each barrel per day of capacity produces roughly 10,000 barrels of fuel, yielding a simple average investment cost per total barrels produced of roughly \$3.00 per barrel, or less than \$0.10 per gallon.

This average is comparable to the investment for many oil wells, though the wells of course produce more rapidly. Now note that \$30,000 for each barrel per day of production is almost exactly \$2.00 for each gallon per year. Even taking into account the time value of money with an annual capital recovery factor of 0.15, typical of many commercial projects, this investment amounts to a capital cost of only \$0.30 per gallon.

Since most synthetic fuels plants are highly capital-intensive, with capital charges amounting typically to one-half to two-thirds the total cost of the product, I think most people would find this cost tolerable. Moreover, in this era of inflation, synthetic

fuels plants built in the early 1980's will be among the cheapest sources of supply in the 1990's, because so much of the product cost is fixed cost. Put in these terms, I think most Americans would find the insurance not only affordable but attractive.

Uncertainty about future oil prices, and the very large capital investments that must be risked for large-scale coal or shale-based synthetic fuels plants, currently deter private investors from proceeding on their own. To encourage them to begin investing soon, to move ahead rapidly in the national interest, the Federal Government may need to be able to provide incentives that effectively reduce investors' uncertainty about future fuels markets and assist those who may need other assistance to maintain competition.

HR 3930, which amends the Defense Production Act, appears to us to provide quite useful mechanisms to achieve both these objectives. It contains authority for Federal purchase and price guarantees, with provisions that appear likely to make them effective. It also contains authorities for a range of other mechanisms—including loans and loan guarantees—that, while limited, could prove useful and important in assisting innovative smaller firms, individually or in consortia, to enter the synthetic fuels business.

The President has personally announced his support for HR 3930, with a few changes. The Administration believes that it would be a useful vehicle to encourage commercial development of synthetic fuels, and an important element of an overall synthetic fuels program.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That concludes my formal presentation. I would be pleased to try to answer any questions that you may have.●

GASOLINE PRICES

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the era of cheap energy is over. If we did not realize this during the OPEC price hike in 1973 we must surely know it now. The days when Americans could go to the local gasoline station and fill up their tanks with 30 cents per gallon gasoline are no more. But is this an unexpected development? Not at all. Almost every other industrialized nation has been paying much higher prices for their gas.

In Europe prices range from a low of \$1.49 a gallon in the United Kingdom to \$2.22 a gallon in Italy. In France the government recently announced that the price for a gallon of premium gasoline will be raised to \$3. Japan now pays \$2.49 a gallon. All these prices do not even account for the proposed OPEC price increase to \$20 a barrel nor do they reflect the fact that United States per capita consumption of gas is the highest in the world. What we must do is cut gasoline consumption.

If we were to remove price controls and let the price of a gallon of gas rise to \$1.25 a gallon we would still be able to buy gas at bargain prices when com-

pared to world prices ranging up to \$2.50 per gallon. A combination of OPEC price hikes and Government mismanagement of the energy situation makes a continuation of low gasoline prices an impossibility.●

JAMES PERDIGAO OF NEW ORLEANS

HON. BOB LIVINGSTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we often hear of young people in trouble, but we seldom hear of those who are a credit to their parents and their communities. I am proud to say that there are thousands of young citizens in Louisiana who are concerned about their country, who want to work for its good, and who are willing to take a stand for what is right.

One of those young people is James Perdigo of New Orleans. James will be a senior this year at Isidore Newman High School in that city. Not long ago, James won an essay contest sponsored by the National Society of Colonial Dames of America. His essay, entitled "Our Founding Fathers Can Teach Us Today," is an excellent expression of concern for the direction this country is taking. I want to compliment him and to insert it in the RECORD, so that others can share the thoughts of this fine young man:

OUR FOUNDING FATHERS CAN TEACH US TODAY
(By James G. Perdigo)

Why is the United States losing its international status? Why do its citizens expect more from and give less to the government? The answers to these questions lie in our concept of government in our lives. The leaders of the Constitutional period were faced with the problem of creating a strong central government as well as providing a suitable climate for freedom, wherein the individual could care for his material needs. Lawmakers today face the same challenge.

The Founding Fathers feared uncontrollable power because of the previous British colonialism. They therefore wanted a strong central government with checks upon its power. This concept stressed a central authority with sufficient power to regulate the economy in the best interests of everybody.

Today the tax system and the government attitude toward business discourages investment. The profit motive—the essence of capitalism—is less important to the working man. We are losing the climate instituted by our Founding Fathers wherein a free man can provide for his material needs by his labor. Lawmakers today must reform the tax system to regain the profit motive, before the independent spirit is destroyed.

The power to tax is the power to destroy. The Founding Fathers' fear of the abuse of power was seen in their creation of checks and balances within the central government. They wanted to prevent one branch of government from becoming too powerful at the expense of another. In the past two hundred years this balance of power has shifted several times. Today the federal judiciary has become a dominant force in American society. More recently, after Watergate, Pres-

idental authority has also declined. The challenge of lawmakers today is to restore the balance of power in an effort to ensure our respect internationally, and our peace and prosperity at home.

Government should provide a climate for prosperity. We should not depend upon the government for prosperity itself. The only wealth of government is that of the people. If the government continues to try to redistribute wealth, then we will see the end of incentive and the end of private property. The only wealth will then belong to the state.

Lawmakers today must devise imaginative and resourceful solutions to restore the sanctity of private property. In this way we will ensure our economic prosperity at home and our dominance abroad.

Like the Founding Fathers we must elect to office Americans who are above special interests and possess national views to unify and strengthen our government. Our Founding Fathers strongly believed in the uniquely American traits of individualism, ingenuity, and self-reliance. They sought to create a nation of self-sufficient citizens. Today, the number of Americans on welfare is rising rapidly. The reason for this situation is obvious—a lack of incentive. Who wants to work when he can get an equal amount from welfare? Too many Americans feel that the role of government is to provide for their material needs. With more people on welfare and a consequently smaller tax base, the United States is economically and, thus, politically weaker. Lawmakers must create incentive for a citizen to become self-sufficient.

In order to effect these challenges, we must return to the most important lesson of the Founding Fathers—the spirit of compromise. The ability to compromise has always been a major component of our Anglo-Saxon political heritage. The Civil War was the result of a failure to compromise. Presently with the rise of special interest groups, the ability to make concessions is noticeably weakened. This tends to fragment society and government.

Regaining the sense of national purpose possessed by our Founding Fathers—the freedom to pursue—will not be easy. We must eliminate paternalistic materialism and improve business and political morality. We must awaken ourselves and meet these challenges to ensure our international supremacy. We must return to our ideals to find our purpose. ●

**HIS EMINENCE, ARCHBISHOP
IAKOVOS**

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in welcoming his Eminence, Archbishop Iakovos, to the House of Representatives. Our Chamber is honored by the presence of the leader of the Greek Orthodox Church in North and South America.

It gives me great pleasure to congratulate His Eminence on 20 years of service as spiritual leader to over 3 million members of the Greek Orthodox Church in the Americas.

His years of service have marked him as a man in the forefront of the battle for universal human and civil rights.

From Selma, Ala., to Cyprus, Archbishop Iakovos has fought for equal justice under law. He has become an international inspiration in his quest for world peace.

The spiritual guidance and strength shown by the archbishop have been an inspiration to all faiths, and have marked His Eminence as a leader in the worldwide ecumenical movement.

I wish the archbishop many more years of service and leadership, and pray that his message will inspire us in the Congress to rededicate our efforts in the cause of human rights for all people of the world. ●

TO HONOR JOHN FURGESS, TENNESSEE STATE COMMANDER, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

HON. WILLIAM HILL BONER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to honor Mr. John Furgess, the outgoing State commander of the Tennessee Chapter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to tell you and my colleagues about some of Mr. Furgess' achievements.

Since his return from Vietnam in 1970, where he received the Bronze Star, John Furgess has been very active in the VFW. Beginning at the district level, John worked his way up through the offices of deputy surgeon, judge advocate, junior vice commander, and senior vice commander in his home post, Post 1970, on Charlotte Pike. He then rose through the ranks of the State organization, holding the posts of deputy surgeon, junior vice commander, and senior vice commander, before being named as the State commander for the State of Tennessee VFW, a post he will relinquish this week.

Since his return in 1979, John has earned his living in the insurance industry. For 8 years, he was underwriter and assistant manager with Mutual Life of New York; in 1978, he moved to Independent Life with whom he is currently an underwriter. He is a member of the Nashville Association of Life Underwriters, and the National Association of Life Underwriters.

John was born in nearby Langley, Va., and after moving to Tennessee, he attended Saint Anne's Catholic School, Father Ryan High School, and achieved a BS in general business from Middle Tennessee State University in 1965. After graduating, he went as a lieutenant to Vietnam, where he served in Americal. On March 13, 1971, he married Alma Elmore, and the Furgesses now live in Nashville, with their three beautiful little daughters, Amy, Mary Catherine, and Melissa.

John has been a tremendous leader in his community during the past 9 years,

servicing among other things as president of the Bellevue Exchange Club, president of the Davidson County MTSU Alumni Association, cochairman of the Tennessee Monuments Commission, member of the Knights of Columbus, member of American Legion Post 5 in Nashville, and a member of Saint Henry's Church in Nashville. Currently John holds the rank of major in the Tennessee National Guard.

Mr. Speaker, looking back through John Furgess' tremendously impressive record as an American and as a leader in his community, I would like you and my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating John on his achievements as the outgoing State commander for the Tennessee State VFW, and in wishing John good luck in his candidacy for membership on the National VFW Council, and his candidacy for Young Veteran of the Year. I know you will agree with me that John Furgess is a true leader and a distinguished American. ●

**THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
DISCOVERY OF PENICILLIN**

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the past 50 years have seen advances in medical science almost impossible to have imagined at the beginning of this century. Diagnosis, treatment, and even our very attitude toward the ill have undergone a tremendous transformation. Health is being restored and lives are being saved in cases which even 10 years ago would have been questionable at best.

Many factors have made this possible, but probably the strongest has been the commitment to basic applied research under rigorous scientific standards. Most of us would agree that this logical step-by-step approach is the major reason for such medical progress.

It is, therefore, most ironic that the discovery of the 20th century's most widely known "Miracle Drug" was essentially accidental. I refer, of course, to the discovery of penicillin.

We realize, too, that the accidental nature of this discovery was made possible by the circumstances of ongoing laboratory research.

The June 1929, issue of the British Journal of Experimental Pathology contained a paper by a relatively obscure bacteriologist telling the worldwide medical community how a culture plate, accidentally contaminated some 9 months earlier, had produced a bacteria-destroying substance he called "Penicillin."

The bacteriologist was Alexander Fleming—later Sir Alexander Fleming—a 47-year-old Scotsman.

Fleming knew, of course, that his accidental discovery was potentially im-

portant. He probably did not realize, however, that it would revolutionize the practice of medicine over the years.

In its earliest days of development, penicillin was unstable and difficult to concentrate—early solutions were often only 10 percent pure. By 1941, however, the new "miracle" drug was sufficiently available to substantially prolong the life of an Oxford policeman.

The steps between basic discovery and mass availability of any life-sustaining drug is understandably involved and delicate. It is to this problem that Bristol Laboratories, of Syracuse, N.Y., directed its technology in the early 1940's. And their success, as well as the success of penicillin's myriad applications around the world, is being recognized formally today when Bristol-Syracuse observes the 50th anniversary of Dr. Fleming's discovery of penicillin.

It is significant that this observance is to be held in Syracuse, since it is here that 44 percent of America's bulk supply of penicillin is produced.

Begun in central New York in 1887, the company known as Clinton Pharmaceuticals was formed by William M. Bristol, Sr., and John Myers. Expanding gradually to other locations, the company purchased in the early 1940's the Cheplin Biological Laboratories in Syracuse, changed its name to Bristol Laboratories and began to search for ways to produce large quantities of penicillin in collaboration with British scientists who had continued with Fleming's original work, in a concerted effort to provide a powerful defense against infection during World War II.

By 1945, Bristol became one of the earliest major producers of penicillin in the country.

Producing almost half the penicillin supply in the United States, Bristol-Syracuse is justifiably proud of its manufacturing practices, aware at all times that its products are used to save lives.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention and the attention of my colleagues, many of whom have benefited directly or whose families have benefited from the remarkable bacteria-fighting efficiency of this antibiotic, to this observance, today, in Syracuse.

Actually, I think there will be two "miracles" commemorated this day. One is Dr. Fleming's basic dedication and research which led to the discovery of penicillin. The other is the recognition that only high standards of pharmaceutical practice, exemplified by Bristol of Syracuse, have made the isolation and production of large quantities of penicillin practical. This availability to the average person is the second miracle. And, in this, Bristol-Syracuse has had a major role.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT A. YOUNG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the floor of the House

of Representatives due to prior business. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following fashion:

Rollcall No. 183, passage of H.R. 3464, "yes";

Rollcall No. 184, amendment to H.R. 4289, "yes";

Rollcall No. 185, motion to resolve into the Committee of the Whole for the consideration of H.R. 3875, "yes";

Rollcall No. 186, amendment to H.R. 3875, "no";

Rollcall No. 187, motion to resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of H.R. 3875, "yes";

Rollcall No. 188, amendment to H.R. 3875, "yes";

Rollcall No. 189, amendment to H.R. 3875, "yes";

Rollcall No. 191, passage of H.R. 3875, "yes";

Rollcall No. 193, agreeing to House Resolution 272, "yes";

Rollcall No. 194, agreeing to House Resolution 284, "yes";

Rollcall No. 195, amendment to H.R. 2641, "no";

Rollcall No. 196, passage of H.R. 2641, "yes";

Rollcall No. 197, passage of H.R. 2374, "yes";

Rollcall No. 198, passage of H.R. 3347, "yes";

Rollcall No. 199, approval of Journal of Friday, June 8, 1979, "yes";

Rollcall No. 200, motion to resolve into the Committee of the Whole for consideration of H.R. 2444, "yes";

Rollcall No. 201, amendment to H.R. 2444, "no";

Rollcall No. 202, amendment to H.R. 2444, "no";

Rollcall No. 203, amendment to H.R. 2444, "yes";

Rollcall No. 204, amendment to H.R. 2444, "no";

Rollcall No. 205, amendment to H.R. 2444, "yes";

Rollcall No. 207, approval of Journal of Monday, June 11, 1979, "yes";

Rollcall No. 208, agreeing to House Resolution 198, "yes";

Rollcall No. 209, motion to resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of H.R. 2444, "yes"; and

Rollcall No. 210, amendment to H.R. 2444, "yes".●

NO FEDERAL FUNDS FOR IN VITRO FERTILIZATION

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, in its recommendations to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare earlier this year, the HEW Ethics Advisory Board noted that Federal support of human in vitro—that is, outside the body as in a test tube—fertilization research would be ethically ac-

ceptable, but did not go so far as to recommend that such research should be supported with public funds. This, the Board members noted, was another ethical issue involving the allocation of limited resources, and as such was beyond the scope of their task in this area.

I have studied the issues raised by scientists, ethicists, moral theologians, legal experts, and others with regard to in vitro fertilization, and cannot find a consensus of opinion on what the policy should be in this area. My own feeling is that we should not support research or application of research in this area with Federal funds.

In my view there is reason for concern from a moral and ethical aspect about the use of public funds for Federal support of research on human in vitro fertilization. First, to obtain a successfully fertilized human egg in the test tube fertilization procedures, I understand that a number of eggs, extracted from a human female ovary, must be exposed to viable sperm, in vitro. This raises the possibility, indeed the likelihood, that more than one human conceptus will result. I find the subsequent discarding of these extra early human embryos morally objectionable, and consider this procedure to be tantamount to early abortion of an unwanted fetus. Second, I feel the experimental technique itself—even if only one egg is fertilized—involves unknown risks in terms of possible genetic damage to the embryo. This seems to pose an unacceptable level of health risk to the child and a potential effect on the welfare of his or her parents.

Finally, even if all the risks could be eliminated, and parents could be assured that no extra embryos would be discarded, I feel that public policy would dictate against Federal support of human in vitro fertilization procedures because of the issue of just allocation of limited medical resources. Other health programs in this country are lacking for funds. Diverting Federal funds to the area of human in vitro fertilization would be inconsistent with the priorities and needs of the larger numbers of persons who might better be served under other programs.

Research into the causes and treatment of infertility problems must certainly not be overlooked. However, I do not believe the use of Federal funds to support human in vitro fertilization research is justified for the reasons outlined above.●

TENOR OF SALT DEBATE

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Art Buchwald sheds a revealing light on the tenor of the upcoming SALT debate. I find Mr. Buchwald's approach to the issues involved in SALT totally refreshing. He places the

SALT debate in a context that I feel we should all take note of before we get sucked into counting warheads and assessing hard-target kill capabilities, while forgetting the basic issues of survival in the nuclear age.

The article follows:

THE PLOWSHARE CAPER
(By Art Buchwald)

WASHINGTON.—The first SALT treaty talks were held in about 750 B.C. As reported by the Prophet Isaiah, they took place between King Hezekiah of Judea and King Sennacherib of Assyria. The original draft of the agreement read, "All swords will be beaten into plowshares, and all spears into pruning hooks; nation will not lift up sword against nation and neither side will learn war any more."

When the wording of the treaty reached Hezekiah, there was an immediate outcry from his hawk advisors.

"We can't give up our swords. How do we know the Assyrians will not turn their plowshares back into weapons as soon as the treaty is signed?" said one general.

"The throw weight of the Assyrian spears is far superior to ours," another one cried. "This is a trick of the Assyrians so they can launch a first-strike capability against us."

A third advisor to the king said, "I cannot support a SALT B.C. treaty of this kind. If we turn all our swords into plowshares, the Assyrians will have twice as many land-based plowshares as we have. Each plowshare could be mounted with 10 pruning hooks, and be turned into offensive weapons which would bury every man, woman and child in Judea."

King Hezekiah was impressed with the arguments. He knew there wasn't a chance in Gomorrah of getting the treaty approved by his people, unless there were guarantees that their sword and spear arsenals would remain intact.

He sent word to Sennacherib in Damascus that he wanted a limitation on the number of offensive swords each side could have, and he demanded the dismantling of defensive shields that the Assyrians had developed to deflect Judean steel.

Sennacherib, who had stockpiled thousands of swords and shields and had developed a new SS-18 spear which could be launched from a ditch, met with his advisors and worked out a strategy.

"We will tell Hezekiah," he said, "that as part of detente each side will be able to double the number of swords and spears in their arsenals, and both parties will be permitted to develop one more weapon of its own choosing. Even with this we will still have superiority over them."

"What about the plowshares?"

"We will insist at this time that plowshares not be included in the arms limitation agreement. As you know, our new Backfire plowshare will be ready in six months. It will be an answer to their Minuteman pruning hook."

Hezekiah received the Assyrian proposals which he knew would be rejected by the hardliners in his court. "What about verification?" one of them said. "How do we know the Assyrians will not put six blades on one sword?" another asked. "What would prevent them from turning their pruning hooks back into Mirved lances?"

Hezekiah knew he'd have to promise his army something in exchange for a SALT B.C. treaty. "If you support me on this," he told them, "I will authorize the building of an MX system costing 30 billion sheep. This will enable us to hide our mobile spear throwers underground so the Assyrians will never know where they are. It will be the ultimate deterrent to prevent a surprise attack."

The Judean generals reluctantly agreed and King Hezekiah and King Sennacherib met to sign the SALT B.C. protocols.

CXXV—1053—Part 13

It was the first SALT treaty negotiated by civilized people in history, and it has been the model for arms limitation agreements ever since.●

LIFTING OF SANCTIONS AGAINST ZIMBABWE-RHODESIA

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, while we will be debating the issue of whether to lift sanctions or not against the Zimbabwe-Rhodesia Government today, I must voice my personal objection to lifting sanctions at this time against the Zimbabwe-Rhodesian Government.

Many recent reports have said that representatives of the black community are not concerned with this issue. This statement is absolutely inaccurate. The fact that the United States might prematurely lift sanctions, is of deep concern to the black community and the slightest possibility of lifting sanctions by this Congress and this administration would be viewed as an unjust act against those individuals in South Africa who have continuously struggled for their civil rights as we in this country have struggled for ours.

Is the lifting of sanctions in Zimbabwe-Rhodesia so monumental to our economy that we would deprive the citizens of that country of their basic rights by voting to lift sanctions that we would vote, in essence, for the minuscule amount of chrome that this country had imported from Rhodesia before repeal of the Byrd amendment? Certainly, that cannot be so.

Have we yet so quickly forgotten the personal liberties that this country fought for in order to develop a democracy that we would recognize a government that has not yet had an opportunity to demonstrate that they will be operating under a similar democratic process that would insure the personal freedoms and protections of all its citizens?

To say that we are not concerned is to say that we do not recognize the struggle for human dignity. There is in fact a kinship that exists between the black Americans and Africa as it exists between the American Jews and Israel. The South African situation is the same to black Americans as it is for those American Jews who are concerned about their brothers in Israel.

We would like to see that this Congress does in fact recognize the sensitivity of this issue to United States-African foreign policy and to recognize the fact that the black community is concerned with how we vote on this issue. We would like to see if the Muzorewa government can stand on its own and that it does demonstrate that it is a government "of the people, by the people and for the people." To lift sanctions now would be to remove what little incentive for compromise that still exist in that country to resolve its own internal problems.

In the meantime, we in Congress,

should allow the President of this country, our leader to at least have an opportunity to examine the situation within a reasonable time in order to make a determination as he sees fit for the benefit of all parties concerned.●

RECOVER SAN CLEMENTE EXPENDITURES

HON. ALLEN E. ERTEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. ERTEL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress urging Richard M. Nixon to reimburse the U.S. Government for all improvements made to his San Clemente estate which were unrelated to the performance of his Presidential duties. Mr. Nixon is selling the property and unless something is done, he will be unjustly enriched at Government expense.

Mr. Speaker, the then-President's men seemed to think the GSA had an obligation to enhance the value of the San Clemente property. Haldeman, Erlichman, Kalmbach, and others ordered the Government to pay for boundary surveys, enlarged den windows, a point gazebo, a beach cabana, and other extra-governmental improvements. Fortunately for us taxpayers, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation looked into the matter. In the course of its examination the committee found that the Federal Government had made \$66,614.03 in improvements to the Nixon property at San Clemente which were unrelated to any governmental purpose. In determining the value of the improvements, the committee took great pains to separate legitimate security expenditures from improvements which served no primary protective purpose. For example, in the case of the restored gazebo, even though the committee determined that its restoration was not required nor intended as a security measure, it was found that a Secret Service person did from time to time occupy the gazebo. Part of the value of the gazebo was therefore attributed to the Federal Government rather than to Mr. Nixon.

The value of the improvements paid for by the Federal Government, but unrelated to any Government purpose will be reflected in the purchase price for the property. Accordingly, Mr. Nixon will derive a benefit for unwarranted improvements authorized on his behalf by his aides. My resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that Mr. Nixon ought to recognize his responsibility in this matter and reimburse the Federal Government for the original value of the improvements.

Although I am hopeful Mr. Nixon will see fit to pay for the cost of these improvements, his record in similar matters leaves open the possibility that he may not. Therefore, my resolution also urges the President and the Attorney General to attempt to recover the sum of \$66,614.03 for the improvements.

When the improvements to his San Clemente estate were first criticized in 1973, aides to Mr. Nixon indicated he intended to bequeath the property to the United States for public use. Federal officials may have relied upon this unfulfilled promise in failing to seek recovery for the unwarranted improvements. If so, this would seem to constitute a promissory estoppel which entitles the Government to the present value of the property. This and other remedies ought to be investigated by the Attorney General in attempting to recover from Mr. Nixon.

Some will surely argue that Mr. Nixon suffered enough—that we ought to let him live in peace. However, I think it is the American taxpayer who has suffered in this instance and we ought to recover every last cent. ●

TECHNICAL CHANGES TO TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to make certain necessary technical, conforming, and clarifying changes in title 5, United States Code. Title 5, which relates to Government organization and employees, is primarily within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

These amendments make no significant changes in the law. They merely correct outdated references (such as to the "Commissioner" of the District of Columbia or to the "Director of the Bureau of the Budget"), correct statutory citations, update effective date provisions, and correct typographical errors. Also included are some stylistic changes recommended by the Office of Law Revision Counsel.

It is important that we act quickly since one change relates to the Senior Executive Service which was authorized by the Civil Service Reform Act, and which will come into existence on July 13, 1979. Both the House and Senate bills amended section 2108(3) of title 5, United States Code, to exclude members of the Senior Executive Service from the definition of "preference eligible." Due to a typographical error in the enrolled bill, however, section 2108(5) (not section 2108(3)) was amended, and this has resulted in confusion. This bill will eliminate that confusion and insure that the intent of both Houses is achieved by correcting the typographical error.

Mr. Speaker, I have cleared these amendments with the ranking minority on the committee, and with the Office of Personnel Management which administers these laws. I have also been advised that the Senate will act quickly on the legislation.

Since the Senior Executive Service will become effective very shortly, it is

my intention, at an appropriate time, to ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the bill and ask for its immediate consideration. I hope that in this fashion we can expedite consideration of these technical amendments.

Should Members have any questions, I hope they will contact the committee staff. ●

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS P. DALFONSO

HON. DON BAILEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 14, 1979, the Southwestern Pennsylvania Area Development Corp. of Monessen will hold its second annual recognition dinner. This year the guest of honor will be Mr. Thomas P. Dalfonso. I am very pleased to join with them in praising this fine man who has served Monessen with great distinction for many years.

Tom entered the U.S. Army after graduating from Monessen High School in 1943, returning home in November 1945, after having been a prisoner of war in Germany for 10 months. He attended the University of Pittsburgh for 2 years after which he was employed in the private sector.

In addition to an outstanding employment record, Tom Dalfonso has compiled a very impressive record of public service. He was first elected to the city council in Monessen in 1967 and was reelected in 1971. During both terms on the council he served as director of accounts and finances. When Mayor Hugo J. Parente died in October 1971, Tom Dalfonso was appointed to serve the unexpired term and he was elected to the full 4-year term in November 1973.

Tom was an energetic and effective mayor, very aggressive in seeking out Federal and State grant assistance for the community. Among his other accomplishments, he used such grants to arrange for the establishment of a civic center, the reconstruction of the Third Street Viaduct without cost to the city, the construction of two additional stories on the health center, and numerous other projects of great benefit to Monessen.

Tom also served on the board of the Monessen Redevelopment Authority and twice served as president of the Monessen Council of Governments. In addition to serving on the Governor's Justice Commission Regional Council, he also served on the Southwest Regional Planning Commission.

It is fitting and proper that Tom Dalfonso be recognized for his dedicated service to the community of Monessen. He has earned the esteem and respect of all of us. I join with the Southwestern Pennsylvania Area Development Corp. of Monessen in saluting a distinguished citizen, community leader, and outstanding American—Thomas P. Dalfonso. ●

LET US GET THE TRUCKS ROLLING

HON. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution calling on the Governors of the several States to cooperate voluntarily in standardizing truck weight and length limits.

Over the weekend, I met extensively with South Carolina independent truckers and peach growers. I was most impressed by the cooperative attitude of both groups, and their sympathy with each other's problems. On Monday, Gov. Richard Riley and I again met with the independent truckers in a bipartisan effort to get the trucks moving and the produce to the market.

I am convinced that the truckers are reasonable people who are not interested in depriving the American people of food or in ruining the farmers who cannot move their goods. The truckers I met with are not those who are perpetrating violence on the Nation's highways, but they do have legitimate and serious problems which must be recognized and resolved.

In South Carolina, our good faith efforts paid off. Last night, the truckers in South Carolina's Piedmont agreed to roll, but they are looking to Government at all levels to provide long-term relief for their problems. The truckers tell me they were persuaded to go back to work by the concern expressed by the Governor and by our willingness to sit down and talk with them, and by several tangible actions we took. Governor Riley used emergency powers to allow longer length trucks in the State, and I promised to introduce legislation urging other States to take similar action.

Mr. Speaker, the truck strike and the very real problems of the independent truckers transcend partisan politics. Each of us has a responsibility to his or her constituency to get the trucks moving and get food to the marketplace. To do that nationwide, as we have in South Carolina, we must show the truckers that their problems are being given official attention. My resolution, cosponsored by Representatives BERYL ANTHONY, JR., DOUG BARNARD, JAMES T. BROYHILL, RICHARD CHENEY, VIC FAZIO, KEN HOLLAND, JOHN JENNETTE, JAMES G. MARTIN, THOMAS PETRI, FLOYD SPENCE, and ARLAN STANGELAND, is one way to do that.

The text of my resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the strike by independent truckers is costing the nation hundreds of millions of dollars every week, and

Whereas perishable produce is being lost every day the strike continues, and

Whereas the situation of many farmers is becoming desperate, and

Whereas food shortages in the marketplace will occur with more and more frequency if the strike goes on, and

Whereas independent truckers have legitimate problems which discourage them from driving, and

Whereas one of those problems is a lack of national uniformity among the States as to weight and length limits, and

Whereas the White House has asked the Governors to cooperate in standardizing weight and length limits, and

Whereas the Governors of South Carolina, Missouri and Iowa have already joined in this good faith effort,

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the House of Representatives calls on the Governors of the 50 States to cooperate voluntarily in standardizing truck weight and length limits to 80,000 pounds and 60 feet respectively to encourage striking truckers to go back to work. ●

ALFRED E. ECKES, JR., CONFERENCE
STAFF DIRECTOR

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, as the new chairman of the Republican conference, I am pleased to announce the appointment of Alfred E. Eckes, Jr., as staff director.

Mr. Eckes was associated with me in my district office as a research assistant from 1974 to 1977. He has a particularly impressive academic background, recognized author, and political expert.

As staff director, Al Eckes will be of great assistance to the Republican Party, lending his expertise to all members of the conference. His résumé follows:

SHORT VITA

Alfred E. Eckes, Jr., 831 S. Fifth St., Columbus, Ohio 43209. Telephone: (Home)

XXXX

Born: July 11, 1942 in N. Conway, N.H.

Education:

Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va., B.A., American History, 1964. Special emphasis in economics. Honors include Phi Beta Kappa, magna cum laude, and honors with exceptional distinction in history.

Christ's College, Cambridge University, United Kingdom. International Economics, 1964-1965. Fulbright fellowship.

Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, Medford, Mass., M.A., International Relations, 1966. Woodrow Wilson Fellowship.

University of Texas at Austin. Ph.D., History, 1969. Doctoral dissertation: "Bretton Woods—America's New Deal for an Open World." National Defense Education Fellowship in history, 1967-1969.

Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. International business, summer 1970.

Employment:

1977 to July 1979, Editor of the Editorial Page, *Columbus Dispatch*, 34 S. Third St., Columbus, Ohio 43216 (circulation—daily about 200,000; Sunday about 350,000).

1978 to present, Adjunct Associate Professor, Department of History, Ohio State University.

1975 to 1978, Associate Professor with tenure, Department of History, Ohio State University, Columbus 43210.

1969 to 1975, Assistant Professor, Department of History, OSU.

1974 to 1977, Research Assistant (part time), U.S. Rep. Samuel L. Devine, R-12th, Ohio.

1971 to 1974, contributing columnist for *Columbus Dispatch*.

1966 to 1969, Foreign Service Reserve Officer, Department of State.

Books:

Co-author with Eugene Roseboom, *A History of Presidential Elections: From George Washington to Jimmy Carter*, 4th ed., New York: MacMillan, September 1979.

The United States and the Global Struggle for Minerals. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1979.

A Search for Solvency: Bretton Woods and the International Monetary System, 1941-1971. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1975.

Articles and Essays:

American Conservatism from Hoover to Nixon. St. Louis: Forum, 1973.

"American History Textbooks and the New Issues of Trade, Payments and Raw Materials." *History Teacher XI* (February 1978), 237-246.

"Open-Door Expansionism Reconsidered: The World War II Experience." *The Journal of American History LIX* (March 1973), 909-924.

Book reviews have appeared in the *American Historical Review Business History Review* and *Indiana Magazine of History*.

Approximately 750 articles, editorial, commentaries and reviews (some signed, others unsigned) have appeared in the *Columbus Dispatch* since 1971.

History Professional Activity:

Life member, Organization of American Historians (1977).

Life member, Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations (1978).

Ohio Academy of History.

Other Memberships:

Lambda Chi Alpha fraternity, Torch Club, National Conference of Editorial Writers. ●

BLUE CROSS/BLUE SHIELD: OPEN
ENROLLMENT CAMPAIGN IN NEW
YORK

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that in New York, medical and hospital insurance will be available to anyone, regardless of their age or health. A 1-month, open enrollment drive, by Blue Cross and Blue Shield, will enlist members for health coverage that provides hospital and medical care to any resident within the plan's operating area.

During this open enrollment campaign, which will end July 16, physical examinations will be waived, and no medical histories will be taken for all new applicants for health care coverage. The program is open to all residents of the 17 downstate counties served by the plan who do not have Blue Cross and Blue Shield coverage, or who wish to upgrade their present coverage.

Mr. Edwin Werner, president of the plan, is quoted as saying:

Comprehensive health insurance is practically a necessity today because of the cost of quality medical care. Unfortunately, the people who need this coverage most are often excluded because of their medical histories. I think we have a responsibility to provide them both with health benefits and the peace of mind that comes from knowing they have Blue Cross and Blue Shield protection.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Mr. Werner and his entire organization for this momentous decision toward broad-based health insurance to tens of thousands of New Yorkers. This is a substantial step toward the goal of adequate health care protection for all citizens. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in New York we are well on our way to successful national health insurance. I would like to share with my colleagues this very pertinent information as we begin the debate here in Congress on the various national health proposals. ●

MERIDIAN EMPLOYMENT OFFICE
PROVIDES OUTSTANDING SERVICE FOR VETERANS

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform my colleagues that the Meridian office of the Mississippi State Employment Service has once again won the VFW National Award for Service to Veterans. They previously won the highly coveted recognition in 1977, along with the International Award from the International Association of Personnel in Employment Security.

I am very proud of the dedication and hard work exhibited by the 51 employees in the Meridian employment office. They are all outstanding individuals and I salute them for their contributions to our veterans and all persons who are seeking gainful employment. I would like to share with my colleagues the letter I received from Jim Dawson, the driving force behind the award winning staff at the Meridian office of the Mississippi State Employment Service:

MISSISSIPPI STATE

EMPLOYMENT SERVICE,

Meridian, Miss., May 25, 1979.

Hon. G. V. MONTGOMERY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SONNY: I just have to brag again on my staff.

They have again won the VFW National Award for Services to Veterans.

As you may recall, this office won this national award the first time in 1977, along with the International Award from the International Association of Personnel in Employment Security. The office also won a National Special Merit Award in 1972 from the VFW.

Will journey to the coast on June 23rd to accept the award at the VFW State Convention from a National VFW Representative.

My staff are really remarkable in that this office has been top dawg for the past several years in services to Veterans in Mississippi in these parts, as well as twice winning the national award during the same period.

Off hand I say it's a record that no one will ever match, and it's all due to a dedicated staff.

We have always felt that we should practice what we preach in regard to Veterans preference.

So, as we progressed along, we also gave preference in regard to filling our own vacancies.

At present the total staff numbers 51. Of this number, fourteen (14) are Veterans, of which three (3) are minority and six (6) are disabled Veterans.

We have just received an evaluation from the State level—results were excellent.

Sometime when you have the time, I would like very much for you to visit our office and meet our fine staff.

Take care of yourself.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. DAWSON,
Center Manager. ●

PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES AT
USDA CONCERNED ABOUT THE
FUTURE OF THE EXTENSION
SERVICE

HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 18, I placed an excerpt of a speech by Dr. Daniel C. Phannsteil, director of the Texas Agricultural Extension Service, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 15344. Dr. Phannsteil in his speech expressed concern for recent developments in the Extension Service at the national level, indicating that certain actions have been taken by the Department of Agriculture and at higher levels of Government to render ineffective the traditional State/Federal partnership that has existed between the USDA and this Nation's land-grant universities for many years.

Mr. Speaker, I received another letter today indicating that others are reporting all is not going well with the Extension Service. This letter from Dr. W. R. Van Dresser, dean of the Cooperative Extension Service at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University at Blacksburg, Va., encloses a letter from Mr. Richard G. Ford, president of the Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, dated June 1, 1979, which according to Dr. Van Dresser, points up how serious he (Mr. Ford) considers the problem of the status of the State-Federal partnership of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the land-grant system.

The letter from the president of the Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.
June 1, 1979.

Dr. R. W. VAN DRESSER,
Director of Extension Service, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University,
Blacksburg, Va.

DEAR DIRECTOR VAN DRESSER: The State-Federal partnership of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is approaching a shambles in many of its traditional cooperative efforts. The Cooperative State Research Service, Extension Service, and Agricultural Research Service no longer enjoy the stature and prestige of autonomous agencies in cooperative Department and intra-departmental Committee activities. Each is no longer able to make decisions in its own right to carry out programs beneficial to its clientele.

The consolidation of formerly independent agencies into "superagencies" has concentrated decisionmaking, authority, and budget control in Washington at the expense of local concerns. The thrust for further concentration of decisionmaking and budget control continues in the name of "efficiency," including the consolidation of Federal departments.

Our experience causes us to believe that "efficiency" is a camouflage. There appears to be little concern for the effectiveness of USDA programs in serving people's needs and in helping them solve their problems. The Administration has recommended sharp reductions in the budget and personnel for research and Extension. How long will Secretary Bergland's fertilizer or feed dealer stay honest without the unbiased presence of the university and Extension? In the same vein, the national perspective which the Federal Extension staff now provides to state staffs would dry up and there would be no one at the national level seriously and single-mindedly concerned about assisting the Land-Grant system to improve the well-being of the American farmer.

We are also quite concerned about what the impact will be on the Land-Grant system generally, and the CES in particular, now that SEA plans to move Extension Service (ES) and Cooperative Research (CR) program staff to Beltsville or vicinity. We believe this would be disastrous for much of ES's working relationships with State CES. Most of ES's liaison is with USDA agencies other than Agricultural Research (AR) and with other Federal departments and commissions. For example, the production and marketing staff of ES in 1976 was heavily involved in cooperative programs with 22 USDA agencies and 45 agencies and commissions outside USDA in 11 Federal departments. ES has formal agreements with no less than 7 other Federal departments. These departments and agencies are located in the downtown Washington area. The loss of effectiveness in attempting to shuttle between these agencies and Beltsville would have a serious impact on ES's ability to serve State CES, plus serving CES staff when they are in Washington on business with USDA and other Federal agencies. Some OPEDA members believe that a study should be initiated by State Directors or some other appropriate group to determine how the SEA reorganization is affecting ES/CES relations and where ES should be located to be most effective in serving the Land-Grant system. OPEDA members would be most willing to provide specifics.

There seems to be a determined effort to eliminate the identity of Extension. As you know, in the past, Extension has been the hallmark of objectivity—the one place in which people of all faiths and political persuasions could obtain impartial information on the latest research, government programs, and other information essential to the solution of people's problems. This, we believe, must be maintained. We have serious questions whether this objectivity is a major SEA concern or whether it will be maintained because many major decisions are being made for other reasons but which adversely affect Extension. But more important, many of these decision-makers are foreigners to Extension, who do not understand or who do not appreciate the basic principles of Extension education. In addition, the Department's deemphasis on research and Extension appears to be somewhat inconsistent with the national need to increase productivity and to fight inflation.

We in OPEDA are certain that 1979 and 1980 will be critical years for Land-Grant agriculture in general and for workers in agriculture in particular. The time has come, in our opinion, when we must take decisive

political action. By "we," I mean individuals as private citizens and we as duly appointed or elected officials of organizations and institutions. Events of the past two years should be sufficient evidence that we no longer can sit back and "hope for the best" to happen. There are too many people in high authority, good intentioned or otherwise, who through ignorance, incompetence or design would destroy Federal-State relationships.

For some examples of threats against agriculture and its sister agencies, I am enclosing the April 1979 issue of OPEDA's newsletter.

We are in full agreement with Congressman Spellman to "write your Congressman." In addition to contacting individual Members of Congress, we counsel our members that written and personal contact with appropriate committee members at the time they are considering specific proposals is especially effective, for example, House and Senate Appropriation Committees, Ways and Means Committees, and certain subcommittees. Members of those Committees have expressed interest in the impact of reorganization and agencies' ability to serve their clientele.

To encourage our members to do their citizen's duty, we have provided them with a few pointers on effective congressional writing. In addition, Walter John, our Executive Director, is a registered lobbyist and is in frequent contact with the Congress, and the major Senate and House Committees where he presents our views and gives formal testimony at hearings. On May 9, Walt gave testimony opposing the proposed transfer of the Forest Service from Agriculture. We are happy that the President has dropped that reorganization plan.

During the past two years, many state and county personnel have joined OPEDA. Perhaps you have seen our earlier letters and materials. If you would like additional materials or further information about OPEDA, please call or write. Again, feel free to call upon me at any time; we have many testimonials.

Sincerely,

RICHARD G. FORD,
President. ●

THE OIL SHORTAGE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Energy and the multinational companies continually blame our present fuel shortages, high prices, dislocations on the Iranian stoppage and shortfall in production. The Nation has been told: "Our crude oil inventories are low and crude oil imports are below last year. Refinery capacity utilization is down 6 to 7 percent because there is not enough crude stock available."

At the June 11 hearing of the Commerce, Consumer and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, which I chair, Mr. Dougherty of the Federal Trade Commission testified that current gasoline shortages could not be explained by crude shortages.

Independently the staff and members of the subcommittee had also reached this conclusion.

According to U.S. Census data which is provided and verified by U.S. Customs Service:

First. U.S. imports of crude oil for the first 4 months of 1979 have exceeded last year's import levels for the same time period by 10 percent;

Second. Crude oil imports have averaged 7 million barrels per day for the first 4 months of this year; and

Third. Only in the month of February 1979 did a slight drop—3 percent—occur over February 1978 which could be attributed to Iran and despite this the first

4 months of 1979 showed an overall 10 percent increase over the comparable 1978 period.

Accordingly, we conclude there has been no Iranian shortfall or dislocation here despite statements to the contrary. The following are the Census figures:

U.S. GENERAL IMPORTS OF CRUDE PETROLEUM INTO THE U.S. CUSTOMS AREA, UNADJUSTED, BY MONTH (JANUARY 1976-APRIL 1979)¹

	Net quantity in thousands of barrels				1979 (MMBPD) ²		Net quantity in thousands of barrels				1979 (MMBPD) ²
	1976	1977	1978	1979			1976	1977	1978	1979	
January.....	167,858	207,738	192,772	226,177	7.5	July.....	190,181	229,532	195,244	
February.....	127,070	204,579	198,230	191,449	6.4	August.....	198,417	208,239	219,826	
March.....	154,692	264,202	181,172	200,989	6.7	September.....	183,018	209,539	211,793	
April.....	170,905	194,915	189,079	216,707	7.2	October.....	171,608	210,575	203,394	
May.....	127,751	160,217	179,073	November.....	188,087	215,654	209,578	
June.....	173,795	255,951	197,421	December.....	197,042	171,366	214,769	

¹ Source: Report FT 900, Bureau of the Census.

² MMBPD—millions of barrels per day.

For the first 3 months, in contrast to the Census figures, American Petroleum Institute reported crude oil imports down by almost a million barrels per day—6 to 7 million barrels per week—thus representing this year's imports as being less than last year's for the same time frame.

The Census figures are obtained by U.S. Customs Inspectors and public gagers by gaging and verifying the tanker carried imports. American Petroleum Institute (API) receives its figures from its members—the oil companies. The Department of Energy receives its data from Customs which is not the gauged reading but the amount cited in the ship's manifest. The API data is not verified. According to a recent General Accounting Office report the Department of Energy data is not verified.

The significance of measurement versus nonmeasurement and verification versus nonverification may be shown by the following excerpts from a June 14, 1979, Los Angeles Times story by William C. Rempel:

In fact, a Los Angeles Times inquiry shows that Customs Service import figures conflict sharply with industry or Department of Energy import records. According to Customs, greater amounts of oil are being imported than have been reported elsewhere.

A spot check of tankers discharging foreign crude oil at southern California ports showed that Customs' figures frequently are at odds with the import figures of the oil companies and shippers.

For example, when the Gyoko Maru discharged crude to the Chevron refinery in El Segundo last month, a licensed public gauger hired by the shipper said that 624,148 barrels were unloaded.

Chevron, by contrast, said it received only 601,840 barrels, according to Customs documents.

But Customs inspectors, measuring the oil both in the tanker and in the refinery tank, said Chevron received 646,143 barrels—or 44,303 barrels more than Chevron claimed. . . .

An inspection of Customs records of ship arrivals at California ports disclosed that between January and March of this year, 37.9 million barrels of foreign crude oil were shipped into the state.

The US Department of Energy reported only 32.4 million barrels, however—a difference of 5.5 million barrels, or about 230 million gallons less than Customs showed entering the state.

"Believe me, we don't have any oil going astray," a spokesman for the department said. He said the statistical discrepancy was due to the late filing of oil import forms by importers.

What Customs records show is that in February, for example, 15.3 million barrels of foreign crude was brought into California. The Department of Energy recorded only 11.9 million, however, or 3.4 million barrels below the Customs figures.

How have these crude oil imports affected our crude oil inventory stocks?

According to API and DOE figures—unverified—of our crude oil inventory stocks have risen sharply since the first of the year. Today crude oil inventory stocks exceed 333 million barrels. Thus, existing stocks now equal the lower inventory level of the "glut" period of 1977-78 or about 40 million barrels over traditional inventory levels. If we were to include the strategic petroleum reserve inventory—which is not included, our overall present inventory is by far the highest level it has ever reached. Even without the strategic petroleum reserve inventory we are within 12 million barrels of our all-time high. In fact, our present crude oil inventory stocks are greater than they were a year ago.

Yes, we also verified that refinery capacity utilization is down 6 to 7 percent from the traditional operating levels since the first of the year but it is obvious that it was not due to the lack of available crude oil stocks.

Yes, there is adequate crude oil stock and refinery capacity to refine this Nation's needs—an additional minimum of 1 million barrels of distillate a day.

DOE figures disclose U.S. demand is only up marginally and that world oil production is up over over 4.5 percent despite Iran. Further, the OPEC countries accuse the multinational oil companies and consuming nations of stockpiling crude oil and some of the multinational companies of being involved in price manipulation. The continued OPEC statements indicate where there is smoke, there is a fire and in this instance there appears to be substantive credibility to their accusations.●

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced two pieces of legislation

which would effectively eliminate one of the most disturbing and ominous social concerns facing our Nation—an enormously high rate of youth unemployment.

The first of these bills (H.R. 4534) would create an effective program of full employment, vocational training, and job placement for all young Americans in need of work.

Although both the Carter administration and the Congress have made important and commendable commitments to job initiatives for young persons, the extent of the problem is such that further and more comprehensive efforts are urgently required. Indeed, only a very small proportion of all jobless youngsters are currently being assisted by any Federal work or training project. The persistence of unemployment rates for all youngsters in the 17-percent range and for black youth at a level twice as high should be sufficient proof that we must do more and that we must do it quickly.

H.R. 4534, the Youth Employment Act, seeks to insure, through a variety of mechanisms, full utilization of all public and private employment and training programs.

The bill will move the Nation toward full employment for all persons in the 16 to 24 age bracket by creating within the Department of Labor a National Youth Full Employment Board. This body will work with the Secretary of Labor and prime sponsor planning councils to achieve a significant reduction in the employment differential among various population groups and to place large numbers of currently jobless young people in productive work positions.

The legislation stipulates that within 1 year of its enactment the overall joblessness rate for all American youngsters must not exceed 10 percent. Likewise, the bill requires a further reduction to an unemployment rate of 3 percent within 2 years of its passage and to genuine full employment by the third year. Jobs must, at the end of this period, be supplied within a reasonable period to all young people who are able and willing to work, the legislation states.

These objectives will be accomplished through the provision of financial assistance to the States, localities, private and nonprofit organizations, and the Youth Job Guarantee Office which is

also established under the legislation. The funds will be used for job training and job placement in public service and private employment projects.

The Youth Job Guarantee Office, to be situated within the Department of Labor and in every participating locality, will direct the placement and eligible individuals in job slots. Any youngster facing "special handicaps"—for example, discrimination based on race, sex, physical handicap, or other factor—shall be given special consideration for placement in training or work.

A carefully delineated process for actual placement is also proposed under the legislation. Eligible individuals will be referred first to private and public employment placement units, then to jobs in public service or private employment projects, and finally, if a job is unavailable in either of these sectors, to a position that will be created under the legislation.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation will move our Nation toward the eradication of unemployment among young people. The bill devises an effective and cost-efficient strategy for securing our economic future. There are few goals of greater importance to our Nation, and I hope that this Congress will begin to lead the country toward that reality.

The second piece of legislation (H.R. 4536) would expand the targeted tax credit for job hiring. As currently constituted, the tax credit provides \$3,000 in first-year savings to employers who hire an individual who fits into one of seven categories. My legislation expands one of these categories to include economically disadvantaged young persons, age 16 to 18, who are attending school. According to the most recently available Department of Labor statistics, some 1.7 million youngsters may potentially qualify for tax-credited hiring.

The legislation also amends the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act to allow certification and referral of youngsters to jobs under this program. The bill would encourage hundreds of thousands of young people to remain in school by enabling them simultaneously to complete their educations and to enhance family income.

Taken together, H.R. 4534 and H.R. 4536 will successfully address the awesome and debilitating problem of youth unemployment. I strongly urge all my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this legislation and in working toward a full employment future for our Nation.

The following is a section-by-section analysis of the bill, H.R. 4534, the Youth Employment Act:

The first section is a statement of the purpose of the act: to establish a program of full employment, vocational training and employment placement for all young Americans willing and able to work. The second section states that although the rate of youth unemployment is excessively high, the efforts in this area have been insufficient. Members of a newly established National Youth Full Employment Board in the Department of Labor will work with the Secretary of Labor and prime sponsor planning councils towards two major objectives. These objectives are to reduce the differentials in employment rates among various population

segments, and the rate of unemployment for all youths. Within one year of enactment, the unemployment rate must be at 10%, at 3% within two years, and within three years, jobs must be supplied for all youths who want to work within a reasonable period.

These objectives will be accomplished by the provision of financial assistance to states, localities, private and non-private organizations, and the youth job guarantee office, which is established in the following section. The funds will be used for training, and placement in public service and private employment projects. The youth job guarantee office established in the Department of Labor, and every locality under section four, will ensure that eligible individuals will be placed in a job. Section five provides that any person who may face "special obstacles", for example discrimination based on sex or race, physical handicap and so on, will be given special consideration. This section establishes certain financial and auditing procedures. Under this section, eligible individuals will be referred first to private and public employment placement facilities, then to jobs on public service and private employment projects, and finally, if no job is found then placement will be made under this act.

Section 6 is a Davis-Bacon provision. Section 7 provides that none can be excluded because of discrimination; section 8 is the enforcement clause. Section 9 is an authorization of such sums as needed for fiscal years, '81, '82, and '83. Section 10 states that the CETA prime sponsor planning council shall place projects for assistance which provide public service and private employment. Section 11 defines the terms used in this Act. ●

MEMORIAL DAY SPEECH

HON. H. JOEL DECKARD

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. DECKARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues some recent comments made by Mr. Gary May of Newburg, Ind., in his Memorial Day speech to the Vanderburgh County Council of Veterans Organizations. I was fortunate enough to be present at this occasion and, like all others there, was deeply moved by Mr. May's extremely poignant and eloquent description of the unique social, psychological, and physical problems faced by Vietnam veterans, with which he is personally familiar. In April of 1968, while serving in Vietnam, Mr. May stepped on an antipersonnel land mine, resulting in wounds requiring a bilateral amputation of his legs above the knees.

Following Vietnam, he earned degrees in both sociology and psychology at the University of Evansville, and continued advanced study at the University of Tennessee, receiving his master of science degree in 1974. Mr. May has had 5 years experience with the Veterans' Administration working in both medical and psychological readjustment programs. Currently, he is a social worker at the VA outpatient clinic in Evansville.

His words below are not only expressive of what it is to be a Vietnam veteran, but, perhaps more importantly, what our responsibility is to those veterans. Last month's observance of Vietnam Veteran's Week recognized the

struggle that many veterans endure, yet it is only through our daily attention to their special type of heroism that will provide a solution and remedy to this problem.

I offer his words for your thoughts and actions:

MEMORIAL DAY SPEECH

(By Gary May)

Memorial Day. The day this nation sets aside to pay tribute to its warriors who answered her call to arms but did not return alive. It's a sad day for many. Losses are painfully remembered. Questions about the worthiness of the "cause" which necessitated such sacrifices demand suitable answers. Most will conclude that the end did justify the means.

The situation is very different for those of us who participated in America's most recent war, however. In a very real way we have not yet returned from our war. We have been forgotten. Our sacrifices have not yet been adequately acknowledged. We were lost in the debate over the "worthiness" of our cause. We have not been separated from the war itself. We did not cause the war in Vietnam any more than those who did not speak out against our involvement there from the outset. We did not perpetuate the war in Vietnam. We served admirably and honorably under atrocious conditions. Virtually no one supported us. Even our "leaders" couldn't agree on whether or not we should be there. We didn't go with any assurance that what we were doing was right or necessary.

The situation was no different when we returned home. There were no marching bands to welcome us; only lively debate and demonstrations against the war. Many of us agreed with the dissidents, but we were not welcomed in their ranks either.

We were and are still largely, alone. In spite of the lack of appropriate acknowledgement, in spite of the negative stereotypical portrayal in the media, in spite of being looked upon as drug crazed psychopathic baby killers and "losers", in spite of all the numerous formidable barriers to our safe return home; the fact is, that most of us have done a very good job readjusting to civilian life. We should all be very proud of this fact.

Progress has been made. We hold responsible positions in government and the private sector. The administrator of the VA is a Vietnam veteran as are some other agency heads, congressmen and senators. Recent movies and books have portrayed the war and its veterans more appropriately.

We should not be lulled into complacency by our accomplishments, however. Much work remains to be done. Unemployment, especially among Blacks and other minority groups is disgracefully high. There is no adequate psychosocial counselling program in the VA for our brothers who are having adjustment problems. The suicide rate and incidence of alcohol related problems is higher than for the non veteran population. We do not have adequate information or investigation about the long range effects of Agent Orange. Insensitivity and hostility toward us continues. We are seen as "alien" by many. We are tired of getting nothing but words from officialdom.

We need adequate jobs and counselling services and educational benefits. We want to be accepted and appreciated for what and who we are. We want to be listened to.

As we memorialize our fallen brothers on this day, let's resolve that they shall not have died in vain. Let's insure that their death and our suffering have some meaning.

Tomorrow begins a very special week for the Vietnam veteran, Vietnam Veterans Week. This period was designated by Congress and the President for the nation to

acknowledge and thank the Vietnam veteran for his sacrifices. It's time to put differences aside.

Those of us who have served in this nation's wars know firsthand the horrors of war. We have seen the death, killing, and destruction. We have felt the pain, both physical and emotional. We can see beyond the romanticized notions of war. Our experiences with death have given us new reverence for life. We should be among the primary peacemakers and peacekeepers.

It is my sincere hope that one of the lasting legacies from the Vietnam War will be our ability to avoid such a fiasco in the future. We can no longer blindly subscribe to the "My country, right or wrong" philosophy. We need to look critically and question any strategies that would put us into similar situations in the future. Nothing should be above reproach.

For the Vietnam veteran we need to separate the war from the warrior. We knew who to call upon in time of war; it's time we learn who to thank during this time of peace.

This can be the beginning of an open, honest, constructive dialogue between and among Vietnam veterans. We have not yet taken the opportunity to talk about our involvement. We can't let this opportunity pass. No good will come from keeping all our feelings bottled up inside. It's been several years since the steamy jungles and rice paddies for many of us. There is no time like the present to try to make some sense of what we went through. Let's salvage some meaning from the death and suffering we endured. ●

WISE WORDS ON RHODESIA

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, that respected journal, the Christian Science Monitor, recently ran an article by Joseph C. Harsch regarding the need for clear and sober reflection with regard to the lifting of sanctions against Rhodesia.

Inasmuch as the House will be voting on this important matter in the near future, I insert the article in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 19, 1979]

HOW TO BUNGLER FOREIGN POLICY

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

Offhand I find it difficult to think of a problem in American foreign policy which has been bungled as badly as the US relationship toward the newly emergent black-led government of Zimbabwe Rhodesia.

The right place for applying American influence to the issue is in the capital of that country, Salisbury. There is where the black majority has been given the appearance of power and where practice will determine whether that appearance is real or false.

At the present moment the critics of the new government assert that the new Prime Minister, Bishop Abel Muzorewa, "is just black frosting on a white cake."

Is he just "black frosting"? Or is his assumption of the office of Prime Minister the beginning of an orderly transition from minority white to majority black rule which could become a showcase example of the best way of doing such things?

I do not know the answer to that question. Nor do you. Nor, indeed, does the average member of the United States Senate, 52 of

whom insisted by their vote on June 12 that they did.

To have 52 members of the US Senate vote against Rhodesia is about as unhelpful to effective diplomacy as anything could be. It is bound to encourage the most recalcitrant of the whites in Salisbury to think they can use Bishop Muzorewa as their stooge or "Uncle Tom." And the more of that there is, the less chance the Bishop has of succeeding in a peaceful and gradual transition.

But the folly of the Senate 52 was largely the result of a bungled approach by the White House.

If the Carter administration had from the start made the elements of its Rhodesian problem clear to the Senate, and done its utmost all along to keep the Senate informed, there need not have been the situation we now have where the issue is not how to resolve the Rhodesian problem, but the respective authorities of the Senate and the President.

The essential first fact about Rhodesia is that absolute white rule for the benefit of the white minority is finished. It is no longer tolerable in today's world.

But a second essential fact, and just as important as the first, is that the blacks as well as the whites in Rhodesia will benefit and be better off if that transition is peaceful and gradual and proceeds in a manner which will encourage a substantial number of the whites now in the country to stay on in that country to play an important, constructive, and profitable part in its further development.

We have seen a tragic example in Angola and Mozambique of what happens when the whites leave a former colonial country en masse in sudden panic. The result has been chaos, and misery for the blacks left behind. No one benefits.

Rhodesia is a going economic concern. No one should want that economy wrecked. No one would truly benefit from the wrecking of it. It will be wrecked if either one of two things happens. A panic mass flight of the whites would wreck it. A fraudulent handover of power to the blacks would wreck it. Bishop Muzorewa cannot survive if it is obvious after a sufficient interval that he is only a stooge of the whites and that real power is still in their hands. But the Rhodesian economy and the Muzorewa government can survive to the advantage of all if progress toward black rule is visible and convincing.

The place in which to make the transition visible and convincing, as well as peaceful and gradual, is in Salisbury itself. It cannot be done in the Senate or in a row between Senate and White House over whether the Senate is encroaching on the prerogatives of the President.

The constructive approach would have been for the President and Senate to have taken up jointly in Washington the position that they both welcomed the outcome of the Rhodesian election and the transfer of official power to Bishop Muzorewa and the installation of a government which appeared to mean a handover of power to the black majority. To which they would have added jointly that they would be watching developments after the official handover for evidence of a bona fide transition. They would hope the time would come when both could extend full American recognition to the new government.

That would give American diplomats leverage with the white leaders in Salisbury, and with the governments of the black countries of northern Africa whose continuing goodwill is important to the United States. Legally and technically, the government in Zimbabwe Rhodesia is still without legitimate credentials. Sovereignty technically still resides in London, and will reside there unless or until London recognizes the new government. The United States has only a marginal interest in events in Rhodesia itself. It

should coordinate its policies with London and with the capitals of the black African states and work with them for a safe and sane and peaceful transition which all of them could endorse.

No such safe, sane, and gradual but convincing transition is helped by a row between Senate and President in Washington or by 52 senators trying to take matters into their uninformed hands. ●

SALT II: A PRUDENT STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

HON. JAMES P. (JIM) JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure today, to pass along an article from the Washington Post, June 21, 1979, which, in my estimation, renders an unusually perceptive view of the SALT II Treaty ratification.

We have seen in the past months much literature on SALT II dealing with the need for strategic arms balance and verification. Author William G. Hyland, former deputy assistant for national security to President Ford and currently at Georgetown University, differs from other writers in his approach, in that he emphasizes the need for careful consideration of each amendment offered by the Senate. He petitions the Senate to give serious thought to what the possible consequences of these amendments may mean to the political future of our country.

At this time I wish to insert in the RECORD, "SALT or Limbo" by William G. Hyland. I urge my colleagues to read this most objective essay on SALT II.

SALT OR LIMBO

(By William G. Hyland)

It may be disappointing but should not be surprising that SALT II contains only a modicum of arms control despite seven years of negotiations. It would be astounding if two such hostile rivals were to agree to sweeping limitations on their primary means of military security. The purpose of armament arrangements between two highly competitive great powers is quite different. It is basically a political agreement; to provide a margin of reassurance and thus add an element of stability to the general relationship.

The new SALT agreements set only some rough outer limits. U.S. forces will grow to 11,000-12,000 warheads and bombs and similar Soviet forces will double, from 5,000 to 10,000. Nevertheless, these limits compare not with ideal limits in theoretical treaties, but with the probabilities of no agreement.

Consider, for example, the problem of the potential ability of the Soviet Union to wipe out most of our ICBMs. The United States has two choices. We can develop a new ICBM in some "mobile" basing of about 8,000 alternate launch points for about 200 real missiles. The SALT limits on Soviet missiles and warheads make it exceedingly difficult if not impossible for the Soviet Union to launch an attack on this scale. (Indeed, proponents of the MX mobility should desperately want limits on Soviet Forces.) The second choice is to set aside SALT and to race by producing more "aim points" than the Soviets can produce missile warheads. The United States could probably win, but it is not self-evident why challenging the U.S.S.R. to build the

maximum number of warheads is preferable to limiting them.

There are, of course, several possible improvements in the agreements that would yield American advantages. Some of them have already been tried and have failed in negotiation. Nevertheless, the Soviets probably could swallow some amendments but not the most significant ones. It is almost certain that the Soviets would not agree to scrap the temporary ban on land- and sea-based cruise missiles contained in the treaty protocol (which expires at the end of 1981). It is also unlikely that they would agree to count their Backfire bombers in the aggregate ceilings of 2,400 and 2,250. (If by some chance they did count some or all of them, it would certainly mean that Moscow intended to upgrade the aircraft significantly and probably arm it with long-range cruise missiles—not an attractive outcome for the United States.)

Probably, the Soviets would agree that the United States could have the right to build 300 very heavy ICBMs as the Soviets themselves have done. But deploying the new MX missile accomplishes about the same result within the treaty as written. The Soviets would probably accept some hortatory language about verification. Clarifying the status of "mobile" ICBMs seems to have been accomplished in the Vienna discussions and would not have to be a treaty amendment in any case. Insisting that the treaty protocol expires at the end of 1981 as written is redundant but harmless.

Senators, however, need to weigh some fundamental questions in considering the merits of each individual reservation or amendment. What is the international impact of a test of strength with the president, or the cost of humiliating him by imposing a series of major amendments? What is the risk in testing the limits of Soviet tolerance? And, above all, do the changes have real strategic significance? No amendments being discussed will solve the problem of the vulnerability of our ICBMs, or redress the imbalance in Europe, or check Soviet-Cuban intervention in Africa. Nor will these issues be solved by outright rejection. One theory is that only by defeating SALT can we administer the necessary shock to the American people and warn the Kremlin. But then what happens? Would our allies support us? Would the Senate proceed to vote the necessary defense funds in the new post-SALT environment? Would the president acquiesce in his defeat? What would Moscow do?

It seems likely that we would find ourselves in a political and strategic limbo. The Kremlin might well continue talking, but its basic strategy would be to begin preparing for sharper competition and contention with the United States. They probably would not launch a new "arms race" but would wait for the presidential elections—much like the period after the collapse of the summit in May 1960. We could thus find ourselves in the unenviable position of abiding by the essence of SALT, without any of the binding provisions on verification, while circling in a political holding pattern until November 1980.

This doleful state of affairs would coincide with a period of increasing international turmoil. The Soviet leadership is in transition. Sino-Soviet relations are in flux. Europe is groping for a larger identity. The international economic structure is being radically altered. There is a tendency toward regional instability if not chaos. Is it in the interest of the United States to challenge the Soviet Union in these circumstances and, if so, to what end? To get a new treaty or to force a Soviet defeat?

Confrontation with Moscow may come in any case; SALT unfortunately does not guarantee better Soviet behavior. But defeating SALT certainly is a leap into the unknown.

We need to rise above the technicalities of arms control, verification, amendments and reservations and answer some basic political questions. Ironically, it was one of SALT's main critics, Sen. Henry Jackson (D-Wash.), who put the issue quite correctly in a recent speech, when he asked whether it was possible to achieve an accommodation with a totalitarian superpower through negotiated agreement. The SALT proponents cannot dodge this question by stressing the virtues of a given article in the treaty, or its verifiability, nor can the opponents take refuge in contrived amendments that defer the basic decision. In the end the Senate will be voting to send a signal to Moscow about the direction we wish our relations to follow.

It would seem that the prudent course is 1) to approve SALT with a minimum of change, 2) to use the post-Vienna period to continue the political dialogue that was started there, especially concerning the consequences of Soviet interventionism in critical regions, and 3) to look to our own defenses rather than build up illusory hopes about SALT III (which incidentally deserves much more sober consideration before rushing into negotiations). Soviet conduct at the summit suggests that a wide area of differences with the United States will persist and may even grow. But, at the same time, the signing of the SALT treaty suggests that both sides would prefer these differences remain within some bounds. Can we really expect much more? ●

WHY THE PUSH ON DAVIS-BACON

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of talk lately about the need to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act. Much of the discussion is based on inaccurate and confusing information. I would submit for the RECORD this article from the Washington State Teamster, which I believe is a good statement about why Davis-Bacon was enacted, what it has done in the past 48 years, and why the push for its repeal is misguided:

[From the Teamster, June 15, 1979]

WHY THE PUSH ON DAVIS-BACON

A federal law considered so non-controversial that it barely merited congressional debate before its routine approval in 1931 suddenly has become a hot issue.

After 48 years, the business community and its generally Republican, generally conservative friends in Congress have determined that the legislation—the Davis-Bacon Act—has a lot to do with what ails the nation.

The Davis-Bacon Act, oddly enough, was sponsored by two Republicans—Senator James J. Davis of Pennsylvania and Rep. Robert Low Bacon of New York.

The bill originated with Bacon. After winning approval for construction of a new veterans hospital in his district, he was dismayed to find that, instead of his constituents getting the construction award, it went to an Alabama contractor who had undercut the local bidders.

The Alabamian brought thousands of non-union workers with him from the South. The workers, Bacon told a congressional committee, "were herded onto the job, they were housed in shacks, they were paid a very low wage..."

President Hoover wanted to solve the problem by an administrative order re-

quiring bidders on federal construction projects to maintain local wage scales, but the U.S. Comptroller General ruled that legislation was required. So Bacon introduced his bill, with Davis—a former Secretary of Labor—cosponsoring it in the Senate. The House passed the measure under suspension of the rules, a procedure ordinarily used to speed action on non-controversial bills, and Hoover quickly signed it into law.

The law required contractors on federal projects to pay locally "prevailing" wages—the same wages paid to private sector workers on similar projects in the same area. It later was expanded to cover private construction funded in full or in part by federal dollars, such as medical facilities, schools or housing for the poor.

The law apparently worked well over the years—well enough that 40 states adopted "little Davis-Bacon" laws that protected their local contractors and workers by putting similar conditions on state-funded construction projects.

Now, 48 years after the law took effect, it has come under attack by forces generally seen as pro-big business and anti-labor. These forces are, for the most part, the same individuals and business, conservative and right-wing groups which waged successful battles against situs picketing legislation in 1977 and the Labor Law Reform Act in 1978. Both of those issues were very high on organized labor's legislative agenda.

The opposition's charge against Davis-Bacon is that it's inflationary, artificially pumping up building and construction trade wages. According to a much-disputed report by the General Accounting Office, Davis-Bacon adds \$500 million in unnecessary costs to the nation's annual construction tab.

Not so, says Labor Secretary Ray Marshall, who testified on the legislation's behalf before a number of congressional committees. If he were still teaching, declared the former economics professor on one occasion, he would "flunk" the authors of the report for shoddy work. For example, said Marshall, the report detailed what it considered improper wage rates in 12 construction projects out of a possible 17,000, then applied the findings to a total of 120,000 projects.

More important than the question of wage levels, Marshall said, are the questions of quality construction, productivity and stability in the industry—all of which, he warned, would be seriously threatened by repeal or serious weakening of the Act.

Organized labor charges that the anti-inflation argument is no more than, as one Labor publication put it, "a cover story for what is purely a vendetta against construction unions and their members." The Labor Department and the unions both point out that, by definition, paying a worker the same wages paid to comparable workers cannot be inflationary.

And they document that labor costs in construction are the smallest cost element in new building: in 1949, labor and materials accounted for 69 percent of building a new house; in 1978, those costs were down to 47 percent, of which building materials accounted for 30 percent and labor only 17 percent.

Meanwhile, over the same period, the cost of land increased from 11 percent to 25 percent; finance costs rose from 5 percent to 11 percent, and builders' overhead and profits rose from 15 percent to 17 percent.

A labor spokesman testified on Capitol Hill: "Emasculation or repeal" of Davis-Bacon "is the first step toward dismantling 50 years of carefully-designed social legislation." If Davis-Bacon is threatened, labor asks, what would prevent the Fair Labor Standards Act—the federal minimum wage and overtime law—from being next?

Undeterred by these arguments—or, some might say, perhaps spurred gleefully on—the opponents of Davis-Bacon have launched

their attack. So far, at least, they've met with little success.

Several bills calling for outright repeal of the law have been introduced in Congress. But the major confrontations thus far have come on the state level, where some 30 state legislatures have been urged to repeal their "little" Davis-Bacon, and in congressional committees, where efforts are being made to knock prevailing wage provisions out of dozens of authorization bills.

The state efforts are barely under way, and the score as of late May was 2 to 1. In Utah and Arizona, gubernatorial vetoes of state legislative actions prevented repeal, while the failure of Florida's governor to act following his state legislature's repeal vote eliminated the law.

Supporters of the law on the federal level, at least so far, haven't lost a fight yet. Opponents on several congressional committees have attempted to drop Davis-Bacon provision from defense, housing and other appropriations bills. They've lost on each try, although usually by the slimmest of margins.

The efforts in committee are expected to continue—opponents have more than 50 appropriations bills they can attack. And Davis-Bacon supporters still expect an overall repeal vote to be attempted, perhaps in June. The local fights will continue as well: in four states, as of June 1, repeal votes had been approved by one chamber or another of state legislatures.

Labor sees a lot riding on the outcome of the Davis-Bacon fight. While situs picketing and labor law reform both were lost, working people still emerged no worse off than before the fights began. But the loss of Davis-Bacon would mean a giant step backwards.●

**INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION
TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE
CODE OF 1954 TO ALLOW A
DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS
OF REAL PROPERTY FOR CONSERVATION PURPOSES**

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that could dramatically expedite the future acquisition of natural resource areas by private conservation organizations and the Federal Government.

Current law does not allow tax deductions to corporate or individual owners of property to donate interest in the surface of land areas to be used for conservation or other charitable purposes while simultaneously retaining mineral interests in the property. The landowner must donate the mineral interest in the land as well as a surface interest in order to qualify for a tax deduction under the Internal Revenue Code.

This has resulted in the reluctance of many landowners to enter into land transactions with conservation organizations or the Federal Government at a time when conservation organizations and Government agencies are trying to preserve America's remaining pockets of natural land.

Section I of this legislation would remove this existing impediment and allow for a more expeditious land acquisition

program. The legislation would allow property owners to make land donations while still reserving mineral rights, and to receive a deduction under the IRS Code for the value of that portion of the land donated. For example, if the total value of a parcel of property is appraised at \$1,000,000 and the mineral interests, such as oil or gas, are worth \$300,000, the landowner would be able to donate all surface interests, valued at \$700,000, and retain the mineral interests—and access to them—and obtain an IRS deduction for the \$700,000 donation.

A reasonable question which might arise with such an arrangement is: How can one assure the protection of the integrity of the natural resource donated? The legislation stipulates that the holder of the mineral interests cannot extract the minerals by any surface mining method. The minerals, however, could be extracted by drilling or underground mining methods. Generally, these types of extractions can be compatible with the long-term ecological value of the land surface. Furthermore, it will be up to the recipient of the donation to specify in the deed of transfer which specific restrictions on mineral extraction are further required to protect the long-term natural values of any land parcel. This situation is hardly new since most land now acquired by purchase by charitable organizations for conservation purposes often has the mineral rights outstanding in third parties. The conservation group must negotiate every land purchase so as to assure that the natural values of the land are protected.

In the case where property is acquired by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, of the Department of Interior, the strict compatibility tests of the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act would govern any mineral activity on the acquired land. This statute requires that any extraction of minerals must, by secretarial determination, be compatible with the major purposes of the wildlife refuge.

Section II of the legislation would withdraw the 1981 expiration date of a 1976 change in the IRS Code that clarified that the donation of conservation easements qualified for an IRS deduction. Under this existing provision, any type of easement in any State, irrespective of State easement laws, would qualify for a Federal tax deduction. The 1976 change allowed conservation organizations to acquire conservation easements where they were not able to before.

The easement deduction provides incentives for conservation of valuable natural areas and wildlife habitat. In cases where private owners do not wish to sell their land, easements are often donated. Where easements are purchased, they are often purchased at substantially less cost than fee acquisition.

I urge my colleagues to view this legislation as a vehicle to create an incentive to bring about the further protection of possibly thousands of acres of natural resources. It will remove a longstanding impediment to donations of property in need of management and protection. It will allow potential donors to contribute property for conservation purposes with-

out having to be deprived of interests rightfully theirs.

This legislation is a constructive step forward in the conservation of our natural resources—a step that needs to be taken today.●

**SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO JOHN R.
HUTCHERSON**

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the achievements of a unique and special man. Mr. John R. Hutcherson, of Los Angeles, Calif., is an outstanding human being who has dedicated his life to helping, serving, and caring for others. On June 29, 1979, many of Mr. Hutcherson's acquaintances, colleagues, and friends will be honoring him on the occasion of his retirement from the Los Angeles County Department of Social Services, and at this time, I would like to join with them in their salute to this fine citizen.

Mr. Hutcherson has worked selflessly as treasurer and past president of the Los Angeles County Public Social Services Board of Directors, which administers the vital programs that are so necessary to the well-being of so many of our citizens who need some form of public assistance. For many people, a full-time job such as this would prevent one from participating in other activities, but not John R. Hutcherson.

Mr. Hutcherson was the initiator and prime mover in the building and establishment of the Good Shepherd Manor senior citizens residence sponsored by Christ The Good Shepherd Episcopal Church. He serves as treasurer and member of the board of directors of the residence.

In addition to his work on behalf of senior citizens, Mr. Hutcherson has been exceptionally active in church related activities for many years. He is a past member of the Diocesan Council of the Los Angeles Diocese of the Episcopal Church; past president of Deanery 6 of the Los Angeles Diocese of the Episcopal Church; business manager of Christ The Good Shepherd Episcopal Church; treasurer of the men's club of the church; and a member of the vestry and a past senior and junior warden.

Mr. Hutcherson has also been involved in fraternal organizations. He is a member of Phi Beta Sigma Chapter, Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity; is western regional representative of the fraternity; and also serves on the Inter-Fraternity Council-Los Angeles, which sponsors an annual basketball series to raise funds for scholarships.

John R. Hutcherson served in the Quartermaster Corps of our military services, and was commissioned a first lieutenant, Quartermaster Corps, in 1943, and received reserved commissioned officer grade of major, Army of the United States, in 1960.

Thousands and thousands of people have benefited from the good works of John R. Hutcherson, and now it is our turn to let him know how appreciative we are of his dedicated years of service. I am very happy to join with others from the community in wishing him well in the years ahead. ●

ROBERT A. TAFT, MR. AMERICA AND
MR. REPUBLICAN

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, Senator Robert A. Taft, "Mr. Republican," was firmly convinced that our free society at home required an anti-Communist but noninterventionist foreign policy abroad.

Recently, Michael McMenamin wrote an article on this subject for Reason magazine. I would like to draw excerpts from it to my colleagues' attention:

ROBERT A. TAFT

Robert A. Taft was not, as his wife was wont to remind voters, a common man. Nor was he a common politician. It is worth remembering, as we look back on such postwar American statesmen as Truman, Marshall, Acheson, Dulles, Byrnes, and Vandenberg and lament the absence in the White House, State Department, and Senate of equivalent figures today, that Taft was described by the otherwise partisan liberal journalist Richard Rovere as the "ablest figure in American politics," whose integrity, intelligence, and independence made him seem, "alongside the papier mâché statesmen of the period, almost a figure of granite."

From the late 1930s to his death in 1953, Taft offered a principled and largely consistent counterpoint to the expansionist New Deal foreign policies of Roosevelt and Truman. He advocated neutrality and nonintervention in the European war prior to Pearl Harbor. Less than a week before Pearl Harbor, despite his acknowledged preference for a British victory and abhorrence of National Socialist Germany, he attacked the most conservative members of the Republican Party for advocating American intervention against Germany. After World War II he strongly opposed the formation of NATO and the permanent stationing of American troops in Europe yet supported creation of the United Nations. He characterized as a "brazen disregard of law" Truman's sending American troops into combat in Korea without the consent of Congress.

MR. AMERICAN

Why study Taft and his foreign policy today? For one thing, Taft's national career spanned the critical period from the late '30s to the early '50s, during which the national consensus on foreign policy underwent a radical transformation from isolationism to internationalism. His foreign policy likewise had to be adapted to the transition from a nonnuclear to a nuclear world. Further, that evolution occurred in the crucible of national politics, with Taft as Senate majority leader and presidential candidate.

Finally, as one of his strongest critics, John Armstrong, conceded, in the realm of foreign policy Taft "was more than Mr. Republican. He was Mr. American. It was he, perhaps better than anyone else, who voiced the doubts and prejudices, the hopes and fears, the frustrations, the hesitations, and

the dissatisfactions that the American people felt as they slowly and ponderously went about the business of adjusting to their changed role in the world." Taft's foreign policy positions "caused thoughtful Americans to rethink their position, if only to refute him, and he repeatedly reminded the country there are limitations on what we as a nation can and should do in the field of foreign affairs."

Throughout his career Taft was pejoratively characterized as an "isolationist" by those who supported and fostered the internationalist foreign policy symbolized by Henry Luce's "American Century" series of editorials. He was portrayed in the press as a provincial, conservative, midwestern politician.

A politician he was, and not particularly ashamed of it. A provincial he was not. Robert Taft was the son of a president, and as a young boy he traveled widely through Europe and the Orient. He experienced American imperialism first-hand, living in the Philippines for three years when his father was appointed one of the American commissioners shortly after the Spanish-American War. Taft went to prep school in Connecticut; college, at Yale and Harvard Law. During World War I, after being rejected by the Army on two occasions for poor eyesight, he went to work in Washington for Herbert Hoover, then head of Wilson's Food Administration. After the war he joined Hoover in Europe as legal advisor to the American Relief Administration. While there, the young Taft observed the ravages of war, the duplicities and intrigue of Versailles, and Allies' postwar blockade of food to starving German civilians.

Returning to Ohio after the war, Taft entered state politics. As the son of a former president and chief justice, he achieved almost instant national prominence upon his election to the U.S. Senate in 1938, and he wasted no time in capitalizing on it. On his second day in the the Senate he attacked FDR's foreign policy as likely to lead to war and called for strict neutrality and nonintervention in European affairs.

FOREIGN POLICY RHETORIC

Jimmy Carter talked a lot in the 1976 presidential campaign about having a foreign policy as good as the American people, implicitly suggesting that the policy we had—which bears the rough outline of the one installed by FDR back in 1938—was not so good. After two and a half years in office, however, it is difficult to see where Jimmy Carter has genuinely reexamined any of the basic foreign policy outlines of the last 40 years. . . .

Carter's only genuine departure from the past—an ill-defined commitment to human rights as a cornerstone of foreign policy—has turned out to be merely rhetorical, calling to mind H. L. Mencken's devastating essay "The Archangel Woodrow." As with Carter, Woodrow Wilson was similarly inclined toward "gaudy processions of mere counter-words." "The important thing," wrote Mencken, "is not that a popular orator should have uttered such vaporous and preposterous phrases but that they should have been gravely received."

More than halfway through his term, Carter's foreign policy is still widely perceived as erratic, inconsistent, at times amateurish, and, above all, lacking any unifying theme or principles. While many commentators have offered their opinions on the causes, maybe the answer is simply that a foreign policy ought to be based on something more than piety and ambition.

REAL LIBERTY

Robert Taft's ideas on foreign policy were based on liberty.

No one can think intelligently on the many complicated problems of American foreign

policy unless he decides first what he considers the real purpose and object of that policy. . . . Fundamentally, I believe the ultimate purpose of our foreign policy must be to protect the liberty of the people of the United States . . . so that they may achieve that intellectual and material improvement which is their genius and in which they can set an example for all peoples. By that example we can do an even greater service to mankind than we can by billions of material assistance—and more than we can ever do by war.

Liberty was a comfortable word for Taft. He used it often. More importantly—and this distinguished him from most of his contemporaries as well as virtually all of today's politicians—he didn't use the word lightly. He knew, in the best classical liberal tradition, precisely what liberty is.

And when I say liberty I do not simply mean what is referred to as "free enterprise." I mean liberty of the individual to think his own thoughts and live his own life as he desires to think and to live; the liberty of the family to decide how they wish to live, . . . and how they wish to spend their time; liberty of a man to develop his ideas and get other people to teach those ideas, if he can convince them that they have some value to the world; liberty of every local community to decide how its children shall be educated, how its local services shall be run, and who its local leaders shall be; and liberty of a man to run his own business as he thinks it ought to be run, as long as he does not interfere with the right of other people to do the same thing.

We cannot overestimate the value of this liberty of ideas and liberty of action. It is not that you or I or some industrial genius is free; it is that millions of people are free to work out their own ideas and the country is free to choose between them and adopt those which offer the most progress. . . .

It has been a long time since Americans have heard a nationally known politician from a major party speak of economic liberties and civil liberties in the same breath with genuine understanding. Yet it was Taft's firmly held belief in both civil and economic liberty that formed the core and served as the anchor for his foreign policy views—as is clear if we look at what he said about such issues as war, imperialism, and conscription. And it is from this perspective that one must view Taft on foreign policy in order to obtain a clear idea of what he was trying to accomplish.

NO BLOODLUST

During his lifetime, Taft was not without his critics. Immediately prior to formal American entry into World War II, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., bitterly attacked the noninterventionist position of Taft and many other Republicans, accusing them of harassing, sabotaging, and obstructing FDR in his attempts to destroy Nazism and pointing to the business community as the Republican element most responsible. Taft's response to Schlesinger is worth repeating.

The most conservative members of the party—the Wall Street bankers, the society group, nine-tenths of the plutocratic newspapers, and most of the party's financial contributors—are the ones who favor intervention in Europe. Mr. Schlesinger's statement that the business community in general had tended to favor appeasing Hitler is simply untrue. I have received thousands of letters on both sides of the question, and I should say without question that it is the average man and woman . . . who are opposed to war. The war party is made up of the business community of the city, the newspaper and magazine writers, the radio and movie commentators, the Communists, and the university intelligentsia.

The *Nation* argued that Taft was "following a line almost indistinguishable from that of the Communists" and compared Taft

to the far-left congressman Vito Marcantonio, who had also publicly worried that the power of Congress to declare war had been usurped by Truman's sending troops to Korea. The *New Republican* criticized Taft in similar terms. . . .

Taft's positions on foreign policy had gradually evolved into a rather elaborate whole. Individual liberty for Taft was not necessarily an active end of foreign policy; our foreign policy was not to promote the growth of liberty in this country. It was enough for Taft that domestic liberty in a passive sense be preserved and that foreign policy be conducted so as not to threaten American liberty. This meant the avoidance of a serious risk of war—chiefly because of the internal threat to our political and economic liberty from the total mobilization of the nation caused by modern war, rather than because of any external threat to our country from an aggressor. (Taft believed that no nation ever posed any serious threat to our territorial integrity that could not be successfully handled by adequate air and naval forces.)

AID WITH CAUTION

Taft, however, was neither a pacifist (although his wife came close to being one, threatening at one time in 1938 to get herself arrested if the government tried to take us into war) nor a hard-core isolationist. He never believed in "peace at any price" and consistently favored aiding friendly countries under certain conditions. These conditions were stringent, however, and were never quite flexible enough to suit his interventionist critics:

Prior congressional approval of assistance. Taft believed that presidents, acting alone, are far more likely than Congress to take the nation into war. Taft wanted no president to have sole power to decide war or peace.

No preexisting obligations by treaty or otherwise to furnish assistance. Taft called this the "policy of the free hand": without advance commitments to intervene militarily outside our own territory, we would be left free to decide each such issue solely on whether it was of "sufficiently vital interest to the liberty of this country."

Assistance only within our capability. Taft always recognized that the United States can't police the world, that the national-security state created by Truman had a price tag.

The people of the United States constitute only 6 percent of the population of the globe. Our raw materials are certainly not more than a third of the world's resources. Our huge production is still less than one-third of the world's production. Our people cannot, and do not desire to, boss the internal affairs of other countries. They cannot send armies to block a Communist advance in every far corner of the world. Consequently, we must consider the cost of the policies we adopt, both in men and money, and we are forced to be selective in determining the relative value and cost of each project.

Assistance only upon request. Taft was always sensitive (and therefore opposed) to telling other nations what is good for them and aiding them whether or not they want help.

Fundamentally, I doubt if the standard of living of any people can be successfully raised to any appreciable degree except by their own efforts. We can advise; we can assist, if the initiative and the desire and the energy to improve themselves is present. But our assistance cannot be a principal motive for foreign policy or a justification for going to war.

ON THE SOVIET SPECTER

Taft's views on relations with the Soviet Union have particular relevance for us today. In the years immediately after World War II, his influence in the Republican Party had never been higher. During that same time, as shown by Daniel Yergin's perceptive

book, *Shattered Peace: The Origins of the Cold War and the National Security State*, the Cold War started in earnest. We still live in that bipolar world, and Taft's postwar application of his foreign policy principles to our relations with the USSR demonstrate that anticommunism need not result in confrontation or an interventionist foreign policy. . . .

Despite the liberals' McCarthy-like attacks on him, Robert Taft was an anticommunist without peer.

Let me say that no one is more determined to resist Communist aggression in the world than I am. I think the Russians present a menace to the liberty of the entire world and to our way of life, a menace greater than we have faced in our history.

In his own book on foreign policy, Taft indicated an acute appreciation of the USSR's security needs.

If [the Russians] do not have the intention of starting a third world war, I believe there is only one incitement on our part which might lead them to change their minds and begin such a war. That would be the creation of a condition in which Russia feared the actual invasion of Russia or invasion of some satellite country sufficiently close as to threaten the future invasion of Russia.

He firmly believed that the Soviet Union was more of an ideological than a military threat.

The threat of communism against liberty is not by any means a purely military threat—in fact, if we had only to face the military strength of Soviet Russia I think there would not be any such concern as we see today.

Communism is strong because it has developed a fanatical support and missionary ardor, which have spread throughout the world and appealed everywhere to some of those who are dissatisfied with their present condition. It is a threat because it has developed methods of infiltration and propaganda well-fitted to this missionary ardor and has succeeded in building up, even in the most free countries, at least a strong minority of people who form, in effect, a fifth column behind our lines.

And Taft argued that the Soviet Union ought to be met in this arena and not on the battlefield.

A war against communism in the world must finally be won in the minds of men. . . . Far from establishing liberty throughout the world, war has actually encouraged and built up the development of dictatorships and has only restored liberty in limited areas at the cost of untold hardship, of human suffering, of death and destruction beyond the conception of our fathers. We may be able to achieve real peace in the world without passing through the fire of a third world war if we have wise leadership. Communism can be defeated by an affirmative philosophy of individual liberty, and by an even more sincere belief in liberty than the communists have in communism.

BEYOND IMPERIALISM

Taft's reactions to the Greek crisis in 1947, the formation of NATO in 1949, and Truman's decision to send more American troops to Europe in 1951 are instructive examples of a noninterventionist, albeit anti-communist, foreign policy.

Churchill and Stalin had agreed that Greece would be in the British sphere of influence after the war. When the British announced in February 1947 that they were abandoning the defense of Greece, then in the throes of a civil war . . . Truman leaped at the chance to pick up the fallen British imperial standard.

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

He proposed massive military and eco-

nomie aid to Greece and Turkey. Taft disagreed. He had questions for Truman:

Could Greece, even with American aid, defend itself against a Russian invasion?

How was American "national security" involved?

What evidence was there that a Communist victory in the Greek civil war would lead to Communist takeovers elsewhere in the Middle East?

Would the United States permit free elections in Greece?

Would the United States leave if a freely elected Greek government so requested?

The questions were never answered. . . .

TACTICAL ERROR

Taft, however, went along with Truman on aid to Greece and Turkey precisely to strengthen Truman's hand in negotiations with the USSR. But he rejected any wider implications of the Truman Doctrine.

I intend to vote for the Greek and Turkish loans for the reason that the President's announcements have committed the United States to this policy in the eyes of the world, and to repudiate it now would destroy his prestige in the negotiations with the Russian Government, on the success of which ultimate peace depends.

I do not regard this as a commitment to any similar policy in any other section of the world.

The Truman administration, on the other hand, clearly did regard aid to Greece as a commitment to similar policies all over the world, . . . and intended the Truman Doctrine to shape all of postwar foreign policy.

In retrospect, Taft did make a grievous tactical error in not resisting Greek aid and the Truman Doctrine. For Truman *did* regard it as a commitment to the rest of the world. Taft essentially let the Truman Doctrine go unchallenged, and by not resisting aid to Greece, he lost forever *his* free hand in shaping the course of postwar foreign policy.

NO TO NATO

Taft never had another real chance to oppose the increasingly belligerent "world policeman" foreign policy of the Truman administration. When NATO was formed in 1949, he opposed it vigorously.

It is . . . clear that the pact is a military alliance, a treaty by which one nation undertakes to arm half the world against the other half, and in which all the pact members agree to go to war if one is attacked.

No matter how defensive an alliance may be, if it carries the obligation to arm, it means the building up of competitive offensive armament. This treaty, therefore, means inevitably an armament race, and armament races in the past have led to war.

I am quite willing to consider the providing of assistance to particular countries, at particular times, if such aid seems at that time a real deterrent to war But that is a very different thing from . . . arming half the world against the other half.

When the final Senate vote on NATO was taken, Taft was joined by only 12 other senators in voting no. The Truman Cold War policy of global "containment" of communism had taken hold of Congress and public opinion. Taft simply had waited too long to make his stand.

Although the Truman administration had been ambiguous during the NATO debate about any treaty *obligation* to provide arms to Western Europe, two days after the treaty passed, a \$1.45 billion military assistance program was introduced by the administration and subsequently passed by a 55-to-24 margin. Two years later, in 1951, Truman proclaimed his unilateral right and intention to permanently station American troops in Europe as part of NATO.

Yet again, Taft strongly opposed Truman's policy, touching off what was referred to

at the time as a "great debate" on foreign policy. Taft, as usual, marshaled cogent arguments against a permanent American troop presence in Europe: it would strain the American economy; Europeans would be encouraged to depend upon Americans rather than themselves for their defense; the USSR would be unnecessarily provoked; and Truman had no constitutional right to send American troops abroad in peacetime without prior congressional approval.

But Taft couldn't win . . . In the end, Taft was reduced to supporting a weak Senate resolution (arguably not binding, anyway) requiring Truman to come to Congress for approval prior to sending more than four American divisions (150,000 men) to Europe.

Although ultimately unsuccessful in changing the course of our postwar foreign policy, Taft demonstrated that an anticommunist need not necessarily be a cold warrior and that a foreign policy concerned with preserving internal civil and economic liberties will naturally be more limited in scope and goals than one whose grandiose purpose is to advance human rights throughout the world. It is a lesson from which we can profit today. ●

AN EXTRAORDINARY INTERVIEW

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times carried an extraordinary interview today with Commissioner of Education, Ernest Boyer. In this interview, Mr. Boyer admitted that the proposed Department of Education would have no substantive value, only a "symbolic" significance. He also admitted that most high-level officials in the Government education bureaucracy cannot write clear English. All in all this interview should settle the debate over whether we should have a Department of Education. The answer—from the evidence presented by Carter administration's highest ranking education officer—is clearly "No."

At this time I wish to insert in the RECORD "Boyer Reviews Term in Office," by Edward B. Fiske, the New York Times, Tuesday, June 26, 1979.

BOYER REVIEWS TERM IN OFFICE

(By Edward B. Fiske)

On Saturday, Ernest L. Boyer will step down as the United States Commissioner of Education. Since April 1, 1977, Mr. Boyer, the former Chancellor of the State University of New York, has been the principal educational spokesman for the Carter Administration and the chief administrator of the Office of Education's \$12 billion budget, which covers areas ranging from compensatory reading programs to Indian education.

In a recent interview, he was asked about his thoughts on Federal educational issues and what it was like to spend more than two years in a high Government post. Following are excerpts from that interview:

Q. Is there any such thing as a Carter education policy?

A. Definitely. The gains for education at the Federal level under the Carter Administration have been greater than at any time in the nation's history. The budget has increased from \$7 billion to \$12 billion, and that is a quantum leap. There's also been a clarification of the Federal role in education,

with aid at the elementary and secondary level now focused much more sharply on language and mathematics at the early grades.

Q. You set up a school within the department and taught some courses yourself. What did you teach?

A. Writing. I am frequently asked to sign letters drafted by others, and even the urgency of time does not permit me to put my signature to some of the stuff that comes along. The language is cluttered and ambiguous. It takes several paragraphs to say what one sentence would cover. Even then you aren't always clear what was being said.

Q. Maybe that's intentional.

A. Exactly. Part of it is self-protection. Very often, there is no clear level of accountability, and as a document goes from lower to higher levels everyone tends to want to add some protection, and no one edits what the previous person did. But while being ambiguous might have left us off the point temporarily, it only adds to the lack of confidence and the attitude of cynicism toward government. I don't think we can afford to have this confidence continue to go down.

It can also lead to silly little mistakes. I got one letter that I was written in behalf of the Secretary [Joseph A. Califano Jr., Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare] that began, "I am pleased to respond in behalf of Secretary California." Fifteen people had signed off on it, so it must have been right. It was as if the whole system had a kind of joke that it wanted to move ahead.

Q. Are there other reasons for the obscurantism?

A. The threat of lawsuits is a very big thing around here. We operate in what might be called a climate of anticipatory litigation. You don't write a letter with the simple goal of giving an answer or explaining a problem. It's not that simple. You think up all the possible challenges, and you cover all the bases. So what should have been a simple little statement ends up as a legal brief.

Q. You've also been the first Commissioner of Education to send collection agencies out after loan defaulters.

A. That's what it took. We had a runaway default rate in the Guaranteed Student Loan program that was administratively a scandal. Since April 1978 the number of students in default has dropped from 400,000 to about 300,000. We're now saving millions of dollars a month, and in 18 to 24 months the default rate will be close to zero.

Q. Is there anything you haven't been able to do?

A. One thing I didn't get done was name the building. I've been working in "FOB6"—Federal Office Building 6. It's degrading. It has all of the signals of a nameless, faceless bureaucracy.

Q. The legislation to create a separate department of education seems to be running into unexpected trouble. How much difference would a department make?

A. The difference would be primarily symbolic. I think it would be an important statement about the significance of education in our society if the Cabinet had a secretary of education. But I do not believe that it would alter significantly the shape or size of the Federal budget in education or the influence of the Federal office on the schools either pro or con. The only way a budget grows is for Congress to appropriate more money. And I'm not sure it would lead to great efficiency.

Q. Someone suggested calling it the department of public education and youth.

A. That was a public relations coup for the opposition. In fact, it's the one time I can think of when an acronym was worth the effort.

Q. What will you miss about the job?

A. I'll miss the excitement of being with

Congress and helping shape policy. I'll miss the great—the almost breathless—pace of this city. I'll miss the tremendous sweep of encounters. The great excitement of this job is that one hour you're meeting with a group concerned about the handicapped and the next with those involved in Indian education and then people concerned about libraries in the schools. These are all caring and concerned people, and the end result after two and a half years is a tremendous cafeteria of very exciting offerings.

Q. Anything you won't miss?

A. I won't miss the distortion of priorities. One of the big failings of this city is that it gives priority to too many things. The signal around here is "by C.O.B." Everything has to be in "by close of business," whether it's important or unimportant. They don't say 5 o'clock, which would give you the suggestion of when business ends. They just say "C.O.B."

One of my first weeks here, I was going to a meeting at double time, and someone stopped me and said that he had just gotten a message that by C.O.B. I was to have a memo on how I was going to stay in touch with "the people of America." I said, "You can tell them that I'm on my way to a meeting, and there are some 'people of America' there." Why that had to be "C.O.B." never occurred to anyone.

It's exciting to work here, but it's not something one should do forever. The worst thing you can do is make a career of trying to manage government of this sort. I think you should be here for a period of time and try to keep your perspective and then move on. ●

SALT II THE EUROSTRATEGIC IMBALANCE

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD excerpts from a study by Air Vice Marshal Stewart W. B. Menaul of the British Royal Air Force on the dangers to European security incorporated in the proposed SALT II Treaty. While reading Air Marshal Stewart's comments I recalled the euphoric media statements attributed to NATO leaders about the great contributions SALT could make to world peace. Would the U.S. SALT sellers stretch the truth by providing their own facts?

The excerpts follow:

THE DANGERS TO EUROPEAN SECURITY IN SALT II

West Europeans are becoming profoundly concerned that the American-Soviet Strategic Arms Limitations Talks (SALT II) may result in a treaty which adversely affects the security of the European half of NATO. Weapons systems excluded from the talks because they are not considered strategic weapons to the superpowers are completely strategic as far as Europe is concerned. Air Vice Marshal S. W. B. Menaul, a former Chief of Staff of Bomber Command and member of the Governing Council of this Institute has written a very authoritative study¹ explaining this Eurostrategic weakness.

¹ SALT II The Eurostrategic Imbalance. By Stewart Menaul. Institute for the Study of Conflict, 12/12A Golden Sq., London W1R 3AF. £2 or \$4.50.

UNPRECEDENTED SOVIET BUILD-UP

The author notes that in the previous SALT treaty the Americans were hopelessly outwitted. He writes:

"The net result of SALT I and the Vladivostok accords was an unprecedented build-up in Soviet strategic nuclear capability, while the entire United States ICBM and SLBM forces remained frozen at the 1968 level."

The European anxiety is simply that in order to achieve the political benefits of a successful SALT treaty, unilateral concessions may be made by the Americans which will put the survival of Europe in freedom at risk.

The Air Vice Marshal points out that:

"Constant reference by the Carter Administration to the degree of unanimity reached between the superpowers on the many issues confronting them in the SALT II discussions and the deliberate propaganda campaign conducted within the United States for the past six months, indicates an attempt by the Administration to persuade the Senate and American people (and the United States' allies) to accept what is patently an unpalatable package. Yet the claim that any agreement, whatever its defects, must be in the interests of detente and a lessening of tension is not sustainable."

Of the SALT II conditions the author notes:

"There are to be limits on development and testing of new ICBMs and SLBMs, and a protocol agreement would ban ground- and submarine-launched cruise missiles with a range greater than 600 km (320 st miles). Thus, cruise missiles deployed by NATO in Europe would be precluded from reaching Soviet territory. Moreover, non-circumvention provisions might inhibit the transfer of crucial advanced military technology to America's allies."

COHESION OF ALLIANCE AT RISK

When considering the existing conditions of SALT II, the author reminds us that:

"It is not possible to detect how many MIRV warheads are installed in a particular missile, nor could it be guaranteed that the Backfire bomber would not be used against targets in the United States. The range of cruise missiles cannot be ascertained with certainty and the Soviet SS-20 missile which is currently targeted on Europe, could be converted to intercontinental range by the addition of a third stage to the booster. Backfire bombers not deployed by the Soviet Long-Range Air Force against the United States will be deployed against targets in Europe, further strengthening the missile and manned bomber strategic nuclear forces targeted on European hard and soft targets."

"Whatever agreements finally emerge from SALT II, with its associated protocols, it is important that the terms of the treaty should be carefully scrutinised by Europeans, who must insist that any future strategic arms limitation talks should involve greater European participation. Weapons systems which have not so far been included in SALT negotiations are presenting ever greater threats to European security and thus to the cohesion of the alliance. So far, SALT discussions have included only weapons systems that can reach the United States (or the Soviet Union)—a situation that Dean Rusk described as 'a dam across half a river'"

"Having gained a measure of superiority over the United States in strategic nuclear capability, it was inevitable that the USSR should attempt to achieve a similar advantage in what has become known as Eurostrategic nuclear capability (as distinct from theatre nuclear forces), in which nuclear delivery systems based in the Soviet Union pose a strategic nuclear threat to European hard and soft targets. This is precisely what

Moscow has now achieved, while NATO watches with growing apprehension, but little sign that positive action will be taken to redress the imbalance; indeed, the ban on cruise missiles with a range exceeding 600 km and the inhibition on the transfer of cruise missile technology apparently agreed in SALT II places further obstacles in the way of doing so. Nor has any pressure been exerted on the Soviet Union in any discussions, official or unofficial, to reduce the strategic nuclear threat to Europe, which has steadily increased over the years.

"Meantime, attempts to achieve a balance in theatre conventional forces have been deadlocked in the ongoing Mutual Balanced Force Reduction (MBFR) negotiations in Vienna. Now that the United States and China have resumed diplomatic relations, the prospects for persuading the Soviet Union to reduce its nuclear and conventional threats to Europe are unlikely to be enhanced.

POLITICAL COERCION

"One of the most important aspects of the development of new strategic nuclear weapons targeted on Europe is the virtual obliteration of any dividing line between strategic and theatre (or tactical) nuclear forces so far as Europe is concerned, if indeed such a distinction ever existed. A disturbing character of some Soviet medium-range strategic weapons systems is that they could be used to deliver nuclear, conventional, chemical or biological warheads, thereby enhancing not only Soviet capability to wage war, but also their capacity to indulge in political coercion or blackmail"

"The situation has changed dramatically since the SALT I agreement of 1972. Not only has the United States fallen behind the Soviet Union in strategic nuclear capability, but even with a crash programme it is doubtful whether it could catch up within a decade. Meanwhile, the threat to the Minuteman silo-based force is as great as ever. The United States second strike capability has lost much of its credibility, while in Europe the strategic and theatre (or tactical) nuclear balance, which could influence the outcome of a confrontation, has shifted demonstrably in favour of the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies."

"In January 1978 the Soviets had about 700 I/MRBMs, 430 medium bombers and at least 20 submarine-launched ballistic missiles, all targeted on high priority European targets. The introduction by the USSR of the SS-20 mobile MIRVed ballistic missile and Backfire bomber has greatly increased their Eurostrategic capability since the SS-20 carries three MIRV warheads. It has been estimated that by 1985 there will be about 275 SS-20 missiles and 250 Backfire bombers deployed against European targets in addition to the 700 I/MRBMs, 430 medium bombers, 20 submarine-launched missiles and other nuclear capable systems. This represents a massive nuclear capability in Eurostrategic delivery systems in addition to the theatre nuclear superiority already enjoyed by the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact—a threat to which NATO has not so far responded."

"At their October 1978 meeting the NATO Nuclear Planning Group noted the increasing nuclear capability of the Soviet Union, especially in the European theatre and endorsed proposals for strengthening and modernising the alliance's theatre nuclear forces. But nearly all NATO's theatre nuclear weapons systems are short-range, except for the United States F-111 aircraft and the nuclear ballistic-firing submarines allotted to SACEUR."

IMBALANCE AGAINST NATO GROWS

"There are no other delivery systems in NATO with performances comparable to the TU-16, TU-22 Soviet medium-range bombers,

the SS-20 missiles, or the I/MRBMs. NATO could produce about 150 British and French IRBMs and SLBMs, 200 nuclear capable aircraft (including carrier-borne aircraft) and a few United States Polaris/Poseidon submarines assigned to SACEUR. Of these, the French force is under national control and not available to SACEUR."

"None of these systems comes within the scope of current or projected SALT negotiations between the superpowers, and NATO has made no effort to adjust the imbalance in Eurostrategic nuclear delivery systems that exists today and will continue to grow during the next decade unless limitations are agreed with the Soviet Union. . . ."

"Senator Henry Jackson warned the North Atlantic Assembly, meeting in Lisbon in November 1978, that the emergence of the SALT II treaty would severely limit NATO options to cope with the huge Soviet military build-up. 'Arms control agreements that permit the Soviet Union to continue their military buildup while constraining the United States and its allies from taking compensatory action', the Senator said, 'will only deepen the instability and insecurity that these negotiations are intended to moderate. But bearing in mind that nearly all the nuclear capability available for Western deterrence and defence is provided by the United States, what compensatory action could Europe take to reduce the present asymmetry?'"

After considering the future development of the British, and larger French, strategic nuclear forces which are completely separated and relatively small, the author stresses that:

"The imbalance in Eurostrategic nuclear capability between NATO and the Warsaw Pact (or more precisely the Soviet Union) has increased and will continue to increase as the Soviets deploy more SS-20 missiles and Backfire bombers. United States nuclear capability in Europe has been virtually frozen, while France and Britain make only a modest contribution to the overall forces available. Europeans may complain that the United States has been over-generous in concessions made to the Soviet Union, but much of the responsibility for this unsatisfactory state of affairs rests firmly with the Europeans themselves. They have taken no action to condemn, much less offset, the Soviet buildup. . . ."

MISSILE FLIGHT TIME IS 5 MINUTES

"The continued build-up in Soviet Eurostrategic nuclear capability, coupled with their greatly superior theatre nuclear, conventional and chemical forces in the European theatre, has created a situation long dreamed of by the Warsaw Pact, in which they can seriously contemplate the prospect of subjugating Western Europe with theatre nuclear, conventional and chemical weapons (or conventional and chemical weapons alone) without the risk of escalation to a strategic nuclear exchange between the Soviet Union and the United States or even a Eurostrategic exchange between Europe and the Soviet Union."

"Even now every European city, airfield, port, assembly area, military headquarters, communications centre, rail and road transport system is targeted by Soviet nuclear missiles or manned aircraft. Missile time of flight is about five minutes from Soviet bases."

"The Soviet leaders do not regard existing NATO Eurostrategic nuclear forces as a serious threat to important targets in the Soviet Union. If a SALT II treaty is permitted to impose limitations on the range of cruise missiles and on the transfer of technology to America's allies, the United States and European members of NATO will find it much more difficult to redress the present imbalance in Eurostrategic nuclear systems."

THE NEED FOR THE NEUTRON BOMB

"It is sometimes forgotten that the theatre (or tactical) nuclear balance in Europe is a

separate issue from the Eurostrategic nuclear forces. The overall balance in theatre (or tactical) nuclear capability between NATO and the Warsaw Pact is roughly equal in warheads in their respective nuclear stockpiles, but in delivery systems the Warsaw Pact has a considerable advantage, and the balance is shifting perceptibly in their favour year by year. To redress this trend, the NATO theatre nuclear stockpile must be modernised and reorganized to include enhanced radiation warheads (the so-called 'neutron bomb') for delivery by missiles and manned aircraft. The Pershing II mobile ballistic missile, with improved range and terminally guided warhead, and cruise missiles capable of operating against a wide variety of targets, on and beyond the battlefield, should be introduced into NATO forces as a matter of urgency.

"The correction of the imbalance in Eurostrategic nuclear forces will be more difficult and time consuming and will involve the deployment of nuclear delivery systems capable of attacking Soviet hard targets and a wide variety of hard and soft targets throughout the whole Warsaw Pact area.

"There should be no question of the United States maintaining its offer to remove nuclear warheads from Europe in exchange for a reduction in Soviet conventional forces deployed in satellite countries, as happened in December 1975 in a desperate effort by the United States to achieve some progress in the permanently stalled MBFR negotiations in Vienna. NATO Eurostrategic nuclear capability is required to offset Soviet nuclear systems targeted on Europe, not those targeted on the United States.

"The development of a mobile, intermediate-range ballistic missile now under consideration by the United States and its NATO allies, based on a project known as 'Longbow', should be approved as a matter of urgency and not subjected to the delays and procrastinations that have characterised the development of the enhanced radiation warhead and the cruise missile. In addition, the possibility of extending the range of the Pershing II ballistic missile from the present 460 miles to 1,000 miles should be given serious consideration. A force of 250 long-range Pershing II missiles and 250 new IRBMs in addition to cruise missiles would do much to correct the dangerous imbalance in Eurostrategic nuclear delivery systems that exists today. It would also go some way towards restoring NATO capability to what it was in the early 1960s, before the United States removed the Thor and Jupiter IRBMs from Britain, Italy and Turkey. . . .

EUROPEAN STRATEGIC NUCLEAR FORCE BUILD-UP NEEDED

"Cruise missiles may be launched from ground bases, surface ships, submarines or manned aircraft; they may be short, medium or long-range and armed with conventional or nuclear warheads. They could be deployed in strategic nuclear theatre nuclear, Eurostrategic nuclear or conventional roles. Range limitations imposed on cruise missiles to comply with the requirements of SALT II should not be accepted by Europeans, since such limitations would prevent NATO members, other than the United States, from developing the new and potentially highly effective weapons systems for deployment in roles other than close support for short-range interdiction, i.e. to pose a threat to such military targets in the Soviet Union as headquarters, communications, airfields and concentration areas. . . .

"Restrictions on submarine launched cruise missiles (SLCM) could prevent Britain from developing SLCMs as replacement systems for the Polaris A3 missiles if it otherwise wished to do so. France, on the other hand, would not be affected, since it appears to favour development of a mobile missiles

system as part of the strategic nuclear forces during the next decade. Cruise missiles deployed in Europe in addition to existing systems and the introduction of long-range Pershing IIs and new IRBMs could, within an acceptable time scale, redress the balance in Eurostrategic nuclear delivery systems. They could also strengthen NATO's nuclear and conventional defensive posture, thereby enhancing the deterrent triad.

"European nations have the technology to produce cruise missiles from their own resources, and studies are already being undertaken in Britain and France, but development would be speeded up with American assistance, which would in any case be required, at least in the initial stages, in preparing stored data for the terrain contour matching guidance system (TERCOM). Thus, any limitations on the transfer of the relevant technology imposed by a SALT II agreement would place these European powers at a serious disadvantage.

The author concludes:

"The NATO alliance must now accept the reality of the world situation and give urgent and serious consideration to building up its Eurostrategic nuclear forces. Europeans must also demand a more effective voice in any future nuclear arms control negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union, the results of which could have a profound effect on the cohesion of the NATO alliance and on the future security of Western Europe." ●

WORK TO PREVENT THE RUDENESS EPIDEMIC FROM SWEEPING CAPITOL HILL

HON. ADAM BENJAMIN, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. BENJAMIN. Mr. Speaker, the June 25 issue of U.S. News & World Report contained an interesting article entitled "Rudeness: An Epidemic in the Land."

I concur with the findings as well as some of the rationale explaining the phenomenon. On the other hand, I certainly hope that my colleagues will share their personal vaccine, or in some cases, antidote to avoid the contagion from sweeping Capitol Hill.

Fortunately, Members of the House long ago recognized that they were fourth in the pecking order behind staff, press and the public. As a consequence, their civility has generally not been the subject of debate. However, any appetite for power which voids the senses and allows the staff and, in instances, employees, interns, and pages to become heady to the extent that cordiality, politeness, and good sense are neglected, is attributable to the Members and certainly reflects adversely on the institution of the Congress.

In other words, each and every one of us have a responsibility to assure the public, without whose support this institution would not exist, that any epidemic of rudeness, no matter how prevalent elsewhere, will not sweep Capitol Hill.

With the influx of young people in our temporary and summer ranks, it becomes more important than ever to emphasize and reemphasize that sharing some

function of the Government does not make one so powerful that the Golden Rule can be ignored. In fact, the principle of our Government is that the power is in the people and that our only manifestation is to represent them.

I hope that all of my colleagues will admonish their staffs, and the other legislative branch employees over whom they have jurisdiction, that there is no substitute for courtesy and that we are expected to be gentlemen and ladies in our contact with the public and each other. This, of course, means deed as well as word. This also means some consideration in the sharing of our limited facilities with the taxpayers who have come to see their Government in action and to share it with their families. I am personally convinced that a little thoughtfulness will go a long way and I urge the best behavior in every legislative employee whether the highest paid official or the newest intern. It is not a question of cleaning up our act—it is the point of being impeccable in our observance and response to those who constitute America—the visiting taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, the articles I spoke of follow. My hope is that we will all work to abate the epidemic of rudeness and that the effect here will be one of total inoculation—by my fellow Members and their staffs.

The articles follow:

RUDENESS: AN EPIDEMIC IN THE LAND

IN STORES, IN OFFICES, EVEN IN THE WHITE HOUSE, ORDINARY COURTESY SEEMS TO BE GOING OUT OF STYLE. FOR A LOOK AT WHAT'S GOING ON AND WHY—

In Atlanta, an angry woman shopper hurls a box of shoes at a clerk and stalks out of the store.

In New York, two elderly women are spun out of a revolving door and thrown across the lobby of an apartment building by young people who whirl the door around too rapidly.

In Los Angeles, a woman waits in line at the Department of Motor Vehicles for 45 minutes, only to have a clerk slam the window in her face.

At the White House, consumer representatives complain so harshly to President Carter about fuel prices that the President's consumer adviser, Esther Peterson, feels compelled to apologize to Carter in writing for their conduct.

Are Americans behaving more rudely toward each other these days?

Many insist that discourtesy is on the increase, and they blame it on all sort of causes—pressures of an uncertain economy, overcrowding, lack of training in home and schools, a growth of self-centeredness. In fact, many Americans feel that rudeness has reached epidemic proportions.

SELFISHNESS ON RISE

There has been "a definite decline in courtesy over the last five to 10 years," asserts Jim Ponder, an official at a Los Angeles hospital that runs a tension-control program. "People are more blunt, more forceful and more self-centered. They're asking, 'What can I get?' instead of asking, 'What can I give?'"

Reports of rude behavior are legion. David Riesman, a Harvard University sociologist, recalls admonishing some college students who were heckling a stewardess on a flight from New York to Boston. The students cursed him and told him to mind his own business.

Says Riesman: "We live in a society in

which letting it all hang out and being candid are viewed as virtues, and this leads to rudeness."

A Los Angeles man tells of smoking a cigar while standing in an outdoor cafeteria line and being hit over the head by an angry woman yelling: "Cigars stink!" The man turned and said: "I beg your pardon?" She screamed back: "Go stand somewhere else." The man moved to the back of the line.

In Detroit, the organizer of a meeting for 17 clergymen reports that only five showed up. None of the others even bothered to telephone. She says: "Nobody feels they have to tell somebody they won't be there. Ten years ago that never would have happened."

Discourtesy, experts contend, is similar to a contagious disease: People who have been treated impolitely are in turn rude to others, and the crude behavior is quickly transmitted throughout society.

WELL-MANNERED YOUNG?

Some observers report that rudeness is a particular problem among the young, and they blame parents and teachers for not handling children properly.

But Christopher Lasch, professor of history at the University of Rochester and author of *The Culture of Narcissism*, argues that young people are more polite today than during the 1960s, "when it was almost a demonstration of one's political rectitude to be rude."

A New York salesclerk insists that older people are more rude than the young. Says she: "Kids, by and large, are pretty well-mannered. It's the older people who are evil-tempered."

Most experts agree that the pressures of modern living play a major role in rudeness.

Impoliteness is said to be particularly common in places that are experiencing rapid change—where the social structure is unstable and people often feel alienated and alone.

The Mental Health Authority of Houston and Harris County reports that the Texas city's rapid growth is contributing to social disintegration. Nancye Goodwin, a staff member of the authority, notes: "It has gotten to be such a hassle to make make a living and to get from Point A to Point B."

GASOLINE FRENZY

The behavior of Californians facing the gasoline shortage is cited as a classic example of what can happen when rapid social change and the pressures of modern living converge.

Cases of assault have been widely publicized, but everyday rudeness is more common.

Customers at a service station in Manhattan Beach, Calif., waited through the pre-dawn hours for the station to open. At precisely 6:30 a.m., the owner was ready for business, but the line of cars couldn't move. Reason: The driver of the first vehicle in line had parked her automobile the night before, locked it and left. She arrived 30 minutes after opening time, oblivious to the angry crowd around her.

At another service station, a driver who had waited in line for 2 hours was unable to contain his frustration as he approached the gas pumps. He let loose a barrage of obscenities. "Get out of here!" retorted the station manager, "This mess isn't my fault." The angry motorist left—without his gasoline.

Many people find the highways a handy outlet for anger and frustration. Stories of rude behavior—and worse—on the road are commonplace.

A Virginia state trooper was bitten by a cab driver while the officer was writing a ticket. The officer describes the cabbie as "just an average guy driving a cab at night, going to school during the day, wife and kids at home. It just happened to be the wrong morning, the wrong time."

Toll-booth attendants on Maryland's Chesapeake Bay Bridge report that some drivers spit on change, try to sideswipe collectors, shoot them with squirt guns filled with ink or ammonia and hand them rolled dollar bills containing feces.

Joggers report their share of unpleasant encounters with drivers. James Flax, author of *The Complete Book of Running*, says he often has to dodge beer cans thrown at him when he runs.

Perhaps the most frequent complaints of rudeness come from customers who encounter grumpy store clerks and hostile government employees.

William Blackburn, personnel ombudsman for the Michigan Department of Civil Service, replies that heavy workloads and the public's "bitter attitude" toward public employees can make government workers seem uncaring when they are not.

REGIONAL RUDENESS

Harvard sociologist Riesman speculates that people on the East and West Coasts and in some parts of the sun belt are more boorish than those in the Midwest and South. People behave better, he contends, where there are closer ties to traditional religion.

Similar views come from J. Ray Hays, a psychologist at the Texas Research Institute of Mental Sciences. Says Hays: "In a small town, you know the druggist or Miss Ethel who lives down the street, and you make an effort to be courteous. Where there is anonymity, it is easier to be nasty."

Some sociologists say that the women's-liberation movement has contributed to impoliteness by discouraging men from opening doors for women and from performing other acts of courtesy.

Will rudeness grow even worse? Barring some unexpected change in the social climate, most analysts anticipate little improvement in public behavior.

While they don't pretend to like it, many Americans are adjusting to the dwindling of what used to be considered common courtesy. Says a woman in Houston: "It's gotten to the point that if people weren't rude, I wouldn't know what to think."

[Interview With Jonathan Freedman, Professor of Psychology at Columbia University]

WHY ALL THE DISCOURTESY? "PEOPLE ARE ANGRY"

ECONOMIC PRESSURES, POLITICAL FRUSTRATIONS, SPREAD OF A "ME FIRST" ATTITUDE. AN EXPERT CITES CAUSES OF RUDENESS AND OFFERS SOME SOLUTIONS.

Q. Professor Freedman, why does uncivil behavior appear to be increasing these days?

A. We don't really know, but I would speculate that one reason is that people are feeling angry and they are taking it out on whomever happens to be close at hand.

People seem to be very unhappy with the direction in which the country is going. They work hard, but don't feel they are getting ahead. They think that the bureaucracy isn't treating them well. They feel there is no one who is really looking after their well-being. They no longer feel that the government is their government. Life seems out of their control. This builds frustration—and when people are frustrated, that tends to lead to anger and aggression.

Q. Do you think that all this is a result of the "me society"?

A. Possibly. The message of many of the new "therapies" is: "Look out for yourself. Get as much as you can." They don't specifically say, "Kill the other person," but that could be taken as the implicit message.

The upshot may be less concern for how your actions affect others. If you are in a hurry, you rush. So what if you knock somebody over? If you don't want to bother carrying paper to a wastebasket, you drop it on the street. Someone else will pick it up—and if

they don't, you don't care. This attitude isn't universal, but it's widespread.

Q. In what situations are you most likely to encounter rude behavior?

A. I can't say when it is most likely, but it seems to me that many people are driving incredibly rudely, for one thing. It's almost a battleground on the highways. I did one study that shows 25 to 30 percent of drivers go through red lights at some street intersections in New York—often with a policeman looking on and ignoring it.

Q. Do economic worries cause some people to be less considerate of others?

A. That's quite possible. Most Americans are no longer growing in affluence. Although we're not really doing poorly, our expectations are so high that when there is a slowdown, when life is not as terrific as we expect it to be, we get frustrated.

There's another factor at work. Many people have so much in the way of material goods, and they expect these goods to make them happy. But as research has shown, money is not an important factor in happiness, so they find they are not happy.

They wind up saying: "I've worked hard. I'm rich, relative to most people. I have two cars and three television sets and a hot tub in the back yard. But life isn't any better than it used to be. It's all worthless."

There's almost a desperation in a lot of people.

Q. How can we improve the way people behave toward each other?

A. That's not easy and I don't have an answer. But a more personalized government at all levels, for one thing, might make people think of themselves more as part of society. If government, especially local government, did its best to be civil, that would help set an example.

In New York City, for example, they recently passed a law requiring people to clean up after their dogs. It was astounding. People did it. I never thought they would, but in fact the streets are a hundred times cleaner. For once the government said: "Listen, this is a problem. We've got to do something about it." And people did it.

Q. What do you see as the long-range consequences for society of increasing rudeness?

A. My hunch is that as you get more people violating minor laws, such as littering, that leads to more-serious crimes.

The fabric of society begins breaking down in minor ways and then starts breaking down in more-major ways. That's what is of deepest concern. ●

HUMAN RIGHTS IN PANAMA

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, the House has now done its duty in the approval of legislation which will implement the provisions of the new Panama Canal Treaties. I supported this legislation, just as I supported the efforts of four Presidents to negotiate the new treaties, which now stand as a new foundation for a relationship of mutual respect and dignity between the United States and Panama—indeed, between the United States and all developing nations.

We would be remiss, however, if we did not imply an expectation as a fundamental tenet of that new relationship of respect—an expectation that the people of Panama are entitled to the same

kind of respect and dignity from their own government as that government has asked from the United States.

As Members of this House are too well aware, respect for the civil and political rights of the Panamanian people has not been the most exemplary characteristic of the current Panamanian Government. This fact was documented by a report by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States, which was published last year after an extensive investigation by that Commission. For the information of the House, I will submit for the RECORD a summary of the Commission's report, as prepared by the Panamanian Committee for Human Rights.

On October 1, when the new Panama Canal Treaties take effect, the United States will enter an era of which we can truly be proud, an era in which we have recognized and accepted that greatness can be better represented by wisdom and respect for the rights of others than by force of arms or blind retention of a posture no longer acceptable in an interdependent world. I hope that Panama, too, will enter a new era at that time—an era in which, respected as a sovereign nation, its government learns to respect the sovereignty of its people, and takes its rightful place as a free society in the world community.

The summary of the Human Rights Commission's report follows:

SUMMARY OF THE COMMISSION REPORT

CHAPTER 1. THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Panama is a signatory to over 20 international instruments relating to human rights. Panama's 1972 Constitution provides human rights protection, but the concentration of powers in the Executive permits suspension of guaranteed human rights.

CHAPTER 2. THE RIGHT TO LIFE, LIBERTY AND PERSONAL SECURITY

The Report details:

Cases of death or mysterious disappearance such as that of Father Hector Gallego (P. 19-21), a Catholic priest who "had organized peasant cooperatives that affected economic interests of the Torrijos family". He was arrested by the National Guard and never seen again. "As a consequence (of his death) there were created difficult problems between the Church and the Government." In this and the many cases of death attributed to the National Guard the Commission concludes "The Government of Panama did not carry out an impartial and exhaustive investigation."

"Forced and unremunerated labor of un-sentenced detainees."
Torture by the National Guard by such tactics as:

Electric shocks to vital parts of the body, ears, genital organs and the anus (as in the case of Leopoldo Aragon, P. 30);

Holding prisoners incommunicado for an indeterminate length of time;

Physical beatings of male or female prisoners, most often with a hose;

Fondling of private parts of female prisoners and threats of rape;

Subjecting prisoners to long interrogation periods while depriving them of rest, sleep, food or water;

"The Commission concludes that the above charges are substantiated."

CHAPTER 3. THE RIGHT OF PROTECTION FROM ARBITRARY ARREST—HABEAS CORPUS

Writs of habeas corpus are denied or avoided by keeping prisoners incommunicado. Unless someone outside knows of his predicament, a writ is an inaccessible remedy

(as in the case of Eusebio Marchosky, P. 32).

The Commission concludes "Arbitrary arrests have occurred * * * the protection of habeas corpus has been ineffective."

CHAPTER 4. RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS AND A FAIR TRIAL

The Constitution guarantees trial according to law, except that public officials may fine or arrest anyone who insults them or who is in contempt of their authority.

"The lack of due process and a fair trial is very serious because the police night judges play a very important role in the criminal justice system of Panama." 46% of the 547 sentenced prisoners on the penal Island of Coliba had been sentenced by police night judges. Summary justice is illustrated by the fact that 98.5% of those had been arrested and sentenced the same night ("10% sentenced apparently for nothing more than 'suspicion'"). Of the total sentenced in 1977, almost 50% were sentenced in November when the Coliba penal colony requires harvest labor. "None of the 251 appeals made were effective."

American citizens are arbitrarily arrested, jailed without trial, held incommunicado, habeas corpus denied, jurisdiction shifted, judicial orders illegally countermanded by the Chief of the Secret Police. The Report cites, as an example, the case of an American, Cassandra Lee Gosler, (P. 60-66), who was imprisoned for more than 6 months without trial, accused of international drug traffic. She was never tried but eventually freed. The Commission concludes "the case of Cassandra Lee Gosler corroborates allegations that:

1. The legal process is not respected;
2. The judiciary and the public prosecutors do not have complete independence of action; and

3. In some cases, the national guard disregards the legal process and attempts to impose its will upon the courts and prosecutors.

CHAPTER 5. RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF INVESTIGATION, OPINION, EXPRESSION AND DISSEMINATION

Freedom of expression is still "given with an eye dropper". The restrictive self-censorship Decree 343 was canceled, in a cosmetic gesture, but it was soon replaced by Law No. 8, which among other improprieties, requires licensing of all newsmen.

The Report cites crackdowns on independent media and commentary; i.e., the stoning of radio station "Impacto"; the arrest and exile of its owner; shutdown of the station and arrest of employees. Earlier dictatorship threats to Radio Impacto had been triggered by its "coverage of student strikes against communist influence".

Press is controlled by the dictatorship either by its ownership by members of the government or by business associates of the dictator. This results in "a uniform expression of the government's position", "absence of other points of view and a tendency to manipulate the news", and "intimidating and denigrating persons considered as opponents of the government". The Commission concludes that the right of investigation, opinion, expression and dissemination would be sufficiently protected only "if interpreted by an independent judiciary."

CHAPTER 6. RIGHT OF ASSEMBLY AND ASSOCIATION

"In today's Panama, labor groups are semi-officially forced to become part of the Federacion Sindical, a communist controlled labor federation created by the government to control organized labor. Independent labor groups fail to get favorable action on union matters at the Labor Ministry. New unions are not given the legal recognition or denial required by law. Professions (those) requiring license (to work) can only get renewals through government recognized unions."

"Some political parties continue to exist and to hold meetings, but without their legal

character they are subject to suppression at any time, and they cannot participate in elections as parties."

The Commission concludes "that the Government of Panama has employed formal and informal means that make the parties feel insecure and inhibit the right of association."

CHAPTER 7. RIGHT TO RESIDENCE AND MOVEMENT

Although the Panama Constitution specifically prohibits exile of Panamanian citizens, hundreds were exiled by threats or force.

Some exiles were allowed to return, but there was no general permission until April 14, 1978. Since then, the fact that many exiles fear to return or only make occasional visits to their homeland suggests their apprehension is based on the trumped up criminal charges still pending against them, and that there is no safety for dissidents under the continuing structure.

The Commission "has taken notice of the return to Panama of some of the exiles."

CHAPTER 8. THE RIGHT TO VOTE AND PARTICIPATE IN GOVERNMENT

Gerrymandering (P. 108) results in the regime's self-perpetuation. Only 8% of the electorate—in sparsely, easily controlled rural districts—elect sufficient representatives so that by themselves they elect the President of the country.

Under the dictatorship, the legislature (Assembly) has lost or had drastically limited its check on the Executive, power of approval, investigatory or censure powers, appointive or judicial powers and power to enact legislation.

The Commission concludes "the average citizen may have an opportunity to participate in government through appointment, but his participation through suffrage counts for very little."

THE REPORT MAKES STRONG RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE GOVERNMENT AND THE PANAMANIAN PEOPLE

1. "insure effective independence of the judiciary and instruct officials to comply expeditiously with judicial order."

2. Protect persons in custody from "physical abuse", with particular efforts "to prevent sexual abuse of women".

3. "Apply strictly . . . the norms prohibiting forced labor . . ."

4. "Provide persons accused of criminal offenses with adequate means to prepare and conduct their defense" and "elimination of the night court procedures which permit jailing without . . . opportunity to prepare their defense".

5. Implementation of international and Constitutional provisions and thus prevent exiling and expatriation of Panamanians.

6. "to take steps which would allow judicial review of cases involving persons convicted by administrative action under Decree Law 342."

7. "Guarantee "rights" to organize and assemble for peaceful political purposes and dissemination of views . . ."

8. "apply generally recognized norms for classification and separation of persons in custody."

9. "relieve existing congestion in detention centers and prisons and to assure availability of adequate medical facilities . . . particularly on Coliba Island."●

JOHN ANDERSON ON ENERGY

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, with increasingly long gaslines and continuing shortages predicted throughout the com-

ing winter, the energy policies of this administration must be questioned. Major oil producers are reaping record profits while production is down, and this has caused one of the Presidential candidates to speak out. I call attention to the testimony of my colleague from Illinois, JOHN ANDERSON, before the Senate Subcommittee on Anti-Trust, Monopoly, and Business Righters, June 19, 1979, calling for vigorous enforcement of anti-trust laws as a means of instilling competition in the oil industry. I recommend to my colleagues his cogent and perceptive analysis of the economic centralization in the oil industry which now threatens to go far beyond the energy sector:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN ANDERSON

Because of the enormous surge of cash into the treasuries of the major oil companies during a severe energy crisis, we find ourselves faced with a freakish situation in which consumers and small firms are threatened with economic disaster, while the oil companies are busy accumulating more cash than they can handle within their own industry.

It appears that a number of these companies are not willing to plow this additional capital back into the areas where it is needed the most: in the exploration and development of additional oil reserves, or even coal reserves and uranium reserves; in the upgrading of refinery capability and capacity; and in the technological effort to develop alternative energy resources.

Something tells me this shouldn't be the case when gas lines are getting longer by the day . . . and when talk is beginning already about potential shortages next winter of home heating oil.

Imagine: with all the cash holdings oil companies are sitting on top of, and the energy predicament we are in, here they are spending their time looking for investments in other, unrelated industries.

Recent examples of such distractions include the Mobil acquisition of MARCOR (the holding company for Montgomery Ward and Container Corporation), the Atlantic-Richfield acquisition of Anaconda Company, and the bid by Exxon to acquire Reliance Electric Company. The Mobil and Atlantic-Richfield acquisitions were allowed to go through without opposition from the government. The Exxon-proposed billion dollar purchase of Reliance is still under review at the Federal Trade Commission.

In response to yet another threat to disgorge these huge oil profits—this time by acquiring a circus, of all things—the President finally requested the Justice Department to "study" the situation. The conclusions of such a study have not yet been made available, and there is some question as to whether they will ever be made available. It seems to me that affirmative anti-trust action could prove a bit more productive than the mere instruction to engage a problem in further "study."

Not having the investigative power of enforcement agencies, I do not know whether these mergers violate existing law. But I do know that we have had little assurance one way or another from this Administration. The legislation before us would endeavor to make it clear that such mergers are an appropriate matter of public concern, and it would lay down explicit ground rules to be observed.

Mr. Chairman, the decision on the part of oil companies to use available cash holdings in an aggressive acquisition program poses a serious threat to free enterprise and equality of opportunity in America. It is reminiscent of the phenomenon of the 1960's when so many conglomerates de-

veloped and tended to engage in mergers which seriously increased concentration in the American economy. In a sense, the activity of the conglomerates may actually have been less objectionable. Their earnings were not derived from windfalls at the expense of the public, and the amount of cash they had to work with was considerably smaller.

The potential for excessive concentration is obvious from a little history. In 1911, the Department of Justice succeeded in the breakup of the huge Standard Oil Companies. The case is still hailed as a landmark of anti-trust prosecution, but without vigorous anti-trust enforcement under the Clayton Act, we may slip back into a situation much worse than that the country faced in 1911.

The original Standard Oil companies (Exxon, Mobil, Standard Oil of California, Standard Oil of Indiana, and Standard Oil of Ohio) for the year 1978 reported aggregate income of \$6,521,136,000. This represents more than 10 percent of all the net income of the Fortune 500 largest industrial companies in 1978. And net income for the first quarter of 1979 increased even more drastically for the old Standard Oil Companies. According to U.S. News & World Report, Standard of Ohio increased its earnings 302 percent over 1978.

It would be the height of irony to allow these massive infusions of cash, permitted by government policy, to be used by oil companies in a buying spree of American corporations.

For some reason, the Administration has lacked the ability, or lacked the will, to deal with this looming crisis of the American free enterprise system.

Mr. Chairman, for me this is the central point: That at the very time outright economic war is being waged upon us by the unholy OPEC alliance, we are not doing everything in our power to get new energy supplies on stream. To my mind, one obvious way is to encourage competition in the energy industry, so that firms will have a real incentive to explore for the great new supplies of energy we will require if ever we are to loosen our fragile and mortally dangerous dependence on imported oil.

All companies should not be permitted to divert themselves from the critical task of creating new energy supplies. There is no need for them to go off gobbling up smaller firms that are already doing as good a job, if not a better one, than they would under new, conglomerate management.

The present energy crisis has had a silver lining for the oil companies of America. They should share their bountiful blessings. Rather than frittering away precious resources by buying up Boardwalk and Park Place and Baltic Avenue, they should be enlisting themselves in the front-line of America's new energy war.

For their great financial strength and their great creative abilities will need to be enlisted in the cause—if we really are to fight the heroic battle necessary to get America back on its feet, and no longer prostrate at the feet of others. ●

**A SHORT COURSE ON INFLATION:
PART I**

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal, with its customary excellence, has recently published two

long articles on the inflation we are now enduring. The first of these articles makes it abundantly clear that the fault for inflation can be found in numerous Government policies and in the unwillingness of too many people to face the fact that many things that are desirable are not always immediately affordable. In our private lives this leads to a philosophy of "buy now, pay later"; in Government it means "legislate now, pay through deficits." In either case, the result is eventual economic disorder, lack of savings, huge debts and a radically different sense of ethical attitudes toward working, productivity and debt.

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD the first part of this two-part series, "Price of Progress? U.S. Inflation Blamed on Attempts to Avoid Slumps, Aid the Needy," by Richard J. Levine, Wall Street Journal, Tuesday, June 19, 1979.

The article follows:

[First of a Series]

PRICE OF PROGRESS?—U.S. INFLATION BLAMED ON ATTEMPTS TO AVOID SLUMPS, AID THE NEEDY

(By Richard J. Levine)

For more than a decade, inflation has gripped the U.S. economy.

The current inflation, the most durable in U.S. history, has survived mandatory wage-price controls, voluntary guidelines, constant presidential crusades and two recessions. Since 1966, consumer prices have risen an average of 6 percent annually, and so far this year they are increasing at a 13.2 percent pace. By contrast, consumer prices rose an average of 1.7 percent a year from 1948 through 1965.

"Rapid inflation has become a chronic disease for the first time," concludes Arthur Okun, a Brookings Institution economist. It is a disease that is angering consumers, frightening businessmen and endangering the nation's social fabric. Declares Columbia University sociologist Amitai Etzioni: "Inflation is threatening the psychological safety of people. They can't retire or save to put their kids through school. All bets are off."

What are the origins of the current inflation? What explains its persistence? Today as yesterday, experts are divided on these questions. Among commonly cited causes of inflation are large, continuous federal deficits; expansionary monetary policy; the increasing vulnerability of the U.S. economy to events abroad such as oil-price rises and food shortages; the momentum of the wage-price spiral as inflationary expectations deepen; rising payroll taxes and spreading government regulations on job safety and the environment.

All these developments have played a part. Yet an extensive search for answers from private economists, businessmen and government officials leads to a more-fundamental explanation that is gaining acceptance among experts of all political persuasions. It is that the U.S. inflation is the inevitable result of the kind of economy and society that we have been shaping for decades, a society in which both individuals and businesses are protected against the worst economic hazards of earlier eras and consumption is favored over savings and investment.

"Inflation is a product of—and can only be cured by—the people," says A. Robert Abbot, the thoughtful chairman of the First National Bank of Chicago. "It's a function of their expectations and ethics."

LIBERALS IN AGREEMENT

Sitting in his book-lined office at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge, Robert Solow, one of the nation's leading liberal economists, spells out a similar thesis. "The single most important reason for inflation is that we are a society that has tried to prevent deep recessions, to provide income security for people and to help those who suffer," he says. "We no longer let big businesses go bankrupt or people go unemployed for a long time." Mr. Solow's MIT colleague, Nobel Prize-winner Paul Samuelson, sees inflation as the price paid for "our becoming a more-humane society."

Many economists to the right of Messrs. Samuelson and Solow tend to agree. Milton Hudson, a senior economist with Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. and a former Federal Reserve Board official, believes that inflation results from "the almost universal commitment to the objective of 'full employment' . . . and the welfare-state idea which holds that government ought to have a continuing active concern with the poor, the sick, the aged and the chronically unemployed."

Unfortunately, it is "the common practice of politicians and voters to pursue the booty of government without showing concern about how to pay for it," contends Edgar Fiedler, vice president for economic research at the Conference Board, a business research organization. As a result, he adds, social and economic goals "get translated into inflation mostly through large budget deficits and excessive monetary creation."

JOHNSON BLAMED

Today, there is widespread agreement that the current inflation traces its origins back to President Johnson's failure to press for an across-the-board tax increase in January 1966 to help finance the rapidly escalating war in Vietnam. Aware of the war's unpopularity and fearful of congressional cutbacks in his cherished "Great Society" programs, Mr. Johnson insisted on a "guns and butter" strategy that led to inflationary deficits.

The federal deficit in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, was a slim \$1.6 billion. But without a tax increase, it swelled to \$3.8 billion in fiscal 1966, to \$8.7 billion in fiscal 1967 and to \$25.2 billion the following year. "The failure to enact the tax increase was a colossal error," Otto Eckstein, a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers during the mid-1960s, has admitted.

Although the national economy was running close to full blast, the Johnson administration's highly expansionary tax and spending policy was supported by a monetary policy that turned stimulative in 1967. The Federal Reserve, which despite its quasi-independence often feels compelled to go along with the basic thrust of fiscal policy, permitted the nation's money supply to rise 7.2 percent in 1967 and 6.1 percent in 1968.

In mid-1968, with enactment of a temporary 10 percent surtax, fiscal policy finally shifted to restraint. But the damage had been done. After consumer prices had edged up moderately by 1.9 percent in calendar 1965, 3.4 percent in 1966 and 3 percent in 1967, the increase accelerated to 4.7 percent in 1968. Richard Nixon entered the White House in January 1969 determined to wage a gradual but persistent war against inflation.

Despite restrictive economic policies that helped set off a mild recession late in the year, inflation stepped up to 6.1 percent in 1969. The recession moderated the price rise a bit in 1970, but by August 1971, with inflation still around 5 percent, President Nixon announced a 90-day wage-price freeze and, subsequently, mandatory controls. Inflation subsided, with consumer prices rising 3.4 percent in both 1971 and 1972.

With the controls in place, economic policy

turned highly expansionary in the 1972 election year; it aimed at a reduction in unemployment from a level of around 6 percent. The Federal Reserve, much to the administration's pleasure, increased the money supply at an annual rate of more than 8 percent in the second half of the year.

SOME BIG SHOCKS

The Nixon administration started dismantling its wage-price controls in 1973, just as forces were gathering abroad that would soon subject the economy to extraordinary shocks and inject a new term—"double-digit inflation"—into the public lexicon.

One painful shock was supplied by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, which embargoed crude oil that fell and increased prices sharply; by January 1974, the benchmark price of crude was four times higher than that six months earlier. Another shock resulted from American farmers' inability to produce enough grain and beef to meet demand at home and abroad; the problem was aggravated by the huge 1972 wheat deal between the U.S. and Soviet Union. Finally, the simultaneous expansions of economies throughout the industrial world ballooned prices of basic industrial commodities.

The results of all this were soon evident to the American consumer: Prices shot up 8.8 percent in 1973 and 12.2 percent in 1974. The recession that began in late 1973 and lasted until early 1975 did help cool inflation; prices climbed only 7 percent in 1975 and 4.8 percent in 1976. But economists still were dismayed: The deepest recession since the Depression of the 1930s, with unemployment approaching 9 percent, hadn't returned inflation to the level of the 1950s and the early 1960s. Moreover, by 1977 the wage-price spiral was accelerating again.

HUGE DEFICITS

A key reason for the lack of progress against inflation lay, of course, in the huge federal deficits and frequently expansionary monetary policy all through the Seventies. During the Nixon era, the government ran back-to-back deficits of \$23 billion in fiscal 1971 and 1972. Congress and the Ford administration, determined to prevent the 1973-75 recession from worsening and throwing even more people out of work, produced a \$45.2 billion deficit in fiscal 1975 and a record \$66.4 billion of red ink in 1976.

More concerned about reducing unemployment than fighting inflation when he entered the White House, President Carter presided over a \$45 billion deficit in fiscal 1977 and a \$48.8 billion deficit the following year. And despite all its tough anti-inflation talk, the Federal Reserve let the money supply expand 7.8 percent in 1977 and another 6.7 percent in 1978; only last fall did money-supply growth start slowing significantly.

But clearly new economic forces also have been fueling inflation in recent years.

What has happened, many economists believe, is that years of rapid price increases have produced a deep-rooted "inflationary momentum" reflecting the way workers, businessmen and consumers perceive the future and affecting the way they behave; that guarantees more inflation. University of Minnesota economist Thomas Sargent says people are simply "responding to their expectations about the future"—a future that they automatically assume include continued inflation.

HOW IT SPREADS

"Expectations of inflation and workers' desire to maintain their real wages lead to indexing of wage rates to price increases," President Carter's economic advisers explain. "A wage increase won in one sector of the economy can generate demands for equivalent increases elsewhere." As for prices, the economic advisers say, the "widespread belief that inflation will con-

tinue also leads businesses to accede to cost increases in the expectation of being able to pass the costs forward into higher prices."

Undergirding this approach, some analysts argue, is the assumption of business and labor that the government will quickly take expansionary action to keep recessions short and shallow. As Mr. Okun, chief economist for Lyndon Johnson, sees it:

"Most of our economy is dominated by cost-oriented prices and equity-oriented wages. Most prices are set by sellers whose principal focus is on maintaining customers and market share over the long run. The pricing policies designed to treat customers reasonably and maintain their loyalty in good times and bad times rely on some standard measure of costs. Prices are set to exceed costs by a percentage markup that displays only minor variation over the business cycle."

"Similarly, the key to wage decisions in both union and nonunion areas is the common long-run interest of skilled workers and employers in maintaining their job relationships. Employers make investments in a trained, reliable and loyal work force as well as in plant and equipment. They know that, if they curbed wages stringently in a slump, they would pay heavily for that strategy with swollen quit rates by their workers during the next period of prosperity."

BUYING IN ADVANCE

Among consumers, inflationary expectations have created a "buy-in-advance" psychology that lengthened the economic expansion since 1975. Until the past two years, the characteristic response of American consumers to rising prices was to "try to hedge against the resultant uncertainty by increasing savings and retrenching on spending," says F. Thomas Juster, director of the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research. Since mid-1977, however, he has found that "a much higher proportion of consumers than usual have reported that 'this is a good time to buy (houses, cars and major durables) because prices are rising.'"

Edwin Yeo, a Chicago banker who has served as Under Secretary of the Treasury, has watched this development with fascination and alarm. "If as a manager of a household you perceive a period of inflation as being limited, you save for this hurricane which has a beginning and an end," he says. "But if you perceive the weather system to be changing permanently, you start to advance large fixed purchases, and you come to think of buying now as saving." He calls this a dangerous "set of calculations that prompts 'spending, discourages savings' and fuels inflation."

Amid the general inflationary atmosphere, the government has contributed to inflation directly through increases in payroll taxes, special-interest legislation and regulatory actions. A. Gary Shilling, a New York economic consultant, estimates that farm price supports, beef and steel import restrictions, a higher minimum wage and increased Social Security taxes will account for almost three percentage points of this year's anticipated 9-percent inflation rate.

COSTS OF REGULATION

The costs imposed by government regulation have been increasing rapidly since the early 1970s, when Congress responded to demands for cleaner air and water and safer work places with new laws. Richard Zeckhauser, a Harvard political economist specializing in regulatory issues, maintains that this legislation "tended to come on the books at exactly the wrong time"—amid the inflationary shocks of 1973-74.

Washington University's Center for the Study of American Business contends that the costs imposed by federal regulations on the nation's production of goods and services are exceeding \$100 billion a year. "Like a sales tax, the cost of complying with regula-

tion is initially covered by business," says Murray Weidenbaum, the center director. "But ultimately the burden is borne by the consumer in the form of higher prices."

In the past decade, White House economist Charles Schultze says, "social regulation has become a major factor in our economy. It affects the quality of our lives, the productivity of our factories, the pace of inflation and the fortunes of major industries."

Increased federal regulation is one reason for an alarming slowdown in the growth of U.S. productivity, or output per hour of work—a slowdown that itself is inflationary. Last year, productivity in private employment rose only 0.3 percent, and from 1973 through 1977, the average annual increase was just 1 percent. In the 1965-73 period, in contrast, productivity grew an average of 2.3 percent a year, and in the 1955-65 span the average gain was better yet at 3.1 percent.

Research by John Kendrick, a productivity expert at George Washington University, shows that capital expenditures for compliance with environmental and safety regulations reduced productivity growth by 0.3 percentage points annually from 1973 to 1977. Moreover, the Council of Economic Advisors says, "The implementation of new regulatory statutes is often associated with considerable litigation and uncertainty, which tends to reduce innovation and investment"—major ingredients in maintaining high productivity.

Rudiger Dornbusch, an MIT economist, puts it more bluntly: "You're not going to put up a big new plant tomorrow if the government might tell you to close it because it's in the wrong place."

DANGERS AHEAD

Noting that wage increases unsupported by productivity gains are "translated into higher prices which leave the wage-earner back where he started," New York Stock Exchange Chairman William Batten declares, "If we fail to improve productivity, our economy may be further bedeviled by inflation, sluggish or nonexistent real growth and a loss of competitiveness in international markets."

Both Treasury Secretary Michael Blumenthal and Federal Reserve Board Chairman G. William Miller worry that U.S. inability to compete effectively abroad would seriously undermine the strength of the dollar. The omens are hardly encouraging. Productivity growth in the U.S. has been lagging far behind that of this country's major trading partners. And from 1966 to 1976, nonresidential fixed investment averaged 13.5 percent of national output in the U.S., well below the 17.4 percent in West Germany and the 26.4 percent in Japan.

The Carter administration maintains that capital investment must rise about 10 percent annually in real, or inflation-adjusted, terms, far faster than recently. "Unless we begin catching up" in the investment race, Mr. Blumenthal has warned, "we will pay a serious price at home and abroad in the 1980s." ●

THE RHODESIAN ELECTIONS AND THE SANCTIONS ISSUES

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit to the RECORD part of a study done by Samuel T. Francis, a policy analyst with the Heritage Foundation in Washington, D.C. I know there has been a great deal of controversy surrounding the elections and the Constitution, and

the administration claims that these two areas are the stumbling blocks preventing them from totally lifting the sanctions against Zimbabwe-Rhodesia. I wish to insert two sections from Mr. Francis' study which provide a thorough review of the Constitution and the election process. I think it is important for us to understand these issues and to lift the sanctions against Zimbabwe-Rhodesia as soon as possible so that this newly elected government will be able to survive.

[From the Rhodesian Elections and the Sanctions Issue]

THE RHODESIAN CONSTITUTION

(By Samuel T. Francis)

On March 3, 1978, Prime Minister Ian Smith of Rhodesia signed in Salisbury an "Internal Settlement" with the three principal black leaders of the country—Bishop Abel Muzorewa, Senator Chief Jeremiah Chirau, and the Reverend Ndabaningi Sithole.¹ The Internal Settlement obliged its signatories to co-operate peacefully in a transitional government, to draft a new constitution based on majority rule, to guarantee certain principles and procedures in the constitution, and to hold elections for the final transition to a government based on majority rule. A proposed draft of the constitution was published on January 2, 1979. On January 30, a referendum was held among the whites, "coloureds" (i.e., those of mixed white-black descent), and Asians on whether to accept the draft constitution. This referendum, in which about 75 percent of the eligible voters participated, resulted in acceptance of the constitution by over 85 percent of the votes.

The Constitution, the referendum, and the elections of a new government have all been topics of controversy. Critics of the Internal Settlement say that the Constitution provides merely a facade of democracy while in reality ensuring that the white minority continues to control the government through the "entrenched clauses" of the Constitution.

The Rhodesian government disputes these criticisms and points to the undoubted fact that for the first time in Rhodesian history, blacks have elected the majority of the members of the government and will sit and work with white colleagues in the highest councils of state. A detailed examination of the most controversial portions of the new Constitution will be useful in understanding these objections, the position of the Rhodesian government.

The Constitution approved on the January 30 consists of a description of the electoral arrangements and legislative structure of the government, a justifiable bill of rights strongly modeled on those of the U.S. Constitution and of Great Britain, and the structure of the executive, judicial, and administrative branches of the government. Like the American and British Constitutions, Rhodesia's Constitution is heavily based on the principle of checks and balances, contains a declaration of fundamental rights limiting state power, and generally seeks to limit and regularize the power of the state over the lives of its individual citizens. However, it is the sections of the Constitution that deals with the electoral and legislative arrangements that have excited controversy, and the following discussion will be largely limited to these portions.

1. The Electorate: All citizens, male and female, over the age of eighteen are eligible to vote for members of the legislature. This differs from the previous Constitution, which

¹ For an analysis of the internal settlement and its development, see Samuel T. Francis, "Rhodesia in Transition," Heritage Foundation Background No. 62.

limited the franchise to about 3 percent of the population based on property and education qualifications (not, as was sometimes thought, on a racial basis). In the new Constitution, there will be two rolls of voters. The Common Roll will consist of black and white voters, and the White Roll will consist of whites only. Whites may vote twice, on the Common and the White Rolls, and blacks may vote once, on the Common Roll.

Discussion: The major criticism of the franchise provision is that it permits whites to vote twice. The principal defense of these provisions is that some guarantee for the white minority is necessary to assure protection for the whites. The white population of Rhodesia in 1976 was estimated at 277,000 but at the present time it is numbered at no more than 250,000 due to emigration caused by the war. Since the whites constitute at most only about 4 percent of the total population, there is a need to protect them against the majority and also a need to discourage them from leaving the country and plunging it into economic chaos.

Other African states, such as Tanzania, Kenya, and Zambia all had similar safeguards in the form of separate voting rolls in their constitutions, so that there is precedent in African politics for these provisions. These other states are now one-party states in which the white population has been excluded from power completely or largely driven out by an oppressive majority. The safeguards proved incapable of maintaining political pluralism within these states. However, perhaps the most telling argument in favor of the separate and weighted voting rolls is that they make very little practical difference. Despite the fact that whites are able to vote twice, their second vote on the Common Roll cannot conceivably affect the outcome of an election because black voters outnumber white voters by over 19 to 1 (the black population over 18 numbers about 2,760,000; the white population over 18 numbers only about 140,000 at the most). The justification for the double vote for whites is that it lends a certain degree of psychological security to the white voters, not that it will have any real effects on the elections of the black members of the Legislature.

2. The Legislature: The Legislature (or Parliament) will be bicameral—a Senate (upper house) of 30 members and a House of Assembly (lower house) of 100 members. The Senate will consist of 20 blacks and 10 whites, and the Assembly will consist of 72 blacks and 28 whites. In the old Legislature, there were 50 whites and only 16 blacks. The Assembly and the Senate will have authority to amend the Constitution (except the "entrenched clauses") by a two-thirds vote of approval by each chamber. The Senate is forbidden to amend money bills (similar restrictions pertain to the Senate in the U.S. Constitution and the House of Lords in Great Britain), but may recommend amendments. The life of the Legislature will ordinarily be five years; the members of both will elect a President for a term of six years, and the President will appoint a Prime Minister able to command a majority in the Assembly.

3. Election of the Legislature: (a) House of Assembly: The 72 black members will be elected by the Common Roll and 20 white members will be elected by the White Roll. The 8 remaining white members will be elected by the 72 black and 20 white members from a list of 16 candidates nominated by the 20 white members. (b) Senate: The 10 white senators will be elected by the 28 white members of the Assembly, and 10 of the 20 black senators will be elected by the 72 black members of the Assembly. The remaining 10 black senators will be elected by the Council of Chiefs and will be equally distributed among the Matabele and Mash-

ona peoples, with five senators for each tribe.

Discussion: The principal objection to the Legislature and its election—especially the House of Assembly—is that 28 percent of the lower house will be white, although only 4 percent of the population is white. Again, the reason for this fixed percentage is the protection of the white minority. The critics of the Rhodesian Constitution claim that the new government cannot be called democratic because of the disproportionate number of white seats and that the whites are guaranteed not only protection but also continued dominance in the government.

This view simply cannot be sustained. In the first place, there will be 72 black members of the Assembly. On all questions of legislation except amendment of the Constitution, a simple majority rule of 51 percent will be the procedure, and the 72 black members (or the 51 members of the UANC) can easily determine the future legislative course of the Rhodesian government. For the passage of amendments, a two-thirds vote of each chamber is required. Again, the 72 black members can pass such amendments. Only in the case of the entrenched clauses (see below) would the 72 black members be unable to amend the Constitution. The black members of the Legislature will certainly be able to elect the President of the country, who will appoint a black Prime Minister. Fourteen of the 20 cabinet members will also be black, and 10 of them will be from the UANC. In the case of such paramount legislative matters as the declaration of war, the raising of revenue, the passage of domestic legislation, and all other matters the black majority will have the initiative and the control of Rhodesia's future.

In the second place, in the Anglo-American Plan, which is still the only alternative to the Internal Settlement that has been proposed and endorsed by the U.S. and U.K. Governments, there were 20 seats out of 100 in the Legislature that were reserved for the special purpose of giving "adequate representation to minority communities." Although there was no specific racial clause in establishing these seats, the clear purpose was to restrict them to the whites by one way or another. These reserve seats, for "Specially Elected Members," were to be elected by the popularly elected members of the legislature, who were to be elected by adult suffrage. The arrangements in the present Constitution of Rhodesia appear to be based on the provisions of the Anglo-American Plan. Originally, when the Internal Settlement was being negotiated between white and black Rhodesians, the whites demanded 36 seats as specially reserved and the blacks insisted on no more than 20, as in the Anglo-American Plan. As a compromise, both sides finally agreed to reserve 28 seats—8 less than what the whites wanted and 8 more than what the blacks wanted. Bishop Muzorewa and the other black members of the interim government have repeatedly defended the concept of reserved seats for whites as the best way to insure that the vitally important white minority remains in Rhodesia and as a morally proper means of ensuring that the white minority is protected under black majority rule.

4. The Entrenched clauses and their amendment: The "Entrenched Clauses" of the Constitution are those sections that deal with the structure of the government, the financial, administrative, and military provisions, and the amendment process itself. They are entrenched because they are purposefully made difficult to amend in the first ten years of the new government. The amendment of the Constitution in other respects requires a two-thirds vote of each of the legislative chambers. The amendment of the entrenched clauses requires a two-

thirds vote in the Senate but 78 votes in the Assembly, as opposed to 67 for other clauses. Thus, even if all the black members of the Assembly voted as a bloc, they could not pass an amendment to the entrenched clauses by themselves. They would have to have the support of at least six of the 28 white members. After ten years or two parliaments, whichever is longer, the entrenched clauses will be reviewed by a special commission and their abolition will be considered.

Discussion: The purpose of the entrenched clauses is to protect the white minority from the "tyranny of the majority" that was of such great concern also to the Founding Fathers of the United States. Like the U.S. Constitution, the new Rhodesian Constitution is not a purely democratic document. It establishes "checks and balances," separation of powers, staggered and indirect elections, a bicameral legislature, a bill of rights, and other institutional mechanisms to protect individual liberties. Unlike the U.S. Constitution, and despite the entrenched clauses, the Rhodesian Constitution is in fact very simple to amend. In the U.S. Constitution, an amendment—any amendment—must be passed by a two-thirds vote of each house and ratified by three-fourths of the state legislatures. In practice this means that an amendment must be passed by 67 U.S. Senators and 290 Members of Congress as well as 38 of the 50 state legislatures (comprising about 7,500 individual legislators). Moreover, 34 Senators from 17 states representing only 6.7 percent of the population can thwart a very popular amendment. By contrast, the entrenched clauses of the Rhodesian Constitution require only 78 members of the Assembly and 20 Senators. Since there are no state legislatures in Rhodesia, the whole amendment process is much simpler and far more democratic than that of the U.S. Constitution. Furthermore, in the Anglo-American Plan, there were also entrenched clauses which were specially exempted from amendment for eight years (as opposed to ten years in the present Constitution).

It is by no means impossible that the entrenched clauses will be amended before the minimum ten years are concluded. When Bishop Muzorewa was in the U.S. in 1978, he and other black leaders specifically stated that they expected some white legislators to vote with them in the Assembly. In order to amend the entrenched clauses before the ten year period is concluded, at least six white votes in the Assembly would be required. The 20 white members who are directly elected will be unlikely to support such an amendment, but there is the possibility that at least some of the 8 white members who are elected by majority vote of the 92 black and white members may vote for it. Since these 8 members are dependent for their election on the 72 black members, the latter could easily assure their support to those of the 16 candidates who agree to support amendments of the entrenched clauses, and thus assure the election of white members sympathetic to them. It should be remembered also that many white members are not experienced in dealing with political oppositions, designing political tactics, or making political deals, while the black politicians have sometimes had wide experience in their own political organizations with such problems and have often become more politically sophisticated than the whites through their experiences in exile, education abroad, and familiarity with other political systems. Despite the safeguards for the white minority, then, it should not be discounted that the black members and politicians will be able to dominate Rhodesian politics completely well before the ten year transition period is concluded.

Yet, even granting that the entrenched clauses will remain in effect for ten years

(or even longer), how does this affect the prospects for majority rule in Rhodesia? In answering this question, it must be considered that the entrenched clauses prevent only a few measures from being enacted by the legislature. These measures are (1) the redistribution of power within the Rhodesian government and society and (2) the violation of the Bill of Rights. Since the Bill of Rights is almost exactly the same as that of the United States and British Constitutions, it is difficult to think of occasions in which any majority would have legitimate reasons for tampering with it. In regard to the distribution of power, it must be recalled that a major purpose of any written constitution is to prevent the arbitrary and irregular abuse of power, and this is a central aspect of the Anglo-American constitutional tradition. To prevent the abuse of power, it is always necessary to prevent sudden redistributions of power that would lead those losing power to resort to desperate measures or would entice those standing to gain to resort to abusive measures. The avoidance of such extreme situations was a central concept in the formation of the Rhodesian Constitution (which, like the U.S. and British Constitutions, originated in civil war and under revolutionary circumstances), and one of its key features is the degree to which it seeks to limit power and stabilize power relationships within Rhodesian society.

In short, the Rhodesian Constitution seeks to distribute power in government and society in a balanced way in order to prevent any one sector (race, class, or region) from obtaining a monopoly of power with which it could dominate and exploit the remainder of society. This is true in regard not only to whites vs. blacks, but also to Mashona vs. Matabele, rich vs. poor, north vs. south, etc. The same idea of a balance of power was paramount in the British and American experience as well, and is manifested in Rhodesia through the different circumstances and historical background that have made Rhodesia what it is today and affects what it hopes to become tomorrow. The entrenched clauses of the Rhodesian Constitution therefore do not prevent majority rule but do seek to prevent abuses of rule by a majority. In this they are consistent with the Anglo-American constitutional traditions and with the ideas of the Anglo-American plan endorsed by the U.S. and British governments.

5. Safeguards for Government Personnel: A final and extremely controversial aspect of the new Constitution is that through the entrenched clauses it assures the continuity of the government personnel in the civil service, judiciary, and military forces. It is argued by critics of the Constitution that these provisions cleverly allow continued white domination of the government and that blacks will have no important role in exercising governmental power. However, the provisions of the Constitution in question do not specifically bar black participation in these sections of the government. They merely assure the independence of these sections and their freedom from political manipulation. In effect, of course, this means that the civil service, army, and judiciary will be composed of whites for some time to come, but also that blacks will gradually be entering these government positions. These provisions of the Constitution are in accord with established liberal principles that defend an independent civil service and judiciary and a non-politicized military. It is in fact difficult to see what other provisions could have been made, unless there was to be a kind of "purge" of these positions of the experienced whites who have held them until the present time or unless a kind of "affirmative action" program with quotas for black appointments was instituted. Both

such alternatives were clearly unacceptable to either the white or black members of the Internal Settlement, nor would such alternatives work very well in the circumstances of Rhodesia.

Ambassador Young frequently compares the situation in southern Africa to the situation in southern U.S. during the 1960s; in fact, Rhodesian whites appear to have accommodated themselves to social change on an extremely sensitive and controversial issue far more rapidly and easily than most Americans did during the 1960s. The progress that Rhodesia has already made from a white supremacist society to one in which the principles of racial equality prevail is perhaps the most rapid transition of this kind in the modern world. All indications are that the change will accelerate in the future as whites increasingly see black members of the security forces fighting for their country and black political leaders taking charge of the Rhodesian government. Already there is far more basis for interracial harmony in Rhodesia than exists in the United States. Blacks make up over 80 percent of the personnel of the security forces and comprise 72 percent of the legislative assembly and 66 percent of the Senate, as opposed to 15.6 percent of the U.S. armed forces in 1977, 16 of 435 members (3.7 percent) of the House of Representatives, and no members of the U.S. Senate. Unlike the U.S. Constitution, the Rhodesian Bill of Rights specifically forbids discrimination on the basis of race. Laws that discriminated against blacks were repealed in the fall of 1978. In short, Rhodesia has made far more progress towards a non-discriminatory society, given its point of departure, than the United States has.

THE RHODESIAN ELECTIONS

The Rhodesian Constitution authorizes certain special procedures to be adopted for the first election that will install the new government. The purpose of these special procedures was to ease and protect the transition and the voters during a period of civil war and rampant terrorism. The special procedures were (1) election of the 72 black members by a party list rather than by the regular constituency system; (2) nomination of the 16 white candidates for membership in the Assembly by the old House of Assembly rather than by the 20 white members of the as yet unelected new Assembly; and (3) the agreement by all participating parties to form a government of national unity for the first five years of the new government—the leader of the party that won the most seats in the legislature will become Prime Minister and will form his government on a proportional basis from other parties represented in the legislature. This decision was made on December 3, 1978.

These special provisions were relatively non-controversial, but more often criticised were the adoption of the Constitution itself and the supposed exclusion of the parties of the Patriotic Front from the election. The Constitution was adopted on January 30 by a vote among the white, coloured, and Asian voters. The purpose of this means of adoption was that Mr. Smith's government felt that it lacked a mandate for the transition from its own supporters and felt the need to establish such an endorsement from the white and non-black minority before proceeding. The black citizens of Rhodesia were not to vote in the referendum because it was assumed that they overwhelmingly approved majority rule; the test of the black acceptance of the particular Constitution adopted was to be confirmed by the turn-out in the ensuing elections. Since the voting was by secret ballot and since the spoiled ballots were only 4.5 percent of the total vote, the black voters had an opportunity to register their dissent from the new Constitution but did not apparently feel that it violated majority rule.

As for the exclusion of the Patriotic Front from the elections, the Front was repeatedly invited to participate in the elections by the government. Prior to August 1978, the political organizations of both wings of the Front operated freely inside Rhodesia. When the Front began to denounce the elections and to promise to disrupt them and "punish" citizens who voted and "execute" the black leaders of the government, martial law was imposed and the leaders of the Front inside Rhodesia were arrested. However, as late as February 5, 1979, the Executive Council of Rhodesia again invited the Patriotic Front to participate. On that date the government released a press statement that said:

"The Executive Council once more extends an invitation to the leaders of the Patriotic Front to return and take part in the election and thus join with us all to ensure a peaceful transition to majority rule."

Thus, despite such terrorist atrocities as the shooting down of a civilian airliner with a Soviet missile launcher in September 1978, by Nkomo's forces in ZAPU, and the murder of ten of its eighteen civilian survivors afterwards, the government persisted in its invitation to the Front to participate in the elections, and on March 6, 1979 again stressed that the only bar to participation by the Patriotic Front in the elections would be their own refusal to take part. The Executive Council also gave assurances that martial law bans on ZAPU and ZANU would be lifted if the Front would indicate its willingness to participate peacefully in the election and that nomination day would be postponed if the Front indicated that it would like to participate so that it could nominate candidates.

It should also be noted that the internment of sympathizers with foreign enemy governments and disloyal persons is by no means unknown in the United States and Britain. During World War II the British government incarcerated Sir Oswald Mosley, the British Fascist leader, and at the present time has imposed martial law in Northern Ireland. The United States during its Civil War also interned Confederate sympathizers without benefit of *habeas corpus*, took similar security measures during both World War I and II, and even during demonstrations against the Viet Nam war which could potentially have led to civil unrest.●

JIM THORPE

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest athletes and greatest examples of moral courage this land has ever produced was Jim Thorpe. And yet, Mr. Speaker, Jim Thorpe has been done disservice by the Nation which should be so proud of his memory, and I request today that my colleagues help redress that wrong.

I suspect there are few in this House who are not aware of the international acclaim Jim Thorpe won at the 1912 Olympics, when he set records and won gold medals in both the pentathlon and decathlon. His subsequent career won him designation as the greatest athlete and greatest football player of the first half of the Twentieth Century by a jury no less knowledgeable than the sports editors of the Associated Press. His

career was an inspiration to all American youth, and particularly to the Native Americans from whose numbers he came. By sheer talent and determination he overcame social, economic, and physical challenges that few of us ever encounter.

Yet in 1913 Jim Thorpe was stripped of his Olympic medals because of inaccurate allegations that he was not deserving of amateur status. In 1975, the Amateur Athletic Union reviewed the facts and confirmed once and for all that Jim Thorpe was indeed an amateur. There remains no reason why his Olympic achievements should not be restored to the official books.

This concurrent resolution would request that the International Olympic Committee do restore Jim Thorpe to the official position he deserves. It also asks that the committee present duplicate gold medals to the heirs of Jim Thorpe.

It is appropriate that Congress take this action now because the United States will host the Olympics again in 1980. It is also appropriate because Jim Thorpe was a great runner, and because at this moment there is underway a 500-mile marathon race from DQ University, a Native American college in my district, to Los Angeles. The runners in this marathon are Native Americans from across the country. As they do every year, they are running to bring attention to the condition of Native Americans in the United States. It is perhaps symptomatic of that condition that Jim Thorpe's medals were taken away. We should welcome the opportunity to return them and to thereby refresh our awareness of the obstacles he overcame to greatness.●

NUCLEAR VERSUS COAL ECONOMICS—SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

HON. RONNIE G. FLIPPO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Speaker, on June 6 the Washington Post reported that a confidential internal study by the Exxon Corp., raises serious questions about the economics of nuclear energy. The Post suggested that Exxon's study showed that the favorable economics previously attributed to nuclear power may be a myth. This "fact" was duly reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We now are advised by the Exxon Corp., in a recent letter to Esquire magazine, on whose article the Post story was based, that Exxon's conclusions are quite the opposite. In their letter, Exxon states that their study showed nuclear costs to be somewhat lower than those for coal, and that recent analysis indicates "a significantly greater cost advantage for nuclear energy" than did the earlier study.

There can be little doubt that the Nation must rely on both nuclear energy and coal to meet its future energy demands. It is also true that factors other

than cost must be considered when utilities choose which energy source to rely on for additional electrical generating capacity. What is clearest of all, however, is that these decisions must be made based on fact, rather than emotion, and it is on this basis that I recommend the Exxon letter to my colleagues' attention. The letter follows:

EXXON CORP.,
New York, N.Y., June 11, 1979.

The Editor,
Esquire,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: I am writing about a recent ESQUIRE article by Mr. Dan Dorfman which discussed the future of Exxon Corporation and the efficiency of nuclear energy. Referring to one of a number of nuclear studies which have been made within the Corporation, it stated that analyses done at Exxon had raised serious questions concerning the economics of nuclear energy. There was, indeed, a staff study within Exxon which presented data very close to that reported in the Dorfman article. It should be pointed out that the electricity costs cited in the article did include capital recovery items in both the coal and nuclear cases. Since the higher investment cost for nuclear was accounted for in the electricity cost, the statement that the difference in electricity cost was hardly worth the construction outlay is incorrect. This 1977 study concluded that although nuclear costs were somewhat lower than coal costs, the differences were small enough so that either could be the most economical fuel in specific situations. Additional analyses have subsequently been done using more current data. Our most recent study indicates a significantly greater cost advantage for nuclear energy than did the 1977 study.

Naturally, we will continue our studies of nuclear economics since we are in the energy business. If circumstances change, our views might change. But we want the record accurately to reflect our current corporate view which is that nuclear power is an economical source of energy, and that its increased use will play an important role in helping the nation meet the energy challenge it faces.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE T. PIERCY.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the House of Representatives on Friday, June 22, 1979. Had I been present, I would have voted: "Aye" on rollcall No. 274 calling for the House to resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to consider H.R. 4394, making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and independent agencies; "aye" on rollcall No. 275 on an amendment to increase research and development appropriations for Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) by \$10 million; "aye" on rollcall No. 276 on an amendment to add \$10 million in appropriations for research and development and \$10 million for emergency abatement, control, and compliance for EPA.●

VINCENT J. RUGGIERO WINS OPERATION DRIVER EXCELLENCE AWARD

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to ask my distinguished colleagues to join with me in congratulating Vincent James Ruggiero, a 17-year-old student from Jersey City, N.J., who has won the top prize in Operation Driver Excellence.

Operation Driver Excellence is a national competition sponsored by the Dodge Division of the Chrysler Corp. and AMVETS, the American veterans of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam. It is endorsed by the National Association of Secondary School Principals, and is aimed at promoting traffic safety and driver education, especially among the young people of our Nation.

In the national competition finals recently held at Hershey, Pa., Vincent proved his driving ability, knowledge of theory and traffic laws, his ability to handle an automobile in emergency situations, and respect for the vehicle.

In recognition of his driving excellence, Vincent was awarded a Dodge Aspen of his choice by the Dodge Corp., a trophy, and a watch. The AMVETS presented him with a \$2,000 scholarship and a \$100 savings bond. Vincent has received citations from Jersey City Mayor Thomas F. X. Smith, Police Director Michael Borsoso of Jersey City, and Sheriff John Gillen of Hudson County.

I would also like to commend Vincent's driving teacher, Mrs. Florence M. Lipari, who conducts driver education programs for various private schools in Hudson County. Mrs. Lipari is a registered nurse who became interested in driver education and traffic safety as a result of seeing many patients who had been involved in automobile accidents. She is the first and only woman to judge the teenage safe driving competitions in Hudson County, N.J., and has consistently provided winning students in driving competitions.

Vincent Ruggiero will represent the Nation's youth in many driver education functions throughout the United States for the next year. He will hold his title until the 14th national competition in Operation Driver Excellence which will be held in St. Louis, Mo., in May 1980.

Vincent, who recently graduated from St. Aloysius High School, will enter St. Peter's College in Jersey City in September. He plans to major in business administration.

I am proud to have this opportunity to salute Vincent Ruggiero who has demonstrated the skill and sense of responsibility which all of our Nation's drivers should possess through his outstanding performance in Operation Driver Excellence.●

GLASSPORT LEGION MARKS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the national American Legion is known throughout the world for its work in behalf of those who have served our country in time of war. But, Americans realize that individual Legion posts are far more than just an organization for veterans of military service. We know these posts frequently are the focal point for many community activities and the spearhead for numerous projects of community improvement.

Such a group is Post 443 of Glassport, a community in the Mon-Yough Valley of southwest Pennsylvania, which on June 23 formally observed the 50th anniversary of its founding. The principal speakers at this event, commemorating a half-century of community involvement, were two prominent residents of the area: Mr. Leonard C. Staisey, the former chairman of the Allegheny County Board of Commissioners, and Mr. Robb Austin, representative from Pennsylvania's 39th Legislative District.

Post 443 was officially organized in April 1929, with 50 charter members and held its first meetings in the council chambers of the local municipal building. Its first commander was Andrew Edding and other officers included Arthur Mayou, Michael Cobak, Herman Freyer, Paul Fabry, John Thomas, and Craig Mawhinney.

Shortly after its organization, Glassport demonstrated its support for the fledgling Legion post. The borough council donated a plot of ground for a post home on a 99-year lease and later the school board offered it an abandoned schoolhouse that was moved to the site and became the center for the activities of its membership.

Nearly 20 years later, with the idea of one day building a new home, the post purchased a piece of property across the street from its original location. In 1955, under the leadership of Commander Norman Papernick, that thought crystallized and 2 years later became a reality. The opening of Post 443's new home was highlighted by the installation of a beautiful bronze plaque, donated by Copperweld Steel Co. as a memorial to those who died in the service of our country.

Since its beginning, Post 443 has reflected the spirit of Glassport and its people. Members of the post have sponsored numerous civic programs, including Memorial Day services, children's parties, scout troops, athletic events, spelling bees, and art contests. The veterans dedicated themselves to bettering the lives of comrades confined in hospitals, alleviating the problems of the elderly and the handicapped and molding the character and leadership qualities of the borough's youth.

A list of individuals who have contributed to Post 443's achievements over the past 50 years would be far too lengthy

to insert into the RECORD but I feel it fitting and proper to recognize the present-day officers who have successfully met the challenge of responsibility set by their predecessors:

Commander Raymond Krills, Senior Vice Commander Robert A. Pavol, Junior Vice Commander Clarence Kibe, Adjutant George Pattakos, Finance Officer Leo McConeghy, Chaplain Pauline Rocco, Judge Advocate Michael Kurka, Service Officer Edward Goyke, Historian Raymond Krills and Sergeants-at-arms Clarence Kibe and Charles Puka.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Congress of the United States I extend official congratulations to the officers and members of Post 443, American Legion, on the occasion of the organization's 50th anniversary and wish them continued success in years to come.●

IRONY IN ATLANTA

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the visit of Mr. Nkomo to Atlanta still continues to reverberate across the land. In this connection, see my remarks on page 12995 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 30, 1979. The Richmond Times-Dispatch in an editorial on June 22, 1979, discusses this same incident pointing out again the type of terrorist Mr. Nkomo is and what a hypocrite he is. The item follows:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, June 22, 1979]

IRONY IN ATLANTA

Jeshua Nkomo, one of the terrorists leading the fight against Zimbabwe Rhodesia, got a hero's welcome in Atlanta the other day, not the bum's rush he deserves.

Mayor Maynard Jackson proclaimed "Zimbabwe Day" in Nkomo's honor, and presented the Soviet-backed guerrilla leader a check for \$4,000, which sum presumably will be used to add to the body counts in Nkomo's grisly terrorist operations. Part of the money was raised by a raffle, in which the winner received an expense-paid plane trip to Africa.

Nkomo also delivered the commencement address in the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Chapel of Morehouse College. He asserted that violence is the only solution to Zimbabwe Rhodesia's problems. He received a standing ovation.

The raffle of a plane ticket was ironic because Nkomo's troops have declared open season on civilian airliners. In September 1978, one of their Soviet ground-to-air missiles felled an Air Rhodesia plane, killing 38. The heroic Nkomo terrorists then moved in and butchered 10 survivors. Another 50 persons were killed in the crash of a civilian airliner brought down a few months later by one of Nkomo's rockets.

As Rep. John Ashbrook, R-Ohio, has suggested, let us hope that Mayor Jackson obtained a commitment from Nkomo not to blast the lucky raffle winner out of the sky.

There was even more irony in persons who honor the memory of Atlanta's famous apostle of nonviolent protest, the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., enthusiastically applauding one who murders both black and white civilians in Zimbabwe Rhodesia as his form of political expression.

Atlanta's black community is, of course,

not alone in its lionizing of a racist murderer who would turn Zimbabwe Rhodesia into a Marxist dictatorship. The Georgian in the White House has slanted the nation's foreign policy to favor the Nkomo types as against the biracial peacemakers inside that beleaguered southern African nation.

And that's not just ironic; it's tragic.●

HOPKINS PRESS CONFERENCE

HON. LARRY J. HOPKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, more than 20,000 burley tobacco growers in central Kentucky are greatly concerned about a decision now pending in the office of our former colleague, Agriculture Secretary Bob Bergland. On Monday, June 25th, I held a news conference in Lexington to outline my position on the matter at issue. With your permission, I would like to share the text of that announcement with my colleagues. The announcement follows:

Ladies and gentlemen—I called this news conference to brief you on a matter of great importance to the burley tobacco industry and, therefore, of great importance to this community and to the entire state.

The issue is whether the government should permit the marketing of tobacco in the loose leaf bales in addition to the traditional hand tied form.

As most of you know, during the past year the U.S. Department of Agriculture conducted an experimental program under which burley growers were allowed to bring up to 5 percent of their quota to market in loose leaf bales.

Within the next few weeks the Secretary of Agriculture must decide:

1. Whether or not to continue the loose leaf experiment as is,
2. Enlarge the program
3. Eliminate loose leaf all together.

As a candidate for Congress, I expressed my support for the loose leaf experiment because I felt it was a concept of tobacco marketing which was due a fair trial.

Now, as a member of Congress who not only serves on the House Agriculture Committee, but also on its Tobacco Subcommittee, I have been in a unique position to study and evaluate the loose leaf program.

I have had the opportunity to talk with many, many people in all aspects of the tobacco industry: growers, big and small; warehousemen; and representatives of the major tobacco companies.

I have met on several occasions with Secretary of Agriculture Bob Bergland and other leading department officials to discuss this important issue. The latest meeting with Secretary Bergland was early last week. I shared with the secretary the results of a survey I recently conducted of the tobacco industry on their attitudes toward loose leaf marketing.

I think the results are interesting and revealing and I want to share them with you.

Perhaps most interesting was the fact that over ninety percent of the growers who have tried loose leaf marketing like it. One of the chief reasons given for preferring loose leaf was it saved the producer time and money. This was confirmed by a United States Department of Agriculture study which showed that even though the baled tobacco averaged one cent per pound less than hand tied when sold, the loose leaf method saved an average of seven cents per pound in production costs.

But the results of last years experiment, though they sound impressive, are inconclusive.

Because, as of this date, only a relatively small percentage of growers have actually tried marketing their tobacco in loose leaf bale form.

The logical question is why?—Why didn't more growers participate in the loose leaf experiment?

I think the answer is three fold.

1. There is a natural, human reluctance to try anything which is new and unproven.
2. Last fall farmers were uncertain how much the price of baled tobacco would be discounted at the warehouse.
3. The five percent celling on the amount of tobacco which could be marketed in bales was too low to give farmers incentive to bale at all.

But, none of these reasons is insurmountable or justify not continuing to try loose leaf marketing.

There are many, quite frankly, who want to see loose leaf done away with all together. They argue it will be detrimental to the burley tobacco program.

If I were convinced that was true, I wouldn't be here this morning.

I personally believe a tobacco farmer should be able to market his product in whatever method he chooses. I say, let the market place determine which is the best marketing method for all involved. That's the free enterprise system—the American way.

But, I also am totally committed to protecting the burley tobacco price support program and, therefore, I am inclined to move cautiously until more complete facts are in as to whether or not loose leaf would be harmful to our burley tobacco program.

I don't think it will be—and from the evidence we've seen so far—it hasn't been. But, I for one, want to be absolutely sure there will be no adverse effects to our tobacco program before I would recommend unlimited baling.

I told the secretary the jury is still out on loose-leaf marketing. I told him we haven't heard enough evidence yet. And I told him—in my opinion—it would be foolhardy to close this case until we have heard all the evidence. It's just too soon to decide this, one way or the other. That's why I recommended against a referendum. It just wouldn't be fair until more people had tried baling.

Let me emphasize under the program I suggested, no producer will be forced to bale even one leaf of his crop unless he wants to—no buyer would be forced to buy one bale if he didn't want to. But, by the same token, we are taking positive steps toward removing government barriers which prohibit this type of freedom of choice.

I believe the course of action I have just outlined is a fair and reasonable one. It strikes a balance between the desirability of moving toward giving the producer more freedom of choice in his marketing method while maintaining certain safeguards to protect the tobacco program which is so very important to the economic health of this area.

I was most encouraged by the reception Secretary Bergland gave to these suggestions and am optimistic about their chances of being adopted.●

NEEDY CHILDREN BENEFITS

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, once again the Supreme Court has handed

down a just decision which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues. Yesterday the High Court ruled 9-0 that it is unconstitutional to make social security benefits available to needy children of unemployed fathers, but not to children of unemployed mothers.

In light of the fact that more women are becoming heads-of-households, I think this is a responsible decision. As Justice Blackmun said, "Congress, with an image of the 'traditional family' in mind, simply assumed that the father would be the family breadwinner, and that the mother's employment role, if any, would be secondary." This assumption can no longer be made, and I think we should go all-out to see that Congress passes legislation to comply with yesterday's ruling. ●

TURKEY HEDGES BETS ON UNITED STATES

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, the Oxnard Press-Courier recently printed the following editorial, "Turkey Hedges Bets on United States."

The editorial, which appeared June 5, 1979, comments on the decline in United States-Turkish alliance. The latest evidence of the split is Turkey's request of the Soviets to allow U.S. planes to use Turkish airspace. In the absence of stronger U.S. support for Turkey, we should not be surprised at these latest events.

The editorial follows:

TURKEY HEDGES BETS ON UNITED STATES

Developments in Turkey clearly reflect the relative decline of the United States' power in the world and the continuing havoc wrought in U.S.-Turkish relations by the ill-advised arms embargo imposed against Ankara by Congress in 1975.

Turkey, once an unshakable ally, now feels obliged to seek approval from the Soviet Union before permitting U.S. reconnaissance planes to use Turkish airspace in electronic monitoring of Moscow's compliance with the prospective SALT II treaty.

The Soviets, evidently oblivious to both the spirit of detente and of arms-control agreements, have suggested their answer may be "Nyet."

There was a time when Turkey felt sufficiently shielded by the United States against the expansionist designs of the Soviet Union to reject any accommodation with the Russians. Thus bolstered, Turkey served its own interests as well as those of the United States by standing firm on NATO's southern flank.

That was before events in South Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Taiwan, South Korea, Iran and elsewhere called into question the strength of U.S. guarantee. Congress, spurred by the so-called Greek lobby, effected a quantum jump in Turkey's nervousness with the infamous arms embargo enacted after the Turkish intervention in Cyprus.

Now, Turkey hedges its bets. That the Turks do so even after President Carter succeeded in persuading Congress to lift the embargo and provide new economic and military assistance only underscores the extent of the original damage.

As for the Soviets, their characteristic

truculence threatens to undermine chances for Senate ratification of the SALT II treaty. But, then, Moscow may be less interested in ratification now that President Carter has pledged to observe the treaty even if the Senate rejects it.

Meanwhile, Turkey may be forgiven its doubts about U.S. will and wisdom. ●

IT IS CRIMINAL WHAT WE HAVE TO PAY FOR OIL THESE DAYS (AND WHY THE CRIMINALS ARE NOT BEING PROSECUTED)

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, since the Arab oil embargo in 1973, prices of petroleum products have skyrocketed. The consumers cost for gasoline and heating oil have tripled in this time, and comparable increases have been added to the price of goods and services which utilize petroleum products in their production.

The initial reaction was to blame the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) exclusively for the runaway price increases which we have had to pay. However, as the full picture emerges, we see that a disturbing share of the blame for the oil and gas price increases is of domestic origin.

While decisions made abroad may have set the stage for the inflationary spiral in oil prices, firms and individuals at home have seized the opportunity to reap enormous windfall profits, often through the use of criminal practices.

Two House subcommittees recently joined forces in looking at fraudulent practices in the oil industry and at the enforcement efforts by the Federal Government to prosecute such conduct. The Subcommittee on Energy and Power of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has congressional oversight responsibility for the Department of Energy, and the Subcommittee on Crime of the Committee on the Judiciary, which oversees the activities of the Department of Justice, undertook a joint investigation because of the joint responsibility that the two Departments, Energy and Justice, have in seeing that fraudulent pricing practices are detected and prosecuted.

What we found was bumbling, indifference, ineptitude, and incompetence to a degree that would be laughable, were it not so serious, and the consequences for our Nation not so devastating. It is no laughing matter, however. While we have no reliable figures on just how much of the astronomical increases in petroleum products the last half-dozen years is attributable to criminal fraud, we are convinced that it is substantial. One Federal prosecutor who has handled these cases thinks that fraud may account for as much as two-thirds of the 90-plus cents per gallon being charged in some parts of the country for gasoline.

This astonishing figure was challenged by other participants at the hear-

ing, and the witness who offered it stressed that this was only a possibility and that no reliable data is available on the subject; nonetheless, testimony and documentary evidence presented to the subcommittees reveal that illegal price manipulation is taking place on a massive scale in numerous phases of the process of moving crude oil from the well-head to the refined product as it reaches the ultimate consumer.

The hearings focused on just two of the many illegal practices which have sprung up to exploit the opportunities for fraudulent price escalation in the current oil "crisis." These are "old oil/new oil flips" and "daisy chains."

Under regulations in effect since 1973, the price which may be charged for oil from domestic wells already in production at the time of the embargo is controlled at the level being charged at that time—a little over \$5 a barrel. Foreign oil and newly discovered domestic oil are not subject to these controls, and such oil may be sold for more than twice the price of "old" oil.

This dual pricing structure has created the opportunity for enormous profits by those willing to engage in the illegal practice of buying old oil at the controlled price and selling it at the new oil prices. Needless to say, many have been willing. Crude oil reseller operations have increased more than tenfold during this period. The joint hearings established that there seems to be no legitimate business purpose for this increase in oil reseller firms which is explained only by opportunity for these huge and quick profits.

A related practice is that of "daisy chaining," under which petroleum products—usually refined products rather than crude oil—are passed through several paper sales, each time increasing the price of the product, with no actual physical movement of the product. Testimony before the subcommittees indicated that this practice alone accounts for a tripling of the cost of products such as home heating oil.

Utility companies have passed these costs on to consumers through "fuel adjustment costs," another new phenomenon of this era. Witnesses at the hearings testified that hundreds of these daisy chain operations have been discovered in all parts of the country. The subcommittees were presented with documentary evidence of several such operations. Oil industry defenders argue that while the sale of a given supply of fuel as much as 20 or 30 times from the time it comes out of the refinery until it reaches the consumer is extraordinary, these are extraordinary times, and such a phenomenon is explained by unusual and complicated market conditions, not fraudulent price manipulation.

Documents provided to us suggest otherwise, and point to simple conspiracy, not complicated market conditions, as the motivating force behind daisy chain operations. A typical letter of agreement memorializing a daisy chain operation, one of many such agreements made available to the subcommittee, reads simply as follows, with only the company names deleted:

(Company "A" letterhead)

NOVEMBER 7, 1974.

To: Co. "B"
Co. "C"
Co. "D"
Co. "E"

GENTLEMEN: The following book transfer has been agreed to among all companies concerned and will be effective in October business:

Product: No. 2 Fuel Oil.
Volume: 25,000 barrels.
Transfer Sequence: Co. A to Co. B to Co. C to Co. D to Co. E to Co. A.
Location: Tyler, Texas.
Thank you for your cooperation.

Co. A.
(Signed)

Obviously, these are men of money and affairs, not given to excessive or flowery language. This tersely worded letter does, however, establish: First, that everybody in the chain knows of the entire scheme, including knowledge; second, that the oil ends up back where it started, or, to be more precise; third, that the oil never physically moves, since these are "book" transfers only; and, fourth, that not only are these paper transactions only, but paper transactions that will apparently be retroactively entered in the books of the companies, since this November 7 letter reflects agreement as to transactions which "will be effective in October business."

Other documents made available to the subcommittees show price increases as the oil moves from one member of the chain to the next, which increases are, of course, the purpose of daisy chaining.

If pricing manipulation such as this is widespread, and if it is illegal, why is it not being detected and prosecuted? A report furnished by the Department of Justice indicates that only three cases have resulted in criminal convictions for fraudulent activities such as these. The following factors are contributing to this pathetic record:

THE NATURE OF THE OIL INDUSTRY

Persons in all phases of the industry see themselves as part of a free-wheeling, fast dealing, hard driving industry in which "anything goes" is not only the prevailing ethic, but is seen as a necessary ingredient of success. "Government interference" is greeted with almost universal hostility, and "interference" is broadly interpreted to include not only the imposition of pricing and marketing controls, but the application of traditional criminal laws relating to bribery, false statements, and fraud.

As a result, there is little self-enforcement, either by way of direct internal corporate management controls, or indirectly through employees reporting of illegal practices to appropriate authorities (so-called "whistle-blowers").

TEMPORARY NATURE OF PRICE CONTROLS BEING VIOLATED

Price control laws and regulations, which form the basis of some (but by no means all) of the criminal violations involved, have, from their inception, been seen as temporary in nature. This seems to provide still additional disincentive for the industry to take the controls seriously—a temporary criminal law does not seem to make any sense. Further-

more, the temporary nature of the controls is a substantial contributing factor, I am convinced, to the demonstrated reluctance of the Federal Energy Office, the Department of Energy, and the Department of Justice to mount effective enforcement efforts.

A few young lawyers and investigators have responded with zeal and enthusiasm to the professional and public interest challenges inherent in the enforcement programs to combat these fraudulent practices. They are, however, few and far between, and more importantly, it is high ranking political appointees and senior career bureaucrats, not young lawyers, who must provide the push necessary to build up the large, sustained staffs necessary to effectively pursue violations of the magnitude which are occurring.

Empire builders choose their terrain carefully, however, and temporary crash programs which might be wiped out in a few months are not big drawing cards. Relatedly, many senior officials, particularly in the regulatory agencies, are "revolving door" officials who came from industry and will return to it later—providing they do not while passing through Government, bite the hand that will have to feed them when they return to the private sector.

REFUSAL OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TO SEE THESE CASES AS ANYTHING OTHER THAN ROUTINE

The Department of Justice has a practice of reacting to charges of criminal misconduct which are brought to it, rather than going out and looking for it. This is particularly true in regard to criminal misconduct within activities under the jurisdiction of Federal regulatory agencies, such as the Department of Energy. Justice Department witnesses appearing at our hearings stubbornly insisted that Justice has no obligation to intervene in these oil fraud practices except when Justice has received a formal referral of a criminal allegation which DOE has investigated and found to have prosecutive merit.

Information coming to Justice in any other manner is, apparently, not cognizable. For example, in December of 1974, Federal Energy Agency Administrator John Sawhill issued a press release which indicated that FEA had reason to believe that illegal pricing practices were widespread throughout the oil industry. A front page story in the Washington Post—a newspaper that is required reading for government officials in Washington—following Sawhill's release quoted him saying that "Investigators have found cases of power companies paying as much as 89 cents a gallon for distillate oil that left the refinery costing 20 to 30 cents," and that "there was also evidence that some brokers altered invoices, changing price-controlled oil which sells for \$5.25 per barrel to "new" oil which sells for some \$10 or \$11 per barrel."

Despite the fact that these allegations came from the chief energy enforcement official of the United States, Department of Justice witnesses told our hearings that such allegations were "not specific enough" for them to act on at this time.

If the practices mentioned were not specific enough to move Justice to action, certainly Sawhill's explanation why he was taking the extraordinary step of releasing information about an ongoing investigation should have caught Justice's attention:

Our preliminary investigations indicate that the practices under scrutiny are such as should be immediately exposed.

However, even this apparently was not sufficiently provocative to merit so much as a telephone call to Sawhill asking "John, what's this all about? Is it anything we need to get on top of?" Note that the lead item mentioned in the Sawhill story was the ballooning of fuel costs to utilities through use of daisy chains. Three years later the first such case involving overcharges to utility companies was finally referred to the Justice Department in the proper manner.

An ironic footnote to the story is that, even after such a long delay, it appears unlikely the case would have been referred for prosecution had not a customer of the power company being overcharged taken another newspaper article concerning the fraud to a local prosecutor, who was instrumental in getting Federal authorities to finally move in the case. "DAISY-CHAINING" WITHIN THE ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES THEMSELVES

Not to be outdone by the oil industry, the Departments of Energy and Justice, under the leadership of Justice, have their own version of daisy-chaining. In this case, it is the movement of information regarding alleged criminal conduct unnecessarily from one office or agency to another, consuming weeks, months, or even years at every stop along the journey. Let us take an example. Suppose a DOE official in Houston discovers that a crude oil reseller in Houston is "flipping" old oil to new and selling it at illegal prices. Chances are this case, if it is to be prosecuted, will be prosecuted by the U.S. attorney in Houston.

Is the DOE official therefore under instructions to take this information to the U.S. attorney so that the two agencies can work together to see if they have a case? No, his instructions are diametrically the opposite of this logical approach—he is forbidden to have any contact with the U.S. attorney's office at this time. Pursuant to agreements between the two agencies, DOE field personnel must fully develop criminal referrals with no help from local DOJ lawyers and investigators, ship the case to DOE headquarters in Washington, where it is reviewed and, if found appropriate, sent to "Main Justice" (Department of Justice headquarters in Washington) which in turn reviews it and, if it finds that prosecution is warranted, sends it back to Houston, to the U.S. attorney, for further action.

This process is followed at the insistence of the Department of Justice, which told us that "this is the way to expedite cases." I have to agree with my colleague and cochairman of the hearings, Congressman JOHN DINGELL, who responded to this testimony, "Only a government bureaucrat could conceive of this as expediting."

"FLIPPING" OF CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS FROM ONE TYPE OF CASE TO ANOTHER

At the risk of stretching an analogy, I offer the observation that there also seems to be, between DOE and the Justice Department, some "flipping" of case classification reminiscent of the flipping of old oil to new. By way of background, we need to keep in mind that Justice's insistence that DOE fully develop criminal referrals before Justice will enter the case is based upon the argument that the criminal offenses are, by and large, violations of complicated economic regulations of DOE, and only DOE has the expertise to detect and document these violations.

This position has some surface plausibility, but the plausibility disappears once we go beneath the surface and look at the actual cases themselves. Of the 45 cases that have been referred to the Department of Justice by the Department of Energy under these arrangements, only two have been for violation of DOE regulations—all the others involve allegations of violations of the Criminal Code of the United States for offenses such as bribery, wire and mail fraud, perjury, and other "traditional" offenses.

Thus, DOE is told to develop the cases on their own because the cases are "economic" and "regulatory" in nature, but they are also told that Justice will ordinarily only pursue felony violations of the Criminal Code.

Justice's reasons for not wanting to pursue regulation cases, which reasons include weaknesses in the regulations, limited sanctions available compared to the magnitude of the violations, and the difficulty of getting convictions for violations of "mere" regulations, may be valid. The point is that the justification for making DOE take the lead is gone once we recognize what kinds of cases Justice is interested in.

DOE is not equipped and staffed to do these kinds of criminal investigations. More importantly, their regulatory scheme, largely built around single company audits, is not designed to detect the kinds of criminal practices Justice is inclined to prosecute: Bribery, racketeering, and wire fraud rarely shows up in an audit of a company's books.

In the case of daisy chains, a single company audit reveals only the transactions involving that company, and does not trace the product all the way through the chain. In such cases, it is possible to have a criminal conspiracy to inflate prices with a series of transactions each of which, standing alone, would be legal.

Though there is a certain therapeutic value in formulating a statement of the horrible state of affairs a matter is in, this is at best only the first step in remedying the situation, or, even less, it merely establishes that the first step has to be taken. It is obvious that in this matter of detecting and prosecuting fraud within the oil industry, the first priority should be the establishment of national leadership.

The fact of the matter is that the magnitude of fraud is so great that no one is

willing to even accept responsibility for measuring it, yet alone for combating it. The Justice Department says "not us," claiming that the problem has political, economic, and international implications far beyond the authority of its prosecutors. Department of Energy accepts regulatory responsibility, but claims—and demonstrates—that it is woefully unequipped to effectively develop complicated criminal cases.

The obvious response to such bureaucratic buck-passing and ineptitude is leadership from above—from the President himself, assisted by the Office of Management and Budget and the Domestic Council.

The first product of this Presidential leadership should be a determination of the scope of these illegal practices, and a measure of just how much they are costing the American consumers. Evidence that is being assembled by various congressional committees suggest that the fraud is massive, affecting all parts of the country and all types of petroleum products.

Admittedly, however, the evidence gathered so far is fragmentary, and a much more complete and systematic examination needs to be made. Denials of complicity from individual firms in the industry have begun to trickle into the congressional committees looking at the problem. Detecting and measuring the fraud is not made easier, however, by the fact, even in the case of firms not engaging in such practices, there is little incentive to expose those who are, since the pricing structure dictated by governmental regulation provides liberally for "pass through" of increasing costs at various phases of the production and marketing process.

There may be some truth to the suggestion by one witness at our hearings that the industry welcomes practices such as these to inflate the price of petroleum products while we are still under price controls, in that the politically unpopular increases to be made after decontrol will not have to be so great. We should consider also the contribution that these price escalating practices make to efforts to discredit and terminate controls, hardly a development that the industry wants to head off.

Once we have an accurate measure of the extent and cost of these practices, adequate resources must be brought to bear against them. The President must lead with something in the nature of his "moral equivalent of war," and must disabuse enforcement agencies, particularly the Departments of Energy and Justice, of their parochialism and complacency. If the laws are weak and full of loopholes, Congress should be informed and asked to fill the loopholes. If personnel and other resources beyond what is currently available are needed, and I am convinced they are, Congress should likewise be called upon to appropriate the money needed.

Rather than asking for increases in enforcement personnel, however, DOE is substantially cutting its enforcement staff in anticipation of decontrol. The Department of Justice, despite numerous

highly publicized declarations by the Attorney General and his top aides of a new "pro-active," aggressive enforcement posture regarding white-collar crimes such as these, is maintaining a "business as usual" posture of concerning itself with only those oil industry criminal matters which make it over from DOE despite all the obstacles placed in their way by the lack of cooperation between the two agencies.

Finally, let us not be confused by the deregulation argument, which suggests that with the lifting of controls, all these practices will be legal. Decontrol will not legalize bribery, perjury, racketeering, and filing false official documents. Even where changes are made in the market structure which remove the basis of and incentive for past criminal price manipulation, no justification is provided for excusing past criminality. After all, if a bank which has been robbed later goes out of business, we do not turn the robber loose on grounds that he will never rob that bank again.●

THE HYDE AMENDMENT AGAIN

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, once again, the House Appropriations Committee has approved language in the fiscal year 1980 Labor-HEW Appropriations bill restricting Federal funding for abortion except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term.

It is my view that this language is totally inadequate and exceedingly restrictive—even more so than the "compromise" language of last year. These restrictions impose a discriminatory barrier against women simply because they are poor. These economically disadvantaged women should enjoy the opportunity to make such a fundamental decision about whether or not to bear a child, just as more affluent women enjoy this opportunity.

While I believe that there should not be restrictions at all on Federal funding for abortions, the present language in the HEW bill should at least be broadened to allow exceptions for serious genetic disorders or deformity of the fetus.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to offer two amendments relating to abortion funding when the Labor-HEW Appropriations bill is considered on Wednesday. The first amendment would provide for funding for abortion where the mother has sickle cell anemia or where the fetus is determined to have sickle cell anemia. The second amendment would provide for funding for abortion where the mother has diabetes mellitus.

I urge my colleagues to support these amendments which recognize two serious medical conditions and their potential consequences that confront many women.●

TERENCE CARDINAL COOKE URGES
"LET IN MORE ASIAN REFUGEES"

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the Indochinese refugees has reached the disaster point. The human exodus streaming out of Indochina, and the squalor into which they are forced to flee is a tragedy which demands our active attention.

The U.S. efforts, and the efforts of all developed nations to resettle the Indochinese refugees have been grossly insufficient. Between January and May 1979, the monthly number of Indochinese refugees reaching the filth-ridden camps in Malaysia, Indonesia, and elsewhere has quadrupled to 65,300. Roughly 300,000 refugees are presently huddled in camps, slums, beaches, or in border jungles. They lack adequate food, shelter, sanitation facilities, and most importantly—a country in which to resettle. In one small camp in Malaysia, 45,000 people are stranded in the chaos of beaches covered with garbage, with virtually no health or sanitation facilities. The number of refugees entering these "countries of first asylum" is Southeast Asia has been increasing at such a rapid rate that Thailand and Malaysia have adopted brutal expulsion policies. Together with the other member countries of the United Nations, we must consider concrete ways to alleviate this burden quickly.

A broad comprehensive refugee program should be an integral part of our human rights policy and must give credence to our tradition of welcoming people of other lands into the United States. In the past, such groups have made invaluable contributions to our society.

I bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent column which appeared on the ed page of the New York Times on June 23, 1979, written by Terence Cardinal Cooke. In the past, Cardinal Cooke has made significant contributions to pressing urban problems in the New York area. His efforts to help Spanish-speaking populations by adapting local parishes to meet community needs is a reminder to us of our concern for the poor and oppressed. Cardinal Cooke's words are timely and well taken.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, June 23, 1979]

LET IN MORE ASIAN REFUGEES

(By Terence Cardinal Cooke)

People who need the help of the United States do not always suit our national or personal convenience. We would like distressed people to fit into established programs of aid. They rarely do. We would also like to settle some problems. We rarely do.

The frightful crisis on the Cambodian-Thailand border is a terrible example of what man can do to man. More than 300,000 refugees (a figure that could easily rise) are in Thailand. Of those, more than 100,000 are penned in a tight area just inside the Thai border. Many of them have fled the powerful Vietnamese military forces inside Cambodia. Most of them are women and children. They are desperate for food, clothing and shelter.

As I write this, the Thais, who have been generous and helpful to refugees in the past, are now driving Cambodians back to their own country where an "uncertain future awaits them." The sound of gunfire across the border strongly supports the concern that a tragic massacre is taking place.

A series of most unhappy turns seems to be isolating refugees in Southeast Asia from help.

The Thai Government, driven by fear of both the Cambodians and Vietnamese, is alarmed by so many volatile refugees occupying Thailand's border areas; at the same time the Vietnamese have announced an ethnic war on people of Chinese origin, sharply evoking Germany in 1933; and France, usually so hospitable to Eastern refugees, will soon reduce the number of refugees it will receive. As the Vietnamese Government is about to expel 1.3 million ethnic Chinese from its shores, we also have word that Malaysia and Indonesia are sealing their coastlines against boat people. The prospect of wholesale death is on the horizon. Death by drowning, starvation or bullets is imminent for as many as two million people.

The very finest tradition of American concern for human beings is being challenged. Understandably, the President and the Congress are weary and see no end to requests for help. But this Southeast Asian misery is neither hopeless nor endless, if we act now.

If our Government moves swiftly to reassure and help the Thais with their refugee problem, with food and medicine, and above all by enlarging the number of refugees we will take, the fearful slaughter of Cambodians may be stopped. World pressure should also be exerted on the Vietnamese to stop the expulsion of a whole ethnic group from its longtime home in Vietnam. New Yorkers can do something. They can speak to the White House and the Congress. They can urge the international community to support these poor people. They can write to the President and they can strongly encourage all others to take positive action to save the lives of hundreds of thousands of our brothers and sisters in God's one human family.

American aid to the Cambodians will create a special American witness. Unlike people who were once our allies and who share our cultural or religious heritage, the Cambodian refugees, pitiable in their human distress, have no political or cultural or social claims on Americans. They were, some of them, part of an army that in 1975 led a mass death march in Cambodia which may rank as one of the great horrors in history. Many are Communists and bitter verbal despisers of the United States. They are promising us no special gratitude or future friendship. What a splendid opportunity for America to reaffirm its authentic concern for suffering men, women and children and to stand firm for the human rights of all people.

What's in it for us? Nothing and everything. ●

AFDC IS NOT SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, an article about a Supreme Court decision on the front page of this morning's Washington Post contains an error. The article begins with a statement that Congress had "made social security benefits available to needy children of unemployed fathers, but denied the same benefits to children whose mothers are jobless."

A further reading of the article reveals that the benefits in question are AFDC benefits.

I would like to state for the RECORD that AFDC benefits are not social security benefits. AFDC is not part of the social security program and AFDC benefits are not paid for out of social security payroll taxes. AFDC is a general welfare program paid for entirely out of general revenues. The AFDC program and other welfare programs sometimes become mistakenly associated with the social security program simply because they are part of the Social Security Act.

This is a mistake often made—so often that many people think general welfare payments do come out of social security taxes. This is an unfortunate misconception as it causes some people to lessen their support for the social security program. ●

AMENDMENT TO TRANSPORTATION
APPROPRIATIONS ACT

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, when the House takes up the Transportation Appropriations Act (H.R. 4440) on Thursday, June 28, I intend to offer a proposal to provide modest increases primarily emphasizing energy conservation, public transportation, and highway safety. With critical gas shortages across the country, this proposal could not be more timely.

I earnestly invite your support for these provisions, which would result in a level consistent with the administration's budget request and well below budget authority contained in the first concurrent budget resolution.

The appropriation bill provides, in part, funding for several programs authorized by the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978. That legislation was enacted after intense debate over its funding levels, resulting in substantial reductions both on the floor and in conference.

In effect, these programs have already been subjected to the full force of the budget-cutting process. Yet the bill as enacted provided for substantial increases in certain programs and a select number of new initiatives in response to emerging needs.

The administration has sought severely reduced funding for the existing programs and has requested zero funding for the new initiatives, in effect seeking through the appropriations process to prevent initiation of programs which it could not keep out of authorizing legislation.

Zero funding or reduced appropriations were thus recommended for such energy conservation provisions as car-pool and vanpool promotion, capital and operating assistance for public transportation, and measures to stimulate use of intercity buses fulfilling a legitimate public transportation role.

Also affected are the safer off-system

roads program, speed limit enforcement (with its energy and life-saving potential), and assistance for safety promotion and grants to foster innovation at the local level. This is despite the fact that safety programs are financed from the Highway Trust Fund, financed by user fees rather than treasury revenues.

Unfortunately, the appropriations bill largely reflects the administration's position in this respect, and provides a level of \$9.1 billion, which is \$152 million below the administration's total request and \$674 million below the first concurrent resolution.

My proposals, in total, would increase the level in the bill by \$152 million, with the increase distributed evenly between highways and public transportation.

Since the 1978 act was enacted to provide these public transportation and other programs affected by the appropriations bill, the gas lines have stretched out again, confirming the wisdom of the Congress in authorizing the programs.

Now is not the time to backtrack on fiscal restraint; but needs of our safety programs and those with a direct impact on energy conservation demand that we at least meet our responsibilities within reasonable budgetary constraints. My proposal does just that, and I urge your support.

HIGHWAY-RELATED APPROPRIATIONS

(In millions)

Safer Off-System Roads.....	\$40
Carpools and vanpools.....	4
55 mph enforcement *.....	20
Beautification	9
Innovative grants (highway safety) ..	2
Hwy. Safety Educ. & Information.....	1
Total Highway-related.....	76

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION-RELATED APPROPRIATIONS

(In millions)

Section 3.....	\$30
Section 5 (3rd Tier).....	20
Intercity Bus Terminals.....	15
Intercity Bus Subsidies.....	10
Transportation Centers.....	1
Total Public Transportation-related	76
Total Howard amendment.....	152

*In addition, the Howard amendment would strike unauthorized mandatory earmarking of \$40 million Sec. 402 safety funds for 55 mph enforcement and raise the Sec. 402 obligation ceiling from \$175 million to \$195 million to permit States to supplement \$20 million in authorized direct appropriations for 55 mph enforcement (as proposed in the amendment) at State option.●

AN ANSWER TO THE ENERGY CRISIS—"SUN" POWER

HON. JIM MATTOX

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. MATTOX. Mr. Speaker, oil and gas companies have certainly come in for their share of criticism during our current energy shortage. But perhaps exceptions in this blanket of condemnation can be found for companies such as Sun Gas Co., of Dallas, Tex.

Faced with high energy costs them-

selves, Sun has taken the lead in voluntary conservation measures, setting an example for us all. Under the enlightened and innovative direction of President Robert B. Anderson, Sun has instituted such energy-saving devices as vanpooling for employees, special engines on company vehicles, and higher thermostat settings for their offices this summer.

This last move has spawned what is perhaps their most interesting, and humane, measure—relaxation of the dress code. In consideration of employee comfort, suits and ties are no longer necessary. Balancing professionalism with comfort, Sun workers have found a happy medium for the summer. And with lowered temperatures coming this winter, I suspect sweaters will be "de rigueur."

The Congress would do well to "follow the Sun" in raising its building temperatures this summer. And to draw attention to our conservation, as well as to provide a more comfortable debating atmosphere, I suggest that our stringent dress code be relaxed. It would be a relatively simple task, embodied as it is in the traditions, and not the rules, of the House. And I believe it would not detract from the professionalism of this body; I suspect the sight of Members in rolled up sleeves and opened collars would contribute to our reputation as "hard working."

After all, clothes are one of the seven deadly sins, and "fine clothes are good only as they supply the want of other means of procuring respect," as Samuel Johnson has noted. Freed from the stricture of a tight tie, our thoughts will be more clear than ever, and we can get on with the work of solving this Nation's energy problem. A "no tie" summer can be a symbolic—and practical—way to demonstrate our concern over this issue.

[From the Dallas Morning News,
May 20, 1979]

SUN GAS TRIES ENERGY-SAVING FOR EMPLOYEES (By Joe Sinnacher)

The management of the Sun Gas Co. in Dallas has taken steps to help keep its employees from getting hot under the collar with the firm's latest energy conservation measures.

The Dallas-based natural gas company is accelerating the energy-saving steps that it and its parent company, Sun Co., initiated during the Arab oil embargo of 1973 and 1974, Robert B. Anderson, president of Sun Gas, said in a recent interview.

The new round of energy-saving measures is designed to put an emphasis on Sun employees by raising their awareness of the energy situation, Anderson said.

During the past five years, Sun had undertaken a number of other energy-saving steps aimed at its plant and transportation operations.

The existing energy saving measures include special engines, radial tires, aerodynamic cabs and radial tires for Sun's fleet of vehicles. Some of the company's trucks have been fitted with recording meters to monitor the drivers compliance with the 55 mph speed limit.

Anderson said Sun's fleet of 10 ships now operate with their engines at lower speeds and now use 20 percent less fuel.

One of the new energy-saving steps the firm has taken is obvious when entering Anderson's office on the 10th floor of Three North Park East. The day of the interview the temperature in Anderson's office was a

bit warm, and the company's top executive was wearing a blue, short-sleeved shirt with an open collar. And his office is going to get even warmer.

"What we are really doing is elevating the level of activity we started in '73-'74," Anderson said. The latest energy conservation steps include raising the temperature in Sun's offices to 78 degrees in the summer and lowering it to 68 degrees in the winter; establishing a van pooling system and encouraging car pooling.

Anderson said the temperature in the offices will be raised to 78 degrees on Monday from the present 74 degrees.

The Sun office temperatures will be raised to 80 degrees, should President Carter's request for mandatory room temperature settings in non-residential buildings be passed, Anderson said.

To help its employees cope with the warmer office temperatures, Sun has relaxed its dress code, as evidenced by Anderson's open collar.

As part of the dress code change, Sanger Harris held a dress code clinic for Sun's women employees attended by 160 of Sun's 174 women in Sun's Dallas office. Anderson said the clinic offered tips on dressing for the heat, but with a professional look.

Anderson pointed out that the warmer office temperatures and relaxed dress code do present a few new problems for Sun employees. "We're victims of traditions," Anderson said, pointing to the coat and tie in his closet. Anderson keeps the tie for meetings with other companies that still observe older dress codes and cooler office temperatures.

Many of the more casually dressed employees will also be driving to work in one of four vans which Sun Gas purchased for use in rider pools. Anderson said that a group of nine employees interested in participating in a van pool will be issued a van. One pool member drives and maintains the van. He also has the van for his personal use.

Anderson said each pool will break even if it has nine members—each paying from \$26 to \$30 per month.

It makes money with more than nine members.

A van pool is allowed to carry up to a total of 12 passengers, with the driver keeping the profit of carrying more than nine passengers. This gives the driver financial incentive to fill up his van and make the system work.

To help employees who work hours that are not predictable enough for van pooling, Sun is lining up informal car pools. Anderson said that when an employee knows he will be able to ride with his car-pool, he will call his pool's driver and say, "Hey, pick me up on Tuesday."

As a result of the pooling program, employees are beginning to schedule company meetings earlier in the day, so that the poolers will be more likely to leave their offices on time.

Anderson is not sure whether or not his fellow employees will carry their new energy conservation measures home with them. He said that it's possible that the conservation efforts will cause a backlash, with employees turning their thermostats down at home to get "comfortable" when they are not at work.

Sun is issuing booklets to its employees with the hope that they will conserve energy. The booklets give tips on the energy-saving advantages of storm windows, easing back temperature settings on air conditioners, heaters and water heaters.

Anderson is not just telling others what to do. He said he has been personally conserving energy for years. Since 1973, he has purchased only automobiles with standard transmissions and cars that get at least 20 miles per gallon of gasoline. He also sets his home water heater to a lower setting when there is not as great a demand for

hot water. He resets the setting when the demand for hot water increases, such as when he has guests.

Anderson said that the U.S. energy supply problem was made up of "many, many small parts." For example he points out that the motorists in California have panicked, making their situation worse than it really needed to be.

If the drivers of the 140 million vehicles in the United States—including all trucks, cars and buses—were to "top off" (fill to the brim) their tanks at the same time, the gasoline delivery system would lose 17 million barrels of gasoline, he said. This would create quite a problem, because the United States uses 21 million barrels per day.

In other words, it would make the nation short of gasoline by nearly one full day's supply. In a panic, "people gradually move to the pumps and soak up one day's (extra) supply of gasoline, placing an unreasonable load on the system," he said.

And, as a sidelight on the current energy situation, Sun is issuing a booklet to its employees, which explains the current energy situation in "simple layman's language," Anderson said. The booklets are being distributed so that the employees can defend themselves "at little league baseball games and cocktail parties, so they won't feel bad about working for an energy company."●

A COUNCIL OF OIL IMPORTING NATIONS

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the effort of the administration, the Congress and the American people to meet the energy crisis by adopting an energy program. As one who supports gas rationing, decontrol of domestically-produced crude oil, and the windfall profits tax, however, I am becoming increasingly pessimistic that this program will solve the crisis because it is lacking one key element, namely a strategy for dealing with OPEC.

On May 10, Secretary of the Department of Energy, James R. Schlesinger, appeared before the House Committee on Ways and Means. I asked Secretary Schlesinger whether the administration has any plans on how to attack the OPEC problem, such as import licensing, developing Mexican oil, making long-term contracts with Venezuela, or are we just at the mercy of OPEC now and forever. He replied that our position at the moment is of course quite vulnerable and that until we are able to control our demand for oil, our bargaining position will not improve. There is no prospect of immediate relief.

I am continuing my efforts to work in a constructive manner to alleviate the demand for oil. People waiting in line for gas, however, are not unlike Members of Congress who are being asked now to make sacrifices that in the near future may prove to be irrelevant in the face of OPEC price increases.

If there is no prospect for immediate relief, that debilitates against each individual's decision to take immediate steps to conserve energy. If there is no hope of moderating OPEC price be-

havior in the long run, that debilitates against each Member's hope that his or her vote will ultimately help solve the crisis itself.

Next week, the OPEC members will meet again and they will probably decide to raise prices again. Soon, the House of Representatives will meet to decide on windfall profits taxes. How the United States and other members of the "consumer cartel" react to the former event will figure heavily on how our colleagues react in the latter regard. Efforts in the meantime to develop a policy to deal with OPEC is the missing ingredient for success.

My own view is that if OPEC continues to act in an unreasonable manner with respect to consumer prices, a consumer cartel is the only feasible alternative. I recognize that forming a consumer cartel would be very difficult and that an economic confrontation with OPEC would be a risky and economically dangerous game, but it may be a risk that would avert an eventual economic collapse.

For these reasons, I am today introducing legislation which expresses the intent of Congress that the President initiate negotiations with other oil importing countries to establish a Council of Oil Importing Nations (COIN) to negotiate with the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) reasonable base prices for oil and the elimination of unreasonable or unjustified surcharges.

The bill also provides that COIN use economic and political sanctions, when appropriate, to encourage compliance with its negotiated price level. OPEC needs our technology and food, and collectively the industrial nations can bargain with them.

In conclusion, I believe this legislation is absolutely necessary if we are to avoid the economic devastation that will come with an unrestrained OPEC oil price spiral. We are not proposing to approach OPEC as antagonists—but as equals in bargaining. This bill takes a first step in that direction.●

NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, the following June 17 editorial by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., regarding our national energy priorities. The editorial follows:

SET OF PRIORITIES NEEDED FOR ENERGY

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—As you read this I am recovering from eye surgery. Before being hospitalized, I arranged with John DeYonge, chief of the editorial page of our Seattle Post-Intelligencer, to write a special article on the availability of all of our energy sources. Mr. DeYonge, a Stanford fellow who majored in energy matters, was formerly environmental editor of the Post-Intelligencer. His article follows:

In a famous decision that has set American oil law off from that of other countries ever

since, a 19th century frontier judge defined oil "as a crittur that belongs to him that gits it first."

For the last hundred years we Americans have been catching and utilizing that crittur for history's greatest energy binge. We've found and used more oil than all the rest of the world put together. That's one reason why we're so rich. And that's a main reason why we're so upset now. Our national experience refuses to believe that like any crittur, oil can be killed off, used up.

But at home that's true. Our landmass has more holes drilled into it per square inch than the arm of a heroin addict. We've found tremendous amounts of oil and used most of it. Each day now our production decreases just a little. But until this decade, our use has been jumping up higher and higher each day. And our population growing.

Last winter we used more oil than ever before—20 million barrels a day. But we're producing fewer than 9 million barrels a day now and importing the rest, with all of the economic and political difficulties that is bringing us.

Can we expect to find vast new fields of oil within our own borders? The answer is no. All the easy, cheap oil has been found, experts say. We may find significant amounts of expensive oil in the Alaskan arctic or under the sea out on the continental shelf. But the odds against finding enough new oil to relieve us of our dependency on imported oil are worse than those against finding a gas station selling 50-cent gasoline.

What about Mexico and China? Mexico has already served notice that it has learned from the lessons of Iran and Saudi Arabia. It intends to limit export sales, charge the world price and sell first-come, first-served. Mexico could help ease our supply problem, but not our hemorrhage of dollars over our borders.

China may have large amounts of oil, maybe not. If it does it will use its supply for its own population of nearly a billion.

Our best, cheapest source of oil for essential uses is conservation. It's as popular in this country as a smashed toe. Everyone wants it to apply to the other fellow first. Politically, conservation is not selling with Congress, which cannot muster the will to give the president even so much as a standby rationing program in case of disaster.

As for alternative energy sources, geothermal, wind and hydroelectric power for differing reasons cannot add significant new supplies of energy. But here are some that can:

Natural Gas—There is much natural gas to found in this country but that will require federal government to deregulate the wellhead price. Natural gas supplies a big part of our energy now and could replace a lot more oil.

Coal—We have vast supplies and the technology for increasing our use of it is tested and in hand. But coal requires extensive environmental and health safeguards. And our biggest deposits are in water-poor western areas. The lack of water limits its use on site to generate electricity or to be made into synthetic gasoline or natural gas. Worse, we've let our coal transportation system run down. If we pay the price to use it correctly, coal is an obvious answer to immediate energy needs.

Nuclear fission power—Tarnished by Three Mile Island's accident in its present practical form. Its safety problems are real. Its economic problems are real. And so is the political opposition to it. But it provides energy at tolerable costs.

Fusion power—Nuclear power from jamming atoms together, rather than splitting them. Still in the experimental stages in the U.S., U.S.S.R. and Japan. It may be the "technical fix" 20 years from now. Another distant but promising prospect is MHD, in which electrons are stripped from a fuel plasma by strong magnets.

Solar power—Today's popular alternative, and a real one. It becomes more and more practical as oil and other energy prices go up. Its use will increase in proportion to government will to provide money and incentives to research, develop and install it. Simple installations are now in use. Sophisticated solar power technology may free us from energy worries.

Biomass—Using vegetable or animal matter to provide energy. Even the president plans to install a new wood stove. But in more sophisticated forms, biomass offers tremendous potential. Gasohol, after all, is a mixture of gasoline and more expensive ethyl alcohol (the same stuff as in booze). Wood alcohol also can be used to extend gasoline supply. Wood products also can be used to fire power plants. Another biomass possibility is algae grown in ponds to produce protein for food or converted to hydrogen or methane gas for burning. Biomass is nothing more than another way to capture solar power for energy and demands far more attention than it has gotten.

Hydrogen—The gas, the element. It can be made in endless amounts from water. It burns cleanly without much pollution. It is safe, easily transported and can be used directly to power automobiles. Again, a source crying for development once the price is right.

Oil Shale—Oil locked up in western shale deposits. Its development depends on much higher oil prices generally. It poses a major problem for the environment and it requires immense amounts of water in an area where there is little, and all of that with claims upon it.

Considering these and other energy sources being investigated, our country and our world are not short of potential and actual energy supplies.

Our problem is that we are addicted to what has been a cheap, plentiful, easily used form of energy: oil—which is running out of supply. Because of the systems built upon oil, moving away from oil to other energy sources poses immense economic and political problems.

Our country's problem is not in energy crisis, but a political crisis. How do we manage our energy supplies and uses?

As the journalist W. W. Howe pointed out years ago, "A good scare is worth more . . . than good advice." The country has an overload of advice. Apparently it has not yet had, despite the gasoline problem, a good scare.

I don't know about you, but Mr. De Yonge scared me. America needs a set of firm priorities, which are not now in existence, in dealing with our energy shortage. We should be concentrating on new energy sources that can be brought into production quickly, and leaving to the laboratories and drawing boards those esoteric ones that require more time.

It strikes me that it is the Department of Energy that is insufficiently scared. ●

SIMON AMENDMENT TO APPROPRIATIONS BILL

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, we will be considering the 1980 Labor-HEW Appropriations bill. I will offer two amendments to restore to the current level of funding cuts made in research and training efforts to serve the needs of disabled people.

First, my amendments, will return \$2.325 million to the program of training for teachers working with handi-

capped students, bringing the funding back to the 1979 level of \$57.7 million.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, a fundamental step in the successful implementation of programs to educate handicapped children is the provision of an adequate supply of teachers. Yet, the cut in training for special education teachers proposed by the 1980 appropriations bill comes at a time when the supply falls far short of the demand. States projected a need last year of 85,000 new special education teachers while colleges and universities are only able to produce about 20,000 new teachers a year in special education. A restoration in the cut for training funds would help fill the positions needed to provide all handicapped children with full educational opportunities.

Second, my amendments will bring funding for research back to the 1979 level of \$31.5 million, adding one and a half million to the appropriations proposed for 1980.

The Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1978 established a National Institute of Handicapped Research with new authority in the areas of research related to technological developments to assist disabled people, special problems in rehabilitation of handicapped children and disabled elderly people, and the development of new employment training and placement techniques for the severely disabled.

Mr. Speaker, these important new research activities and the viability of the new National Institute of Handicapped Research responsible for leadership in the field of research for the handicapped depend on adequate support. To sustain a cut in research funds would work against the best efforts of this endeavor.

Third, the amendments I will offer restore the \$1.5 million cut in the appropriations bill for training rehabilitation professionals, to maintain the current funding level of \$30 million.

The vocational rehabilitation program is serving increased numbers of severely disabled people. The specialized rehabilitation professions should continue to be upgraded in order to serve better these severely handicapped clients. A cutback in training programs could mean a decrease in rehabilitation services for those disabled people waiting to return to employment but who lack the skills to secure a job.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the amendments I will offer are modest, adding slightly over \$5 million to the 1980 appropriations bill. However, these funds, spread across three programs, will reaffirm our support for the improvement of services to our Nation's disabled citizens. ●

NEW SPIRIT OF ST. LOUIS LABOR MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, with the creation of the New Spirit of St. Louis Labor Management Committee, St. Louis has become the largest metro-

politan center in the United States to create an area-wide labor-management committee. The new group joins major AFL-CIO unions, the Teamsters and the United Auto Workers with the chief executives of many of St. Louis' largest employers. The group has set out to prevent the further erosion of the St. Louis area's manufacturing base and to improve labor-management relations through regular, and mutually beneficial discussions. The organization is modeled on PRIDE (productivity and responsibility to increase development and employment) which was established in 1972 by the construction industry to improve productivity in St. Louis' construction industry. The highly successful organization has been responsible for keeping many of the major redevelopment efforts in downtown St. Louis on time or ahead of schedule.

Recognizing the success of PRIDE and the need to improve relations between business and labor, many of St. Louis' most influential citizens have joined to form the new Spirit organization.

In seeking to improve the labor-management climate in St. Louis, union and business leaders have agreed to several concepts including:

The concept of a fair day's work for a fair day's wage;

The maintenance of acceptable working conditions and the establishment of realistic productivity standards;

Open communication with each other and with all employees;

Compliance with collective-bargaining agreements and avoidance of unauthorized strikes and production slowdowns; and

The contractual rights of labor and business.

I applaud these goals and look forward to the fulfillment of the promise that the formation of Spirit holds out for the future of St. Louis. I am particularly pleased that the organization has sought to address one of the Nation's most important and least understood economic problems of the past decade, the declining rate of productivity growth. Productivity improvement is needed to sustain and raise our standard of living, lessen inflationary pressure, and maintain our long-run competitive position in the international economy.

The average annual rate of productivity growth during the last 10 years has been only half of that of the preceding 20 years. The present rate of productivity increase in the United States is considerably less than that of other industrialized nations, such as Japan and West Germany.

Productivity or the efficiency with which we use labor, capital, and other resources to produce goods and services, is of great importance in achieving the objectives our society demands. These objectives include a higher standard of living, better quality products and services, a clean environment, and better working conditions.

Increasing our productivity aids the economy in three separate ways:

First, increasing productivity enables a worker to earn higher real wages without giving up leisure time in order to support a higher standard of living. The

high standard of living we enjoy today is due to sustained productivity growth over the past century.

Second, productivity improvement is useful in lessening inflationary pressures by offsetting the effects of rising wage rates on unit labor costs and thereby producing upward pressures on prices, and

Third, productivity improvement is important in maintaining the long run competitive position of the United States in the international economy. A lag in the growth rate of U.S. manufacturing productivity over the past decade is one of the factors that has weakened the ability of some American industries to compete with foreign producers both home and abroad.

As measured by output per staff hour, U.S. productivity increased at an average annual rate of 1.6 percent from 1967 to 1977 in the private business economy. This rate of increase is only half that of the 3.2 percent experienced between 1947 and 1967. For the manufacturing sector, the annual rate of productivity growth between 1967 and 1977 has been only 2.1 percent, compared to about 2.7 percent between 1947 and 1967. Many experts on productivity agree that the depressed rates of the past few years will probably continue indefinitely without some positive measures to turn the trend around. Thus, efforts such as the formation of labor-management groups in our major cities such as PRIDE and Spirit are only the beginning of our efforts to reverse these alarming trends.

Some are quick to point out that while the United States productivity growth was the lowest of 12 major industrial nations in the period of 1967 through 1976, the United States has had a much higher, sustained, rate of productivity over the last century and the other industrialized nations of the world are merely catching up. But the reasons for this decline are very real to the United States and deserve the kind of study and attention that Spirit in St. Louis pledges to devote to the problem. The reasons for our decline include:

Shifts in the industrial composition of the economy, changes in labor force composition, apparent slowdown in the rate of improvement in the capital labor ratio, slowdown in research and development expenditures, diversion of capital investment to satisfy the requirements of environmental health and safety regulations, stagnation of some industries, and changes in workers attitude toward his work.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers considers the slowdown in productivity one of the most significant economic problems facing the United States today. A higher rate of productivity growth in the decade ahead will provide opportunities for expanding the productive capacity at a time when private and public demands on the Nation's resources are expanding at a rapid rate. A reversal of the recent trends in U.S. productivity is essential to achieving a more stable, less inflationary economy in which the real incomes of all groups in the economy rise without one group taking from another. In a rapidly developing economy, steady increases in produc-

tivity will provide a more sound and sure basis for international competition. ●

COORDINATING OUR DEALINGS WITH OPEC

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in Sunday's edition of the New York Times. The article, entitled "Leading Japanese Politician Suggests Oil Users' Cartel," discussed the idea of developing a "common front" for negotiating with the OPEC nations. Kiichi Miyazawa, an unofficial adviser to Prime Minister Ohira concluded that the major importing nations "have nothing to lose" by establishing a common position for dealing with OPEC.

Recently, I met with Mr. Miyazawa during his stay in Washington and we had a frank discussion of our mutual concerns. At that time, I recommended a consortium to deal with the OPEC nations. I am grateful that Mr. Miyazawa has suggested the same action.

It is important that a coordinated effort on the part of the oil importing nations begin at once for dealing with OPEC. For this reason, I have just recently introduced H.R. 4574 which would express the intent of Congress that the President should establish a Council of Oil Importing Nations (COIN), consisting of the oil importing nations, would be charged with the responsibility of negotiating with OPEC, a reasonable base price for oil.

The entire article follows:

LEADING JAPANESE POLITICIAN SUGGESTS OIL USERS' CARTEL

(By Henry Scott Stokes)

TOKYO, June 23—In a sharp response to the recent surge in international oil prices, a leading Japanese politician has called on Western industrial nations and Japan to form an oil "consumers' cartel" to bring pressure on the oil cartel, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries.

"Our immediate task is to break that cartel," said Kiichi Miyazawa, an unofficial adviser to Prime Minister Masayoshi Ohira who served three times as Economic Planning Minister and also as Foreign Minister.

"We should not overlook the fact that we face a suppliers' cartel," he said in an interview here. "The only effective way to deal with it is to form a consumers' cartel—there is no other way."

REMARKS ARE A DEPARTURE

Mr. Miyazawa's views differ from official Japanese policy, which has been to conciliate the oil cartel since the 1973 oil crisis. Japan imports more than 99 percent of its oil, most of it from OPEC members, and oil accounts for more than 70 percent of Japan's energy.

But Mr. Miyazawa commands attention here because he is a possible successor to Mr. Ohira as Prime Minister and has acted over the years as Japan's spokesman to the West. He is the only senior Japanese politician, who speaks English, as he did in the interview.

Mr. Miyazawa is the first Japanese leader to speak out against OPEC in many years. His remarks suggest that opinion in Japan

is hardening against the oil producers, although the risks of alienating them by extreme confrontations are still generally considered to be not worth taking, however high oil prices go.

At a meeting starting Tuesday in Geneva, the OPEC members are expected to raise the official price of crude oil sharply from the current level of \$14.55 a barrel, after another increase approved earlier this year.

"This may be the most serious crisis since the end of the Second World War for industrial democracies," said Mr. Miyazawa.

COMMON FRONT IS URGED

Referring to the summit meeting of seven industrial nations to be held in Tokyo on Thursday and Friday, Mr. Miyazawa said, "The seven have to agree on a common front. We have nothing to lose by taking a tough position."

He contended that the situation in the Middle East has completely changed since 1973 when Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger tried and failed to persuade other major oil-consuming nations to take a common hard line against the producers.

One of the changed factors, he indicated, was President Anwar el-Sadat's treaty with Israel. "I really don't believe that without Sadat the Arabs can start another war against Israel," he said. "The key is Saudi Arabia, which we now know is moderate on oil matters, though we did not know this in 1973."

"I would like the United States to repair relations with Saudi Arabia in a very discreet and careful manner," he said, "so that Saudi Arabia can be sure, despite events in Iran and the American failure to help the Shah, that the Americans will help the Saudis if the Russians try to fish in troubled waters there."

Asked how the West and Japan could "break the oil suppliers' cartel," Mr. Miyazawa said that the oil consumers must convince moderate members of OPEC, notably Saudi Arabia, that continued price increases were self-defeating and would undermine growth in the developed world.

"If one of the major members of OPEC agreed to this line of thinking," he said, "that would weaken the cartel."

"Yamani is right," he said, referring to Sheikh Ahmed Zaki Yamani, the Saudi Petroleum and Mineral Resources Minister. "The West should economize on oil." ●

THE ATTITUDE OF YOUNG PEOPLE

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the British historian, Arnold Toynbee, made a study of the rise and fall of many of the world's great civilizations. He concluded that none of them were ever on an even keel, that they were either on the rise or on a decline. And he also discovered a formula by which one could measure what a nation would be in the future. He said,

Look at your young people. Measure their hopes, dreams and aspirations, and in twenty years that's exactly what the country will be.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am especially thankful for young people like Janie Cartwright of Columbus, Ga. I wish to share with my colleagues her essay, "America—My Heritage And What It Means To Me." This kind of

good attitude bodes well for the Republic.

The essay follows:

AMERICA—MY HERITAGE AND WHAT IT MEANS
TO ME

(By Janie Cartwright)

Three hundred years ago, our country was a wilderness. Two hundred years ago we were a handful of colonial villages. A little over a hundred years ago, we were torn apart by a civil war. Yet, today we produce over half the total wealth of the universe—a wealth which we share with friends, former enemies, and dubious neutrals in the most extraordinary display of generosity in the history of mankind.

Two hundred years ago, our forefathers, armed with guns, axes, plows, and Bibles, began to transform a wilderness into one of the world's greatest nations. Though America, in 1781, was only a fledgling, and though I was as yet unborn, America showed her concern for me by creating laws which would guarantee and protect the personal, political, and religious freedoms which I and every other American today can call our heritage.

In 1787 the founding fathers wrote the Constitution, thereby shaping the political destiny of this homeland graced by God. This unique plan of government began with the words, "We the People," establishing a shield of democracy under which Americans have, for two hundred years, governed themselves as a free people. I am proud that my forebears had the wisdom to write this remarkable plan of government. I am thankful for the system of checks and balances established therein which has helped to preserve a democratic government for me. I am confident that I am well protected by this supreme law of the land.

The Bill of Rights clarified my rights in 1791 by stating the specific freedoms which I, today, am entitled to as an American—freedoms which I may abandon, but freedoms which I will never lose. My personal happiness is dependent upon my heritage of freedom. In return I intend to make some contribution, however small, to preserve the democratic structure which will allow ambition and creativity to flourish.

Our democratic system is designed to care for and protect the most humble and ordinary American. I, a common citizen, am privileged to enjoy the personal liberties of the human mind and spirit and reasonable freedom and opportunity to express them. Freedom of thought and action has led each succeeding generation to accept the challenges in the growth and progress of our country. Even after the bitterness of the war years, our forefathers sought to bring us peace and tranquility. To implement this, the brilliant, patriotic leaders needed the support and cooperation of the ordinary American. Yes, from the Pilgrim's landing at Plymouth Rock, to the triumph of the American Revolution, to man's first steps on the moon—the history of the United States is a stirring saga of courage and a quest for freedom.

Just as important as my political freedoms are my religious freedoms. Today, we are truly a nation under God. Our money carries the motto "In God We Trust." Sessions of Congress and the Supreme Court open with a prayer. Every President takes his oath of office on a Bible. Witnesses swear on a Bible in court proceedings. Indeed, just as America has had a unique background of searching for freedom, we have had a unique background of faith. Let us continue this unshakable belief in God and Country. The course of history will be determined by the faith that men are guided by.

Our American heritage has endowed us with both political freedoms and religious convictions. We must put this freedom and conviction to work with the zeal, the fire, and the enthusiasm that has become the

wonder and envy of the rest of the world. My solemn obligations are to help guard our heritage of freedom and to uphold the prestige and preeminence that our nation has achieved.

A necessary consequence of the personal, political, and religious freedoms bequeathed to me is an unparalleled challenge. I have the opportunity to prove that the "American Dream" is not a myth. I have the opportunity to become not what I must be, but what I can be.

I am proud my heritage offers me the opportunity to obtain a good education. One of the guiding principles of our forefathers was to ensure everyone the opportunity of an education. Today, this country, one of the few nations of the world, has a free educational system. Our schools have become career-oriented, and programs have been initiated which teach a wide variety of vocational skills which prepare students for entry into the national work force. Many comprehensive high schools provide programs which incorporate both the academic and vocational programs so that graduates are prepared for college or work force entry. I believe education is the key to man's success for tomorrow. Our governmental system must be intellectually capable of sustaining itself, and it is up to us, together with other nations seeking prosperity and happiness for their own people, to summon up our knowledge and skills to solve the problems that threaten us all. We cannot let the assumption stand that nations can live to themselves, for in everything that is of utmost importance, the world is interdependent.

We cannot have a great country without turning some thoughts to ecology and environmentalism. We must think of conservation for future generations. Above all we must be parsimonious with our resources. We must face the fact that our resources, as well as those of other nations and continents are finite; we are running out of gas and oil; we are even running out of breathable air. We must try to reverse what now seems the inexorable exhaustion of natural resources, and we must do so in cooperation with all other major powers.

The American people are humanitarians. They will make the ultimate sacrifice to protect and uphold the principles by which we live, and we must strive to foster these rights throughout the world. President Carter's policy has repeatedly emphasized the fact that his administration will not look the other way when basic human rights are violated here or abroad. We value our personal human rights, guaranteed by our forefathers, who met and successfully mastered the challenges of the past. We must secure for future generations these precious liberties as those before us have endowed us with a proud heritage. We must be diligent lest a plague of apathy destroy us. Indicative of this humanitarian concern is the Statue of Liberty, standing at our nation's gateway, which beckons to the world—

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,

The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,

I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Whatever talent or ability I have, I shall use it to an optimum degree in the service of my fellow human beings and in the service of God. At the periphery of my vision my responsibilities and dedication lay claim to issues for people caring, hoping, and working for a better tomorrow—not for just one race but for the entire world.

My legacy of rights, liberties, and opportunities has made me a more independent and self-reliant person. I shall consider it an honor and a responsibility to help pre-

serve these rights for future generations. I can compare my freedom to a levee that holds back the waves of oppression. It must be kept in repair or small holes will let the floods in to wash away the entire structure. I shall cooperate in every way possible to help maintain a sound public opinion and high idealism, which will make possible the increase of righteousness, justice, patriotism, and good-will. "America, I love you, You are truly the land of freedom and opportunity."●

MCPL PAPER: THE RHODESIAN
CONSTITUTION

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, as cochairman of the task force on Rhodesian sanctions of Members of Congress for Peace through Law (MCPL), I wish to offer for the RECORD the MCPL analysis of the Rhodesian Constitution. This brief but cogent paper points out that even where there is no specific mention of race, the constitution's provisions are stacked against the black African, and instead perpetuate the power of the white European in Zimbabwe-Rhodesia. Perhaps most disillusioning, the paper points that there is little chance to improve the constitution because the procedure for amendment, like the substance itself, is stacked in favor of the status quo.

This paper is especially useful in light of the fact that the House will be debating the compromise bill on Rhodesian sanctions within the next 2 days. To those who claim that we should lift sanctions because the April elections were "free and fair," I suggest: Look a little deeper; see who holds the power; see just how far the constitution does not go. For, as in our own country, it is the constitution which is the cornerstone of the system of government. If the constitution is severely flawed, as is the Rhodesian one, we should not be leading the international community into premature recognition of a white-dominated, entrenched system of government in a black land.

I commend to my colleagues this paper, prior to the House debate on H.R. 4439:

THE RHODESIAN CONSTITUTION

The following is a preliminary analysis of the Constitution of Rhodesia Zimbabwe approved on January 30, 1979, by the white voters of Rhodesia, as a framework for a transition to majority rule in that country. The paper addresses the Constitution in three parts: A) the composition of the three branches of government; B) the rights of the citizens; and C) procedures for amendment of the Constitution.

A. COMPOSITION OF THE GOVERNMENT

(1) The Legislative Branch: Chapter III, Part III of the Rhodesian Constitution sets forth the composition of the Legislative Branch. Article 22 states:

"There shall be 100 members of the House of Assembly, of whom:

- (a) 72 shall be Black members
 - (b) 20 shall be White members, elected on a preferential voting system;
 - (c) 8 shall be White members (elected through other procedures)"
- and

"The Senate will consist of 30 Senators, of whom:

(a) ten will be Blacks elected by the 72 Black members of the House of Assembly; and

(b) ten will be Whites elected by the 28 White members of the House of Assembly; and

(c) ten will be African Chiefs elected by the Council of Chiefs . . ."

Impact: Clearly, there is distinct racial discrimination in the language of the Constitution. This distinction is made all the more apparent when the proportion of seats reserved for whites (28 percent in the House of Assembly and 30 percent in the Senate) are guaranteed to a group which constitutes roughly 3 percent of the population. Moreover, since other Constitutional provisions require "the affirmative votes of . . . not less than 78 members of the House of Assembly" (Chapter XI, Arts. 157 and 160) (actions affecting the electoral laws, education programs, medical services, national parks, housing standards, etc.), it becomes clear that any legislative actions in these areas are subject to the approval of at least 6 of the 28 whites in the House.

(2) The Executive Branch: While the language of the Constitution regarding the Executive branch is not as overtly racial as is that regarding the Legislative Branch, Chapter IV of the Constitution mandates that the President, "acting on the advice of the Prime Minister, will be required to appoint Ministers from each political party which is represented in the House of Assembly by five or more members in the proportion of seats held by each such party."

Impact: The Executive includes the President, appointed by the Parliament, and the ministers, appointed by the President. Whites are effectively guaranteed more than one-quarter of all ministerial positions because of the proportional requirement based on political party. Therefore the whites, with their protected 28 seats and probable high degree of party unity, may well exercise a predominant role in the Executive Council, given the likelihood of a number of black parties, each of which will have ministerial representation.

(3) The Judicial Branch:

(a) Qualifications of Judges: No racial terms are used to specify qualifications of judges. However, Chapter V of the Rhodesian Constitution specifies: "A person will not be qualified for appointment as a judge unless he is or has been a judge in a country in which the common law is Roman-Dutch and English is an official language, or he has been qualified to practice as an advocate for not less than ten years in Rhodesia or in a country in which the common law is Roman-Dutch and English is an official language."

Impact: Clearly, few if any Africans will be able to qualify as judges under these provisions, since the only qualifying countries under the language of the Constitution are those few such as South Africa, which has a Roman-Dutch system of law.

(b) Removal of judges: The Constitution provides for removal of judges on the basis of "inability to discharge the functions of his office" or "misbehaviour" if an independent tribunal has recommended that he be removed on one of these grounds. The make-up of the tribunal is to consist of not less than three members selected by the president from the following:

"(a) retired judges of the High Court;

"(b) judges or retired judges of a superior court . . . in which the common law is Roman-Dutch and English is an official language;

"(c) an advocate of not less than 10 years' standing;

"(d) an attorney of not less than 10 years'

CXXV—1055—Part 13

standing from a panel nominated by the association representing attorneys."

Impact: Clearly, the impact on the removal of judges is the same as on their appointment. Black Africans are effectively denied a voice in the judicial branch of their government.

(4) The Police Force: Again, race is not specified in the language of the Constitution. However, the effects of the qualifications are similar to those in the judicial branch. Chapter VI of the Rhodesian Constitution specifies: "The Police Force is established for preserving internal security and maintaining law and order and will be under the command of the Commissioner of Police who will be appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Judicial Service Commission. A person may not be appointed as Commissioner of Police unless he has held the rank of Assistant Commissioner in the Police Force or any more senior rank for periods which in aggregate amount to at least five years."

Impact: Since the appointments are made on the recommendation of the white-controlled judicial service commission, and since the qualifications for service currently exclude all blacks from consideration, the police force will remain under white control.

(5) The Military: "The composition of 'the Defense Forces,' which consist of the Army, the Air Force and any other branch established by law, follows that of the Police Force."

Impact: Since the President will appoint all military commanders on the recommendations of a board consisting of the retiring commander (white), one of the other commanders (white), and a third member, the defense forces will remain under white control. The Rhodesian Army only commissioned its first black officers (13 in all) in 1977. Black commanders are apparently not on the Constitution's horizon. Nor, under the power of a white-controlled military, is political insurrection or rebellion.

B. Rights of Citizens:

(1) Voting Rights and Procedure: The Constitution establishes two voting rolls, one a "White Voters Roll" and the other a "Common Voters Roll." The "White Voters Roll" is defined in Chapter III as "persons who are Europeans as defined in the present (Ian Smith) Constitution."

Impact: Since the "Common Voters Roll" includes all citizens over 18 years of age, the practical effect is that white voters are allowed to vote twice—once for whites and once for blacks—when blacks may vote only once, for their black candidates.

(2) Apportionment: Chapter III specifies that in the first general election, the 72 Black members of the House of Assembly will be elected "by voters on the Common Voters Roll . . . on a party list system and not on a constituency basis." The Constitution then specifies eight provinces to which it apportions blocks of seats.

Impact: Since the eight provinces are mostly dominated by heavy concentrations of a particular ethnic group, the allocation of seats in the Constitution appears to have been designed to encourage divisions among Africans in the face of white unity. Furthermore, the allocation of Senate seats, which reserves one-third for whites, one-third for blacks, and one-third for the chiefs, gives whites even more disproportionate representation (30 percent) than in the House of Assembly. It also gives significant influence to what is regarded as the most conservative element among the African people—the chiefs—who in most instances are government appointees.

(3) Declaration of Rights: Chapter VIII of the Rhodesian Constitution provides 16 Articles in which specific rights are enumerated and described in some detail: Among other provisions, it prohibits "any written law"

containing "any provision that is discriminatory" and any execution of the laws "in a discriminatory manner." The term "discriminatory" is defined to include distinctions on the basis of "race, tribe, place of origin, political opinions, color, or creed."

However, after making these statements, the Constitution goes on to exempt certain areas from the prohibition against discrimination. Areas in which discrimination is permissible include adoption, marriage, divorce, "entry into employment . . .," "the appropriation of public revenues or public funds," and "the exercise of any discretion relating to . . . criminal proceedings in any court."

Impact: This list of potential exemptions to the Constitutional guarantees of equal protection seem to authorize continued discrimination based on race, tribe, etc., especially in the adjudication of private or family law.

(4) Provisions relating to Property: Chapter VIII (which includes the Declaration of rights) also includes language protecting any individual from deprivation of property. It states:

"No person's property may be compulsorily acquired unless the High Court or another court established for the purpose is satisfied that the acquisition is necessary in the interests of defence, public safety, public order, . . . (etc.) In the case of the settlement of land for agricultural purposes, the land may only be acquired if it has not been substantially put to use for agricultural purposes for a continuous period of at least five years. . . . Where property is compulsorily acquired, the owner will be entitled to receive adequate compensation promptly and, if he is a citizen or permanently resident in the country, he will be entitled to remit the compensation outside the country. . . ."

Impact: Even if the land has been abandoned for several years, it may not be acquired for settlement purposes. Whites presently control 50% of the land—and virtually all of the prime agricultural land—but only the high court (which will be white controlled) can authorize that that property be acquired for the public interest—and then only with compensation, which can be taken out of the country. This provision significantly reduces the possibility of any land reform.

(In contrast to this provision, the Tribal Trust bill, which facilitates the acquisition of black land, makes it legal to "move tribespeople away from an area to make way for a scheme of national importance.")

(5) Pension Rights: Pension rights and financial savings of past and present officials are protected for a period of ten years.

C. Procedure for amendment:

The final provisions of the Rhodesian Constitution necessary to address are those which relate to its duration, its flexibility, and its characterization as "a step" toward majority rule.

(1) Procedure for Constitutional Amendment: Provisions of the Constitution relating to the Executive, the Legislature, the Judiciary, the Police and Defence Commission, the Declaration of Rights, etc., will be "specially entrenched." Chapter XI of the Constitution states that these provisions "will not be capable of amendment unless the amending Bill receives the affirmative votes of at least 78 members of the House of Assembly. The amendment of any other provision of the Constitution will require the affirmative votes of two-thirds of the total membership of the House of Assembly."

Impact: Since a minimum of 78 votes is required to pass any Constitutional change for the next ten years, 6 white votes in the House of Assembly are required. This means that the whites retain an effective veto over the crucial questions of the composition of the government and the rights of its citizens.

(2) Ten-Year Review: The Constitution provides that the reserved seats and racial distinctions in voting procedure will remain

in effect for ten years, at which point they will be subject to review by a Commission. The Commission will be composed of the Chief Justice, 2 persons selected by the 28 white members of the House of Assembly, and 2 persons selected by the President.

Impact: Since the composition of the Commission seems to mandate a majority of white members (the Chief Justice, due to the qualifications, will be white, as will the members appointed by the white parliamentarians), the review procedure appears to be written so as to preserve indefinitely the voting power and veto power of the white minority. ●

INVESTIGATE OIL PRICE FRAUD

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, some unscrupulous people within the oil industry have illegally bilked consumers out of at least \$2 billion since 1973 and yet the Federal Government has stood by, helplessly allowing the frauds to continue, and in fact encouraging them by their inaction. Today I am introducing legislation along with Representative BILL RATCHFORD which establishes a Special Prosecutor to investigate oil pricing regulation frauds in an effort to put a stop to what is possibly the largest criminal conspiracy in U.S. history, in terms of dollars involved.

The 1973 Arab oil embargo and the resulting enormous price increases led to a number of well-recognized schemes to cheat on oil prices and to violate criminal laws prohibiting unjust enrichment and fraud. At its height the frauds accounted for \$2 million a day in overcharges. While DOE has spent millions of dollars to ferret out fraud and abuse in the oil industry, these efforts have led to only two successful criminal prosecutions.

Enterprising white-collar criminals have used two schemes to defraud the public. The first involves daisy chains where oil products are fraudulently routed through numerous dummy corporations for the express purpose of illegally inflating the price in violation of price control laws. The Energy and Power Subcommittee has been doggedly pursuing these schemes since 1976 in an effort to prod DOE and Justice into action.

The second scheme involves reseller fraud, which was the subject of a recent joint hearing by the Energy and Power Subcommittee chaired by Representative JOHN DINGELL, and the Subcommittee on Crime chaired by Representative JOHN CONYERS. In this scheme, resellers falsely certify old oil, priced at close to \$5 a barrel, as new oil, priced at \$12 a barrel. After pricing regulations went into effect in 1973, the number of resellers ballooned from less than a dozen to over 450. Most of these companies started with little more than a telephone, but overnight their officers became DOE millionaires.

DOE first recognized the reseller scheme in 1975 and identified criminal activity, yet it took until the spring of 1978 to make the first referral to the

Justice Department, and until the spring of 1979 to obtain the first indictment of a crude oil reseller.

DOE was also aware that it was not just fly-by-night resellers that were involved but also major oil companies. Yet DOE still failed to investigate despite specific evidence of abuse. Many cases that were investigated were shuffled back and forth between the regional and national offices awaiting referral to the Justice Department. One case has yo-yoed between Dallas and Washington for 4 years and is just now in the process of being referred to the Justice Department. DOE field investigators were further frustrated by a DOE directive barring interviews with companies involved in reseller frauds. While it is difficult to differentiate bureaucratic bungling and deliberate coverups, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that top DOE officials failed to deal forcefully with documented reseller fraud.

DOE is not alone in pursuing reseller investigations; the Justice Department has also been unwilling to devote sufficient resources to the task. In one instance where a major oil company had admitted guilt of reseller frauds, the case sat on the desk of a key Justice Department official for 9 months before it was sent to the U.S. attorney's office in Houston. Indeed most of the cases now before the Houston grand jury were not referred by DOE via main Justice, but through anonymous tips and information from friends of regional Justice attorneys. The U.S. attorney in Florida learned of the major Florida Power daisy chain case from a Jack Anderson column.

Clearly this pattern of neglect and indifference cannot be tolerated. The statute of limitations is running on many of these schemes which will leave consumers without a means to recover money which was defrauded from them. In fact, there is much evidence to suggest that the reseller frauds are continuing today, yet the track record of DOE and Justice suggests that most of these cases will not be pursued.

In testimony at the recent hearing, GAO was sharply critical of the DOE/DOJ performances. GAO argued that DOE waits too long in referring cases to Justice, and that DOE concentrates its efforts in the wrong areas. The Government watchdog agency also said that DOE has been able to complete audits of only 9 percent of the crude resellers over the last 5 years. DOE and Justice have no written memorandum of understanding which has led to confused and contradictory policies. DOE told GAO that it was going to increase its reseller audits, yet at the same time it has cut its audit staff from 650 to 250.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that, if a special prosecutor is not appointed, the job of investigating and prosecuting these frauds will not be completed. The American people will have every right to be cynical if white-collar criminals are not prosecuted for this \$2 billion conspiracy.

The legislation I am introducing will establish an independent prosecutor with full judicial investigatory powers. The prosecutors will have joint jurisdiction to investigate any violations of provisions of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act. This will enable DOE and Justice to con-

tinue current cases but allow the special prosecutor to have free rein on new investigations. The office of the prosecutor would terminate in 5 years unless Congress extended the term to complete pending investigations.

We should not resort to the appointment of a special prosecutor as a cure-all for Federal investigations except in extraordinary circumstances. I believe that \$2 billion of fraud is in that select category. A special prosecutor is the only way we can put an end to the largest conspiracy in U.S. history. ●

SSI DISABLED CHILDREN'S PROGRAM

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which will amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to maintain for an additional 3 years, the SSI disabled children's program.

The SSI disabled children's program was established in 1976 through Public Law 94-566 to correct the original SSI law in order that children on SSI would receive the same case management and services provided to SSI adults. Despite the common knowledge that the earlier the intervention the greater the possibility of reversing disability, funding was available only to disabled adults prior to the enactment of this law.

The SI-DCP program has done much more than just eliminate an inequity in our law, it has worked to save lives and contain health care costs. I have received letters from 17 State agencies describing their programs for SSI disabled children. A letter from the State of Connecticut summarizes the importance of this program:

The Connecticut DCP has been able . . . to provide required services which were not available to the child through any other resource; to locate existing resources for care, of which a child's family may have been unaware; to coordinate planning and service provision and in general, to insure compliance with the SSI-DCP mandate that the medical, social, developmental and rehabilitative requirements of handicapped children, who are receiving SSI benefits, be addressed in a prompt, comprehensive and competent fashion.

A further example of the benefits of the SSI-DCP program was brought to my attention by the State of New Jersey. In this case, a child had been born with his heart outside of his body. Medicaid was paying for the child's hospital care at a cost of about \$140,000 per year. Meanwhile, the child was not doing very well because of repeated viral infections that the child's doctor thought might be related to the number of visitors in his hospital room. It became evident that this child might not be healthy enough to have the operation necessary for his recovery. However, the SSI-DCP program enabled the child to return home, because the program permitted funding for private nursing, the rental of a ventilator and family counseling. This

cost will be about \$30,000 annually, or a reduction of \$110,000 per year from the Medicaid allowable expenses. Additionally, and beyond dollars, the child has progressed significantly enough that an operation can be scheduled in the near future.

By 1980, a total of 209,500 children are expected to be eligible for this program. This is a dramatic increase from the original estimate by the Social Security Administration of 83,500 children in 1977.

Under the current law, \$30 million is allocated to States. The funds are distributed to each State based on the number of children under age 7. The money is used for counseling services, establishing individual service plans for prompt referral to medical, educational, and social services; monitoring those plans and providing any other services that would enable children under age 7 to become self-sufficient in the future. The bill I am introducing would simply continue this program intact.

The Federal and the State governments have begun the commitment to provide care for these disabled children in order that they can have normal lives. The States have agreed to this program on the assumption that this program would be adequately funded. Time is running out to enact legislation to continue this needed program. Therefore, I hope that the Ways and Means Committee will immediately consider this legislation.

I would like to thank all of my colleagues who join me in sponsoring this legislation and I would especially like to note the contributions of Congressmen ABNER MIKVA and JIM CORMAN, who played such instrumental roles in initiating this program during the 94th Congress. I am pleased to note that Senator ROBERT DOLE, who has also been involved from the beginning with this program, has introduced the bill in the Senate.

The needs of SSI disabled children were not being met until the enactment of this law. Thus, it is vital that we move quickly to continue to provide these children with the individualized care they receive through the SSI disabled children's program. ●

RESPONSIBILITY OF YOUTH

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the recognition of 1979 as the International Year of the Child, I would like to share with the House the text, to be included in the RECORD, of one of the best and most pertinent speeches I have heard by a young person on the subject of the responsibility of youth to the community and the importance to the community of our next generation of adults.

The speech follows:

VIEWS OF THERESA SPANN

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, the people of Wyandanch and our visitors. My name is Theresa Spann, I am the president of the Youth Council at the Wyandanch Community Development Corporation and also a senior at the Wyandanch Memorial High School.

I am here today to speak for the youth of our community and the youth everywhere. The United Nations has declared this year, 1979, "the year of the child." So I thought this would be an appropriate subject to speak about the child, or rather the children of Wyandanch.

It is often said that the youth are the future of the nation. Nowhere is this more true than right here in Wyandanch. Over half the population of Wyandanch is under 20 years old, meaning a greater role for the youth in the development of our hometown. Moreover, we have historically been the cutting edge of the movement for social change.

Black youths have paid a heavy price for being in the vanguard of struggle. Thousands of black youths have been lynched, murdered, maimed and jailed. Yet young people have still rebelled and struggled against racism or oppression and exploitation.

Today in 1979, and with the 1980's fast approaching, clearly a massive and systematic assault has been launched against black youth with the aim of weakening our fighting spirit and locking us into the basement of society. If this is allowed to continue unopposed, all hope of a brighter future for our community will be smashed under the grinding weight of the "Master Plan".

The defense of the youth must become a top priority in Wyandanch if we are to insure our survival and future growth for our children and their children.

The following areas must be dealt with by you our elders and ourselves for united we stand, divided we fall, sounds familiar.

In education: We must develop a stronger school system, that prepares the youth for tomorrow's competitive world. This can only be accomplished by all parents involvement in the school system.

In employment there is a desperate need to develop businesses and jobs that will service to the skills and knowledge of our youth. So that the teenagers of our community can stop depending on their hussels to get them over. Like selling drugs and gambling. You the elders must give us good role models to follow. For instance, Ms. Mildred Simpson the Vice President of the School Board; Ms. Mary Bizzle the School Community Rel. Person, and Ms. Irma St. Martin who is a candidate for the School Board of elections. And by the way, for all of you who didn't know or either forgot, the school board elections will be held on Wednesday, June 13th, at the Straight Path School.

The ladies of the community should be recognized everyday and especially today, Wyandanch Recognition Day. They have set some strong role models for the youth and the elders of the community. We should all look up to them for they are a great asset to the Wyandanch Community.

In other words, stop working for someone else and start working for yourself.

Politics, we must register to vote, choose the best candidate that has Wyandanch's improvement in mind and run our own for public office, so that we can determine our own future.

Our youth have willingly sacrificed their strength and their lives for the good of Wyandanch, it is now a must that Wyandanch rally to the defense of the young and to help us prepare adequately for the 1980's and beyond. ●

RESOLUTION CALLING FOR THE RESIGNATION OF DR. JAMES SCHLESINGER

HON. JAMES A. COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution calling for the resignation of Dr. James Schlesinger as Secretary of the Department of Energy. Although Dr. Schlesinger is a fine man and a dedicated public official, it has become glaringly apparent that he is the wrong man for the job. Hired to resolve our national energy problems, Dr. Schlesinger and the Department of Energy have become part of our energy problems. Enjoying neither the confidence of Congress nor of the American people, his continuation as the Secretary of the Department of Energy can serve no useful purpose.

Over the last 18 months we have seen what can only be described as a complete lack of leadership in the Department of Energy. It would seem that with the resources at his command, 20,000 employees, and a budget of over \$10 billion, Dr. Schlesinger could have developed an energy policy which would have prevented the current crisis. Instead, there has been a history of indecision, equivocation, and misallocation which has resulted in confusion, shortages, and gas lines. In the leadership vacuum created by Dr. Schlesinger the United States has increased its dependence on imported oil, experienced a phenomenal rise in oil prices, delayed the development of alternate sources of energy, and offended Mexico, a major source of oil and gas in the Western Hemisphere.

Dr. Schlesinger's tenure in office has cemented the American people's basic distrust in their Government. Statements and promises emitting from DOE and Dr. Schlesinger consistently have no basis in fact.

Admittedly, the Iranian situation was completely misread by all elements of this administration, but there is no excuse for DOE's inability to predict the impact the cutoff of Iranian oil would have on the U.S. fuel supplies. Many of us still do not understand how a 4-percent reduction in oil imports from Iran resulted in a 10- to 15-percent reduction in production by U.S. oil companies.

Even more perplexing is the absence of reason behind the rejection of the Mexican offer to sell natural gas to the United States. The Mexican Government was willing to sell its gas to the United States at \$2.60 per 1,000 cubic feet, approximately the OPEC price. Dr. Schlesinger and the administration stubbornly refused to buy at OPEC prices from Mexico. As a result, the \$1.5 billion pipeline from Mexico to the United States remains incomplete and Mexico is burning off 500 million cubic feet of natural gas a day. Moreover, the United States continues to buy liquid gas from Indonesia at \$3.14 per 1,000 cubic feet.

My confidence in Dr. Schlesinger's ability has been severely shaken by his

admission that he was ignorant of the fact that although crude oil imports are up from last year, our refineries are only operating at 84 percent of capacity, a 5-percent reduction over last year. It is incongruous that imports should be up and production down in the midst of an energy crisis of this magnitude. And it is incredible that the Secretary of Energy would be unaware that this situation exists.

At the heart of the present crisis is the DOE's allocation policy. The contrived mechanism has disrupted the process of supply and demand resulting in a surplus of gasoline in some areas of the country and crippling deficiencies in other areas. Dr. Schlesinger's reluctance to take decisive action is symptomatic of the debilitating indecisions in the upper echelons of the administration.

The demonstrated impotence of the Department of Energy and Dr. Schlesinger to respond to the demands of the people for the fuel to run our society is perhaps the greatest indictment of the man and his Agency. He should make way for someone with the courage and the ability to get the job done, and with the credibility to win the confidence of the American people. ●

I AM A VIETNAM VETERAN

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, the Sun City Post No. 101 of the American Legion recently held a meeting in which they paid special tribute to Vietnam veterans. Mr. John LaDue, a member of the Sun City Post No. 101, and himself a Vietnam veteran, read the following poem he wrote for the occasion. I commend the poem to my colleagues:

I AM A VIETNAM VETERAN

I am a Viet Nam Veteran.
I was born of war—the World II type; Nurtured on the rationed milk of national sacrifice and pride, in the 1940's.
I remember watching my father rise to dress for camp where he would learn to defend us from the Nazi foe . . . and I watched my mother cry.
I still hear the shouts through youthful ears—of Days called VE and VJ, and I remember tears of another kind—those of joy—rise from Mother's eyes.
I schooled in Mid-America, with plains of corn standing tall like legions of warriors.
I watched and cried with my grade school friends, as General Mac faded away in the televised halls of Congress—returning from our National War of Transition . . . Korea.
I heard no shouts of any kind as this 50's chessboard exercise of back-and-forth, faded to a fizzled end.
I entered manhood and also Army as was my patriotic duty, when the 60's first emerged.
I learned the arts of enemy destruction while newspapers began to talk of war in distant Asian lands.
I answered the call when Uncle Sam said to go across the distant waves to steaming jungles and rice paddies, which echoed the sound of bullet and bomb.
I sloshed the mud, and fought mosquitos, and watched in driving rain both day and night for those who came, in silence and in shout—and saw them fall as did those beside me, never to rise again.

I took R & R—both in country and out—climbing mountains of joy that made me forget a while the smell of burning faces and the cracking sounds of death.

I read the Stars and Stripes about battles in Nam and out, and wondered with puzzled head at pictures of long haired brothers burning the flag I carried, while hoisting the one of those I fought.

I left the land of South Viet Nam as my year of war was ended—still feeling pride at what I'd done, but looking with a question at the growing eye of televised carnage, which seemed to put a different slant on the places I had been these past twelve months . . . and I wondered.

I returned to Southeast Asia in the 70's, a volunteer this time; to advise our allies of war and peace as the fighting in Viet Nam jungles began to wind down, while that in American cities continued to grow.

I taught my Vietnamese counterparts the ways of self-sufficiency and struggling alone, while showing civilians how to grow more productive crops and rebuild the blackened thatch-roofed dwellings destroyed by the fires of many guns.

I lived among the people and learned their words and ways;

I handed out C-ration chocolate bars to tattered children, just as my comrades in wars before had done.

I found a bright-eyed maiden who spoke a different tongue—and brought her with me as I departed, when "Peace With Honor" descended upon the country of her birth . . . and my mother cried, then tears dried . . . but so did no one else.

I look back as the dawn of a fifth decade approaches at the years quickly past since my time in war did end:

I see babies born of white skin but laughing, slanted eyes matching those unclaimed which still, hopefully, are alive, in the streets of Vietnam cities.

I see refugees by the thousands flowing to our shores in a never-ending stream which bonds us eternally to a war that cries, "Forget!! . . . me not."

I see band empty streets, and cheers of silence, and parades that never were, to those who fought with faith in a faithless war for a thankless, puzzled, media-burged country.

I see Veterans knock at closed doors and wander, wondering where are the rewards of past returning comrades—who won—or tied—but didn't win only to have someone else lose for them, on battlefields and at "peace" tables . . . and mothers cry . . . and wives cry . . . and children cry . . . in hunger.

I am a Viet Nam Veteran.

I.

Me,

He,

She,

You,

They,

Us.

We all, are Viet Nam Veterans.

Forget . . . we . . . not.

JOHN LADUE. ●

AMERICA MUST OPEN ITS DOORS TO THE REFUGEES OF INDO-CHINA

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the terrible tragedy of Indochina continues. A generation of war has wrought a generation of refugees, an endless river of humanity, diverted from one country to

another—a river which today empties into an ocean of death.

In the past few weeks, the Government of Vietnam, in a display of racism not seen since the war against the Jews, has systematically expelled Vietnamese of Chinese origin from the country. Prior to expulsion, the Government first strips these Vietnamese of their riches; each person pays a bounty of at least \$4,000 to leave. The payment allows them to become boat people. They are then cast off by soldiers and police from the shore, with the certain knowledge that at least half of them will die. In this manner, Vietnam is guilty of the murder of no less than 100,000 people in the past 3 months.

The forced exodus from Vietnam has its counterpart along the Thai-Cambodia border. The Khmer nation is completely prostrated. Perhaps a million—no one will ever know for sure—were decimated under the unspeakable regime of Pol Pot. Millions more face starvation and illness in a country which has simply ceased to function. The only hope for those strong enough to resist has been escape—brutal journeys over hundreds of miles of jungle and mountains into Thailand. Over the past 4 years, 300,000 were able to reach the border; untold hundreds of thousands have died en route.

The Asian countries which have received these refugees from Vietnam and Cambodia—Thailand, Malaysia, and the colony of Hong Kong—are at the breaking point in their ability and willingness to accept them on any basis whatsoever. Recently, 325,000 were in refugee camps in these countries. More than 3,000 per day are pouring into Hong Kong. But in the past several days, Thailand and Malaysia have forced over 100,000 back—into Cambodia, where they are rotting in the jungle, and into the ocean. In the absence of any relief, most of them will die, for no reason.

The scope of the tragedy is overwhelming, almost beyond comprehension. But our difficulty in grasping the enormity of this holocaust—and it is no less than this generation's holocaust—must not prevent us from acting to save these people.

In a world which 40 years ago permitted itself to witness, in silence, in utter paralysis, the systematic murder of 10 million under the Nazis, there is no excuse for refusing to act to save the next innocent victims of crimes against humanity. Incumbent on the survivors of a holocaust is a sacred responsibility to never let it happen again.

And it is in our power to prevent it from happening again.

The United States has been more generous and compassionate than any other nation in absorbing refugees from Indochina—over 200,000 of the million which have been uprooted. The rest of the world—including France, Australia, Canada, Great Britain, and Germany—have permanently resettled but 100,000 others. That all can do more—much more—in the face of desperate need is all too evident.

It has been argued that the United States has a special obligation to be of assistance by virtue of our past involve-

ment in Indochina. I would argue that no matter what the circumstances that has produced this exodus, none can turn their backs on these refugees. Unprecedented efforts are required.

It is not enough—it is pathetically insufficient—to merely condemn Vietnam, for its crimes, or Cambodia, for its anarchy, or Thailand and Malaysia, for their cruel expulsion of thousands. Words in these circumstances are useless. They will save no lives.

The only worthy response is to open our borders and to admit into our country as many as are necessary. We must bring as much pressure as possible to bear on our allies to do the same. And we must act together to save these refugees.

The United States currently authorizes the entry of 7,000 Indochinese refugees per month, or 84,000 per year. But because of funding obstacles, far fewer than 5,000 per month have recently entered the country. Moreover, our immigration laws, with their preference for those who were formerly associated with us, or have other ties to American citizens, limit our ability to accept refugees on an unrestricted basis.

This is simply not adequate.

At the least, our quota must be doubled. Congress must commit the necessary funds for processing and resettling this higher number of refugees. The President must obtain similar commitments from other Western nations. None can plead ignorance of this tragedy. The moment to act is now.

In a brilliant and compelling essay in the Los Angeles Times, Dennis Prager of the Brandeis-Bardin Institute has written of the moral imperative of saving these refugees. I urge my colleagues to read these words and to search their hearts, to join in refusing to be indifferent to this horrible tragedy, and in committing this Congress to legislation which would open America's doors to this multitude.

Also attached for my colleagues is Henry Kamm's grim account of the Cambodians who have been forced to return to their country.

The articles follow:

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 21, 1979]

WILL WE IGNORE THIS HOLOCAUST, TOO?

REFUGEES' PLIGHT OFFERS CHANCE TO ATONE FOR 40-YEAR-OLD CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY

(By Dennis Prager)

Certain events in history present humanity with a clear moral choice. The Nazi Holocaust was one of them; how nations and individuals responded—or failed to respond—to the cries of European Jewry was a measure of morality.

We are now witnessing another such event: the shipment of Vietnamese boat people and Cambodian refugees back to their deathlands. History will surely judge our generation by its response to the suffering in Southeast Asia. The issue is not political; it is a matter of good and evil in the starkest sense. Just as innocent Jews were tortured and killed when handed back to the Nazis, innocent Vietnamese and Cambodians are being tortured and killed when returned to the Communists. It is as simple as that.

I have never been able to understand, since first learning about it as a child, the apathetic response of governments and individuals to the mass murder of Europe's Jews. The past week has given me the terrifyingly simple answer: With few exceptions, people

and nations do not relate to—and ultimately do not care about—the suffering of others. Only when tragedy has the potential to strike us directly do most of us react.

During the past week, front-page stories have reported Thailand's and Malaysia's deportation of nearly 100,000 Cambodian and Vietnamese men, women and children from their sanctuaries in Thailand and Malaysia. Yet we have been preoccupied with DC-10s, gasoline prices and nuclear power—issues which affect us directly.

The affluent world can still redeem part of its soul. We can save virtually every refugee from the Asian Communist deathland. Wealthy nations could pay for their food and transportation; and all of us could offer to adopt an individual or family. The moral imperative is clear and overwhelming.

American Jews especially must press for immediate aid to these refugees and must volunteer en masse to take them into their homes and communities, or else the Jewish community stands to lose a significant measure of moral authority when it condemns non-Jews for neglecting the plight of Jews before and during the Holocaust and when it asks non-Jews to aid Soviet Jewry. After all, Soviet Jews are as foreign to non-Jewish Americans as the Indochinese are to Jews.

The American Jewish Committee has been active on behalf of the Asian refugees, and Israel's record has been good compared with that of other nations, but these efforts are a mere drop in the bucket. The onus is on the American Jewish community, not on impoverished Israel or a handful of Jewish leaders.

The specter of the Asian deathlands presents President Carter, Congress and the American people with a moral challenge and a great opportunity. By opening America's doors to the Asian refugees, we pay a certain economic price—but we may reap infinitely more in return.

All Americans, and particularly the young, would begin to regain the pride that we had prior to the Vietnam war. The saving of Vietnamese and Cambodian lives can help reverse some of the terrible consequences of that war: the greatly reduced American moral authority in foreign affairs and the amoral cynicism common among young Americans. This is our chance to tap the potential of our nation as it's not been done since President Kennedy's call for the Peace Corps.

But the greatest challenge posed by the Indochinese refugees is to the moral integrity of the Left. Suffice it to say that failure by leftists to condemn the Vietnamese and Cambodian Communists not only renders their opposition to the Vietnam war morally suspect but also places them in the same moral category as Josef Stalin's supporters in the West. The refusal of Jane Fonda, Tom Hayden and others to condemn the brutality of Vietnamese Communists or work for the Indochinese refugees means simply that they condone the present mass murder in Southeast Asia. As Harvard historian Adam Ulam noted, regarding leftists who condemned Francisco Franco's atrocities during the Spanish Civil War but who kept silent about similar atrocities by Communists, those who care only about the sufferings of children under rightists do not care about the sufferings of children.

Another group that faces a moral litmus test is the Arab world. For 31 years the Arab nations have focused world attention on the plight of the Palestinian refugees who resettled, on the average, less than 50 miles in friendly Arab lands. Now that many Arab nations are among the wealthiest states on earth, they are in a position to offer help to Asian refugees who have fled great distances to hostile lands.

Concerning the United Nations there is little to say, for it has lost its moral credibility to such an extent that it is rarely

even mentioned when the rescue of these people is discussed.

Often individuals and nations are tragically powerless to effect change. In this case that is completely untrue. The United States alone, or in concert with other nations, could begin airlifting the Southeast Asian refugees tomorrow. But the President and Congress fear that a wave of protest could swell up if tens of thousands of refugees are allowed into the United States during this period of economic uncertainty.

Members of Congress have privately stated that communications from enough Americans would change the present policy of restricted Asian immigration. All we have to do is write or call our representatives and the White House, and if possible volunteer our homes for a short period of time. Unlike many Europeans during the Holocaust we do not have to defy a gestapo to lend a helping hand.

I grew up thinking that the world was indifferent to the murder of Jewish children. If we continue to do nothing to stop the Indochinese mass murder, it will be a macabre consolation to know that ethnicity is irrelevant.

[From the New York Times, June 25, 1979]

REFUGEE TELLS OF COMRADE'S PLIGHT

(By Henry Kamm)

BANGKOK, THAILAND.—Thousands of Cambodians forced back into their country by Thailand this month are huddled starving in a forest at the foot of cliffs that marks the border, waiting to be rescued, according to a refugee who made his way back into this country.

Many have died already, a frail and trembling former civil servant said today in halting French. They are staying where they are because they hope that the world will come to their aid, feed them and find a way to bring them back out.

Even if they wanted to move, the frequent sound of exploding land mines restrains them, the returned refugee said. So does the knowledge that ahead of them lies only deep forest, with few trails, hardly passable in this season of heavy monsoon rains. The smell of death hovers in the forest that hides them, the Cambodian said, because the ground is rocky and the dead lie unburied.

FORAGE FOR FOOD AMONG TREES

The refugees are dying of hunger and illness, and from land mines that explode when they forage among the trees for fruit, leaves or roots, or go to a pond for water. When they try to cross back into Thailand, they are deterred by rifle fire.

"Does the United States know this, does the United Nations know this?" the refugee asked. He said that some of the refugees had brought transistor radios with them from Thailand, and people were listening to know whether their fate had been noted. When he left a week ago they had had no sign that this was the case.

A number of embassies here, as well as international relief agencies, are studying ways in which food can be sent to the refugees despite the absence of contact with the Vietnamese-dominated Cambodian authorities.

Phnom Penh radio said Friday that 10,000 of the 45,000 Cambodians forcibly repatriated by Thailand were still in the border region, suggesting that the others had been brought under the control of the Cambodian authorities. This cannot be verified. Although the area is nominally under the control of the Vietnamese-backed regime, no one exercises effective control.

The refugee said it was impossible to tell how many thousands were in the border area. He said the dense forest prevented taking even an approximate count. But he said people were huddled on the ground everywhere within view, and that smoke from the fires they made covered a large area.

The Cambodian described the situation of

his compatriots as desperate and hopeless unless help arrived quickly.

'WE FEEL ONLY DESPAIR'

"If you reach the American Embassy," he said people had told him before he set out on his journey, "tell them we are very sad. They have entrusted their hope for their lives into my hands. We have suffered so much in Cambodia. We fled to seek help from the Americans.

"Now we feel only despair. Either we will die where we are or you must help us."

He said the refugees were seeking shelter from the heavy rains under large boulders that are scattered through the forest. Most are coughing, many have high fevers, diarrhea or malaria; the elderly lie listlessly on boulders; children whimper and women cry.

Few of the refugees have any of the rice left that they brought with them from Thailand, either from rations issued by the camps from which they were expelled or donated by ethnic-Chinese communities in the villages their bus convoys passed on the way back to Cambodia. Most of the refugees are ethnic Chinese.

TRADING FOOD FOR MEDICINE

Some of those who still have food are trading parts of it for medicines that others obtained in Thailand from the International Committee of the Red Cross. Most live entirely on roots, leaves and fruits that are normally considered inedible, which they boil over fires that are difficult to light in this season. All are hungry unless they are too sick, the returned refugee said.

The Cambodian said he did not see any food being handed out by Thai troops as they forced the refugees across the border along a deserted region of north-central Cambodia.

Thai military authorities asserted that the refugees were being expelled into a region in which pro-Vietnamese troops would receive them and where they would be able to obtain food. They said also that all refugees received a five-day food supply before they were forced across.

The refugee reported that Thai troops fired at them as they were being driven across, an assertion also made by the Phnom Penh radio. He said that as he scrambled down the narrow path through the mountain pass across the border, he saw the bodies of two children and two adults, all of whom had been shot.

He said shots were occasionally heard from the Thai side of the border, presumably when refugees tried to make their way back.

Diplomatic sources here regard the refugee's account as in keeping with what scarce information has become available to them through intelligence channels. They said various means of bringing relief were being considered, but because of the dangers presented by land mines, supplying the Cambodians overland was problematical. Air drops are under consideration, but would require assurances that military forces inside Cambodia would not open fire on the planes.

"If there is no intervention from foreign nations or the United Nations," the Cambodian said, "these people will all die."●

EPILEPTIC WOMEN SHOULD BE ALLOWED ABORTIONS

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, when the Labor-HEW appropriations bill, H.R. 4389, is considered by the House, I in-

tend to offer an amendment to section 209 dealing with Federal funding for abortions. As reported by the Appropriations Committee this section contains the language of the so-called Hyde amendment which restricts Federal funding to only those abortions where "the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term."

While I would prefer no restrictions at all, I firmly believe that the House must, at the very least, take action to create provisions for specific instances in which Federal funding must be allowed. One such special circumstance exists in the case of a pregnant woman suffering from epilepsy, or seizure disorders, and my amendment would simply extend to them Federal funding for abortion.

Because the epileptic population is widely scattered and because epilepsy may be completely or partially controlled by anticonvulsant drugs in up to 80 percent of the cases, it may surprise you to learn that there are over 2 million epileptics in the United States. These anticonvulsant drugs help to prevent violent seizures in the pregnant woman, who, for a number of metabolic factors, becomes much more susceptible to increased, more dramatic, and often uncontrollable seizures during the gestation period. Such drugs, however, have been proven to lead to coagulation defects, or bleeding disorders, in up to 50 percent of the newborn. In addition, studies have confirmed that where mothers receive regular anticonvulsant drugs, there is an increased tendency for malformation syndromes such as heart defects, harelips, and cleft palates, which often occur in association with mental deficiencies and growth retardation. These serious malformations may occur in 6 to 10 percent of the offspring of mothers receiving such drugs, while minor problems such as low nasal bridge and mild defects in terminal development may appear in up to 30 percent of these newborn. Palate and heart defects must occur before 8 weeks gestation, while the majority of other problems occur later, up to 12 to 14 weeks gestation.

If, however, a pregnant woman were to discontinue the use of anticonvulsant drugs during her pregnancy, the tendency toward increased seizure susceptibility, already raised 45 percent by the pregnancy itself, would be even further increased. The majority of these seizures occur during the first trimester of pregnancy and poses a serious health threat not only to the fetus, but to the pregnant woman also. About 20 percent more children have neurological abnormalities at 1 year of age if their mothers suffered seizures during pregnancy as compared to those who did not.

The dilemma for the pregnant epileptic woman becomes obvious: Should she continue the use of anticonvulsant drugs which leave her only about a 70 percent chance of bearing a completely normal child, or endure her pregnancy without these drugs, under increased threat of violent seizures which would harm not only her child, but herself? In either case, the offspring of epileptic parents have

two to four times the general population frequency of malformations and neurological defects.

It hardly seems fair, therefore, that we should force these women to bring into the world defective human beings, not because they are legally forbidden to procure an abortion, but merely because their indigency prohibits them from obtaining an otherwise perfectly legal abortion. Such discrimination against epileptic women on the basis of their poverty should not be tolerated, and I sincerely hope that all Members of the House will thoughtfully consider and approve my amendment, which would provide Federal funding for abortions to indigent epileptic mothers.●

PALESTINIAN ASPIRATIONS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the coming stages of the peace negotiations, more than ever, it will be critically important for the United States to understand the Palestinian people and their aspirations. Too often in the past, I fear that we have not done so.

There is an emerging literature on the Palestinians which should be useful to all of us in our attempt to educate ourselves on this vital issue. I have just come across a book review in the Economist of one new book on the Palestinians which may intrigue some of my colleagues. Although I have not yet read the book and cannot provide my views on its content, the Economist review has inspired me to read it. I hope it will have the same effect on others.

The review follows:

PALESTINIANS: FROM PEASANTS TO REVOLUTIONARIES

(By Rosemary Sayigh)

The one element almost always missing from the growing number of books on the Palestinians is the voice of "ordinary" Palestinians. True, the voice of "ordinary" people is missing from most books. But the issue at the heart of the Arab-Israeli dispute is the uprooting and dispersal in 1948-49 of more than half the Arab population of Palestine; the fact that most of these displaced people were subsequently concentrated into refugee camps where, after 30 years and three further wars, many of them still remain means that the middle-class Palestinians who articulate the injustice and the camp Palestinians who suffer it are living in wholly different worlds. Rosemary Sayigh, the wife of a distinguished Palestinian economist, has done valuable service by taking herself and a tape recorder into refugee camps in Lebanon, winning the confidence of the inhabitants by sharing their lives and then patiently recording what they have to say.

Their voices break through the tired controversies with the freshness of a people whose lives have been suspended since the day they fled their homes. Mrs. Sayigh argues that the displaced Palestinians endured 20 years of humiliation at the hands of their reluctant hosts until the birth of their own resistance movement gave them back their

sense of identity and purpose. She records interviews with men who recall the intense feelings of joy and liberation that surged through the camps in Lebanon in the late 1960s when the PLO took over the running of the camps from the Lebanese authorities: "Those were beautiful days in the camps, like wedding days." The later horrors that hit the camps during Lebanon's civil war are outside Mrs. Sayigh's brief. What she does drive home most forcefully with her mixture of narrative and direct quotation is the Palestinians' "pariahdom" of being handless and stateless, their slow realization that they could not count on the other Arabs to win their land back for them, and the subsequent transformation of many of them into revolutionaries wielding guns. If she admires her camp people too uncritically, their stoicism and dignity make this easy to understand. ●

MODERATES BACK SANDINISTA PLAN

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Washington Star ran an article by Bernard Diederich entitled "Moderates Back Sandinista Plan for Government." In this article, Mr. Diederich reports that the Broad Opposition Front, the largest coalition of business interests in Nicaragua, has endorsed the provisional government and has said that it feels satisfied with its degree of representation in the provisional junta. This news presents still further confirmation of the unity of the Nicaraguan people in their struggle against the bloodthirsty regime of General Somoza.

Nicaragua is a very small country. Thus, the members of the Broad Opposition Front are quite familiar with the members of the provisional government and would know, much better than we would, if there was reason to be wary of it. The fact that the Broad Opposition Front, whose members would have the most to lose by a Communist takeover, would endorse the new plan, should assuage fears in this country that the junta is dominated by Communists.

We should be gladdened by this latest news from Nicaragua. The chances that General Somoza will be replaced by a truly democratic and representative government can only be enhanced by this most recent show of unity.

The United States, however, must resist the impulse to intervene in Nicaragua. If we truly believe in the ideals of our own Government, we must realize that is not for us to decide the structure of another nation's government. Only the Nicaraguan people have the right to determine their form of government. The OAS resolution passed this weekend confirms this belief with its call for the scrupulous adherence to the principle of nonintervention.

Should the United States feel impelled to meddle once again in Nicaragua, the result will certainly be self-defeating. Given our four-decade alliance with the oppressive Somoza family, our participation in the efforts to forge a transitional government would only serve to discredit that same government.

Thus, instead of insuring a government of moderates, we would end up dividing the Nicaraguans and giving the more radical groups a potential opening. The process of developing a unified democracy in Nicaragua will be a slow one. However, if we attempt to artificially speed it up, we will only end up killing democracy once again, as we did four decades ago.

The text of the article in the Washington Star follows:

MODERATES BACK SANDINISTA PLAN FOR GOVERNMENT

(By Bernard Diederich)

MANAGUA, NICARAGUA.—The right-of-center Broad Opposition Front today gave its backing to the provisional government named by the Sandinista guerrillas fighting to oust President Anastasio Somoza.

The seven-group Front coalition said the junta was the only viable alternative to the embattled Somoza government. Spokesmen said they feel they are represented in the guerrilla-backed, five-member Provisional Government of Reconstruction by two of its members, and they hope to make sure all segments of society are represented.

Somoza, 53, rejected an Organization of American States' call for his resignation, saying he would "continue the fight" against guerrilla forces who launched their latest offensive May 28.

A broader U.S. proposal before the OAS that urged an inter-American peacekeeping force failed to win support, and an OAS majority Saturday night voted in Washington for a nonintervention resolution sponsored by Andean Pact nations that calls for Somoza's immediate resignation.

The guerrillas' control, meanwhile, has broadened with the evacuation of the National Guard garrison at Masaya, located 20 miles south of Managua.

(The rebels also drove the guard out of Diriamba, 28 miles south of Managua, the Associated Press reported. They have controlled all of Leon, the nation's second largest city, for more than a week, and reportedly have the guard bottled up in their garrisons in several other cities, including Estel, Chinandega, and Matagalpa.)

After four hours closeted with his Cabinet Saturday night, Somoza made a rare call to his military commanders over his National Guard's radio system.

Those listening heard him tell his commanders that "instead of promoting a real peace, the OAS is encouraging that we continue the fight. I want to tell you since I last talked to you in the reunion of commanders, it was understood that we could come to this."

He added: "I'm willing to continue to fight to defeat the enemy."

Somoza called the OAS resolution "fragment intervention into the internal affairs of Nicaragua," adding: "This means that we will have to fight only with the resources that our own country can give us, that is our resources—the men that this country can provide."

Somoza, a West Point graduate who has spent most of his adult life as commander of the National Guard, ended with: "OK, boys, the National Guard must maintain itself united and cohesive to maintain order and the constitution of the republic."

"It doesn't matter to me what some countries say who don't know the reality. We know the reality and we must go forward, Roger and out."

Then yesterday afternoon Somoza read a statement on national television that was much more moderate in tone than his talk with his military commanders, which had been intended to be confidential.

He declared himself "open to dialogue," expressing willingness to "receive the initia-

tive of member governments of the OAS which have a real interest in the resolving of the Nicaraguan crisis through democratic, just and permanent formulas."

He did not condemn the defeated U.S. resolution, which he had criticized the day before. He simply called the new resolution a byproduct of countries with "strong Communist influence."

The radio called on the population to join the army, stating, "The country needs you, we must join to defend it. Report to the National Guard commander. Have faith in Christ." Then the announcer struck at communism, charging that the Communists convert the youth with an orgy of blood, sex and drugs.

Since the first large uprising last September, the National Guard has been recruiting new members and expanding its ranks throughout the country, even enlisting women. Some recruits say they are as young as 13.

But many Nicaraguans feel that recruitment that has been voluntary up until now may soon become compulsory. From an initial force of 8,000 men the National Guard has grown to more than 12,000.

Guardsmen are spread thinly around the country, fighting a smaller but now seasoned guerrilla force that can count on popular support of the population in most areas.

(Lanica, the national airline, resumed flights out of Managua with its only passenger plane, a Boeing 727 returned by the Costa Rican government after its crew sought asylum there Friday, the Associated Press reported. Managua Airport was a scene of pandemonium, with crowds of people waving U.S. currency, trying to bribe their way aboard, AP said.) ●

FTC PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROGRAM

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article by Michael Pertschuk, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, which appears in today's Washington Post.

The article discusses the public participation program mandated by Congress in the 1975 Magnuson-Moss Act. Regrettably, the program has come under attack of late as critics of the Commission attempt to weaken the agency. The fact is that public participation works; \$750,000 is a small price to pay to involve in the rulemaking process the small business and consumer groups otherwise unable to afford a costly appearance before the Commission. As Chairman Pertschuk has ably articulated, the public participation program has substantially improved the already high caliber of work at the FTC.

The article follows:

LISTENING TO THE LITTLE GUY

(By Michael Pertschuk)

Every few months or so a diverse group of very determined advocates sits down around a conference table with the five members of the Federal Trade Commission and proceeds, one at a time, to denounce the commission's staff.

Most of these advocates, representing business, denounce the staff for proposing needless, ill-designed, excessive or punitive regulations. Others, meanwhile, decry what they

see as milquetoast halfway measures, excessive deference to the free market and unseemly responsiveness to business concerns.

In what must be a Guinness world record for self-inflicted bureaucratic pain, the commission not only welcomes these torrents of criticism, but reimburses the out-of-pocket expenses of those who could not otherwise afford to document, assemble and present their complaints.

Now, the Chamber of Commerce, the toy manufacturers and some congressmen have generously offered to relieve us of the necessity of having to listen to consumer and small business advocates by urging termination of the public participation program that reimburses them.

This would leave the opportunity of criticizing our staff's proposals to those business interests that can afford to do so (helped, of course, by their right to deduct the cost of whatever they spend from their taxable income). In the tradition of bureaucracy, we should be grateful for any reduction in the level of criticism directed at the commission. We're not.

The Federal Trade Commission's public participation program was created by Congress in the Magnuson-Moss Act of 1975.

For years it has been a cliché that regulatory agencies are captives of the industries they regulate. Whether that is true or not, the fact is that regulators have heard almost solely from those well-financed business interests that have a clear economic stake in the outcome and the economic resources to make their positions known. To redress the imbalance, Congress in the Magnuson-Moss Act, set up a modest program (\$750,000 for this year) to reimburse those advocates representing a significant interest—consumer or small business—that would not otherwise be heard in the regulatory process.

Those who attack the public participation program and the Federal Trade Commission's implementation of it claim that it is wasteful and unfair. As they see the rule-making process, the commission staff proposes a rule and then the commission itself rubberstamps the proposal and goes through the motions of a rule-making hearing, paying consumer groups and friendly small businesses to bless the proposed rule. This assessment would certainly provide grounds for concern—if it were not untrue.

The Federal Trade Commission has completed or neared completion of four rules under Magnuson-Moss since I joined it: 1) eyeglasses—freeing up price advertising; 2) vocational schools—providing pro-rata refunds for students; 3) insulation marketing—requiring that claims for home insulation be clear and substantiated; and 4) funeral homes—requiring that price information be given and prohibiting certain abuses.

In each of these proceedings, the commission listened to the participants. In each of them, the final rule has been (or will be) honed down substantially from the initial proposal, reflecting our effort to cut back on what we consider needlessly burdensome regulation, while preserving what we believe to be the core remedy for the demonstrated consumer abuse. While we did listen to the evidence and arguments presented by industry participants, who on the average outnumbered consumer participants by 3 to 1, the safeguard in each rule-making against our overreacting to industry arguments was the presence of consumer and small business advocates able to point to the record and express to the commission their view of the risks of weakening the rule to a point where its effectiveness would be destroyed.

As an individual commissioner I know that I have benefited enormously from this class of advocacy. I know that in each of the rule-making proceedings I have found arguments by both industry and consumer witnesses persuasive on certain points. I also know that at the end of the process, most of those who participated industry and con-

sumer alike while rarely uncritical of the final result, expressed satisfaction that the commission had been fair and open in listening to the arguments before making its judgments.

It would be ironic if Congress were to cancel this program in the face of its success. ●

THE PANAMA CANAL—STILL AN ACTIVE ISSUE

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation are deeply disappointed that the U.S. House of Representatives failed to stop the pay away of the Panama Canal.

The absurdity of the Panama Canal treaties is only exceeded by the danger they pose to the security of the United States and the Western Hemisphere.

The House on June 21 passed implementation legislation (H.R. 111) by the close vote of 224-202 and failed by only a small margin of 216-210 to pass my "honesty amendment" which would have Panama pay the multibillion dollar transfer charges out of its "windfall profits" from tolls instead of the burden being on U.S. taxpayers and consumers.

However, the Senate has yet to act and we will have one more turn at bat when a House-Senate version comes back to the House for final consideration. We can yet carry the day if we remain vigilant since,

First, the Senate with the President's urging will no doubt pass legislation to make implementation much more costly and liberal than the House version which could fatally erode the small margin of support for the treaties in the House where Committee Chairman JOHN MURPHY could only gain majority support by pledging to reject any such compromises, and

Second, the continuing exposure of Panama's illegal gun trafficking in the United States and open affiliation with Cuba in support of Marxist revolutionary and terrorist activities in Nicaragua, El Salvador, Guatemala, and other Central American countries could force the Congress to finally concede that Panama is not only unwilling and unable to provide for the "neutrality" of the canal, but it is openly provoking conditions of military retaliation against the canal in violation of terms of the new treaties and therefore decide these treaties should be scrapped.

In the meantime, the legislation which passed the House was a tough bill which included most of the key provisions of my original bill H.R. 1958, such as: An annual audit by the General Accounting Office; annual review and action by Congress; U.S. military control for the life of the treaties; block voting by the U.S. delegation on the joint commission to assure our continued control; payment of the \$10-million bonus provision, if available, to relieve U.S. expenses instead of providing more windfall profits to Panama; and preservation of article IV of the Constitution requiring an act of Congress to transfer property.

Nevertheless, it is important to note

that H.R. 111 was a property transfer and appropriations authorization bill which means that a vote for it was a vote to give away the Panama Canal and pay billions for the privilege—all for no real reason except to buy the goodwill of a violent and unstable left-leaning, anti-American dictatorship with the worst record of human rights in the Western Hemisphere.

Official committee hearings on Panama's revolutionary gunrunning in violation of U.S. laws were recently held at my request with startling revelations which prompted the first secret session of the House of Representatives in 149 years and further developments are scheduled to follow. Panama has recently become brazenly defiant of the United States and international law now that they view the canal pacts as irreversible. Unless we can alter our Nation's foolish course in the next few weeks, we will begin a partnership which is to provide the Government of Panama, at the expense of U.S. citizens, nearly \$100 million per year to pay off scandalous loans with the international banks and expand its Cuba-style Marxist revolutionary activities throughout Latin America—\$100 million per year which will provide little benefit for the people of Panama who for weeks have been violently rioting against Torrijos, who is pumping his money into making war against his neighbors instead of providing for food and fuel needs at home.

Mr. Speaker, our efforts in this House developed remarkable strength in a few short months to crush an unrealistic administration treaty implementation bill, H.R. 1716, which would have provided the State Department a virtual 20-year blank check with little supervision by Congress, a limited military role, and questionable U.S. control. And with the circumstances now emerging, we may yet win further battles to protect our Nation's economic and military security by being alert to the opportunities ahead.

Dick Motta, a sage constituent from my congressional district, who coaches the Washington Bullets basketball team said during dark days before he won the national basketball championship a year ago, "The opera isn't over until the fat lady sings." Despite the long odds, this also holds true in the continuing Panama Canal battle. We have scored a lot of points and the final buzzer has yet to ring. We will keep up the fight.

Mr. Speaker, I enclose for the Record the following analysis of the House debate on the Panama Canal Treaty implementing legislation from the June 23, 1979, Congressional Quarterly.

The article follows:

PANAMA CANAL BILL SURVIVES HOUSE TEST

Apparently persuaded that last year's Panama Canal treaties can't be wished away, the House June 21 handed President Carter a major victory by approving legislation to implement the treaties.

With a handful of votes to spare, the House turned back repeated attempts by conservative opponents of the treaties to tack on amendments the administration said would violate U.S. commitments.

The victory for Carter followed weeks of intense lobbying during which it often seemed the House might reject the bill out-

right or attach amendments Carter could not accept.

The bill (H.R. 111) now goes to the Senate, where the administration is expected to have an easier time in shaping a bill to its liking. But key House members warned that the House will not accept major changes when the bill goes to a conference committee.

Carter said he would ask the Senate to make "improvements" in the bill, but said he appreciated "the courage of all those [House] members who recognized the national interest by voting for this legislation."

On the key vote, the House June 20 sidetracked an amendment by George Hansen, R-Idaho, that would have forced Panama to pay all U.S. costs in implementing the treaties. The vote was 220-200.

Administration officials had said that amendment would violate the treaties, giving Panama the legal right to take over the canal Oct. 1, when the existing agreement expires. The bill survived six other test votes, including a 210-213 defeat of a portion of the Hansen amendment.

The bill was passed on a 224-202 vote that was virtually identical to the vote on the Hansen amendment. The bill won support from 189 Democrats and 35 Republicans; 80 Democrats and 122 Republicans voted against H.R. 111.

The two-day debate (June 20 and 21) was highlighted by the first secret, or closed, session of the House since 1830.

FEW CHANGES MADE

As passed, the bill differed little from the version reported by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in April. H.R. 111 was shepherded through the House by committee chairman and sponsor, John M. Murphy, D-N.Y., and David R. Bowen, D-Miss.

The legislation sets up a Panama Canal Commission to run the canal through 1999, sets pay and other standards for commission employees, provides for about \$75 million in annual payments to Panama from canal revenues, requires congressional approval of all canal spending, authorizes the transfer of U.S. property in the Canal Zone to Panama, and establishes the procedures for setting canal tolls.

President Carter had wanted considerably more flexibility than the House bill allowed. Administration officials warned in April that portions of the Murphy bill might violate the treaties. But when it became obvious that Carter's bill (H.R. 1716) could not pass the House, the administration reluctantly backed the Murphy bill and launched a campaign to head off further restrictions.

Carter also gave up his demand that Congress enact the legislation by May 31. He had said that early approval was necessary to gear up for the Oct. 1 effective date of the canal treaties. But the administration and House leaders postponed floor action several times in attempts to round up enough votes. There is only a faint chance that Congress will clear the legislation before its August recess.

Supporters credited passage to three factors: The administration successfully argued that Panama could legally take over the canal in October if the United States violated the treaties; the bill had strong support from the maritime industry; and Murphy carefully crafted a bill and a key floor amendment that met most objections of many of the treaty opponents.

In lobbying for the bill, the administration even enlisted the services of actor John Wayne. On June 7, four days before he died, Wayne sent House Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill Jr. a mailgram supporting the bill. Wayne was a long-time friend of Panama strongman Omar Torrijos.

HANSEN AMENDMENT

During six months of haggling over the bill, opponents focused their efforts on passing the Hansen amendment.

Hansen built support for his amendment largely on charges that President Carter and

his aides lied to the American public in 1977 and 1978 when they said the treaty would not result in additional costs to U.S. taxpayers.

In January administration officials admitted the treaty would cost the United States approximately \$350 million. That estimate was later upped to \$871 million. Hansen claimed the treaty would cost \$4 billion, but he never mentioned that at least \$2 billion of that amount would come from canal revenues, not from the U.S. Treasury.

Bowen, a key supporter of the bill, said the total direct cost of the treaties to the United States through 1999 would be \$830 million. Most of that amount—\$757 million—was for moving U.S. military bases in the Canal Zone and paying for hospitals, schools and other services for canal employees and their dependents.

Another \$2.8 billion in annual payments to Panama required by the treaties would come from canal revenues, not from the United States. The net book value of the canal and related property turned over to Panama was another \$650,000, Bowen said.

Hansen's amendment would have prohibited "any cost to the U.S. taxpayers" of implementing the canal treaties. The amendment, in effect, would have required Panama to buy the canal from the United States.

In presenting what he called the "honesty" amendment, Hansen said it was "meant to do no more than keep the promises that were made by the president of the United States, by senators and others who were proponents of the treaties, that the taxpayers would be immune from any costs in these treaties."

Murphy offered a substitute which, on its face, sounded like the Hansen amendment, but which merely repeated the existing provisions of H.R. 111. The only new provisions in his amendment prohibited the transfer of canal property to Panama unless Panama paid for all water, electricity and other services it bought from the canal commission.

Murphy argued that his amendment, unlike Hansen's, did not violate the treaties. The amendment sends "a very clear message" that "our people will not pay to give away the canal," he said.

The administration backed the Murphy language as the only way to head off the Hansen amendment. Murphy's substitute was adopted 220-200, the key test of House support on the bill. That vote effectively broke the back of the anti-treaty forces, and all but assured passage of the bill in a form acceptable to Carter.

Treaty opponents insisted the vote was not a clear test of the merits of the Hansen amendment. So the following day, after amendments were completed, Robert E. Bauman, R-Md., moved to recommit the bill to the Merchant Marine Committee with instructions that the Hansen amendment be included. That motion failed 210-216.

MONTGOMERY AMENDMENT

The closest vote on the bill, 210-213, came June 21 on what administration supporters called a "son of Hansen" amendment sponsored by G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery, D-Miss.

Montgomery's amendment would have required Panama to pay the \$75 million cost of relocating U.S. installations in the Canal Zone. He said "the United States should not have to pay for moving these military facilities."

But Murphy said that amendment, like the Hansen amendment, would "clearly violate" the treaties.

House leaders had to make last minute appeals for votes to defeat the amendment.

OTHER ANTI-TREATY MOVES

The House rejected four other attempts to add language that the administration said would violate the treaty:

By Ken Kramer, R-Colo., to, in effect, prohibit Panama from appointing its members to the Canal Commission until its government had been installed by "free national

elections in which all population groups and political parties have been allowed to participate." The amendment was an attempt to embarrass President Carter, who has not criticized the autocratic government of Panama, but had demanded free elections in Rhodesia. Recorded vote, 142-274.

By Ed Bethune, R-Ark., to strike the enacting clause, thereby killing the bill, before it was opened to amendments. Recorded vote, 97-315.

By Philip M. Crane, R-Ill., to retain U.S. control of all property in the Panama Canal Zone until after Dec. 30, 1999, when further congressional approval would be required. Recorded vote, 177-248.

By Bill Goodling, R-Pa., to require Panama to pay the United States the fair market value of any property given to Panama, which was constructed after April 18, 1978. That is the date when the Senate approved ratification of the main canal treaty. Voice vote.

GUN-RUNNING AMENDMENT

With no debate, the House adopted by voice vote an amendment that attempted to force Panama to stop its support for the rebels in Nicaragua. The amendment could prove troublesome to the Carter administration if it is not removed in the House-Senate conference committee.

Sponsored by Charles (Chip) Pashayan, Jr., R-Calif., the amendment prohibited annual payments to Panama if the president or Congress determined that Panama was "interfering in the internal affairs of any other state, either directly or indirectly."

The amendment was accepted by Murphy without comment. Murphy is a close friend of Nicaraguan dictator Anastasio Somoza, who has charged that Panama is supporting the Sandinista rebels seeking to oust him from office.

CITROCOSE AMENDMENT

The House rejected, 194-227, what opponents described as a "private relief" amendment on behalf of America's reputed richest man, shipping magnate Daniel K. Ludwig.

Sponsored by Mario Blaggi, D-N.Y., and Ronald M. Mottl, D-Ohio, the amendment would have stopped the annual payments to Panama from canal revenues unless Panama settled all outstanding expropriation claims by American businesses.

Blaggi said the amendment would benefit all 107 American businesses in Panama that were "potential targets" of takeovers. Blaggi accused the State Department of "foot-dragging" on expropriation cases.

But opponents including Murphy, said the amendment was aimed solely at forcing Panama to settle a claim by Citrocose Corp., owned by Ludwig. That company ran a fruit plantation in Panama until 1974, when it was shut down by Ludwig. Panama then took over the plantation. Negotiations on the case have continued ever since.

Ludwig hired the Washington law firm of Ragan and Mason to lobby for the amendment. One of the firm's lobbyists is former Rep. James V. Stanton, D-Ohio (1971-77).

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

An attempt by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to pare back especially lucrative benefits for Panama Canal employees was rejected by the House.

H.R. 111 as reported by the Merchant Marine Committee accepted most administration recommendations for increased benefits for canal employees. Those benefits were: early retirement at age 48 after 18 years' service; higher annuities for employees who continued to work on the canal after Oct. 1; special "bumping" privileges for employees who lost their jobs; and special cost-of-living pay.

But the Post Office and Civil Service Committee had voted to reduce those benefits to the same level enjoyed by other federal employees. During the committee's deliberations Chairman James M. Hanley, D-N.Y.,

had added his panel's version to the Murphy bill.

In both the Murphy and Hanley bills, all special benefits were to be paid from canal tolls, not from U.S. taxes.

On the floor, Murphy offered a substitute to the Hanley version that contained the benefits Hanley sought to reduce. Referring to warnings that canal employees might strike if their benefits are cut, Murphy said the Hanley amendment "will affect the co-operation of an element vital to the continued smooth functioning of the canal."

The Murphy substitute was adopted on a 277-142 vote.

OTHER AMENDMENTS

Other amendments adopted by the House were:

By David C. Treen, R-La., to allow the Canal Commission to establish a 15-cent-per-ton surcharge on canal tolls to pay the estimated \$61 million annual capital costs of the canal, including the \$20 million annual payment of interest to the United States. Vessels bound for, or coming from, the United States would not have to pay the surcharge. Voice vote.

By Bauman, to permit the United States to assume military authority over the canal if Panama was at war with another nation. Voice vote.

By Bauman, essentially adopting an administration proposal for special immigration status to Canal employees. The amendment covered some 7,500 employees, many of them West Indians. The Judiciary Committee sought to delete the provision, arguing that the administration already could admit those employees to the United States. Voice Vote.

CLOSED HOUSE SESSION

The secret, or closed, session held June 20 during consideration of the Panama Canal legislation was the first in the House in 149 years. After the House agreed to a motion by Robert E. Bauman, R-Md., to close the session, police cleared the public galleries and the press gallery. Guards were posted around the House chamber to prevent eavesdropping.

On May 27, 1830, the House convened in closed session to hear a confidential message from President Andrew Jackson during debate on a bill dealing with trade with Great Britain. The bill eventually became law.

The Senate has gone into closed session more frequently, usually for discussion of secret national security information. From the end of World War II through the 95th Congress, the Senate held 20 secret sessions.

The most recent closed Senate session also dealt with Panama. On Feb. 21 and 22, 1978, during debate on the Panama Canal treaties, the Senate met in private to hear charges by treaty opponents that high Panamanian officials were involved in illicit narcotics trafficking.

Other recent secret Senate sessions were held on July 1, 1977, to consider information dealing with the neutron bomb; on December 17 and 18, 1975, to consider U.S. activities in Angola; on Nov. 20, 1975, to consider releasing a study on the Central Intelligence Agency and alleged political assassinations; and on June 10, 1974, and June 5, 1975, to consider the development of new strategic missiles.

During the secret session June 20, according to members present, Rep. Bauman presented a statement from General Dennis P. McAuliffe, commander of U.S. armed forces in Panama, on alleged Panamanian involvement in the Nicaraguan civil war. Bauman and other treaty opponents had charged that Panama was supplying guns, men and money to guerrillas seeking to overthrow the regime of Nicaraguan dictator Anastasio Somoza. A House panel had held hearings on the issue June 6-7.

Although McAuliffe's evidence was classified, several members said they heard little

or nothing in the session that was not public knowledge. And those members said much of the one and a half-hour session was taken up with a vigorous debate on the legislation, led by Majority Leader Jim Wright, D-Texas.

House Speaker O'Neill referred the transcript of the session to the Merchant Marine and Select Intelligence committees for a decision on what sections should be published in the Congressional Record. ●

DEMOCRACY FOR PANAMA

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, the dictatorial regime in Panama has made promises to the United States that it will bring democracy to the people of Panama. General Torrijos promoted so-called "reforms" which ostensibly will make the authoritarian Government of Panama responsive to the true voice of the people. The fact remains, however, that no real change has been instituted since the autocratic military regime of General Torrijos. Further, the Panamanian economy is burdened with crippling Government debts. Meaningful political and economic reforms have yet to materialize. Panama's Agrarian Labor Party calls on the Government to honor its promises of bringing honest and democratic government to Panama.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I now insert in the RECORD an English translation of the manifesto of the Panamanian Agrarian Labor Party:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
Washington, D.C.

MANIFESTO OF THE AGRARIAN LABOR PARTY (P.L.A.) ON THE PROBLEM OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TORRIJOS-CARTER TREATIES

In our message on the occasion of the 1st of May, Labor Day, we took the opportunity to inform the community of the authorization received from the Elections Court to proceed with the formation of the Party pursuant to the new elections law. As of that date, we assumed the commitment to participate actively and speak out on the main problems that affect the present and future of our populace; and we seek to do so as long as we are permitted to publicize our manifesto in the press, on radio and television. Now, on the occasion of the serious problem that is facing our country with regard to the implementation of the Torrijos-Carter treaties, in view of the debates that are being held in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress which make clear the possibility that the laws required for the implementation may not be approved by said House; the Agrarian Labor Party believes it necessary and timely to state its position in the face of such a situation. The Torrijos-Carter treaties were approved by the United States Senate with a series of amendments, through great difficulty, thanks to the leadership demonstrated by the leaders of said House, of both the Democratic majority and the Republican minority.

If we jog our memory, we will be able to recall that the Senators opposing the Treaty based their arguments on the fact that the people of the United States were handing the Canal over to a country governed and dominated by a leftist military dictatorship.

With the visits to Panama by the Senate leaders, and the backing of the Presidents of the neighboring nations, the understanding which General Omar Torrijos H. assumed of democratizing Panama and restoring the guarantees that would create a climate of tranquility and peace around the Canal, was evident, so that the Treaty would be approved by the Senate.

For this a period of almost two years was agreed on before it went into effect, that is, a period within which the changes must be brought about in Panama towards restoring democracy. Within that period, General Torrijos succeeded in passing constitutional reforms and the law of political parties, seeking to fulfill his part of the agreement through this, at the same time that he was publicly stating that in the future the power of the military boot would not prevail, but rather the popular vote, honestly counted at the polls.

However, the Panamanian people and the political, economical and social organizations, of which they are a collective part, were able to manifest their dissatisfaction over the pretended democratization of the nation inasmuch as the reforms and laws adopted do not constitute the necessary guarantee for putting a real democracy into effect.

One simple example makes it plain that democracy cannot exist in Panama when the Executive Power controls and approves the whole nation's budget, and the representatives of the Legislative body (the people's power) and the Judiciary body (Justice) depend financially on the Executive.

If Panama aspires to putting the Torrijos-Carter Treaties into effect, this government will have to keep its acquired promise of creating in Panama the indispensable democratic conditions for the Panamanian family to get together and to be able to work towards peacefully assuming the responsibilities that derive from the treaties; and at the same time to develop the spirit of mutual assistance and sacrifice which the restructuring and reconstruction of a country immersed in the deepest public indebtedness that a country without major natural resources has ever borne necessarily implies.

Just as recent reports indicate, 55 percent of the whole Government's revenue is used for payments on the public debt; and in 1983, when the periods of grace granted for the payment of the capital expire, that percentage will increase to 71 percent, if the nation's economy increases its rate of growth.

In order for the Panamanian people to be able to be in a position to pay off the debt they have, they will have to submit to great sacrifices; and these cannot be carried out by a disunited people who distrust some hand-picked leaders who have not been of their free choice.

These sacrifices cannot be asked of a people who do not have democratic guarantees that justify and warrant those sacrifices.

Only a people satisfied with their laws and who freely choose their leaders will be willing to pay any price and sacrifice that might be necessary in order to defend their ideals and their political and economic independence.

In order for the Panamanian people to undertake their Crusade of Grandeur in face of the adversity of their destiny and the Treaties, they first demand that this government make the real and true changes that are necessary for putting a real democracy into effect, thus making good General Torrijos' words that here in Panama only the power of the popular vote will prevail.

Once the establishment of democracy is achieved in Panama, the leaders of the United States Senate and the Carter Administration will have the tools they counted on in order to exercise all their political leadership and to succeed in passing the laws

for implementation just as they passed the Treaties.

A united people of good faith, who live satisfied in a real democracy, would face up to a common cause such as that of the implementation of the Treaties, as the best tool of world pressure which there would not be any force capable of repressing. ●

GASOLINE SHORTAGE

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, the gasoline shortage has reached emergency proportions in my district and State. It is seriously affecting the ability of my constituents to travel to their jobs and carry out normal activities, and they are rightfully demanding to know what Federal energy officials are doing to alleviate the shortage.

The fact is, not nearly enough is being done. While Secretary of Energy Schlesinger is in Japan, my constituents are enduring an energy crisis worse than the Arab oil embargo of 1973 and 1974. Long lines at gasoline stations, closed stations and limits on purchases of gasoline have caused near panic. People are unable to get to work. Stores are losing business. Unless the President takes immediate action to help New Jersey and other urbanized States, there will be a crisis of unprecedented proportions in our region.

I have acted to deal with this shortage by demanding the Department of Energy immediately approve a pending energy application that will release over 3 million barrels of oil, thus diverting them for refining into gasoline. That application was approved yesterday at my urging. Additionally, earlier this week I requested an emergency meeting with Deputy Energy Secretary John O'Leary, who is the No. 2 man in the Department. At my personal request, Mr. O'Leary will meet 2 days from now with the New Jersey congressional delegation; at that meeting, I intend to present a comprehensive program to assist New Jersey. In my judgment, the Department of Energy must immediately:

Revises Federal allocation guidelines that are shortchanging New Jersey in its gasoline supplies;

Supplement New Jersey's gasoline allocation with an emergency allocation from States where supplies are plentiful;

Obtain commitments from U.S. refiners that they will increase refining capacity and expand oil production; and

Increase the State set-aside for New Jersey.

There must be a substantial and immediate commitment from the Department of Energy to aid New Jersey so that it does not bear the brunt of this gasoline shortage.

Immediate adoption of my proposals will help to alleviate the shortage that is currently crippling my district and State. It will free up greater supplies of gasoline and crude oil and prevent economic dislocation and disruption. But that only deals with the immediate prob-

lem. We must also have a long-range plan, because there is a growing cynicism that this is only the beginning; that we have no national energy program to prevent future drastic shortages; and that we will continue on an aimless course in dealing with the worldwide energy crisis.

We need an all-out, crash program for the development of alternate, renewable sources of fuel that will free us once and for all from foreign-based sources. That is the most vital component of a long-range energy program. At the same time, we must increase the emphasis on conservation and, as a final part, make maximum use of domestic supplies such as coal and fossil-based fuels beneath the Outer Continental Shelf.

I have presented such a program to the President and have been urging the White House for 2 years to present such a comprehensive plan to Congress. I would like to outline for my colleagues what I feel are the most important components of a national energy program.

OIL AND GASOLINE

To insure a longer-term supply of crude oil, I have urged the President to take the following actions:

Join with Mexico and Canada in establishing a North American hemisphere market in energy;

Reduce bureaucratic delays in the construction of oil pipelines from Canada and California to carry Alaskan oil to the Midwest and Texas;

Expedite drilling for oil and gas in the Baltimore Canyon off the Atlantic seaboard.

I have cosponsored legislation in the House of Representatives to establish a Federal program to promote the development of synthetic fuels by private industry. I have also cosponsored bills to prohibit the export of Alaskan oil and to create an Energy Corporation of the Northeast, to focus on the serious energy problems of that area.

I also feel that the United States should use its trading leverage against the oil-producing nations in order to keep imported oil prices down. I support the establishment of an organization of wheat-exporting countries—including the United States, Canada, Argentina, and Australia—to increase the price of wheat exports to offset price increases in imported oil.

CONSERVATION

It is vital that the American people increase their efforts to conserve our scarce oil resources. I am opposed, however, to unworkable conservation plans which would cause undue hardship to the public. I voted against President Carter's proposed standby gasoline rationing plan because it was essentially unworkable and would have unfairly impinged on employees who must drive to work, as well as on businesses which need gasoline to provide essential services. The plan would have been a bureaucratic nightmare to implement and would have cost \$2 billion to operate in the first year alone.

I favor less onerous and more effective methods to conserve crude oil. I voted to support the President's plan to

require resetting of thermostats in non-residential buildings to 65° in winter and 80° in summer. I also favor the enforcement of the 55-miles-per-hour speed limit and the voluntary reduction of travel by 10 miles per week.

I feel that the individual States, rather than the Federal Government, are better equipped to formulate and implement conservation plans which will meet the differing needs of the States. New Jersey has imposed an odd-even plan for gasoline purchases as well as a minimum purchase requirement.

I also support improved mass transit programs for areas such as northern New Jersey, and I have voted for increased Federal funding for development of mass transit.

NATURAL GAS

Although the United States currently has a good supply of natural gas, action should be taken to insure that long-term supplies are available. I have urged President Carter to support an energy development bond issue of \$15 billion to provide low-interest loans to build a natural gas pipeline from Alaska to the continental United States. I have also urged negotiations with Mexico to assure U.S. supplies of Mexican natural gas in the future.

ALTERNATE SOURCES OF ENERGY

The long-range future of stable and affordable energy supplies in the United States depends on increased development of alternate energy sources to replace depleting oil supplies. The Congress and the administration have delayed for too long in recognizing the need for a massive Federal effort to develop alternate sources of energy. Now is the time to undertake this important investment in our Nation's future.

Solar energy offers great potential for heating homes and office buildings. I supported legislation enacted into law last year to provide an income tax credit for the installation of solar space and hot water heating equipment, and I have voted for increased Federal funding of solar energy research.

I am the cosponsor of a bill to establish a Solar Energy Development Bank to provide long-term, low-interest loans for the purchase and installation of solar energy equipment in commercial and residential buildings. And I favor programs to encourage the increased use of solar power in the Sunbelt States, in order to make increased natural gas and oil supplies available in the Northern States.

Gasohol is another source of fuel which will decrease the need for oil. It is already in wide use in the Midwestern States, and I have cosponsored legislation to increase gasohol production so that it can be used throughout the Nation. I have also cosponsored bills to promote the use of gasohol by consumers, by requiring retailers to sell gasohol instead of unleaded gasoline, as gasohol supplies become available, and to provide tax incentives for building gasohol production facilities.

I favor the increased utilization of our Nation's plentiful coal reserves, and I supported legislation enacted into law

last year to require new industrial and utility plants to use coal, and to require existing utility plants using oil or gas to convert to coal.

NUCLEAR POWER

Nuclear power is an important component of our Nation's energy program, but it is vital that improved safety measures be implemented for nuclear powerplants.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation will not be able to deal effectively with our energy problem until we have in place the type of comprehensive energy plan that I have outlined. My constituents, and people across the country, are demanding as much, and they certainly deserve no less.

I intend to continue fighting to see that this Nation adopts such a plan so that the drastic gasoline shortages we have witnessed in recent days will be avoided in the future.●

FREE THE INDEPENDENT TRUCKERS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I find it inconceivable that tens of millions of dollars in food is rotting in the fields of this country every day because the administration refuses to put in practice what it claims is its aim for the trucking industry.

The independent truckers' shutdown is now 2 weeks old, yet the administration continues to avoid dealing with the issues and solving the problems it claims it is interested in.

Listening to the administration, one almost gets the feeling that the shutdown has already gone away.

Yet meatpacking plants in the Midwest have been closed for days due to unavailability of trucks. Several days ago in California, a network television affiliate, ABC, reported that virtually no food was leaving the State for the east coast.

Watermelons, peaches, potatoes, lettuce and many other table items hauled by independent truckers are literally rotting in the field.

Food processing plants are shutting down all over the country.

The Hershey Chocolate Co. laid off 950 workers, one-third of its work force, and even a small manufacturer of tabasco sauce told President Carter last Friday that it is faced with its first shutdown in 110 years of manufacturing. Companies such as Hormel, Armour and many other meat processing plants have shut down. Farmers are plowing under crops in California because they cannot get trucks to move it.

And the South Carolina Department of Agriculture sent telegrams to the President appealing for a solution.

But rather than negotiating with the organization that sanctioned the shutdowns, the White House has given abso-

lutely no affirmative answers. Instead, it prefers to deal with the problem by issuing press releases containing promises which the truckers have continued to say will not solve their problems.

On Thursday, June 21, the White House announced it was introducing legislation which would allegedly modernize trucking. But such a long and complicated piece of legislation will take years to sift through the congressional legislative process. In addition, provisions in the bill discussed publicly will hardly do the job legislatively.

One allegedly helpful provision—which reads well in the press release—allegedly "eliminates all backhaul restrictions immediately." Yet members of the Independent Truckers Association argue that this claim is grossly misleading. They explain that the way the proposed legislation actually works is as follows: If a truckline, for example, has the ICC authority to haul film from the Eastman Kodak plant in Rochester, N.Y. to Chicago, that truckline could "backhaul" film from Chicago to Rochester. However, in the real world, shippers of manufactured goods do not receive those same goods. Thus, the "backhaul" provision is misleading.

On top of this, what little help is contained in the legislation for the Nation's independent truckers could not really benefit most of them for at least 2 years—if then.

In short, the administration's legislation falls far short of the President's 2-year-old promise to help the independent truckers of this Nation.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has the power, administratively, to carry out the public promise of the President in a crucial area of equality. And even the proposed 90-day temporary emergency authority for independent truckers would not satisfy all their demands.

The President promised the Nation on March 16, 1977, that he believed in, and would support, legislation that would modernize trucking with the intention of helping the independent trucker.

On June 21, after more than a 2-year delay, the President introduced his idea of legislation meant to help truckers, but which appears to be another stall. If the President really believed his proposed legislation would help the small truckers, why does the White House refuse, to this very day, to pressure the ICC into mandating the legislation for even a temporary period? The ICC has the power to do this, yet the White House has not pressured the agency into helping the independent truckers.

The Independent Truckers Association, for instance, has flatly rejected the inflationary surcharge procedure which the truckers say is designed to help the large, monopolistic carriers. Thus, the ICC and the White House are stonewalling the real needs and demands of the independent truckers. What better proof of this is there than the fact that the surcharge was rejected by 99.99 percent of the truckers?

The surcharge is a complicated formula based on a sliding scale which has

to be adjusted weekly, and monitored—therefore controlled—by the ICC. It amounts to a 4- to 5-cent-per-mile reimbursement to only about half the independent truckers engaged in interstate commerce. And the food haulers are not helped at all.

The root of the problem lies in the fact that the independent trucker, in order to exist, must pay a brokerage fee of from 25 to 50 percent of his gross revenue to companies that control virtually every pound of "regulated" freight. This system does not exist in any other business, and it has not only driven the independent trucker to the edge of bankruptcy, but now results in massive trucker shortages especially in the food-hauling areas. Yet, the entire program to eliminate the need for this shutdown was explained, in detail, to top ICC and White House and Department of Energy officials—long before the shutdown started. They ignored the pleas and the programs. Incredibly, they still are, even though the shutdown is more than 2 weeks old.

We need immediate steps to free the thousands of small businesses of America, otherwise known as the independent truckers.

We need it for them and even more for the millions of American consumers who depend on them.●

NEW YORK STATE ASSEMBLY RESPONDS TO THE PROBLEM OF ULSTER

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues two resolutions recently passed by the assembly of my native State of New York regarding the problem of Northern Ireland.

The first resolution was sponsored by Assemblymen Lehner, Abramson, Butler, Gulotta, Hannon, Healy, Larkin, Madison, Parola, Robles, and Seminario and Assemblywomen Lipschutz, Rettaliata, and F. M. Sullivan. It calls upon the new Prime Minister of Britain, Margaret Thatcher, to address the problem by convening a meeting of the leaders involved. The second resolution was introduced by the following Assembly members: Messrs. S. P. Walsh, Velella, Abramson, Behan, Butler, Conners, D'Andrea, Dearle, Ferris, Finneran, Gulotta, Hannon, Ms. Jacobs, Keane, Larkin, Mrs. Lipschutz, MacNeil, Madison, McGrath, Murphy, Orazio, Parola, Robles, Seminario, Smoler, and Spano. It calls upon our Government to act upon the human rights problem in Northern Ireland. As chairman of the 131-member Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs I wholeheartedly welcome these initiatives on the part of the New York State Assembly and commend that distinguished body for their compassion and commitment with regards to the Irish question.

The plight of the Irish people has received increased attention, both national and international, largely because of the work of the ad hoc committee and other legislative bodies in this country. I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 122 on May 17 calling upon the new Government in Great Britain to take a stand in promoting self-determination for the people of Ireland and assist in ending the daily violations of human and civil rights that occur there. The resolution already has 65 cosponsors and I am confident that this number will grow as States put further pressure on their elected officials to join in this effort.

At this point I would like to insert the texts of the aforementioned resolutions:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION, ASSEMBLY No. 624

Whereas, It is the avowed foreign policy of the United States of America to encourage worldwide respect for the human rights of all citizens of the world; and

Whereas, The inhumane treatment and abuses presently being inflicted upon those residents of Ulster, known as Northern Ireland are of great distress to the people of the State of New York; and

Whereas, Under the guise of emergency powers, British officials try political foes in special non-jury courts and impose excessive and often torturous punishment upon those wrongfully denied their basic rights; and

Whereas, The inhumane treatment and reported systematic torture by the British Government in Northern Ireland and in 1976, the European Commission of Human Rights found the British Government guilty of torture in Northern Ireland; and

Whereas, In 1978, the European Court of Human Rights found the British Government guilty of "inhumane and degrading treatment" in Northern Ireland and Amnesty International again reported on-going and systematic torture by the British Government in Northern Ireland; and

Whereas, British law in Northern Ireland is in direct contravention of fifteen Articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and also, violates the most fundamental principles of the Common Law such as

1. Imprisonment without charge or trial.
2. Non-jury trials.
3. Denial of habeas corpus.
4. Coerced confessions are admissible evidence.

5. The burden of proof is on the accused. One is guilty until proven innocent in the Special British Courts in Northern Ireland; and

Whereas, The Archbishop Tomas O'Flaich, Primate of All Ireland has stated "How can one explain the jump in prison population of Northern Ireland from five hundred to three thousand unless a new type of prisoner has emerged? The problem of these prisoners is one of the great obstacles to peace in our community . . . it is only sewing the seeds of future conflict"; and

Whereas, The Reverends Denis Paul, Raymond Murray and Brian Brady, Political Prison Chaplains in Northern Ireland have stated, "In the last seven years five thousand men and women have been imprisoned in the North of Ireland. All of them come from the poor areas of Northern Ireland. They are the Irish poor and they have suffered gross violations of human rights. Many of them are the third and fourth generation of unemployment—unemployment contrived by sectarian British Governments and bigoted Northern Ireland Governments. In these areas, unemployment is twenty-five to thirty percent"; and

Whereas, It is the intent of this Legislative Body to officially condemn this inhumane

treatment and publicly deplore this abridgment of liberty; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Legislative Body does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to take any and all action it deems necessary or appropriate to secure the freedom of Northern Ireland and end the oppressive treatment of Irish political prisoners in Northern Ireland; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Chairman of the House Committee on International Relations, and to members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives from the State of New York.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION, ASSEMBLY No. 583

Whereas, On May fourth, nineteen hundred seventy-nine, Queen Elizabeth II of England accepted the resignation of the outgoing Prime Minister, James Callaghan and a few moments later Margaret Thatcher, Tory leader of the House of Commons, agreed to the Queen's request that a new government be formed with Mrs. Thatcher as its Prime Minister; and

Whereas, Prime Minister Thatcher directly went to 10 Downing Street to assume the tasks of governing and before entering her official residence paused at the doorstep, prior to entering, and reflected aloud, paraphrasing the words of Saint Francis of Assisi: "Where there is discord may we bring harmony. Where there is error may we bring truth. Where there is doubt may we bring faith. Where there is despair may we bring hope" causing the hearts and minds of many to leap with joy among them, of course, all Irishmen the world over; and

Whereas, It is undeniable that the violence in Northern Ireland is an abomination that should no longer be tolerated and its persistence and pervasiveness is due in no small measure to the fact that the British Government has failed to uphold and put into action its recent pledge to the European Court of Human Rights at Strasbourg that certain practices by its security forces, amounting to brutality and even torture, would be discontinued and no longer tolerated in Northern Ireland; and

Whereas, It is the sense of this Legislative Body that it ought to pause and make note of its sentiments not as a political statement to its Irish-American Constituency but to make those sentiments known to all people of this great Empire State, regardless of ethnic or religious persuasion, who abhor violence and the denial to others of the right to Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness as proclaimed in this Nation's cherished document, the Declaration of Independence; and

Whereas, The Governor of this State, the Honorable Hugh L. Carey, joined in a strongly-worded Saint Patrick's Day statement of other state and national leaders that the United States would continue to "stand ready" to provide all appropriate assistance to achieve the important goal "of linking Northern Ireland with the Republic of Ireland" and proclaiming further that "A whole Ireland, with institutions that link the Protestant and Catholic communities and that protect the rights of each community, can bring greater benefits to both parts of the divided island"; now therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Legislative Body pauses in its deliberations and respectfully exhorts the Honorable Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister of Great Britain to address immediately at the threshold of her tenure the Irish Question and urges her to discard the shroud of despair and put on the mantle of hope and in the exercise of her high office

to convene a meeting of the leaders of Northern Ireland, Protestant and Catholic, beseeching them to rid themselves of doubt by approaching the matter with faith that a solution to their problems is an achievable goal; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted to The Honorable Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister of Great Britain at 10 Downing Street, London, England, to the Honorable Hugh L. Carey, Governor and a copy to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of New York. ●

**DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT
AMENDMENTS**

HON. ED BETHUNE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. BETHUNE. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has before it today a very important bill to create a synthetic fuels industry to meet our defense needs. We have bungled this Nation's energy needs for many years now and somehow we have managed to get by. The Congress must act now on H.R. 3930 because we are running out of time and are jeopardizing our Nation's security.

It has been estimated that the United States now has about 2 months' worth of oil to keep our Navy going. Our vulnerability to increased dependence on imported petroleum supplies is evergrowing. This bill would lessen the OPEC nations' grip by providing seed money to the private industry to develop a domestic synfuels program. It will at the very least offer America a short-term solution while other energy sources are developed.

The bill's synfuel goal is 2 million barrels per day. It would enable a joint Government-private effort to cultivate the use of coal, shale, biomass, or any other feedstocks and conversion processes for synthetic fuel. Our coal supply is plentiful and the possibilities for millions of barrels per day of synfuels are immense.

Synthetic fuels are not new. Synthetic coal and other compounds were discovered in 1923. As a matter of fact, when fuel supplies were blocked during World War II, the German's built six synfuel plants to keep their tanks and planes in operation. In 1948, a firm in Texas built a synfuel plant which eventually closed because it could not compete with petroleum production.

The risks involved with starting up a synfuels plant are great, and it would be even more difficult for private industry to survive today than it was in the 1940's. Not only has our economy changed immensely, but Government controls and regulations have mushroomed. Unfortunately, I do not believe the private market can overcome the stranglehold of Government regulations unless the Congress gives it this chance to succeed. H.R. 3930 would authorize sufficient funds to allow the President to issue contracts for the purchase of synthetic fuel. The money could be used to pay the difference between the contract price and the market price of the fuel. This is a small price tag for the assurance that our multi-

billion-dollar Defense Department can operate. It is a small price to assure additional fuel for domestic industry. Our manpower and defense equipment is worthless if it cannot be mobilized for action and our private sector is hamstrung without sufficient energy.

All this bill does is give private industry the incentive it needs to get into the synfuels business. Let us give our free enterprise system a chance to work.

Mr. Speaker, it is rather ironic that while we are debating this bill today, the OPEC nations are meeting to set higher oil prices. Future OPEC meetings may decide our Nation's fate unless we act now. As a cosponsor of this bill, I urge my colleagues to support this insurance policy for our Nation's future security.

It is a clear signal to the OPEC countries that America has had enough. We have begun to fight for our energy independence—at last. ●

HOW TO RESPOND TO RECESSION

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Senator LLOYD BENTSEN, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, and I held a press conference on the state of the U.S. economy. This press conference was prompted by the bad economic turn of events the last 2 months that convince Chairman BENTSEN and me that we are heading for a recession and thus an end to this long, but labored, recovery from the recession of 1974-75. We are less sanguine about shortrun outlook for the economy than is the administration.

Some of the press coverage of the conference emphasized the discussion of a \$20 billion tax cut which occurred during the question and answer session. Unfortunately this somewhat overshadowed the main point of the press conference.

The point we wish to make is that any tax cuts should be of the proper structure and shape to stimulate economic growth. We need cuts in marginal personal tax rates to increase after-tax incentives to additional work effort. We need tax credits to increase the after tax return to additional saving, which will finance investment and increase productivity. We need faster tax write-offs of depreciation, to raise the rate of return on investments which will improve the Nation's productivity and help break the cycle of stagflation followed by recession, followed by stagflation that has plagued us for 15 years.

Inflation is increasing tax revenue so rapidly that there is ample room for the tax reductions and restructuring we desperately need to turn the economy around. A \$20 to \$25 billion tax cut is needed.

This year, inflation will push individual taxpayers into higher tax brackets that will take \$13 billion away from them—without any increase whatsoever in statutory rates. In addition, the 1977

amendments to the Social Security Act will draw \$6 billion from wage earners this year.

As for business, inflation is increasing taxation due to underdepreciation and phantom inventory profits at the rate of \$25 billion per year. We ought to work off a portion of that—at least \$5 billion per year.

We must take a long-run view of the economy in formulating answers to our economic problems. The consensus Joint Economic report, issued last March, does just that.

I would like to insert in the RECORD Chairman BENTSEN's statement and my statement presented at the press conference yesterday.

STATEMENT BY CLARENCE J. BROWN

I welcome Mr. Bentsen's remarks.

His aid in pushing for the recognition and adoption of the supply side of the economic equation is extremely helpful to the nation.

The major economic indicators point to an imminent recession. This ends one of the longest recoveries since World War II. And, yet, the recovery has been something less than a satisfying experience because, during the best of it, our unemployment rate never got much below 6 percent—and our inflation rate is spiking at double digit levels.

Most economists are predicting that we are heading into a slack period which may reduce inflation, but where unemployment will spike at much higher levels—and even inflation rates won't drop back to previous lows.

The result is that America is being tortured by an Iron Maiden Economy. We are in a torture chamber where every turn of the economic cycle stabs us with spiking inflation or spiking unemployment—and neither problem ever gets cured. Twisting away from one only makes the pain of the other worse. After a dozen years of similar cycles, what used to be considered extraordinarily high rates of inflation now appear to be the best or lowest we can hope for; and the lowest rates of unemployment in the present recovery are as high as the unemployment rates we thought undesirable a couple of recessions back.

Some of the other spikes in this Iron Maiden Economic Era we are in include:

The value of the dollar against gold and many other currencies;

U.S. productivity lagging behind almost all industrial societies in the world;

Record balance-of-payments deficits;

Mountains of additional government regulations;

And mounting consumer and taxpayer anger.

Confusion and lack of confidence in the American economy are growing as workers, employers, producers, and consumers believe that our national economic policies make very little sense.

This confusion and lack of confidence are not unfounded. The economy, for 15 years, has followed a boom and bust scenario. At the end of every recovery, we are left with higher trend rates of inflation, then higher unemployment, and greatly lower projected economic growth.

The table below shows what I mean. The table cites the peaks and troughs of prices and unemployment 1967 to the present. Note the continually rising price and unemployment minima. Each trough is higher than the last. The current unemployment rate looks like a bottom. We have been stuck there since last fall.

On the other hand, each unemployment peak is higher than the last one. And we haven't seen the last of the current price rise. It will very likely exceed the 1975 peak before it is through.

PEAKS AND TROUGHS IN PRICES AND UNEMPLOYMENT, 1967-79

GNP deflator

(Percentage changes from previous year, by quarter)

Troughs:

II. Quarter 1967, 2.5 percent.

I. Quarter 1973, 3.7 percent.

IV. Quarter 1976, 4.7 percent.

Peaks:

I. Quarter 1970, 5.7 percent.

I. Quarter 1975, 12.1 percent.

Current, 8.7 percent.¹

Unemployment rates

(Quarterly averages)

Troughs:

I. Quarter 1969, 3.3 percent.

III. Quarter 1973, 4.8 percent.

IV. Quarter 1973, 4.8 percent.

Current, 5.7-5.8 percent.²

Peaks:

I. Quarter 1971, 6.0 percent.

II. Quarter 1975, 8.8 percent.

How do we end this Iron Maiden economic pattern of stagflation followed by recession followed by inflation?

The path-breaking Joint Economic Committee Annual Report points the way for the Congress and the President. As we face another economic sag again, it is imperative that:

This time, we avoid the mistakes we have made each time we have fought a slowdown in the past.

This time, we devise a program to revive growth in the short run that does not cripple growth in the long run.

This time, we avoid the demagoguery that has caused Americans to fight each other over dwindling incomes and scarce goods.

This time, we unite behind a strategy for economic growth.

This time, we get the country moving again for good on a path that can give us growth and jobs without inflation.

Each time we have fought recessions in the past, we have done it in the same way, by hyping up "demand." We have printed money; so we could spend more money; we have found ourselves at the end of recession with a larger burden of Federal debt, and a higher number of Federal spending programs.

Each time, the tax, inflation, unemployment, and debt financing burdens on the productive sectors of the economy have been ratcheted upwards; incentives to work, save, and invest have been ratcheted downward, thus creating higher levels of unemployment.

As we have hyped demand, we have strangled supply. The result has been progressively weaker recoveries, each with a higher basic inflation rate, a higher basic unemployment rate, and a lower potential growth rate—Iron Maiden spikes that have increased our pain with every twist and turn. And what is worse, Administrations of both parties have accepted as inevitable the pain that comes from the continued stabbing. We must have a true bipartisan effort so we can do better this time. We must do better this time to avoid higher basic rates of unemployment, high "normal" inflation, deeper recessions, and less successful recoveries.

The JEC Report pleads with the Congress and the President to break out of past short-sighted, self-defeating policies. The short-run recession problem, the long-run inflation and growth problem, and even our chronic international payments problems are all part of the same problem. They can be fought with a consistent set of policies.

¹ Probably rising in II Quarter 1979 to 9 or 10.

² Stuck for the last 9 months in the same range, and about to turn up.

These policies—moderation in fiscal and monetary policy to fight inflation and uncertainty; reduction of tax barriers to saving and investment to improve competitiveness and increase productivity, growth, and employment; better targeted private-sector programs to fight structural unemployment; and a concerted effort to reduce red tape and regulation to promote efficiency and speed economic development—will restore the U.S. economy to long-term health at home and a stronger position abroad.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LLOYD BENTSEN

We're heading into a period of stagflation in this country that will cost hundreds of thousands of Americans their jobs, while doing very little to bring down the cost of living.

Some economists—and these aren't the most pessimistic ones—are forecasting that two million more people will lose their jobs, bringing total unemployment up to eight million; while the rate of inflation will go no lower than 8.5 percent. There obviously is going to be a very substantial increase in unemployment.

Administration spokesmen are shy about using the word "recession," I'm not. We're heading into a recession, hopefully a modest one. Let's look at the evidence to date:

Clearly, gasoline shortages will add substantially to the severity of the recession. We've already seen a 30 percent drop in car sales during the first ten days of June and we know from bitter experience that when the auto industry slumps so do steel and plastics and rubber and many other manufacturing components.

The leading economic indicator dropped by a record 3.3 percent in April. Retail sales were down in both April and May—the first two-month decline since December 77-January 78. The University of Michigan's widely used Index of Consumer Attitudes for May of this year was almost 15 points below the survey for May 1978. After several years of dramatic April employment gains, employment is now 500,000 jobs below the March peak.

In spite of this inflation remains far too high, running at the double-digit annual rate of 13.9 percent for the three months ending in April. The CPI stood 10.4 percent higher in April 1979 than in April of 1978.

Hopefully, with the economy turning down we'll see a reduction in the cost of living rate during coming months but it will continue to be far too high and over the long haul I expect the downturn to have little effect. The built-in inflationary pressures—such as lagging productivity—remain, and as soon as the economy picks up so will the cost of living.

I am firmly convinced that if the American economy is ever to get out of its boom and bust pattern, we must face the facts now. We must embark on a new set of economic policies designed to achieve our long-term economic goals.

It's becoming increasingly evident that we are going to have to have a tax cut next year, with individual tax reductions to give relief to Americans hard-hit by inflation and with other cuts to boost the supply side and help end this continuing cycle of inflation and recession.

The need for cutting taxes in 1980 has been downplayed up to this point, by people both in and outside of government. But the evidence grows daily that we'll need one and we'll need to take some other steps as well.

It is essential that (1) we begin planning early to avoid the mistakes we have made in fighting slowdowns in the past, and (2) we need to devise a program to revive growth in the short run that does not cripple growth in the long run.

In March of this year, the Joint Economic Committee submitted a unified Annual Report to the Congress for the first time in 20

years. It stressed the theme that economic policy must focus on the supply side of the economy—on the capacity of the economy over the long term to increase the standard of living for the average American, to create a job for every American who wants to work and to hold down the cost of living by increasing the goods on the shelves of the Nation's businesses.

These policies: Moderation in fiscal and monetary policy to fight inflation; encouragement of saving and investment to promote employment and productivity; targeted private sector programs to reduce structural unemployment; and reduced red tape and regulation to promote efficiency and to increase the rate of technological innovation; are designed to expand the capacity of our economy to produce more goods and services more cheaply over the long run to effectively combat the major economic ill of our time—stagflation.

The JEC's Midyear Hearings begin this week. Those and subsequent hearings which we will be holding this year will focus on the need to formulate specific policies designed to stimulate a period of long-term sustainable growth. ●

PANAMA CANAL TREATIES—BIG TROUBLE FOR UNCLE SAM

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the House on June 21 passed implementation legislation (H.R. 111) by the close vote of 224 to 202 and failed by only a small margin of 216 to 210 to pass my "honesty amendment" which would have Panama pay the multimillion dollar transfer charges out of its "windfall profits" from tolls instead of the burden being on U.S. taxpayers and consumers.

However, the Senate has yet to act and we will have one more turn at bat when a House-Senate version comes back to the House for final consideration. We can yet carry the day if we remain vigilant since, first, the Senate with the President's urging will no doubt try to make implementation even more costly and liberal than the House version which could erode the small margin of support for the treaties in the House, and second, the continuing exposure of Panama's illegal gun trafficking in the United States and open affiliation with Cuba in support of Marxist revolutionary and terrorist activities in Nicaragua, El Salvador, Guatemala, and other Central American countries could force the Congress to finally concede that Panama is not only unwilling and unable to provide for the "neutrality" of the canal, it is openly provoking conditions of military retaliation against it in violation of terms of the new treaties and therefore decide they should be scrapped.

Prior to the House vote much information became available regarding enormous costs for treaty implementation and Panama's involvement in illegal gun running and fomenting revolution among its Latin American neighbors which is well defined in the following article from the June 23, 1979 issue of Human Events:

HANSEN LEADS OPPOSITION: CANAL TREATIES FACE TOUGH HOUSE TEST

You may have thought the Panama Canal debates were over when the Senate yielded our strategic waterway to Gen. Omar Torrijos over a year ago. But the controversy rages on. And the House this week is likely to face its first major vote on legislation implementing those unpopular pacts. The Administration is so concerned that Rep. George Hansen's (R-Idaho) "Honesty Amendment"—rather than the committee bill (which the President will try to alter in the Senate, but feels he can live with now)—will be approved that it has twice persuaded the Democratic leadership to delay the vote.

The Administration, in the words of the Washington Post, has "pulled out all the stops" to prevent the Hansen amendment from being passed, with President Carter personally making several calls to wavering lawmakers. The White House, the State Department, the Joint Chiefs, former Ambassador W. Averell Harriman, George Meany, Gerald Ford, and Henry Kissinger have been unleashed against Hansen. So has conservative columnist William F. Buckley, and, according to news reports, John Wayne was coaxed into lobbying against the Hansen amendment from his death bed.

Nevertheless, the Hansen amendment—which requires Panama to agree to pay all of the transfer costs before the treaties go into effect—may still carry the day.

Under the amendment, Panama must pay for such things as the physical moving of U.S. military facilities, the costs resulting from early retirement of U.S. personnel, the upkeep for U.S. housing and schools now paid for out of the tolls but which the Administration wants the American taxpayer to pick up directly, etc.

Since Panama accepted the treaties on the grounds it wouldn't have to pay for these costs, the Administration insists Hansen is being unfair and irresponsible, that his changes amount to killing the treaties, and thus sully American honor.

While Hansen is getting grief from the Administration and its allies, the Hansen amendment was actually prompted by President Carter's irresponsible handling of the treaties and the astonishing deceptions employed in selling them. Indeed, the Idaho lawmaker would almost certainly not be putting up such stiff resistance to implementation if the President had played fair with both the Congress and the American people from the outset.

First off, the Administration contended the House had no say over whether the U.S. Canal and the Canal Zone could be transferred to Panama, yet the Constitution is precisely clear on this. Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 states: "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needed rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States." The Congress, of course, means the Senate and the House. But the President has steadfastly insisted that the Senate vote on the treaties legally disposed of U.S. property, and that the House would be "irresponsible" in trying to exercise its constitutional rights on this issue. According to the White House, about the only thing the House is permitted to do is to lay down a few rules governing how the treaties are to be implemented.

What Hansen is also protesting is the Administration's con job in selling the treaties, because it repeatedly pledged that these pacts would not cost the U.S. taxpayer a single cent. Just how enormous the deception was brought out vividly in the minority views of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries which reported out the implementing legislation. Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher testified to the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations panel that the "treaties will not require any appropriations

from the American taxpayer." (Emphasis added.)

Secretary of State Cyrus Vance said in the same hearings: "The treaties require no new appropriations, nor will they add to the burden of the American taxpayer."

President Carter said: "We wanted a treaty that did not put a financial burden on the American taxpayer, and we got it."

But when the House began the markup on the impending legislation, the Administration began to confess that the treaties would, indeed, cost the taxpayer a little something.

First it said that "certain expenses" would cost \$350,000,000, and then, on March 29, just four days before the House Merchant Marine Committee began markup, the department admitted its original estimate was off about \$500,000,000. House foes of the pact, however, say the real cost over a 20-year period will be \$4 billion, and that doesn't include the huge increase in the tolls and the value of the real property and assets we are transferring to Panama.

The General Accounting Office has estimated that moving fixed installations from the present Panama Canal Zone to a greatly reduced area on October 1 will cost about \$400 million. Certain revenue producing facilities, such as restaurants, ship repair and retail stores, will be given to Panama at no charge, thus costing the American taxpayer \$2 billion over the life of the new treaties.

Tolls produced by the Panama Canal Company now pay for U.S. schools, commissaries, hospitals and the like. But these operations are to be transferred to the U.S. Defense Department, thus costing the American taxpayer another \$2 billion or so in annual Defense appropriations.

So angry were Representatives William Carney (R.-N.Y.) and Don Young (R.-Alaska), both members of the Merchant Marine panel, they accused the Administration of engaging in "lies" about the costs.

Representatives Gene Snyder (R.-Ky.), Robert Bauman (R.-Md.) and Walter Jones (D.-N.C.) were more charitable: "The picture which these statistics paint," they wrote, "show that there has been a deliberate effort to deceive the American people regarding the cost of these treaties."

In other words, Hansen is saying the President has no right to trifle so lightly with members of Congress. Since Congress was sold on the pact on the grounds it wouldn't cost a dime, well, says Hansen, his amendment forces the Administration to keep its word.

"Without the Hansen Amendment to H.R. 111," he says, "American citizens will be saddled with taxes and lost revenue of over \$4 billion for transferring the Panama Canal. The Honesty Amendment keeps the promise of the President . . . so that there will be no cost to U.S. taxpayers."

But Hansen is worried about something else as well. Under the terms of the treaties, the government of Panama, beginning October 1, will receive payments from the tolls amounting to anywhere from \$75 million to \$90 million annually, over thirty times what it presently receives from the tolls. And this money will almost certainly enable Panama to increase its revolutionary activities in Central and South America.

That Panama is fomenting leftist revolutions in these areas, including the funneling of aid to the pro-Castro Sandinista guerrillas now trying to impose a Marxist-Leninist regime in Nicaragua, is beyond dispute, and, in fact, has been even trumpeted indiscreetly by Panamanian officials. Consider the evidence:

Before the Panama Canal subcommittee, Lt. Gen. Gordon Sumner, former chairman of the Inter-American Defense Board, who until last year held a senior post concerned with Latin American affairs in the Pentagon, testified that Gen. Torrijos personally informed

him of his efforts to aid the Sandinistas and export revolution elsewhere.

"My personal knowledge of Panama's involvement," said Sumner, "came from a two-hour conversation with Gen. Omar Torrijos in November 1977. He told me then of his intention to support rebellion and insurrection in his neighbor republics."

During his meeting with Torrijos, said Sumner, he brought up charges by President Somoza of Nicaragua that Panama was funneling aid to the Sandinistas, "expecting a full-blown denial. Much to my surprise and chagrin, Gen. Torrijos defended the Sandinistas and his support of their efforts. Further, he stated that he would continue and increase his support."

In addition, said Sumner, Torrijos "strongly defended the opposition that was developing in El Salvador and stated that he, too, would support the insurgents in their efforts to unseat his classmate, Gen. Romero." The entire session was so disturbing that Sumner said he "reduced the salient points to a memorandum which I forwarded to the late Gen. George Brown, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

Appearing before the subcommittee on June 7, Col. James C. Thomas, recently retired from six years duty in the office of Secretary of Defense, with primary responsibility for Latin American affairs, told the lawmakers Panamanian support for terrorists in Nicaragua was an "entirely proper" question to probe, that "it raises some serious questions regarding U.S. security interests at our very doorstep, and that the countries known to be supporting the insurgency should be held accountable. . . . The Administration has long had extensive information indicating Cuban, Panamanian, Costa Rican and, at time, Venezuelan, support for the Sandinistas."

In a "Dear Colleague" letter sent to House members on June 11, Representatives Carroll Hubbard (D.-Ky.), chairman of the Panama Canal subcommittee, and Bob Bauman (R.-Md.), the ranking Republican on the panel, said that when asked to confirm the complicity of Panamanian and Cuban gun-running noted by Sumner and Thomas, Lt. Gen. Dennis P. McAuliffe, presently head of the U.S. Southern Command, "affirmed the existence of such reports and indicated that although they are classified, 'I have seen intelligence reports . . . pertaining to members of the government. . . .'"

Before the Organization of American States last week, the Nicaraguans presented an arsenal of captured weapons, which they said had been smuggled to leftist guerrillas through Panama. "Far from being offended by the allegations," noted an Associated Press dispatch, "Panamanian Ambassador Juan Antonio Tack said Sevilla Sacasa's evidence of Panamanian complicity 'has brought great pride to the Panamanian people.'"

On November 28, 1978, the Associated Press reported that "generally reliable intelligence sources show Panama as a possible conduit for Cuban-financed aid and weapons in the struggle to overthrow the anti-Communist government in Nicaragua."

On May 15, the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida indicted five individuals for illicit gun running, including Jose A. Pujol, Miami cargo manager for Air Panama.

An affidavit given by Special Agent Donald Kimbler of the Federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms strongly indicates that Panamanian intelligence officials directed Pujol and the then Panamanian consul in Miami, Edgardo Lopez, to smuggle arms to the Sandinistas.

According to the affidavit, Pujol, in ordering \$2 million in weapons from the Garcia National Gun Shop in Miami, said he was doing this on behalf of the Panamanian

consul and even contended that the weapons were destined for Nicaraguan guerrillas. Federal agent Kimbler said that "Lopez stated to me that he had been involved in at least seven firearms transactions . . . which involved the purchase of over two hundred firearms to be exported from the United States. Lopez said he had received his instructions from an official of the Panamanian G-2, an intelligence agency of the Republic of Panama."

Before the Panama Canal subcommittee on June 6, Max Kelly, secretary to the President of Nicaragua, pointed out that Nicaraguan customs officials on March 13 and 16 intercepted two vans on the Costa Rica-Nicaraguan border, which among other items, contained a number of M-1 carbines that had been shipped from the Garcia National Gun Shop in Miami.

Both Hubbard and Bauman have said the evidence presented at the hearings was "both shocking and compelling," and believe that Panama is violating the OAS charter and "the letter" of the neutrality treaty.

The Sandinistas, moreover, are not a group fighting for Nicaraguan independence and an end to the supposed tyranny of President Somoza. On the contrary, they are a militant Marxist group that has been nurtured in Cuba.

In a piece for the Washington Post last year, journalist Tad Szulc, after interviewing the Sandinista leaders, wrote: "If they come to power, they said, they would establish a revolutionary state . . . that would expropriate all Somoza property, nationalize natural resources and implant social justice along with the establishment of a 'popular and Democratic army.'"

"The guerrillas left no doubt about their admiration for the Cuban revolution, whose influence is powerful within the movement. . . ."

When President Somoza last year released 59 prisoners at the behest of the Sandinistas, 22 of them went directly to Cuba from Panama.

Even the U.S. State Department admits that the Sandinistas' most critical support has come from Cuba. In a letter dated April 19, 1977, Michel M. Bova, director, Central American Affairs for the department, sent a memorandum on the Sandinistas (the FSLN) to then Rep. Ed Koch (D.-N.Y.), now Gotham's mayor. The guerrilla movement, said Bova, "was founded in Havana in September 1962 by a group of leftist extremists who had been active for some years in revolutionary causes in Nicaragua. Carlos Fonseca Amador, perhaps their most significant leader, was a proponent of Marxist-Leninist theory."

External support has come from Nicaraguans living abroad, the memo continued, "but probably the most important source of external support has been Cuba."

And now Panama has joined with Cuba. Hence the reason those Panama Canal treaties are still in serious trouble. For a lot of lawmakers just can't see their way clear toward turning over our canal to a nation that now appears to be working in tandem with Fidel Castro to topple pro-American nations in this hemisphere. ●

A VOTE AGAINST GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES FOR SYNTHETIC FUELS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I voted no

today because I really believe the choice of whether to go forward with Federal subsidies for synthetic fuel development is really an economic and not a technical one. Coal liquefaction, for example, is not some sort of modern alchemy that can be penetrated by only the most divinely inspired of wizards, backed by a Manhattan-type project. It is a relatively straightforward industrial process that is comparable in complexity to the most modern petroleum refineries. There are certain engineering challenges that have to be overcome. But those challenges are, by all available evidence, no greater than the challenges U.S. industry has been overcoming for decades.

The real risk in synthetic fuel projects is that they will be economic failures. And on that question—the economics of synthetic fuels—the private capital market has made a clear choice:

There is very strong evidence to support the argument that synthetic fuels will not be competitively priced if their commercial development is started today. In fact, the very companies that have received, or are about to receive, Department of Energy contracts on synthetic fuel projects have quite evidently and explicitly made a judgment that synthetic fuel technology is not commercially feasible at the present time. Gulf Oil Co., for example, has published and distributed an economic analysis of a proposed synthetic fuel demonstration facility that shows it cannot produce fuels at the same or lower price than available substitutes.

Mr. Speaker, when the company that knows the most about a process, that has invested a considerable sum of its own money over the past 10 years, and that has access to extremely good data about the potential markets for synthetic fuel products, comes right out and says it is unwilling to invest in the projects as a commercial venture, have we not good reason to pause when the Department of Energy officials urge us to press \$500 million into an oil company's palm as a subsidized inducement to build a synthetic fuels plant?

Gulf, to continue the example, is not some fledgling small business applying for a SBA loan to get an innovative retail store off the ground. We are talking about a company that regularly invests more than \$2 billion per year in capital projects in the United States alone, a company that has earned more than \$5 billion in net profits since the 1973 embargo. They have the resources to fund any kind of synthetic fuel project they want. And if they are unwilling to do so, we should at least consider the possibility that they have some pretty good economic reasons.

Why then does the Department of Energy continue to push for tax-funded subsidies of synthetic fuel development? I believe the answer lies in the disparity between DOE's judgment about what the price of competing fuels will be over

the next 10 to 15 years and the implicit judgment of the private capital market as evidenced by its refusal to fund synthetic fuel projects. The answer is really a simple one:

The Department of Energy has been much slower than the private sector in processing information about changes in the world petroleum supply and demand situation since the 1973 Arab embargo. The world has not stood still in the face of the very large real price increase for oil that took place in 1974. A massive search has been going on all across the world for potential new sources of both conventional and unconventional energy supplies.

There have been net additions to worldwide prices reserves of oil each year for the past 3 years, so that the world actually has larger reserves of oil now than it did just after the embargo. Investments have been attracted to new development areas, some of which show signs of extreme promise. The best example is Mexico, which went from less than 5 billion barrels of proved and probably reserves to 40 billion barrels in just a few years. Other developments of similar magnitude have taken place elsewhere. In Canada, for example, Dome Petroleum Co., Ltd. has been engaged in an extensive exploratory drilling program in the Beaufort Sea region of Arctic Canada. The company now believes that the potential new oil resources in the area may be comparable to another Mexico or even Saudi Arabia.

As for developments of unconventional oil, the prospects of massive new resources are still larger. Imperial Oil Co., Ltd., a Canadian subsidiary of Exxon, has filed plans for a commercial heavy oil extraction plant that will cost \$5 billion and produce up to 250,000 barrels per day of refinable liquid fuel feedstock. Canada could be producing over 1 million barrels per day of synthetic crude by the late 1980's if all current projects are completed on schedule. Experts in the field have claimed that there may be as much as 3 trillion barrels of heavy oil available at prices approximating the current price for crude oil. Much of this heavy oil is located in the Western Hemisphere, in the United States, Canada, and Venezuela.

Tar sands and heavy crude potentially made the Western Hemisphere 3 to 4 times as oil rich as the whole Middle East.

The Office of Technology Assessment estimates that application of enhanced oil recovery technology to older conventional oil producing regions could yield as much as 1 million barrels per day of additional production by the late 1980's at prices equal to current world oil prices. To put the question in perspective, this increment of EOR production would be equal to 8-to-10 full-scale coal liquefaction plants—and produce fuel for perhaps as little as half the cost.

The signs of response to higher world oil prices are all around us, particularly in those parts of the world where artifi-

cial price and allocation controls, have not acted to suppress the normal market forces. I believe the cumulative evidence of production of the past 5 years has made it hard for private investors to make a decision in favor of going to synthetic fuel technologies. Investors look at what has happened in the world—in Mexico, the Beaufort Sea, Indonesian, the South China Sea, heavy oil, oil shale, and widespread development of new conservation technologies—and come to the conclusion that it is going to be a long time before today's proposed highly capital intensive synthetic fuel technologies become commercially viable.

Mr. Speaker, as a proponent of an incentive-oriented approach to energy production, I find it disturbing that in the face of such undeniable facts, the Department of Energy of this administration is still determined to subsidize private corporations and create Government corporations to achieve synthetic fuel development—rather than concentrate on bringing about incentives for the production of the most economically efficient form of energy, as determined by the free capital market. It is the American taxpayer who really assumes the risks of both the lending institutions and the energy corporations that are subsidized. This is really a form of collectivism, not democratic capitalism, where the American taxpayer is carrying the burden for big Government and subsidized big oil, while the small independent energy producer is once again left out in the cold.●

THIRD ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1979

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, recently I was proud to receive an overwhelming response to my third annual questionnaire. The questions were hard—the kind we have to answer almost daily on the floor—and the responses sincere and enlightening. I have attempted to compare this year's answers and opinions with some of those submitted over the past 2 years. There are some significant shifts in important areas.

A grave problem facing the Nation is the finite nature of the world's oil and gas supplies and the growing demand for power and energy throughout the world. They simply will run out in the not too distant future. Many alternate sources are suggested or available, some apparently safe environmentally and others posing potentially grave hazards. Nearly 75 percent expressed a first choice among those alternates with 34 percent favoring solar, 18 percent coal, 13 percent nuclear, 6 percent geothermal, and 2 percent wind. Those replying ranked their preferences on a scale of 1 to 6. I applied a factor of 1 for the most preferred source through 6 for the least preferred, thus establishing a total factor, the lowest

number being the most desirable. The overall preference rating was:

Solar	140
Coal	179
Nuclear	196
Geothermal	204
Wind	221

Support of nuclear energy appears to have diminished over the past year. Fifty-nine percent agree with those who maintain that development of same should be curtailed until perfectly safe methods of production and waste disposal are developed, while 36 percent disagree. Sixty-five percent agree that States should have the right to veto the construction of a Federal nuclear waste storage facility in that State while 30 percent disagree.

The nuclear question was posed shortly after the Three Mile Island incident, I should note.

In contrast, in 1978 I asked if my constituents felt that "more nuclear power plants should be built right now." The result:

Strongly agree—48 percent.
Mildly agree—20 percent.
Mildly disagree—8 percent.
Strongly disagree—15 percent.

In 1977, a similar question found that 52 percent favored increased nuclear development and 6 percent said "no."

Finally, this year I posed the question: "Do you agree with those who maintain that the United States should place a greater priority on the development of energy and power sources and less emphasis on preserving the environment?" The result:

Strongly agree—35 percent.
Mildly agree—20 percent.
Mildly disagree—18 percent.
Strongly disagree—24 percent.

In 1977 I asked a similar question with regard to conversion to increased coal usage:

Strongly agree—29 percent.
Mildly agree—30 percent.
Mildly disagree—14 percent.
Strongly disagree—20 percent.

Rising costs, prices, and Government expenditures are with us daily and are eating at the basic fiber of American life and spirit.

The Federal budget poses one constant source of debate and dilemma. I suggested a target date of fiscal 1983—adopted in 1982—for balancing the budget and 79 percent approved of that target, 14 percent disagreed, and 7 percent did not answer.

When asked to suggest which budget categories should be cut, many people selected more than one. The following is a list in descending order of categories suggested for cuts with the percentage of respondents favoring a cut therein:

Foreign aid.....	63
National defense.....	33
Income security.....	27
Highway and mass transit.....	25
Education.....	25
Veteran's benefits.....	21
Natural resources.....	20
Health.....	15
Energy.....	11

In 1977 the first choice for cutbacks was income security followed closely by unemployment insurance and national defense.

I then posed the question of which level of Government should assume the responsibility of funding programs cut-back on the Federal level if those programs are to exist; 21 percent chose State government and 52 percent chose local government.

Various other attacks on inflation have been suggested and I advanced a few of them for comment. Mandatory price controls brought a favorable response from 61 percent, while only 21 percent were opposed. Wage controls were favored by a 49 to 28 percent margin, while only 19 percent favored the voluntary system and 12 percent leaned toward no controls at all.

In 1978 a similar question found 29 percent in favor of both wage and price controls and 52 percent opposed. Forty-eight percent favored price controls on key commodities and 39 percent were opposed.

Several alternatives were presented concerning health costs and care. They are general and were posed before the most recent Carter health plan was announced.

A "Kennedy-type plan" was approved of by 37 percent to 33 percent, with 30 percent abstaining.

A "Carter-type plan" was approved by 34 percent to 29 percent with 37 percent not certain.

This area of concern showed the greatest uncertainty of any polled, as it did over the last 2 years.

In a series of questions concerning cancer, the environment and searches for a cancer cure—55 percent favored greater industrial and environmental controls and improvements, 20 percent said "no" and 25 percent did not respond.

Fifty-seven percent support increased research for a disease—viral or bacterial—cause of cancer while 17 percent said "no", with the remaining 26 percent being undecided.

Significantly, only 11 percent favor maintaining the current levels of expenditures and research.

Soon to be before the Congress are various approaches to the system of furnishing manpower for our Armed Forces.

When faced with the question of approving or disapproving various alternatives concerning selective service and Government service the responses were varied and most showed a good deal of indecision:

(a) Completely restoring the old lottery system:	
Yes, 21 percent.	
No, 37 percent.	
No answer, 42 percent.	
(b) Funding registration of youths at age 18:	
Yes, 33 percent.	
No, 24 percent.	
No answer, 43 percent.	

(c) Universal training—mandatory service for all citizens at some age in some aspect of government service:

Yes, 47 percent.
No, 23 percent.
No answer, 30 percent.

(d) The current "Volunteer" system or a variation thereof:

Yes, 37 percent.
No, 24 percent.
No answer, 39 percent.

Recently there have been moves in several States to hold a constitutional convention to discuss proposed changes in the Federal Constitution. Some proponents of such a convention desire to limit the purpose to one or more specific subjects.

In addition, various public interest groups are advocating single amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

I posed the question of whether a convention should be held and also sought opinions as to which proposed amendments are acceptable or preferable:

(a) Approval of a Constitutional Convention:	
Yes, 38 percent.	
No, 50 percent.	
No answer, 12 percent.	
(b) Equal Rights Amendment:	
Yes, 53 percent.	
No, 33 percent.	
No answer, 14 percent.	
(c) Right to Life Amendment:	
Yes, 25 percent.	
No, 59 percent.	
No answer, 15 percent.	
(d) Balanced Federal Budget (no target date):	
Yes, 61 percent.	
No, 26 percent.	
No answer, 14 percent.	
(e) Outlawing forced busing for educational integration:	
Yes, 68 percent.	
No, 25 percent.	
No answer, 8 percent.	

In 1977, 73 percent favored a balanced budget while in 1978, 60 percent favored same even if lower benefits or higher taxes resulted.

The questionnaire contained several questions concerning abortion and as to whether it should be:

(a) Never permissible or legal:	
Yes, 10 percent.	
No, 65 percent.	
No answer, 25 percent.	
(b) Permitted upon demand:	
Yes, 57 percent.	
No, 28 percent.	
No answer, 15 percent.	
(c) Permitted when life/health of mother or fetus in danger:	
Yes, 79 percent.	
No, 4 percent.	
No answer, 17 percent.	
(d) Permitted in cases of rape or incest:	
Yes, 78 percent.	
No, 7 percent.	
No answer, 16 percent.	

President Carter and the Senate have been involved in several areas of foreign policy during the past 2½ years, some extremely controversial.

I posed several foreign policy questions, as follow verbatim, asking whether

my constituents approved of the actions or possible actions:

(a) The Panama Canal Treaties, which turn over the Canal Zone to the Panamanian government over a period of time:

Yes, 51 percent.
No, 41 percent.
No answer, 8 percent.

(b) The normalization of relations with Mainland China and the cancellation of our treaty with the Taiwan government:

Yes, 57 percent.
No, 33 percent.
No answer, 10 percent.

(c) Normalization of relations with Castro's Cuba:

Yes, 50 percent.
No, 42 percent.
No answer, 8 percent.

(d) A less firm attitude with the Mexican Government regarding the movement of drugs and illegal aliens into this country because of our desire for oil and natural gas:

Yes, 22 percent.
No, 70 percent.
No answer, 8 percent.

(e) Agreement with the Soviet Union on

the limitation of weapons: (This was asked before the signing of SALT II)

Yes, 71 percent.
No, 22 percent.
No answer, 8 percent.

(f) The Peace Treaty between Israel and Egypt:

Yes, 83 percent.
No, 11 percent.
No answer, 6 percent.

I thank all those who took time to let me know their thoughts and for playing a role in their Government.●

SENATE—Wednesday, June 27, 1979

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 21, 1979)

The Senate met at 12 noon, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. DAVID L. BOREN, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God before whom the generations rise and pass away, we thank Thee for making the diverse peoples of this land "one nation under God." As with rituals of memory and patriotic ceremonies we recall the valiant fighters and the wise political philosophers providentially present at the birth of this Nation, so we ask that we may be born again to their vision of human dignity, decency, industry, reliability, and national purpose. Show us once more that freedom is never free, but must be won and preserved in every generation. May the spiritual impulses of the Founding Fathers arise anew in us that we may be a servant people to all mankind.

Be with all who are Members of this body or serve it in any way. May goodness and mercy attend us that we may abide in Thee forever. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. MAGNUSON).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1979.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID L. BOREN, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, to perform the duties of the Chair.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BOREN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the majority leader is recognized.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I have no requests for time. I will reserve my time or yield some of it to the minority leader, if he desires.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the minority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader.

I have no need for additional time.

THE SALT II TREATY

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, today I called a press conference to announce that I shall oppose the SALT Treaty. I did so with regret, for I had hoped that a treaty I felt was inadequate could be improved and strengthened and be made acceptable.

I have expressed my willingness to work toward that end if I received some assurance that those efforts would be favorably received. I talked at great length with President Carter and the administration has not expressed a willingness to consider amendments.

In a statement by Foreign Minister Gromyko on Monday, the Soviet Government is saying that the U.S. Senate and the American people are faced with a "take it or leave it" treaty and threatening dire consequences if the treaty is amended or rejected.

I am disappointed by the administration's apparent position, and I am not

impressed by the Soviet position. Therefore, I wish to announce today that until the administration demonstrates a willingness to accept reasonable amendments—and until the Soviet Government demonstrates a willingness to consider them—I plan no further efforts to try to improve this treaty, and I plan to vote against it.

If I perceive a different point of view, a different attitude later, then I am willing—and in fact I would be anxious—to resume those efforts. But it seems counterproductive to proceed further at this time.

In the best light, this treaty is not favorable to the United States, and at the least, it is inequitable in that it provides a substantial strategic superiority to the Soviet Union.

The treaty is vague where clarity is required. It rests on faith where hard evidence is essential.

And most important of all may be the signal it sends, not only to the Soviet Union but the rest of the world, that the United States is willing to accept this status quo: a questionable American strategic adequacy born of a decade of vast Soviet military growth coupled with a gradual diminution of American strength.

I believe in the strategic arms limitation continuum. I voted for SALT I, in the belief it was a first step toward bringing equality to the strategic forces of the two countries.

I supported the agreements arrived at in Vladivostok. While they were not perfect, they were, I thought, another step in the right direction.

I would like to support SALT II—and III, and IV, and V, until we have reduced substantially the threat of nuclear war.

The question should not be whether we support a SALT Treaty, but whether we support this SALT Treaty. I do not and I cannot, without amendments. If the administration does not signal a willingness to consider amendments, and if the Soviet Government does not stop threatening the Senate, then I shall work diligently and, I trust, effectively to defeat this treaty.

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