

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION?
THE FACTS SAY "NO"

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Phi Delta Kappa magazine, September 1979, reports some findings from "The Condition of Education: 1979 Edition," the annual report of the National Center for Education Statistics. According to this survey, public confidence in the people who run the Nation's schools is the lowest in 6 years; 64 percent of 17-year-olds devote less than 5 hours to homework each week; current expenditures of public school systems have more than tripled since 1957, even when adjusted for inflation.

A recent interview with the head of the National Education Association (NEA) suggests that the decline in American education is now in its critical stage. Teachers are quitting because of classroom violence and public apathy, states William H. McGuire, president of NEA.

U.S. News and World Report, in its September 10, 1979, issue, reports calls to upgrade education are reaching a fever pitch reflecting wide discontent—and promising change in America's classrooms.

The proposed Department of Education will not solve any of the problems that have brought about this discontent. In fact the opposite is true: It is precisely the kind of Federal bureaucratic interference represented by the Department of Education that has contributed to the decline of the public school system. The best thing that could happen for American children is for the Department of Education to be forgotten.

At this time I wish to insert in the RECORD "Condition of Education: 1979 Reports Significant Trends" as published in Phi Delta Kappa, September 1979; "Classroom Violence and Public Apathy: Two Reasons Why Teachers Are Quitting in Droves," from People Magazine, September 10, 1979; and "Give Us Better Schools," U.S. News and World Report, September 10, 1979.

The articles follow:

CONDITION OF EDUCATION: 1979 REPORTS
SIGNIFICANT TRENDS

What's the condition of education in 1979? The Condition of Education: 1979 Edition, the annual report of the National Center for Education Statistics, offers the best answer available in one volume.

This year's effort, continuing the same high quality of the series since its inception several years ago, reports that:

Public confidence in the people who run the nation's education system has fallen to its lowest point in six years. Only 28 percent said they had "a great deal of confidence" in 1978. It was 37 percent in 1973 and 49 per-

cent in 1974. The percentage who had "hardly any confidence" increased sharply—from 9 percent in 1977 to 15 percent in 1978.

The average salary for classroom teachers was \$14,995 in 1977, and the projected salary for 1979 was \$15,575 (in 1977 dollars).

Parents overwhelmingly respond negatively when asked about the effect of the one-parent family on the education of children. Sixty-three percent see single parenthood as adversely affecting education.

The percentage of children living with both parents has declined among both whites and blacks since 1960. In 1977, 53 percent of black children and 15 percent of white children were living with only one parent.

Since 1969 college graduates have faced increased competition for higher-status white-collar employment. Less than half of the college graduates who joined the labor force between 1969 and 1976 entered professional or technical work.

Sixty-four percent of 17-year-olds devote less than five hours to homework each week.

Since 1950 the percent of youth enrolled in school has increased, and the proportion enrolled in grades lower than normal for their age has decreased sharply. In 1950, 26 percent of 15-year-olds were enrolled in lower-than-normal grades; in 1976 the figure was only 9 percent, showing that social promotions are much more common now.

More than two-thirds of the public believe examinations should be used to determine grade promotion.

Of the 36 states developing minimum competency tests, less than half plan to use the examinations as a requirement for high school graduation.

College graduates earn at least 30 percent more annually than high school graduates with no college experience. Ten years ago, however, college graduates earned 50 percent more.

Fifty-one percent of the public believed in 1978 that too little is spent on education and health and too much on welfare and foreign aid/defense.

Since 1942 state and federal shares of public school revenues have been increasing, while the local share has decreased by almost 20 percent.

The percent of successful school bond elections increased to 55 in 1977, up from only 46 percent in 1975. In 1967, however, the success rate was 65 percent. The number of elections decreased from 1,625 in 1967 to 858 in 1977, and the total value of the issues approved decreased from \$2.1 billion in 1967 to \$1.3 billion in 1977.

Current expenditures of public school systems have more than tripled since 1957, even when adjusted for inflation.

Median per-pupil expenditure in the nation in 1977 was \$1,278. Highest-spending states: Alaska, \$8,049; Wyoming, \$1,601; New York, \$1,591. Lowest-spending states: Tennessee, \$766; Kentucky, \$821; South Carolina, \$833; Mississippi, \$840.

Single copies of the report are available without charge from the Publications Division of NCES. Phone 202/245-8511. For more than one copy, order from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, and ask for stock number 017-080-02008-4. You may send a check or be billed. Price: \$7 per copy.

CLASSROOM VIOLENCE AND PUBLIC APATHY:
TWO REASONS WHY TEACHERS ARE QUITTING
IN DROVES

As Willard H. McGuire took over as president of the 1.8 million-member National

Education Association last week, teachers were out picketing for better pay and benefits in eight states. It was not an auspicious beginning for the school year. McGuire, a 51-year-old junior high algebra and Spanish teacher from Long Prairie, Minn. (and for the past five years vice-president of the NEA), enjoyed hearing from old friend Fritz Mondale: "Finally a vice-president from Minnesota has become a president!" Aside from that moment of levity, McGuire foresaw many problems in the nation's school system, caused by plummeting teacher morale. He knows the problems first-hand. Born the son of a shoe repairman he was high school class valedictorian, graduated from Macalester College in St. Paul and got an M.Ed. before putting in 24 years in the classroom.

"I didn't win any student polls," he admits, "but early on they dedicated a year-book to me." In the 1950s concern for working conditions and quality education made him an activist in the local teachers' association ("I guess I wanted to have a hand in my destiny"). Now on leave from his school district, McGuire lives in Arlington, Va. with wife Helen, 50, a high school sweetheart, and daughter Lynn, 17. There he discussed with Barbara Rowes of PEOPLE the growing malady of "teacher burn-out," a problem he believes "threatens to reach hurricane force if it isn't checked soon."

What is "teacher burn-out"?

I'm talking about the stress, tension and anxiety which is driving teachers out of the field. A third of them, according to an NEA survey, would not enter teaching if they were starting their careers again.

What causes such widespread teacher dissatisfaction?

Thousands are in desperate need of help. They can't sleep, often feel depressed and are physically run-down. Basically the problems stem from teachers' not knowing how to cope with violence, vandalism, disruptive students, inadequate salaries, involuntary transfers, oversized classes, excessive paperwork, standardized tests and the lack of support from school administrators and community groups.

How serious is student violence?

More than 110,000 teachers—or one in 20—were physically attacked by students last year. Only half the teachers who reported attacks against them were satisfied with support from administrators, many of whom refuse to report violent incidents for fear of tarnishing the school's reputation.

How does this differ from classroom mischief of the past?

Pranks have been part and parcel of the school scene for centuries. But today we're dealing with hard crime: assaults, murders, robberies, extortion and rampant vandalism. Some teachers have begun to evidence psychological symptoms similar to "combat neurosis." Often they face real danger. A dramatic example of this took place in Austin, Texas. A bright 14-year-old student came to school with a rifle and shot one of his teachers to death in front of his horrified classmates. The boy is now in a mental institution.

How has the nature of school vandalism changed?

A generation ago a window might accidentally get broken during a ball game. But today school authorities often return one morning to find literally hundreds of windows broken. This is high-cost destruction. In addition, more than 25 percent of the teachers in this country suffered damage to

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

or loss of personal property in their schools during the year.

In general, how are relations between students and teachers?

In the past there was almost an unquestioning attitude on the part of the students. When I was growing up in Minnesota, there was a healthy respect for education and educators. Education was the foundation of our republic, the key to upward mobility. The teacher was right. The school was right. That probably was going too far, but today that respect is dying or already dead. As many as 75 percent of teachers now say that discipline is their No. 1 problem.

Why is there a decline in authority?

Virtually all institutions are being questioned by the public. Schools are of course not immune. They have been the subjects of the same criticism and lack of trust. And students, who are raised in this environment, pick up on this. The genesis of all of it is frustration, frustration at school, frustration with life and society. It can find expression in lighting a fire in a wastepaper basket or stealing expensive equipment from the classroom.

How do most students react when a confrontation occurs?

A decade ago peer pressure was always on the side of the teacher when a disruption broke out in the classroom. Today that peer pressure has shifted to the side of the disruptive student.

Is violence largely the problem of inner-city schools?

No. That's an important point. The blackboard jungle of the 1950s is everywhere in the 1970s—rural, suburban, urban, even in the highest-income communities. Last Christmas vacation, in fact, it happened right here in Fairfax County when two students and a recent grad set fire to a high school, causing \$4.5 million worth of damage. Even after they were released on bond, one of them was involved in a second incident. At night, he and some others spun their car wheels on the assistant principal's lawn and did other damage to his property. This was in one of the better school districts in this country!

How are teachers coping with drugs in the schools?

There is no pat way to handle it. Not only is the teacher unsure about what to do, but society in general is unsure. Experimentation with marijuana often begins in grades four, five and six. The difficulty is that the teacher has to make very quick judgments about what to do when she smells students smoking marijuana in the bathroom or the hallways. It would be deceptively easy to believe that all the teacher has to do is remove those students who are high. Each school employee along the line has a problem. The principal has a problem, because he or she needs support from the community and law enforcement and perhaps isn't getting it. What we find is a new ball game, where the various players don't know what the others are going to do. That leads to a very uneasy situation.

What is different about this generation of students?

A generation ago we had a high dropout rate in high schools—only 50 percent of students stayed in through the age of 17. Now we have a retention rate of at least 85 percent—and in many cases better than that. This means that problem students who previously dropped out are now being kept in school. In general, I do believe this benefits society in the long run, but in the short run the size of classes has increased, giving the teacher less time to interact with the students.

Why are thousands deserting the public schools, like the former Florida "Teacher of the Year" who is quitting in frustration after 18 years?

Any ill that society discovers, it now turns over to the schools. In addition to teaching students to read, write and do arithmetic computations, there have been increasing pressures to meet other needs—driver training, family education, vocational guidance, life adjustment, drug education, needs of the handicapped. The burden of filling out forms and other paperwork falls on the classroom teacher, who now has to meet deadlines for local, state and national records as well as prepare lessons and teach. Many teachers think it's just not worth it, and are looking for other ways to earn a living.

Is job security a problem?

There were heavy layoffs in the early 1970s. Today the greatest insecurities arise around tax cut legislation. As late as last month, some teachers didn't know if they had a job for this school year. In many cases they resigned rather than wait around until the last minute.

Have salaries improved?

The high point in real income for teachers was 1969-71. From the time of the 1971 wage-price freeze, teachers have been losing ground. In at least eight states we actually have teachers on food stamps. Teachers have even had to buy their own supplies and paper for the classroom.

How can we rehabilitate the profession?

First we must admit we have a problem. That is the most difficult part—getting the community to acknowledge the problems of violence, vandalism, teacher stress and now burn-out.

What is the NEA specifically doing to improve the situation?

We had such an overwhelming demand from teachers for instruction about discipline that we have started discipline workshops throughout the country. We have even prepared a "discipline kit" to sensitize the communities to the problems in the schools. These are being sent out to all of our nearly 10,000 local associations. In Colorado, a new law requests administrators to report attacks on teachers to law enforcement agencies. That state also is planning a hot line so teachers can get immediate counseling—something we'd like to see done across the country.

Does teaching have a future?

We have a sense of mission which I did not detect some years ago. I am very optimistic that there will be a tomorrow.

KIDS, TEACHERS AND PARENTS: "GIVE US BETTER SCHOOLS"

Calls to upgrade education are reaching fever pitch, reflecting wide discontent—and promising change in America's classrooms.

Shocked by the deterioration of U.S. schools, millions of Americans are demanding rapid improvement in every aspect of education as a new term opens.

The taxpaying public, its nerves rubbed raw by the steep decline in educational standards during the last decade, is suddenly belligerent—no longer willing to support lax school performance.

The message is clear: Americans want the 46 million students enrolling this fall to get better value in return for a record 80 billion dollars in public-school funds budgeted for 1979-80.

Parents are demanding a wide range of changes—from tests of teacher competency to better textbooks.

Teachers want more discipline in the many schools where young vandals and thugs run riot. They also seek higher salaries for their efforts.

Students are calling for more-effective courses to equip them better for jobs and colleges.

Because of these demands, changes already are under way. "Alternative schools," catering to the special needs of individual stu-

dents, are on the rise. Private schools where traditional values predominate are increasingly popular. Parents are assuming more power in school affairs.

Many taxpayers are particularly worried about deteriorating academic quality among students and teachers alike, turmoil over busing for racial balance and teacher militancy that is showing up in strikes from Pennsylvania to Oklahoma.

There is also uncertainty about the prospect of a new federal department of education and the impact of tight budgets and declining enrollments.

TURNING POINT

Most educators agree that by any measure this will be a pivotal year for American education. Observes Virginia Sparling of Bellevue, Wash., newly installed president of the National PTA: "U.S. schools educate more people to a higher level than any other nation, but they face compelling problems that must be solved if free public education is to survive."

Ernest L. Boyer, who recently stepped down as U.S. commissioner of education, notes that 25 percent of students leave high school before graduation, a dropout rate he calls "a national disgrace." He adds:

"The mood in many schools is one of hostility. Students sense a great gap between their own goals and the goals of the institution. Much of what is taught in school is relevant—but much is not."

Teachers, too, complain that the climate in many schools is not designed for learning. One fifth of all senior high schools report five or more crimes each month. Eleven percent of junior-high and high-school students have something stolen every month.

Leaders of teacher groups complain of "teacher burnout" under such conditions. Thousands of teachers, particularly those with long service, are leaving the field because of the excessive mental and physical stresses imposed by today's classrooms.

"Violence and vandalism are problems that were not there 20 years ago," says Willard H. McGuire, president of the National Education Association. So disgruntled were teachers last school year that they called 160 strikes and walkouts, closing schools for millions.

FALLING SCORES

Most disheartening to many is the falloff in achievement levels. Since 1965, Scholastic Aptitude Test scores have declined steadily, dropping roughly 11 percent nationally for an average student. An estimated 13 percent of all high-school graduates are functional illiterates—unable to read and write well enough to get along. Some book publishers have revised high-school texts to the sixth-grade level of comprehension.

Efforts to set up competency standards for students—an idea designed to raise academic bench marks—now are being cited as reducing academic performance. Contends John C. Sawhill, president of New York University: "In their attempt to correct social inequities, schools are often setting standards as low as to be meaningless and even detrimental."

Sawhill and others believe that schools have been asked to do too much to solve the nation's social problems. They note that the long-sought goal of equality of educational opportunity is now within reach for all—the handicapped, the culturally and economically disadvantaged, racial minorities and women. However, educators also suggest that these gains in access may have been bought at the price of quality for all.

Increasingly, middle-aged parents are reacting to such changes by putting their children in private or select public schools, or by turning to low-cost denominational schools.

The result, asserts Milton Bins of the Council of Great City Schools, is a "stratified school society" in which urban schools are populated by the poorest and most deprived

students. In nearly all major cities, black, Hispanic and other minority students comprise more than 60 percent of the total public-school enrollment.

Many educators agree that financial problems are at the heart of most problems in the classrooms. As the chart on page 31 shows, there are fewer and fewer students to teach, yet built-in instructional costs allow no letup in the rise of school budgets.

Explains Boyer: "If you have 35 children in first grade this year, and only 29 children next fall, you still need a teacher, you need to heat the classroom, you need the same equipment."

TAX RESENTMENTS

That does not appease today's antispending, antigovernment public, particularly in states with tax-limitation proposals.

Local property taxes—for decades the chief support of public schools—are the least fair and most hated form of tax, say advocates of Proposition 13-type proposals. They also note that property-poor areas must tax themselves at a higher rate to generate the same tax dollars as their property-rich neighbors.

Moreover, declining birth rates mean more childless families with little direct stake in schools, thus adding to taxpayer resentment—and a tendency, in many areas, to fight school taxes.

Efforts to reform school finances to equalize per-pupil spending have only shifted the burden away from local levels to the states, officials point out.

In California, the state's share of school costs has jumped to 80 percent from 46 percent two years ago—partly the result of the Proposition 13 vote.

Now California may lead the way in a voucher plan known as "Family Choice." The proposed voucher system would make scholarships equal to 90 percent of tuition available to every student and applicable at either a public or private school. The question is likely to be voted on next June.

Public-school administrators shudder at the idea, and teacher groups contend that vouchers would signal the death of public education. Proponents assert that competition would improve public schools and student choices.

AID OUTLOOK

Will the federal government come to the aid of local schools that are financially oppressed? Few officials expect a massive increase in federal funding, but they do look for more funding for specific programs—such as basic-skills development, bilingual education and aid to the handicapped.

Legislation creating a federal education department is not expected to be enacted until October, and even then the vote in Congress will be close. If approved, the department may not be organized until March.

Despite rising public disgruntlement with schools, there is some cause for optimism. Parents are taking a more active role in education, challenging school-board policies, teacher competency and budget priorities.

Another hopeful sign is that attention is being given in many school systems to courses tailored to individuals. Alternative schools have brought a wider range of educational options to students in thousands of public-school district around the country.

Many educators also are convinced that the decline in achievement may be ebbing. Test scores have bottomed out in the last two years, and may be poised for a jump upward.

Elementary-grade children are doing better than children of comparable age did in the mid-1960s. Reading and math scores among junior-high-school students have crept upward in recent assessments.

Mary Berry, U.S. assistant secretary for education, says more families are aware that education is a shared enterprise between home and school. "If we do not discipline

kids at home, they cannot be disciplined in school. Learning cannot take place without discipline," she says.

Teachers, defending their record, also point out that American education succeeds far better than school systems in most other nations. From infancy, Americans have learning opportunities rarely available elsewhere.

Educators realize, however, that schools are now on notice as never before to improve, and that this will be a crucial year in deciding whether they will succeed, or merely survive.●

FELLOWSHIP OF CHRISTIAN ATHLETES BRINGS PRO GOLF TOUR TO FAIRFAX

HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, normally a professional golf tournament is not the type of activity that deserves recognition on the floor of the House. But there is a very special golf tournament scheduled for Monday, September 10, at the Country Club of Fairfax, in the district which I represent, which I believe deserves special recognition. The tournament is being held on behalf of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes which works with some 22,000 young people around the country teaching them athletics and the value of living in a Christian manner.

The organization sponsors summer camps throughout the country and has chapters in many of our Nation's schools and colleges. Thousands of professional athletes donate their time to this organization, including Dallas Cowboy's quarterback Roger Staubach, Miami Dolphin's quarterback Bob Griese, and former Baltimore Oriole's baseball great, Brooks Robinson.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud that this organization has decided to hold its first national Pro-Am tournament in this area. And the Country Club of Fairfax is to be commended for donating the club's facilities for the tournament. I would especially like to commend the hundreds of members of the club for performing voluntary services to help run the tournament.

Some 30 of the top names of the Pro Golf Association will take part in Monday's tournament and many of them have donated their services. The pros will be headed by Larry Nelson who is No. 2 on the PGA money winning list this year. Among other pro competitors will be Andy Bean, Gil Morgan, J. C. Snead, Leonard Thompson, Curtis Strange, Gibby Gilbert, Wayne Levi and two outstanding golfers from this area, Lee Elder from Washington and Jim Thorpe from Falls Church.

The tournament has special congressional significance because the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) who is a member of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes will be the featured banquet speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this will be an outstanding golf tournament and I can recommend it highly to anyone who wants to

see good golf and at the same time help thousands of kids throughout the country.●

MR. C. R. SMITH EXHIBIT AT UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues who served in the House during the late 1960's, along with the Members familiar with the history of aviation, are familiar with Mr. C. R. Smith.

Mr. Smith headed American Airlines for several years and served as Secretary of Commerce in 1968-69. He has been considered a leader and a pioneer in the aviation field. C. R. Smith is a distinguished alumnus of the University of Texas at Austin. In his honor, the university has recently opened an exhibit of his memorabilia.

Now living in Washington, C. R. Smith is enjoying retirement, after a long and distinguished career in aviation, business, and government service. The attached news release from the University of Texas mentions the exhibit and reviews the career of this fine American:

NEWS RELEASE FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

AUSTIN, TEX.—The University of Texas has placed on permanent exhibit some of the notable awards and other memorabilia marking the career of C. R. Smith, a UT alumnus who is considered to be a legend in the development of U.S. commercial and military air transportation.

The materials are housed in a special alcove of the Reserve Reading Room (2,500) of UT's main library, the Perry-Castaneda Library.

Mr. Smith headed American Airlines for many years, was deputy commander of the U.S. Army Air Force's worldwide Air Transport Command in World War II and served as President Lyndon B. Johnson's Secretary of Commerce in 1968-69.

Now retired, he makes his home in Washington, D.C. He attended the University from 1921 through 1924 and was named a "distinguished alumnus" by the UT Ex-Students' Association in 1963.

Among mementos in the new UT display are trophies, medals, citations, photographs and other materials attesting to Mr. Smith's accomplishments in civil and military aviation, business and government.

Included are the 1970 Wright Brothers Memorial Trophy, given by the National Aeronautic Association "for significant public service of enduring value to aviation in the U.S.;" the 1977 Daniel Guggenheim Medal "for great achievement in aeronautics;" the 1961 General William E. Mitchell Award; the 1974 Aviation Hall of Fame citation; the 1976 Hall of Fame for Business Leadership citation given by the editors of Fortune magazine, and an array of military decorations including the U.S. Army Air Force's Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit and Air Medal, and, from Great Britain, the Honorary Commander, Order of the British Empire.

The UT ex-student also is shown in photographs with three U.S. Presidents—with Franklin D. Roosevelt during a conference in Hawaii, with John F. Kennedy at a rededication ceremony of Chicago's O'Hare Field and with Lyndon B. Johnson when Mr. Smith was sworn in as Commerce Secretary.

His first pilot's license is on view, as well as his membership certificate in the Hump Pilots Association, which was made up of World War II air transport pilots who flew over the Himalayan "hump" to provide defense supplies to China.

On many occasions Mr. Smith has been a benefactor of his alma mater. He has donated many volumes of Western Americana to the University library. The University also is the repository of the C. R. Smith Collection of Western Art, a valued collection numbering about 80 paintings, drawings, sculptures and reproductions by some of the most noted artists of the American West.

Seven works from the Smith art collection will be shown in the Perry-Castaneda Library on the wall adjoining the alcove where his memorabilia is exhibited.

The UT Art Museum plans to place the Smith art collection on permanent exhibit this fall on the second level of the Michener Gallery (located in the Harry Ransom Center at 21st and Guadalupe) ●

THIRD ANNUAL DAVE BARBER CELEBRITY GOLF TOURNAMENT FOR DIABETES

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to draw the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an event being held on September 9 in Flint, Mich., which is a growing and significant benefit for diabetics in the Seventh Congressional District. The event is the Third Annual Dave Barber Celebrity Golf Tournament for Diabetes, and it will be held in conjunction with a banquet at the Flint Elks Club golf course. The money raised by the tournament is retained in the community to fight the disease of diabetes there by the Michigan affiliate chapter in Flint of the American Diabetes Association.

The tournament was founded 2 years ago by Dave Barber, a popular and well-known radio personality with Flint radio station WTRX. Through Mr. Barber's imagination, hard work, and strong commitment to public service, the golf tournament has grown this year to become one of the largest and most successful benefits of its kind in Michigan. Participating this year will be 15 touring professional golfers, who will compete for prize money in a special professional division, as well as about 275 amateur golfers of varying abilities and backgrounds who all share a desire to assist in raising money to fight diabetes. More than 500 patrons are expected for the 6-hour banquet.

Dave Barber is to be highly commended for the great contributions derived from his golf tournament in raising money and in increasing public awareness of the danger and prevalence of diabetes. The disease is the third major killer in the Nation. It is estimated that there are 23,000 diabetics, detected and undetected, living in the Seventh Congressional District. Mr. Barber's assistance in the fight against this disease in the Flint area is of inestimable value. ●

NEW YORK TIMES SERIES ON VIETNAM

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as one who recently returned from a study mission to Vietnam, I read with great interest a series of articles about that country by Seymour M. Hersh of the New York Times.

In these articles he shared the insights and observations of one of our country's finest reporters. The result is a series of dispatches that should be read by all Members of this House.

The first three in his series appeared in yesterday's RECORD and today I am inserting the remaining reports. I commend them to the attention of all our colleagues:

[From The New York Times, Aug. 10, 1979]

BLACK MARKET MAKES HO CHI MINH CITY RUN

(By Seymour M. Hersh)

WASHINGTON.—Four years after the Communist victory, Ho Chi Minh City, renamed for the father of the Vietnamese revolution, has emerged as one of the black market capitals of Southeast Asia.

During a three-day visit to Ho Chi Minh City last week, it seemed clear that the Government of Vietnam is unchallenged otherwise in its control of the life of the city, whose prewar population of about three and a half million was considered predominantly non-Communist or anti-Communist.

Virtually all of old Saigon's private shops and restaurants are shuttered, with only their fading and torn signs providing reminders of the past. The nightclubs and girlie bars are long gone. The air-conditioned office buildings that once housed American and South Vietnamese military missions serve as Government offices. The well-appointed downtown hotels have been converted to drab guest houses run by the Government for foreign visitors.

Ho Chi Minh City is not a happy place, many Vietnamese officials reluctantly acknowledge. Hundreds of thousands have fled the metropolis and the country, thousands more were forced to leave, and thousands more want to leave.

TWO MILLION RESIDENTS?

One Western resident estimated the city's current population at slightly more than two million—one million less than official estimates—and said that half of those who remain want to flee.

To the peasants who fled to Saigon to escape the bombings and terror of the war in the country side, the new Communist Government seems far more welcome. It is that group, many of whom have been relocated to "new economic zones" and state farms in the countryside, on which Communist Vietnam is depending for the future.

There is a heavy emphasis on mass education and ending illiteracy. Some four million could not read or write in the South in 1975. And the mass education program has the added advantage for the Government of serving to re-educate the nation's youth politically.

Those who seem to be suffering the most under the new regime are those who did well when the United States was pouring in billions of dollars each year in military and

economic aid to South Vietnam. After the Communist victory in 1975, the shopkeepers, restaurant owners and traders found themselves without any means of support—except for Government doles of food.

TO SOME, "DEATH CITY"

For those hundreds of thousands who were satisfied with the far easier life under the umbrella of American aid, Ho Chi Minh City has become, as a Westerner put it, "Death City."

The resistance to the new Government by those who have not, or cannot, leave seems passive—and it is expressed most often in the free-wheeling black market that exists today in downtown Ho Chi Minh City.

Every morning, scores of Vietnamese men and women line up outside the Caravelle Hotel, renamed the Independence Hotel, to buy for dollars American cigarettes from those fortunate enough to receive them in the mall.

Cigarettes are far and away the most commonly peddled item on the black market. A visiting foreigner can purchase a package at a Government-sanctioned exchange store for 80 cents, or roughly two dongs in local currency; on the black market, the cigarettes are worth as much as 35 dongs. At the moment, the black-market currency rate appears to be nine dongs to the dollar, or 300 percent higher than the official rate.

GASOLINE ON THE BLACK MARKET

Gasoline, too, can be purchased on the black market. Although traffic inevitably has thinned out, with far more bicycles, the city's streets still teem with traffic in comparison with Hanoi. Motorcycles, mopeds and Lambretta taxicabs, many driven by teen-agers with long hair and mod dress, still fly around the streets, and still emit pollution.

Some Westerners living in Hanoi and here insist that sophisticated consumer goods such as cameras and stereos can be purchased in Cholón, the famed Chinese quarter of old Saigon that became a focal point of a Government crackdown on capitalism and black market activities 18 months ago.

Two visits to the area by a correspondent last week, however, found few signs of commercial activity. Banks were closed, stores shut down, and outdoor market stalls gone. In their places, one could see the inevitable cigarette peddlers on every corner, a group of youths staging a cock fight in a small park, and motorcycle repair shops every few hundred feet.

Keeping motorcycles and automobiles running is a problem in Ho Chi Minh City since the shaky finances of Vietnam in effect prohibit imports of spare parts. Another problem stems from the lack of diplomatic relations and trade negotiations with the United States—parts for American-made products are not available in Ho Chi Minh City or elsewhere in Vietnam.

Western diplomats and United Nations officials who commute between Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City said one basic problem in Ho Chi Minh City was the fixed pay scale for all workers.

Salaries range from 40 dongs for a typical Government bureaucrat—or about \$16 at the official rate—to 106 dongs for senior doctors in Government sanitariums. One interpreter for a Western official being in Ho Chi Minh City, who holds the title of deputy director of his department, earns 70 dongs a month.

"That's not even enough for his breakfast money," the Westerner said, referring to an inflation that has led to the doubling of some food prices in the last year.

FOOD BENEFITS REDUCED

The Government does provide food benefits, but those have been sharply reduced because of Vietnam's decision to shift some food supplies to famine-stricken Cambodia.

Young children can still be found begging

for food downtown along the former Tu Do Street, now called General Uprising Street, but they seem to be exceptions, and not the rule. Some old men can still be found sleeping in doorways at night, but only a few. With the exodus of nearly one million residents, by official Government count, the shortage of adequate housing seems to have been eased.

An optimistic view of Ho Chi Minh City and its problems was provided during an extensive interview with Le Quang Chanh, the former Deputy Foreign Minister of the Provisional Revolutionary Government, who now serves as Deputy Mayor.

"We believe in our correct policy and we believe in our success," Mr. Chanh said, noting that the conversion of capitalist Saigon to Communist Ho Chi Minh City was nearing completion.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 12, 1979]
VIETNAM FOILS AN ELABORATE SWINDLE IN EXIT VISAS

(By Seymour M. Hersh)

WASHINGTON.—Ho Chi Minh City's newspaper Tin Sang reported on its front page last week that the police had foiled five entrepreneurs who had falsified exit visas for members of Vietnam's Chinese community in return for large payments of gold.

Although the newspaper's account was matter of fact, the Vietnamese who shared the story with a visiting foreigner seemed to find it exceptional and amusing.

Tens of thousands of Chinese, who have been the main targets of an 18-month Government crackdown on private enterprises and black-market dealings, have fled the city in the last year. Most of them have paid more than \$1,000 in cash and gold to become, in many cases, "boat people."

The newspaper said the conspirators all found guilty by the People's Tribunal of Ho Chi Minh City on Aug. 1, received prison terms of 8 to 18 years for their efforts to dupe members of the anxious Chinese community.

HOW SCHEME STARTED

According to Tin Sang, the leader of the group was Phan Dinh Thai, who managed to get the uniform of a lieutenant colonel in the Interior Ministry and official papers indicating that he had been assigned to process exit visas of the Chinese population in Ho Chi Minh City, formerly called Saigon. The newspaper said Mr. Thai had been arrested before for forgery.

Mr. Thai, apparently aware that he would need all the trappings of a high-level Communist Party official to make the confidence game work, first acquired a car and a driver, Ta Si Hoan, then an apartment befitting his high station from Vu Xuan Thin, its owner, who joined the conspiracy. Mr. Thin's apartment apparently was used to receive and entertain Chinese merchants who had gold.

Of course, an office was necessary, Tin Sang said, and Mr. Thai persuaded Nguyen Van Be, keeper of a rarely used guest house at the Ministry of Social Welfare, to let him have access to those quarters, which were luxurious by Ho Chi Minh City standards.

The final step was to enlist Luu Xuan Dien, a traffic policeman, to make things look official so the Chinese businessmen would not think they were being duped.

CHARGED ACCORDING TO AGE

According to Tin Sang, Mr. Thai's prices for the counterfeit exit visas depended upon age. Children under 6 years old were to sail free, the fee for those 6 to 16 was roughly \$3,000 worth of gold and for those over 16 it was about \$2,700 in gold.

Mr. Thai, who began his operation in May, told potential customers at one point that they could sail on Vietnamese Ship No. 60, which was then in port.

CXXV—1494—Part 18

Tin Sang did not say how the group was caught, although it said the members were arrested while going to collect gold from 400 Chinese who had been duped.

The newspaper said that Mr. Thai, as ring-leader, received the stiffest sentence, 18 years. The driver, Mr. Hoan, got 17 years; Mr. Thin, the apartment owner, 14 years; Mr. Dien, the policeman, 12 years, and Mr. Be, the guest-house keeper, 8 years.

Vietnamese officials, in discussing the article with a foreigner, said that under current Government rules, Chinese could get exit permits easily without paying bribes. The Chinese, they said, still believe that bribes are necessary.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 13, 1979]
NON-COMMUNIST EDITOR FINDS HIS INDEPENDENT DAILY IS FLOURISHING IN HO CHI MINH CITY

(By Seymour M. Hersh)

WASHINGTON.—There was a party recently in the unpretentious second-floor offices of the newspaper Tin Sang on the edge of downtown Ho Chi Minh City. It was the independent daily's fourth anniversary.

That a non-Communist newspaper can flourish in Vietnam seems remarkable, and even more so because its editor is Ngo Cong Duc, a former member of the South Vietnamese National Assembly who was widely known for his anti-Communist views in Saigon, as Ho Chi Minh City used to be called.

Mr. Duc, now 43 years old, was also known for his opposition to the Government of Nguyen Van Thieu, and in 1971 he was jailed for a few days and forced into exile when he charged the South Vietnamese Government with vote fraud.

At the time he was the publisher of Tin Sang, then an opposition newspaper whose articles were often severely censored by the Thieu Government. During Tin Sang's days of opposition, President Thieu often ordered all copies of the newspaper confiscated, and it was shut down after Mr. Duc fled the country.

RETURNED AFTER FALL OF THIEU

An affable man, Mr. Duc was pleased to renew an acquaintance with an American colleague the other day and to explain how he got where he was and what it was like.

He returned from the exile to Saigon on May 29, 1975, he said, a month after the Communist takeover of the city.

"After a month or so," he recalled, "I gathered my old friends together to discuss whether we could have an opportunity to reopen the newspaper." At the time he was unsure whether the Government would agree since he, unlike others in Saigon who had been neutral, had not known any members of the Communist guerrilla forces during the Vietnam War.

The Government gave its approval, Mr. Duc said, and he now believes that its leaders "wanted to give journalists and intellectuals an opportunity" to work within the new system.

Tin Sang began publication again on Aug. 3, 1975. Mr. Duc said the initial money for its resumption came from his own pocket.

PAPER ACHIEVED QUICK SUCCESS

With a laugh, Mr. Duc explained that although President Thieu confiscated his assets after forcing him into exile in 1971, he had managed to hide away some cash. He declined to elaborate.

Tin Sang was an immediate success, easily selling out its press run of 3,000 copies at 20 cents each. Many more copies could be sold, Mr. Duc said, but a severe shortage of newsprint throughout Vietnam limits the circulation.

"After a year, I took back my money and

now the newspaper belongs to the employees," he said. "It's now a collective."

Each week, he explained, his editorial board meets with union representatives to discuss editorial policy and any problems. Ironically, Mr. Duc said, the authorities in Ho Chi Minh City initially disapproved of the arrangement.

"It wasn't sure that the collective would be responsible," he said, "You see, there is no party cadre at the newspaper and no censorship."

"If we print something wrong," he went on, "the Government asks us to come in and discuss it." Sometimes, he said, "we must accept the Government's criticism" and print a correction.

With all that, Mr. Duc said, "we have published more critical news under this Government than under the Thieu regime." The Communist leadership, he added, even provides a wide selection of critical Western news items each day for Tin Sang to publish at its discretion.

Mr. Duc was interviewed in early evening, at the end of a working day, and as members of his editorial staff finished their work they drifted into the interview room to drink beer and join the talk about America, the Vietnam War and foreign-policy problems facing Vietnam.

NEWS OF AMERICAN FRIENDS SOUGHT

Much of the conversation was in English, and Mr. Duc, who toured the United States early in 1975 as a critic of the Thieu Government, was surprised at how rusty his English had become. He did not see enough of his many American friends, he said.

"I'm glad I came back," Mr. Duc suddenly said amid the nostalgia. "It's my country. What I'm doing now is for my country—for my people."

After the fall of President Thieu, Mr. Duc said, times were difficult for the new government in Ho Chi Minh City. "There was a lot of gangsterism in the city led by former army rangers and professional criminals who escaped from the prisons," he said. "Even in 1976, you could hear shooting in the streets every day."

The Communists eventually took hold, Mr. Duc said, but added that problems still abound. He cited the continuing black market, the low wages and the generally stagnant economy. "Life's very hard now for the shopowners," he said. "It's been a big change. But some are adjusting. They have the duty to work to rebuild their country, not to buy and sell and have the easy life."

"SOLUTION" FOR THE DISCONTENTED

For those who can't make the adjustment, Mr. Duc added, one solution is "to choose another country and leave."

"Don't be misled," Mr. Duc went on, "I'm not a Communist. I'm a Catholic."

"I'd like to tell our American friends that our country is trying to build, but there are a lot of difficulties as a consequence of the United States' domination of South Vietnam and as a consequence of the Vietnam War," he said. "We'd like to ask them to understand the situation."

The newspaper editor expressed anger at people in the United States who have been criticizing Vietnam for its policies on refugees and its invasion of Cambodia early this year.

The people of Vietnam do not want any more than that in Cambodia, Mr. Duc asserted. "And I believe that the Communist Party—our Government—cannot do anything against the will of our people."

The biggest problems in Vietnam are economic, Mr. Duc said. The Chinese in the Cholon district, a target of intensive Government drives in early 1978 against black-market operations, still exert control over as much as 15 percent of the flourishing black market in Ho Chi Minh City, he said.

Pay scales are far too low, he added, and economic development has been retarded at all levels by a lack of competent Government officials. Another war with China is looming, Mr. Duc said, and that would be a further economic blow.

"Don't give us more difficulties," Mr. Duc said. "Give us more time to work for the country. We have to fight the economy and the Chinese, too. We have enough problems."

[From the New York Times, Aug. 14, 1979]
EVERYDAY LIFE IN COMMUNIST VIETNAM CAN BE SURPRISING

(By Seymour M. Hersh)

WASHINGTON.—Her name is Weiller Keu Unh. She is 13 years old, shy but very proud. The officials at the state orphanage just north of Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam, said the girl was told just a few days before that she had finished first in a district-wide literature exam.

Her essay, Miss Unh said, was on the importance of planting trees in memory of Uncle Ho Chi Minh.

Her father, if he were still alive, might have strongly disapproved. Officials at the orphanage, one of seven in the area, said he was a white American named Weiller who was killed in an accident in 1970. His body was apparently returned to the United States for burial.

Miss Unh, sniffing quietly as she talked about the past, said he was an electrical engineer. She did not know, she said, whether he was in the military.

There are 523 children in the former Catholic orphanage, now known as Bamboo Shoot Number 1, officials said, and 67 of them are of mixed race.

The children seemed happy, well fed and well dressed.

But Weiller Keu Unh cried when she spoke of her father.

"Hey, Liso," the street kid asked, "do you have any dollars?"

This correspondent had been in Ho Chi Minh City less than two hours and had begun his first walk down former Tu Do Street, the site of bars, shops and clothiers during the Vietnam War.

The youth waved me into a small shop, checking the street carefully for the police, and then offered to exchange nine dong for each dollar, a rate more than 300 percent higher than the official exchange rate. When that was rejected, he quickly produced what he said was a jade chess set and asked the equivalent of \$200 in cash for it.

A Government official later explained that "Liso" is Vietnamese slang for Russian. He acknowledged with a shrug that Tu Do Street was near the foreign sailors' club along the Saigon River. Russian sailors, it seems, are not averse to bargains.

Although a foreign visitor is always concerned about being propagandized while visiting a tightly controlled country such as Vietnam, sometimes that concern is misplaced.

On the second day of a three-day visit to Ho Chi Minh City, my official escort announced that we were going to see a "new economic zone," one of the state farms set up by the Government after the 1975 Communist victory in South Vietnam in an attempt to lure city dwellers back to the country.

It seemed that I was going to be shown a shining success. In fact, the farm, known as Le Minh Xuan, was chosen because it was the closest to Ho Chi Minh City, some 15 miles southwest. It was not a success at all, largely because of its acidic soil.

Officials of the farm said that although it was opened in September 1975, four months after the overthrow of the Saigon Government, only about 1,500 acres were now under cultivation. What had been planted, officials said, was the only crop possible—pineapples.

None had yet been harvested, although the officials hoped to produce 2,000 tons this year.

Officials said there were plans to have 7,500 acres under cultivation by 1981. Meanwhile, the 12,000 people in the area are provided with homes and enough land to grow their own crops. Not all choose to grow pineapples.

A few homes were visited at random, and their occupants seemed reasonably content. Phu Hoang Ho, who boasted that he was 66 and had 10 children and one wife, said he had come to the camp from Cambodia, where he had fled to wait out the fighting. "I consider myself to be a good citizen," he said, "because I didn't take sides in the war and once my country was liberated, I came back to cultivate it."

Hoang Thai Thach is 31 and a Government bureaucrat. He spent four years in the late 1960's and early 70's in Fullerton, Calif., where he attended what was then California State College on a South Vietnamese Government scholarship. He earned his B.A. degree and then, unlike other South Vietnamese who stayed away to avoid the draft, he went home.

Mr. Thach immediately found a job in a Government office in Saigon responsible for selling shares of Government enterprises to civilians. When the revolution came, he said, he decided to stay and wait and see.

"I wasn't scared by the revolution," Mr. Thach, one of seven children, explained, "because I had a brother who was with the revolution." The two had remained in touch, he said, and Mr. Thach had even sent him medicine and money.

On the morning after the Communists took over Saigon, Mr. Thach said, he went to work as always. "A cadre came in and assured us, 'It's all right and don't go anywhere—just go to the office every day,'" Mr. Thach recalled.

A few days later, he had to report to the Communist authorities who took over control of his ministry. Later there was a three-day re-education class where, Mr. Thach said, "they told us how wrong we were when we worked for the old regime."

He was released, his old office was disbanded, and he was reassigned to a job in financial planning for Ho Chi Minh City.

He has some complaints, he said. The street life is much quieter, living conditions are not very good, and the bureaucracy can be stifling. He misses some old friends who fled, and he misses the American books and magazines that were once available.

But he does not regret returning, he said, explaining that "this is my country and my family."

With the long war finally over, Mr. Thach said, he does not have to think about some of the books he read in America. He mentioned "Casualties of War," by Daniel Lang of New Yorker magazine, which dealt with a series of brutal war crimes by American troops.

Not everyone had such an easy time with re-education programs.

Dr. Nguyen Hung Tin was a lieutenant colonel in the South Vietnamese Army, a doctor in a military hospital, when Saigon was taken over. He was sent to re-education camps for 30 months before he was permitted to resume medical practice.

If he was bitter about the experience, the 47-year-old doctor did not show it during a 90-minute interview in Ho Chi Minh City.

"I engaged in manual labor—felling trees, building houses and growing gardens," he said of the time he was in two camps scores of miles from his family and friends, who were permitted four visits a year. "For myself," he said, "it was a pleasure, especially the manual labor."

There were monthly political education lectures, and conditions were good, he said, "if you didn't violate the rules."

Dr. Tin, who practices in a tuberculosis sanitarium in Ho Chi Minh City, said he was interned with other former senior officers from the South Vietnamese Army.

"The camps were full of collaborators; many of them were engaged in Phoenix operations," he said, referring to the operations sponsored by the Central Intelligence Agency aimed at assassinating Vietcong officials during the war.

"I didn't realize until I was in the camp that those people were committing such crimes against the people," Dr. Tin said. He told of a former South Vietnamese Army commander who confessed to ordering the killing of four Vietcong prisoners just before the signing of the 1973 peace agreement between the United States and North Vietnam.

"We didn't hide anything from each other," Dr. Tin said. ●

REAL SOVIET INTENTIONS

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, there is a strong hint of Russian diplomatic game-playing in the air and the stench is nearly unbearable.

Last week it was announced that a 2,000 to 3,000 man Soviet military unit has been slowly moved into Cuba. Our intelligence has determined that these troops are fully equipped with two motorized rifle battalions, one a tank battalion and the other an artillery battalion.

While such a force poses no direct threat to our American border it serves to underscore the real intentions of the Soviet's interest in world dominance.

Nearly a year ago, the Russians "sold" to Cuba sophisticated Mig-23 supersonic aircraft and today more than a dozen of these planes are stationed on the Cuban island, well within range of American soil.

Cuban troops, with the help of Russian advisors, serve as a police force for several African governments who were lifted into office through Russian aid and Cuban firepower.

Unless the United States takes appropriate action the Soviet buildup of troops in Cuba may jeopardize confidence in America and deteriorate our credibility in the Western Hemisphere.

For some time the Russian Government has wanted to increase its sphere of influence in the Western Hemisphere beyond Castro's Cuba. Many Central American States, including Panama and Nicaragua have leanings toward the Soviet Union. Other countries may be encouraged toward the Russian line with the presence of troops in Cuba and a gun to their head.

Furthermore the force may also serve as a security guard for Castro himself. After all, his Cuban troops are stationed throughout the world to conduct the Russian's dirty work. At last count, nearly 40,000 Cuban troops were serving in Angola, Ethiopia, and other faraway lands.

Regardless of the excuse the Soviets use to justify troops in Cuba, I know they

have no business there. For 18 years the Soviets have attempted to secure a military stronghold in Cuba and we can no more tolerate having a Russian military base 90 miles off our coast today than we did in 1962.

Obviously the Russians are testing the Carter administration and we should respond accordingly. First, demand the immediate withdrawal of the new Soviet force. Second, delay consideration of the SALT II treaty until the troops are removed and finally, threaten to withhold the delivery of the grain recently purchased and expected to be purchased by the Soviets.

An affirmative response will be the only type understood by the Soviets.●

AN ENERGY OCTOPUS

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

I would like to share with my colleagues a recent newspaper article written by Congressman Ed MARKEY which was printed in seven papers in Massachusetts. As a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Congressman MARKEY has been participating in our consideration of H.R. 8, the Public Energy Competition Act. As he outlines in his article, H.R. 8 is not a radical step. It does not require the oil industry to divest themselves of anything.

As we try to increase our domestic sources of energy, it is vital for us to increase the number of players in the energy game. H.R. 8 aims at preventing the oil giants from controlling the development of Federal resources. This is a small and modest goal as the following article by Ed MARKEY persuasively argues:

AN ENERGY OCTOPUS

(By Congressman ED MARKEY)

The last straw for those in the gas line last week was the news that OPEC's latest price increase would add \$165 a year to the average Massachusetts family's heating oil, electricity and gasoline bill.

Do we have any other fuel choices? Despite their serious safety and environmental drawbacks, both coal and nuclear power can offer us electricity. Coal can also provide liquid fuels such as gasoline.

Atomic power is already high-priced, however, and its costs keep on climbing. The same is true for coal.

One reason for the high cost of these potentially reasonably priced energy sources is that oil companies are moving toward total control of the coal and uranium industries. In part, the prices of coal and uranium climb when oil companies control them because the energy conglomerates want to maximize profits as a whole rather than the profits of any one division.

This means that an energy octopus might, for example, cut back on coal production if, by doing so, the high cost of oil would be maintained.

Right now, oil companies own 14 of this

country's top 20 coal companies, as well as one half of our total coal reserves. Furthermore, eleven oil companies own more than 50 percent of the domestic uranium capacity. Since 1970, when oil companies began large-scale investment in coal and uranium, their prices have more than quadrupled.

The control of alternative fuels by oil companies is worth watching because the history of the oil industry is a story of virtual domination by a handful of large firms. Whether or not these firms openly or secretly conspire, their pricing and production decisions emerge from mutual "understandings."

It is clear that the interdependent practices of the oil companies in the past will extend to the coal and uranium industries under their control unless something is done to stop them.

With Congressman Morris K. Udall, chairman of the Energy and Environment Committee of which I am a member, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 8, designed to prevent the top eight oil companies from obtaining new federal leases for coal and uranium lands. We will hold an open hearing on the bill, July 17.

Our bill should restore competition in the energy industry by encouraging competition for coal and uranium leases and by giving smaller companies a better chance in bidding for those leases. These companies, as well as independent coal producers, can't get a fair deal now when they are up against oil giants like Exxon. Even the nation's largest utility, the Tennessee Valley Authority, currently is overmatched when it comes to obtaining coal leases.

H.R. 8 does not force anybody to do anything. The Federal Trade Commission has already brought court action against Exxon and other large oil companies for restraint of trade. I think the Justice Department should do the same. But, this bill does not require divestiture. Rather, it says only that, in the future, on federal lands, the big should get no bigger.

Recently, the House defeated an amendment brought by Congressman Udall and myself that would have stopped the largest eight oil companies from receiving federal loan guarantees for investment in synthetic fuels, such as those made from coal liquefaction or shale oil.

That defeat means that the major oil companies could take control of the potentially enormous synthetic fuels industry. We cannot allow them to control coal and uranium as well.

To keep energy prices as low as possible, we must let increased competition determine prices and supplies. H.R. 8 goes a long way toward freeing the energy market. It is the least we can do to provide a secure energy future for the United States.●

OUR NATION'S PRIORITIES

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, we return today from the district work period. A time, I believe, that was well spent meeting and talking with the people who elected us to serve in this distinguished body.

For the past 4 weeks, the American people told us first-hand that energy and inflation are the major problems facing this Nation today. However, we have returned today, not to debate and

vote on legislation which will solve our domestic ills, but on a bill that will spend \$7.9 billion for assistance to foreign countries.

I ask, where are our priorities?

Instead of voting to spend \$100 million for the Sahel Development Fund, we should be voting to spend \$68 million on coal mining research and development.

Instead of voting to spend \$265 million for the Asian Development Bank, we should be voting to spend \$88 million on the development of cleaner and more efficient ways to use coal.

Instead of voting to spend \$1.8 billion on economic support to other nations, we should be pumping that same \$1.8 billion into the economic support of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we have a commitment to the American people, and I hope that that commitment has been strengthened during the past 4 weeks. Inflation is eating away at the American people's income and many fear they will not have enough heat this winter.

It is up to us, the Congress of the United States to provide the leadership this country so badly needs. We must set our sights on the goals that this country needs, not on what is needed by other countries around the world.

We have enough problems right here at home, and I say it is time we do something about them.●

FORMER CONGRESSMAN JAMES BURKE OPPOSES DISABILITY INSURANCE AMENDMENTS

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, it is significant that our beloved former colleague, Jimmy Burke, former chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security of the Ways and Means Committee is unalterably opposed to the disability insurance amendments. His statement follows:

AUGUST 7, 1979.

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Honorary Chairman
WILBURN J. COHEN,
Chairman, Save our Security,
Oxford Road, Ann Arbor, Mich.

DEAR FRIENDS: I have reviewed the provisions of H.R. 3236, the disability insurance amendments of 1979. As the former Chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee, I am well acquainted with the bill and its development.

While the bill contains a number of improvements which I favor, I am vigorously opposed to the three cut-backs in benefits. I strongly urge members of Congress to vote against the bill unless it is changed to eliminate the cut-backs.

I favor further improvements in the disability insurance benefits including more adequate provisions for the blind, coverage of all the permanently disabled under Medicare, and the provision of home health benefits for the disabled and aged without a three-day hospital stay.

I am glad to be a member of your organization to help oppose these undesirable amendments.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. BURKE,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Social Security, House Committee on Ways and Means, 1977-78.●

THE PROPER USE OF UNION DUES

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, the American system of government is based upon the notion of popular participation in the governmental process. The right to express one's own views freely, without coercion, is central to this proposition. From that, it follows each citizen should have the right to choose for him or herself the points of view he or she will support; no one should be forced to advocate a viewpoint with which he or she does not agree. While few would disagree with this in theory, in practice things are sometimes a bit different, as a recent decision by a Federal judge in Maryland has pointed out.

The case in question involved the right of a union to use compulsory dues for political purposes. Judge C. Stanley Blair ruled that it was, indeed, unconstitutional for a union to collect and then spend mandatory dues from workers for any purpose other than collective bargaining. If upheld, this means that union leaders will not be able to utilize members' dues to influence the lawmaking process unless the worker authorized it or, to put it another way, no longer will workers have to support political causes in which they do not believe.

This decision should not be viewed as a defeat for labor, but rather as a victory for liberty. The triumph of individual choice over coercion should be cheered by all freedom loving Americans. I insert an editorial which appeared recently in the Santa Ana, Calif. Register, in the RECORD at this time; it points up the significance of both this decision and the basic right which it reinforces:

A DEFEAT FOR COERCION

A federal court judge in Maryland struck a blow for freedom when he ruled that the use of compulsory union dues for any political activities violates the constitutional rights of employees who object. U.S. District Court Judge C. Stanley Blair held that the collection or disbursement of mandatory union fees for any purposes other than collective bargaining services infringes the First Amendment rights to free speech and association of employees who object.

The suit was brought against the Communication Workers of America (CWA) union by National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation attorneys for 20 telephone workers.

Judge Blair has also required the CWA to make a full accounting of how its fees have been spent and to refund to objecting workers all fees which exceed the union's cost of collective bargaining. The refunds will represent the proportion of union expenditures for political contributions, lobbying, ideolo-

logical causes, union organizing efforts and all other purposes unrelated to collective bargaining.

This is the first time this precedent has been established in the private sector. A similar precedent was established for public sector employment in a U.S. Supreme Court decision.

Judge Blair also denied a CWA motion to stay the lawsuit until the 20 plaintiffs had first tried to obtain refunds through the union's internal appeal procedure. The judge noted that the "time necessary for the series of intraunion hearings would better be calculated in years rather than months, and . . . at the end of it all, this court would be called upon to make the determination it is now prepared to make."

The court's decision will prevent workers from being forced to support the political activities of labor union bosses. The precedent set will have far-reaching ramifications in the cause for individual choice which is the foundation of freedom.

No worker should ever have to support anyone else's politics in order to retain his employment. Now, union bosses have been clearly told that it is unconstitutional for them to collect compulsory political funds from unwilling workers. And that workers don't have to rely on an intra-union kangaroo court before obtaining the right to choose where their money will go.

This may turn out to be the worst news labor union bosses have ever had. With more and more private sector workers becoming disenchanted with belonging to a union coupled with a decision depriving union officials of funds to buy legislation, their bonanza may be on a real decline.

The National Right to Work organization deserves much credit for its efforts on behalf of the American working man and his right of choice. We do not believe that any worker should be forced to join a union and we have always been against any form of a closed shop situation.

There is simply no justification for making union membership a condition of employment and there certainly is no justice at all in using members' money for the political aims of the labor union bosses.

This legal determination may slow down some of the abuses which have been so prevalent for too long a time.●

A TRIBUTE TO W. H. KELLEY

HON. JAMES A. COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, on September 17, 1979, the friends and associates of Mr. W. H. Kelley will gather to honor him on the occasion of his retirement. For the past 13 years Mr. Kelley has been the executive director of the House of Good Shepherd near Hackettstown, N.J. But, Mr. Speaker, his dedication and leadership go far beyond his duties at the House of Good Shepherd.

In addition to guiding Good Shepherd so that it grew and prospered, Mr. Kelley has served his profession well. As president of the New Jersey Association of Nonprofit Homes for the Aging, he arranged for homes for the aging to participate in the New Jersey Hospital Association Unemployment Reserve Fund. He was instrumental in the formation of standards for the licensing of nursing

home administrators. He also was a leader in establishing a standard accounting procedure for homes for aged.

In 1978, Mr. Kelley's profession honored him as the Administrator of the Year. This type of dedicated service and humanitarian effort is becoming all too rare. As Mr. Kelley's colleagues honor him for his outstanding work and contributions in the field of care for the aged, it is my pleasure to call his achievements to attention of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives.●

INFLATION REDEFINED—A NEEDED AGENDA

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Mr. Speaker, my constituent and friend, Horace R. Hansen of St. Paul, Minn., recently called to my attention an excellent editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on Sunday, August 12, by Richard Parker. Mr. Parker, a noted economist and author of the "Myth of the Middle Class", hits the nail on the head when he asserts that it is time to redefine the inflation debate by embracing an action-agenda that applies the research already in place into bold and innovative programs to reverse our spiraling inflation rate.

I urge my colleagues to consider Mr. Parker's suggestions and recommendations, because, as he says, quoting Thomas Mann over a half-century ago,

If we do not redefine the inflation debate quickly, there is great danger: it will destroy us as a nation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit Richard Parker's editorial, "Inflation and Recession: Our Democratic Duo," as part of the official RECORD:

INFLATION AND RECESSION: OUR DEMONIC DUO

(By Richard Parker)

"A cynical 'each man for himself' becomes the rule of life. But only the most powerful, the most resourceful and unscrupulous, the hyenas of economic life, can come through unscathed. The great mass of those who put their trust in the traditional order, the innocent and unworldly, all those who do productive and useful work, but don't know how to manipulate money, the elderly who hope to live on what they earned in the past—all those are doomed to suffer. An experience of this kind poisons the morale of a nation . . ."

I happen to like those words a lot, even though Thomas Mann wrote them about the inflation that occurred in Germany more than 50 years ago. I like them because they enlighten the discussion of what's happening to American life with a clarity of emotion and reason that dry statistics never reach. We need the numbers to plot the course of our life's decline, but we need men like Mann to remind us what the rot of our economy is doing to our souls, and what we pay for not speaking honestly about inflation's victims.

These are hard times—and they're going

to get worse. Gas costs \$1. Houses cost \$100,000. But that's only the tip of it. At current inflation rates, a pound of beef will cost \$7.56 by 1981, and a gallon of milk, \$3.96.

Mann concluded from watching German inflation that inflation was "a tragedy," but it's not. It's a crime, and the victims of it are far from evenly distributed in society. To date, we've failed to understand precisely that fact, and we ignore it not just at the peril of greater inflation, but of the collapse of the republic.

Last month, a gruesome milestone was reached in the Great Inflation Debacle of the '70s: The number of millionaires in America passed 500,000. Less than a decade ago, there were fewer than 100,000 millionaires in the United States and inflation alone comes nowhere near explaining how the very richest among us have quintupled their numbers in so incredibly short time.

In the same period, the average pay of the American factory worker actually declined in real, inflation-adjusted dollars. And the poor—though this should come as no surprise—fared even worse. Ten years ago, the federal poverty level stood at one-half the median American income; today it stands at barely a third. One in four Americans lives below what the government itself calls a "minimum budget" level.

Two months ago in a commencement address at Yale, John Kenneth Galbraith finally said aloud what timid economists and commentators have been afraid even to whisper: We are not merely in the midst of inflation, we are experiencing "a revolt of the rich against the poor."

For those of us who are neither rich nor poor, if this sounds exaggerated in the slightest, consider for a moment these statistics:

In the first four months of 1979, inflation rose overall at 7.1 percent;

Overall inflation, however, concerns a bitter set of numbers: In four key sectors of the economy—housing, health, food and energy—inflation increased, not at a serious 7.1 percent, but at a staggering 17.2 percent;

Four out of five Americans spend between 60 percent and 70 percent of their income on those four items alone, and the suffering grows proportionately as one moves down the income ladder.

By that definition, Galbraith's "poor" encompasses 80 percent of us. And that 17.2 percent inflation rate was before President Carter deregulated oil.

Americans are an exceedingly tolerant people, but in our tolerance we have failed to sort out how inflation rises disproportionately among us. We blame, for example, the gas crisis on our indulgent driving habits, when in fact pleasure driving accounts for only the tiniest fraction of the total energy consumption in America. The production of useless plastics and carcinogenic herbicides accounts for far more.

What we fail to understand—and what we receive little help in understanding—is that the very structure, the very distribution of income and wealth, is at the root of inflation. Most of us are not the hedonistic spend-thrifts whose wasteful buying and lack of "discipline" make inflation; we can't afford to be. Life even at \$20,000 or \$25,000 a year requires careful shopping at the supermarket.

The fact is that the majority of us can have little influence over inflation, because we cannot give up the basics of food, clothing, and shelter in the "national interest." But few of us understand that the majority controls only a small minority of the total income anyway—indeed, according to official statistics, the top 7 percent of families receive more than the entire bottom half of the American population and in terms of discretionary income—money left over after the basics—the hold of that tiny minority is even greater, possibly as high as 50 percent or 60 percent.

That's what Galbraith means when he describes the current inflation as a "revolt of the rich against the poor." The majority of us cannot be drafted into anti-inflation wars—whether President Ford's WIN program or President Carter's wage and price guidelines—when we've been denied the arms and ammunition with which to do battle.

An economist friend of mine has taken to describing the current period as "the dawn of the post-affluent society."

America, as he sees it, has finished a grand cycle of expansion that isn't likely to return. While it lasted, it was fueled not—as current wisdom has it—by canny businessmen making shrewd investments in space-age technologies, but by two less-understood phenomena, one domestic and one international.

Domestically, we experienced not an economic boom after World War II, but a social revolution—spearheaded by women. For the past 20 years, women have left the home at unprecedented rates, and flooded the economy. They entered the job market at wages 60 percent those of men, and bought new goods and services at unheard-of levels. Their low pay and vast numbers swelled production, and their purchases sustained demand—and in the process, the creation of two-income families engendered a whole new level of American prosperity, in which millions shared.

Internationally, America benefited from the devastation of our wartime enemies (and peacetime competitors), and from expanding markets throughout the Third World. We could sell or manufacture our goods at cheap prices, and still ship home the profits to add to our domestic well-being.

But both those trends are now at an end. In world commerce, Germany and Japan, and even Brazil and Singapore, compete more effectively. Here at home, the number of new women workers is falling, and low birth rates mean it will continue to fall for the rest of the century.

But inflation, as my friend emphasizes, takes account of neither fact benignly. Instead it pushes prices past the point where even prosperous two-income families can share in the old dream of an affluent society. And for the rest of us, earning less than \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year now, the future is grim.

The message he offers is simple: Until we give up blaming ourselves collectively for inflation, there will be no solution. The American economy is a vastly unequal one, and the means by which many of us thought we could beat the system are at an end. The income of the top 7 percent is over \$400 billion—greater than the entire federal budget itself—and their spending fuels an awesome proportion of the inflation we must all bear.

But simply "being aware" of inequality, and its role in inflation, is pseudo-psychotherapy masquerading as justice. Inflation will no sooner go away than will world hunger, just because we think about it.

We need an agenda, and not one that a politician can run on and then forget after the election. Its rudiments go something like this:

We stop pretending that inflation is like some massive sore throat that has hit us all, and hurts us all equally. If you happen not to be one of the lucky top 7 percent, you need to know how badly inflation is hurting you. Sit down, for a start, and calculate what you spend for food, housing, health care and energy—then tack 17.2 percent onto that and see what's left of your disposable income after taxes. It will be chilling.

Stop looking to politicians for "quick fix" solutions. There aren't any. And don't blame the poor; talk of welfare "chiseling" may vent your anger, but it won't cut inflation. The poorest 50 million Americans together—a quarter of our society—have barely 5 per-

cent of the total income. Cutting off their crumbs won't cure our ills.

If you want a start, not a panacea, to controlling inflation, try insisting that we (a) put a lid on selected prices, from hospital costs to oil and gas to basic foods; (b) expand the supply of basics such as housing through selected mortgage support, push conservation over synfuels, introduce consumer co-ops, family farm aid, and more direct marketing of food; (c) institute new public—public, not government—institutions from energy corporations to health-maintenance organizations to force the huge corporations to compete both openly and more efficiently.

The list could go on, but much of the vital research is already in place. What we lack is public knowledge and public willingness to try what hasn't been tried before. Not monstrous government energy programs nor costly corporate giveaways, but sound, small- and middle-scale attempts to reassert our own control over our economic lives.

Inflation, especially now, is not something we can hide from. Talking of his German experience a half-century ago, Thomas Mann said that "an experience of this kind poisons the morale of a nation . . ." If we do not quickly redefine the inflation debate, there is a greater danger:

It will destroy us as a nation. ●

THE SOVIET THREAT IN THE 1980's

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there is weeping and gnashing of teeth every time there is a demand for more spending in the area of national security. President Carter's 3 percent rise in defense spending is greeted in some quarters as if he were asking for an outrageous sum.

A recent study demonstrates that, given current trends, the Soviet Union will be spending 20 percent of its gross national product (GNP) in the 1980's. The Foreign Affairs Research Institute of London calls such a figure "staggering." Yes, the Soviet Union is ready to undergo some drastic economic setbacks the next decade, but that will not stop that nation from increasing its military spending. And here we are worrying about whether we should build a B-1 bomber, because some critics say it will cost too much. We are being pennywise and freedom-foolish if we force our national defense system to be measured only by the rules of accountants. If we do not have a strong national defense we may soon find that we have no accounts to take care of.

At this time I wish to insert in the RECORD, "Prospects of Soviet Military Power in the 1980's," a publication of the Foreign Affairs Research Institute:

PROSPECTS OF SOVIET MILITARY POWER IN THE 1980's

(By Edgar O'Ballance)

In 1977, NATO nations agreed, some perhaps reluctantly, to maintain an annual 3 percent real increase in their defence allocations. A few of them have since had some difficulty in keeping to this agreement. On average NATO nations spend about 4 percent

of their GNP on defence. In sharp contrast the Soviet Union is currently allocating at least 11-13 percent of its GNP to defence, and during the past decade has been increasing its annual rate of growth of its defence allocation by at least 4-5 percent. Moreover this rate of increase is expected to continue, which will mean that by the end of the 1980s, the Soviet Union will be allocating 20 percent of its GNP to its military potential.

This staggering deduction has been reached by an American expert, of the US Department of Defense, in a well reasoned Paper.¹ It would seem that we have been drastically under-rating the Soviet military capacity for some time. It is even more significant, as in the next decade the annual Soviet economic growth is expected to slow down, due to a number of factors, such as lack of capital, shortage of manpower, the changing ethnic composition of the labour force, and other reasons, while the defence expenditure increases.

SOVIETS AIM TO WIN

These stark facts do not seem to have been fully appreciated in the West. Looking so often at comparative charts of NATO and Warsaw Pact aircraft, warships, tanks, guns and missiles, perhaps our eyes have become glazed and our investigative perceptions dulled, leaving us with the vague, but false, impression that although the Soviet Union has more weaponry, and "nuclear thrown-weight" than the West, this is to some extent comfortably counter-balanced as the West—meaning the United States—has superior technology, especially in the nuclear field. These all too familiar charts are misleading. We have become so accustomed to counting weapons, and matching them one for one against each other, that our attention has been diverted from the overall Soviet military potential, and the rapidity with which it has developed. It is a perfect example of the old saying that "You can't see the wood for the trees". The Soviet "wood" has become a "forest", while the West has been busy counting "trees".

This Paper presents a view of probable major trends in the Soviet military effort in the 1980s. The most plausible developments are described and major alternatives considered. The West tends to separate "strategy from theatre weapons", whereas the Soviet Union has a completely co-ordinated all-arms concept, that includes all nuclear means. "Except for SALT purposes it is doubtful whether the Soviet Union singles out intercontinental forces for separate assessment". The Soviet doctrine embraces all available forces, and does not exclude any: nor does it think of them separately. It is significant that the "Strategic Rocket Forces and Long Range Aviation include, not only weapons with intercontinental range, but also forces for peripheral attack".

We tend to forget that Soviet doctrine and strategic thinking regarding strategic nuclear forces, are quite different from those of the United States. "The object of the Soviet strategic-force programme is to develop a capability to fight, survive, and if possible, win a nuclear war". SALT limitations will therefore have only a marginal effect on the Soviet military capability: that is if they are observed at all by the Soviet Union, and whatever they might be, the Soviet Union is still "most likely to continue the development of its strategic force posture". There

¹Prospects of Soviet Power in the 1980s Parts I and II. The International Institute for Strategic Studies, 23 Tavistock Street, London WC2. £1 or \$2.50 each. In short, although the Soviet economic growth rate will slow down, the Soviet defence allocation will increase. In terms of "dollar expenditure", the Soviet defence effort is 40 percent higher than that of the US.

will be a continued "strengthening of Soviet capabilities to function during, and after, a nuclear war, which will include a broad programme for the survival of the political and administrative leadership, the industrial work force, and the military infrastructure".

U.S.S.R.'S INTERNATIONAL ROLE

Soviet military missions will probably remain much the same, but an expected major development may be "the continued expansion of capabilities to project power to distant crisis areas". Until the 1960s, the Soviet military capability was confined to its own peripheral areas, but that changed in the 1970s, when we saw developments in its strategic airlift, its airborne forces, and its "naval related forces". This is confirmed by the "appearance of training manuals, emphasising the U.S.S.R.'s international role", which has been enlarged to include the "protection of Soviet interests, and international Socialism".

"In general the Soviet Union is likely to become bolder. This boldness may manifest itself in the actions she takes to provide herself with more direct lines of communication to the Middle East and to Africa". The Soviet Union may first try increasing pressure on adjacent nations to allow transit, or over-flight of aircraft. "She will probably make greater use of Cuba, and other allies, to support her clients in local conflicts". In this respect to Soviet areas of weakness, for example are in the protection of its own battle groups, logistic forces, and airlift forces, so "it seems more likely that the Soviet use of these forces will be political in nature—perhaps in an attempt to pre-empt a crisis".

Three possible changes in the Soviet external environment may effect these expectations. The first would be the emergence of regional powers which will develop significant military capabilities in the 1980s, and the second would be a wider distribution of sophisticated weapons in the Third World, both of which would make Soviet intervention more risky. The third is the "extremely unpredictable factor" of the "future Japanese defence effort". The big question is in what circumstances would the Soviet Union be willing to commit its own forces in combat at a distance. The Soviet Union would "be, and will continue to be, quite vulnerable, if she were to come into actual conflict with the U.S., or the West, at some distance". The Soviet Union will also try to obtain access to ports and airfields in Third World countries as part of a systematic attempt to create an improved support system for distance operations.

NUCLEAR DEVELOPMENT

In the nuclear field, there will be a "strong commitment to maintain the Strategic Rocket Forces as the main element of the strategic forces", and so the Soviet Union will have to seek solutions to protect its vulnerable silo-based missile systems. This must mean that it will either develop a mobile ICBM, or some form of "site defense using ABM (anti-ballistic missile) systems". The Soviet Union is expected to continue to develop high quality MIRVs, for its submarine-launched ballistic missiles, SLBMs, "The Soviet Union's commitment to the ability to conduct nuclear operations in Europe will continue into the 1980s". It is expected to continue to develop its "exotic technology", which means the development and deployment of high-energy lasers, and "space-based weapons". In this field the Soviet Union is expanding, in "dollar cost" about two and a half times as much as the U.S.

WEAPON DEVELOPMENT

As the long-term Soviet aim is that of achieving technical superiority over the West, especially in the military field, there will be a continued emphasis on science and technology. The last decade saw major technological improvements to weapons, and an

increased investment in Research and Development is expected to continue. The West "may be obliged to catch up in areas in which the Soviet Union has been the first to deploy new technology". Soviet weapons have been designed to require limited maintenance in the field by relatively unskilled labour, and they are sent back to factories, where a skilled labour force is concentrated, for major repairs and major maintenance.

A long-term steady Soviet weapon modernisation programme will be directed against Europe. The current modernisation programme of replacement of the new generation of tanks, self-propelled artillery, and the BMP infantry combat vehicles, will not be completed for several years. There will be an increased use of computers to enhance command and control capabilities in "theatre warfare", that is in Europe.

Tactical aircraft are likely to be the focus of continued modernisation through changes in tactical doctrine and training, newer long-range aircraft, and the continued development of avionics. The tendency will be to control fighter-aircraft from the ground, and not leave it all to the pilot. The Soviet Union will not put all the essential electronics into the aircraft, as is done in the West. "In time we may even see her deploy detachments of Backfire aircraft, in a manner similar to her current deployment of ASW (anti-submarine warfare) patrol aircraft, to deny the use of certain sea and air spaces to the West".

FORCE DEVELOPMENT

In Europe the Soviet Union will continue with the preparation of its conventional forces to operate in nuclear situations, as it believes it can survive a nuclear war. In the nuclear context, the Soviet Union will probably deploy its SS-20 missiles, and develop "dual-capability" aircraft, that is aircraft able to make nuclear strikes. Soviet conventional forces are better equipped than NATO ones to detect radiological and chemical contamination, better protected against it, and better able to decontaminate men and weapons. "Many operational headquarters for (Warsaw) Pact forces are hardened with protective shelters and buried antennae to reduce the effects of nuclear attack." The Soviet Union is also concerned with the protection of key facilities and installations, and the modernisation of Soviet nuclear weapons, and their means of delivery. There is a widening gap between the capabilities of Soviet and Warsaw Pact forces.

NAVAL DEVELOPMENT

In the naval sphere, it is expected that the Soviet Union will concentrate upon ASW, and will be alert to, and respond to, naval developments in NATO. The Soviet navy will develop means to interdict the sea-lanes of communication to Europe. "The seas peripheral to the Soviet Union will remain of great importance," and the Soviet navy will continue to modernise ships and land-based aircraft to control the Norwegian, Baltic and Black Seas in that area, because much of its naval power is contained in its land-based naval bomber force. The Soviet Union will try to establish naval facilities in the Mediterranean, and "basing rights" in that area. It will also work to neutralise Turkey, and so remove the south-east bastion of NATO. The Soviet Union is also expected to expand amphibious and air-assault capacities to support the flanks in case of operations in the North of Europe, on the Central Front, and in the Black and Mediterranean Seas. In time, the Soviet Union will try to extend its naval defense in line further to the south, perhaps beyond the Norwegian Sea, and perhaps beyond Iceland. It will also try to obtain access to ports in the Third World.

THE FAR EAST

Approximately a quarter of Soviet ground forces and tactical air forces are stationed along the Chinese border, and the USSR maintains a major naval force in the Pacific. "These forces are unlikely to diminish during the 1980s but they may not grow much," despite the long-standing Soviet concern about China. The main Soviet effort has been devoted to improving the basic military position through construction of defensive zones, and the modernizing of equipment, especially for air and naval forces.

"The Soviet Union is likely to continue to develop nuclear capabilities against China". This may well involve the deployment of the SS-20 missile, and the modernization of the "frontal aviation and long-range air force units" in the area. There will probably be an emphasis on improved warning from air-defense systems around key Asian and Pacific installations. In the Far East, the Soviet Union will probably increase sea control and power projection forces, and "is likely to improve her amphibious and air assault capabilities to seize straits and conduct other amphibious operations". The introduction of newer heavy-lift helicopters could also significantly enhance Soviet military capabilities, given the problems of transport in the area.

Japan has one of the most powerful and productive economies in the world, but has very limited defensive military forces. Recently Japan has become increasingly concerned about the development of Soviet strength in the Far East and has "taken more notice of specific Soviet force developments and exercises". Japan might play a critical role in the future development of China's military forces. "Any major shift in Japan's policy with respect to her defense effort would soon alter significantly the military situation in the Far East". Soviet naval forces would no longer appear adequate, and access to and from the Sea of Japan would seem less assured. "The technological level of the military competition in that region could be revolutionized".

CONCLUSION

The conclusion reached in the Paper, is that there will be a "continuation of current trends and momentum" in the Soviet forces during the next decade, and that we can expect to see a "military force of increasing sophistication and strength, but of a size comparable with that of today". The Soviet Union has a manpower problem that will get worse, and there may be "organisational and manpower adjustments, but the composition of the military force will remain much as it is today, except for the continuing emergence of power projection forces". The Soviet Union will have problems of "higher costs of acquiring, operating and supporting its technologically more advanced force".

With 20 percent of the Soviet GNP devoted to the military capability, it should be able to meet these "higher costs" comfortably. ●

A TRIBUTE TO HARRY SNYDER

HON. JAMES A. COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, as we travel the road of public service we occasionally share that road with someone who is exceptional in his duty and dedication. Harry Snyder is one such individual. Harry was the county clerk of Warren County, N.J., for 18 years. He

distinguished himself with his professionalism in that position.

His peers elected him as the president of the New Jersey County Officers Association. He was one of only four county clerks chosen to standardize the absentee ballot system for the whole State of New Jersey. He was instrumental in the formation of the driver education system in the high school systems of Warren, Sussex, and Hunterdon Counties.

But Harry did not leave his talents and civic mindedness at the office. He served as the mayor of Lopatcong Township and donated his time again to serve as the president of the Lopatcong Civic Association. He also lent talent and energy to the planning board and industrial commission.

His concern for community health was shown by his contribution to the Warren County Cancer Crusade—serving as the president 1 year.

The Lord called Harry from us recently. My neighbors in Warren County will not have the opportunity to take advantage of his wise counsel and generous heart. ●

A SALUTE TO COLONEL MICHAEL KOVATS DE FABRICY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are striving to insure basic human rights and freedoms for all people of the world, I feel it is important to reflect on our own Nation's past and salute a man who played such an important role in helping us gain our independence. I am referring to Col. Michael Kovats de Fabricy, distinguished Hungarian patriot and American war hero during our Nation's fight for independence.

Just a few weeks ago, our Nation commemorated the 200th anniversary of the heroic death of Colonel Kovats. The commemoration included weeklong festivities in Charleston, S.C., the site of Colonel Kovats' history making, and final battle. A constituent of mine, Dr. Andrew Tibor Udvardy, President of the Colonel Commandant Michael de Kovats Historical Society, did an outstanding job in heading the well-attended festivities, which included a parade, many honored guests, and written words of praise from various notable Americans such as President Carter, and former Presidents Ford and Nixon.

However, the highlight of the commemoration festivities came in the form of a greeting and Apostolic Blessing from His Holiness Pope John Paul II. The message, which was presented by the Catholic Bishop of Charleston, stated:

In this special way, We honor the heroic contribution of the Hungarian Patriot Colonel Commandant Michael Kovats de Fabricy. Such a commemoration affords all the opportunity to be dedicated anew to the struggle of achieving those human rights which Commandant Kovats de Fabricy cherished so much.

Certainly, the message from Pope John Paul, who has long taken a leading role in helping to achieve human rights in Eastern Europe, had very special meaning and significance.

The life of Colonel Kovats is certainly an excellent reminder to all Americans who often take for granted the opportunities which we have been blessed with for over two centuries.

Kovats left his native homeland of Hungary, after serving admirably in the Austro-Hungarian Army, due to the repressive rule of Empress Maria Theresa. Recognizing the serious threat to American freedom at the time and wanting desperately to help preserve it, Kovats contacted Benjamin Franklin, who was our Nation's Ambassador to France, and offered his superior military expertise to the cause of our independence. In his letter to Franklin, Kovats wrote:

I now am here of my own free will, having taken all the horrible hardships and bothers of this journey, and I am willing to sacrifice myself wholly and most faithfully as it is expected of an honest soldier facing the hazards and great dangers of the war, to the detriment of Joseph as well for the freedom of your great congress.

He was appointed to serve under the Polish Gen. Casimir Pulaski, and later was elevated to colonel and given the task of forming the first U.S. Cavalry, fashioning it after its European counterpart, the Huszar regiments.

It was while serving as Commander of the newly organized Continental Cavalry that he led the successful effort to save the city of Charleston, S.C., from British occupation. While history has documented Colonel Kovats' significant contribution to American independence, it also tells us that he lost his life during the process.

However, his death should not be viewed tragically. Rather, it should serve as an inspiration to our continuing efforts on behalf of the many courageous people throughout the world who are being denied even the most basic freedoms. This includes the great freedom fighter's ancestral homeland, Hungary, where those proud people are forced to endure severe repression under Communist domination.

I am hopeful that the remembrance of Colonel Kovats' supreme devotion to the preservation of freedom will help to further our own efforts in the area of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to insert a statement by Dr. Udvardy, describing the heroic actions of Colonel Kovats in the battle of Charleston:

PATRIOTIC AMERICANS AND HUNGARIANS

200 years ago, on May 11, 1779, Colonel Michael Kovats de Fabricy, Commander of the newly organized Continental Cavalry, saved the City of Charleston, S.C. from British occupation. He was killed during that battle and buried where he fell, near the Citadel in Charleston.

During the American Revolution, Charleston, S.C. was the largest and most active port of the South. Well fortified towards the sea, it repelled a British naval attack in 1776. It was General George Washington's most vital life line to the outside world for the export of goods and import of military hardware. The loss of Charleston would have

had fatal consequences for the revolutionary government.

The British Headquarters was well aware of Charleston's importance to General Washington and had made the strategic decision to attack the city in a pincer movement from the southern flank on land, where fortifications were inadequate. Almost 8,000 British soldiers, considered the best in the world, supported by Tory units from South Carolina, Georgia and as far as Virginia, occupied the peninsula. Almost 100 ships in the port and some 1,000 sailors were trapped within the city walls, when the City Fathers, in a desperate attempt to save their people from massacre and their city from destruction, had prepared on May 10, 1779, for surrender to the enemy the following morning, when out of nowhere, a small cavalry unit broke through the city walls in a daring storm attack. The offensive warfare tactics employed by the continentals for the first time, and the psychological effect of surprise, caused the battle experienced British infantry to fall apart. The new fighting spirit of this cavalry unit broke the siege, the enemy withdrew.

Michael Kováts de Fabricy, the Hungarian-born commanding colonel of the cavalry started the raid with extraordinary valor. By correctly evaluating the oncoming disaster, and his subsequent charge, undoubtedly, changed the future of 13 American colonies. His total personal commitment represents a turning point in the development of American freedom, as we enjoy it today. To quote Michael Kováts de Fabricy himself: "Golden Freedom cannot be purchased with yellow gold." ●

SAMSO

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, the Space and Missile Systems Organization (SAMSO) is an organization of unusual composition and background. Its current mission started from a need that arose more than a quarter of a century ago to establish, rapidly and efficiently, an intercontinental ballistic missile capability superior to that of any other nation.

Over the past 25 years, SAMSO and its predecessor organizations have played a vital role in sustaining and improving our country's deterrent strength. Through continuing research, development, and updating of missile and space systems, the organization has stretched man's technological reach and created new capabilities for meeting and neutralizing any threat from potentially hostile forces.

In fulfilling its many roles, SAMSO contributes significantly to the economy of its host communities, both directly and indirectly. The Norton Air Force Base in San Bernardino is a dynamic part of the Inland Empire and I take great pride in its contributions to our community. The expansion of these operations will add dimension to an already outstanding organization.

Mr. Speaker, SAMSO's record of accomplishments over the past quarter of a century is a matter of historical pride to our community and our country. It is my pleasure to commend the people of

SAMSO on their fine record of service and charge them to expand upon their heritage of excellence. ●

SHATTER THE SILENCE VIGIL: NAUM MEIMAN

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the ordeal of Naum Meiman, a Soviet Jew who simply wishes to emigrate to Israel, is distressingly familiar. At age 67, he has been removed from his job and is in poor health. He is shunned by his former colleagues. His political associates have been jailed. His dream of leaving for Israel has been nearly extinguished by the Soviet Government.

In 1975, Naum Meiman was refused permission to leave the Soviet Union, the official explanation being that his work as a theoretical physicist at the Moscow Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics from 1955 to 1975 involved alleged "state secrets"—even though it had been two decades since Dr. Meiman worked on "sensitive" projects.

The breakthroughs in physics of 20 years ago are today in the public domain. Nevertheless, Naum Meiman agreed to retire from the institute in exchange for a declaration from its director that Meiman's work had been published openly in Soviet journals.

Dr. Meiman's sacrifice of his job and the institute's declaration had absolutely no bearing on the attitude of the Soviet emigration officials, who have repeatedly turned down his application to leave—most recently last July 28.

Naum Meiman has also been actively involved in the human rights cause in the Soviet Union. With Anatoly Shcharansky and others, he helped establish the Helsinki Monitoring Group of Moscow, the organization which has sought Soviet compliance with the Helsinki Final Act. Meiman also saved Shcharansky from arrest in 1977 by employing him as a secretary, thereby saving Shcharansky from the charge of "parasitism."

The strain of the struggle to be free has affected Dr. Meiman's health. He suffers from chronic gall bladder illness, and is not receiving adequate treatment.

Naum Meiman's struggle is but one of thousands in the Soviet Union who are seeking to exercise the most basic right of freedom of emigration. We cannot and must not be indifferent to the cruel treatment of so many by the Soviet Government.

Following are recent articles on Dr. Meiman's plight:

FRAIL AND ALONE, A JEWISH ACTIVIST WAITS IN MOSCOW

(By Anthony Austin)

Moscow, July 10.—In a bare two-room apartment left from better days, one of the last of the Jewish activists lives alone, in frail health, waiting for an answer he was promised within a month six months ago.

His name is Naum S. Meiman and he is 67 years old. Until four years ago he was a

senior research fellow at the Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics in Moscow. He has appealed for reconsideration of the denial of his 1975 application for emigration.

His story typifies a tangle of attitudes that not even he can quite sort out. Hard though it has been for many Russified Jews to uproot themselves from the land of their forebears, they have increasingly come to feel that they have no future in a country where, they maintain, discrimination against Jews in education and the professions has been on the increase.

Though the authorities have permitted emigration, mainly involving Jews, to rise to a rate of about 50,000 a year, those who apply run up against an age-old Russian feeling of contempt for anyone who abandons the motherland.

STILL REGARDED AS TRAITORS

"They used to say to us, 'People like you ought to be stood up against the wall,' " Mr. Meiman said. "They no longer say that, but they still regard us as traitors."

Some have found themselves on a visa blacklist—in Moscow alone perhaps 100 families. Why these people and not others? "Who knows the full answer?" Mr. Meiman said. "They seem very reluctant to let scientists go. Maybe that's meant to discourage other scientists who are not Jews. You must be cleared of all suspicion of possessing state secrets. Can you imagine what personal grudges can be paid off against you by your superiors or co-workers on that point alone?"

On Dec. 20, though weak with a virus infection developing into pneumonia, Mr. Meiman took himself to a house off Herzen Street where, once a month, appeals in visa cases are heard by a high official named Konstantin I. Zotov. A crowd of petitioners, mostly Jews but ethnic Russians, too, and ethnic Germans from their ancestral lands on the Volga packed the waiting room and spilled out into the alley.

Through the bold act of a phone call to someone in the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, Mr. Meiman had arranged to be taken out of turn. Mr. Zotov, a big, heavyset man, received him in his office, sitting behind his desk.

"VERY POLITE THESE DAYS"

"He is a colonel or a general but he was in plain clothes and very polite—they are very polite these days," Mr. Meiman related. "I told him it had been four years since I applied for a visa, and the reason for the rejection, that I was in possession of state secrets, must surely be recognized by him as nonsensical."

To prove it, Mr. Meiman had a statement given him in 1975 by the director of his institute, I. V. Chuvilo, confirming that his work for the previous 20 years had been in the field of abstract mathematics and had been published in open Soviet scientific journals. Mr. Chuvilo gave him the paper for a price: that, as an applicant for emigration, he leave the institute at once. Mr. Meiman retired and has been living on a modest pension.

"True," Mr. Meiman continued with his account, "I had done some secret work from 1948 to 1955, on conditional calculations. But that was 24 years ago, and whatever sensitive work I might have done then has long ago become obsolete and lost all practical significance."

"I told Zotov all that. I showed him the paper. I told him I was not well. I have a chronic gall-bladder condition and my heart is not good. I am all alone here. I don't know if I can go through another winter like the last one. To tell you the truth, it has become not only a question of leaving, but of life and death."

After a five-minute interview, Mr. Zotov said he would give an answer within a month. There has been no word since.

TWO FRUITLESS APPEALS BEFORE

Twice before Mr. Meiman appealed for intercession, in a letter in December 1976 to Leonid I. Brezhnev insisting that he had no secret information and in a letter in December 1977 to the president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, Anatoly P. Aleksandrov, saying that "you, better than anyone, can appreciate the falseness and absurdity" of the matter of secret information. Neither replied.

After the arrests in 1977 that thinned the ranks of Moscow dissidents, after the increase in Jewish emigration in 1978 and 1979 and after the expulsion of five dissidents in exchange for two Soviet spies last May, there are few "rejected ones" left who are also prominent in the Soviet human-rights movement. Among them Mr. Meiman is one of the most active.

One of the men he got to know well in 1977 was Anatoly B. Shcharansky, the Jewish rights activist now serving a 13-year sentence. At the time, being without official work, Mr. Shcharansky could have been picked up for "parasitism." To save him from that danger, Mr. Meiman made him, officially, his secretary. When Mr. Shcharansky was arrested on the incalculably graver charge of espionage, Mr. Meiman was twice called in by the security police for questioning, and each time refused to appear.

In October 1977, while he was under house arrest, the strain told and he suffered a violent gall-bladder attack. A doctor gave him a written opinion that he was in urgent need of special care, which, living alone, he could not have.

Continuing with his account, Mr. Meiman said: "But I don't want to paint everything in black colors. I have been lucky in life to have known such people as Andrei Sakharov, Anatoly Shcharansky, Yuri Orlov, Vladimir Slepak, Gen. Pyotr Grigorenko, Valery Turchin."

They are some of the human-rights figures he has been associated with, all except Dr. Sakharov, the physicist, now either in prison or in exile. "And this apartment, which the authorities haven't taken away from me—by our standards it's comfort," he said. "Two rooms, a cot, a table, and here, my own bathroom, my own kitchen. And an added convenience, a K.G.B. listening device, right there behind that wall."

"What oppresses me," he said, "is that I am denied contact with other physicists, and without such contact in the field of modern mathematical physics you fall behind. I have a few years left for scientific work. I have a feeling I am in a race with time and the odds are against me."

SOVIET BARS EMIGRANT VISA AGAIN

Moscow, July 28.—Naum S. Meiman, a Jewish activist who appealed to the Soviet authorities seven months ago to reconsider their denial of his 1975 exit-visa application, said today that the visa had again been refused.

He said he was informed of the new refusal in a telephone conversation several days ago with an official of the Soviet visa department. The reason given, he said, was the same as the first time, that he was in possession of state secrets as a result of his work in the Moscow Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics from 1955 to 1975.

The 67-year-old former physicist had to sever relations with the institute after he applied for emigration in 1975; he has been out of work since. He based his appeal partly on a letter he had obtained from the institute director, I. V. Chuvilo, stating that his work there had not involved secret material.

Mr. Meiman has been active both in support of Jewish emigration and as a political dissident, a member of a Moscow group formed to monitor Soviet compliance with the human rights provisions of the 1975 Helsinki accords. ●

WORLD OIL OUTPUT SET RECORD DURING U.S. GASOLINE SHORTAGES

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, Government and industry officials have given various explanations of the recent severe gasoline shortages but have always emphasized the political crisis in Iran, which resulted in an immediate cut in worldwide oil production of 5 million barrels per day. Last February, I asked Mr. Dario Scuka, a petroleum analyst with the Library of Congress, to attempt to quantify the worldwide oil shortage and to determine the extent to which other exporting nations had increased production to compensate for the loss of Iranian oil production.

Mr. Scuka's analysis, based on projected figures, showed that world oil production during the first three quarters of 1979 was likely to be the same as it was during the first three quarters of 1978, despite the Iranian shutdown. This was a limited but highly significant point. Based on Mr. Scuka's analysis, I expressed the fear that an exaggerated hysteria about the immediate impact of the Iranian revolution on oil supplies was diverting our attention from the very real impending "price crisis," and creating a panic that could lead to hoarding.

Since that time, gasoline prices have risen far beyond our expectations. A dollar-per-gallon gasoline is now a very painful reality in most of our country. And there is no end in sight to the skyrocketing price of gasoline and no relief for the many Americans—farmers, small business operators, working families—who are hit hard by these price increases.

Recently, actual worldwide oil production figures for the first 6 months of 1979 have become available. These figures confirm the projections made earlier this year in Mr. Scuka's analysis; in fact, they show that worldwide oil production was actually somewhat higher than Mr. Scuka's projections. These figures, initially reported in the Oil & Gas Journal and later summarized by the Washington Post, show that world oil production was 5.8 percent higher in the first half of 1979 than in the comparable period in 1978.

I want to take this opportunity to commend Dario Scuka for his excellent work in predicting this result from early projected figures. He was the only one who did so. Now that the chips have been counted, his figures have been proven amazingly accurate, if slightly conservative. It should give us pride in the work of the Congressional Research Service.

I would like to share with my colleagues the articles reporting these new statistics during the August recess:

WORLD OIL OUTPUT SETS RECORD DESPITE IRAN

(By J. P. Smith)

Despite the revolution that shut down Iranian oil output—and no matter the gas lines in the United States—world oil pro-

duction rose to record levels during the first six months of this year.

Sharply increased production from the Arab Gulf states (primarily Saudi Arabia), from the North Sea and from Third World countries outside the oil cartel more than made up for the Iranian loss.

Worldwide oil output was 5.8 percent higher the first half of 1979 than in the comparable period last year, according to the authoritative Oil & Gas Journal. The Central Intelligence Agency and administration experts have come up with similar estimates.

These figures are sharply at variance with the impression left earlier this year by former energy secretary James R. Schlesinger and others in the administration, who attributed the U.S. gasoline lines and 40 percent increase in gasoline prices in part to a world oil shortage brought on by Iran.

But to some extent the year-to-year production figures are deceptive, analysts said yesterday. During the first half of 1978, world oil production was kept artificially low, as the industry tried to work off a glut that had put downward pressure on prices the year before. Indeed, U.S. companies seem in retrospect to have gone a little too far in 1978, and to have let inventories fall below normal.

Thus the production increase so far this year to some extent represents recovery, and to some extent reflects the normal annual increase in world consumption of petroleum products.

It is theoretically possible to have an increase in production and a tight world market at the same time.

Prices have also been lifted by anxiety. The chaos in world oil markets spurred by the Iranian revolt has still not totally subsided, and most oil analysts say future production is still marked with uncertainty.

Iran, formerly the second leading producer in the organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, reduced its oil output from more than 5.5 million barrels a day during the first six months of 1979.

Nevertheless, total free world oil production was not far below forecasts the major oil companies and the Energy Department made last year before the Iranian revolt.

Oil & Gas Journal, an industry trade publication, says total world oil production averaged 61.8 million barrels a day during the first half of this year compared with 58.7 million barrels a day during the first six months of 1978.

Reflecting on the sharp increase in world oil output, a New York-based international petroleum analyst, Walter J. Levy, said, "Production was definitely higher than people expected."

Levy, however, cautioned that "the danger is that the statistical supply picture can deceive us about the underlying weakness of our position" as oil importers.

The sharpest increase in oil output during the first half of the year came from the Saudis, who raised production 1.4 million barrels a day over their average level during 1978—a rise of 18.8 percent. During most of the first six months of this year, the oil-rich kingdom's output exceeded its self-imposed ceiling of 8.5 million barrels a day.

Iraq, likewise, dramatically increased its production by 900,000 barrels a day, a jump of 37.6 percent over last year, and has replaced Iran as the cartel's second leading producer.

Overall, despite the interruptions and sharp decline in Iran's oil output, the 13-member OPEC cartel's production during the first six months of this year rose from 28.3 million barrels a day in January to 31 million barrels a day in June. Moreover, according to Central Intelligence Agency internal analysis, the cartel's oil production continued at higher levels during the first half of 1979 than in the first six months of 1978.

John Lichtblau of the Petroleum Industry

Research Foundation says that "there was clearly a shortage during the first quarter" of 1979 but that free world output rose during the second quarter.

As for the current state of world oil markets, Lichtblau says he expects free world production to hold at between 52 million and 53 million barrels a day. During the first three months of this year, Lichtblau says, free world production stood at 50.5 million barrels a day.

At the Energy Department yesterday a senior official said, "Our numbers show production is up dramatically too."

As for Schlesinger's pronouncements earlier this year that the world oil shortage was as much as 2 million barrels a day, the DOE official said, "Our view was that demand including stockbuilding exceeded supply." As for the current oil outlook, the official said, "We are on the knife's edge now—just about at equilibrium."

Ironically, in June in Geneva as OPEC announced the stiffest price increase since 1973's embargo, most oil ministers said that production and demand were in close alignment.

Before the OPEC meeting opened, Dr. Fadhil Chelabi, an official with the cartel's secretariat, said that much of the confusion in oil markets during the spring resulted from the massive replenishment of inventories in the industrial nations, not from shortages in oil production.

Schlesinger, however, disagreed. A week before the OPEC ministers met he told a Washington press conference that the world shortage amounted to about 1.6 million barrels a day, and predicted, "There will be some easement, but it will not be great."

U.S. OIL IMPORTS INCREASED DURING GASOLINE CRUNCH

(By Patrick Tyler and Jonathan Neumann)

While American motorists were waiting in gasoline lines earlier this year, U.S. oil firms were importing 9 percent more crude oil than they did in 1978.

A detailed examination of oil company records shows that among those crude oil import increases for the first six months of 1979 were: Gulf Oil Corp., up 23.5 percent; Ashland Oil, up 19.6 percent; Mobil Oil Corp., up 17.9 percent, and Exxon U.S.A., up 15.5 percent.

The import records are filed monthly by each oil company with the Department of Energy (DOE) and are certified by the firms as accurate under penalty of law.

In interviews, executives of Gulf, Exxon and Mobil acknowledged that their imports—and their total crude supplies—were up substantially, despite the shutdown of the oil fields in Iran for 10 weeks at the beginning of the year.

None of the company officials offered an explanation of how this summer's gasoline shortage was touched off in the face of fast-growing imports.

"We at Mobil don't make or create gasoline lines, that's an industry phenomenon," said Bonner Templeton, a vice president for supply and distribution.

Said Jon Deakin, senior vice president for Gulf's oil supply arm, "That's always the thing that's hard . . . because I know we maintained our refinery runs pretty consistently this year . . . insofar as we are concerned, our level of crude supply was pretty well sustained."

"Where did the oil go? You've got me bothered by the fact that I don't have a satisfactory answer to the question," said Anthony L. Seaver, manager of the planning division at Exxon International.

It was reported this week that worldwide oil production was up 5.8 percent in the first six months of 1979. And federal energy officials have reported in the past that total U.S. crude imports were up.

However, DOE officials have never present-

ed these figures on a company-by-company basis.

Until now, federal energy officials have explained the summer gasoline shortage in part by saying that refiners used their increased crude supplies to rebuild their reserves, that they used their refineries at less than capacity and that to some extent they cut gasoline production in favor of other and more profitable oil byproducts like jet fuel. At the same time, federal officials have said that gasoline demand rose artificially earlier this year as panicky motorists and other consumers began topping off their tanks.

Total crude oil import figures from company records show that in the first five months of 1979 U.S. oil firms imported 385 million barrels more than in the first five months of last year.

That much crude oil would have supplied an additional three weeks of driving gasoline to American motorists this summer, according to the National Petroleum Refiners Association.

While crude oil imports rose this year by 9 percent, demand for gasoline in the nation rose by approximately 3 percent, according to oil industry spokesmen.

Even as imports increased steadily in the first half of 1979, oil companies cut gasoline supplies to service stations by as much as 15 percent. The resulting tight market led to a 50 percent increase in the price of gasoline.

The records show that just after Iran stopped oil production on Dec. 26, the U.S. companies sharply increased their crude oil imports from other nations, including Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Nigeria, Algeria and Venezuela.

For example, Exxon, the nations' largest oil company, had been importing approximately 3 million barrels of Iranian oil for U.S. use each month before the Iranian shutdown.

Yet, when it lost 9.4 million barrels of Iranian oil in April, May, and June, Exxon replaced that amount with imports from other countries and still increased its overall crude imports by 5 million barrels compared with the like three months in 1978.

Indeed, just as Iran concluded its first full month of shutdown in January, Exxon was setting its record for a single month's imports—26.6 million barrels.

Executives at Exxon, Mobil and Gulf and federal energy officials offered varying explanations of why gasoline supplies to the public were reduced in the face of rising crude oil supplies.

A spokesman for Exxon declined to provide specific information to show how Exxon's additional crude oil as used this year.

"The numbers you want are simply not going to be made available because they never were made available before," said Margaret Earle.

Another Exxon spokesman said that, generally, Exxon used some of its additional crude to build up reserves, which had been drawn down in the first quarter of 1979 to meet higher demand for gasoline and to replace "marginally lower" supplies of domestic crude oil.

The spokesman, Seaver, of Exxon International, said that while Exxon's crude oil supplies were higher than 1978, they were not as high as the company had planned.

Seaver declined to disclose what the company had projected for its crude oil needs this year.

Peter Wolgast, manager of Exxon International's planning and analysis division, had said in an interview last Friday that "our actual imports were lower [in 1979] than they had been at the same time in 1978."

Yesterday, Wolgast acknowledged that "when I went back and checked, I found the opposite." He said that while crude oil imports were up by about 15 percent, imports of

refined fuel oil and gasoline were down by about half as much. Still, he said, the figures had increased overall.

At Mobil, where crude oil imports were up almost 18 percent, Templeton said that his company used some of the additional oil to build up its reserves of gasoline in order to prepare for refinery shutdowns for maintenance this fall.

By July, Templeton said, Mobil had more than a million additional barrels of gasoline in reserve than it normally maintains to prepare for those shutdowns.

"In hindsight, we could have released that million barrels and our inventory wouldn't have gone below last year's levels," Templeton said.

He said Mobil was operating this year with about 52,000 additional barrels of imported crude supplies. Part of that, he said, was to make up for a loss of 15,000 barrels a day of domestic crude oil that Mobil could no longer buy, leaving a net increase of 37,000 barrels a day.

Templeton said that during the period of the gasoline shortage Mobil's crude oil reserves remained fairly constant, with 21 million barrels in April, and back to 21 million barrels in May.

At Gulf, Deakin acknowledged that crude oil imports were up by 23.5 percent, but added that imports of refined fuel oil and gasoline were down. Gulf increased its net imports of oil and oil products by about 10 percent in the first six months of 1979, Deakin said.

He said he could offer no specific explanation of why there were lines at Gulf stations just as there were at other stations.

"It's always hard comparing statistics," Deakin said. "You're really comparing apples and oranges—what you planned to import and the marketing environment. One reason we were able to run our refineries so well is because we were not relying on Iranian crude."

Les Goldman, assistant secretary of energy, professed surprise over the 9 percent increase in crude oil imports. Nonetheless, he said consumer demand was larger than the oil supply could accommodate this summer.

On Feb. 7, then secretary James R. Schlesinger told the Senate Energy Committee that the Iran shutdown would reduce oil imports by 500,000 barrels a day. And in a special report to the president released three weeks ago, the DOE said that imports in February through May this year increased by only 3.3 percent over last year.

Goldman defended both of those positions, despite the oil company records showing a 9 percent crude oil import increase.

He said Schlesinger was right, because DOE views the increased import figures as a "reduction" since imports were not as high as they might have been if Iran had not stopped oil production.

Goldman also said that the 3.3 percent figure cited in the report to the president referred to total figures for imports of all petroleum products, including substantial quantities of residual fuel oil used primarily by electric utilities to power generating equipment. ●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN J. CAVANAUGH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. CAVANAUGH. Mr. Speaker, weather held up my return flight to the city and I unfortunately missed a vote on rollcall No. 435. Had I been here I would have voted "aye." ●

REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT ON CHICAGO'S SOUTH SIDE

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

• Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a representative of an urban community, I am always interested in the efforts of people and institutions that support our city neighborhoods. The subject of a recent New York Times article is the South Shore National Bank's redevelopment project on Chicago's South Side. The bank's program, now 5 years old, was set up by Ronald Grzywinski. By all indication the project has helped stem neighborhood deterioration, reduce crime, and stabilize the community it serves. I would like to insert this article in the RECORD:

CHICAGO BANK MAKES MONEY ON LOANS THAT AID DETERIORATING NEIGHBORHOOD

(By Nathaniel Sheppard, Jr.)

CHICAGO, July 26.—Five years ago the new owners of the South Shore National Bank set out to disprove the notion of their fellow bankers that making development loans in deteriorating neighborhoods was like throwing money out of the window.

Today, buoyed by its success in helping to arrest blight in the South Shore district, a predominantly black community of 80,000 seven miles south of the Loop, the bank is preparing to embark on an even larger rehabilitation effort.

In a joint venture, it will finance its holding company's multimillion-dollar purchase and rehabilitation of about 500 units of deteriorating multifamily housing in the most blighted section of South Shore. It will be one of the largest rehabilitation efforts involving other than high-rise buildings.

NATIONAL MODEL IS HOPED

Officers of the bank hope that the effort will help their neighborhood redevelopment project become a national model of how local banks and institutions can play a vital role in preserving communities while still turning a profit. Other banks in Chicago and in other cities have expressed interest in the bank's efforts, and it is setting up a seminar for bankers who would like to know more about the bank's methods and experience.

"While other banks are redlining neighborhoods we are greenlining them," said Susan Davis, vice president of the bank. "And we have been able to turn a profit while doing so."

Redlining is the practice by banks, insurers and other institutions of refusing to make loans, grant mortgages or write insurance in certain neighborhoods because of perceived risks. Redlined neighborhoods are usually poor or predominantly occupied by minorities, or they are close to such neighborhoods.

"In the new project we will take the biggest and the worst buildings in South Shore and make them as good as new and hope that smaller buildings and homes in the area will ride on our coattails," said Thomas Gallagher, president of the City Lands Corporation, an affiliate of the Illinois Neighborhood Development Corporation, the bank's holding company. "We believe the project will be sufficiently dramatic to get the community back on its feet."

99 PERCENT WHITE IN 1950'S

In the 1950's South Shore was 99 percent white, a well-to-do community with a lakefront on its eastern boundary, an area of

stately mansions and a mix of houses and three-story, multifamily buildings.

Rapid growth of surrounding black communities increased the demand for housing in South Shore and prices began to rise rapidly. As blacks moved in, whites moved out, along with virtually all of the businesses and the exclusive shops that had thrived there. The area is now 85 percent black.

As the neighborhood changed, the South Shore Bank began to cut its services, granting only two mortgages totaling \$59,000 in the community in 1972. As a result of its cutback in services, deposits declined from a peak of \$80 million to \$46 million and the bank's owners decided to bail out.

"We call this disinvestment," said Ronald Grzywinski, chairman of the bank's executive committee and the man who set up the redevelopment project. "As the former operators of the bank saw it, the new people in the community were not as credit-worthy, did not maintain accounts large enough to be profitable and presented the risk of increased fraud and higher delinquent loan payment rates."

"When a neighborhood changes racially," Mr. Grzywinski went on, "the people in its institutions often throw up their hands and say there is nothing that can be done to save the community, and leave. Bankers have at least as much if not more prejudice as others and when a neighborhood changes they keep investment money out of that neighborhood."

By this time, Mr. Grzywinski had developed his model for a bank's participation in community development through a holding company and was looking for the opportunity to try it out.

After obtaining about \$4 million in financing from foundations and other groups, he and three partners took over the bank and began the neighborhood redevelopment effort.

In the last five years the bank has granted development loans totaling \$18 million in the South Shore community. In 1977 and 1978 the bank financed the rehabilitation of 625 multifamily housing units at a cost of \$3.7 million. It also granted 114 mortgages for single-family homes, 37 mortgages for multifamily homes, 209 home improvement loans, 125 commercial loans and 293 student loans.

BUSINESS RENOVATION SLOWER

Despite the infusion of money into South Shore housing, many storefronts remain vacant or in disrepair along 71st Street, the hub of the neighborhood.

Last year a group of South Shore residents joined forces with developers and formed the Phoenix Partnership. The partnership bought three and a half blocks of commercial buildings along 71st Street. With loans from the bank the group began a renovation effort that already has resulted in the restoration of a block of vacant storefronts.

And the owners of the Rosenblum Drug Store, the only business to remain in the neighborhood after its population shifted, have undertaken a \$340,000 project, underwritten by the bank, to rehabilitate and expand their retail space.

"We knew that the community had to be revitalized at some point because everybody can't move to the suburbs or to the North Side of the city," said John Kelly, one of the drugstore's owners. "And besides, the neighborhood wants us to stay."

LARGER SPACES GOING FAST

Last year the bank extended \$6.4 million in development loans to the South Shore neighborhood, raising its total outstanding loans to the area to \$15.2 million. The 90-day delinquency rate on the loans, at 2.4 percent, was well below the industry average, according to bank officials.

The bank's net income last year, after subsidizing its redevelopment project for the

\$30,254 difference between development income and development expenses, was \$208,000, representing a 5.2 percent return on its equity. The level was well below the industry average of 14 percent for banks of its size, "but it proved those critics wrong who argue that you can't make loans for commercial real estate ventures in black communities without losing your shirt," said Milton Davis, the bank's president.

REHABILITATION DOES WORK

"Conventional wisdom has it that the economics of rehabilitation don't work and that you have to bulldoze and build anew from the ground up," he said. "We've come to the opposite conclusion—that you can rehabilitate, get sound housing and put it back on the market at prices people can afford."

Two studies by a University of Chicago sociologist indicate that the rehabilitation effort has played a significant role in arresting blight, reducing crime and stabilizing the South Shore community.

In a follow-up to a 1974 survey of the community, the sociologist found a dramatic reduction in population turnover and the crime rate, a stable welfare rate and rising median family incomes and property values. He also found residents more optimistic about the neighborhood's future. ●

FREEDOM FOR DR. SEMYON GLUZMAN

HON. S. WILLIAM GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

• Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, once again I rise to speak out on the case of Dr. Semyon Gluzman, a 32-year-old psychiatrist who has been unjustly imprisoned in the Soviet Union for over 7 years. I make these remarks as part of the "Shatter the Silence, Vigil 1979," organized in conjunction with the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews, a daily event on the floor of this House which seeks to gain freedom for Soviet Jews.

Semyon Gluzman is a man of great courage and conviction, who was imprisoned 7 years ago last May, because he refused to certify human rights and political activists as insane for the KGB. Dr. Gluzman was only 25 at the time he went to prison for refusing to abrogate the tenets of his profession, and he has paid dearly for his love of freedom and truth. The record of his prison term includes prolonged terms of solitary confinement, resulting in severe ill-health, and a seriously damaged physical condition bordering at times on death. A recent photograph I received compares starkly to the one taken at the time he was so unjustly incarcerated. Last May, after his official 7-year prison term was over, Dr. Gluzman began his 3-year term of "internal exile" in Siberia, where he now languishes.

What makes the plight of Semyon Gluzman so personally compelling to me and thousands of others in the United States and abroad is that he has never ceased to speak out for freedom and truth throughout his prison term. In the early years of his sentence, he coauthored with Vladimir Bukovsky a "Manual of Psychiatry for Political Dissidents," a

guide for fellow dissidents describing techniques to prevent being classified as psychotic by government psychiatrists, and managed to smuggle this to the outside world. While in prison he vigorously protested the treatment of his fellow prisoners, which brought about his placement in harsh solitary confinement. Last January, another of his poems reached the West, and once again Semyon Gluzman spoke out for freedom and truth and religious beliefs in a magnificent and moving way. His courage seems undaunted despite the adversity which he has experienced.

It is important that the leaders of the Soviet Union realize that the world is watching what happens to Semyon Gluzman. There are 63 cosponsors of House Joint Resolution 265, which I have introduced along with my colleagues BIAGGI, BINGHAM, and KEMP, calling upon the Soviet Government to release him and allow him to emigrate to Israel with his family. On May 9, the anniversary of his prison sentence, 42 Members of the House wrote to President Carter asking for his intervention on behalf of Dr. Gluzman. There are organizations working on Dr. Gluzman's cause in the United States, and in other countries, such as Amnesty International and the Committee to Free Dr. Semyon Gluzman.

Our outrage at his treatment has not abated. Our work on his behalf will persist. And we continue to pray for his health and fortitude so that in fact Semyon Gluzman will realize his prayers for freedom soon. ●

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert a speech by the chairman of the Captive Nations Week Committee of the Republic of China, Dr. Ku Cheng-kang, which he gave while visiting Washington, D.C., in connection with the Captive Nations Week celebrations here in the United States. During his visit to the Congress, Dr. Ku spoke before both House and Senate Members.

As shown in Dr. Ku's address, it is imperative for us to continue to uphold the human dignity of those peoples held captive of communism, who struggle for their freedom, democracy and human rights:

BETTER NEW RELATIONSHIP FOR GREATER COMMON INTEREST

(Speech by Dr. Ku Cheng-kang, the 20th Captive Nations Week Anniversary, Washington, D.C. July 17, 1979)

It was here on the Capitol Hill, a solemn symbol of freedom and democracy, that observance of Captive Nations Week became a public law 20 years ago. The objective was to bolster the subjugated peoples' aspirations for freedom and independence. Taken thus was a Congressional step of moral courage in line with America's national spirit. More recently, especially since mid-December last year, the righteous words enunciated by you on the China issue and in support of the Republic of China's endeavor for free-

dom and democracy have won acclaim the world over.

On this notable occasion, I have the privilege to express my heartiest respect for all of you. It is my great honor to visit this country for the historic 20th Captive Nations Week Anniversary and thus be with you at the very place of that noble legislative move.

BASIC CONFRONTATION BETWEEN SLAVERY AND ANTI-ENSLAVEMENT

This is a turbulent age with dangers lurking everywhere. People are earnestly praying for peace and seeking ways to avert wars. But the unchanged Communist goal is world communication and enslavement of mankind. Still continued, therefore, is the fundamental confrontation between those bent on spreading slavery and those who oppose it. This involves freedom and democracy on the one hand and, on the other, Communism and autocracy.

The confrontation is presently manifested mainly in three forms:

One is Communist nuclear blackmail versus the nuclear armament of free nations.

Another is Communist aggression through proxy wars versus the effort of free nations to safeguard freedom.

The other is multifront Red expansion versus the free world exertion to promote common security.

Asia is the major sensitive area of confrontation. The Russians are stretching out into the Middle East, the Indian Ocean, the South Seas, and the Sea of Japan. The Communists of China and Vietnam are resorting to their utterly ruthless inhuman tactics—export of refugees—in their attempts to harass and subvert free nations of Southeast Asia. Add to this picture the energy crisis that is shaking the world, and it becomes unequivocally clear that the course of Asia will decide future world outlook.

Promotion of freedom and security in Asia is indispensable if the free world is to avoid being plunged into wars and disasters. This promotion urgently requires the pooling of Asian forces that stand for freedom.

Freedom forces are awakening and rising in Asia. The United States must grasp this advantageous situation, firmly stand with free Asians, and strive with strength for the protection of security in the Asian and Pacific region.

CHINESE COMMUNISTS—AN ASSET?

One popular strategic concept demands alliance with the Chinese Communists for the restraint of Russians. This seemingly attractive idea is in fact quite mistaken and dangerous.

The mistake lies in the attempt to unite with a force of enslavement for opposition to another similar force. This will spur multifront Red expansion and provide the Chinese Communists with opportunities to trick industrially developed democratic countries into supplying them with knowhow, capital, facilities, food stuff and weapons for growth as another aggressive force.

The danger stems from the blurring of demarcation between friend and foe. This loosens the free camp and exposes free nations as targets of individual conquest by the Russian and Chinese Communists who are racing hard for hegemony. Even more dangerous is that the two Red powers may at any time join hands for their common communication goal and advance together against the free democratic world.

The Chinese Communists are poor, backward and very bellicose. Alliance with them certainly will be liability, not an asset, to free nations.

For some time not long ago, the Chinese Communists were talking boastfully about their so-called Four Modernizations, supposedly requiring a total capital outlay of 600 billion dollars. Radiant but actually unrealistic pictures of "Chinese mainland

market" were painted in the minds of many outsiders.

But as numerous sources were looking forward to big business deals, the Chinese Communists found themselves having no choice but to admit that the program is just as impracticable as the "Great Leap Forward" of the late 50s. Unilaterally they scrapped a number of foreign trade and monetary contracts and agreements. This was accompanied by terrorist steps at home against those clamoring for freedom, democracy and human rights.

At the two-week Second Session of the 5th "National People's Congress" that opened in Peiping ("Peking") on the 18th of last month, Hua Kuo-feng said the Chinese mainland poverty and backwardness could not be erased in a short while and that inaccurate estimate and planning had been made for Four Modernizations. He spoke of the existence of "obvious defects" in economic and production management systems, then called for overall adjustment.

Many recent visitors from abroad have been shocked by the ignorance and backwardness of the Chinese Communists, the destitution of the people, and the widespread loss of hope in Communist rule. Jay Mathews wrote for the Washington Post July 5 that the majority of people, including cadres, were resentful and unwilling to make further sacrifice for Peiping. He feels the regime is in no shape to continue its rule and the Chinese mainland political outlook will change as a result before long.

The Four Modernizations program has failed without getting under way, but the Chinese mainland people's campaign for freedom is spreading and gathering momentum. Young people want freedom of schooling, occupation and marriage; workers are demanding freedom to choose jobs; farmers are badly in need of freedom from hunger. People are gallantly proposing that the mainland learn from Taiwan. One notable characteristic of this situation of all-out anti-Communism is that even those of the younger generation, who have been brought up and educated under Communism, are rising against the regime and its doctrine. A fatal wound has been inflicted. The Chinese Communist rule can fall apart overnight if the anti-Communist campaign of the people there receives proper assistance from free nations.

HOPES ATTACHED TO THE U.S.

Distinguished Senators: In this crisis-ridden world seriously threatened by Communist expansionists, high hopes continue to be attached to the United States.

America doesn't have to be an international fire company, and no young American blood need be shed in any foreign land. All that the people hope the U.S. will do is:

First, refrain from doing anything that will help Red growth and never dance to the tune of Russian or Chinese Communists. Instead, adhere to the stand for freedom with strength and check Red advances.

Second, avoid damaging free forces. Do not mistake enemies as friends, thereby hurting America's truly faithful companions. Instead, give full play to the nation's massive productivity and advanced science and technology, and help the other free nations speed up their industrialization for the enhancement of their defense capabilities. Furthermore, strive to unite all the world's freedom forces for positive safeguarding of free people's common security.

Third, keep away from matters that make it easier for the Communists to tighten their grip on the captive masses of people—more than a billion of them—behind the Iron Curtain. Drive in wedges of human rights campaign and encourage those in chains to fight for freedom and democracy.

GROWTH OF NEW U.S.-ROC RELATIONS

Distinguished Senators: The peoples of the United States and the Republic of China

share identical ideological patterns and ways of life and similarly love freedom and democracy. The ROC is exposed to sharp impacts on the international front but remains firmly on the free camp side and continues to promote the nation's democratic constitutional rule. The ROC respects free economy and is presently America's eighth trade partner. The two-way U.S.-ROC trade total in the six years from 1980 to 85 is expected to exceed 100 billion dollars.

Through endeavors to safeguard freedom and democracy, the ROC government and people in Taiwan have kept a beacon lamp burning for the 800 million Chinese mainland population. Whether those 800 million people are to remain in captivity or regain freedom has decisively to do with the future of the entire world. If those people are to become massive additional manpower of the free camp instead of remaining as Red Chinese tools of aggression, the strong existence and growth of the ROC is an absolute prerequisite.

The security of the ROC's Taiwan base has inseparably to do with the security of North-east Asia and the entire Asian-Pacific region. Taiwan also is a shield for the protection of America's strategic bases in the Western Pacific. Because of its strategic position, the island can help check Russian expansion into the area. If the security of Taiwan is undermined, the entire Western Pacific will be exposed to so much easier Red advances.

For the common interest of the U.S. and the ROC, the two nations should seek to develop new relations through economic, trade, cultural, people's diplomacy and other channels.

For the security of the Western Pacific, our two nations must exert greater joint endeavor against the spread of Communist forces of enslavement.

For the promotion of lasting friendship between the two great peoples, the U.S. and the ROC must together assist the Chinese mainland people's fight for freedom, democracy and human rights.

Distinguished Senators: Developments in all parts of the world have made it crystal clear that people everywhere invariably are after national security, political democracy, social stability and economic prosperity. The Communist class struggle and dictatorship of the proletariat, being contrary to human nature and human rights, have been discarded by the world at large. Notable indications are the examples of defeat suffered by Communist candidates in the recent European and Japanese elections. The Communist rampancy today is only on the surface. It cannot conceal the continuing Red bloc trend of degeneration and dissolution. Neither eclipsed is the surging tide of freedom forces with insistent determination. The campaigns waged behind and outside the Iron Curtain against Communism and tyranny will be joined as a torrent of the age, destroying all Red forces as it surges ahead. America as the mainstay of the free camp is charged with the historic mission to lead and promote free world endeavor for freedom and democracy. The world ardently hopes and earnestly requests that all of you Senators will continue to uphold justice and see that the American will power is kept at the highest possible level. ●

OPENNESS IN GOVERNMENT

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, during the recent Congressional recess, Pat Harris, the new Secretary of HEW, took

another giant step in the President's "openness in government" policy. I ask my colleagues to take a look at the attached memorandum and draw their own conclusions:

MEMORANDUM

WASHINGTON, D.C.,

August 16, 1979.

To Assistant Secretaries, Heads of Principal Operating Components, Heads of OS Staff Offices, Principal Regional Officials, Special Assistants, and Executive Secretariat.

This is to ask that no communications be sent to Members of Congress or staff on any pending or proposed legislation without express approval by me through the Assistant Secretary for Legislation.

Until further notice, there are to be no meetings, calls, or staff contacts with Members of Congress or staff, White House Staff, Office of Management and Budget, or the Economic Policy Group regarding proposed or pending legislation, 1980 authorizations or appropriations, or policy development without prior discussion with me through the Assistant Secretary for Legislation.

PATRICIA ROBERTS HARRIS. ●

VLADIMIR BUKOVSKY SPEAKS OUT ON THE MOSCOW OLYMPICS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, in his outstanding commentary on the 1980 summer Olympic games in the Wall Street Journal, exiled Soviet dissident Vladimir Bukovsky reviews new developments in the preparation of the 1980 Olympics particularly as it is being touted by the Soviets. Anyone who has accused those of us who opposed Soviet sponsorship of the games of politicizing the Olympics would do well to read this article, which follows my remarks.

It is frustratingly clear that the Soviets are using this opportunity to create a false face of socialist superiority to show the world, yet they are insulating themselves from charges that they are politicizing the Olympics by accusing their critics of the very violations of Olympic principles of which they are guilty. In other words, if we criticize their program of propaganda, we are guilty of propagandizing, therefore we are politicizing the Olympics. If we fail to criticize this obvious convolution of Olympic principles to fit socialist ends, are we not then also guilty of allowing the games to become political? This catch 22 situation is adding insult to injury, and I intend to continue protesting vigorously any indications that the Olympic games are not being carried out in the spirit in which they were created.

Mr. Speaker, does it take a Russian to stand up for the rights of the free world? Apparently so, for among those voices raised in protest that Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe will not be permitted to cover the games I hear Vladimir Bukovsky, but not the U.S. Olympic Committee. Among those concerned that Russian dissidents and so-called prisoners of conscience will be cleared from those areas where events

will be held to create an aura of internal contentment with the Soviet system is Vladimir Bukovsky, a victim of 12 years in Soviet prison camps. He knows what many will not believe or choose to ignore—that the Soviet Government will go to whatever extent we permit to legitimize its systematic discrimination and repression of its citizens, which is clearly a violation of the Helsinki agreement and of the Olympic principles first articulated by Baron de Coubertin.

If the U.S. Olympic Committee is not going to represent our interests by recognizing and protesting Soviet violations of Olympic principles, then the people of our country must speak out for themselves. We must make our voices heard, in concert with the articulate words of Vladimir Bukovsky, to prevent the Soviet Government from using the Olympic games as an official sanction to violate human rights and as an official podium from which to proselytize and to aggrandize communism.

Mr. Bukovsky leaves it to the individual athlete and tourist to decide what road to take. We could boycott, we could participate. "But if you still decide to participate in the games," he foresees from the vantage point of indisputable experience, "remember that some of the Olympic souvenirs you buy are made by prisoners in Soviet labor camps."

Mr. Speaker, it is no longer my intention to advocate a boycott of the 1980 summer Olympics. I believe it is extremely important, however, for us to do our utmost to insure equal participation for all those who do desire to attend the games. It is in that spirit that I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 180, expressing the sense of the Congress that, in hosting the 1980 summer Olympic games, the Soviet Government should adhere to the Helsinki accords and the Olympic spirit of fair play and equality of opportunity. I urge my colleagues to join me as cosponsors in this effort to keep the summer Olympics as nonpolitical and nondiscriminatory as possible. Our strong advocacy of this position will mean a great deal to all those who participate in or are affected by the Olympics, either directly or indirectly, and will tell the world that Americans do not have to have their freedoms taken away from them, as Vladimir Bukovsky did, before we will defend the principles we hold dear.

The article follows:

GAMES RUSSIANS PLAY

(By Vladimir Bukovsky)

Who can forget the greatest Olympic Games of modern times, when Berlin became the scene of widespread gaiety? Scarlet banners with black swastikas flew in the wind, parades and festive ceremonies crowded the city and choirs sang. And who can forget that memorable moment when children presented a visibly moved Hitler with an olive branch?

Such peaceful scenes, far removed from the heat of politics, are about to be repeated in Moscow, the "capital of smiles," as they say there nowadays. Preparations for the Summer Olympics are going on at top speed. Construction may be behind schedule, but in a totalitarian state this sort of difficulty is easily overcome. All civic and housing construction has been halted in order to concentrate on the Olympic facilities.

The labor is provided by Soviet Army soldiers, in exchange for free passes to watch the Games. The building of the facilities has been declared a Komsomol shock-worker project, which means that free labor will be provided; indeed as of next autumn scientists, scholars, students will be taken from their own work and forced to labor on building sites and clean-up campaigns. Moscow is undergoing a complete face-lift: houses are being decorated, buildings are getting repainted, even the cobblestones in Red Square are being renewed.

Moscow is "cleaning up" in other spheres as well. One reason for the recent trials of dissidents was to get them out of Moscow, and to persuade the West that there is no dissent in the U.S.S.R., but merely parasites, agitators, malicious hooligans, spies and madmen. Potential troublemakers will be kept under close watch or barred from coming to Moscow. Indeed, the city will be closed for the whole summer, which also means that apart from registered Muscovites, ordinary Soviet citizens won't be able to see the Games.

PIONEER CAMPS

Schoolchildren are undesirable, too. They have already been asked to state where they intend to spend next summer. Those who have no specific plans will be organized into groups and sent to special "pioneer" camps in order to be saved from the corrupting influence of foreigners. The authorities, on the other hand, will be saved from the embarrassment of having children ask for chewing gum or jeans. One never knows what to expect from them and the unpredictable cannot be permitted.

American tourists will be organized into 15-day tours costing about \$1,500 a person. They will spend three days in Moscow, but the Olympic events they attend will be chosen by Intourist. Then they will depart for Central Asia, the Caucasus or Siberia. They won't be able to make friends or mix with local people; 10,000 students are being specially trained as guides, and Soviet guides are obliged to report to the KGB about every move tourists make.

Even when they actually attend an event they will probably find themselves next to a soldier or some official—only 35 percent of the tickets will be sold to Muscovites (at a price up to \$37.50) and about 30 percent to foreigners. It doesn't take a lot of imagination to guess where the rest go. (During the Berlin Olympics the predominance of officials was also noted by the foreign press. But in Moscow they will be wearing civilian clothes and won't differ much from "ordinary" people.) The events will be scattered all over Moscow and other towns to avoid people assembling in greater numbers than can be observed by the watchful eyes of the KGB.

Originally the Soviets were giving assurances that access to the Olympics would be free; there was even talk that visas wouldn't be needed to enter the country and about two million people were expected to come. Now the estimated number is down to 300,000 and there is no question of "opening the borders."

Representatives of "unfriendly" media such as Radio Liberty or Radio Free Europe won't be allowed to cover the Games. And there are signs that emigration will be stopped on the pretext that the authorities are too busy dealing with visas for foreign visitors to the Games.

The estimated cost is about \$330 million to \$345 million. The whole financial burden will fall on the Soviet people. The government is diverting all available resources to the Olympics, so the production and supply of food and consumer goods are being severely cut back. In addition, house-building has been stopped. In 1968, lack of food in

the shops was blamed on Czechoslovakia—it was necessary to feed the Soviet soldiers there. Now the Olympics are the scapegoat.

For the Soviet government the economic gains are very real—the Games will bring in desperately needed hard currency.

The basic Olympic principles haven't changed much from 1936. They are aimed to create international respect and goodwill. German officials also invoked "the goodwill and readiness of nations to dedicate all their forces and faculties to the pursuit of friendly combat for the benefit of mankind" to achieve "universal understanding among the world's peoples."

International respect for the Soviet authorities means approval of its aggressive international policy, a policy aimed at undermining the stability and independence of other countries, unlawful occupation of sovereign territories and permanent ideological warfare against all noncommunist countries. Soviet propaganda is tirelessly hammering into the heads of people that the country is surrounded by enemies and any attempt to escape from Russia is treated as high treason, as it would be during war.

Holding the Olympics in Moscow means giving silent consent to the imprisonment of people like Kovaljov, Shcharansky, Shelkov, Osipov, Orlov and many others whose opinions are in conflict with official ideology. It means consenting to the severe persecution of organizations like the Human Rights Movement and the Helsinki Monitoring Group, whose activities are aimed at the observance of legal and humanitarian principles which are in accordance with those of the Olympic Games.

By signing the contract with Moscow, the International Olympic Committee has violated its own rules, which forbid holding the Games in countries where there is racial, national, religious or political discrimination.

The committee is giving respectability and legitimacy to this totalitarian regime and its aggressive, oppressive and chauvinistic policies. It allows the Soviet authorities the opportunity to use the Games as a rostrum for political propaganda. The highest government and party officials are involved in organizing the Games, among them Goncharov, head of the Communist Party Central Committee Propaganda Department, and Gres'ko, expelled from England in 1971, and former controller of British spies Philby, Burgess and Maclean.

PROOF OF SUPERIORITY

The Soviet press calls the Games the greatest event in the history of mankind and has emphasized that they will take place in the first socialist country. Any success by Soviet or Eastern European sportsmen is always interpreted by their countries as yet another victory for the Communist system and proof of its superiority. The large number of medals are secured by the fact that Soviet sportsmen are highly trained professionals. Only Komsomol or Party members are allowed into international teams and they enjoy privileges only the Soviet elite enjoys—the best salaries, roomy flats, access to special shops, trips abroad. This is a direct breach of the first principle of the Olympic Games' intention "to promote the development of those fine physical and moral qualities which are the basis of amateur sport."

About a year ago, I appealed for the first time to world opinion to press for the removal of the Olympic Games from Moscow. Recently members of the Helsinki Monitoring Group also appealed to the IOC to make a "ceasefire" in the war against humanitarianism and mercy a necessary precondition for holding the Olympics in the USSR. The IOC remains deaf to the appeal.

It would be possible to hold the Games in Montreal; it would be possible for sports-

men to boycott the Games for moral reasons; the same applies to tourists. The Soviet authorities would find it embarrassing and difficult to explain this to the people.

But if you still decide to go or participate in the Games, remember that some of the Olympic souvenirs you buy are made by prisoners in Soviet labor camps.

Mr. Bukovsky, who spent 12 years in Soviet prison camps, was exiled two years ago and lives in England. His book, "To Build a Castle: My Life as a Dissenter," was published last year by Viking. ●

DEEP SEABED MINING BILL A MUST

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, legislation to develop the immense stores of minerals on the ocean floor becomes more important with each passing day. We have seen, year after year, the delays which have been engineered by the third world countries to bring the Law of the Sea Conference to a standstill. Yet, with each passing moment, this Nation has come to depend more heavily on importing those very minerals which lie on the deep seabed, waiting for the development of a rational legislative framework within which American technology can more reasonably make the huge capital investment required to reduce our dependence upon foreign sources for many of our strategic materials.

It is complicated legislation: five Senate committees have jurisdiction over portions of the bill, and four House committees. We have not been idle in the House; my own Merchant Marine Committee has already reported the bill out, as has the Interior Committee, and I have specifically requested the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ZABLOCKI, to expedite the reporting of his sections of the bill, so that we can quickly bring a consensus bill through conference before the end of this year.

Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the official publication of the Seafarers International Union, The LOG, spells out quite clearly the need for immediate and positive action by the Congress in bringing the deep seabed mining legislation to the President's desk. Our economy is one which depends upon a multitude of interacting factors, but as the article points out, there is no reason for this Nation to default on such an important issue as an insufficiency of vital minerals. The legislation is before us, and needs only to be speeded on its way.

For the enlightenment of my colleagues who may not have had an opportunity to read the excellent article from the Seafarers' LOG, I have included the text of the article as a part of my remarks:

ECONOMY DEMANDS ACTION ON OCEAN MINING

Congress is once again considering passage of an Ocean Mining Bill, one very similar in tone and substance to legislation proposed last year.

If enacted, the new bill would provide

many benefits to the beleaguered American economy, including the creation of badly needed jobs for a host of American workers, especially those employed in the maritime sector.

The bill is being considered at a time when the Law of the Sea Conference has come to an impasse. The Conference was convened nearly six years ago to, among other things, regulate the rich natural resources which lay at the bottom of our planet's oceans.

It was hoped that the Law of the Sea Conference would quickly produce an agreement under which the nations of this world could recover vast mineral deposits considered to be "the common heritage of mankind."

The American economy desperately needs the mineral resources paving the ocean floor. At the present time the U.S. imports 98 percent of its manganese and cobalt, 90 percent of its primary nickel, and 15 percent of its copper. All these minerals could be obtained from the bottom of the ocean instead of from foreign countries.

Elliot Richardson, the U.S. delegate to the Law of the Sea Conference, has gone on record as supporting interim legislation which would set standards for American participation in the mining of ocean minerals.

Companies have been reluctant to mine resources from the ocean floor because the legal duties and obligations which govern such activity remain unclear. The companies are afraid of risking the enormous investment it would require to undertake such a venture so long as their investment may be jeopardized by a lack of legislatively defined standards.

Last year, the ocean mining legislation which was proposed ran into problems because of time difficulties.

It enjoyed considerable support in Congress as well as with labor and industry officials. It passed easily in the House. However, it was set aside in the Senate because of the supposedly overwhelming workload which confronted Congress.

It was overlooked even though manganese is an essential ingredient in the production of all iron and steel products. The iron and steel industries are among the most important in this country. Their performance affects every facet of the American way of life.

The legislation was overlooked even though copper plays an important role in the manufacturing of electrical motors, power generators, transformers, plumbing, brakes, radiators, heaters and carburetors.

The legislation was overlooked even though nickel is used in petroleum refining and in the production of gas turbines, aircraft frames, marine and automotive bodies, and ceramics.

And it was overlooked even though cobalt is used to produce industrial magnets, telephones, gas turbines; and plays an important role in radiation research and treatment.

Congress is again confronted with a seemingly overwhelming workload. It may overlook ocean mining legislation as it has done before. And if it does then the natural resources which would have helped to ease the grave economic problems which confront our nation will lay untouched at the bottom of the ocean floor. These minerals will still have to be imported, and their cost will aggravate an already astronomical balance of payments deficit.

Last year, the U.S. was the only nation to actively consider legislation which would have set interim regulatory standards for an incipient ocean mining industry. This year, however, both Japan and West Germany have been studying the issue. Congressional inaction on this matter is threatening to erode America's competitive edge in an important economic area, and could conceivably deprive many unemployed American workers of increasingly scarce jobs. ●

FORCING HISTORY BACKWARD IN THE MIDEAST

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the major rhubarbs that occurred during the congressional recess was the "resignation" of Andrew Young as United Nations Ambassador. I wish to insert in the RECORD, at this point, one of the most penetrating commentaries that I have seen on this event, by columnist Michael Novak which appeared in the August 27 Washington Star:

FORCING HISTORY BACKWARD IN THE MIDEAST

So selected black leaders are now negotiating with the Palestine Liberation Organization. This is one of the most outrageous acts of ethnic politics in recent American history.

It reeks with resentment and hostility, and it divides blacks from other Americans. I have not yet heard of black leaders standing up for the rights of the Ukrainians to self-determination, or of Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Czechoslovaks and others. The blacks have not spoken up for Irish Catholics in Northern Ireland. It is not oppression everywhere that seems to move them. What is it, then?

Jewish success in every walk of life mocks the excuse of victimhood. More recently blacks were slaves, Jews were the victims of pogroms, limited civil rights and Nazi concentration camps.

I am not black, nor am I Jewish. But it is impossible for me to believe Andrew Young and his colleagues are not following classic lines in making Jews victims of their frustration at Young's resignation from government. It has happened before.

There are three features about the PLO that makes it absurd for the State Department, Andrew Young or the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (pledged to non-violence) to force Israel to negotiate with the PLO.

First, no state should be forced to negotiate with a party sworn to annihilate it. Survival is not subject to negotiation.

Second, the PLO is not a representative body or even a shadow government. It has no economic plan. It has no cabinet ready to function. During World War II, Czechoslovakia had a government in exile. In 1948, Israel had plans for economic and political development. The PLO, by comparison, shows no signs of economic responsibility. It does not even pretend to be ready to lead an independent state.

Third, the PLO does not collect taxes. Who, then, is paying the salaries of its army, and buying its weapons, and feeding it, and training it? The Soviet-bloc nations train its assassins in training camps. Various foreign nations fund it. The PLO is not an independent force. It has no financial base of its own. It is a puppet of many strings.

Along among the 100 million political refugees since World War II, the Palestinians have been refused welcome by those who say they are passionate friends and united kin. They have been deliberately kept by Arab nations in refugee camps. Jordan controlled the West Bank from 1948 to 1967 and did not set up a Palestinian state.

Many Arab nations import hundreds of thousands workers. The Middle East holds plenty of land, much of it potentially as fertile as Israel has become. It is one of the wealthiest, most sparsely settled regions of the world. Why aren't the Palestinians welcome? Jordan in particular is part of their homeland.

The Palestinians are an unusually talented people. Those who live in Jordan, or who have settled elsewhere, often have risen to levels of wealth and leadership. There are many cultivated, peaceful Palestinians. The PLO tries to intimidate such persons.

Some Palestinians do suffer from injustice, and a better solution than the present one must be found. Israel has agreed. But not all the burden should fall on Israel. Outside forces that support the PLO do not help.

Since 1945, more Jews have been driven from Arab lands than Palestinians from Israel. More Palestinians now live in Israel than Jews in Arab lands. To force all Palestinians into the hands of the PLO is to force history backwards. It is not a humane program.

It is not in the interest of human rights, or of the U.S. to empower the PLO. The PLO is a puppet organization, hostile to Israel's existence, the servant of distant powers. In supporting the PLO black leaders discredit themselves, injure national unity and jeopardize the security of all of us.

From Martin Luther King, Jr. to Yassir Arafat is off a precipice. ●

M. L. KING CENTER A RIP-OFF?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Martin Luther King used the civil rights movement as a mask to cover his anti-American and radical ways when he was alive. It would come as no surprise to learn that his successors may be doing the same thing.

Many questions have been raised about the operation of the King Center in Atlanta, Ga. It obviously has been used to gain many Federal funds for its operation. The article which I am including with this speech contains many questions which seem to be unanswered.

Many Americans could well ask if the King Center is being used as a front for a rip-off of the unsuspecting public. Who has the answers? Let us find out.

The article follows:

KING CENTER QUESTIONS GO UNANSWERED

(By Ken Englade)

ATLANTA.—Steven Klein was brisk, impatient, maybe a little harried. His telephone voice had an unmistakable I-told-you-so undertone.

"Mrs. King doesn't want to talk about it," he said. "She's bored with the whole thing."

The subject Mrs. Coretta Scott King didn't want to discuss was the monetary structure of the Martin Luther King Jr. Center for Social Change.

There are other things she doesn't want to talk about, such as the FBI report on the late King's alleged philandering, the assassination itself and, especially, finances, either her own or the center's.

Press relations man Klein had accurately predicted she would refuse an interview.

"She already gave Bob Coram a four-hour interview," Klein said. "She feels that's the last word on the subject."

Coram, an Atlanta free-lance writer, wrote a 10,000-word story for ATLANTA magazine based on the interview and his study of the center's operations.

So far, however, the story has not been published—a situation ATLANTA Managing Editor Phil Garner says will be remedied soon.

In the meantime, Coram talked freely about his story. So, too, did Boyd Lewis, an Atlanta radio newsman who did a similar piece for his station and a longer story for "All Things Considered," a show broadcast on National Public Radio.

What they found was a long list of unanswered questions—questions not necessarily meant to imply wrongdoing or questionable dealings.

Still, Coram wrote that center officials refused to answer questions about a quarter of a million dollar annual payroll or divulge the number of center employees.

Center officials, he said, refused to explain why Mrs. King's honoraria for speeches are not reflected in the center's tax returns, although she claims the money all goes to the facility.

Also, Coram said, so far as he could determine, none of the grants to the center from the Health, Education and Welfare Department have ever been audited.

Additionally, he said, there is the question of the money raised by the center—a total of almost \$6 million in the past 10 years. "Where has it gone?" he asks.

Coram said reports show the center received a total of \$101,000 in federal money from the time it was created shortly after King's assassination until 1976. Then, after President Carter assumed office, the federal grants increased dramatically.

In 1977, Coram said, the center received \$181,000—\$80,000 more than the previous 10 years combined—and, in 1978, the center was given \$237,500 in federal funds. Mrs. King Coram said, denied Carter's office has influenced the grants.

Like Coram, Lewis' chief interest in the center is in its financial structure—a situation he found as confusing as did Coram.

Lewis is a strong believer in the civil rights movement. He has spent six years working on black newspapers in Atlanta. And he cares enough to try to get some answers to his nagging questions about the center.

Many of those questions were broached in the show he did for ATC in March. Questions like:

Why won't the center give newsmen a copy of its latest annual report? Lewis says center officials have repeatedly refused requests for the document. Coram also was unable to obtain a copy. Klein said the report, due in January, has not yet been published. "We're a little late," he said.

Why did the center neglect for 10 years filing the necessary forms to qualify as a non-profit organization? The forms are required under Georgia law, yet no one at the center did anything about it until the late Ben Fortson threatened an investigation at the end of January 1979.

What happened to the \$87,000 in center money shuttled to the Martin Luther King Fund for Peace, Non-violence and Brotherhood in 1976-77? The fund, according to Lewis, is not described in any center literature.

"There is no indication the funds are being improperly used," Lewis said, "... but the purpose (of the fund) remains a mystery."

Lewis also wants to know where all the money collected on behalf of the center goes. Looking at the center's operations, he said, gives no hint.

The Community Center section of the facility gets its \$3.2 million in funds from HUD through the city of Atlanta.

The Day Care Center part of the facility gets its money from a HEW grant.

The house where the late Dr. King was born was purchased by a black fraternity, restored with HUD money and donated to the center, which collects 50 cents a head from visitors touring the building.

The building housing the center's administrative offices, Lewis said, was restored with \$47,000 in HUD money. ●

FEDERAL OVERREGULATION

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge that Federal overregulation is rampant throughout the land. A concrete example of the problem recently was brought home to me, however, and I mean that in a very literal sense.

Just this summer an automobile equipped with a catalytic converter ignited a fire on green grass on my own farm. Others had warned me of the hazard, and I had attempted to get EPA's attention to the problem. This incident crystallized my belief that we no longer can afford this blatant example of misplaced regulation.

The increased potential for vehicles equipped with catalytic converters to start fires is beyond dispute, and the insensitivity of EPA and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to this problem is particularly disturbing because: First, the use of the catalytic converter is not required to meet ambient air quality standards in rural areas; second, it reduces fuel efficiency at a time when we need to do everything possible to conserve; and third, there is no penalty to an individual who removes a catalytic converter in areas where they are needed to meet ambient air quality standards.

The law should be changed according to the following principles:

(1) In areas where air quality problems require the use of such technology, a penalty should be provided for anyone who intentionally thwarts its operation—although the penalty should be less for an individual who does so to his own vehicle than for someone who takes compensation.

(2) EPA should be prohibited from imposing emission standards on vehicles in excess of those required to meet ambient air quality standards in the area in which they will be predominately operated.

(3) There should be no penalty for anyone who removes a catalytic converter or other technology from a vehicle which will be predominately operated in an area which does not require the use of such technology to meet ambient air quality standards. The installation of such technology should be required, however, if and when the vehicle's predominant area of operation becomes one in which the use of such technology is required to meet ambient air quality standards.

(4) EPA should be prohibited from requiring the use of non-leaded gas in areas where it is not required to meet ambient air quality standards, and no penalty should be assessed anyone who either purchases or sells leaded gas in such areas—unless the predominant area of operation of their vehicles is one in which the use of unleaded fuel is required to meet ambient air quality standards.

I have today introduced legislation to accomplish these purposes. The text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to make certain modifications in provisions relating to automobile emission control devices and fuel additives, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 202 of the Clean Air Act is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, no regulation promulgated under this section shall apply to any motor vehicle which the Administrator determines, upon the application of any manufacturer or other person, will be used predominantly in an area in which the reduction of motor vehicle emissions is not necessary in order to attain and maintain the national ambient air quality standards."

(b) (1) Section 203(a)(3) of such Act is amended by inserting the following after the words "ultimate purchaser" in each place they appear in subparagraphs (A) and (B) thereof: "unless the Administrator has determined, in such manner as may be prescribed by him by regulation, that the vehicle or engine will be used predominantly in an area in which the reduction of motor vehicle emissions is not necessary in order to attain and maintain the national ambient air quality standards".

(2) Such section 203(a)(3) is further amended by inserting the following new subparagraph at the end thereof:

"(C) for any person other than a person referred to in subparagraph (A) or (B), knowingly to remove or render inoperative any device or element of design installed on or in a motor vehicle or motor vehicle engine in compliance with regulations under this title following its sale and delivery to the ultimate purchaser unless the Administrator has determined, in such manner as may be prescribed by him by regulation, that the vehicle or engine will be used predominantly in an area in which the reduction of motor vehicle emissions is not necessary in order to attain and maintain the national ambient air quality standards; or"

(c) Section 205 of such Act is amended by inserting the following new sentence after the second sentence thereof: "Any person who violates subparagraph (C) of section 203(a)(3) shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than \$1,000."

(d) Section 211(c) of such Act is amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(5) No fuel, class of fuels, or fuel additive may be controlled or prohibited pursuant to paragraph (1) where the Administrator determines that—

"(A) such fuel, class of fuels, or fuel additive will be predominately used in an area in which the reduction of motor vehicle emissions is not necessary in order to attain and maintain the national ambient air quality standards; and

"(B) the use of such fuel, class of fuels, or fuel additive will not impair to a significant degree the performance of any emission control device or system of the motor vehicle in which such fuel, class of fuels, or fuel additive will be used."

Mr. Speaker, according to the General Accounting Office, 25 percent of all cars coming off assembly lines do not meet Federal pollution standards. More than 50 percent exceed the standards within a year, and the failure rate rapidly increases thereafter.

These facts further highlight the foolishness of applying these standards to vehicles which operate in rural areas. Where the emission control standards are required to achieve ambient air quality standards, they should be made maximally effective; and my urban colleagues ought to devote their attention to this matter.

Where the emission control standards

are not required to meet ambient air quality standards, however, they are not only an unnecessary expense and inconvenience, they are also downright dangerous. This is not the first instance of rural people having to bear the brunt of the sins of their urban cousins nor will it be the last, but it is one example which can and should be corrected.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is unwise, unnecessary, unfair, and unjustifiable to require the use of catalytic converters in areas which meet national ambient air quality standards without them. The fire hazard and the need to conserve petroleum simply make it imperative that we abolish this example of overregulation. ●

ESSAY CONTEST WINNERS

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the winner of the 11th annual high school essay contest which I sponsor was Julie Ryan, a June graduate of Fort Worth Country Day School and the daughter of Betty Ryan and the late William T. Ryan, of 59 One Main Place in Fort Worth.

The three runners-up were Kathy Kay, of 3920 Wedgview, Hurst, a graduate of L. D. Bell High School in Hurst, and the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Kendall K. Kay; Thomas Dewar, of 3129 Chapparral Lane, Fort Worth, a graduate of Paschal High School, Fort Worth, and the son of Mr. and Mrs. Norman Dewar; and David Smith, a graduate of Diamond Hill-Jarvis High School, and the son of Mr. and Mrs. James H. Smith.

In addition to these awards, honorable mention went to the following: Steven Sisney, 2305 Miriam Lane, Arlington, Sam Houston High School; Lee Christie, 424 Eastwood Avenue, Fort Worth, Arlington Heights High School; Jarrell Wicker, 1068 Renee Drive, Hurst, L. D. Bell High School; Joe Claunch, 2117 Woodside Drive, Arlington; Steven Picht, 3709 Kelvin Avenue, Fort Worth, Southwest High School; Joey Holstead, 305 Concord, Hurst, L. D. Bell High School; and Eddie Stemple, 2408 Harrison Avenue, R. L. Paschal High School.

There was an unusually large number of exceptionally well-written essays this year and I am sure that the judges had a difficult time coming to their decisions. Julie Ryan's essay, which deals with the problem in some of our schools of allowing functional illiterates to obtain high school diplomas was so good, in my opinion, that I think that it deserves a larger audience.

For that reason, I am asking today that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The essay follows:

HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION: TESTS FOR MINIMUM COMPETENCIES OR OTHER ALTERNATIVES?

(By Julie Ryan)

"Why can't Johnny read?" "Why can't Johnny write?" "Maybe the reason is

Johnny's high school education. Americans today must be able to process all the information presented them (printed, verbal or statistical) and communicate intelligible, logical answers—skills which our schools ostensibly provide. Yet many American students graduate from high school virtually illiterate; often, they comprehend and write below an eighth grade level. How can these young adults possibly be expected to function competently in today's demanding and complex society?

A minimum competency requirement is the best solution for preventing a nation of people unable to communicate. A standardized test measuring specific skills could be used to indicate those students not capable of reasoning, communicating, or calculating on an acceptable level. However, this level must be defined by realistically set, uniformly administered criteria. Students should be able to read well enough to comprehend the daily newspapers or instruction manuals, directions, etc., written for a general audience, to reason well enough to find solutions to logical problems of moderate difficulty and draw accurate conclusions from premises, and be able to handle simple mathematical functions—not algebra or higher math, but certainly the basic operations, such as addition, subtraction, percentages, fractions, etc., that are essential in dealing with checks, salaries, payments, and taxes—in short every facet of the economy.

However, designating those students incapable of meeting the minimum verbal and quantitative requirements standards is not enough. The school system must initiate special programs designed to provide them with the skills of basic math, reading comprehension, English grammar and composition, and elementary logic. These courses should not be of the "elective" type, which students tend to regard lightly and view as a slack-off time or an easy way to complete a noisome graduation requirement. These programs should be non-nonsense and comprehensive enough to provide the student all the information he will need. However, they should be designed to encourage the minimally motivated student to pay attention and want to learn the material presented; they need not be drudgery or "punishment."

The teachers must also cooperate if high school students are to become educated adults. Presently, teachers routinely pass students who do substandard work. In fact, many teachers are hesitant, or fearful, to flunk students or require them to take remedial courses. Teachers must help indicate these students, so they can be brought up to a functioning level, not blithely pass them on from one grade to the next, until finally they graduate unable to communicate and deal in even the simplest capacity in society. Special considerations should be made for students physically unable to pass the test (due to a physical or mental disability).

A high school diploma has become a prerequisite for obtaining almost any job. Also, the laws requiring all children to attend school up to the eighth grade gives everyone a chance for an education that will enable him to cope in the modern business/communication-oriented world. However, allowing students to graduate without even minimal verbal and mathematical abilities defeats the whole concept of education; it is actually unfair to graduate! If minimum competency tests were instituted, a greater percentage of American adults could have better communicative abilities, could avoid being misled by today's gimmicks and subversive organizations, and could be better equipped, if not to find actual solutions to the nation's problems, to at least comprehend their possible eventual alternatives and effects. ●

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF HOWARD E. VANDER CLUTE, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VFW

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my privilege to attend and address the 80th Annual Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. During this convention officers were elected to lead the organization during the year ahead. Howard E. Vander Clute of Montvale, N.J., was chosen as commander in chief and his acceptance speech represents the viewpoint and attitudes of an important segment of Americans. I am inserting his address in the RECORD so all our colleagues may have access to its message.

The speech follows:

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF HOWARD VANDER CLUTE

My comrades, for years the people of America have said that time was on our side. That, in time we could be prepared to meet the threats to our national security; that, in time we would have adequate programs to meet the needs of those who served their country in time of war. When things did not work as we wished, we said, "time heals all wounds." And, somehow time seemed to take care of us.

Today we live in another age. And, time has run out.

Today, an intercontinental ballistic missile takes but minutes to reach its target. Today, those who fought for their country are treated as second-class citizens. Today, there is a bold, concerted effort to cut and eliminate all veterans programs.

Today, we see an Administration laughing at the Congress and doing as they please, slowly tightening the thumbscrews on what was once a viable medical care system.

Today, we see an Administrator of Veterans Affairs—who should be the champion of veterans needs, fighting for every program, expanding services—instead he is at the beck and call of the President, applauding each cut and backing all negative legislation.

But, my comrades, today also offers us a rare and unusual opportunity.

We are at the crossroads—a place to choose a new path for the future. A turning point at which those who care for their country can determine if we are to remain strong and recognize the sacrifices of those who served, or whether we shall lose all that we have fought for.

Today, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States must provide the leadership to clear a path for our great and beloved country. This was the path chosen by our forefathers and fought for by millions of Americans. What has been preserved is too dear to pass, forgotten by history. We cannot let a group of amateurs throw away our hard-won rights and the security of our country. It is time for the people to speak, and that they will!

My comrades, our organization has always been honest with its membership. I will continue that policy. You are aware that our country and its veterans programs are in jeopardy. Today, I tell you that unless drastic action is taken by us, we may see the final end of all that we have fought for.

All of you know what the present Administration promised when it came to Washington. We said then it is the Congress to whom we must turn, for they raise armies and they take care of those who have served.

However, the Congress itself is changing. The swing of sentiment from veterans programs to social welfare has historically come with peacetime and we have known how to deal with this in the past. Today things are happening far beyond a change in sentiment.

A few short years ago, "Tiger" Teague took to the floor of the House of Representatives a bill with the words, "this is a good bill, it takes care of veterans, it should pass." And, it did, overwhelmingly and without question.

This is no longer the case. Every two years, almost 100 Congressmen retire or lose their seats, including many of our old friends.

These patriotic Americans are being replaced by younger men and women, many of whom are not veterans. Their staff members, assigned by members of Congress to do research and advise them on veterans legislation are also younger and usually not veterans either.

Until recent months, it was unheard of for a member of the House or Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee to vote against legislation which would benefit a veteran. But, it has happened now. Recently, 100 members of the House, five of whom serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, voted against money for veterans legislation. Two additional committees of the House spoke against money for veterans programs, saying that if the Administration would not spend it, why vote it?

In the Senate, the Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee sponsored a bill to cut out three programs for veterans and ramrodded the bill through the entire Senate.

You can see from what I have said that we are now having problems with the Congress of the United States and that it is time to take positive action.

It is with that thought in mind that I compliment you for your action to establish a V.F.W. political action committee.

This will give us the added clout which only comes from the ability to influence elections by financial assistance. The V.F.W. remains the vital, vibrant, moving force it has always been, but now adds a new dimension to its influence.

You can be assured that much thought will be given to the make-up of the officers and board of directors of the committee. It will remain under the control of the V.F.W. and will be used to influence veterans and national security legislation.

We join a large group of special interest organizations that have found the changing nature of the Congress needed a new approach to keep favorable legislation or to outweigh attempts by the Administration to cut programs.

Let there be no doubt in your minds that this Administration has become more bold, more thrusting, and also more successful in attacking the entire wide range of veterans programs.

It has turned the older veteran against the younger; the service connected disabled against the non-service connected disabled; the deserving, in their opinion, against the non-deserving veteran.

Their attack reaches into the very heart of the VA medical system. And it must be stopped.

It began with the now infamous conversation between President Carter and VA Administrator Max Cleland in the White House soon after this Administration came to power. The President ordered Cleland to initially cut 5,000 beds from the hospital system and "get rid" of the unworthy veteran from medical care—the unworthy being the non-service connected disabled.

There is unified concern in the V.F.W. that the Administration has a grand design to dismantle the VA hospital system.

We know that about 10,000 beds have been eliminated from VA Medical Centers. We know that at a recent meeting, the Admin-

istration disclosed plans to close an additional 13,000 acute beds and covert 3,000 other such beds to chronic care beds within the next five to seven years. We understand that the Office of Management and Budget plans ultimately to reduce the total number of VA beds to 35,000. When that happens what can the Administration do but turn over the entire 172 VA Medical Centers system, now unused because of bed closures, to the national health insurance or a welfare program?

We know from a recent article in U.S. Medicine that the chief medical director of the VA was upset that the VA was not included in the Carter Administration's national health plan.

We know that the 5,000 doctors and nurses already cut in the VA budget and the lack of money for outpatient treatment has and will cause veterans who by law are authorized treatment to be turned away. Some die after being turned away, others are immediately admitted to a private hospital obviously needing care, and others are counselled by social workers to accept welfare treatment. The VA answers our charges by saying that the veteran, in their professional judgment, did not need the care. Yet, heart by-pass patients receive form letters telling them that they no longer qualify for medical assistance.

This must stop!

As one of my first acts as your Commander-in-Chief, I will call upon the Chairman of the Senate and House Veterans' Affairs Committee to conduct an investigation into the VA's hospital and outpatient facility admission policies. I will ask them to call a select group of hospital directors, chiefs of staff and chiefs of nursing service to testify concerning the admission policy and the effect of budget and personnel cuts, and I will ask that they testify under oath. The first question asked should be, "Did you receive any orders, by any means, which required you to testify in any particular manner?"

The V.F.W. is fed up with this Administration's treatment of veterans and must do something about it!

Now, this tampering with the VA programs for veterans does not stop with the medical care. Personnel losses in the regional offices have caused delays and inaccuracies in the processing of claims and appeals even for the simplest action.

These facts have been brought to the attention of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in an oversight hearing, and we expect that action will be taken to provide more money to hire more people.

We believe that these problems would never have come to pass if veterans had an advocate as an Administrator of Veterans Affairs. One who stood up for veterans and told Carter and the Office of Management and Budget that veterans did something special for their country and deserve something special in return. One who could sense that the Congress was interested in the veteran and his medical care. But, no, Mr. Cleland was silent when the OMB spent extra money intended for beds, doctors and nurses for other purposes.

We veterans no longer have an advocate, and so, the job of advancing veterans legislation falls upon our shoulders. This message must be clearly understood by each of us in the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Ladies Auxiliary.

The leadership rests with us.

As advocates we must become activists. We must tell our story. We must write, telegram and call our representatives in the Congress when called upon. We must use the Ladies Auxiliary to help us defend veterans preference, for the most vocal of our enemies are women's activist groups. We must tell our story at the community level—tell people

what we stand for, the good we do, what we have to offer.

To this end, I am dedicated to an ambitious and effective public awareness program at all levels of our great organization. We must tell the veteran and the public what must be done and what we are doing to accomplish our goals.

We will initiate a public relations effort to reach local radio and TV stations and will continue to reach local daily and weekly newspapers. We will assist you in any way we can by instituting a plan to have a professional communicator travel ahead of my visits with you to interest your local media in our efforts to tell the V.F.W. story.

Along with these plans, you at the Post level must show by deeds and words that we care. Emphasize your community programs, your patriotic deeds and your concern for the youth of this country. Get younger veterans to join by telling them what our V.F.W. is doing. Bring them into our programs.

Encourage them to work into positions which will bring them leadership roles in an organization dedicated to fighting for veterans rights.

The way to leave your stamp on this organization is to train the younger veteran in our proven ways. Let's see an explosion of young leadership at all levels.

Unless there is active participation we cannot be the advocate for veterans programs—the role we have now assumed. Unless our deeds are understood we will not be listened to when we demand a strong national defense posture.

My words on the defense and security posture of our beloved country will be brief, blunt and to the point.

For the 31 months of its existence, the Carter Administration has presided over—and has even taken credit for—the greatest dismantling of American power—spiritual as well as physical—in our nation's moderate history.

Perhaps you think this to be an extravagant charge.

My comrades, listen—then you decide.

On January 21, 1977, President Carter promptly kept one campaign promise. He extended total amnesty to America's young contemptibles—the draft dodgers.

He killed the B-1 bomber, thereby causing America's bombing pilots to fly an aging aircraft—the B-52—in some cases the planes are older than the pilots flying them. No off-setting concession was even mentioned to the Soviet Union.

Incredibly, the President, a former naval officer, is watching in frozen fascination as the U.S. Navy—once our first line of defense—has, deteriorated to the point that we are second to the Soviet Navy.

Remember when the Administration told us that the Canal Treaties—the cave-in to Torrijos—wouldn't "cost the taxpayer a dime." Well, my last count of the cost totals forty billion dimes or four billion dollars. And even this dollar cost pales when set beside the lost security brought on by this self-inflicted retreat from one of the world's strategic choke points.

We have seen one staunch ally, the Republic of China, betrayed; another, the Shah of Iran, overturned and sent fleeing for his life. In our own hemisphere, Nicaragua, once a solid ally, could well be our next Cuba.

But the Administration tells us, look at our record on human rights.

As far as I am concerned human rights comes down to a pressure on, and embarrassment for our partially freed friends. The communists, of course, ignore this campaign when they are not laughing at it.

My comrades, the greatest set of human rights this, or any, American Administration can provide us is to keep America and her allies alive and free.

Our civil defense program is a national disgrace and an international joke. It is non-existent. We stand naked before our enemies.

The neutron warhead, designed to offset the massive Soviet tank threat to NATO Europe, has been shelved.

And, finally, this sad accounting must take note of SALT II. A treaty which if ratified in the form approved by the President, will lock us into an irreversible posture of strategic inferiority.

The President and his people urge us to accept something called "rough equivalence" with the Soviet Union. They want us—with more than twice the wealth and a hundred-fold the decency of the Soviet Union—to settle for being equal.

We all remember General McAuliffe's reaction in 1944 when the Germans demanded his surrender at Bastogne. He said "Nuts" then, and we say "Nuts" now to any defeatist nonsense that settles for a transitory equality with the Soviet Union.

Our country, our home, America, has twice the dollar value of their extended slave society and we must carry the necessary level of "home owner's" insurance.

I will proudly carry forth your security mandate which charges our organization to "Regain and Sustain a Total American Defense Posture which is Clearly Number 1."

And I say this without any ifs, ands, or buts.

We call upon the Administration and the Congress to stand by our allies.

We will fight for an infusion of all our economic classes and educational levels into the active duty and reserve forces.

We see today the poor and nearly poor in the paisled All Volunteer Force being called upon to defend all of us—rich and poor alike.

I say those upon whom this country has showered its blessings can pay something back to America. It will be good for the country; it will be better for these pampered freeloaders.

All members of this great organization have answered the charge of Revolutionary war patriot Tom Paine who said,

"Those who expect to reap the blessings of liberty must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

Some mindless critics will, predictably call us "war mongers."

Nothing could be further from the truth. We neither conceived of, nor dissented from, the last four wars. We did our duty—and we salute especially the more than one half million of our members who stood fast in Vietnam when self-important people in this country, who should have known better, counselled dissent, disobedience, draft-dodging and desertion.

But, just being for peace isn't enough. Peace must and will be safe-guarded and under-girded with American power.

My comrades, my charge to you to be "In Front of the Rest" applies with special meaning to our beloved country in our foreign policy.

We intend to help those who fight for American security and veterans' entitlements in the Congress and we will oppose and expose those who don't.

We in the V.F.W. are "In Front of the Rest" and we're going to stay that way.

Thank you. ●

KATYN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions, I have directed the

attention of the House to the fact that the dictators of the Soviet Union cannot be trusted. The latest demonstration of this fact is the presence of Soviet combat troops in Cuba.

Earlier this week, I had the opportunity to attend a press conference held for Louis FitzGibbon, author of "Katyn," which is the documentation of the murder of more than 14,000 Polish officers by the Soviet Army at Katyn Forest and elsewhere during 1940. Mr. FitzGibbon's book is published by Noon Tide Press.

"Katyn" is a dramatic and precise description of the murder of these Polish officers by Soviet authorities. I highly commend the book, "Katyn," to my colleagues. ●

WE HAVE TO ACCEPT RISKS TO SAVE OUR CITIES

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, distressed cities throughout the United States are coming to rely, more and more, on the urban development action grant program as one means of helping in their economic development efforts. UDAG has become, in its very short life, one of the most successful programs ever devised for stimulating massive amounts of private investment in those communities where such investments are needed the most.

As with any program of its size and scope, there will be some problems and some questionable uses of the funds. Yet the UDAG program has been remarkably free of scandal and it has demonstrably helped a large number of communities in a number of ways.

Neal Peirce, one of the most knowledgeable and thoughtful journalists writing on urban affairs, recently did a column on the UDAG program and the need to accept risks in order to stimulate investment, which warrants all of our attention. I would like, therefore, to ask that this column, which appeared in the Niagara Falls Gazette on August 26, be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I found it illuminating, and I think all of our colleagues would as well.

The article follows:

UDAG IS WORTH SOME DANGER

(By Neal R. Peirce)

WASHINGTON.—Alleging actual or potential abuse in a handful of cases, critics have begun to nip at the heels of the urban development action grants (UDAG), the Carter administration's premiere program to help distressed cities. Sufficient criticism could cripple or kill the big \$400 million a year experiment to revive cities' economies by stimulating private investment.

Housing and Urban Development Secretary-designate Moon Landrieu has had questions to answer about his involvement, while in private business, with the grants program. And the General Accounting Office has sniffed out some apparent improprieties—specifically, a few cases in which UDAG grants, contrary to the program's proclaimed standards, financed private development that probably would have occurred anyway.

The alleged abuses don't negate the case for the UDAG program, highly popular with mayors and developers for its quick, flexible action to bridge urban investment gaps. The program provides cities, for instance, with "front end" funding to attract a big private investor, to assemble land for a major downtown or industrial park project, or to upgrade a blighted area to retain a job-providing plant.

But the criticisms underscore the hard trade-offs in designing a government program. Smother the program with rules, regulations and tight definitions and chances are you'll get an abuse-free—and probably quite ineffective—program. Make it flexible, responsive to real need and quick to act, and the likelihood is it will produce admirable results—along with occasional sloppiness and abuse, and at worst some old-fashioned political pork barreling.

If any program was ever worth some danger of abuse, UDAG may qualify. The idea germinated during the Carter administration's earliest urban policy debates when it was decided the problems of the country's "distressed" older cities were predominantly economic—lack of jobs, high tax rates, high land costs and the like—and couldn't be solved by social service or income support programs alone. Cities needed permanent jobs; they needed to invigorate their economies and job bases. And it was clear, in tight budget times, that Washington neither could nor would pay the entire bill—that private business would have to provide most of the capital.

The result was the first federal economic development program ever to require a firm "up front" private sector investment and job commitment before the first dollar of federal money could flow to a project. And of the 427 projects in 327 cities funded so far, HUD claims it has "leveraged" almost \$6 in private commitment for each \$1 of federal subsidy.

Such stimulus, claims HUD Assistant Secretary Robert Embry, is required to help "distressed" older cities become truly competitive and rebuild their job and tax bases. With the \$819 million it has committed under the UDAG program since it started in 1977, Embry claims a private sector commitment of over \$5 billion involving 133,000 permanent new jobs, 76,000 jobs retained that cities otherwise would have lost, and 123,000 construction jobs during the building of projects.

The GAO doubts whether the UDAG grants have leveraged quite that much private sector activity. But the development community has few doubts. "Two years from now," says developer James Rouse, "the center of the American city will have been more dramatically affected by UDAG than any other program, within such a short period of time, in the country's history."

One of UDAG's strong suits has been its lean staff—only 39 in Washington, plus part-time assistance from HUD officials in the field. Even under political pressure, grants haven't been made without a strong assurance of private-sector commitment. Developers and city officials praise the lack of bureaucratic red tape and rapid turnaround on applications—usually within 60 days of their receipt, some kind of a record in the federal government.

Neighborhood groups, particularly National People's Action, have bitterly criticized UDAG for preferring posh hotel projects (with allegedly low-paid jobs) to neighborhood projects. But the figures indicate a fairly even balance between downtown, commercial and neighborhood projects.

Will many cities use UDAG grants for projects they'd push through anyway, simply substituting federal money for local government or private sector investment? Embry claims the danger isn't great: The process is rigorously competitive among cities, there's

opportunity for full citizen and press review, and federal fraud statutes apply to misrepresentation in applications.

Even UDAG's staunchest friends, however, confess that at least the potential for abuse will remain in a program controlled by high-ranking political appointees handing out, on a necessarily somewhat subjective basis, huge sums of money (the total may now be raised to \$675 annually).

Such a flexible action grant program clearly needs constant oversight from Congress and vigilant local newspapers. But in energy-scarce and recession-prone times, it would seem foolish in the extreme to scrap or hobble, for fear of abuse, the cities' most successful economic development program of the '70s. ●

A NATION RUN BY KIDS

HON. GARY A. LEE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of you and my distinguished colleagues an article that appeared in the September 2, 1979, issue of Parade magazine about a unique and very special educational institution, the George Junior Republic, in Freeville, N.Y.

Under the superb guidance of its current director, Mr. Frank Speno, this institution has done much to help many young people turn from delinquency to become productive members of society. The article follows:

A NATION RUN BY KIDS

(By Reynolds Dodson)

The 17-year-old magistrate of the world's smallest republic banged his gavel and ordered the courtroom to silence. The defendant, a girl of 15, had been charged with illegal use of tobacco—an offense against the republic's laws for designated smoking areas.

"Since this is your second offense," said the black-robed magistrate, "I have no choice but to fine you \$10. If you're caught smoking in an undesignated area again, you'll get another \$10 fine plus a day in jail."

In the currency of the George Junior Republic in Freeville, N.Y.—a mini-nation run by teenagers for teenagers—\$10 is the equivalent of 3½ days' pay. And although jail does not mean physical imprisonment, it does mean that the offender will be denied privileges such as conversation with other citizens, the use of soft furniture, and staying up to the regular bedtime of 9:30.

Every day at 4:30, the court metes out justice to offenders against the republic's society. It employs an attorney general, prosecutors, defense lawyers and police—none of whom is over 19.

Life had not always held so much responsibility for Bruce, the young magistrate. The product of a broken home, he spent his early teens in rebellion against all authority. The schools had washed their hands of him, and he'd had several brushes with the law. The local family court had finally recommended his enrollment in the 84-year-old republic.

When Bruce first arrived at the beautifully manicured campus, he might have thought he was in an exclusive Eastern prep school. There were only 170 students, 63 of them girls. Many wore coats and ties, all were properly groomed, and no adult was ever addressed without the proper "Mister" or "Miss." But beyond that, any resemblance to a prep school was purely coincidental.

In the first place, Bruce—like all the

republic's "citizens"—was allowed to arrive with only a few luxuries and a pre-set list of clothing. He could accept no gifts from the outside world without paying a tax on them. He would be expected to work or go to school at least 35 hours a week, for which he would be paid a modest starting salary of 40 cents an hour, republic currency. He would live by an ironclad rule: "Nothing without labor."

If these had been adult-imposed laws, Bruce wouldn't have listened. But these laws were made by teenagers like himself and had been passed down through generations of "town meetings" in which adults had no say.

The effect on Bruce—as on all newly arrived citizens—was both confusing and profound. Now when he rebelled, it was against his own peers and against laws which he himself would have a voice in formulating.

Slowly, the light began to dawn. After a period of adjustment, Bruce wrote his father that "things seem to be going better now. There's a position of magistrate open and I'm going to try for it. It'll be tough, because it'll take me about two months to pass my bar exams."

To understand what all this meant to Bruce, you have to go back to the republic's founding and to a remarkable man named William "Daddy" George, a jewelry box maker. In 1881, the old New York Tribune initiated one of the first "fresh air funds" for city kids, and George began taking underprivileged boys for vacations to his farm in upstate New York.

But George became disenchanted. Many of the kids, he felt, were coming only to take advantage of the free food and donated clothing. And they were stealing from each other.

One day George declared that henceforth *everything* would have to be earned. You could clear a field or help build a cabin, but that was the only way you were going to get shoes and clothes. As for the thievery, he called the kids together and asked what they thought should be done with the offenders. The boys huddled for hours and finally came up with a kind of crude police system and a set of punishments to fit the offenses.

In 1895, the George Junior Republic was officially founded, with a constitution, by-laws, and a tripartite system of government similar to that of the U.S. Through the years many laws have been changed and new ones added, but no law has ever been imposed against the citizens' will by a "tyrannical" adult.

In governing this mini-nation, its citizens have had to deal with such weighty issues as taxation, national budget, road and sewer construction, constitutional amendments and—more recently—narcotics smuggling and drug abuse.

A youth with a history of failure in school may rebel at first and announce that he has no intention of going to classes. Imagine his surprise when he learns that school is not a requirement at the George Junior Republic. A boy can work in the carpentry shop, in the garage, or on the 500-acre farm. A girl may choose one of these activities, or dress-making, or helping in the kitchen.

But here's what happens. The boy in the garage is handed an automobile manual and told to make all the necessary repairs on a carburetor. He discovers that he will never be a mechanic until he learns to read. The obvious solution? Go back to school.

To be admitted to the republic, a youngster must be between 13 and 17 and of sufficient potential to be helped. The program is long and arduous. For it to have any effect, the average would-be delinquent must stay 18 months, and 24 months is recommended for optimum results.

Nor is it cheap. The cost per student is a little under \$20,000 a year, much of it from

public funds, some of it from fund-raising by the republic itself.

The republic's alumni include at least one Pulitzer Prize winner, several Academy Award winners, and a slew of successful doctors, lawyers, professors and businessmen.

As for Bruce, the young magistrate—he's left the republic, has a high school diploma and a steady job.

Bruce is the first to admit that he owes a great deal to William "Daddy" George and the spirit of the George Junior Republic.

As Bruce's father, so do I. ●

LOVE AND DEATH IN NICARAGUA

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post of August 9, 1979, by Colman McCarthy, describing the effects of the recent Nicaraguan struggle on two individual lives.

The sufferings of the people in a nation immersed in a violent struggle are well known to us all. Yet all too easily we depersonalize them—nameless soldiers and obscure villages are dismissed as statistics, facts remote from and unrelated to our lives. But for the families and friends of those whose lives are destroyed in such a struggle, it is all very personal. The stories of these people, people like Enoc Ortiz and Kay Stubbs de Ortiz, bring a little closer to home the tragedies of any war. Their stories could be our stories, and, in a sense, they are.

I commend the following article to the attention of my colleagues:

LOVE AND DEATH IN NICARAGUA

(By Colman McCarthy)

Between 10,000 and 20,000 Nicaraguans died in the struggle to end the violence of the Somoza regime. Few Americans knew the details of the revolution as it unfolded, and fewer still were personally touched by the individual tragedies of each Nicaraguan death.

An exception is Kay Stubbs. Her story is worth knowing because most of the qualities currently said to be in dwindling supply—hopefulness, a spirit of sacrifice, commitment to ideals—are brimming in her. This fullness is also a means of sharpening our focus on what has been happening these past years in Nicaragua and what better things may be happening in the future.

Kay Stubbs went to Nicaragua in 1968. She was a high school student from Middletown, Ohio, who traveled with her local Baptist church group to work in health projects. She found spiritual reward in getting to know the families and their culture. It wasn't the dabbling of the in-and-out do-gooder, because every summer after, she returned.

At home, she graduated from the University of Tennessee. She came to Washington to study at the Antioch School of Law, graduating in 1977. In her first week, she met Enoc Ortiz, a Nicaraguan in his early 20s.

He was the youngest of 12 children of a small coffee farmer in Nueva Segovia in northern Nicaragua. With one brother, a priest and two sisters in the convent, the family sent Enoc to a seminary in Managua. But he loved the open life in the mountains of his village, and came home. Later he went to the national university in Chile to study economics. He was held in prison and tortured for six weeks by the Pinchet regime.

Everything that Kay Stubbs had found so

beautiful in the Nicaraguans—their warmth and simplicity, the earnest regard for poetry and the life of the mind, the love for children, a yearning for the chance to be free of official terror—she also discovered in Enoc Ortez.

In Washington, he worked as a dishwasher and housepainter. The work was lowly but it didn't matter. All the time, he was learning. He came to know the refreshing truth that a difference existed between U.S. citizens and U.S. policy. He met Americans who had read the poetry of Ernesto Cardenal, the Nicaraguan writer who had studied under Thomas Merton at the Trappist monastery in Kentucky. He discovered that several members of Congress—Robert Drinan of Massachusetts, Thomas Harkin of Iowa, Donald Fraser of Minnesota—were authentic allies of the poor in his homeland.

This helped keep him from being despondent about the backing Somoza had long received from American policy-makers, bankers and corporations.

In June 1978, Enoc Ortez and Kay Stubbs married. During their courtship, he had made flower coronas for his beloved's hair. She shared his dreams for a free Nicaragua. They took a small apartment and began saving money for the day when they could start a family. Friends rejoiced that Enoc and Kay—both of them with large spaces in their hearts for laughter, tenderness and hope—had found each other.

Four months after their marriage, the couple decided that Enoc should return briefly to Nicaragua and put his patriotism to work in the Sandinistas' drive to end their country's torment.

He wrote often to his wife. This is one of the letters: "My little pine blossom, today, May 24, one month before the first anniversary of the day in which we declared our long-standing commitment to love and nurture one another and to struggle for our people's freedom, I am filled with a mixture of happiness and sorrow.

"My happiness comes from the realization that we are fulfilling the vows we made that day. Yet my heart is heavy with sorrow because I am not at your side. . . . Darling, I am very proud to be able to be here and that in the midst of our personal suffering from the separation, we remain true to our pledge to fight for our country's liberation. . . . Precious, I am proud of you. I love and adore you."

That was the last letter. Enoc Ortez was killed in early July in a battle in the Segovia mountains by Somoza's national guard. Days later, the fighting stopped.

Kay Stubbs de Ortez plans to return to Nicaragua. ●

HEAVY CRUDE AND THE INCREASED PRODUCTION OF DOMESTIC OIL

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, President Carter set some ambitious goals for our Nation in his televised energy speech. He set some high targets for domestic oil production to move our Nation toward energy independence.

Today, in my home district in Southern California, Federal energy officials, local and State government experts, and representatives of the oil industry are gathering to discuss proposals which could launch an impressive and speedy start toward the maximum development

of U.S. oil fields and could place us well ahead of schedule in meeting the President's production goals.

This morning, Department of Energy officials will hear a chorus of support for a broader definition of heavy crude oil, in order to decontrol a much larger amount of California's heavy oil. Because of the thickness of this oil, it is too expensive to bring out of the ground while prices for it are held down. I am supporting the redefinition proposal with the belief that such action is necessary to substantially increase California oil production.

If we prevail, the payoff could be tremendous. California oil reserves are vast; yet, over 6,000 wells have been closed down in recent years. I applaud the Carter administration for providing us with the opportunity to look at this issue more thoroughly, and to reverse this trend of nonproduction. ●

OIL DEREGULATION IS THE ANSWER

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, what can provide the energy answer? I have just read an interesting article by the noted economist, H. A. Merklein, of the Graduate School of Management of the University of Dallas. Writing for World Oil magazine in the August 15, 1979, issue, Merklein stayed with basic economic fundamentals. The statement was entitled "Mr. President."

Here are some of the best comments from this statement by Dr. H. A. Merklein:

COMMENTS BY H. A. MERKLEIN

If there were not one more drop of oil or one more cubic foot of natural gas to be found in the U.S., the price of oil and gas would still have to be permitted to rise in accordance with dictates of the market, and for two reasons.

First, this would cut consumption efficiently and rationally.

The second reason why energy prices would have to rise, even if no more oil or gas were to be found in the U.S., is that oil and gas are not the only sources of energy.

Mr. President, the American public does not want the government to play a central role in the production and distribution of energy. The public looks at Amtrak and at the Post Office and it wonders out loud why it should believe that the level of efficiency in a centrally regulated energy sector would be different from the efficiency at these two agencies.

Coming to the specifics of your plan, here is a sober summary of it: The plan envisions heavy and permanent taxation of the American public. To the extent that the tax revenues are insufficient to meet the expenses of the energy plan, the federal government proposes to borrow additional funds, thereby contributing to further deficit spending, to an increase in the national debt and to a further rise of an already high rate of interest.

Perhaps the most forceful point you made, Mr. President, in delineating your energy policy was when you set the clear goal never to use more foreign oil than this nation did in 1977. Never.

After all, you yourself were running on

a platform that, among other things, envisioned the government getting out of the energy area, a platform that included a firm commitment to deregulated energy prices.

Mr. President, we have talked and legislated and regulated energy in the post-embargo period, but there has been very little action. And now you tell us that we have talked enough, that the time for action has come now, immediately.

For the good of the nation, I hope that your import goal will not be met. It's not that I would disapprove of the objective, but I fear the method. In essence, this is a national energy shortage plan. You propose to hold imports in line, and then let's see who gets whatever oil is available. You speak of priorities in allocating gasoline: The police ought to get it, ambulances, fire fighters. And then, as a residual claimant, comes the motorist of this country. This spells gasoline lines, black markets, frustration. Why not try higher prices instead? After all, this is not a new or a unique remedy, and it's working well in Germany and in Japan.

If so, your announced intention to decontrol domestic crude oil prices by Sept. 30, 1981, is a long-overdue step in the right direction. This plan, if implemented, will indeed eliminate our energy shortage and do away with gasoline lines. Of course, if price decontrol is such a good thing, it would be better to implement it in its totality tomorrow morning.

The deterioration of the U.S. dollar cannot be blamed on OPEC. Germany and Japan both import some 95 percent of their crude oil needs, as opposed to our 50 percent, and their currencies are as strong as ever. ●

DAVID HOROWITZ

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on September 29, 1979, the City of Hope (Oakwood-Toluca Hills Chapter) will present their highest honor—the Spirit of Life Award—to David Horowitz at a dinner at the Beverly Wilshire Hotel. The proceeds of the dinner will establish a cancer research fellowship in memory of David Horowitz's father, Max Leo Horowitz.

David Horowitz needs no introduction, I am sure, to anyone who has followed with interest, outrage, or concern, the special problems which consumers have been facing. We are all consumers and thus we all have been affected by the battles David Horowitz has waged against ripoffs, scams, profiteering, and calculated infringements on our laws. His Goliath is in the form of individuals and companies who willfully defraud the public whenever and wherever it is profitable and possible.

David Horowitz was always a "fighter." He followed the example of his European-born parents to speak up and fight back. They were experts in dealing with abuses in the Bronx ghetto neighborhood where David grew up. School held little interest for him. Life in the street was so much more challenging until he became the editor of his 6th grade class newspaper. From there on his achievements as a journalist are legion. An honor graduate from New York School of Printing, this led to a scholarship to Bradley University where he became the first recipient of that school's Outstand-

ing Journalism Award. This was followed by earning a Master of Arts Degree with honors from Northwestern University and later postgraduate work in Public Law and Government at Columbia University as a CBS News Fellow.

While still attending college, Horowitz wrote for the Peoria Journal-Star and several country weeklies. His early television news career included writing for the Huntley-Brinkley Report—NBC. He was one of the first TV reporters to cover the Vietnam War. His incisive style of reporting from the field was a departure from the established more controlled news coverage of that time and place.

His consumer reporting career was launched in 1964 on "Call for Action," WMCA, New York. His investigation on slumlords brought him national recognition. In 1966, enlarging his TV consumer-awareness reporting through numerous daily segments, led to the David Horowitz consumer buyline program which is now seen nationally. His special combination of characteristics—concern, knowledge, sense of humor, empathy, are the roots of his popularity.

When not broadcasting, David Horowitz spends time as a lecturer and adviser on consumer affairs. He has assisted such groups as the National Education Association in creating consumer awareness interest in the classroom and has influenced many companies to include consumer affairs departments in their operations.

Perhaps the most important contribution David Horowitz has made has been to place the subject of consumer protection before the eyes and ears of the public and into the hands of the consumers themselves. Where once the fight for consumer rights was in the province of Government assisted protection or in the collective battleground of consumer interest groups, David Horowitz has made it an individual concern and has given consumers the awareness, knowledge, and confidence to take action on their own.

David Horowitz has received wide recognition for his work from such diverse groups as Daughters of the American Revolution, Mormon Church, city and county of Los Angeles, American Cancer Society, Veterans Administration, American Society of Travel Agents, California Teachers' Association, California Trial Lawyers' Association, National Film Advisory Board, and Academy of Television Arts and Sciences. I am glad to be able to join on this occasion with his wife, Suzanne and daughters, Victoria and Amanda, in congratulating David Horowitz on his accomplishments. I ask the Members to join me in wishing him continued success in his important work. ●

REAFFIRMING THE AMERICAN WAY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, to many of us the sight of cheerleaders,

car washes, and Rexall drugstores is relatively commonplace. However, to those behind the Iron Curtain, these scenes of everyday life in America are rare visions of life under freedom and democracy. I am proud to call my colleagues' attention to the town of Granville, Ohio, and its contribution to showing those living under communism the American way of life. Granville was the subject of a display at the U.S. Embassy Information Office in Sofia, Bulgaria. Crowds of people stood, up to six deep, to catch a glimpse of the exhibit. This was quite an embarrassment to Bulgarian officials, who like to tell their oppressed subjects that life is wonderful under the thumb of the U.S.S.R. It is reassuring to know that every now and then reality can filter through the shrouds of censorship in Eastern Europe. The contrast of the freedoms we take so much for granted, becoming a major event in a Communist capital once again reaffirms my faith in what America stands for. I urge my colleagues to take a few moments to read an article by Mr. Michael Dobbs about the Granville exhibit and current life in Bulgaria:

EXHIBITS ON LIFE IN UNITED STATES DRAW EAGER CROWDS IN BULGARIA

(By Michael Dobbs)

SOPIA, BULGARIA.—This quiet city of broad leafy boulevards is plastered with posters and slogans applauding Bulgarian-Soviet friendship, but it often seems that the best show in town is on the sidewalk outside the U.S. Embassy.

Much to the embarrassment of Bulgarian authorities, the sidewalk is always crowded with Bulgarians gazing at window displays in the U.S. Embassy Information Center. Every week a new photo exhibition covers nonpolitical subjects, from jazz to space technology. But what draws the biggest crowds is any insight into how ordinary Americans live.

Recently, for example, several hundred people gathered six deep outside the embassy trying to catch a glimpse of life in Granville, Ohio, despite the presence of a uniformed militiaman intent on moving them on. The exhibition explained the significance of such mysterious institutions as the Rexall drugstore, high school cheerleaders, and an automatic carwash.

It would be a mistake to conclude that Bulgaria is about to jettison its alliance with Moscow and embrace the Western way of life. But there are signs that after 35 years of copying the Soviet model, many Bulgarians are seeking to broaden their horizons.

The first impression that strikes the visitor to Bulgaria is that Soviet society is flourishing in the Balkans, scaled down certainly, but otherwise faithfully reproduced. The second impression is of a country whose exposed positions makes it at once more relaxed and open to outside influence than the Soviet Union, yet less adventurous than its unorthodox Communist neighbors, Yugoslavia and Romania.

On the surface, Bulgaria remains the very model of the Soviet Union's loyal younger brother, a favorite phrase of Bulgarian leaders. Bulgaria seems to have benefited politically and economically from its close ties with Russia, which go back to its liberation by czarist armies in 1878 following five centuries of Turkish rule.

Bulgarian leaders constantly inculcate love for the Soviet Union among the country's 8.5 million residents. The annual May Day parade, for example is a replica of the Kremlin version—with the Bulgarian Politburo gathered atop the mausoleum of longtime

Bulgarian Communist leader Georgi Dimitrov, placards describing how workers have overfulfilled their plan by staggering percentages and a cacophony of stirring music.

Every portrait of the Bulgarian leader, Todor Zhivkov, whose 25 years in power make him the longest-living serving Soviet bloc leader, is flanked by an equally large portrait of Leonid Brezhnev. "From Centuries—For Centuries," proclaim the slogans. No one needs reminding that they refer to Bulgarian-Soviet friendship.

A sole reminder of Bulgaria's somewhat Ruritanian past is provided by the hussar-type uniforms on a goose-stepping honor guard outside the mausoleum. Said to have been designed by a former Bulgarian king, they resemble the ill-fated uniforms commissioned by Richard Nixon for the White House guard.

Looking at home in a sea of red banners is the Soviet ambassador, who occupies a post akin to what a Western colleague describes as "a viceroy to India." The former ambassador, Vladimir Bozovskil, has just returned to Moscow after a round of farewell parties attended by the entire Bulgarian Politburo. During his tour of duty, he frequently attended Politburo meetings and accompanied Zhivkov around the country.

Soviet economic assistance has furnished Bulgaria with more than 90 percent of its productive capacity in heavy industry and more than 40 percent overall. In 1977, 55 percent of Bulgaria's foreign trade was with the Soviet Union. The Kremlin supplies Bulgaria with more than 90 percent of its oil.

Bulgaria's economic system was integrated further with the Soviet Union's with the November opening of ferry service between the two countries. Operating across the Black Sea, the huge ferryboats—each has a capacity for 108 freight cars—eliminate long delays for overload transport through Romania and could have strategic importance in the event of trouble elsewhere in the Balkans.

Combined with his long service, Zhivkov's unswerving loyalty has won him a special place in the Soviet bloc. He has been entrusted with several foreign policy missions on behalf of the Kremlin, and in the fall he will travel to Vietnam and Cambodia in a demonstration of the Kremlin's diplomatic support for the new rulers of Phnom Penh.

The ambivalence of ordinary Bulgarians toward official glorification of the Soviet Union was expressed by a middle-class mother whose son returned from Sofia's elite Russian-language school boasting to his friends about the superiority of all things Russian. Proud that he was doing so well in class, she nevertheless took him to one side and rebuked him: "You are not a Russian, son. You are a Bulgarian—and don't you ever forget that."

Also irritating are governmental attempts to attribute all successes to the period of Communist rule since World War II but resurrecting the glories of the medieval Bulgarian state when convenient. A current joke runs: "Bulgaria has had 1,300 years of history—all in the last 35 years."

Zhivkov has stated flatly that Bulgaria has no dissidents. While there is no movement to match Charter 77 in Czechoslovakia or even the Helsinki monitoring groups in the Soviet Union, beneath the surface are undercurrents of discontent, indicated by the recent daubing of the slogan "35 years of slavery" on a building in downtown Sofia.

Of more immediate concern to Bulgarian authorities are mounting economic difficulties. Measured in terms of capacity to repay, Bulgaria's indebtedness to the West is greater than any other East European country. And despite the enthusiastic placards carried by workers on May Day, production has been running well below planned targets, particularly in heavy industry.

Even much-vaunted Soviet subsidies have a negative side. In the view of Western economists, they have distorted the overall development of Bulgaria's economy and left it ill-prepared to cope with sudden jolts such as the sharp increases in the price of Soviet oil that the Kremlin is imposing on its allies.

The economic problems are reflected in widespread shortages of many goods including basic foodstuffs such as meat, fruit, and vegetables. Although Bulgaria is an agricultural country with a food surplus, it sells much of its produce abroad to reduce the trade deficit.

Popular grumbling over meat shortages has become a sensitive issue for Bulgarian politicians, but they are at a loss to solve it. Looking on the bright side, a Western ambassador remarked recently at a diplomatic reception that eating less meat was good for the health. The remark was overheard by Zhilvov, who said, "If you can convince the Bulgarian people, we'll award you the order of Dimitrov." ●

NATIONAL VIETNAM-ERA VETERANS WEEK ACTIVITIES—FRESNO, CALIF., MAY 28, 1979, TO JUNE 3, 1979

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, during the week of June 28 to June 3, this Nation paid tribute to the men and women who served their country during the Vietnam conflict.

I am particularly proud of the fine program sponsored by the community of Fresno, Calif., during that week and would like to share with you the highlights of the week's events.

At least one event was scheduled every day to keep the Vietnam veteran in the public eye.

Monday, May 28 began with an ecumenical worship service and a flag ceremony at the Veterans' Administration Hospital followed by a public speech by a decorated disabled Vietnam veteran at the Fresno Memorial Gardens.

On Tuesday a memorial service and wreath presentation honoring Vietnam veterans was held at California State University, Fresno.

On Wednesday a luncheon for 450 Vietnam veterans was held at the Veterans' Administration Hospital followed by a "veterans helping veterans" workshop. The event was coordinated by the American Legion and hospital personnel.

On Thursday, May 31, a reception was held at the Veterans' Administration Hospital to honor Vietnam veteran hospital employees. This was followed by a panel discussion on ways of improving hospital services and issues of major concern to the Vietnam veteran.

Friday, June 1, five Playboy bunnies, accompanied by chaperone and photographer spent the day with hospitalized veterans at the Fresno VA Hospital. After meeting with hospital officials and news media, they visited with every veteran patient and lunched with 10 selected Vietnam veteran patients.

Saturday, June 2, a job-search work-

shop was held at the local fashion fair for Vietnam-era veterans.

Sunday, June 3, concluded the week with the Presidential citation being presented to Vietnam-era veteran, Bruce Thiessen, by a national officer of the American Legion, George C. Sinopoli. The final act of the week was appropriately a silent remembrance to all Vietnam veterans killed in action in Southeast Asia. ●

SPENDING MORE, DEFENDING LESS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, our friend and colleague, Hon. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, has served as an outstanding Member of Congress for many years, representing the Seventh District of New York, which is contiguous to mine.

Earlier this year he became chairman of the powerful Subcommittee on Defense of the House Appropriations Committee, where he has long served with much distinction, bringing to that role his expertise in and knowledge of our defense policies.

Richard E. Cohen has written an article which appeared in the National Journal of August 11, 1979, delineating JOE ADDABBO's particular contributions to the debate on SALT II. His clear and precise statements on the needs of our national defense set a reasonable and temperate tone for the forthcoming debate in the Senate.

For the benefit of the Members of this House who might not have had an opportunity to read the article, I am taking the liberty of having it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

SPENDING MORE, DEFENDING LESS

While practically all eyes have been on the Senate, Rep. Joseph P. Addabbo may have contributed the most important statement to the debate on the strategic arms limitation treaty and the future of the defense budget.

"It is my contention that dollars alone do not buy national defense," Addabbo told the House on Aug. 2. "I do not believe we can afford to continue to be guided by simplistic, expensive and wasteful formulas. . . . It is clear that we are spending more [on defense] and getting less for it, year by year. . . ."

Although Addabbo won't vote when the Senate considers SALT II this fall, he will have more long-term influence on the nation's defense posture than will most of the 100 Senators. A House Member from New York City, he became chairman this year of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense. His views make the current Senate skirmishing on SALT look like a semantic exercise in which the participants appear concerned primarily with scoring debating points and asserting their role in defense policy formulation.

As the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees' hearings on SALT progressed, attention focused less on the technical terms of the treaty—for which support seems to be growing—than on the amount the Pentagon will spend on weapons in the next few years. Sen. Sam Nunn, D-Ga., supported by Sens. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., and John Tower, R-Texas, wrote President Carter on Aug. 2 that a 4 to 5 per cent increase beyond inflation in the defense budget

is "essential" to "begin reversing the unfavorable trends in the military balance." In effect, Nunn said his vote for SALT depends on Carter's response.

Nunn has demonstrated his serious concerns about the nation's defense and has become one of the Senate's leading experts on many military issues. Therefore, when he said earlier that "the SALT II treaty will become nothing more than an instrument for registering emerging Soviet military superiority" unless Carter makes a five-year commitment to restore the nation's military strength, some proponents of the treaty were shaken.

But Nunn's strategy has several problems. First, his letter to Carter asked general questions about defense plans: how much will the Administration spend, where will the increases go? He neither advocated specific weapons systems nor asked Carter about his plans for them. The premise of the letter is simply that more money is the answer.

Is it, however? Addabbo, for one, thinks it is not. He complains that the Pentagon asks for more money than it needs and then puts the money aside "for a rainy day," at which time it spends it for unnecessary and excessively expensive programs. At the same time, Addabbo says, the department completes projects of "dubious military value" while more conventional weapons are in short supply. As an example of wasteful spending, he cited the recent decision to spend \$2 billion for another nuclear carrier that will not be completed until the 1990s, when advanced missiles will make it more vulnerable to attack.

Sen. Gary W. Hart, D-Colo., an Armed Services Committee member, echoed Addabbo's thoughts when he told his panel that a larger defense effort would not necessarily strengthen national defense. "It is more difficult but more important to define what specific steps we must take to secure our nation," Hart said. Rather than a "more is better" or "less is better" approach to national defense, Hart is calling for "better is better." Specifically, he has advocated greater planning of military strategy and weapons selection, combined with use of innovative technologies and better management.

From the Nunn perspective, managerial changes, while important, must be accompanied by budget increases. Defense spending, he is quick to point out, has been so neglected that it now has its smallest share of the federal budget since before the Korean War.

Nunn may also be dealing with the wrong person, however, when he seeks assurances of more military dollars. For one thing, no President—let alone one in the third year of a shaky four-year term—can guarantee budget outlays four or five years hence. And, as Carter aides have pointed out, Congress has regularly reduced his defense budgets. This year, for example, Addabbo's subcommittee sliced \$2 billion from Carter's request of nearly \$130 billion, which Nunn and others earlier had attacked for not meeting Carter's commitment to other Western heads of state to add 3 per cent in real terms for defense.

In the meantime, the Foreign Relations Committee's thorough handling of the treaty has bolstered the hopes of treaty supporters that the Senate debate and vote will not be as difficult as they had feared a few weeks ago.

If their hopes are realized, the committee leaders and staff deserve considerable credit for the way they structured the debate so that all points of view were heard and legitimate concerns were met. Sens. Frank Church, D-Idaho, and Jacob K. Javits, R-N.Y., the panel's chairman and ranking minority member, announced before the August recess that they will propose two understandings and two reservations to the treaty that they said would clarify its meaning and "re-

move certain doubts that have been expressed about what it is we are agreeing to—and not agreeing to”—if the treaty is ratified.

The proposed understandings are intended to reinforce promises that the Administration already has made to the Senate; the reservations spell out commitments by the Soviet Union to U.S. negotiators. Church and Javits said their proposals "reflect an emerging consensus" among committee members.

Of course, Church and Javits have been in no position to head off the debate about the size of the defense budget. President Carter will have to meet that test and convince doubters that he understands the treaty's significance for U.S. military capabilities.

Both Carter and the Senate should thank Addabbo for injecting a note of reason into the treaty debate, a step that may make SALT II a useful exercise in national defense as well as diplomacy. ●

TIBOR BARANSKI RECEIVES YAD VASHEM "RIGHTEOUS GENTILE" AWARD

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, only 3 years ago the United States was celebrating its Bicentennial, commemorating the dissolution of our ties with an empire that did not respect the freedoms and aspirations of the people of the American colonies. While this struggle is history to our Nation, the striving for freedoms in which we have such pride still continues today. Thus, it is proper that we reward the efforts of a great Hungarian Freedom Fighter, Tibor Baranski.

Tibor Baranski, a teacher who lives in western New York, suffered untold atrocities himself as a captured prisoner of the Communists. He was recently honored in Israel when he was presented with the Righteous Gentile Award. This is the highest award given to non-Jews by the Yad Vashem, which commemorates the Holocaust. My wife Joanne and I had the privilege of visiting the Yad Vashem during our recent trip to Israel, and came away with an even greater appreciation of the courage of those who defied Nazi genocide.

Tibor Baranski received this award, because of his unselfish efforts to free 3,000 to 6,000 Jews from Nazi death or persecution during World War II. In 1939, Germany invaded his homeland, Hungary, and began the enslavement of Jews in concentration camps across Europe. Tibor immediately began to work in accordance with the orders of Pope Pius XII whom the Nazis allowed to house 12,000 baptized Jews. His efforts included obtaining baptismal certificates for the Jews and protecting them from the Nazis. He also assisted his aunt in obtaining false documents for the Jews and hiding them in secure underground locations.

In 1944, Tibor was made the leader, the executive secretary, of the Jewish Protective Movement. There were many times that he risked his own life in this position to save others. He says that if the Nazis had known what he was doing, "I would have, within 10 seconds, a bullet in my head."

Mr. Speaker, Tibor Baranski is a devout Christian of the Catholic faith who risked his life many times for thousands of Jews during World War II. At this time, I would like to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Western New York Catholic Visitor which tells the complete story of this great Hungarian Freedom Fighter.

TIBOR BARANSKI, THE "RIGHTEOUS GENTILE"—
HUNGARIAN CATHOLIC GIVEN HIGHEST HONORS IN ISRAEL

(By Kay Lyons)

Tibor Baranski, a teacher who lives in Snyder with his family, is probably best known locally as a member of the 37 Captive Nations Committee, a former Hungarian Freedom Fighter, who suffered untold atrocities himself as a captured prisoner of the Communists, who managed to escape to the United States.

He is a man of old-world charm who bows to kiss a lady's hand—yet there is a certain air of militancy about him, and he could very correctly be called "a militant zealous Christian of the Catholic faith for which he'd willingly die if necessary." This description he does not deny.

STRAIGHTFORWARD

He minces no words, whether he is paying a glowing compliment, or blasting out verbally against the Nazis and Communists for all that he saw and experienced from their hands.

He was recently honored in Israel as "a hero," even though he insists he simply did what had to be done.

He tells of a Nazi who once asked him, "Why do you, a Christian, protect and defend the Jews?" In his typical candor, he replied, "You are either silly or an idiot—for it is because I am a Christian that I help the Jews."

With extensive knowledge of Scripture and more than a smattering of Catholic theology, he quotes the very simple and well known words of Jesus Who said, "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

"If we believe and practice the teachings of Christ," he said, "then we must recognize all of mankind as 'our neighbor,' be they Gentile or Jew. . . ." But there is an exception to his love for neighbor, also based on the teachings of Christ Who said to hate that which is evil, and there is little love in Tibor Baranski's heart for the Nazis or Communists whom he calls "those devils . . . the advocates of Satan."

"I tell you," he says to anyone who will listen, "anyone who lives by the rule of communism becomes no more than a wild animal, a beast!" He says this with good reason.

In early January, as a result of several years' effort on the part of a Jewish lady chemist in California, Mrs. Hedwig Szekeres, Baranski went to Israel to receive the "Righteous Gentile" award from Yad Vashem at the Holocaust Memorial Center in Jerusalem. It is Yad Vashem's highest honor to non-Jews and only 500 have received the award.

INVESTIGATION

It is not an award easily gained. Mrs. Szekeres and eight members of her family are among the 3,000 to 6,000 Jews Tibor Baranski helped to escape Nazi death or persecution during World War II. In 1975 she submitted his name to the committee for Yad Vashem. There followed a long and thorough investigation as to whether this man really did what Mrs. Szekeres said he did. Last Christmas week he received a cablegram from Jerusalem announcing he had been selected for the honor.

The pure silver medallion, on a bed of velvet in a square box made of olive wood, on which appears the holy symbol of Jews and all of Israel, the Menorah, has on it hands reaching out to the world. The symbolism literally means, "If you saved only one

life, it is as if you had saved the entire world."

Mr. Baranski was thrilled to actually meet again several hundred Jews whom he remembered, despite the years' toll, both at the ceremony and after a Hungarian newspaper announced the ceremonial which honored him. He is the third Hungarian to have received the Righteous Gentile award.

He is also one of the very few who was privileged to plant a tree in the gardens of the Yad Vashem building, with a plaque bearing his name for future generations to recall, as "one of the just people of the world." Only Gentiles are so honored by Yad Vashem, a commemorative organization.

CITATION

He was also given a citation, written in Hebrew on one side and in French on the other, which tells of his magnificent fight for the Jews during World War II, saving them from the death ovens and other abominable crimes of persecution.

One of those people turned out to be the principal of the school where Tibor's daughter's music teacher's husband formerly taught in Israel. Another, at the ceremony, who had forgotten the name of Baranski but who recognized him, was almost speechless with joy when he ran up to grip the honoree's hand and said, "I'm one of those you saved!" Mr. Baranski slept in the home of a family whom he had saved, who now lives in Haifa—there were others.

In 34 years people do change—people do not always remember the kindness shown them, even for a day—but what Baranski did was no small "kindness." He saved several thousand lives of people who did not share his religious faith or beliefs, who were "nothing" special to him personally except that they were human beings created by God who deserved the right to live.

He was a young man of 22 when the Nazis invaded his homeland. He had been brought up by a deeply religious aunt. He was then and is now a man of unusually deep conviction and principles. Even today he says, "I will never give up my Christian principles and convictions," and sometimes he pays a heavy price. He is brutally truthful. As a teacher, he refuses "to twist the minds of children with false, liberal, barbaric teaching." He calls himself a "progressive conservative" Catholic-Christian.

He is something of an expert on European history and speaks five languages. Although he is not exactly shy in citing his own capabilities, there is a note of humility about him when he says of his work with the Jewish Protection Movement, an arm of the Church, of which he became executive secretary. "I only did what God demanded of me. I was really acting in accordance with the Orders of Pope Pius XII whom the Nazis allowed to house 12,000 "baptized" Jews in 42 houses. But those dogs didn't keep their word to the Pope—they changed, with no warning, to 3,000 Jews in 12 Vatican houses."

DEATH CAMPS

Until March, 1944, Hungary was an "independent" ally of Nazi Germany, with legal opposition parties and relative freedom for the Jews. "A puppet government" was installed, Baranski recalls. Anti-Jewish legislation was enacted, the yellow star was introduced, and the collection of Jews for the death camps began.

In October, 1944, when Mr. Baranski was studying theology in a Hungarian college, the Russian army crossed into Hungary. He returned home to Budapest to find that his aunt was very active in the underground movement which helped obtain false documents and found hiding places for the Jews. She had "adopted" and housed the Szekeres' infant son while his parents were in hiding. His aunt asked Tibor to help the Szekeres family who faced death.

He sought help at the office of Bishop Angelo Rotta, the Papal Nuncio, Vatican diplomatic representative, in Budapest. This is

typical of Tibor Baranski—he goes to the top to get something done.

There were many Jewish-Gentile intermarriages which brought about some definitely real Jewish conversions to Catholicism—an estimated 35,000 "baptized" Jews in Hungary in 1938. But some later admitted that their "conversion" was for safety's sake, a real matter of life and death. The Pope was intent on saving the lives of all who could be saved from the doom of the Nazis. Who is to judge the "convenient" baptisms except God Himself?

Baranski obtained baptismal certificates for three members of the Szekeres family alone from Bishop Rotta, in charge of the 12 "Vatican houses" in Budapest. Baranski filled out protection letters for all nine members of that one family, went to their homes and brought them to one of the protected buildings.

Impressed with Baranski's fluent German, the papal nuncio asked him a few days later to shepherd about 40 "baptized" Jews out of a factory where hundreds were kept before they were marched to death camps in Germany. He was asked to go the next morning, but Baranski insisted upon going immediately. He was offered a small car, but he refused, insisting on a Rolls Royce.

"Primitive people"

"I told the bishop, 'The Nazis are primitive people. A little shoehorn car would not show any representation of power—they'd be impressed by a Rolls Royce.'" The bishop realized that Baranski thoroughly understood the Nazi psychology.

He drove the big impressive limousine right up to the gate of the factory in the very neighborhood where he had once lived and bluffed his way completely past the guards with his most aggressive demeanor. The guards offered to escort him but he assured them he knew his way around. When they asked, "How?" he curtly answered, "That's none of your business."

He found the Jews he was looking for, took them to a small house on the grounds where they were watched overnight by two guards "who had the swastika on their lapel but not in their hearts," he says, the next morning they were taken by streetcar to one of the protected buildings.

The Jews in the factory for whom there were no protection papers that day were not forgotten. While he occupied the attention of the Nazi guards (and Baranski does, indeed, have the gift of a glib tongue!), his aides helped those left behind to escape through the underground.

It was a few days later when he was made the leader, the executive secretary, of the Jewish Protective Movement. His first assignment as such was to go to the Austria-Hungary border and bring back "baptized" Jews who were part of the infamous death march to Germany. The 3,000 allotted spaces in the protected apartments were filled within three or four days. After that, Baranski supervised the 12 buildings, finding food and medical supplies, taking ill ones to hospitals, keeping the Nazis away.

Disgruntled Nazis

Of course, the Nazis violated their agreement with the pope at least eight times, taking Jews from the protected buildings. Each time this happened, Tibor went to the Nazi district headquarters where the apprehended Jews were held and obtained their release from disgruntled Nazis.

"Not a single Jew under my protection died at the hands of the Nazis," he declares. He does not boast; he simply states a fact. He might have known 30 of 3,000—"I saved them for God, not for personal reasons," he says. His efforts meant less than five hours sleep a night, sometimes only a half hour nap, and many days with nothing to eat.

He got no pay for what he did. He inflated food orders for the apartments so that Jews

in hiding might eat. Had the Nazis known what he was really doing with the underground, "I would have, within 10 seconds, a bullet in my head," he says.

On one occasion a drunken Nazi waved a loaded pistol at him for several minutes. He was captured by Gestapo officers at the Austria-Hungary border. He was held by a Nazi in a Budapest basement. He escaped all three times. "God gives very special help to those who help others," he insists. He considers physical life as "nothing" in comparison with eternal life with God, the only reason for physical life being worthwhile.

On Dec. 30, 1944, he was captured again when the Russian army took Budapest, and he was assumed to be a Hungarian supporter of the Nazis. He was forced to march 60 miles during the next 16 days, with Russia the destination. He and the other 2,000 marchers had four meals in those 16 days—many died on the march. Baranski almost died. He was beaten unmercifully by a Russian officer when he fell, unconscious. He credits his life that time to the sympathetic intercession of a Russian soldier.

BAG OF BONES

He was left behind in a Hungarian hospital, "a bag of bones, looking exactly like a Jew in Auschwitz" he says. After a long, slow recovery in the spring of 1945, he returned to Budapest to learn that the Jews in the protected buildings had been moved by the Nazis to their own ghetto.

Nothing could keep this zealot, Tibor Baranski, from his intense fight for what he believed to be right. He again became involved in underground anti-Communist activities. But he paid a heavy price—57 months in Hungarian prisons, with release coming in 1953 following Stalin's death.

Mr. Baranski, once stated that, because of the physical torture he endured, "It is only a miracle of God that I became a father."

He joined the freedom fighters during the Hungarian Revolution in 1956 when he went to Rome to get Vatican support for the freedom fighters and organized a school there for Hungarian refugees. The following year he moved to Toronto. In 1961 he came to Buffalo with his family, each one of whom is a story within themselves.

Katalin, his wife, saw her own well-to-do family stripped of everything by Communists in Hungary, and her dreams of becoming a doctor shattered. She is a Research Chemist who speaks three languages as does "Kathy," Jr., who is a statuesque beauty, a junior in Amherst Senior High School. Their son, Peter, is a doctor serving with the U.S. Navy in California, and Tibor, Jr., speaks five languages. He is a Junior on a full scholarship at Princeton University where he majors in oriental languages and has lived in Taiwan and Japan to better familiarize himself with those languages, customs and culture. He is a young man filled with hope and wonderful dreams for the future.

FREE WILL

Tibor, Sr., has taught his children that God gives one a free will with which they can either make beautiful carvings—or kill.

He is probably the only Catholic in Western New York to have received the highest award from the Israelis. Sometimes people do remember the good that was done to them by another.●

EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1979

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced, at the request of the administration, the legislation submitted

by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. This draft proposal was the subject of five hearings held by the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education which I chair.

I commend this bill to the attention of my colleagues.●

PROPOSES WORKING AT HOME TO SAVE ENERGY

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to insert into the RECORD today an article from Sunday's Washington Post that explores the idea of allowing certain employees to work at home.

The author, Frank W. Schiff, argues the case for this idea on grounds it will save thousands of barrels of gasoline, lessen traffic congestion and help curb air pollution.

I would like to concur with those reasons, and go Mr. Schiff one better. His idea also can be expected to increase American productivity.

Arresting our declining productivity is a major concern of mine. Our success in halting this decline will determine how well we contain and reduce inflation in years ahead, and on a larger scale how we evolve as a world economic power.

Declining productivity in America is ironic because our reputation and greatness has been built on an unparalleled ingenuity and resourcefulness. If something could be achieved, Americans could achieve it—even if no one else in the world could. We seem to have lost that feeling, and with it our self-confidence—and our international edge.

We are a long way from foundering, but we are not so far ahead that we can afford to ignore any idea with merit.

Mr. Schiff's considered article is more than thought-provoking, in my view. I am convinced it can work and at once strike a blow for energy conservation and productivity acceleration—not to mention the tonic it would provide in other social areas. For example, reduced commuting times or decentralized business locations will open new vistas for rural areas that have dried up from large migrations to big cities and their suburbs. Within cities, new strategies can be employed for "setting up a business"—strategies that will affect land usage, transportation patterns, neighborhood development.

What perhaps is most encouraging about Mr. Schiff's suggestion is that it is not so futuristic that it cannot begin almost at once. The technology—home computer terminals, inexpensive calculators, portable reference files on microfiche and the world's most sophisticated communications—is on hand today to allow workers to work productively at home without distractions, getting more accomplished in less time.

Mr. Schiff's idea will be one of many ideas I hope to consider this fall as I chair an ad hoc Industrial Innovation Task Force. The first session is next

Tuesday and will feature Jordan Baruch, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology.

The purpose of the task force is to explore meaningful ways to stimulate industrial innovation, thereby making American companies and workers more productive so we can continue to enjoy the fruits of our labors through a quality lifestyle. The task force will help to bridge the gap between committees having jurisdiction over the components of a strong innovation program.

In this small way, I hope Government—so often the bogeyman that stifles productivity—can play a constructive role in pointing to productive avenues to pursue, both in the private sector and in public policy.

But in the end the real salvation of our people will be our own best weapon—our creativity and good sense. Of that, Mr. Schiff has shown he has much, and he has greatly encouraged me that there are solutions if we just look hard enough. His article follows:

WORKING AT HOME CAN SAVE GASOLINE

(By Frank W. Schiff)

Millions of Americans commute to work five days a week, primarily by car or bus, in a massive population movement which accounts for much of the country's gasoline consumption, traffic congestion and air pollution, and which is a major source of mental and physical stress.

There are many possible ways to ameliorate these problems, but, surprisingly, virtually no attention has been paid to the contribution which could be made by working at home one or two days a week.

While only a minority of workers would be able to use this option, their impact on reducing gasoline use and alleviating other conditions related to commuting could be quite pronounced. Moreover, the size of such a group could increase rapidly and substantially in the next few years.

If 10 percent of those who commute to work each weekday were to start working at home two days each week, this would reduce the volume of such travel by 4 percent. This is not a large number in the absolute, but significant when compared to the 3 to 5 percent overall shortfall in petroleum availability which brought on the recent gasoline lines.

Although the idea that most work must be done away from home is deeply ingrained, it has not always been regarded as the norm. Even manufacturing work was typically carried out at home in the "cottage industry" system before the Industrial Revolution concentrated work in factories and introduced the rigid disciplines of the factory process—disciplines that were widely applied to office workers as well.

The rationale for the change in work location was clear at the time. The new machines required the concentration of workers in the places where they were located.

But while the identification of work with a place away from home continues for most workers, many of the underlying conditions which brought about the shift from cottage industries to central workplaces no longer hold true.

For one thing, there have been extraordinary changes in the nature of jobs. While manufacturing has remained at one quarter of total employment over the last 50 years, the share of service industries has risen from 40 to over 60 percent. And, according to a recent study, more than 50 percent of all U.S. jobs are now centered in information-related activities. Our economy has become far less dependent on muscle power and far more

dependent on professional, technical and clerical skills.

Even more far-reaching have been the changes in the nature of the "machinery." Some of the most dramatic have emerged within the past decade through the rapid advances in computerization and electronic chip technology.

REVOLUTION IN REVERSE

Future historians may well view this period as an Industrial Revolution in reverse, since it is providing the working tools that make it possible to move a growing number of employees out of centralized workplaces into new types of "cottage" industries. Consider just a few of the changes that make work at home far more feasible than just a few years ago:

Some of today's hand-held "programmable" scientific calculations can be used to carry out complex calculations that less than a decade earlier could only be handled by the largest computers available. Even the less advanced hand-held calculators perform functions that not long ago required bulky office machines or even computers.

Through computer terminals, persons working at home can gain access to the latest computer facilities as well as to vast quantities of stored data. Such terminals are available in portable form and can be readily used in homes if they are connected to a telephone.

In the field of economics, for example, a consulting firm called Data Resources Inc., provides its subscribers with access to a potential total of about 5 million economic and related series. The terminals can also be used to produce econometric and other statistical analyses with respect to these data, transform the results into graphs and build various economic models.

Portable machines now are widely used to record dictation previously taken down in shorthand by secretaries in an office. It is also possible for persons working at home to use the telephone to dictate directly into machines located in their offices and to listen to playbacks of relevant passages.

The contents of large files and entire libraries can be reduced to very small proportions and encoded on 4-by-6-inch microfiche film sheets, which can then be carried home and used to display the desired pages on portable viewing machines. A microfiche stack an inch high can incorporate the contents of as many as 20,000 pages of printed material.

PAPERLESS OFFICE

With such technological advances, working part of the time at home is feasible for engineers, computer programmers, physical and social scientists, medical researchers, lawyers, accountants, insurance company employees and salespeople. This list, moreover, is not exhaustive.

A firm called Micronet Inc. recently opened a "paperless office" in Washington, which demonstrates how existing technologies can be employed to carry out virtually all office tasks with completely automated equipment—equipment that generally can also be used at home.

Nor are the opportunities for changes in work location confined to professional and clerical work. In factories and laboratories, many tasks now are carried out through remote control devices, and it is possible to operate some of these devices from more distant locations.

In the next decade or so, moreover, the sophistication of machines available at home is likely to increase tremendously, a trend that is already foreshadowed by the beginning emergence of a market for home computers. A growing number of homes is likely to become equipped with machines that combine the functions of television sets, videophones, computer terminals, electronic files and word and data processing systems and

that can be directly connected with offices and other homes.

These technological advances do not by themselves provide sufficient proof that much more work can be done at home. Skeptics offer at least three lines of argument to show that such a change in working patterns would not be practical.

The first, most obvious objection usually is: If people work at home, how can one tell how well they are doing or whether they are working at all?

The answer is that, in judging the performance of an employee working in an office or other central workplace, personnel management experts generally reject the notion that conclusions should be based on a workers' input, as measured by hours spent at the place of work. Instead, they hold that performance should be judged by output and its relation to the firm's objectives. For many employees, these criteria can be applied just as readily when the work is done at home.

A second argument is that work at home would cut off employees from needed contacts with their co-workers and others. Clearly, such contacts are often highly important for effective performance and for employee morale.

But this argument, too, is not as convincing as might appear at first sight. Much of today's communication among employees takes place over the telephone, even for people working in the same building. Moreover, these proposals call for work at home only part of each week, leaving ample opportunity for face-to-face contacts with other employees.

Finally, it is argued that working at home will simply prove impractical: too many distractions and the lack of a quiet place in which to work.

In many cases, the opposite is likely to be true. Many working in offices often find themselves unable to finish planned work because of interruptions by co-workers or unnecessary internal meetings. And there are many instances of employees working on tight deadlines finding that the only way to get the job done in time is to work at home because this involves far less distraction and interruption.

Working at home should be an entirely voluntary option, to be used only where it is convenient and desirable for the individual worker as well as for the firm.

Even so, any such change is likely to encounter considerable resistance within many companies and unions, if only because established patterns are inherently difficult to change. If the working at home alternative is to make any headway, therefore, it is important that its advantages for individuals, firms and the public generally be fully understood.

SAVINGS IN WORKING TIME

The most obvious advantage for workers is the time gained by not commuting every day. Potential reductions in work time are currently a major issue in labor-management negotiations; the reduction in work-related time proposed here is one way by which workers can gain added time without imposing extra costs on management.

The total time saved can be quite substantial: An employee who drives an hour to work would save 16 hours in commuting time each month, or the equivalent of two 8-hour workdays, by working at home two days a week. In addition, he would save the money he would otherwise have had to spend on gasoline, parking fees and outside lunches.

Doing more work at home could improve the quality of life for many—though by no means all—individuals and families. There could be a better division between work and leisure during the day. Married couples could spend more time with each other and their children and still get as much work done as before. The task of taking care of young-

sters, older people and pets would be considerably facilitated. And many more people might be able to engage in paid productive work who are now precluded because of the commuting requirement.

Business firms, too, can be expected to gain important benefits from the proposed arrangements—benefits that are likely to outweigh the extra burdens of coordinating individual work schedules. Worker productivity and satisfaction are likely to rise, while the pool of available labor with special skills would be enlarged.

There also can be some quite specific benefits. Some firms, for example, encourage engineers, computer programmers and others to work on computer terminals at home so that they can gain faster access to regular computer facilities than is possible from the office during regular hours.

What will it take to encourage much more widespread reliance on working at home for at least part of each week? No single dramatic step is likely to provide the solution, nor is this a case for extensive government subsidies. Instead, there is need for a concerted effort to bring this issue more clearly into the national consciousness.

Business firms, unions and employees need to take a hard look at existing work patterns to ascertain which jobs can be carried out only in central workplaces and which can at least partly be carried out at home. A new look at management practices, union rules and government laws and regulations is required to determine whether they unduly discourage work at home; government should fund research in the area.

A really serious effort along these lines could bring a far larger shift toward work at home than most consider possible. Doing more work at home is one way to help solve some of the country's most persistent problems, a way which promises major benefits without hardships.

Why not give it a try? ●

A BILL TO REAUTHORIZE THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I support the draft legislation for reauthorization of the Higher Education Act as introduced yesterday by Chairman FORD of Michigan and cosponsored by myself and other members of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education. Although I may disagree with the majority party on many issues that come before the Congress, I find that with regard to education there is a great deal that I have in common with them.

I am particularly pleased to see that the commitment Congress made to provide Federal student aid to students from middle class families which began with the enactment of the Middle Income Student Assistance Act last year is continued and reinforced by this legislation. I am convinced that one of the greatest assets this country has is its youth and that we should insure that all citizens have the opportunity to develop to their full potential.

Steps taken in this legislation underscore the primary role of the State in providing education to students. Several programs which involve the States have

been consolidated to make them more cost and program effective. Of particular interest to me is the change to the restriction in the State student incentive program (SSIG) which mandates that a State statute regarding State grant aid should be superseded by Federal law. This change will provide more flexibility to the States and is consistent with what should be all Federal education policy.

Although I am a supporter of the bill I realize that there will be some issues which may cause disagreement. One concern of mine is the total cost of these programs. I look forward to the Congressional Budget Office cost estimates which are forthcoming and I will do everything I can to insure that these programs deliver the most student aid dollars for the least governmental costs. ●

IN MEMORIAM: MRS.
ANTOINETTE SLOVIK

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned today of the passing of Antoinette Slovik after a long battle with illness. Mrs. Slovik was the wife of Pvt. Eddie Slovik who on January 31, 1945, became the first member of the U.S. Armed Forces to be executed since the Civil War.

Private Slovik's death takes on an even more tragic note when one realizes that there were 28,000 deserters during World War II, of which 4,000 were tried, and 2,900 were convicted. Yet, only one Pvt. Edward Slovik (service No. 36896415) was executed for desertion.

Having personally served in a combat role during the Korean war, I fully understand the gravity of Private Slovik's desertion. But at the same time, I cannot help but be moved by the arbitrary and excessive action by the U.S. Army in singling out Eddie Slovik for execution. To have made an example of Private Slovik in such an extreme manner can in no way be considered equal justice under the law.

Therefore, during the 95th and again during the 96th Congress, I introduced legislation which would have paid Mrs. Antoinette Slovik the proceeds plus interest from her husband's Veterans' Administration \$10,000 life insurance policy, which he forfeited upon his execution. This legislation failed to pass either the House or Senate and in fact failed to even receive a hearing by either the House or Senate Judiciary Committees despite the numerous appeals of many of our citizens and the endorsement of President Carter, Secretary of the Army Clifford L. Alexander, and Veterans Administrator Max Cleland.

Mrs. Slovik's death once again brings home the sadness with which I view Private Slovik's execution. It is even more disheartening when one realizes that Mrs. Slovik died without any solace for the grief she endured. For 30 years

knowing that it was only her husband who was executed. Her suffering was great and heightened during her last years because of her financial plight. While passage of H.R. 2326 can no longer help Mrs. Slovik, it should be enacted if for no other reason than to acknowledge the arbitrariness of Pvt. Edward Slovik's death. ●

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE
PLATFORM 1979-80

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues four resolutions from the national affairs section of the American Veterans Committee Platform, 1979-80. These resolutions address the issues of low- and middle-income housing, welfare reform, revenue sharing, and public service employment.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION ON OPENING THE SUBURBS TO LOW AND MIDDLE INCOME HOUSING

AVC notes with dismay the increasing isolation of two societies—the black inner city and the white suburbs. This has resulted from continued racial discrimination and the action of such jurisdictions to deny low and middle income housing through zoning restrictions. The effect of this action has been to increase polarization between black and white and rich and poor; to deny black and low income workers job opportunities in the suburbs, accelerate the physical blight and economic decline of our cities and negate federal programs designed to provide low and middle income housing.

AVC therefore urges that the Department of Housing and Urban Development deny federal grants to suburban and other jurisdictions unless such jurisdictions establish affirmative action programs to provide and permit low and middle income housing commensurate with the needs of the residents in the metropolitan region.

RESOLUTION ON WELFARE REFORM

AVC notes with great distress both the cut-back in welfare programs and the impounding of duly appropriated, Congressionally enacted funding for such programs.

With a sense of great urgency, AVC wishes to reaffirm its longstanding position that every individual has the right to adequate income, health care, shelter and sustenance. Therefore, we call upon the Congress to deal forthrightly and immediately with regard to these problems, with particular emphasis on the following:

1. A unified and largely federally financed program of assistance to assure equitable and efficient treatment and administration.

2. Benefits should be available to everyone in need—those in low paying jobs as well as the unemployed, those without families as well as dependent children and their parents.

3. Assistance grants should provide all Americans with an income adequate to sustain them in a state of health and minimal decency. If fiscal consideration preclude such immediate grant levels, then provisions should be placed in the legislation for orderly steps at time intervals to reach standards of adequacy for health and decency as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics with flexibility of grant levels to meet realistic variations in costs of living.

RESOLUTION ON REVENUE SHARING AND
FEDERAL AID

AVC supports the principle of federal financial assistance to state and local government because of the far superior revenue raising capacity of the federal government through the progressive rates of federal income and estate taxes, etc.

However, we are opposed to the "no-strings" revenue sharing proposal of the Nixon Administration known as "general" and "special" revenue sharing. The general revenue sharing proposal currently contemplates grants to states starting at \$5 billion a year totally unrestricted as to use, purpose or level of local revenue raising efforts. The "special" revenue sharing proposal would give no "new money" to the states and localities but would merely combine into broad subject area "block grants," such as health, housing, education, etc., the funds now going to specific project and categorical grant programs, and would end or endanger many constructive and creative programs such as Model Cities and the multi-state Appalachian Regional Commission. It would also eliminate almost all of the federal conditions (or strings) necessary to see that the funds are distributed on a non-discriminatory non-boondoggling basis.

We favor the continuance of the present method of making categorical grants for specific purposes and projects, on a matching and grant-in-aid basis. With respect to the allocation of these funds by statutory formulas, however, we demand that all federal agencies strictly observe the conditions attached by Congress to the grants.

We also wish to encourage those state and local governments which make a significant effort to raise their own funds through progressive rate taxes such as the income tax rather than regressive sales and real property taxes—to this end we favor a tax credit for a significant portion (say 80%) of local income taxes paid instead of merely a tax deduction for them.

We are sympathetic to the great needs of our American cities because of the high cost, in many areas beyond mere welfare, necessitated by the large concentration of our poorest citizens in urban areas.

RESOLUTION ON PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT

AVC has long stood for forceful implementation of the Employment Act of 1964, calling for full employment. In particular, we have from time to time specifically called the attention of the federal government to the need for it to act as "employer of the last resort." That is, we have been willing to allow free enterprise to provide the jobs that are needed for those who want to work, with government to take up the slack when necessary.

We veterans for whose benefit the Act was passed continue to call attention to:

1. Record levels of unemployment (including veterans)
2. Rising demands for people to go to work
3. Increasing effective demand for public services and
4. Declining ability or willingness of local and state government to provide services.

We agree that "leaf-raking" jobs solve no problems. For this reason, we support Public Services Employment legislation, so that local government can provide jobs in health, education, parks and public safety.●

SALT II: THE BATTLE IS JOINED

HON. JAMES P. (JIM) JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the SALT II

Task Force of Members of Congress for Peace through Law, I feel compelled to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House and Senate a perceptive article which recently appeared in the *New Republic*.

"TRB" gives an interesting account of Senate committee hearings on SALT II, and discusses Senator BYRD's recent trip to Europe and the Soviet Union. Soviet warnings against Senate amendments to the treaty have served only to anger some Senators, and Senator BYRD now reports that advisory additions may be acceptable to the Soviet leadership. The author makes reference, however, to the 15 reservations Senator Lodge was able to attach to the Treaty of Versailles in 1920—the reservations which killed the treaty. It is imperative that the Senate exercise prudence and restraint in its consideration of any amendments or additions to the SALT II treaty. The spirit, integrity, and substance of the treaty must be maintained.

The article follows:

THE BATTLE IS JOINED

It is 9:15 a.m. but the line of tourists already snakes around the corridor. Red crow-control cords direct them to an electronic scanner like the ones in airports. Shirt-sleeved cops stand about and there is a great ruffling of credentials. What's going on? Democracy at work, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is holding hearings on the SALT II treaty. The Armed Services Committee will hold parallel hearings shortly. The Senate Intelligence Committee will hold hush-hush hearings on how the pact will be verified, if and when the Senate itself adopts the treaty. That will depend on approval of two-thirds of those present and voting; 34 senators have veto power. Formal debate should begin maybe next September, if the nation's conjoined crises permit. A vote?—oh, maybe in November. The Russians are fuming. They don't understand. In Moscow the Politburo presses a button and that's it.

The vast room inside is architecturally akin to Grand Central Station, or the foyer of the downtown RKO movie palace before they ripped it down. Only this is the real thing, the walls slabbed with marble, a dozen Corinthian columns, a ceiling higher than a basketball court, 40-foot maroon drapes, four bombshell chandeliers, carpets to match. It is jam-packed, blazing with lights. It is as crowded as it was when they investigated the Titanic disaster, the Teapot Dome scandal, the Watergate scandal, the Great Crash, and when the circus midget climbed into James Pierpont Morgan's lap. (He thought it was a child. They used flash powder, then.) This is the Senate Caucus room where little men, in larger-than-life surroundings, investigate large-than-life events.

At 10:04 Chairman Frank Church, who comes from Idaho (Borah's old state), raps smartly three times and we're off. There are about 100 press seats, 100 for tourists, and maybe 50 for senators, witnesses, and staff. World interest centers here for the moment, thought practically nobody abroad can understand the subtleties of senatorial ratification. My seat is between the London Daily Telegraph and the Yomiuri Shimbun (Tokyo), circulation 8,000,000. Everybody is represented.

That's because everyone thinks this may be a final test—whether there's enough trust left between the two superpowers to prevent Doomsday. Secretary Vance is quiet, restrained; he does not have a commanding voice and sometimes he's dull, but he doesn't

alienate people like Dean Acheson, and he's not afraid to talk back. "No, you're wrong!" he tells Senator Muskie tersely over a technical point. Senator Helms says savagely that the whole treaty is a phony—"This is an arms escalation treaty!" he charges. "No, it's not," says Vance, and continues explaining.

In brief, Russia and the US now have 14,000 strategic nuclear warheads and bombs in their arsenals and the smallest one of them can destroy a city: "Several times as powerful as the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima," says Vance quietly. Will they be used? Nobody cites one hopeful precedent: all belligerents had poison gas in World War II, but nobody used it.

This is the hearing that was supposed to fill the front pages with passionate argument but instead, so far, people are talking about gas lines and inflation. Can the Carter administration save itself from collapse? It has been under semi-siege at Camp David. It will be harder than ever for the public to concentrate on SALT II when Jimmy comes down from the mountain and tells what he plans to do next.

The administration's low-key approach might help SALT's ratification. Unlike Nixon and Kissinger when they presented SALT I, there have been no extravagant claims; Vance and Defense Secretary Harold Brown say that it's a pretty good treaty, all things considered; that it limits and even curtails some weapons; that it establishes an equilibrium of "rough equivalence"; that America is adequately protected; and that its approval is vital for the future. Where they speak most emphatically is in describing the consternation among European allies if SALT fails. "Failure to agree on SALT II could cast a chilling shadow over the whole range of East-West relations," Vance declared in what for him is a high-flown metaphor.

Back from Europe, Senate Majority Leader Byrd tells the same story. He talked to the president of France and the French and Italian defense ministers, who told him that if the US rejects the treaty it will mean an all-out nuclear arms race, and we could also expect the possible isolation of the United States from its European allies.

Byrd was the unofficial emissary to tell grim-faced Brezhnev and Gromyko in Russia that the Senate is almost certain to play its role in formulating the treaty by adding its own reservations and clarifications. It was Byrd's uncomfortable task to inform these somber Slavs of the facts of life about the US Senate. He brought back word that may save the treaty. President Carter and the Russians have warned against amendments. But Byrd reported that the Soviets might accept Senate additions that are advisory and not matters of substance "if we're talking about amendments to the Resolution of Ratification that clarify the meaning, that help to affirm the understanding of the Senate. . . ."

I have before me the 15 Lodge reservations which the crafty Republican senator from Massachusetts grafted on to the Versailles treaty, and which defeated it. The first insisted on America's right to withdraw at will from the League of Nations "by a concurrent resolution of Congress." One supported the Monroe Doctrine. Reservation number 14 insisted that the US should have as many votes in the League as the British if the Dominions voted. The final one expressed sympathy for Irish "aspirations" for self-government. On March 18, 1920, the Senate voted, 49 to 35, for the treaty with reservations. This was less than two-thirds, so America entered 20 years of isolation. It ended with World War II, which Wilson had predicted.●

TESTING LEGISLATION: A CONSUMER FRAUD?

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Education and Labor Committee, Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education will continue its hearings on the so-called truth-in-testing legislation this fall. It is my understanding that this legislation might even be considered by the full committee during October. I am concerned over the possible unintended consequences of overly hasty Federal action. New York State has recently passed "truth-in-testing" legislation which is slated for implementation in January 1980. The New York law is similar to the legislation currently before our subcommittee. I think it would be especially useful for my colleagues to consider the thoughts of a highly respected educator which appeared in the August 15 New York Times regarding the testing issue:

THE LAW ON TESTS IS BAD

(By Diane Ravitch)

New York's new "truth-in-testing" law, passed by the state Legislature and signed into law by Gov. Carey, guarantees that anyone who takes an entry test for college, graduate or professional school is entitled to get a copy of the test, along with the correct answers. Passage of the law is a triumph for Ralph Nader and his associates, who have been campaigning against standardized tests in general, and the Educational Testing Service in particular, since the early 1970's.

On the surface, the law seems unassailable.

Most of its advocates claim that public scrutiny will make college-entry tests fairer and less subject to "cultural bias" against minorities. Some, however, have admitted that their real object is not to improve the tests but to undermine their validity and usefulness to colleges.

In reality, the "truth-in-testing" law will accomplish few, if any, of its intended purposes.

It will create a bonanza for private tutoring services, which will now have actual tests as teaching tools, not just their own inventions; this will increase the advantage of those who can afford to pay for coaching.

As a result of the law, the cost to the student who takes the Educational Testing Service college-admission test, now \$8.25, is expected to increase substantially. This is because compliance with the law will increase the costs of test preparation.

Anyone who understands the process of test-making could have foreseen these results.

The testing organizations devise questions that are pre-tested extensively, then used repeatedly, in order to provide a basis of comparison among students. This kind of pre-testing and retesting makes it possible to weed out questions that are poorly worded or confusing.

Even more important, this process helps to isolate "culturally biased" questions, when any identifiable student population consistently misses or misconstrues a particular test item.

Divulging the answers at the end of each test will require the testing companies to hire more employees, devise more questions, and charge more.

So it is the consumer, not the corporations, who will pay for this "reform."

Nor is the law likely to have much impact on college admissions.

Colleges ask their applicants to take standardized tests of verbal and mathematical skills because the scores are useful in comparing the aptitudes of students from all kinds of secondary schools—public, private, urban, suburban, rural. Colleges use the tests because they have some value as a predictor of future academic performance.

College admissions officers are professionals. They know that standardized tests have limitations; they know that such tests reveal nothing of a student's imagination, creativity, motivation or character; they know too that some students freeze in test-taking situations.

The scores are only one element in the student's record, which is made up of high school grades, rank in class, extra-curricular activities, teacher recommendations, work experience, and a personal interview.

If the tests were abolished, very little would change.

The highly selective colleges, where applications outnumber places by more than five to one, would continue to be highly selective; some would probably write their own entry tests, just as they did in the years before standardized testing. And more emphasis would be placed on high school grades and on the personal interview.

The fact is that, with or without standardized tests, colleges admit whomever they wish.

Those who have more applicants than places will continue to find some basis for selection.

Those who wish to increase their minority enrollment will do so, regardless of test scores or high school grades.

What is especially ironic is that college-entrance exams will have less significance in the future because of the decline in national enrollment. Pre-college youngsters have already become accustomed to receiving mountains of mail from colleges eager for them to apply.

With fewer students entering colleges each year, more and more colleges accept anyone who can pay the tuition (which for most youngsters is a more formidable obstacle than standardized tests). The number of colleges that will continue to be selective is a shrinking minority.

The "truth-in-testing" law will not change standardized entry tests in any meaningful way, will not affect the college admissions process in any meaningful way, and will not increase the number of minority students in college.

What it will do is cost the student-consumer more for the same level of services.

In short, New York's new law is a consumer fraud. ●

LEGISLATION TO EXTEND THE LIFE OF THE C. & O. CANAL ADVISORY COMMISSION IS INTRODUCED

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, on September 5 I introduced H.R. 5182, a bill to extend the life of the advisory commission to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park. The Commission, composed of citizens and representatives of jurisdictions surrounding the 185-mile canal, was created with a 10-year life when the park was established in 1971. H.R. 5182 would ex-

tend the Commission's existence for another 10 years.

Part of the original rationale for creating the advisory commission stemmed from the unique nature of the canal. Unlike most parks managed by the U.S. Park Service, it runs along a 185-mile stretch of river shoreline, and is flanked by a major city, suburban communities, and numerous small towns. These circumstances clearly warrant the need for some mechanism which enables those who live along or near the canal to share a voice in its management.

The advisory commission, technically referred to as the "Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission," is composed of 19 members: Two each from the Maryland counties of Montgomery, Frederick, Washington, and Allegany; two each from the States of Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia; and three appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, two of whom are members of conservation organizations. The members of the Commission serve without compensation.

There is no doubt in my mind that the C. & O. Canal Park and its visitors have been well served by this advisory commission. By allowing the good work of the Commission to continue, Congress can take a significant step toward insuring proper management of the park in the years to come. ●

COLORADO RIVER MANAGEMENT PLAN AND ENVIRONMENT IMPACT STATEMENT

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I have received hundreds of letters from outraged citizens regarding the National Park Service final environmental impact statement of the Colorado River management plan which will ban the use of motors on the river.

One such letter that I received was from Gale James of Phoenix, Ariz. She attached a poem to her letter which I am commending to my colleagues:

PLEA

(By Gale James, an American)

Please save our love for the natural land
You cannot take that too
By making us stop the river trips
That our freedom entitles us to.

We do not disturb the river or land
Our intent is not to destroy
We merely want our Colorado Grand
To see, to love and enjoy.

What makes you think you have the right
to take our liberty away
Unless you too, have ridden the Grand and
felt the enchantment beg you to stay.

Its like a spell thats cast upon your senses,
body and soul
As you are one with river and cliff you can
scream out, "At least I am whole!"

So if you choose to take from us part of our
heritage, history and strife
Then what have we fought for in our wars?
Not justice . . . not freedom . . . not life! ●

THE UNITED NATIONS: ACCOMPLISHMENTS AS WELL AS DISAPPOINTMENTS

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the International Institutions and Development Committee of Members of Congress for Peace through Law, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article which appeared on the New York Times "Op-Ed" page during the recent August recess and which they may have missed.

The article by American University president and former Undersecretary of State Joseph J. Sisco, is entitled "The U.N., Flawed but * * *." It points out that while the United Nations and its specialized agencies have problems, they also have a very creditable record of achievement in dealing with complex international crises and long-term global issues.

Too often, we tend to confuse the United Nations system with the political debates at the General Assembly and in the Security Council. The UN's membership express their views in those bodies. But the UN machinery for dealing with economic problems, natural and man-made disasters, complex legal disputes, hunger, disease, and ignorance works on in many countries. The UN's peacekeeping missions in the Middle East, on Cyprus, and in Kashmir continue to carry out their thankless and dangerous responsibilities. And the army of experts in so many fields continue to search for solutions to the environmental, educational, scientific and technological problems we must solve if human society is to survive on this planet.

Mr. Sisco's article points out some of the accomplishments and some of the problems of the United Nations system. I insert the text in the RECORD:

THE U.N., FLAWED BUT . . .

(By Joseph J. Sisco)

WASHINGTON.—President Carter's recent meeting with Secretary General Kurt Waldheim, and the recent informal United Nations Security Council decision to substitute an augmented United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) for the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) to help carry out the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty, offer a timely moment to assess how well the world organization has been performing its peacekeeping functions.

There is a lot wrong with the United Nations, and this has led to diminished reliance on it, but United Nations peacekeeping remains a valuable option that should not be dissipated.

Both overzealous admirers and critics of the United Nations have tended to state their conclusions in bold-faced type. One group has viewed criticism as desecration of a religious shrine; the other has rarely failed to point out the yawning chasm between aspirations and accomplishments. Neither group looks at the United Nations for what it is: a reflection of a turbulent, pluralistic, diverse world—an institutional arena for the interplay of national power and interest.

The United Nations has often been sanctified and buried. Twenty years after World

War I, the League of Nations was dead; 35 years after World War II, the United Nations is in great difficulty, yet it makes modest contributions in limited areas. Moreover, some problems of a global character, such as the plight of the Vietnamese refugees, can be dealt with, if at all, primarily through its mechanisms.

Its disabilities are numerous. Power and responsibility is skewed in the General Assembly, and numerous unrealistic resolutions have seriously discredited it.

The specialized agencies attack economic and social conditions that carry seeds of war. Their record in dealing with problems of health, the environment, population, pollution, food, weather and communications is credible; if these organizations did not exist, they would have to be created from scratch. But budgets have become bloated, as has the bureaucracy, and collective financial responsibility and apportionment are out of balance. The continuing tendency toward politics in lieu of technical work has also made the specialized agencies less effective than they might otherwise be.

But in peacekeeping, the United Nations record remains noteworthy. About 15,000 troops have been serving in the Middle East, Cyprus and the Subcontinent. Moreover, plans are in place for a United Nations Transitional Assistance Group to assist in Namibia if agreement can be achieved on internationally recognized elections.

It remains to be seen whether Israel will accept the Truce Supervision Organization. The alternative of a multinational force outside the United Nations is not likely to attract many countries, though supervision by the parties themselves remains an option. The three oldest peacekeeping groups, in the Middle East, Cyprus and Kashmir, were based on trip-wire concepts: static peacekeeping largely limited to disengagement and surveillance, reporting cease-fire violations, and based on the presence of the United Nations as mediator.

The United Nations has gone somewhat beyond the static concept in southern Lebanon where it was to supervise the cessation of hostilities between the Palestinians and Christian Lebanese and Israelis, establish for itself an area of operation, and help to assure the restoration of Lebanese sovereignty. The interim force has been operating in a political environment without clear precedents in light of the virtual absence of an effective Lebanese Government and the presence of opposing nongovernmental Lebanese armed groups. It has practiced freedom of movement throughout most, but not all, of its operational area, and on occasion it has been able to resort, when necessary, to bringing superior local force to bear in order to restore cease-fire conditions.

This more active policy derived not from a new, preconceived doctrine, but from the unique circumstances in southern Lebanon. The force has not been in a position to be effective in the six-to-10-kilometer strip on the Lebanese side of the border that was turned over to the Lebanese Christian militia.

Such work by the United Nations on the ground—decentralized, disorderly, pragmatic and adaptive—contrasts with early ambitious plans for universal central institutions as the prime means to world order. A worldwide organization disparate in power, wealth and culture makes for real limitations, as do the different fundamental approaches of the United States and Soviet Union. The United Nations is not an entity apart from its membership, and can act only by sovereign consent. We need not overdraw or undervalue its utility. On balance, we are all a little better off with it than without it. ●

JAMES H. DENVER OF SPRINGFIELD, MASS., NEWLY INSTALLED COMMANDER, MASSACHUSETTS AMERICAN LEGION DEPARTMENT, GIVES MESSAGE ON PATRIOTISM

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of my valued and longtime hometown friends in Springfield, Mass., is James H. Denver, newly elected State commander of the Massachusetts Department, American Legion. I will have the honor of being a guest and speaker at his American Legion Testimonial Dinner at the Sheraton-Lincoln Hotel in Worcester, Mass., on November 24. He was elected Massachusetts Department Commander at the 61st annual State American Legion Convention held at Springfield in late June.

Jim Denver has long been active in the functions of the American Legion, the world's largest organization of veterans. He has given unstintingly of his time to the American Legion's great programs for hospitalized veterans, for the widows and families of veterans, for the elderly veterans, for the youth of our community in oratorical contests and scholarships and for Vietnam veterans.

Jim Denver has served with distinction as Massachusetts State Vice Commander and as past commander of Springfield's American Legion, Post 21. I want to take this opportunity to commend Jim for his past contributions to this great veterans' organization, and to congratulate him on his elevation to the most important post of Massachusetts Department Commander. I include with my remarks State Commander Denver's message on patriotism which appeared in the Springfield Sunday Republican on August 12, 1979:

PATRIOTISM: HANDY MEASURE OF ATTITUDE

(By James H. Denver)

Remember when each school room had an American flag, when a prayer and a Pledge of Allegiance were commonplace? Remember when everyone knew at least one verse of the national anthem?

Remember when the flag was displayed in a proper manner, lowered to half-staff only when that was called for in the country's Flag Code?

Remember when a federal judge would not have dared to rule that it was not illegal to wear the flag on the seat of trousers? Remember when nations throughout the world respected our flag and what it stood for?

I do, and I don't like what I see today, and I have tried and I will continue to try to do something about it.

To be a good American is the most important job that will ever confront us.

What is Americanism? The way we in the American Legion define it, Americanism is:

Love of America and loyalty to her institutions as the best yet devised by man to secure life, liberty, individual dignity and happiness; the willingness to defend our country and flag against all enemies, foreign and domestic; a vital, active, living force meaning peace, strength and the will and courage to live as free men in a free land, meaning a friendly hand to people every-

where who respect our institutions and our thinking.

Not a word but a cause, a way of life, a challenge and a hope in a world of turmoil; an ideal of loyal patriotism, religious tolerance, fearless courage, integrity, abiding faith in the commanding destiny of the United States.

Fathomless love for the principles which led our forefathers to found this country; complete and unqualified loyalty to the ideals of government set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Respect for and informed obedience to duly constituted authority and laws of the land; freedom without license, religion without bigotry, charity without bias or race hatred.

I'm sure you'll all agree that America does indeed have problems, and that it must do more to meet the needs of our people. I also believe that the most serious crisis Americans face, both as individuals and as a nation, is the one that nobody talks or writes much about: we are mired in an age of disbelief, which is eroding our will not only to succeed but also to survive.

Sons do not believe fathers, blacks do not believe whites, stockholders do not believe corporate executives, the public does not believe the president.

We owe it to ourselves and to our children to dream new dreams, to have pride in our past and faith in our future, for without such dreams, such pride, such faith, we will have no future. If believing these things is wrong, then patriotism is wrong.

Tell me I'm wrong to care about abuses in the proper display of the flag right here in Springfield by city officials, schools and civic and fraternal organizations who take liberties with the flag that aren't theirs to take, and tell me I'm wrong to try to do something about it.

Tell me I'm wrong to be upset about the way spectators fail to stand at attention at sporting events during the playing of the national anthem. Tell me that the way hockey players break ranks before the second-to-the-last, or sometimes earlier, stanzas of the "Star Spangled Banner," schoolboy and professional players alike, shouldn't bother me.

Tell me I'm wrong to want to see flags flown on holidays, at least, over homes, factories, stores and public buildings, and flags placed on the graves of those who answered the final call, either on the battlefield or since.

Tell me that like hundreds of others, veterans or not, I'm wrong, that I shouldn't be bothered by pictures and reports of flag-burnings.

Tell me that I should be tagged Super Patriot because I still march in or watch parades in my city and like to listen to the Pledge of Allegiance and like to hear the national anthem played properly and sung by those who have cared enough to learn the words.

If I'm wrong, if I'm "too patriotic," I certainly don't plead the Fifth Amendment, as some people do for almost anything, and I'm certainly proud of it. ●

PROGRESS AGAINST GOVERNMENT FRAUD

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report from

August 15, 1979, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PROGRESS AGAINST GOVERNMENT FRAUD

Fraud continues to plague the programs of the federal government. It accounts for part of the 1 percent-10 percent of funds for federal programs which the Department of Justice recently estimated to be misspent. In terms of dollars, the estimated loss attributable to fraud, abuse, and waste ranges up to \$50 billion. By comparison, the federal deficit is under \$30 billion.

These figures are very discouraging, but the costs of fraud cannot be measured merely by the amount of money misspent. Some instances of fraud, such as the use of inferior materials on government buildings, can in fact create public hazards. Even more important is the loss of public confidence in government which fraud occasions.

Fraud is not a new phenomenon in government. It has existed for a long time, so solutions to the problem can be neither quick nor simple. Nevertheless, the recent headlines exposing serious scandals and widespread theft are signs that things are getting better, not worse. The Congress and the Carter Administration have given the prevention and detection of fraud a high priority. Although much action still needs to be taken, the federal government is making some progress.

A major step was taken last year when Congress established an office of Inspector General in 12 federal agencies. This office consolidates the auditing and investigative responsibilities of each agency under one high-level, independent official who reports directly to Congress and to the head of the agency. Other government bureaus have set up similar offices. Armed with subpoena and prosecutorial powers, the Inspectors General have shown that they will more than pay for themselves through the revenues they recover. In 1978, for example, the work of the Inspector General at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) led to 230 convictions. It is expected that HEW alone will save \$1.1 billion this year.

Other recent congressional action has been aimed at the problem of fraud. For example, a major law enacted during the last Congress is cutting down fraud and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs. The result of several years of legislative work, this law has increased penalties for fraud and abuse, strengthened oversight of the programs, and mandated greater disclosure of information by providers of health care.

Investigative procedures for combatting fraud are being improved as well. First, the federal government has stepped up the training of investigators and prosecutors involved in fraud detection. Extra manpower will be brought to bear where none could be before. Second, a single auditing guide has been designed to replace the more than 100 different methods currently used to audit federally assisted programs. This action is expected to simplify techniques of fraud detection. Third, advanced computer systems have been installed to organize large amounts of data on the operation of federal programs. Computers make possible large-scale investigations, such as the one which is now checking lists of welfare recipients for any federal worker who may be receiving payments illegally. Fourth, each agency has started a program to protect and encourage "whistle blowers," federal employees who desire to report suspected instances of fraud within their own agencies. With their "insider's knowledge," these employees are very valuable weapons against fraud. Fifth, bills are now pending before Congress to speed up the hearing process and bolster penalties for those who commit fraud. Swift and forceful action when fraud has been uncovered deters others who might be tempted to break the law.

Because the very organization of an agency sometimes invites fraud, the Carter Administration is conducting a thorough review of each agency's vulnerability to fraud and its capacity for fraud prevention and detection. Also being reviewed are existing policies and procedures used in determining applicant eligibility for federal programs. It is anticipated that these efforts will lead to a sizeable reduction of fraud in such programs as food stamps, social security, and federally insured student loans.

Private citizens should be aware that they can voluntarily enlist in the fight against fraud. A toll-free hotline (800-424-5454) has been opened to give people anywhere in the nation the opportunity to report suspected cases of fraud. So far, the hotline has been very active. In the first six weeks of its operation, over 30,000 telephone calls were received and followed up.

I strongly support these wide-ranging government efforts to stamp out fraud. The task, however, is far from complete. The control of fraud requires independent observers, good management, and vigorous prosecution. Of course, the best solution to the problem will be found in a system which continuously monitors federal programs. Such a system would help to ensure that the government effectively provided the essential services it was created to provide. It would also go a long way toward restoring public confidence in government. ●

FLIGHT FROM LAOS

HON. MATTHEW F. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD today an eyewitness account of the massacre of 189 Hmong tribesmen. The men, women, and children in this group were killed on a small island in the middle of the Mekong River by soldiers of the Government of Laos. They were searching for freedom. Instead, after several days of waiting in an effort to find some way into Thailand, they found death.

For months now, Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to bring attention onto the plight of the Hmong, the hill tribesmen of Laos who fought side by side with Americans throughout our long involvement in Southeast Asia. Many have been languishing in refugee camps for years. Others, like the group mentioned in this article, have died attempting to escape to Thailand.

Because the Hmong do not make their escape in boats, their plight has gone unnoticed by the press. More disturbing, our own Government has failed to respond in a meaningful way to the very serious problems our friends have been experiencing.

Although the Hmong represent a substantial number of the total refugee population in Southeast Asia, relatively few have been admitted into the United States. Yet, of all the refugees, no group has a greater claim on our country. We have a special obligation to the Hmong, Mr. Speaker, an obligation that we should not continue to ignore.

Thus, I hope that my colleagues will take the opportunity to read this article, which was written by Jane Hamilton-

Merritt and appeared in the New York Times earlier this week:

FLIGHT FROM LAOS

(By Jane Hamilton-Merritt)

The plight of the Hmong, a hill-tribe people in Laos—or Meo, as the people are known in the Western press—is one of desperation. Little news about these people who fought so long for the Americans in Laos reaches that press. Meo refugee camps in Thailand are remote and inaccessible.

July 27, 1979. The river and freedom are in sight. A group of 189 Meo—30 men and 159 women and children—have endured a two-month trek through the mountainous high jungles of Laos, running from the Pathet Lao and Vietnamese soldiers.

Tonight, they sit by the edge of the Mekong River waiting for darkness to provide cover for a crossing into Thailand—the final obstacle to freedom. Adults have not eaten for many days to preserve food for the children. Small amounts of the remaining rice, are forced into mouths of children—many only skeletons. Afraid to light fires for fear of detection by enemy soldiers, they wait in the monsoon darkness. Children are given more opium to keep them quiet: Any noise may alert soldiers known to patrol the banks of the Mekong searching for Meo trying to escape.

Meo who have escaped Laos tell of Pathet Lao and Vietnamese soldiers killing children for nothing, women for their silver necklaces, men because they are soldiers. They say that enemy soldiers take their rice, chickens and buffalo; that poisonous gases are dropped from planes on their villages and that their people die. They are convinced that the soldiers intend to kill all the Meo. Yet these Meo continue to fight the Communists in Laos although they have few weapons left and no meaningful support from outside.

July 28, 1979. At the darkest time of night, they cross the Mekong, only to discover as the dawn mists lift that they have miscalculated and have crossed at a very wide part of the river. They land on a long river island and still far from the Thai banks. Hurdled by the Meo gather vines to weave into ropes to attach to mounds of sand and patches of river reeds to make a link to shore and safety. There is so little time, for the river is rising noticeably and storm clouds hang over the mountains to the north. They could all drown if the river suddenly rose. Now that they believe themselves off Laotian territory and safe, they build fires to boil water in United States Army canteens. Women take off their blouses and, with sticks for frames, make shelters for the sick, babies, and old women.

Many Thai soldiers appear on the Thai bank along with a machine gun mounted on a jeep. Soon a patrol in two boats lands on the island to inform the Meo leader that the Meo must go back to Laos—they cannot cross into Thailand. The Meo tell the Thai soldiers that they will build bamboo rafts and leave during the night. Since the Thai side of the island is lower than the Laotian side, the Meo huddle on the lower side hoping that enemy soldiers from Laos will not see them.

Men and women cut bamboo from small clusters on the island while others continue to make survival ropes. In the afternoon, Thai soldiers in boats cut the vines, the Meo lifelines to freedom. Night falls and the Meo take up guard. They have no food and the river is rising.

July 29, 1979. Day breaks and they continue to build rafts, but not, as the Thai soldiers want, to cross back to Laos, but to continue downstream in hope of passing undiscovered into Thailand. All the Meo are convinced that if they are forced back to Laos they will be killed—including the children.

About midday, another American journal-

ist manages to obtain a wooden boat from a Thai villager upstream and paddles to the island. The Meo leader gives him a note to take to Vong Yee, chief of the Meo residing in a nearby refugee camp, Ban Vinal. The note tells of their location and that the Thai soldiers will not allow them to go to the Thai police station (a standard debriefing procedure for new arrivals before allowing them to enter refugee camps), and requests urgent assistance from the chief at the camp to obtain permission for them to enter Thailand.

July 30, 1979. The day is hot and there are many who are sick and starving. They eat grass and drink boiled water. Thai soldiers come again and insist that they leave tonight. The Meo explain they don't have enough rafts to ferry all the people, but the Thais insist.

July 31, 1979. The situation remains the same.

Aug. 1, 1979. Morning brings signs of another torrid day. The Mekong continues to rise. Thai soldiers remain vigilant. Many rafts have been built. The stranded Meo believe that Vong Yee will send help soon.

As I stood watching the Meo marooned on the island, I remembered the stories of so many Meo who, like those out there, had fled Laos under the most terrifying circumstances. Drumming in my mind were the words of one young Meo: "I feel sad for my wife. Her clothes are shreds and she's sick with malaria, yet she cares for my brother's five children. The youngest is four and he's so weak he cannot stand alone; she must carry him. My brother and his wife are dead. His wife disappeared while searching for food. I often think of my American friends. They gave me their addresses but I've lost them. It seems so long ago that the Americans left—maybe four years, and now the fighting is even more difficult, with so few weapons and no one to help us. We Meo are all so tired. So many Meo are dead. We Meo people are so pitiful."

The Meo who fought under Gen. Vang Pao for the Americans in Laos against the Communists since the early 1960's find it difficult to accept that no one cares about them, hardly anyone writes about their tragedy, no American friends seek to help.

Aug. 2, 1979. A group of 30 to 40 Pathet Lao land on the island. Shooting breaks out and the Meo are massacred. It is not known whether there were any survivors. These 189 brave Meo men, women and children did not know that the island on which they had landed was Laotian territory.

After so long a struggle, freedom never came.

As Vong Yee, the Meo chief said to me: "We Meo fight, work like buffalo, run, starve and die—and no one knows." ●

PRIVATE SCHOOLS AND PARENTS' RIGHTS—NO THREAT TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, while I have been one who feels strongly that the Federal role in education should be kept at a minimum and limited largely to no strings financial assistance, I have always believed in a strong public school system. A very substantial factor in my long legislative record of opposition to forced racial busing is the disastrous impact of this policy on our public schools and upon public support for them. At the same time, I also strongly support tax-relief for parents of nonpublic school

children, and including those children in the benefits of Federal programs designed to help education.

In my view, viable private school alternatives will not weaken public education. Diversity and competition will strengthen our total educational system. But too often these questions are debated on points of law rather than the merits. And more often than not the fundamental right and responsibility involved—that of the parents to shape the education of their children—is scarcely mentioned, if at all. That is why I was delighted to see the thoughtful column of Joseph Sobran entitled "Private Schools and Parents' Rights" in the Washington Post of July 25. We need far more consideration of the role of the family and the rights of parents in education, and Mr. Sobran's column is a welcome contribution.

The column follows:

PRIVATE SCHOOLS AND PARENTS' RIGHTS

(By Joseph Sobran)

Like many people, I used to oppose government aid to private education in any form. I attended public schools, and I felt that if other people thought the free system wasn't good enough for their children, they shouldn't complain about having to foot the bill for private schools. Besides, what if a dime of public funds should wind up in some priest's pocket? That would violate the First Amendment, wouldn't it?

I'm afraid this was, and is, a rather mean attitude. People don't choose private schools out of ingratitude, but out of love. They make sacrifices to give their children the best education they can. They deserve at least some consideration for that.

Besides, there is a matter of principle at stake, a principle we have nearly forgotten. Education means, finally, the shaping of the young. This is a grave duty, and it rests primarily with parents, and only secondarily (if at all) with the state.

Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-N.Y.), our leading advocate of tax relief for parents of private-school pupils, points out that the issue hasn't really been weighed on its merits. Liberal opponents of even that mild a form of aid to private schools insist it is unconstitutional; but that question can be temporarily waived. The main question is simply whether aid to private schools is a good idea. Both the Democratic and Republican platforms of 1976 agreed that it is.

Liberal ideology generally wants government to supervise things. It is suspicious of private schools as havens of privilege and subterfuge for segregation. In addition, the public-school establishment—state officials and teachers organizations—resents independent schools as it resents parental pressure. It prefers the rule of accredited state "experts," and has been harassing private schools—especially the proliferating religious schools of the Southeast—in the name of "standards."

There is irony, not to mention impudence, in this. Parents choose private schools in part because the standards of public schools have deteriorated so badly. And private schools generally do a better job of teaching by all measurable criteria.

But measurable criteria are only part of the story. Parents choose private schools for less tangible reasons: They want their children taught in the atmosphere of moral and religious values that are (to some extent necessarily and properly) excluded from public schools. They feel that what the private schools supply is not extra luxuries, but vital necessities. Private schools are in a special sense free schools: free to be purposeful, free to reflect parental values.

All this runs counter to the instincts of modern liberalism, which implicitly regards

education as a process of "liberating" the young from the presumably backward values of the home. Though tactfully downplayed, this attitude shows up in the campaigns for sex education and for the minors' "rights" to contraception and abortion.

It also shows up negatively. The fashionable intellectual journals have almost nothing to say on behalf of parents' rights—a strange anomaly in an age that elaborates the rights of minorities, women, homosexuals, even animals. Nobody openly denies a parent's rights to select a child's education. But it is a right that is losing weight fast.

Usually, liberals argue that a right worth having is a right worth subsidizing. We are told that poor women don't really have the right to an abortion unless they have "access"—in the form of tax monies—to abortion. We are also assured that subsidizing abortion in no way implies approval of it. Why isn't this logic applied to private education?

In essence, public education has the status of an established church. All, regardless of personal conviction, are required to support it. Dissenters are "free" to support alternatives only after they have paid their dues to the establishment.

That situation trivializes genuine freedom. The preferred status of public education prevents some, and tends to discourage all, from supporting pluralistic education. Justice requires nondiscriminatory tax relief, at a minimum, to parents of private-school pupils. And that means no discrimination against religious schools. ●

POLISH REMEMBRANCE DAY

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a commentary concerning the 40th anniversary of the infamous German invasion of Poland on September 1, 1939. Col. Anthony K. Podbielski, Historian of the Bayonne Chapter of the Polish American Congress, has spoken often about the contributions of Polish Americans and other ethnic groups in the United States. I am deeply impressed by the pride of the millions of Americans of Polish descent. Pope John Paul II's recent visit to his native Poland has inspired the world. It is all the more significant that His Holiness, while celebrating Holy Mass at the site of the notorious Nazi concentration camp in Auschwitz, Poland, called attention to the horrible slaughter of 3½ million Polish Christians and 2½ million Polish Jews. Therefore, I would urge that this commentary be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as further evidence of the tragedy of World War II.

Mr. William Kowalski, president of the Bayonne Chapter of the Polish American Congress, Bayonne, N.J., declared that:

Polish Remembrance Day is the official title for the anniversary of the Nazi attack on Poland. Poland was the first nation to meet and resist the powerful Nazi military challenge on her soil. After seventeen days of incessant and unequal struggle, communist Russia invaded Poland from the east in accordance with a previous, premeditated agreement with Germany. At this point, the Polish struggle went underground with the brave Poles fighting alongside the American, British and French allies across North Africa and in Europe.

How ignominious were the final fruits of Allied victory, when the Polish Armed Forces were denied the right to participate in the many victory parades in London, Paris and Rome. Further humiliation followed with Poland being "sold down the river," at the secret conferences of Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam. These conclaves sealed the doom of Eastern Europe, bringing millions of people under communist domination.

Deprived of participation in the post war Marshall Plan, Poland nonetheless rose like Phoenix from the ashes of destruction. Despite a government not of their choosing, the people of Poland serve as an example of faith and dedication to the ideals of freedom.

On September 1, 1979, Poles and their descendants all over the world will join with Pope John Paul II in fervent prayers for the never-ending struggle for Poland's right and will to live.

The day will be a solemn one with religious services predominating on this tragic anniversary. We take pride and encouragement that here in the United States, the millions of Americans of Polish descent will pause to pray for the victims of Nazi and Communist oppression and that we will continue to contribute to the well-being of our nation so nobly begun and exemplified by those first famous Poles in the Jamestown colony in 1608. ●

SOVIET TROOPS IN CUBA

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join a substantial number of my colleagues in expressing deep concern over recently revealed evidence by the State Department showing that 2,000 to 3,000 Soviet troops have been operating as a combat unit in Cuba since "at least the mid-1970's."

This revelation raises two very serious questions that need prompt and sufficient answers. First, what is the mission of the Soviet combat unit in Cuba? While a few thousand Russian combat troops in Cuba may not pose "a direct threat" to this country, as the State Department has said, there are many other dangers to contend with here.

Simply stated, the United States cannot afford to allow a Soviet military base to be established 90 miles from our shores. The Soviet Union, by secretly strengthening their military power in a highly sensitive region just off the American coast, has displayed a total disregard for clearly established, though not formalized, United States-Soviet foreign policy. If we do not aggressively pursue this matter, and indicate our strong opposition to such a troop buildup, what is to stop the Soviets from increasing their military capability in Cuba?

Certainly expressions of opposition are necessary in this serious matter. However, we in the Congress can and must go a step further. We can actively support a Senate resolution to halt consideration of SALT II until President Carter either reports that Soviet combat troops have been removed from Cuba or states that any Soviet troops there pose no threat to the foreign policy interests of the United States and our Latin Ameri-

can allies. Such action would insure that this issue is dealt with promptly and effectively, and would help us to determine whether the Soviet Union has negotiated SALT II in good faith.

Second, and I believe more important to our long-range national security, is how such a combat unit, maneuvering with tanks and artillery since at least 1976, could go undetected by U.S. intelligence for so long. This question is especially critical since the U.S. ability to verify Russian compliance with the missile limits established by SALT II is so very important.

Certainly, U.S. intelligence failure in Iran should have taught us a very valuable lesson about the threats posed to U.S. foreign policy as a result of insufficient intelligence capability. Unfortunately, it is obvious from the long-undetected Soviet presence in Cuba that the problems and weaknesses within our intelligence community have not been corrected.

I view this as a much more serious threat to our national security than the presence of 3,000 Soviet troops in Cuba. This is a problem that must be addressed promptly—certainly prior to final consideration of SALT II.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that a full-scale congressional investigation be made into the competency of U.S. intelligence agencies to determine an effective solution to this most serious problem. ●

CENTENNIAL OF THE LOS ANGELES ATHLETIC CLUB

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the anniversary of an institution with a long and august record of achievement and distinguished service to the community of Los Angeles. On September 8, the Los Angeles Athletic Club will begin its historic centennial year and can reflect back upon the past 99 years with justifiable pride for the contribution it has made to achieving the goals it set in 1880 to support amateur athletics and promote physical fitness.

Notable among the achievements that combine to constitute the club's rich heritage was the 1932 Olympics—the first Olympiad ever held in the United States—which was attracted to this country largely through the efforts of the then Los Angeles Athletic Club president, William May Garland, and other members. These same dedicated club members also devoted their time, talents, and energy to actively participate in the organization and operation of the 1932 games.

The Los Angeles Athletic Club's history is steeped in a tradition of Olympic support and participation. Many of America's amateur Olympic competitors have performed under the auspices of the club, including such Olympic champions as swimmer Buster Crabbe, yachtsman

Owen Churchill, shotputter Parry O'Brien, and diver Pat McCormick, Continuing in that Olympic tradition, the Los Angeles Athletic Club today, under the leadership of its board chairman, Frank G. Hathaway, is deeply involved in the planning of the 1984 Olympics to be staged in Los Angeles. Mr. Hathaway and three club members have been appointed to serve on the Los Angeles Olympic Committee.

Although the Los Angeles Athletic Club has attracted prominent athletes, businessmen, and representatives of government from all levels—as well as celebrities from the entertainment industry such as Charles Chaplin, Mack Sennett, Al Jolson, and Rudolph Valentino—the club and its facilities also provide recreational outlets for thousands of members who are average citizens of Los Angeles.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you and my distinguished colleagues will join with me in congratulating Mr. Charles F. Hathaway, president of the Los Angeles Athletic Club, his staff, and members, on the occasion of this historic milestone and wish them continued success during the club's second century.●

LITTLE KNOWN HISTORY OF ATOMIC ACCIDENTS

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, as a participant in the public information project on the little-known history of atomic accidents, I would like to share with my colleagues the following excerpt from Leo Goodman's catalog of mishaps involving nuclear materials:

1950 ATOMIC ACCIDENT

January 17, 1950—Loss of 40.3 mg. of radium, Bldg. 233, U.S. Naval Station, Treasure Island, California.

Source: Excerpt from Memorandum AD-219(OE), "Decontamination of Building 233, U.S. Naval Station, Treasure Island, California," by V. V. Vandivert—November 25, 1953: page 4.

As a result of the accidental loss of 40.3 mg. of radium from an instrument calibration capsule, the two-story Damage Control Training Center (Building 233), U.S. Naval Station, Treasure Island, California, became radiologically contaminated on 17 January 1950. The accident occurred during a laboratory exercise in which a Radiological Defense class was being instructed in the calibration of radiac instruments.

The release of the contaminant was caused by the unnoticed loss of a threaded plug from the bottom end of the metal calibration capsule. Loss of the threaded plug allowed the radium salt to fall to the floor of the laboratory classroom (Room 110). The accident was unnoticed for a short time, during which the movements of students and instructors in the room contributed to the initial spread of the contaminant.

The first indication of the accident came in the form of erratic readings on the radiac instruments which were being calibrated. Because of a recent previous experience with a radon gas leak from a similar calibration capsule at the same location, and the similarity between the erratic responses of radiac

instruments on the two occasions, the existence of a leaking capsule was suspected. The laboratory was evacuated promptly, and measures were taken to monitor the exposed personnel for contamination. Further investigation following the removal of the students from the room showed the true nature of the accident and resulted in the determination of the approximate location of the spill. Steps were taken immediately to prevent further spread of the contaminant and to protect the exposed personnel.

Source: Excerpt from Memorandum "Hazard Evaluation and Control Following A Spill of 40 Milligrams of Radium," November 25, 1953: page 7.

Personnel Contamination:

Bodies: A number of the students had microgram amounts of radium on the backs and palms of their hands. Routine cleansing and scrubbing procedures had been attempted immediately after detection but they were only partially successful. The hair and the legs of the students were also commonly contaminated.

Clothing: Uniforms and shoes . . . were all heavily contaminated.

Automobiles, Homes, etc.: It was possible to track the students into their homes by means of radiac instruments.●

THE GLOBAL POPULATION PROBLEM: TOO MANY PEOPLE AND TOO FEW RESOURCES

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, as president of the Peace Through Law Education Fund, I take great pleasure in inserting into the RECORD the formal remarks of Ambassador Marshall Green at the July meeting of the food and population breakfast series sponsored by the fund.

Ambassador Marshall Green, a director of the Population Crisis Committee, has served in the Department of State for 32 years. In 1975, he was designated by Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger as coordinator of Population Affairs. As chairman of the Interagency Task Force on Population Policy, he coordinated U.S. international population policy. He also served as head of the U.S. delegation to the U.N. Population Commission in 1977 and 1979.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues Ambassador Green's outline of the dimensions of the global population problem:

OUTLINE OF MARSHALL GREEN

I welcome this opportunity to talk about global population growth and its effect on the human condition. The population 'problem' is more than just a question of too many people with too few resources. It is the critical element in the economic development strategy of every Third World country. Without an effective policy of population control, many developing countries will be unable to provide enough jobs, grow sufficient food or construct adequate health care facilities for their citizens.

To effectively combat the political, economic and social problems brought about by the high rates of population growth, politicians around the world must think and plan in decades and not in years. Long-term population programs must be devised which are

rooted at the village and the community levels, so that their success is not tied to the uncertain political futures of national leaders.

One of the most critical problems facing policy planners in the developing world is that of the overcrowded cities. Huge slums, like those surrounding Mexico City, Lima and Calcutta, are breeding grounds for political violence. In a recent series of articles in the Washington Star, George Ball attributed, in part, the downfall of the Shah of Iran to runaway population growth in that country and to mounting frustrations in the teeming slums of south Tehran.

The status of women and the economic roles women play in developing countries are key factors in the equation for controlling population growth. Too many women in developing countries are condemned to lives of repeated child-bearing, wasted health, drudgery and early death. Millions of unwanted children are born every year, many of them to be abandoned or allowed to die.

One of the most obvious consequences of overpopulation is the lack of employment opportunities for men and women. The International Labor Organization predicts that the world labor force will grow by over 900 million workers before the year 2000, almost all of whom will be in the developing world, and that massive unemployment will be the inevitable consequence. For most countries, creating new jobs is a very expensive proposition. In Mexico, I have heard that it costs, on the average, almost \$20,000 to create one job. In Egypt, the comparable figure is about \$10,000.

For family planners in these and other regions, one of the largest hurdles to overcome is the large number of wanted children. Vigorous national and local leadership is essential in overcoming these traditional attitudes. With effective leadership, efforts to promote the education and training of women, the provision of contraceptive services and overall economic development can succeed in bringing down birth rates.

Unfortunately, in many areas of the world population growth rates remain at unacceptably high levels. In particular, in the arc of countries from Morocco to Burma population growth continues at very high levels. In most countries national leadership in the population area is sadly lacking as is any effective network of village-level population organizations. In Egypt, for example, President Sadat has acknowledged his country's population problem, but he has thus far shown himself unwilling to take vigorous action to combat it. Despite large amounts of foreign assistance, Egypt has failed to create a unified population policy at the village and national level.

I strongly urge that all future population assistance be oriented, as much as possible, to village or community-wide programs organized and directed by local villagers or residents. In many countries, peer pressure at the village level is an essential element in effectively reducing birth rates. Our foreign aid officers need to learn more about how things work on a community level and how best to assist locally-managed population control programs.

The world population explosion has had an adverse effect on a wide range of global issues, all of them affecting the United States, as well as other nations. I refer to resource availabilities, energy, environment, development, North-South disparities, political stability and peace. The fundamental problem will not be resolved by throwing a lot of dollars and contraceptives at it, needed as they are. It will be resolved by the determination and cooperation of countless millions of people who earnestly seek a better life for themselves and for their children.●

CRISIS IN HEALTH CARE

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, during the August recess, I chaired a hearing in Longview, Wash., on behalf of the House Select Committee on Aging. The hearing was in response to complaints by my constituents that local nursing homes were not accepting medicare patients, denying many senior citizens the benefits to which they are entitled under the medicare program.

While the hearing focused on medicare benefits as they relate to nursing home care, we were to learn about a variety of abuses in the program which clearly made victims out of our elderly. We also discovered that:

First, Medicare is not providing the coverage originally intended, paying less than 40 percent of an individual's health care costs.

Second, Widespread abuse persists in the sale of supplemental health insurance policies.

Third, Nursing homes are not participating in the medicare program even though the reimbursement rate is higher than medicaid.

Fourth, Due to lack of medicare beds senior citizens are losing their right to 100 days of benefits in a nursing home.

Fifth, Hospitals are routinely keeping the elderly in the hospital longer than necessary due to this shortage which is considerably more costly for the system.

Obviously, something is wrong. Congress can no longer ignore this crisis in health care. No other segment of society is so unprotected from health care services as our senior citizens. I pledge my support to work with Chairman CLAUDE PEPPER and my colleagues on the Select Committee on Aging to correct these abuses and insure adequate health care for senior citizens.

Recent action I have taken in initial steps to address this crisis include the following letters which I submit for the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, D.C., August 14, 1979.

HON. BENJAMIN R. CIVILETTI,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CIVILETTI: For some time, the House Select Committee on Aging has been investigating abuses in the sale of health insurance to the elderly. Our hearings, including those in Longview, Washington last week, have documented serious abuses in this field.

I am writing to ask if certain common abuses in this field are crimes prescribed by Federal law. I would appreciate your comments and any pertinent statutory references.

1. Is it a violation of Federal law for an insurance agent to represent himself as an employee of Medicare, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or other government agency when he is employed by a private insurance company and appears at the senior citizen's door for the purposes of soliciting the sale of health insurance?

2. Is it a violation of Federal law for an insurance salesman to take money paid to him as premiums on a health insurance pol-

icy sold in supplementation of Medicare and to convert that money to his own use?

3. Is it a violation of any Federal law for an insurance agent to purposely misrepresent the provisions of an insurance policy during a sale?

4. Similarly, is it a violation of any Federal law for an insurance agent to misrepresent the provisions of an existing policy for purposes of causing the senior citizen to drop that policy and purchase a different policy which he is selling?

5. Is it a violation of any Federal law for an insurance agent to forge the name of a senior citizen on an application for health insurance?

6. Is it a violation of any Federal law for the agent to fail to report pertinent information given to him by the person when the agent knows this information, if disclosed to the company, will cause the person to be disqualified from benefits?

7. Is it a violation of Federal law for insurance agents to deliberately sell senior citizens numerous overlapping and duplicative health insurance policies knowing that only one policy will pay and that the purchase of several policies is not in the best interests of the insured?

8. Is it a violation of Federal law for an insurance company to teach its agents to misrepresent policy provisions, to withhold pertinent information or to forge the names of senior citizens on policy provisions?

Finally, our staff has come to the conclusion that an insurance company is a perfect method of laundering money. Some states such as Arizona have notoriously lax standards. Almost anyone can form their own insurance company under the laws of that state with very little capital reserve being required. Insurance forms can be sold immediately upon filing. And then, too, no one ever audits an insurance company. As you know, the Federal government has delegated its responsibility for the regulation of insurance to the states. Some do a fine job, but many do not. My question is this: Have the FBI or the organized crime strike forces uncovered any evidence that organized crime may be involved in the ownership and/or operation of insurance companies? If so, are investigations in this area going forward at the present time?

I would appreciate your response at your earliest convenience.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

DON BONKER,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D.C., September 6, 1979.

HON. PATRICIA ROBERTS HARRIS,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY HARRIS: The purpose of this letter is to inform you of the recent hearings I chaired in Longview, Washington on behalf of the House Select Committee on Aging. The subject of the hearings was why nursing homes are dropping out of the Medicare program.

The hearing resulted from complaints by senior citizens who asserted that they were losing the right to 100 days care in nursing homes and from hospitals who asserted that they were routinely keeping the elderly in the hospital longer than necessary because of the shortage of participating Medicare nursing home beds.

Prior to the hearing, I directed a questionnaire to every nursing home in the State to learn why they were dropping out of Medicare. The answer given by most was the red tape which apparently goes with participation in Medicare. Another factor given prominence was the uncertainty of payment. Other factors such as the assertion that Medicare rates are too low or that Medicare standards

are too high were given little emphasis by providers.

Testimony from providers indicated that a nursing home operator must fill out 7 times as many forms to participate in Medicare as in Medicaid.

May I ask that you examine the validity of this assertion and if it is found to be valid, set forth a plan to reduce the amount of paperwork associated with Medicare participation?

Second, testimony at the hearings indicated that the exodus of providers from the Medicare nursing home program would be greatly increased with the passage of H.R. 4475, an administration-sponsored Medicare-Medicaid reform measure. Specifically, section 107 of this bill would abolish the presumptive periods of coverage established by the Congress to give some predictability to Medicare reimbursement. If section 107 is enacted the conclusion offered at our hearings is that there would be even less certainty of payment than we have at the present time when operators are claiming that accepting a Medicare patient is a cruel form of Russian roulette. May I ask the Department to reexamine its position with respect to this and other provisions of H.R. 4475 which relate to nursing homes?

Third, may I ask what plan the Department has to insure that patients are not kept in hospitals longer than necessary? Testimony at our hearings indicates that the average daily cost to Medicare to keep an individual in a hospital is about \$184 while the average daily cost to place that person in a long-term care facility is about \$34. Obviously, the cost implications are enormous in view of our findings that over 50 percent of the hospitals in my State routinely keep patients longer than necessary because of the absence of viable alternatives.

Fourth, considerable testimony was received at our August 7 hearings on abuses in the sale of health insurance to the elderly. We learned that senior citizens are often sold one or more policies with the representation that they will pay for everything that Medicare won't. The fact of the matter is that these "medi-gap" policies generally do not pay for anything more than Medicare's copayments and deductibles. To make matters worse, senior citizens are often the victims of high pressure salesmen. Greedy insurance companies teach their agents to cheat the elderly; we have found they return 25 cents or less of the premium dollar to their insured. I have been a co-sponsor of Chairman Pepper's bill, H.R. 2602, along with about 265 other Congressmen but the full impact of this problem did not hit me until I heard the testimony of senior citizens from my District. May I ask what plans the Department has for dealing with this serious problem?

We certainly appreciate your help and cooperation in this matter.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

DON BONKER,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D.C., September 6, 1979.

HON. HENRY WAXMAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Health and the
Environment, Washington, D.C.

DEAR HENRY: On August 7, I conducted hearings in my home district on behalf of the House Select Committee on Aging into the question of why nursing homes are dropping out of the Medicare program. Senior citizens, providers, State and Federal officials were invited. We had barely gotten into a discussion of the problem when the senior citizens expressed their outrage at what they consider an even greater issue. They wanted to talk about abuses in the sale of health insurance.

I have been a co-sponsor of Chairman Pepper's bill, H.R. 2602, along with you and half

of the Congress but I did not appreciate the full impact of the problem until I heard the testimony. Senior citizens are being sold one or more policies with the representation that it (they) will pay for everything that Medicare won't. The sad fact is that these Medicare supplementary policies by definition will only pay for Medicare's copayments and deductibles. They will not pay for eyeglasses, dental care, prescription drugs, or for the remainder of a person's medical expenses. Moreover, the problem is exacerbated by high pressure salesmen and by insurance companies who have targeted the elderly as easy marks for sales. As you know from your hearing, some companies return as little as 16 cents on the premium dollar back to their insured in the form of claims.

The problem of mail order abuses was also raised briefly. It seems that if an insurance company files a "group" policy in one State it can then mail policy certificates into every other State and State insurance commissioners are helpless to regulate them.

It seems to me that H.R. 2602 would be a good start towards dealing with these problems. May I ask that you move that bill to mark up as soon as possible. I would be happy to lend any support that I can. I would appreciate anything you can do. I think the situation is serious.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

DON BONKER,
Member of Congress.

U.N. AMBASSADOR ANDREW YOUNG

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, with the resignation of U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young, it is well to look at his positive accomplishments. He was a knowledgeable spokesman on issues of the Third World. He paved new roads and reopened closed avenues in our relations with the continents of Africa and Asia.

We, as Members of this Congress, must appreciate the fact that we are all sisters and brothers in the world community. As Ambassador Young indicated in his eloquent remarks before the UN Security Council last week—"the people of Lebanon and the Middle East look to us to point the way to a solution which will put an end to the random violence, so they may carry on their lives in freedom from fear of attack. We must not fail them."

I for one feel that the worth he gave us, the United States, as well as all members of the United Nations, has been overlooked. It is my hope that the new U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations will continue the journey pioneered with courage, wisdom and compassion by Andrew Young. I would like to submit for the RECORD his remarks concerning the unnecessary violence in the Middle East and possible solutions to the problem.

The remarks follow:

U.S. POLICY ON LEBANON

(By Ambassador Andrew Young)

(NOTE.—Following is a statement by U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Andrew Young before the U.N. Security Council, August 29, 1979.)

I welcome the opportunity afforded by this meeting of the Council to address a problem which has long been a matter of grave concern

to my government. In recent weeks and months, the sorry spectacle of the slaughter of innocent people through random violence, principally in Lebanon but also in Israel, has been an affront to the conscience of mankind. We are meeting now at the request of the Government of Lebanon, in response to the recent upsurge of violence in southern Lebanon.

In recent days alone, thousands of Lebanese and Palestinian civilians have been forced to flee from their homes, and many have been killed and maimed by often indiscriminate shelling. This situation is intolerable. The people of southern Lebanon, Lebanese and Palestinian alike, and the people of Israel as well, deserve relief from the almost daily violence and fear of attack with which they have been forced to live for far too long. They look to us to point the way to a solution which will allow the people in Lebanon to return to their homes and for them and Israeli citizens to carry on their lives in freedom from fear of attack. We must not fail them.

U.S. POSITION

The U.S. Government's policy on Lebanon is well known; We support that country's sovereignty, independence, unity, and territorial integrity. We have special ties of sympathy with the people of Lebanon, and we have supported the government of President Sarkis in its efforts to restore its authority throughout the country—including throughout southern Lebanon. We will continue to do so.

Let me make absolutely clear the position of the United States with regard to events in southern Lebanon. In doing so, I speak with the full authority of the U.S. Government.

First, we condemn those who boast of the murder of an Israeli mother and her child, the attack on a bus filled with Israeli civilians, or the explosion of rockets and bombs in Israeli towns and cities. No political objective can ever justify such barbarism.

Second, and just as strongly, we condemn the policy of artillery shelling and preemptive attacks on Lebanese towns, villages, and refugee camps which Israel and the armed Lebanese groups Israel supports have followed in recent months. Let there be no doubt or ambiguity about this. We cannot and do not agree with Israel's military policies in Lebanon as manifested in the past few months. They are wrong and unacceptable to my government. They are painfully at variance with the values which Israel has traditionally espoused.

WHAT MUST BE DONE

Let me turn to what the U.S. Government believes must be done to break the deadlock of terror and counterterror in which both sides seem to be caught.

First, both sides should cooperate fully with UNIFIL [U.N. Interim Force in Lebanon] in enabling it to carry out its mandate. It is disgraceful that the men of UNIFIL have been subjected to attack and harassment from both Palestinian elements and groups supported by Israel because they seek to carry out the mission entrusted to them by this Council. A lasting end to the violence in the area can only be brought about through scrupulous observance of Security Council Resolution 425. UNIFIL should thus be allowed to fulfill its mandate by functioning in an unimpeded fashion throughout all of southern Lebanon. The objective remains to restore the authority and control of the Government of Lebanon throughout the country.

Second, Israel should end its policy of preemptive strikes on Lebanon soil. It should cease its artillery attacks in support of Lebanese militia groups and use its influence effectively over these groups so that random and indiscriminate violence can be stopped, especially against the men of UNIFIL.

Third, the Palestinian leadership should

help heal the wounds of Lebanon. It should stop attacks on the Lebanese militia groups in southern Lebanon and on Israel. It should renounce the use of Lebanese territory for this purpose. It should carry out its pledge of June 5 to withdraw its fighters from southern Lebanese villages and towns and remove all its armed groups from UNIFIL's area of operation. This step should be taken without precondition and without delay. There is no conceivable justification for the continued presence of Palestinian armed groups in southern Lebanon if the Palestinian leadership is prepared to cooperate with the Council and UNIFIL in carrying out Security Council Resolution 425.

Fourth, all parties to the fighting should carry out and strictly enforce a complete, immediate, and lasting halt to all shelling, terrorism, and other acts of violence.

PALESTINIAN RIGHTS

Members of the Council less than a week ago met to consider another aspect of the Middle East situation, the critical issue of the rights of the Palestinian people. If there is a strengthened understanding in my country of the importance of assuring that the legitimate rights of the Palestinians are included in a comprehensive settlement—and I believe there is—then it is time for the Palestinian leadership to recognize that their objectives cannot be achieved through violence and terrorism. Indeed, it is time, past time, for wiser counsels to prevail on both sides of the border between Lebanon and Israel.

TRIBUTE TO UNIFIL

Finally, I want to pay tribute to General Erskine and the brave men of UNIFIL he commands. Their task has been thankless, frustrating, and dangerous. Subjected to attack in the performance of their duties, they have suffered heavy casualties. Tragically, three members of the contingent from the small nation of Fiji were killed in a recent clash with terrorists.

In difficult terrain and in a country where arms are widely available among the population, the men of UNIFIL have been subjected to a severe test of their steadfastness. They have risen to challenges with exemplary determination and courage. We all owe them a debt of thanks which words cannot repay. They can be proud of their continued contribution to the cause of peace.

THE FAMILY FARM

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, those who operate our Nation's family farms and ranches are accustomed to gambling at every turn of their operation. Whether it be weather conditions or market prices, the severity of the gamble is just the same—instant demise of another family farm.

Unfortunately, there is another problem that family farmers have to contend with—Federal estate taxes and the hardship they create for the spouse of a family farm. One of my First District constituents was recently featured in the August 1979 issue of the Farm Journal concerning her fight against Federal estate tax regulations.

Mrs. Bessie Craig of Groton, S. Dak., spent some 43 years as a full partner in her family's farming operation, sharing with the field work, hauling grain and livestock, and tending to daily chores

with the livestock. This was in addition to feeding and caring for a family of 5 children and a husband. The death of her husband, Clarence, in 1968 suddenly thrust her in the position of proving her contributions as a partner in the farming operation.

In order that my colleagues might have the benefit of Mrs. Cook's struggle to be named a full partner in the family's farming operation, I include her story in the RECORD.

THEY SUED THE IRS—AND WON

BESSIE CRAIG VS. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Facts: Bessie married Clarence Craig in 1925, and they started farming from scratch on rental land in Brown County, S.D. From day one of their 43 years of married life, Bessie was the bookkeeper—she had studied bookkeeping and typing in high school, and she developed her own form of enterprise accounting.

The Craigs were good farmers and good managers. They bought their first farm during the Depression (1930), and from time to time borrowed money to add other parcels to their holdings. They raised wheat, corn, oats, barley and flax, and they had stock, too—a cow-calf operation, hogs, sometimes sheep and a sideline Shetland pony business.

Early in their marriage Bessie worked in the fields, and she was always available to haul grain or stock. Once she trucked a load of horses from Missouri to South Dakota. Somehow she found time to raise a big garden and do a great deal of canning—vegetables, fruit, meat.

The Craigs' five children helped as they grew old enough, but that wasn't sufficient. Clarence and Bessie together hired farm laborers who "lived in." Bessie cooked for them, did their laundry, mended all their clothing, cleaned their quarters.

She had one enterprise of her own—a butter and egg route in town. She churned by hand and molded the butter; and the chickens were her special responsibility. "I'd get up in the middle of the night to see after my baby chicks," she reminisced to me not long ago in her comfortable living room. The money from this and all farm sales went into a single bank account in both names.

When Clarence and Bessie went on cattle-buying trips, she usually wrote the checks. And she was the one who hired truckers to deliver the stock to the farm. A favorite meal of truckers was hamburgers and homemade cherry pie, she says.

The Craigs were fortunate to have an astute attorney, Douglas Bantz of Aberdeen, who persuaded them as early as 1958 to "equalize" their holdings for estate tax purposes. When Clarence died following a car accident in 1968, he held title to 5½ quarter sections of land, Bessie to 7½, and they owned one parcel of pastureland in joint tenancy. In his will Clarence set up a trust, through which his holdings went to the children. Bessie inherited only household goods and the family car, since she already owned half of the farm (966.5 acres.) Neither the South Dakota Department of Revenue nor IRS contested her ownership of real property.

The issue: At stake was personal property valued at \$265,405.09—machinery worth \$53,938.50; livestock, including 620 head of cattle, valued at \$167,864.56; and miscellaneous assets (stored grain, interest in several copos, etc.) worth \$43,602.03.

Attorneys for the U.S., strictly interpreting the Tax Code, claimed Bessie owned none of this personal property and said she therefore owed IRS an additional \$42,318.79 in tax. (A tax she describes as "a whopper" already had been paid by the estate.) Bessie forked over the tax deficiency, but reserved

the right, as executrix, to sue to get the money back.

Bessie's attorneys, Kenneth L. Gosch and Harry N. Sandstrom (then partners of Mr. Bantz), chose to fight the case on their own home ground—that is, in District Court in Aberdeen. They preferred this to the Tax Court, which they feel often favors IRS.

By the time the case began on a blizzard day in November, 1977, Bessie had done her homework. In one instance that meant digging up a check she had written in 1946—more than 30 years earlier.

It was easier to find records than to keep her cool when a U.S. tax attorney accused her of "a self-serving assertion not in accordance with the objective facts." She could not deny that on federal income tax returns (which Bessie always prepared for review by a CPA) that "Mr. Craig is listed as a farmer while Mrs. Craig is not listed as having an occupation." Nor had Bessie and Clarence ever filed a partnership income tax return, the government's attorneys pointed out.

Bessie had a chance to testify in her own behalf ("I wasn't scared," she told me), and so did three of the Craig children and the family banker. The Justice Department attorneys from Washington, D.C., were polite to Bessie, but out of her hearing they often chided her counsel on the futility of her case. Nevertheless, attorneys Gosch and Sandstrom kept hammering away at the idea that if it had not been for Bessie's help, Clarence would have had to employ another hired man. And they never let anyone forget that Bessie had been a joint decision-maker with her husband.

"The best point in Bessie's favor was that she and Clarence really did operate as farm partners," attorney Gosch told me.

He explained to me why he and his partner had delayed filing suit against the U.S. for several years. "We felt there was a changing mood in the country. The longer we waited, the more people would realize the value of a woman in a family business."

The verdict: Judge Fred J. Nichol wrote the Court's decision announced on June 14, 1978. Some of his statements were music to a farm wife's ears: "All in all, the efforts of Bessie Craig, in the operation of the family farm, as well as her capital contributions in income derived from her land, can properly be characterized as those of a partner, in the fullest business sense of the word . . ."

"The Court will not ignore this farm wife's contribution to the success of the business as the Internal Revenue seeks to do . . . (T)he plaintiff is entitled to the refund sought."

In time, Bessie got back her \$42,318.79 plus interest. She had to pay attorneys' fees, of course, but it is a great satisfaction "to get justice," she says with a proud smile.

Now Bessie's place in history is assured—in future law books, later generations will study "Craig vs. The United States of America." ●

THATCHER AND LYNCH MEET— SYMBOLISM OR THE CATALYST FOR MOVEMENT TOWARD AN IRISH SOLUTION?

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday following the funeral of Lord Mountbatten the Prime Ministers of Great Britain and Ireland met for some 5 hours to ostensibly discuss the continuing prob-

lems in Northern Ireland. While all those who seek peace in Ireland were heartened by the fact that the meeting took place—it appears as if the moment was not fully seized. Therefore, it remains to be judged as to whether the meeting was pure symbolism or the catalyst for more involved discussions on a future solution to the Irish question.

As chairman of the 130-member Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs I must express my disappointment over the apparently one dimensional direction of the talks yesterday. I believe as do many in the Irish American community that the final solution for Ireland is a political not a military one. While I can recognize the need for a renewed effort to repel terrorism in Ireland, this cannot be the only initiative put forth by the British Government.

I suggest that these meetings be continued and expanded to include other parties to the dispute in Ireland. I further urge that President Carter participate in the next meetings between these leaders to dramatically demonstrate U.S. interest and concern about the Irish issue.

This is an extremely critical time with respect to Ireland. The resurgence of violence has created an atmosphere of fear and has resulted in some frustration of peace efforts. However we cannot permit the legitimate pursuit of peace to be subordinated to the forces of terrorism. Mrs. Thatcher did state in the joint communique with Prime Minister Lynch that she would "make moves at the appropriate time" to "seek an acceptable way of restoring to the people of Northern Ireland more control over their own affairs."

However, time is of the essence. Great Britain and the Republic of Ireland must put forth and pursue aggressively peace initiatives. The United States should be in a position to assist in any way possible, and should do so at the Presidential level. These peace initiatives should involve input from all sides to the problem in Ireland. To engage in exclusionary practices is to doom any solution to failure.

We of the ad hoc congressional committee intend to continue our pressure for the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 122 which I introduced calling on Great Britain to embark on a new initiative for Ireland which restores lost human rights and promotes self-determination. Passage of this resolution, which enjoys the cosponsorship of some 70 of my colleagues, would demonstrate the concern of Congress about the future of Ireland.

At this point in the RECORD I wish to insert an account of the Thatcher-Lynch meeting from this morning's Washington Post.

THATCHER AND LYNCH AGREE TO BOOST COOPERATION AGAINST IRA TERROR

(By Leonard Downie, Jr.)

LONDON, September 5.—Prime Ministers Margaret Thatcher of Britain and Jack Lynch of Ireland agreed today to "substantially improve" their security forces' cooperation in combating Irish Republican Army terrorism.

In five hours of talks here after both at-

tended the Westminster Abbey funeral of Lord Mountbatten, who was assassinated by the IRA last week, Thatcher and Lynch agreed that their governments would examine a number of each other's suggestions to improve security and would produce final proposals at a meeting of their Cabinet ministers in three weeks.

"There likely will be decisions made" at that meeting on new joint security measures, Lynch said at a press conference tonight after his working lunch and afternoon meeting with Thatcher. "No specific proposals have been ruled out on either side."

This represented some movement by Lynch from his public statements. Earlier this week he appeared to rule out a number of security suggestions that Thatcher was expected to make.

For her part, Thatcher did not press two changes sought by British security forces in Northern Ireland but which Lynch politically is unable to make: Allowing "hot" pursuit of terrorist suspects by Ulster security forces across the border into Ireland and changing Ireland's extradition policy to allow terrorists living or caught in Ireland to be tried in Britain.

According to the official joint statement of the meeting, Thatcher also agreed to "make moves at the appropriate time" to "seek an acceptable way of restoring to the people of Northern Ireland more control over their own affairs."

Lynch, who is pushing for a new British political initiative in Northern Ireland, made clear that any new "form of administration" there must be acceptable to both the Catholic minority and the Protestant majority. He evidently envisions a form of power sharing that could be the beginning of the end of emergency, direct British rule there.

Lynch said he and Thatcher agreed to keep secret the specifics of each country's suggestion for improved cooperation on security. Thatcher did not speak to the press at all.

However, several likely possibilities have emerged:

More troops and police patrols on both sides of the Northern Ireland-Ireland border, particularly in Northern Ireland, where British security forces have abandoned land patrols in some places and perform only helicopter surveillance.

Improved communication between the British and Irish armies, which back up the Northern Irish police and must communicate through the police forces in a cumbersome, un dependable process, even in emergencies.

Increased contact between Ulster and Irish police when terrorist suspects are arrested in Ireland that might include more travel into Ireland by Ulster investigators.

Changes in Irish criminal laws to make it more difficult to release suspects on bail and more likely that those convicted for crimes, including terrorists, would receive longer sentences.

At his press conference, Lynch also said Ireland will sign the European Community's new extradition agreement, most likely at the end of November, when Common Market leaders meet in Dublin. Ireland's Common Market presidency expires then.

The agreement is worded vaguely, however, in practice allowing Irish courts to decide whether extradition should be blocked in some cases.

Instead, Ireland's Criminal Law Jurisdiction Act of 1976 specifically provides for prosecution in Ireland of residents accused of terrorist offenses in Ulster or mainland Britain. Ulster and British security forces never have been able to trigger such a prosecution, however, because of the difficulty of assembling evidence and producing witnesses on one side of the border for use in court on the other side.

This problem might be alleviated somewhat by more extensive contacts between the

security forces on each side of the border, which appear to have increased during the investigation of Lord Mountbatten's murder and the bombings the same day that killed 18 British soldiers in Ulster. Most of those soldiers were buried yesterday and today with full military honors in their home towns throughout Britain.

Hinting at the possibility of stepped-up patrols on both sides of the border, Lynch told reporters, "There are two sides to the border, so security must be two ways. It is incumbent on the British to have as much surveillance on their side of border as we have on ours. We believe our commitment is greater in some places. There are places where there is no British commitment."

He also pointed out that the Irish government is already exploring ways to toughen its criminal laws to better fight terrorism and curb a crime wave in Ireland. However, he said, any changes in criminal law or procedure "have to be politically and legally possible." ●

CHAIN OWNERSHIP OF THE MEDIA

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, over the last few decades, the growth of chain ownership of the media, especially daily and weekly newspapers, has become a source of much controversy. As more and more independent dailies and weeklies are bought by the chains, the power to inform has become centralized in the major media conglomerates.

Rather than establishing new newspapers, the chains are buying out existing newspapers. This situation is of special importance because it affects the marketplace of ideas—the press—and is, as such, a matter of national concern.

Recently, the editorial page editor of the Buffalo Evening News, Millard C. Browne, delivered a speech which touched on the subject of media concentration. Speaking of this phenomenon, he noted:

Growing concentration of newspaper ownership does equal monopoly in an astonishingly high proportion of the local markets where newspapers in this country flourish—and where they used to compete. Of the 1760 dailies published in about 1600 American communities, there is only one local newspaper company in 97.5 percent of those communities.

One consequence of continued concentration in media ownership, I fear, might be the decline of diversity among America's newspapers. While local ownership has brought diversity in editorial views, subject matter, layout, and related matters, I suspect that chain ownership might tend to foster uniformity. Or, as Mr. Browne suggests:

I still have to worry about the potential for abuse. . . . The potential for a kind of homogeneous sterility . . . the potential for a sacrificing of quality, talent, courage and community service to an inordinate focusing on the bottom line. I try to visualize the typical owner of a Gannett newspaper, for example, and I conjure up nothing better than an anonymous fellow on Wall Street handling the investment portfolio for a pension fund, or an inflation-pressed widow in

Miami Beach, and none of them has the faintest idea what the paper I work for in Rochester, or Nashville, or Guam even looks like, much less what kind of news it is printing or what editorial crusades it is running.

I commend Mr. Browne's speech to my colleagues, and will include the portions of it relevant to the above points in the hope that others will come to share his and my concern over the potential impact of chain ownership of the media on American journalism and America's future.

Excerpts of the speech follow:

Yes . . . But

(Excerpts of speech by Millard C. Browne)

. . . Speaking last fall to the national convention of the Society of Professional Journalists, Sigma Delta Chi, he (Mr. Allen Neuharth, Chairman of the board of our largest newspaper chain, the Gannett Corporation) called on every journalist to become "a soldier in defense of the First Amendment." "We must show our readers," he said, "that our rights are really their rights. We have to show our readers that if we are going to give them a free flow of information, we do need some privileges."

Yes indeed. We do need the "privilege" of free access to news sources. But . . . do our readers also have the same vital interest in defending the continued consolidation of more and more newspapers under fewer ownerships? Was this the kind of privilege the Founding Fathers had in mind in the free-press clause of the First Amendment?

Thirty-three years ago, a civil-liberties attorney, Morris L. Ernst, wrote a book on "The First Freedom," in which he lamented: "Our press is fast evaporating. Ten states have not a single city with competing daily papers . . . Three hundred and seventy chain newspapers own about one-fifth of all our circulation. There are only 117 cities left, in our entire nation, where competing dailies still exist . . ."

That was in 1946, and little did he know. Today, if we may take our text from an equally prominent modern press critic, Ben H. Bagdikian, currently of the University of California, we have not 117 cities with competing dailies, but only 34 such cities. And today we have chains owning not one-fifth of all daily circulation, but three-quarters.

As Mr. Bagdikian put it to a Federal Trade Commission "Workshop on Media Concentration" several weeks ago, "It took the first 60 years of this century for chains to control 27 percent of all our papers. It has taken only the last 16 years for chains to reach control of 61 percent of all papers and 75 percent of all daily circulation."

This phenomenon of "fewer and fewer people controlling more and more of our public intelligence," he added, affects all the other mass media as well, with fewer than 100 corporate executives having ultimate control of the majority of each median in the U.S.

His figures: 20 corporations control 52 percent of all daily newspaper sales; 20 corporations control 50 percent of all periodical sales; 20 corporations control 52 percent of all book sales; 20 corporations control 76 percent of all record and tape sales. If one counts the three networks and the ten corporations whose sponsorship dominates prime time, 13 corporations control two-thirds of the audience in TV and radio; seven corporations control 75 percent of movie distribution.

In fact, insists this media critic, there are fewer than 100 corporations in this group because of overlaps. For example, he says, 27 percent of all TV stations are still controlled by newspaper companies. Washington Post

owns Newsweek, and TIME Inc. owns the Washington Star. Time also owns magazines, 17 weekly newspapers, five book publishing houses, a film company and has interests in cable and records. RCA owns NBC, a record company and five book publishing houses. CBS owns 20 magazines, three record companies and three book publishing houses. The biggest newspaper conglomerate (Times-Mirror of Los Angeles) owns four major papers, four magazines, TV stations, cable systems, 50 percent of a news service and New American Library.

But proving concentration in such terms as these, you may say, is far from proving any dangerous tendency toward monopoly.

Even the 167 chains that today own 61 percent of all daily newspapers are a lot of chains—compared, say, to the number of automobile or steel companies which control those industries. And the American media pattern can also be defended as providing far more diversity than in most countries, where in too many cases government has a monopoly on all mass communications, or at least on broadcasting. We here in America do have 1760 daily newspapers, none under government control; and 8600 radio and 700 commercial TV outlets, all government-regulated but privately owned and generally competitive.

Or let us bring this question of media monopoly vs. diversity down to the local scene, as I did in one of my Sunday columns last March. Quoting from a "Media Directory" published by the Arts Development Services of Buffalo, I noted that it listed no fewer than 156 publishers and broadcasters of various kinds and sizes in Western New York, all contending for readers' or listeners' attention.

The list started with 69 newspapers—five of them dailies in the immediate metropolitan area. The other 64 were mostly weeklies, including ethnic, labor or religious papers, as well as suburban or rural ones, plus 14 college papers. The ADS listing then added 18 "pennysavers," 24 company "house organs" and five area magazines. And it closed with 32 AM and FM radio stations and eight TV outlets, including one Canadian and two cable channels.

So there remains, in this community, a lot more media diversity than just that represented in the vigorous competition of the TV news outlets and the two daily newspapers (or even five, if you count those in Lockport, Tonawanda and Niagara Falls). You are well aware, of course, of the current antitrust litigation between the Courier Express and The News, and it is certainly not my purpose or intent to try that case here or even to comment on it in any way. I am talking about trends and conditions nationally that affect my profession of journalism; and I only note here that, even in spite of an accelerating national trend toward concentration of media ownership, particularly of daily newspapers—which I find alarming—there is still a great diversity of published or broadcast viewpoints to be found in this community, if you want to look for them.

But let us not be too readily put off the main scene. Growing concentration of newspaper ownership does equal monopoly in an astonishingly high proportion of the local markets where newspapers in this country flourish—and where they used to compete. Of the 1760 dailies published in about 1600 American communities, there is only one local newspaper company in 97 and one-half percent of those communities. "Those of you," says Mr. Bagdikian, "who live in the 34 cities of the country that still have newspapers in face-to-face competition should realize that you are in a 2 and one-half percent minority." So, here in Buffalo, let us perhaps take a moment of grateful silence to reflect on that blessing.

Let us look about us, for example, and note that nowhere else in upstate New York can any true daily newspaper competition be found at the local level. In Rochester, the monopoly is Gannett; in Syracuse, Newhouse; in Albany, Hearst. Throughout Westchester-Rockland, it is a solid 10-paper phalanx of Gannett monopoly; in Utica, Binghamton, Elmira, Ithaca, the same; in a dozen smaller cities, the readers are blessed by local monopolies owned by other chains—Ottaway, Howard, Ingersoll, etc. In just one conspicuous case is the monopoly a strictly home-owned family newspaper, the excellent Watertown Times.

Back, though, to Mr. Bagdikian and the basic case he makes—which is not merely that local newspaper competition is growing rarer, but that the swift growth of chain ownership is transforming the kind of press we have in America into a pattern very different from the one that existed when we were all a generation younger.

He is supported in this, moreover, by the authors of a multi-part series on "Press Concentration" in the Washington Post. William H. Jones and Laird Anderson. A six-month study brought them to this conclusion: "Within two decades, virtually all daily newspapers in America will be owned by perhaps fewer than two dozen major communications conglomerates. Given current tax laws and economic conditions, the rapid concentration of press power in the hands of a few giant companies appear inevitable."

That was written in 1977, and what has happened since does not exactly suggest any slowing of the trend. On this point, for example, the newspaper trade journal, Editor & Publisher, reported on Jan. 6 that "47 of the 53 daily newspapers that changed ownership in 1978 went into groups."

Not only that, but "three two-paper groups were absorbed into larger groups," and two multi-unit groups joined the big Thomson and Ottaway groups, respectively. The piece de resistance of 1978 acquisitions, however, was larger still: A \$362 million merger of Combined Communications Corp. (publishers of the Cincinnati Enquirer and the Oakland Tribune, among sundry other properties) into the hungry maw of the largest chain of all, the Gannett Co. of Rochester.

So the Gannett group, which owned a mere 29 papers in five states in 1967 when it first went public, has now, in 12 years, spread-eagled into 30 states and two territories, with a total of 80 papers. Among the local markets it dominates, incidentally, are no fewer than eight state capitals. In six of these, it enjoys an uncontested local monopoly, and in the other two—Honolulu, Hawaii, and Nashville, Tenn.—it enjoys a joint-printing arrangement with its competitor, just as it soon will in Cincinnati. Prior to those two latest acquisitions in Cincinnati and Oakland, by the way, the Gannett Corporation did not operate in any city as large as Buffalo, and it has no single-newspaper circulation even now as large as that of The Buffalo Evening News.

The moral of the Gannett story—in sticking to relatively small or middle-sized markets and in shunning those few in which one can still find serious local competition—has been duly marked and copied as the prevailing pattern of chain acquisitions. Two exceptions—the only two that come to mind—are Knight-Ridder and the Los Angeles Times. Both have acquired small papers, but they are more famous for their large ones, and, in the case of the Knight part of Knight-Ridder, even for thriving on competitive situations, as in Philadelphia and Detroit.

But in most of the other cases, the kind of paper the would-be acquirer wants is not a big-city paper, least of all one with a network of tough union contracts, and least still of all one in a fierce locally competitive situation. "No big cities with ghettos for Gannett," says a former Gannett editor quoted

by David Shaw in the Los Angeles Times. "No worry about urban flight or decay or heavy traffic delaying distribution of the paper, or long negotiations and strikes by powerful unions," that ex-Gannetter went on.

Even the great individual papers that are getting into the chain act—the New York Times, with 13 nice little small-city properties in Florida and North Carolina; the Chicago Tribune, with the same in Florida and California; and the Washington Post, with one in New Jersey and one in Washington State—are not particularly looking for other large papers to acquire. And perhaps the Times' experience, as reported in the Washington Post, will tell you why: "In 1976," it said, the 13 Sunbelt papers in the Times chain "produced pre-tax profits of \$6.8 million on \$28.5 million of revenues, while the big New York Times earned pre-tax profits of \$10.2 million on revenues of \$290 million." That's a 24 percent net on the small papers vs. 3½ percent on the Times itself. Last year's Times story was far more dramatic, embracing a heavy loss of \$12.5 million at the Times itself because of an 88-day strike. But despite this, its publisher was able to report happily that "a 25 percent increase in the combined operating profit of our magazines, broadcasting stations, smaller-city newspapers and books, information and education affiliates" still left the Times Company with a \$15.6 million net income for the year.

Before leaving the subject, let me note one other aspect of the chain-ownership phenomenon: The fact, as Mr. Bagdikian puts it, that the chains "do not create, they acquire." With the possible exception of the Philadelphia Inquirer, "no existing distinguished paper was developed by a chain." All came in their older incarnations from "individual owners whose major interest was a particular paper and a particular community"—including many of those like the New York Times, Washington Post, Chicago Tribune and L.A. Times that are now themselves owners of chains.

True, the defenders of the chain acquisition movement will invariably and accurately argue—as Al Neuharth of Gannett did in a panel discussion at a recent editors' convention—that "some of the worst newspapers in America are group-owned; so are many of the very best. Some individually-owned newspapers are setting the highest standards in the business; some are a disgrace to journalism . . . It matters not whether newspapers are owned by individuals or families or partners or chains. What really matters is what those owners do with them. It matters little how many newspapers serve a town or a city. What really matters is how well they serve."

Well, maybe . . . But I still have to worry about the potential for abuse . . . the potential for a kind of homogeneous sterility . . . the potential for a sacrificing of quality, talent, courage and community service to an inordinate focusing on the bottom line. I try to visualize the typical owner of a Gannett newspaper, for example, and I conjure up nothing better than an anonymous fellow on Wall Street handling the investment portfolio for a pension fund, or an inflation-pressed widow in Miami Beach, and none of them has the faintest idea what the paper I work for in Rochester, or Nashville, or Guam even looks like, much less what kind of news it is printing or what editorial crusades it is running.

What to do about it? Here, I'm tempted to offer my final YES . . . BUT as a paraphrase of Scotty Reston of the New York Times. "Yes," he said in effect, "I hate to see that enormous expansion of the chains . . . 'But . . . I'll be damned if I know what you do about it.'"

Some of the press critics, like Mr. Bagdikian, see an answer in forced divestiture. Even some publishers and chain owners, like Arthur Ochs Sulzberger of the New York Times and Katherine Graham of the Washington Post and Norman Chandler of the Los Angeles Times, concede that it might eventually come to something like that. Under this plan, any chain owning more than a permitted maximum of papers or circulation would be forced to sell off enough to cut back to the legal maximum. But, Mr. Bagdikian insists, he would not preclude any chain from starting any new papers, only from acquiring more old ones.

There are problems with this whole divestiture approach, however, that make me wary. Some see an insurmountable First Amendment barrier to telling anyone that he has to sell, or cannot buy, a newspaper. But if the Constitution doesn't immunize newspapers from anti-trust litigation—as it obviously does not—then I tend to doubt that it would immunize the biggest chains from well-drawn legislation seeking to set some reasonable outer limits to further concentrations of ownership.

Another anti-concentration critic who is flirting with legislation to limit new chain acquisitions is Arizona's Rep. Morris Udall. But first he would try to discourage newspaper mergers in another way. Arguing that many occur because families are virtually forced to sell their papers simply to pay estate taxes, he would spread those payments over 15 years. This proposal, incidentally, has just been seconded by our own area's Rep. John LaFalce. Whether this change would have kept The News in the Butler family, I cannot guess—but it might help some of the few remaining family-owned properties, such as Barry Bingham's Louisville Courier-Journal, from going on the block when its time comes to have to pass its properties down to the next generation.

It was not until after I had completed this paper that I read of another approach to limiting multiple ownerships of newspapers that struck me as better thought-through than either of the others. This, I should hasten to tell you, turns out to have been written by no stranger, but by one of the new owners of our own Buffalo Evening News, Mr. Charles T. Munger. His article appeared in last month in the Publishers' Auxiliary, a trade-journal focused on weekly newspapers, and it was the first inkling I had had that anyone in our non-chain organization had formulated or expressed any views on the subject.

His thesis was that continued growth by acquisition of the largest newspaper chains is not only "very undesirable" but against the interests of the free press. And if one doubts this, he suggests, "imagine how despised, resented and reduced in political power the press would be if ITT owned 60 percent of the newspapers." Yet Mr. Munger saw no likelihood that the biggest chains would voluntarily stop buying their brethren, since this would "not stop concentration but only allow a rival to gain the prize." The situation, he argued, presents a logical case for legislative intervention—the public interest in dispersion of economic and journalistic power by limiting the number of newspapers owned by a chain being much the same, in his view, as "a public interest in conservation of wildlife which limits the take of fish and game by an individual sportsman."

Mr. Munger is not talking divestiture, however, or any forced shrinkage of present chains. He would just preclude the largest chains from taking still more fish out of the river. And the particular legislative approach he suggests also intrigues me: He would bar future newspaper acquisitions by the largest chains "as part of new legislation applicable

to conglomerate mergers generally." An important added effect of such general anti-conglomerate merger legislation, he points out, "would be to protect existing newspaper chains from unwelcome takeovers." For an example of this, just imagine that, in the current American Express effort to take over McGraw Hill, the object of the unwelcome takeover was not McGraw Hill but the Gannett Corp., or Knight-Ridder, or the Times-Mirror Co.; and imagine that the one doing the taking over was not American Express but ITT.

Meanwhile, though, the concentration continues, with more and more small family papers sold to the chains; with bigger chains gobbling up the smaller ones; and with the key figures involved in this movement all professing its inevitability. "As long as the First Amendment is still operative," says one knowledgeable broker, John Morton of Washington, D.C., "I don't think there's anything that will stop acquisitions of remaining independent papers until they're all gone, basically."

So my final yes . . . but is not really as wishy-washy as you might expect from all that has gone before. I'll have to say YES, I personally would support well-drawn legislation to check the concentration of newspaper ownership before it goes much further. BUT I see no likelihood of such legislation making serious headway until we are a lot further down the road John Morton sees as inevitable than we are today. And by then it probably won't matter much . . . least of all to an old ex-editor like me. ●

LOG EXPORTS

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues today this excellent editorial by Mr. Dean Shacklett, the editor of the Daily Olympian in my home district in Washington State.

Mr. Shacklett describes in precise and moving terms what the push for log exports has done to our wonderful forests and mountains. I commend the piece to the attention of my colleagues.

SIGHT OF BARE HILLS MAKES NATIVE SON SICK AT HEART

(By Dean Shacklett)

Couple of months back, I made a flying trip around the loop to introduce visiting Midwest relatives to the wonders of Olympic Peninsula scenery. They thought it great. I was appalled.

It had been two or three years since the family and I loaded up our trusty bus and headed into the Olympics on a camping trip. What disturbed me this time was the many hillsides logged clear of all standing timber.

Then a week or so ago I had occasion to drive down to the foot of Washington Street, past the acres of valuable land Port of Olympia dedicates to storage of logs for exports. Mountains of logs, many of them three feet or more across the butt, were all around me.

I thought of recent conversations with local mill owners and lumbermen who complained of the poor quality of timber left for them to turn into lumber and pass on to a generation of buyers who have become indoctrinated to the necessity of working with lousy knot-filled boards and plywood that is

a disgrace to a once justifiably proud industry.

Finally, along came Jimmy Carter with his shift in policy to allow the cutting of timber from federal lands to exceed the growth of new trees. The excuse given was to ease the rising cost of housing brought on by inflation.

Alfred Kahn, the President's chief inflation fighter, said each additional billion feet of timber harvested—mostly in our Northwest—will reduce the cost of a house by half of one percent. That's a lousy \$300 on a \$60,000 house and most economists argue the saving would be even less.

I say it would be next to nothing, the entire argument is phony and our public owned timberlands are being raped for the benefit of a very few, largely because of the lack of a national energy policy.

The move to strip public owned lands of their timber crop will destroy watersheds, drive what is left of our dwindling natural wildlife into earlier extinction, rob our children of their heritage and create such eyesores—where there once was beauty—that native sons and daughters are brought close to tears.

Putting that timber on the auction block, where it can be gobbled up by the timber company giants, will make it possible for them to export even more logs. It will in fact make damned little more lumber available to a housing market that is in its most serious trouble because of the cost of the product, which partially is due to the high cost of mortgage.

And, increased export of timber is what Washington, D.C., wants because it helps reduce the terrible balance of trade deficit created by our near total dependence on imported oil. This is why I believe a lack of energy policy is responsible for a federal timber cutting policy certain to favor log exports at the expense of our forests.

Spare me, please, your arguments for free enterprise and timber as a renewable crop. I was born in this blessed area, the son of a carpenter who went on to become a building contractor. I grew up among the shavings of a cabinet shop, among the delicious smells of freshly cut and planed lumber.

But I also grew up in and around our wonderful forests and mountains and it makes me sick—heart-sick—to see the butchering that is taking place because of greed augmented by national policy. ●

REPORT FROM NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, during my years in Congress, I have taken an active interest in the continuing conflict in Northern Ireland.

Recent outbreaks of violence in Ulster, which must be strongly condemned, are a further indication to me that British policy in the North, designed to stamp out terrorism at all costs, has largely failed. Therefore, I feel it is the responsibility of the U.S. Government to undertake an initiative in exploring a peaceful solution to the conflict.

My understanding of the Irish issue has been enhanced by the work of Rev. Sean McManus, National Director of the Irish National Caucus (INC), an

American-based organization with 43 chapters nationwide involved in making the violation of human rights in Ireland an American issue.

David McDermitt, a legislative assistant on my staff, serves as Chairman of the Congressional Chapter of the Caucus for Capitol Hill employees. Dave recently traveled to Belfast to join Father McManus and other officials of the Irish National Caucus in monitoring the current political climate in Northern Ireland. Prior to his departure, I asked him to make careful note of the current situation in Ulster, and to prepare a report for me upon his return.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the observations contained in Dave's report represent an accurate description of life in present-day Ulster, and I want to take this opportunity to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

REPORT FROM ULSTER

(By David F. McDermitt)

Mr. Zefereetti, prior to my trip to Northern Ireland, I had been involved in the "Irish issue" as a member of the Irish National Caucus for approximately two years. Largely through the work of Father Sean McManus and other leaders of the INC, I felt that I had attained a great deal of knowledge of the history of the past decade of violence in the six counties that comprise Northern Ireland. Therefore, I felt that I had formed in my mind a fairly accurate picture of life in Ulster. In retrospect, I found that, despite my knowledge of the conflict, I was not prepared for the shocking reality of the tragedy that is Northern Ireland.

Prior to detailing my experience, I feel it is imperative to understand the basic history of the conflict in order to grasp the complexities of the current struggle.

Northern Ireland did not exist as a geographic entity until 1920 when southern Ireland was granted dominion status by the British Parliament. This event followed nearly 750 years of colonial rule by Great Britain. British administration during that period can only be described as barbaric. The Irish people, at one time or another, were forbidden to own land, denied the right to vote in elections, denied the opportunity to work in the civil service and even forbidden to practice catholicism. In short, they were treated as second-class citizens.

During the early part of the 17th century, Great Britain undertook its "plantation" policy in Ulster. Many of the Irish were expelled from the province, a number fled into exile and the remainder were largely redistributed so that a network of new protestant communities could be created. Irish soil was divided and granted to individuals on the condition that they bring in protestant tenants to cultivate the soil. Settlers arrived in Ulster from England and Scotland and created a new society entirely alien to the native traditions of the Ulster province.

Despite the great influx of immigrants, they were not sufficient in number to fully exploit the area's resources, and a number of the Irish were permitted to remain. As a result, this newly settled protestant area was dotted with native Irish Catholics—degraded and embittered. This plantation policy accounts for the large number of loyalists (those loyal to the British crown) in North-eastern Ireland.

Following decades of guerrilla war throughout the island of Ireland, the British Parliament adopted the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, providing for the establishment of two governments and two parliaments in Ireland. This measure enabled the British government to maintain a foothold in a

corner of Ireland with the majority of inhabitants sympathetic. It is interesting to note that not all nine counties of the province of Ulster were included in this newly created state, but only those six counties which would ensure a loyalist and protestant majority. Thus, Northern Ireland—a creation of the British government and having no basis culturally, politically or geographically in Irish history—was established. It was established to ensure that an artificial majority of loyalists would seek to maintain close ties with Great Britain.

The ensuing years were marked by policies of blatant discrimination against the Catholic Irish, denying them equal opportunity in housing, employment and other basic rights enjoyed by their protestant neighbors.

In the late 1969, the minority population held peaceful marches throughout Northern Ireland calling for equal rights among all of the people of the country. The protestant population, feeling a threat to their years of dominance and supremacy, violently attacked the marchers. In a short time, British military forces were sent to occupy Ulster ostensibly to protect the Catholic population "for a few weeks" until calm was restored.

However, the minority came to realize that the occupation forces had, to a large degree, sided with the protestant majority in protecting and upholding the unjust government of Northern Ireland. It is particularly interesting to note that the Irish Republican Army (IRA) was virtually nonexistent at the outbreak of hostilities in 1969. It was not until two years after the turmoil had begun that the IRA re-emerged as a fighting force.

That, in a nutshell, is a synopsis of the history of the current conflict that has claimed nearly 2,000 lives and 21,000 injured in the last ten years. But I realize that merely knowing the history of the conflict and keeping abreast of the current situation in Ulster through the media was not enough. Therefore, I accepted Father McManus' request to join him and other leaders of the Irish National Caucus in Ireland.

My initial impression upon my arrival was one of disbelief. Entire sections of city blocks have been leveled by bomb blasts and the streets are littered with the remaining rubble. Hijacked vehicles are left burning in the street. Entire sections of the city have been decimated and abandoned, leaving row upon row of boarded up houses.

During a drive up the Falls Road into the Catholic section known as Andersonstown, minutes after arriving via train, I witnessed the hijacking of a van by a group of teenage youths. After setting the vehicle on fire, the group scattered upon seeing British troops moving up the street toward them in armored cars. At this point, I noticed a number of children who could not have been more than seven or eight years old, gathering behind the walls of a deserted building, seemingly waiting in ambush. When the armored cars approached, approximately a dozen of these kids charged out into the street hurling rocks, bricks and bottles at the soldiers. Their faces flushed with hate and their eyes full of bitterness, they quickly retreated to continue the battle another day.

One cannot travel through the six counties without noting the ominous presence of British military forces and the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC), the police force in Ulster. British patrols, dressed in full battle gear complete with flak jackets and automatic weapons, continually roam the streets in seven-man teams, the last man walking backwards to protect their rear. Soldiers rumble through the streets in heavily armored vehicles. Catholic areas, in particular, are most heavily patrolled.

Scattered throughout Catholic ghetto areas such as Ballymurphy, Ardoyne and

Turf Lodge are army and police barracks—massive grey structures built of sheets of steel, windowless except for lookout posts and surrounded by concrete and barbed wire. It is little wonder why this obvious presence serves as a highly visible reminder to the minority of British political and military domination in Ulster.

Everyday life, as we know it in the United States, is totally disrupted. The entrances to the main shopping district in central Belfast are closed to vehicular traffic with iron bars that permit only pedestrians. Each shopper is scrutinized and often searched by British troops stationed at these posts.

Taxi cabs are marked with one of two identifying stickers: one indicates those cabs that travel into the Catholic areas and, the other, those going into the majority protestant section of town. It is a criminal offense to display the tri-color Irish flag.

Body searches and interrogations are commonplace. The Europa Hotel in central Belfast, where I stayed for two nights, holds the tragic distinction of having been bombed on twenty-eight separate occasions and is surrounded by a wall and barbed wire. Each vehicle entering the driveway is thoroughly searched; every person seeking entrance is given a head-to-toe body search.

Rather than talk to an endless number of government officials in the North, I spent as much time as possible "on the street" talking to the people whose everyday lives are affected by the turmoil. In traveling by car throughout the city with other members of the Caucus, Fred Burns-O'Brien, Rita Mullen, Robert Bateman of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Sean Nolan and Pat Mahony of the Pittsburgh Chapter of the Caucus and Bill Gallagher of the Philadelphia Chapter, we were forced to stop on four separate occasions by the authorities: twice by the RUC, once by a British patrol and once by the British military police.

It was my experience that the military men were more civil in their approach than were members of the RUC police force. The police travel six men to a van, armed with automatic weapons. On each of the two occasions we submitted to a body search as well as a search of the vehicle. We were also given an "on the spot" interrogation and asked questions as to our destination, why we were going there, our occupation, etc. This occurred while we were literally surrounded by other RUC personnel armed with weapons. When informed that we were American citizens involved in making the Irish conflict an issue in the United States Congress there was an immediate air of resentment. We were asked whether we were journalists and if we had played any role in the State Department's decision to suspend the sale of U.S. weapons to the RUC (a development for which the Irish National Caucus can claim a large degree of responsibility).

More than one member of the RUC—a police force that is comprised of 95% protestants and has been indicated by the European Court of Human Rights, the European Court of Human Rights and Amnesty International for the torture and inhumane treatment of suspects and prisoners—informed us that the Irish situation was none of America's business and to "keep your noses out." When I asked a British soldier his impression of the RUC, he stated that it was "just another terrorist organization. They fight beside you during the day and shoot at you when they're off duty."

When I questioned the policemen why we had been stopped and questioned, I was told "suspicion of terrorism," which is a catch-all justification for the virtual suspension of civil liberties in Ulster. I spoke to a number of people whose homes had been broken into and ransacked in a supposed

search for weapons. Search warrants are an unknown aspect of the law in Northern Ireland, as are jury trials. Trials are heard by a single judge. Suspects can be held for a period of three days without legal counsel or a visit from relatives and clergy, and they can be held for seven days without being charged with a crime. A number of individuals indicated to me that they had been arrested, charged, imprisoned and beaten for periods of 11 to 13 months. When they were brought to trial their cases were dropped for lack of evidence, after spending a year of their young lives in prison.

Few Catholic families have been left untouched by the violence: a brother, father or son has been killed, wounded or imprisoned. Children of ten years or younger have never lived a peaceful existence. They have spent all their lives growing up in an atmosphere of violence, bitterness and hate. A number of their play areas are now occupied by police and army barracks, so they play among the bombed out buildings and burning vehicles. Unless a political solution can soon be found, there is little doubt that today's children will become the terrorists of tomorrow.

In Belfast and in London, I joined Caucus leaders in press conferences attended by reporters representing both Irish and English media. The most significant discovery I found during the trip was an intense interest in American involvement in Northern Ireland—the American "initiative" as they call it.

American involvement in Northern Ireland—comprised largely of efforts by the Irish National Caucus, the Ad Hoc Committee for Irish Affairs and the "Big Four" Irish American politicians including Speaker O'Neill, Governor Carey and Senators Kennedy and Moynihan—is viewed with distrust by British government officials and with opposition by the various terrorist organizations. But it is viewed with intense interest and hope by the minority population.

In talking with members of the Relatives Action Committee, an organization of the relatives of prisoners serving sentences in Northern jails, I perceived a sense of hopelessness and frustration that any political initiative is forthcoming from Great Britain. When told of our efforts here in the United States to make the violations of human rights and the entire Irish conflict an American issue, their faces literally lit up with hope and enthusiasm.

In conclusion, it is my impression that, after centuries of British rule and a decade of military occupation, the situation in Ulster has not improved. All too often the turmoil has been called a religious war between Catholics and Protestants. That characterization is only a small part of a much larger political stalemate. 13,000 troops are still stationed in Northern Ireland. British taxpayers spend more than \$5 million dollars each day to support the troops and security operations in Northern Ireland. In addition to welfare subsidies and business subsidies. This policy continues despite the fact that a number of polls indicate a majority of the British people do not want their troops stationed in Ulster. A number of soldiers with whom I spoke disagreed with their government's policy in the North. When I ask a regimental commander if the battle in Ireland wasn't really Great Britain's last colonial war, he disagreed with me by saying that the same conflict would probably be fought in Scotland within a few years.

During the past year, British officials have done their best to convince the world that their hard-line approach against terrorism in the North was paying off. Statistics were compiled indicating that the number of bombings and deaths had steadily declined

in recent years were cited as proof that the terrorist groups were being held in check. The recent outbreak of terrorist acts indicates that, while the paramilitaries have been battered, they will never be broken. That fact has been admitted by British military leaders in Northern Ireland themselves.

Unfortunately, the Thatcher government has given no indication of any movement toward a political settlement, but has merely reiterated its intention to crack down more severely on terrorism.

The terrorists on both sides of the conflict do not have the support of the vast majority of the populace, and terrorists and their activities should and must be condemned. But it must also be realized that the paramilitaries are not the root of the problem in Ulster, but the result—a response to the absence of a just political solution to the conflict. Great Britain is clearly pursuing a military solution to a political problem, and there is presently no end in sight unless the President and Congress accelerate the American initiative in pursuing a just and lasting peace in Northern Ireland. ●

THE NEED TO MAINTAIN OUR COMMITMENT TO THE ARTS

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 1979

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, in late June of this year one of America's most respected surveyors of public opinion, Louis Harris, testified before the Senate Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities in defense of continued Federal support for the arts in the United States.

I believe that Mr. Harris' statement that day sets out a persuasive case for major Federal support for the arts. Perhaps the most telling point he made was the following:

At a time of unparalleled tensions and pressures, the arts represent a massive safety valve to refurbish the human spirit, to renew one's soul, to be better equipped to face difficult tomorrows.

As we concern ourselves—as we ought to—with the more mundane questions of daily necessities, such as food, energy, economic health, and national security, it is important also that we retain a healthy respect for the need to nurture the soul and insure the continued existence of this "safety valve." I think the entirety of Mr. Harris' statement warrants being printed in the RECORD, and I submit it for that purpose at this time:

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS HARRIS

AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR THE ARTS,

New York, N.Y., June 26, 1979.

Mr. Chairman, my name is Louis Harris and I come before you today as the Chairman of the American Council for the Arts, a national organization with headquarters in New York. ACA is one of the few organizations in this country which can claim to work for all of the arts. Our task, as we see it, is to spearhead efforts to work both for greater support for all of the disciplines in the arts, to work for greater fulfillment of the aspirations of individual artists to work for bringing the arts to the rapidly growing

potential audience for the arts, to recommend and to assess national policies which affect the future of the arts, to serve as a watchdog over developments in society which can thwart the freedom of the artist to create, and to work for the maximum delivery of professional creative art output to the disadvantaged, minorities, the elderly, the handicapped, the young—indeed to all of our people.

At the same time, ACA sees its function as demanding from the arts that they exercise policies of full accountability for public and private funds received, that they increase their own revenues from their output, that they give ample recognition and opportunity to new and emerging art forms, and that they press and work for the highest standards of professionalism. Although our Board has represented on it most of the major disciplines in the arts, we are essentially an organization which tries to bridge the gap between arts institutions and the citizens of this country, who, in the end, must be the indispensable audience for the fare that the arts turn out. We have an extensive service program which tries to bring the best and most advanced management techniques to arts organizations in such critical areas as how to manage finances, how to raise money, how to bring together arts institutions and individual artists at the community level, how to market and merchandise the arts, and how to involve all elements in the arts world in the total process of developing the arts in America.

We come before you today at a particularly trying time in our national history. Our people are beset by severe inflation which has reduced many to the status of barely eking out a minimum existence after we had assumed that we had reached that post-industrial state of affluence where such economic trouble seemed largely behind us. This is also a time when we are learning brutally in gas lines in many parts of the country that we can no longer live off the fruits of unlimited natural resources. Our society has become so complex and the pressures put upon our people are so enormous that frustration and alienation has by now reached record levels. Most of all, we live in a period where of all the resources we must utilize for future economic growth and for fulfillment of our personal hopes, we must depend basically on the human resource, easily the most adaptable and creative resource we have known on this planet. And, significantly, my own surveys have shown that the American people are becoming more and more convinced that if the human resource is utilized well, if nurtured properly, then it is in the end well nigh inexhaustible. Thus, it is no happenstance that close to 7 in every 10 of our people today are employed in service industries not physical goods production industries. Basically, how well people serve people in America is going to be one of the real keys to our future national destiny and fulfillment. The arts are central to getting that job done.

The arts have enjoyed enormous growth in recent years, because as much as any single area, the arts represent the most exciting, personally rewarding sharing of experiences which one set of human beings can deliver to another. At a time of unparalleled tensions and pressures, the arts represent a massive safety valve to refurbish the human spirit, to renew one's soul, to be better equipped to face difficult tomorrows. The arts elevate people, provide rare and precious moments that in many ways make the rest of human activity bearable and worthwhile. Take away the arts and you take away in one fell swoop the color

of life, the raising of human spirits, the capacity to project into other worlds, and the ability to understand oneself and one's life better. Indeed, in our surveys, the people themselves tell us that the arts for them are a form of emotional food to sustain them through the trials of their daily grind.

You here in the Congress have recognized this growing role of the arts. You have increased the annual appropriations for the National Endowment of the Arts from a miserly \$7.3 million roughly a decade ago to about \$150 million to date. Both people in the arts and the public generally are grateful for this assistance. You are once again showing insight and foresight by contemplating a five year extension of the National Endowment Authorization.

Your committee here in the Senate has also made a significant human contribution to the arts in the person of your former staff chief, Livingston Biddle, who is now the chairman of the National Endowment of the Arts. We in ACA find that not only is Liv Biddle the kind of leader in the arts whom we can fully relate to, but one who largely shares our basic objective of seeking to bring the highest quality of arts output to a maximum number of our citizens. Chairman Biddle's sensitivity to emerging needs and demands for the arts, his openness, his willingness to entertain change, his determination to bring in an ever-increasing circle of arts professionals into the decision-making process, all make us convinced that he gained from his association with this subcommittee has contributed to his splendid performance to date.

Let me relate to you some basic facts about the arts in this country today:

Over 6 in 10 people 16 years of age and over in this country attend live theatre, a classical music concert, live dance performance, live painting and sculpture exhibits, arts festivals, and arts meetings. Significantly, the arts appeal to the most rapidly growing parts of our population: young people, the elderly, the better educated, the more affluent. But the arts also touch children in ghettos, individuals who lead lonely existences in relatively isolated settings, people who come out in the thousands to our parks across the country, people who need some moments of relaxation in their work areas during lunch hours. The arts are at one and the same time a significant mass and yet highly individual experience.

However, the job of the arts is at best no more than half completed. For example, while 69 percent of the American people think it is important to have an art museum accessible to where they live, 41 percent also report that none is accessible to them. While 65 percent think it is important to have a concert hall accessible to where they live, 44 percent report there is none available. Put another way, 35 percent of all Americans want more ballet and dance in their community and do not have it, 47 percent want more arts festivals and do not have them, 37 percent want more classical music live performances and do not have them. Perhaps most significantly, 54 percent, a majority of all those who do not have such facilities report that if they had them, they would attend such arts events.

This is a mandate that runs deep and wide in our society. By 86.8 percent overwhelming majority wants to see such arts facilities and performances and shows available in all parts of the country. An even higher 93 percent feel that having the arts available to them is important to the quality of life in their community. And 85 percent believe the existence of such facilities and services is important to the business and economic life of their community.

So the job of fulfilling the needs of the American people for the arts is largely undone. Yet the need is there and is growing by leaps and bounds. How desperate is that need? Let me give you two examples. Artists and minorities and the poor all suffer from essentially the same phenomenon: they are almost the last to be hired and to be tended to and they are inevitably the first to be laid off or forgotten. A terrible condition in the country today is that when the schools feel the crunch on funding, almost the first area they cut back on is student courses and participation in the arts. Yet this is precisely the area in which students are likely to feel the greatest identity and fulfillment in schools. It is little wonder why recent studies have demonstrated that student interest in and excitement about the educative process has so fallen off. In community after community, the educational process is eliminating the color, the verve, the challenge to the creativity of our children.

As for funding for the arts, majorities of the public favor increases in federal, state, and local government support. Even higher majorities favor private individual and corporate support. The highest majorities favor private foundation and non-profit institution support. At a time when people want little increase in governmental spending, nonetheless there is ample evidence that the public wants to see arts funding increased. Part of the reason is that the amount funded to the arts from government, compared to other sectors which are recipients of governmental monies, is minuscule. It can be said without challenge that the government receives more beneficial services from helping to fund the arts than nearly any other area of activity.

Nor are the arts mendicants, crawling on their bellies making for a handout. Indeed, 51 percent of all the monies received by all arts institutions are derived from earned income, derived from admissions to performing arts and from public memberships and sales. The private sector in the aggregate contributes 20 percent, and government 29 percent. Not only does a majority of income for arts institutions come from earned income, but one of the most important and poignant subsidies for the arts has been largely ignored. At latest count, the medium salary paid executive directors of arts organizations was \$14,462 a year. Artistic directors were paid even less, a median of \$12,971, compared with university professors and associate professors, not an overpaid occupation, who earn 30-40 percent more. In addition, arts salaries have lagged 20 percent behind the rate of inflation. As a consequence, it can be assumed safely that an amount equal to as much as a third of the national endowment funding is taken out of the hides of arts executives. Faced with growing demand for the arts, often they forego their own pay, not because they are among the most dedicated people in our midst. So the arts have little to apologize for.

We in ACA feel strongly that support for the arts from the private sector must be increased—and sharply at that. We think it is pitiful that at last count in 1976, no more than 4 percent comes from business corporations. Put another way, the arts earn over 12 times the amount that business contributes to the arts. Just this week, we in ACA held a conference on how to raise money for the arts, and we are encouraged by the interest now being expressed by the United Way people. If the arts could be added to the United Way list of worthy causes that people can contribute to in their place of work on a payroll deduction basis, the private sector could be enormously enhanced as a source of arts funding.

My colleague, Ed Block of AT&T, who is a

vice chairman of our organization will elaborate on this prospect for funding from the private sector in greater detail. But let me say this, if I might, to this committee of the Senate. There is much talk that federal funding for arts has increased handsomely over the past decade and that the future will see a "plateauing out" of federal backing for the arts. We have advocated a \$200 million authorization and appropriation for the National Endowment of the Arts, simply because we think the investment of another \$50 million would pay out many times that amount in terms of bringing literally millions more of our citizens exposure to the arts. What this would add to our national productivity and the well-being of our national psyche is enormous.

But now we have an even more practical consideration to bring to your attention. It is this. Your having done such a magnificent job over the past several years, we are worried that if federal funding suddenly were to level out, a signal would be given to the private sector that just maybe the arts are not that important. Therefore, we urge you in the most forceful way to turn a deaf ear to those who feel the federal government has largely brought its contribution up to an adequate level and now can be plateaued out. Indeed, we are convinced that the ground is being broken, the way is being cleared, the road is emerging clear for a major increase in funding for the arts by corporations and private individuals contributing at the workplace.

We say to you: please give us this chance to prove that the private sector can close the gap with the public sector in terms of growth and absolute amounts that are contributed to the arts. Show us that the federal establishment, having done a yeoman job, is now not going to abandon the field and say it has reached full maturity. Put bluntly, we of ACA are not at all afraid to challenge the monied corporate establishment that it must not simply keep up with the rate of federal funding increases, but must close the gap. Such corporate leaders like to talk about the need to finance most such causes as the arts through private means. Believe me, we mean to put them to the test to prove that their pocketbooks are where their rhetoric is. But we cannot do that if the signal from Congress is that enough has already been done by the federal government. Remember, we still have a massive one in three people in this country, 16 years of age and older coming to close to 55 million of our citizens, who have a real and growing appetite for the arts which is now largely unfulfilled.

So we ask you to be our partners in both this strategy and efforts in making this country as close to self-sufficient in arts support as is humanly possible. At a time when a majority of the public is convinced that we are not going to make it on more acquisition of material goods, the arts at one and the same time become both a symbol and a reality that the quality of existence in the last two decades of this century are going to be rewarding and exciting. There is so much to be gained by so little more. The crunch on the human spirit will be enormous if the growth of the arts is stopped cold in its tracks. We ask you to move courageously and responsively to this public demand. These are in no way raids on the treasury, but instead small spurs to the human spirit, small investments in a positive experience. And, in a national life that has come close to turning sour for so many, this act you can perform would bring pure joy in ample measure into the daily lives of our citizens. And that, surely, must be a vital and important task for the people's representatives to tend to. ●