

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PUBLISH OR PERISH

HON. JAMES G. MARTIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to cure a problem which has arisen, because of overly zealous action by the Internal Revenue Service against the learned societies of this country. Far back into the mists of antiquity, learned societies have published bulletins and magazines, charging lower prices to the membership than to nonmembers and supporting part of the cost of publication through advertising revenues. The IRS is threatening to revoke the tax-exempt status of these groups.

We have all heard the refrain from academe: "Publish or perish." The journals in question, for our colleagues unfamiliar with the matter, are those in which the academic must publish, lest he perish. These journals are far more than vehicles for academic and professional advancement. They are the essential medium for the dissemination of scientific and technical knowledge. As a former professor and as an organic chemist in real life, I can personally attest to the national importance of these journals. As you represent Harvard and MIT, Mr. Speaker, you and your constituents know their value and, in many cases, their tenuous financial situations.

It borders on silly that legislation is actually needed. The IRS should back off. But, at this stage, legislation actually is needed. I will press in committee for prompt action.

Mr. Speaker, for our colleagues' reference, I am submitting herewith two editorials on the subject, the first from the Washington Post and the second from the New York Times, as reprinted in the San Francisco Chronicle:

A THREAT TO SCIENTIFIC COMMUNICATION

Before the Internal Revenue Service induces any more upset in the professional societies that publish many of this nation's, and the world's, foremost scientific journals, it might be desirable for the revenueurs to grasp a few obscure, though simple, realities of scientific publishing. By doing so, we hope, the IRS might be led to reconsider a reportedly impending ruling that would bring little gain to the Treasury and much harm to scientific communication.

Reflecting the specialization of contemporary research, most scientific journals have relatively small circulations—often just a few thousand. Small, however, does not mean unimportant; on the contrary, the flow of information that is essential to the conduct of science is routinely channeled through many of these small-circulation journals.

The limited circulations do, however, create a revenue problem, especially since many of these journals are expensive to produce. Some of them run to hundreds of pages and are crammed with detailed charts, tables

and footnotes that absorb a great deal of editorial labor.

To meet these costs, many of the societies that publish the journals employ a two-tier price system—a low price for members, usually included with their dues, and a higher price for non-members who, for whatever reasons, want the journal. In one such typical arrangement, the Journal of Bacteriology, published by the American Society for Microbiology, is available to ASM members for \$22 per year for personal subscriptions; libraries and other institutions pay \$115 per year. And, since some 40 percent of the journal's circulation of approximately 10,000 goes to the higher-paying non-members, the ASM is able to get along with the relatively low price for individual scientists who need the journal.

IRS has indicated, however, that it considers that the two-price system amounts to a subsidy for the members and is incompatible with the preferential tax status that non-profit professional societies enjoy. While a formal ruling is yet to be issued, at least one major scientific society has been notified that it is on the way.

It is clear, however, that no good purpose will be achieved by following an ambiguous tax-collecting principle out the window. The professional scientific press, which is indispensable to the conduct and progress of research, does indeed have very peculiar economics. But that's the way it is. And good sense calls for preserving the conditions in which these organizations can continue to publish—rather than have them slowly perish.

NO REASON GIVEN—IRS RULES THREATEN SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS

NEW YORK.—Some scientific and medical journals may be forced to stop publishing due to Internal Revenue Service rulings and other federal actions, according to an editorial published today in the Journal of the American Medical Association.

If the journals are forced out of business, "effective communication between scientists will be jeopardized, and scientific development will suffer," said Dr. William R. Barclay, the AMA journal editor. "Discovery benefits no one unless it is communicated."

The federal actions, for which no reason has been given, jeopardizes publications in medicine, biology, chemistry, physics and other fields. Robert A. Day of the Council of Biology Editors in Washington, who has characterized the scientific journal as "an endangered species," said recently that such "journals could well move from the 'endangered' list to the 'extinct' list; and Uncle Sam, as well as scientists everywhere, will be left empty-handed."

The AMA editorial said, "The Internal Revenue Service has told the publishers of 90 percent of the chemistry and physics journals in the United States that it plans to revoke their tax-exempt status and has notified the American Chemical Society and the American Institute of Physics that they are no longer to be treated as tax exempt organizations."

Others in the scientific community have said the IRS was taking similar action against other scientific and engineering societies. Loss of tax-exempt status means higher postal rates, as well as taxing of advertising revenues and other income of the journals and societies.

The IRS has already taxed the advertising revenues of the AMA journal. The association has paid \$9 million in back taxes on advertising revenues from the ten journals it pub-

lishes and expects to pay the IRS about \$1.5 million each year for the next several years, Barclay said in an interview.

The journals are considered indispensable to science because they are the scientists' traditional means of communication. Scientists publish the results of their experiments and theories as open communication for the benefit of society. The aim is to allow their colleagues to try to duplicate the results, criticize the findings and make further scientific advances without duplication of efforts. Some scientists pay fees to journals with small circulations to publish the results of their experiments.

The AMA editorial said that in addition to the rising costs of printing, paper and other standard expenses, "the Postal Service is proposing a new rate structure that will be prohibitively expensive for many scientific societies and may result in sharp curtailment of their publications."

Barclay said the medical association is "walking a tightrope" in its publications budget. He said he has "contingency plans" that call for the AMA to stop publishing some journals if costs rise further because of federal action and other factors. ●

RENAMING PARKS

HON. DAN QUAYLE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Indiana are proud of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and many of them worked hard in behalf of the project. Congress seems to have a tendency to want to put its own stamp on such projects by naming them for Senators and Congressmen. For example, legislation has again been introduced to rename the Indiana Dunes in memory of the late Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois.

The Fort Wayne News-Sentinel recently commented on this matter of renaming parks, and the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, in particular. I bring this editorial to the attention of our friends from Illinois and place them on notice that those of us from the Hoosier State are on guard against such intrusion.

The editorial follows:

[Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, Jan. 24, 1979]

RENAMING PARKS

Sidney Yates, a Democratic congressman from Illinois, has a great admiration for a one-time Senator from Illinois whose name was Paul Douglas. And since Yates has an admiration for the late and not especially well remembered Douglas, he is apparently dedicating his life to naming parks in Indiana after his hero.

For the third time in recent years Yates has introduced a bill in Congress to rename the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. He wants it called the Paul Douglas National Lakeshore. Twice before the move has been defeated in Congress, most recently earlier this year.

There is something spiritually consistent

about this inclination of Yates. Paul Douglas was a great spender of other people's money. That was one of the reasons the voters in Illinois replaced him by electing Charles Percy to the Senate. Yates believes he can revive the Douglas name by renaming other people's parks after him.

That Congress should be wasting time and money dealing with these oft-repeated, ill-fated and unwanted wishes to rename a park in Indiana becomes annoying. Before the latest bill goes any further, perhaps somebody in Indiana could introduce bills to change the names of parks in Illinois. One possibility would be the renaming of the Great Lakes Naval Base as Harold Handley Station. Harold Handley was a governor of Indiana along about the time Douglas was an Illinois senator. We don't know if Handley had much of a hand in the Great Lakes Base affairs, but he might have visited the place. Likely, he paid taxes of which a small portion went to its support. He also had a few things in common with Douglas. They called him Hightax Harold. ●

LEGISLATION RESTORING CITIZENSHIP TO PERSONS WHO RENOUNCED NATIONALITY

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced a bill which I first submitted during the 95th Congress, to permit Americans who renounced their citizenship because of their opposition to the Vietnam war to regain their citizenship.

President Carter, soon after taking office, pardoned certain Vietnam-era draft resisters. Nearly 5,000 Americans who fled during the period of Vietnam, however, will not be able to come home despite that pardon program. These are people who gave up their citizenship after leaving the United States.

Under current law, none of these persons may return to this country; none can regain American citizenship; and the President's pardon program will not remedy their plight.

Most Americans now recognize that our involvement in Vietnam was a tragic and costly mistake. This country should not compound and perpetuate this mistake by continuing to penalize those Americans who, in a painful act of conscience, left the United States and renounced their citizenship because of American involvement in the Vietnam war.

The text of my bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to restore citizenship to persons who renounced or otherwise lost American nationality because of opposition to American military action in Indochina, 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) any person formerly a citizen of the United States who lost his nationality through any action taken by such person solely or partially because of disapproval or opposition to the involvement of the United States in military action in Indochina shall, upon petition, to any district court of the United States by

such person or a legal representative, in accordance with subsection (b), be fully and unconditionally restored to United States citizenship.

(b) Any petition submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall include a statement sworn to or affirmed by the petitioner stating that the loss of nationality of such petitioner resulted from action taken by such petitioner solely or partially because of disapproval or opposition to the involvement of the United States in military action in Indochina. Such oath or affirmation shall be conclusive evidence of such fact in case of any person who—

(1) is male and reached the age of eighteen years during the period beginning May 13, 1961, and ending April 29, 1975, or

(2) took such action during such period. Sec. 2. The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization shall, upon the receipt of a sworn written statement from any former citizen of the United States stating that such person lost his nationality through action taken solely or partially because of disapproval or opposition to the involvement of the United States in military action in Indochina, exempt such person from the provisions of section 212(a)(22), of the Immigration and Nationality Act. ●

A BUSINESS FIGHTS BACK

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Sears, Roebuck & Co. has filed suit against the Federal Government. This action was necessary, Sears executives believe, because the quota-affirmative action goals-and-timetables programs of the Government are contradictory, arbitrary, mixed up, often incomprehensible, and unjust.

I want to praise the executives in Sears who had the intestinal fortitude to do what should have been done a long time ago. Bullied by bureaucrats, afraid of its own shadow, eager to please every political demagog who raises his voice, cowering beneath the lash of regulations, playing scapegoat for the sins of society, American business has been the whipping boy of the quota bureaucracy. Now, at last, a business has turned on its tormentors and is willing to fight.

Sears may be right or it may be wrong on the merits of the specific case they have brought against the Government. I cannot judge. But I do know I admire anyone who turns and confronts the quota bureaucracy in the Federal Government which has the soul of a schoolyard bully and, considering the fact that even Government affirmative action programs are not perfect, employs the hypocritical rhetoric of Uriah Heep.

At this point I wish to insert in the Record "Sears Strikes Back" from the Wall Street Journal, January 26, 1979, and "Sears Goes to Court," January 26, 1979.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 26, 1979]

SEARS STRIKES BACK

For more than a few years now, businessmen have complained of the rising burdens of government, aggravated by bureaucrats who treat business with maddening contempt

and regulations that are sometimes unintelligible.

But corporations, particularly the largest ones, have tended to go along, churning out the required paperwork and passing costs to their customers. This week, we are happy to see, one of the largest, Sears, Roebuck & Co., has rebelled. It has filed suit against just about the whole U.S. government for the mess that goes by the name of affirmative action hiring. The noted civil liberties lawyer Charles Morgan Jr. has prepared Sears' complaint.

Sears has a deserved reputation for progressive and generous employment practices and, as its complaint notes, also has tried to cooperate with government goals and standards. It followed the lead of Washington in giving hiring preference to veterans after World War II, just as it answered a more recent congressional call to hire Vietnam veterans. It has tried to follow the federal policy of encouraging part-time work and flexible work schedules. It has responded to the government's call to hire the handicapped, and answered national laws and concerns about discrimination against the elderly by removing mandatory retirement rules. The company also has pursued affirmative action for women and minorities.

Sears says that all these decades of cheerful compliance with shifting goals have on balance cut into the number of women and minorities who might otherwise be in the company. But the current affirmative action establishment in Washington has looked at the numbers and, not caring how they came about, moved to make Sears adopt yet another set of hiring policies. These new standards directly conflict with the older goals to which we are presumably still committed as a nation, and they are filled with internal and interagency contradictions. The upshot is that it is literally impossible for Sears to comply with all the rules.

Apart from this charge of willful and childlike absurdity, Sears says the government has prevented it from fulfilling its affirmative action obligations in other ways. The government's failure in fields such as integrated housing and education have hindered the development of a qualified work force; the inadequacies of federal statistics have prevented an accurate reading of how far Sears' affirmative action attempts have succeeded and how much further the company may reasonably be expected to go; the government's lack of coordination has made compliance an administrative nightmare. All in all, the federal efforts have added up to a rather massive denial to Sears of due process of law.

It's a breath of fresh air to see the Sears suit—in the same way that it was nice to see not long ago that when the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration came up with yet another regulatory horror, the idea of setting different fuel economy standards for different auto manufacturers. Ford Motor Co. responded with an unapologetic attack on NHTSA's policy and the whole view of American society that it revealed. The Department of Transportation has now backed down on the differential standards. Perhaps Sears will get similar satisfaction from the courts. In any event, it's good to see the battle joined; certainly such efforts can't make things much worse than they are.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 26, 1979]

SEARS GOES TO COURT

The Sears suit against ten federal agencies and officials, ranging from the attorney general to the Census Bureau, is another dramatic commentary on government overregulation. "Let's reduce government interference and give (the economic system) a chance to work," said President Carter the other evening. Well, here's a chance.

The main problem is that Sears needs to know how to comply with federal equal em-

ployment standards—without needless delay, legal liability and expense. But that isn't easy to find out. Sears, we are told, has spent well over \$100 million in the past 13 years seeking to comply with U.S. anti-discrimination laws—especially those pertaining to equal employment opportunity, which are of obvious importance for a company employing some 417,000 Americans nationwide. Sears, mind you, hasn't exactly dragged its feet on affirmative action. Black employment by Sears, at 13.5 per cent, exceeds the 1970 census figure for blacks. Sears is also the nation's largest employer of women. Yet the company continues to be the target of Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) harassment.

The Sears suit is immensely complex, as one might imagine, since the vexations faced by Sears are not limited to EEOC requirements. They stem from every quarter of the bureaucratic compass. Yet the problem may be broadly summarized.

For many years, Sears contends, and especially since World War II, all sorts of preferences were extended to war veterans, overwhelmingly white and male. Unsurprisingly, they are now the bulk of the premium national work force. Until the 1950s as a matter of law, and the 1960s as a matter of practice, federal policy in effect helped stack the employment deck against women and minorities. Then the signals suddenly changed. It became federal policy—a policy with which, incidentally, Sears has no quarrel—to enlarge employment opportunities for minorities and women. The EEOC, created by Title VII of the 1964 civil rights act, began applying statistical tests of compliance in minority and female hiring. Yet, since past policies had lodged a white male bias into the workforce, not even diligent and aggressive "affirmative action" efforts fully satisfy the new standards—if you can discover what they are.

For further complication, Congress last year raised the legal mandatory retirement age to 70; and since an unanticipated 60 to 70 per cent of Sears employees wished to work beyond the company's past retirement ages, there is now far less flexibility in promotion opportunities for minority and women employees and fewer new jobs for the same applicants.

It's one of Sears' major contentions, amply documented, that the government has placed it and similar companies in a double bind. It may be reasonable that employees be allowed to work to age 70. It may be equally reasonable for EEOC to insist that a work force achieve statistical parities with the available minority labor pool (if reliable statistics are available, which is another problem). But jointly pursued, the two policies clash. To put the matter in a nutshell, it isn't good law to penalize or harass business for conditions for which the government itself is partially responsible.

Sears contends, and the company's affirmative action efforts bear this out, that it is in no sense attacking the equal opportunity principle, coherently enforced. The problem is policies that are arbitrary, capricious, expensive, dilatory and above all contradictory.

The federal regulatory apparatus has recoiled in indignation at this court challenge by the nation's largest retailer. But the private sector, we suspect, will applaud—and it should. It is too complacently accepted, nowadays, that when the intent is benevolent, government requirements (not only in business but in education and other vital sectors) should be suffered to be clumsy, confusing, contradictory, and costly. But the public's patience with this assumption is wearing thin.

We do not expect a single law suit—even of this scale—to restore co-ordination to the confusing morass of "affirmative action" rules to which business is exposed. Only a determined Congress, led by an administra-

tion cognizant of the problem and ready to knock heads together, can ultimately make sense of the regulatory snakepit. But a Sears victory, which we would enthusiastically welcome, would add judicial pressure for a regulatory cleanup now long overdue. ●

THE THREAT TO TAIWAN IS MOSTLY ECONOMIC

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, the following by Nick Thimmesch summarizes what I believe to be the most significant implication of President Carter's decision to recognize the People's Republic of China. As Thimmesch concisely states, the greatest impact of normalization will be upon the economic vitality of Taiwan's prosperous business community. It is unfortunate, but increasingly apparent, that the United States ignores those countries who have been long-term friends, while courting those nations whose policies are contrary to U.S. interests.

The article follows:

THE THREAT TO TAIWAN IS MOSTLY ECONOMIC (By Nick Thimmesch)

Eventually, that vast cloud of dust born of President Carter's detonating announcement on Communist China will settle. Realizing this, those genuinely concerned about Taiwan must know that the danger is not an invasion, but threats to Taiwan's economic future.

The Peking regime would be mad to invade Taiwan. Superpowers don't fight wars these days; they aren't supposed to act in such unseemly fashion. And Communist China rates as a superpower, not because of its economic or military strength, but for its sheer size, population and nuclear weaponry. The nasty fights today are between smaller nations—the Vietnamese and Cambodians, Rhodesia and guerrilla forces, Israel and the neighboring Arab states. Besides, a China-Taiwan war would be long, bloody and a disgrace to the Communists.

In the real world, the big powers are in economic, not military, combat. In Peking, Teng Hsiao-ping is trying to push Communist China into this fierce, but bloodless, fray.

Indeed, Communist China has missed the great economic boom in Asia because of its ideological parochialism. Because Vietnam turned our heads away from Asia, we Americans are only aware of the Japanese part of this boom.

The reality is that two billion people live east of Iran, that Asia contains 60 percent of the world's teen-agers and children and thus, in the years immediately ahead, will have a work force capable of making that region economically powerful and a huge consumer market as well.

Even while absorbed in ideological disputations, Peking sampled and enjoyed Western prosperity by raking off some \$2 billion a year from its sales of goods, food, water and banking services to Hong Kong.

Those Peking nurtans run 40 department stores in the British Crown Colony (which they could conquer in 30 minutes), use ad agencies and radio commercials to peddle their wares, and indulge in capitalistic relations with evil Western banks.

Given the U.S. pledge to continue selling weapons to Taiwan after "normalization" with Peking, the Carter administration could

still make Taiwan vulnerable to economic harm if it allows Peking to take advantage of the new ball game. That's why Sen. Richard Stone (D. Fla.) and other friends of Taiwan are insisting there be stronger guarantees from the United States to Taiwan.

In 1978, there has been \$7 billion in trade between the two nations, with Taiwan enjoying a \$2 billion surplus. There is also \$4.5 billion in U.S. investment and loans in Taiwan, and hundreds of excellent relationships between Taiwanese and American private firms.

Anyone who has visited Taiwan comes away praising the hard work, enterprise and dedication of the Taiwanese people in building a nation on a mountainous island nearly devoid of resources. Moreover, Taiwan is a world leader in spreading the wealth among its people.

For the United States to allow Peking to demand that U.S. firms route all Taiwanese trade through Communist China would be a betrayal of moral principle—if we, indeed, have any left. The worst scenario would be a communist blockade of Taiwan, with the United States helpless to act because that would amount to interfering—by Peking's logic—with the internal affairs of China.

Taiwan, like Japan, needs access to Persian Gulf oil, European and American credit and markets, and to the raw materials of the world. Teng Hsiao-ping recently remarked that Communist China would permit Taiwan to keep its economic independence. But while Teng is a liberalizing influence, he is an old man. Younger Chinese officials coming up are more purist and less likely to go for Western "contamination."

For the moment, however, Communist China—a nation poorer than India—seems to be rushing into a market-oriented, rather than a centrally planned, economy. In the past year, Peking signed over \$60 billion in contracts to import, contrasted with its \$9 billion annual export total. Sooner or later, the Chinese communists will have to export \$60 billion in goods or services to make this up.

Peking is pressed to quickly improve its economy. If it plans to exploit Taiwan to help reach this goal, then President Carter has blundered. If he made a deal with Peking allowing Taiwan to keep its economic independence, then the passage of time might smooth what now seems a jagged situation indeed.

By the way, wasn't it candidate Carter who railed against secrecy in diplomacy and a president's making momentous foreign-policy decisions without adequately consulting Congress? Oh well. ●

THE CARNEGIE HERO FUND COMMISSION AWARDS

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission has posthumously awarded the bronze medal for heroism to five men who drowned off the coast of Gloucester, Mass., last winter.

I, too, would like to take this opportunity to commend these brave men and to offer my sincere condolences to their widows, their parents and their families.

On February 6, 1978, during the great blizzard, a foreign oil tanker, the *Global Hope*, found itself in distress in the waters off Gloucester, Mass. Frank E. Quirk, Jr., of Peabody, Mass., set out in

his 45-foot craft, the *Can Do*, to assist the crew of the disabled tanker. Quirk was accompanied by four men—Donald R. Wilkinson and P. Kenneth Fuller, Jr. both of Rockport, Mass., and Charles F. Bucko of New London, Conn., and N. David Curley of Norfolk, Mass.

While attempting to reach the *Global Hope*, Quirk and his crew confronted 80-mile-per-hour winds and swells in excess of 30 feet.

All five men were drowned.

In memory of their courage, their valor and their self-sacrificing determination to assist others in need, I hereby commemorate the actions of these great men.●

WILDERNESS AREAS

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, one of the serious controversies in this country regards our wilderness areas and multiuse propositions for these areas. The ultra-environmentalists would attempt to lock up this land and thereby deny the people of this Nation the invaluable timber and mineral deposits located therein. With the current discussion of RARE-II and the extreme provisions for wilderness contained therein it is refreshing to discover a voice of reason.

Mr. Douglas Murray Murphy of Ririe, Idaho, is such a voice and a recent letter to the editor that he wrote for the Post-Register succinctly contains such a viewpoint. I ask permission to insert this retired mining engineer's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that my fellow members may be enlightened by such wisdom for so young a thinker.

LACK OF RESOURCE USES LAMENTED

To leave to posterity an America developed for any emergency becomes essentially impossible, with wilderness cultists Andrus, Carter, Church and our land management agencies actively discouraging advance development.

Our lands, resources, rivers, our best geothermal resources in Yellowstone Park become environmentalist-trampled, defiled by the tinsel trapping of aesthetics, recreation and wilderness. The utter, deliberate wilderness waste of America's resources and initiative equates with destruction by armies of free-roaming saboteurs, steadily adding to trade deficits, national debt, inflation, unemployment, loss of tax base and a dangerous dependence upon fragile foreign supplies. Meanwhile America becomes discouraged, poorer and lazier. Our money, such as it is, becomes inordinately concentrated in foreign hands—enabling them to buy up much of our best lands, businesses and resources, the equivalent of sabotage and collapse from within?

Each of the preservationists' protected predators and raptors can be more destructive of beneficial bird and animal life than the guns of a thousand poachers. For 10 years, \$38,400,000 might be the "aesthetics" cost of each major predator, with its protected, pyramiding increase and consonant, pyramiding decimation of gentler animals and their never-to-be-born offspring (Harvey Shelley). Similarly, all present and future

costs of wilderness wastes might truly approach infinity.

Hydropower and geothermal power wasting in wilderness and Yellowstone Park are replaced (in Idaho) by inflationary, polluting, imported power costing double or more! Logical travel routes are blocked by wilderness areas. On public lands, minerals and fuels development is as actively blocked as by an army of saboteurs.

A measure of the typical wilderness-cult mentality is their often proffered theory of keeping our minerals and fuels in their wilderness "banks," with their proprietary offer to "let us have" our resources if emergency need arises . . . too late by some 5-15 years of required development time!

The best we can do for America is to re-establish the values of work and preparedness over play and aesthetics. Our fathers' and grandfathers' foresight, initiative and work left to us a powerful nation with on-stream mines, mills, fuels, power, transportation and backup resources developed in advance, for any emergency. Regardless of whose aesthetics, anti-development programs or wilderness cults are trampled, we owe no less to coming generations.●

LATIN AMERICA ARMS SALES POLICY SHOULD BE CHANGED

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the views of my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable GUS YATRON, who recently questioned the validity of U.S. policy in restricting our arms sales to Latin America. I agree with Mr. YATRON that our policy is simply not working.

In mid-1978 the Honorable Joseph E. Karth, president and general manager of the American League for International Security Assistance, a labor-management organization, testified before Mr. YATRON's subcommittee. Many of you will remember Joe Karth as a former Democratic colleague who served in this House for more than 18 years. Mr. Karth spoke of the "loss of jobs," "loss of prestige" and "loss of influence" of the United States in Latin America as a result of our foreign military policy in that region in the last 10 to 15 years.

Among the many points Mr. Karth made was the following: In the last decade, the United States supplied less than 30 percent of Latin America's defense imports. According to a Department of Defense witness, he pointed out, that figure is now less than 20 percent. The value of lost sales was more than \$2.4 billion in that period. With the cooperation of European nations, Argentina and Brazil have developed their own arms industries. According to one Brazilian official, by 1980 Brazil will be exporting a billion dollars worth of arms a year.

Customers tend to make other major purchases from countries that supply them arms. As a consequence we have also lost nonmilitary sales following on our rejection of military sales.

The countries of this hemisphere have bought the arms they wanted elsewhere,

in many cases getting more costly weapons from their new suppliers than we ourselves would have sold them.

Basically, as a nonsupplier, we lose a certain amount of diplomatic and political leverage. We have not ended the arms race in Latin America, we have actually escalated it. In the process, we have permitted the Soviets to dabble in the market and permitted other strains to develop in regards to Latin American security.

Lost sales mean lost profits, an adverse effect on our balance of payments, and a loss of American jobs.

The President should be reacquainted with American history. A legitimate reaffirmation of the Monroe Doctrine would logically call for practical U.S. cooperation with most of the countries of Latin America in meeting their legitimate defense needs. Keeping Western and especially Eastern European armaments from gaining ascendancy in Latin America is a logical goal.

In sum, this policy of ours in restraining our arms sales to Latin America has affected hemispheric security, our balance of payments and the American job market—all adversely. It should be changed.●

DR. FRANKENSTEIN, CALL YOUR OFFICE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, when we were children and a course known as "civics" was still taught in the schools we learned that there are three branches of Government: Executive, legislative, and judicial. We were taught about the fourth and perhaps most powerful branch: The bureaucracy.

The Washington Post recently spoke of the power of the bureaucracy in an editorial. I want to insert that editorial in the RECORD, but before I do, I want to first point out that it is not the specific subject matter of the editorial that is important—it is its general theme. The Congress has created a kind of Frankenstein's monster in the executive branch, accountable not to the President, but to itself. As I recall the old movie, Dr. Frankenstein paid dearly for dabbling with things he did not understand. Let the Congress profit from his example.

At this point I wish to insert into the RECORD, "Who Runs the Government" from the Washington Post, January 22, 1979:

WHO RUNS THE GOVERNMENT?

Since the Interior Department is in charge of writing the new strip-mining rules and the president is in charge of the Interior Department, it would seem to follow that the president could have a role, if he wanted it, in what those rules say when they are issued. But life is not that simple anymore, and the White House has gotten itself into a lawsuit by trying to influence the formulation of those rules. This is the first public round in what is likely to be a major quarrel among the White House, Congress and

the bureaucracy over who gets to run the government.

The immediate issue in the strip-mining controversy—whether the rules should be modified or delayed because they are inflationary—is far less important than the principle involved. At least 50 agencies inside the executive branch have been given authority by Congress in recent years to issue regulations on particular subjects, such as strip mines, air and water pollution and industrial safety. The question is whether they are free to use that authority on their own or whether they are subject to presidential influence and guidance.

One school of thought contends that these agencies—and the individuals specifically authorized to issue the rules, who are often Cabinet officers—are required to do their jobs without accepting presidential direction. They can receive whatever information the White House wants to offer during public hearings, the argument goes, but in deciding what rules to write they are independent, like the regulatory commissions. That's what Congress is said to have intended when it passed legislation outlining broad principles and delegating the power to fill in the details to specific executive-branch agencies, ranging from OSHA to EPA to HEW.

That argument is being pushed by some members of Congress and many special-interest groups—in particular environmental groups—that lobbied hard to get legislation of this kind passed. They fear they may lose inside the executive branch some of the battles they thought they had won on Capitol Hill—unless the agencies write the rules without reference to anything but the authorizing law. That's because larger concerns, such as the battle against inflation, could persuade a rule-maker who is subject to presidential direction not to go as fast as he otherwise might in requiring new and costly equipment to limit, say, air pollution.

The other school holds that the Constitution makes the president the government's chief executive officer and that Congress cannot diminish his power by giving part of it to his subordinates. It is fundamentally wrong, this argument goes, to cast the White House as an adversary or an outsider in rule-making proceedings that occur inside the administration over which it presides. Congress, it is said, never intended to do that or, if it did, it violated the Constitution as well as good management principles through its own thoughtlessness.

This position seems to us to be the far stronger in practical and, probably, constitutional terms. The last thing the government needs is an expansion of the bureaucracy that makes rules and policy without being politically responsible for its actions. The president is held accountable for what his subordinates do, and he should not be in the position of having no control over their actions. Regardless of what the courts do with the case challenging the president's right to intervene in these rule-making proceedings, Congress should act to end the controversy and make it clear that the president does, in fact, run the executive branch. ●

A PRICE FOR TAIWAN

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to present for the consideration of my colleagues the following George Will column, which concerns "normalization" of relations with the

People's Republic of China. The article underscores the problems created by President Carter's action relative to the credibility of American commitments throughout the world.

The article follows:

A PRICE FOR TAIWAN

(By George F. Will)

At issue in the dispute about President Carter's China transaction is not whether the United States should have a wide range of relations with China. It should, and does. Indeed, relations have been expanding so fast that defenders of the transaction are hard put to explain why it was necessary. Neither is the issue whether full diplomatic relations are desirable. They are.

Rather, the issue is the price Carter paid. The price makes the transaction seem dictated more by the administration's political needs, and the ideology of the State Department's seventh floor, than by any larger imperatives.

Administration foreign policy is long on TV, weak on strategy. The OPEC decision on oil prices underscores the crumbling of the U.S. position in the Middle East. The subversion of Iran eclipses the Camp David achievement (whatever it turns out to have been). Understandably, the administration, having dined out on Camp David excessively, wanted a transaction it could call a triumph.

The China transaction played to the news industry's bias, which is theatrical, not political: Journalists enjoy big, splashy political strokes, and joy colors the reporting of them. But now that such fun has been had, there is this question: What did Carter get that Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford could not have got on essentially the same terms?

If today's leaders of China (no one knows who tomorrow's leaders will be) are indeed pragmatic, the administration paid too high a price. Pragmatic leaders would not allow the Taiwan question to impede cooperation important to China's development and defense. If China's leaders are not pragmatic, then it is to dangerous men that the United States has consigned Taiwan.

But if you liked the China transaction, you will love the SALT agreement. Both are cut from the same cloth of concessions.

Carter acceded to three demands: severance of diplomatic relations with Taiwan, unilateral termination of the defense treaty and removal of U.S. forces. In return, the United States is allowed: to delay for one year termination of the treaty; to say that it wants the Taiwan question resolved peacefully; and to sell arms to Taiwan. The first "right" is trivial, the second vacuous, the third nugatory.

The "Taiwan question" is like the *Judenfrage* (Jewish question) in the 1930s. It is one of those antiseptic abstractions by which politicians disguise (sometimes from themselves) the nature of what they are doing. The "Taiwan question," like the *Judenfrage*, is only a "question" for one side. Just as European Jews had no "question" (they only wanted to be left alone), the "Taiwan question" is not Taiwan's. Plainly put, the "question" is: How shall Taiwan's liberty be extinguished.

On "Meet the Press," Cyrus Vance, the secretary of state, said that China had not "contradicted" the United States when the United States expressed its "expectations" that the question would be answered peacefully. Asked if the United States had even asked for a Chinese commitment, he said: "The Chinese have made it very clear all along that they will not state that the resolution of this problem is a problem for anybody else to determine, other than them." In other words: No. As in SALT, the adversary's intransigence determined the scope and thus shaped the result of negotiations.

Regarding arms sales to Taiwan, the ad-

ministration's eagerness to comply with Peking's wishes means that there probably will not be sales that might offend Peking.

In an unintended way, Carter's China transaction was timely. The administration has become Egypt's partner in pressuring Israel to rest its security on a treaty that is increasingly honeycombed with problems. But Taiwan's fate reminds Israel that parchment is a thin shield for a small nation. Furthermore, as often occurs when Israel's security anxieties become inconvenient for an American administration, there is talk of assuaging those anxieties with a U.S.-Israel defense treaty. Surely this administration will not have the impudence to suggest such a thing.

In his broadcast announcement on China, Carter did not see fit to mention to Americans that what he was doing involved disavowing a treaty obligation. He left that troubling detail to television commentators. Why? Having recently made a speech reminding Americans that, at last, they have a president virtuous enough to care about human rights, perhaps he did not want to dwell on the fact that he was doing more to jeopardize the rights of the Taiwanese than he has done to enhance the rights of any other people. ●

FEAR OF FACING THE TRUTH

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I recommend that my colleagues read this well-thought analysis written by George Will on the failure of the United States to deal with the Soviet Union in a realistic manner. This article appeared in *Newsweek* on January 22, 1979.

The Congress comes now to considering one of the most important treaties that has ever been presented to it. I refer to the SALT treaty, an agreement which will lock this country's defense policy into a reliance on minimum deterrence and a naive faith in the Soviet Union to comply with the terms of the treaty.

Mr. Will makes the point that the American political class is afraid of facing reality and dealing honestly with Soviet actions and intents.

His article reads as follows:

[From *Newsweek*, Jan. 22, 1979]

FEAR OF FACING THE TRUTH

(By George F. Will)

When, as lately, America's decline accelerates, it is useful to look back along the downward, crumbling path. Eugene Rostow has done so in *The Washington Quarterly*, recalling the 1968 Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. He was Under Secretary of State and was struck, then as now, by the attitude prevalent within government that "Soviet action must always be given the benefit of the doubt." That summer, officials resisted the idea that Soviet military maneuvers presaged an invasion. When senior Soviet officials interrupted their August vacations to convene in Moscow, President Johnson assumed they were preparing not an invasion but an invitation (for him to visit Moscow to begin strategic arms limitation talks). Significantly, they were preparing both. They wrongly assumed what they reasonably assume today, that the U.S. Administration would mute its reaction to Soviet conduct, however aggressive, rather than jeopardize SALT negotiations. (Johnson immediately canceled the trip.)

With today's satellites, U.S. officials would have seen unusual markings on tanks and other vehicles in the Soviet maneuvers. Evidence that these were about to go into action against identical tanks and vehicles—those of the Soviet-supplied Czech Army. But many officials would have resisted any upsetting evidence about the Soviets. Rostow recalls this from the preceding summer:

"... The first time 'Egyptian' MiG fighters appeared over our Sixth Fleet shortly after the 1967 Six Day War, our monitoring sources reported that the pilots of these 'Egyptian' planes were talking Russian... Well, for two weeks our Soviet experts were explaining this away... [They said] that these were training flights, that the pilots were Egyptians who had been instructed in Russian by Russian personnel... and so on. Of course it soon transpired that the pilots were Russian and those arguments collapsed. But for two weeks they were stubbornly held..."

STABILITY IN IRAN

Today, the pattern of strikes and unrest in Iran strongly suggests Soviet fingerprints, but while the Soviets broadcast instructions for manufacturing grenades and bombs, U.S. "experts" suggest that the Soviets are primarily interested in "stability" in Iran. How does Rostow explain such willful imperviousness?

"The answer is: fear. The American political class is afraid of living with the evidence of reality, because if you accept that the Russians are embarked on an imperialist course for the indefinite future, if you accept that their military, economic, educational and cultural policies are all geared to the reduction... of the ability of the United States and its allies to resist, then you have to do something about it."

What the United States has done since the mid-1960s is invest its hopes in arms control. It has based arms-control policy on the hope that the Soviet buildup is merely a reaction to U.S. arms, and can be restrained by unilateral U.S. restraint. So U.S. arms-limitation efforts have limited... U.S. arms. Now The Economist of London warns that the SALT II treaty, designed to run through 1985, "could be the beginning of seven singularly dangerous years."

A HALF-HOUR CATAclysm

The cosmetic equality in permitted totals of launchers conceals, The Economist says, "a large imbalance in Russia's favor." Given existing U.S. arsenals and procurement plans, "by 1985 the United States will be behind Russia both in the over-all total and in some of the most important sub-categories," including "modern large" missiles: the Soviets will be permitted 308 (a force that can carry 3,000 warheads), the U.S. will be permitted none. And SALT II "may leave the United States itself vulnerable to a surprise Russian attack."

"By the early 1980s, the growing number of increasingly accurate warheads Russia can pack into its huge missiles will put it in a position of being able to destroy virtually all of America's land-based missiles in a single half-hour cataclysm, while still keeping quite a lot of its own missiles in reserve, ready for a second blow... [A] counterattack against the Soviet missile system would have to depend mainly on the aircraft-carried Cruise missiles permitted under SALT II, which would take ten hours to trundle toward their targets—and even then would destroy not much more than half of the Soviet launching silos."

To say that the Russians would probably not push the button "misses the point of nuclear mathematics:

"The point is that the Russians would not have to. If they know that [an] exchange of Soviet first strike and American counterstrike

would leave them with more surviving missiles, which would then hold America's cities hostage, they would know that the American President would know it too; and that he would be paralyzed by his knowledge... This is the political reality behind the apparently abstract calculations of who-would-have-more-missiles-left."

On the crucial question of how the United States sank to this danger. The Economist is too charitable: "Americans were so mesmerized by Vietnam and Watergate that they failed to spot the danger." Not true. The political class had sufficient evidence all along. It also had a desire to disbelieve, and with a few exceptions (such as Sen. Henry Jackson) has shrunk from leadership.

Fred Ikle, former director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, writes that we are in a third postwar phase. From 1945 through 1950, the period of "nuclear monopoly," the U.S. actually had few ready nuclear weapons and was substantially weaker than the Soviet Union in terms of ready land-based power. After North Korea attacked, the U.S. immediately tripled its defense budget, building up air and naval capabilities. After the Cuban missile crisis, the Soviets began a sustained buildup, while Vietnam sapped America's material and moral resources.

IGNORANCE AS A STRATEGY

The Soviet Union has doubled its military budget, in real terms, in the last fifteen years. The U.S. budget in constant dollars is less than it was in 1961. And as Ikle says, this "third-phase shift in the Soviet Union's favor is still under way." In 1965, Defense Secretary McNamara said that "the Soviets have decided that they have lost the quantitative race... there is no indication the Soviets are seeking to develop a strategic nuclear force as large as ours." Ikle blames a huge "intelligence failure" in the 1960s for such thinking and for "our harmful persistence in unilateral restraint as a policy for inducing Soviet restraint. For eleven years in a row, the annual U.S. intelligence forecasts underestimated the number of missiles Russia would deploy."

But Ikle, like The Economist, is too charitable. When people are so wrong for so long on the same subject, in the same direction, the failure is not of intelligence but of will. For such people, ignorance is a strategy. Their problem is not in finding the truth, but in facing it.●

HENRY C. CLAUSEN HONORED BY LINCOLN MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues the following article from the Masonic Home Journal and extend my congratulations to Henry C. Clausen, the sovereign grand commander of the southern jurisdiction of the Scottish Rite, who was awarded an honorary doctorate of laws by Lincoln Memorial University recently. I was similarly honored by that fine university in 1973.

Since its founding in 1898, Lincoln Memorial University has been an outstanding educational institution, and its Lincoln Museum has one of the country's finest collections of Lincoln memorabilia.

The article follows:

SOVEREIGN GRAND COMMANDER, HENRY C. CLAUSEN HONORED BY LINCOLN MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY

On Sunday afternoon, October 1st, one of Masonry's most outstanding figures, the Sovereign Grand Commander of the Southern Jurisdiction of the Scottish Rite, Judge Henry C. Clausen, 33°, was honored by Lincoln Memorial University with an Honorary Doctorate of Laws. Conferred on him in appreciation of his exemplary humanitarianism and his leadership in the support of our free public schools, Judge Clausen delivered a ringing address on our country's patriots and educational challenges. A large audience of Virginia, Tennessee and Kentucky Masons and their wives came together at the Harrogate, Tennessee Campus, to honor the Sovereign Grand Commander. Flanked by Grand Masters Tom Roberts, K.C.C.H. of Kentucky, G. Edwards Rothrock, 33°, of Tennessee and Charles E. Webber, 33°, S.G.I.G. of Virginia representing its Grand Master, Judge Clausen was invested with the Doctoral hood and the silver medallion of the Effingery. Also in attendance were George R. Effinger, 33°, S.G.I.G. of Kentucky, Andrew Benedict, 33°, S.G.I.G. of Tennessee and Grand Secretary General C. Fred Kleinknecht of Washington, D.C. President Frank W. Welch, President of the University presided.

Grand Treasurer of the Grand Lodge of Kentucky, also National Commanding General of the Honorable Order of Kentucky Colonels, Joe L. Hamilton, read a message from Governor Julian M. Carroll commissioning Judge Clausen a Colonel on his staff. The Honorable Chester Wolfe of Middleboro hosted the Grand Commander at a dinner in his honor.

Immediately following the ceremony, a reception in honor of the Grand Commander was held in the Abraham Lincoln Museum, presided over by Colonel Harland Sanders, 33°, and Mrs. Sanders, prime benefactors of the Museum. A grand tour of the Museum for Judge Clausen was led by Frank G. Rankin, 33°, Chairman of the Board and Colonel Sanders. The Museum collection represents one of the three largest collections of Lincolniana in the world.

Lincoln Memorial University was founded as a request by President Abraham Lincoln in 1863 to General Oliver Howard, that when the War was over to go down and do something for those good people of Appalachia. Founded in 1898, dedicated to the educational needs of Appalachia it numbers over 1,000 students, drawn mostly from Kentucky, Tennessee and Virginia. No qualified student is ever turned away because of financial lack. It is rated as one of the most outstanding of the small Southeastern Universities. The educational philosophy of the University stresses the work ethic.●

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT IMPROVEMENT ACT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the Congressional Oversight Improvement Act, a measure I initially introduced for study purposes during the closing days of the 95th Congress. This legislation is designed to enable Congress to more effectively fulfill its "total" legislative responsibility: Not only making our Nation's laws, but assuring also that the implementation of these laws is undertaken in accordance

with the congressional intent in authorizing such laws.

The urgent need for an overhaul of our congressional oversight machinery is obvious. With Congress experiencing a serious problem in monitoring the administration of programs it has authorized, there is an increasing number of programs not fulfilling their objectives, with the concomitants of people going unserved and taxpayers' dollars being wasted. Coupled with an alarmingly precarious economy, these factors indicate how imperative it is that we have cost-effective programs to deal with the critical problems now facing our Nation.

Indeed, last month, our distinguished Speaker, distinguished majority and minority leaders of the House, and other congressional leaders, outlined, before a congressional research service workshop on oversight, the explicit need to place increased emphasis on strengthening congressional oversight capabilities.

The legislation I am reintroducing today would significantly enhance congressional oversight capabilities by providing for a more formalized and effective utilization by congressional committees of the substantial resources of the congressional research support groups—the General Accounting Office, the Congressional Research Service, the Congressional Budget Office, and the Office of Technology Assessment.

More specifically, this legislation calls for the following:

I

A congressional oversight statement—contained in the report accompanying legislation approved by a committee, and prepared by the committee with the assistance of the above support groups—outlining criteria, reporting requirements, and agencies involved in providing information for oversight of those programs mandated by the legislation involved.

Mr. Speaker, a February 1977 report of the Senate Committee on Government Operation concluded:

Congressional committees should take increased advantage of GAO's expertise by . . . requesting GAO's assistance in drafting a statement of goals and objectives in new legislation, so that evaluation of agency activity might be easier.

As Congress most valuable oversight support agency, charged with analyzing and auditing the programs, activities, and financial operations of Federal departments and agencies, GAO is in an especially key position to define ways to measure to what degree programs are achieving their goals and objectives. However, the Senate report points out: "To date, committees have not been clamoring for that type of GAO help."

The report also charged that GAO's current efforts are often out of touch with those areas of specific and topical interest to congressional committees, and that GAO reports often suffer from an inordinate production time. Indeed, as an Assistant GAO Director recently stated, vital to GAO's ability to increase the effectiveness of its oversight services to Congress, is the agency's need "to discern congressional needs and priorities early and quickly."

However, as a House Select Committee on Congressional Operations report of June 22, 1978, observed:

Although GAO officials are encouraged to consult congressional sources in planning the agency's self-initiated work, no systematic or formal procedure has been developed to solicit the views of committees, Members, or staffs for this purpose, a situation which tends to limit GAO's responsiveness to congressional needs and may reduce the ultimate usefulness of some of its self-initiated studies.

I am confident that my proposal requiring committees to enlist the assistance of congressional support agencies, such as GAO, in preparing an oversight statement identifying particular aspects of an authorized program which the committee should evaluate, will produce a systematic, formal procedure whereby energies of congressional support agencies can be better attuned to the oversight responsibilities of the congressional committee.

II

Regulation impact report in which executive departments apprise the committee from which legislation originated, of regulations necessary to implement the legislation and the impact of such regulations, and how such regulations fulfill the law's objectives (a recent edition of Time magazine editorialized that Federal regulations cost approximately \$4.8 billion to administer in fiscal year 1978, with compliance costs in 1976, for example, estimated at \$63 billion).

Federal regulations written in incomprehensible jargon, affecting those to whom they apply in ways never envisioned by Congress, pose a serious threat to the integrity of congressional legislative power. By requiring Executive departments and agencies to report back to the committee from which the legislation originated, what the impact of these regulations is and how it squares with the law's objectives, we will allow Congress to regain legislative authority now lost to Executive departments and agencies.

III

Authority for establishing GAO strike forces to investigate incidents of agency noncompliance with the above reporting requirements of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this measure will put Congress squarely on record as recognizing that congressional oversight capabilities must be substantially strengthened. This legislation provides us the means to assure that those programs Congress authorizes are administered in a cost-effective manner which most efficiently utilizes our hard-earned tax dollars.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this timely legislation, and I request that the full text of this bill be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to improve the oversight capabilities of the standing committees of the House of Representatives and of the Senate

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

Act may be cited as the "Congressional Oversight Improvement Act".

Sec. 2. The Congress finds that—

(1) it is the responsibility of the Congress to evaluate the implementation of those programs which have been legislatively authorized and those programs which have been developed as a result of legislative authorization;

(2) it is imperative that the Congress be able to effectively evaluate the implementation of the programs if they are to fulfill the intent of the legislation by which they were established or from which they originated; and

(3) the ability of the Congress to expeditiously and prudently fulfill its responsibility to evaluate the implementation of the programs will be improved by requiring that Federal agencies and certain of the Congressional support offices provide greater assistance to the standing committees as they perform their oversight functions.

Sec. 3. Section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190d) is amended by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b)(1)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), each report accompanying any measure reported by a standing committee or any amendment agreed to by a committee of conference with respect to such a measure shall include a statement entitled 'Congressional Oversight Statement', which shall contain the items described in subparagraph (B). Such statement shall be prepared after consultation with the Comptroller General, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, the Director of the Congressional Research Service, and the Director of the Office of Technology Assessment. Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to alter the responsibility of any standing committee to include in each report accompanying any measure reported by the standing committee any oversight findings and recommendations required to be included under the Rules of the Senate or of the House of Representatives.

"(B) The items referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

"(i) a list of the names of each Government agency which shall administer each law affected by the measure or amendment which the report accompanies,

"(ii) in the case of a report by a standing committee, a list of the ways in which that Government agency can assist the standing committee to fulfill its oversight responsibilities under this section with respect to that law, and

"(iii) in the case of a report by a committee of conference, a list of the ways in which that Government agency can assist each standing committee which will have oversight responsibilities under this section with respect to that law to fulfill those responsibilities.

"(C) The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any report by a standing committee or committee of conference if the standing committee or committee of conference (whichever is appropriate) determines under criteria established under subparagraph (D) that compliance with those requirements is impracticable with respect to that report and includes in that report a statement of why compliance with respect to that report is impracticable.

"(D) The Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate shall establish the criteria which each standing committee of the Senate shall use to determine whether compliance with the requirements of subparagraph (A) is impracticable. The Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives shall establish the criteria which each

standing committee of the House shall use to determine whether compliance with those requirements is impracticable. The Committees shall jointly establish the criteria to be used by each committee of conference to determine whether compliance with those requirements is impracticable.

"(2) (A) Whenever it is requested to do so by a standing committee, any Government agency responsible for administering a law the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the standing committee shall prepare for and send to the standing committee a report setting forth—

"(1) a list of citations to all adopted and proposed rules issued by the Government agency in administering that law, together with a summary of those rules,

"(ii) an assessment of the impact of those rules, and

"(iii) recommendations, if any, for modifying that law to more effectively carry out the underlying legislative intent.

"(B) Each assessment of the impact of adopted and proposed rules which is set forth in a report pursuant to subparagraph (A) (ii) shall include an estimate of the number of persons (classified according to occupation, income, or other relevant criteria) who are (or in the case of proposed rules, who will be) regulated or otherwise affected by those rules and an estimate of their economic impact on those persons, including an estimate of any additional cost of compliance with each recordkeeping requirement provided in those rules.

"(C) A copy of each report prepared and sent under subparagraph (A) shall be sent at the same time to the Comptroller General, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, the Director of the Congressional Research Service, and the Director of the Office of Technology Assessment. The Comptroller General and each Director shall prepare an evaluation of the law to which that report relates, based on that report, and shall furnish the evaluation to the standing committee. The evaluation may be prepared separately by each Officer or in combination with any one or more of such Officers. After reviewing the evaluation, the standing committee shall determine what modifications of that law, if any, would be appropriate to more effectively carry out the underlying legislative intent.

"(D) Whenever any standing committee determines that any Government agency has failed to submit a report to the standing committee in accordance with the requirements of subparagraph (A), the chairman of the standing committee shall notify the President of the Senate (if the standing committee is a committee of the Senate) or the Speaker of the House of Representatives (if the standing committee is a committee of the House of Representatives). On receiving notification under this subparagraph of that failure, the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives (whichever is appropriate) shall direct the Comptroller General to investigate that failure. The Comptroller General shall establish a strike force, composed of employees of the General Accounting Office, to carry out any such investigation. On the conclusion of any such investigation, the Comptroller General shall report the results of the investigation to the President of the Senate or to the Speaker of the House of Representatives (whichever is appropriate) who shall report those results to the chairman of the standing committee.

"(3) Whenever any Government agency has reason to believe that a law as administered or as proposed to be administered by such Government agency may be inconsistent with the legislative intent underlying such law, the Government agency shall request each standing committee of the Senate and of the House of Representatives

having jurisdiction over that law to review with the Government agency each reason for that belief.

"(4) For purposes of this subsection—
"(A) the term "standing committee" means a standing committee of the Senate or of the House of Representatives,

"(B) the term "committee of conference" means a committee of conference between the Senate and the House of Representatives,

"(C) the term "Government agency" means an Executive department, a Government corporation, and an independent establishment, and

"(D) the term "rule" has the meaning given that term in section 551(4) of title 5, United States Code."

Sec. 4. (a) Paragraphs (1) (A), (B), and (C) of section 136(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190d), as added by section 3 of this Act, shall take effect 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Paragraph (1) (D) of such section 136 (b) shall take effect 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) Paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of such section 136(b) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act. ●

THE "COMMON DEFENSE" COMES FIRST

HON. BO GINN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the immediate attention of the Congress a very important analysis of our national defense priorities which has been prepared by the distinguished Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, the Honorable ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS.

Mr. LEVITAS recently attended a meeting of the North Atlantic Assembly, and he has had an opportunity to review our defense posture in general and the status of our standing against the Warsaw Pact nations in particular.

As we all know, a strong national defense is the foundation of our democracy and the pillar that supports the freedom of our people and of people throughout the world. The Congress is now beginning the review of the defense budget, and so it is vitally important that we do so with the greatest of care.

Mr. LEVITAS shares the view that an efficient and cost-effective defense system is absolutely essential, and a summary of some of his observations recently appeared as a column in the Atlanta Constitution on January 25, 1979. I insert this outstanding article at this point in the RECORD:

THE "COMMON DEFENSE" COMES FIRST

(By Elliott Levitas)

I recently attended a meeting in Lisbon of the North Atlantic Assembly, the parliamentary arm of NATO (North American Treaty Alliance). While there, I served with Sen. Henry "Scoop" Jackson and others on the military committee. This was one of the most important meetings I have ever attended because it focused on the direction in which the United States and our Western European allies must begin to move—and that is in bolstering our credibility and our defenses in Western Europe.

Much of the discussion centered on the

agreement among NATO countries, including the U.S., to increase defense spending during the next several years by 3 percent in terms of real dollars. This is a mutual promise previously made by President Carter and our Western allies, and one that I feel is vital, both to our defense capability and, more importantly, to our national credibility, our ability to be relied upon to do what we commit ourselves to do.

Over the past several years, the Warsaw Pact nations have built a strong military threat, capable of launching an offensive attack on Western Europe. Even the doves in military discussions have recognized that the trend in force levels between the East and the West in Europe have not been in NATO's favor. If we do not continue to support a strong and credible defense posture in Western Europe, which can deter any aggressive moves on the part of the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact nations, then we are soon going to be faced with an adverse imbalance that could bring about substantial political changes in the face of a Soviet military threat which cannot be convincingly resisted.

Let me give some examples: the Soviet Union has us outgunned in terms of artillery almost 10 to one. They have us outnumbered in tanks by between seven or eight to one. We have approximately 790,000 soldiers spread all over the world; the Soviets have about 2½ million men under arms . . . only about a quarter of whom face China.

Once we had unchallenged supremacy of the seas, particularly the Mediterranean and the North Atlantic. Today we are being challenged there by the Soviet Union, as well as in the Persian Gulf, the coasts of Africa, and in the Indian Ocean. . . .

During the meeting the North Atlantic Assembly, I had the opportunity to speak with officials from the various NATO countries. I came away with the knowledge that they are looking to the U.S. for leadership and that they are prepared to follow our leadership when we exercise it. I think that President Carter's commitment to increase the defense budget and to make a major commitment to NATO did a great deal to strengthen their belief—and that of the Warsaw Pact countries—in our determination to defend Western Europe.

With regard to the increase in spending for defense, I must at the same time point out that there is a serious problem of waste within the defense budget which must be eliminated. The proposed military budget of \$122.7 billion is a lot of money. Too much of the tax dollars has been unwisely spent or wasted. Those of us who advocate a strong defense need to recognize this and not merely assume that defense dollars are always well spent any more so than in other areas of government. . . .

One question arises during any discussion of raising the defense budget, and that is whether we can afford the increase given our domestic needs. I should like to point out that in the 1979 budget, 24 cents of each "budget dollar" went for national defense, while 37 cents of each of those dollars went for direct payments to individuals through various social service programs. We are currently spending more for social programs than we are for defense and have been for several years, at a time when the Soviets' expenditures for defense have been increasing year by year. . . .

The first obligation of a government is "to provide for the common defense," to protect its citizens from foreign attack. If we cannot preserve our own freedom, our own independence as a sovereign state, then the questions of our beneficent domestic priorities do not even arise. We have the ability and productivity to establish our priorities; to meet our essential human needs and to preserve our freedom. It is not an "either/

or" choice. But defense of nation must not be considered the secondary option.

We can't talk about maintaining the freedom of others unless we're willing to defend defense. But, if we are not willing to pay the price of defense for peace, we will surely pay the cost of war. ●

H.R. 39 AND THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, during the initial days of this session, much of the discussion on H.R. 39, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1979, has centered on an alleged "compromise" reached during the final hours of the 95th Congress. This "compromise," supposedly the result of negotiations between representatives of the House, Senate, and administration, has been trumpeted by some as the logical starting point of any future considerations of the Alaska lands issue.

As a member of the Interior Subcommittee on General Oversight and Alaska Lands, these comments greatly disturb me. While I am aware of the unique factors that precipitated last session's negotiations, I strongly believe that any "compromise" that resulted from these informal meetings should not be accepted as a starting point for this Congress nor even as a desirable final solution. Neither the House nor the Senate had an opportunity to act on this "compromise" and to assume that the "compromise" would have been meekly accepted ignores the national significance of this issue and the sentiment of the Members of Congress. The House's approval of H.R. 39 last session demonstrated that Congress overwhelmingly supported a much stronger and more balanced bill than this "compromise."

The version of H.R. 39 accepted by the full House last session was a sound bill which balanced the need to protect the Alaskan wilderness with the future economic development of that State. The vote for final House passage (277 to 31) confirmed the overwhelming support for the balanced approach of H.R. 39.

The current version of H.R. 39 is an excellent legislative vehicle to resolve the Alaska lands issue. It incorporates the best features of last session's House-passed bill—features which were the result of a lengthy and comprehensive legislative process—with some needed improvements. The use of the so-called "compromise" bill as the legislative vehicle would be a disservice to the legislative process and would not result in a satisfactory solution to this most important national issue.

In an effort to clarify the status of the Alaska lands issue and to end any misunderstandings regarding the actions of last year, I wrote to two of our colleagues who participated in the last minute negotiations, Interior Committee Chairman UDALL and the chairman of the then Interior Subcommittee on General Over-

sight and Alaska Lands, Congressman SEIBERLING. Their responses clearly dispell any notion of a compromise agreement and the use of any such "compromise" as the legislative vehicle for this session. At this time I would like to share with my colleagues the relevant correspondence:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 22, 1979.

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Based on my initial review of H.R. 39, I am glad to see that you have incorporated many of the concepts that were in last year's House-passed version. I want to thank and commend you and your staff for the excellent work that you have done in the preparation of this bill and for your continuing dedication to this most important issue.

As a member of the Interior Subcommittee on General Oversight and Alaska Lands, I am well aware of the countless hours spent in the development of the bill that passed the House in the 95th Congress and feel that in most aspects, we had produced a balanced solution to the question of the use of Alaskan lands. It was a bill that did allow for the economic development of Alaska, while protecting much of the state's unique and irreplaceable wilderness. Indeed, one of the few major criticisms of the bill was that it did not provide adequate protection for some of the most spectacular regions of Alaska, e.g., Misty Fjords. I am pleased to see that the current H.R. 39 rectifies many of these unfortunate oversights.

During the last days of the 95th Congress, you, along with representatives from the Senate and Administration, conducted discussions in an effort to reach some agreement on this issue. Recent comments on these discussions and the "compromise" that they spawned greatly concern me. This so-called "compromise" is now being portrayed by some as the logical starting point of any considerations by the 95th Congress. It is claimed that the passage of this "compromise" failed only because of a threatened filibuster by one Senator. Such claims completely disregard the reality of the situation. Neither the House nor the Senate had an opportunity to consider this agreement at any level. Indeed, the full Senate was not given an opportunity to consider any Alaska lands legislation. Thus, the many supporters in that body for stronger legislation never had a chance to voice their support. To assume that both bodies would routinely accept this proposal ignores the national significance of the Alaska lands issue and is a disservice to our legislative process. While I recognize the unique situation of those last days and commend you for your sincere effort to resolve this issue, I question the prospects of acceptance of this "compromise." I, for one, would have been hard put to support the "compromise." The lack of adequate time to review the proposal and the apparent insufficient protection for Alaskan wilderness made final passage a tenuous prospect at best.

I strongly urge you to put to rest publicly this notion of a "spirit of compromise" which prevailed last October. The bill that the House passed last Session by a vote of 277 to 31 was a sincere effort to achieve a compromise—an attempt that was summarily rebuffed by the opponents of the bill. The continued discussion of some October "compromise" can only create confusion on this issue and will serve to frustrate our efforts to achieve sound legislation. For this reason, every effort must be made to refute the claim that the House accepted this "compromise."

It is also my hope that you will reject most forcefully the exhortations of some to resume considerations of the Alaska lands issue with the "compromise" as the starting point. We are operating in a new Congress with a much different time factor. To rush headlong into accepting this questionable "compromise" would needlessly weaken our position, particularly facing the prospects of further attempts to weaken the proposal via amendments or Conference Committee.

Mr. Chairman, Alaska still remains a national issue of the utmost importance. I look forward to working with you closely again on this issue. The impacts of the decisions that we will be making will affect present and future generations of Americans. The vehicle for our decisions, H.R. 39, is a sound proposal based on the solid foundations of the hearings, data and considerations of the 95th Congress. We must move forward and build upon this foundation. To resume consideration from the "compromise" would circumvent all our efforts during the last Congress and would offer inadequate protection for the Alaskan wilderness.

I am most anxious to hear your views on this matter.

Warm regards,
Sincerely,

BRUCE F. VENTO,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 25, 1979.

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BRUCE: Thank you for your thoughtful and well-reasoned letter of January 22, concerning H.R. 39, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, and the events of the final days of the last Session, when Senate action on the House-passed bill was finally blocked by the delaying tactics that opponents of the bill had been employing throughout the 95th Congress.

The failure of the Senate to act on this matter was undeniably one of the greatest disappointments of the last Congress, and that failure was clearly the direct result of obstructions calculated to force proponents of sound legislation to accept changes that would skew the bill away from adequate protection of many of the irreplaceable wilderness values of the public lands in Alaska.

Faced with these obstructions, and with time running out, Chairman Jackson did initiate meetings among a number of Senators, Members of the House, and Administration officials, as your letter correctly notes. The discussion was wide-ranging, but inconclusive: when it ended abruptly on October 14, a number of items (such as the Senate Committee's recommendations for amendments to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act or for specific land-exchanges among a variety of Alaskan entities) had never been dealt with—and even on some aspects of the legislative proposals which had been discussed, no agreements had been reached.

Thus, there never was a comprehensive "compromise bill." (In this regard, it should be noted that the material which Senator Stevens and others have published is nothing more than an incomplete work product of House and Senate staff, who had been attempting to put into legislative language the matters on which some preliminary agreements had been reached, so far as staff could determine the nature of those agreements. This never received any final review and certainly did not constitute a bill which could be presented to either the House or Senate.) One compromise of a sort was brought forward—an extension of interim protection which would have maintained

the status quo on the relevant public lands pending action of the 96th Congress. As you know, this deadline-extension bill was passed by the House but was blocked in the Senate by the filibuster threat of one Senator.

Those of us who met with the Senators to negotiate a possible last minute agreement on Alaska did so in the belief that it was in the interests of all concerned to settle this matter before the December 18, 1978 expiration of the withdrawals of Alaska lands that were made under Section 17(d)(2) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. These efforts were made under extreme pressures of time as well as threats of filibuster and can hardly be viewed as having produced a satisfactory legislative proposal for consideration under normal conditions instead of conditions of duress. Moreover, the frustration of such efforts by the obstructionist tactics of one Senator rendered moot all proposals tentatively offered in those negotiations.

Now, after the vigorous, determined, and historic actions of President Carter and Secretaries Andrus and Bergland, the overall situation regarding the public lands in Alaska has been considerably altered, and a new foundation has been laid upon which Congress (acting, as your letter notes, under different time factors) can erect a balanced structure of decisions regarding these lands which are the property of all the American people. I believe that the revised bill (again numbered H.R. 39) which so many of us have joined in sponsoring is the proper starting point for such Congressional action, and indeed is a bill which merits support of our Committee and the House of Representatives.

I also look forward to working with you, with our other colleagues who devoted so much time, effort, and care to this matter in the last Congress, and with all Members of our Committee when we again take up this most important conservation proposal.

With best personal regards,

Sincerely,

JOHN F. SEIBERLING,
Chairman, Subcommittee on General
Oversight and Alaska Lands.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 29, 1979.

HON. BRUCE VENTO
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BRUCE: Thank you for your letter concerning the Alaska Lands bill.

I do not intend to confuse anybody about my intentions with the Alaska Lands bill this Congress. I introduced this year's version of H.R. 39, which incorporates much of the Committee's bill of last Congress, with you and 130 of our House colleagues so that this bill will be the vehicle for Committee and full House consideration. My intentions are to hold a limited set of hearings before the full Committee to ascertain the views of appropriate officials of the Administration, the state of Alaska, and other interested parties on this year's legislation. Since so much work has been done on this issue in the last Congress, I am hopeful that the testimony at this year's hearings will be geared towards updating our extensive data base. After the hearings have been completed, I intend to press for full Committee mark-up as soon as possible. The Committee has a deadline, imposed by the House Parliamentarian, to report the bill from Committee no later than March 19, 1979.

I intend to do everything in my power to meet that deadline. I also hope to bring H.R. 39 to the full House for consideration as soon as practicable after our reporting deadline. After the House has considered and acted on H.R. 39, I intend to wait until the Senate has completed its consideration of an Alaska Lands bill and promptly request a conference with the Senate on this issue. If Members of the other body wish to at-

tempt to delay the Senate's consideration of this matter, that's their privilege and right. I, however, will not consent to any informal, ad hoc negotiations between the two Houses. The rightful arena to iron out differences between the House-passed version and a Senate-passed version is a Committee of Conference, open to the public, with full participation by both Senate and House conferees. This is the normal procedure; a procedure that has served this nation well for nearly 200 years, and one that I will strictly adhere to.

Bruce, I value the leadership role you have taken on this, and other important national issues before our Committee. I pledge to continue to work in close consultation with you and other members of the Committee to further our effectiveness in meeting our responsibilities as elected representatives of the people.

Sincerely,

MORRIS K. UDALL,
Chairman. ●

WASHINGTON STATE CONTROLS HOSPITAL COSTS

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, in light of growing concern over escalating hospital costs and the President's commitment to hospital cost containment, a refreshing example of achieving the goal without Government action can be found in Washington State where the hospital commission has succeeded in keeping the increase rate down to 9 percent. These adjustments are below both the recently stated target of 9.7 percent set by HEW Secretary Califano and the voluntary effort program of the American Hospital Association, American Medical Association, and Federation of American Hospitals.

The Washington State Hospital Commission based its report on the approved budgets of 52 percent (60) hospitals in the State. In total, the commission approved average increases of 6.4 percent in total costs per patient per day; for the 60 hospitals approved rates will average \$260.03 per patient day, up \$15.74 from the 1978 average of \$244.29. With an average hospital stay of 5.4 days, total costs per stay will average \$1,404, an increase of \$85 over the 1978 average of \$1,319 per hospital stay.

Residents in Washington State in 1978 paid about \$99 less than the national average for the average stay in a hospital and in 1979, they will pay \$170 less than the national average. This effort is a tribute to the effectiveness of a voluntary, State-regulated system of controls and certainly to the individual hospitals across the State. While Washington State has displayed leadership and restraint in controlling rapidly rising hospital costs, most other States are still struggling in this area. They would do well to heed the example of the Washington State Hospital Commission and the Washington State Hospital Association, thus precluding the necessity for Federal intervention in this area. I salute their major efforts and success in controlling hospital costs. ●

REACQUISITION OF CITIZENSHIP

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a bill introduced during the 95th Congress to simplify the procedure by which U.S. citizens who lose their U.S. citizenship may regain it.

At present, there is no special procedure for such persons. Instead, former U.S. citizens must go through the same immigration and naturalization process as all other aliens. They first have to secure an immigrant visa and then wait 5 years before citizenship is restored.

Approximately 15,000 persons lost their citizenship between 1966 and 1977; about one-third of these did so in connection with the Vietnam war. Since most Americans now recognize that the nature of our involvement in Indochina was a mistake, we should no longer penalize those who renounced their citizenship in a painful act of conscience because of their opposition to the war.

Other former citizens who often wish to return to the United States are those who gave up their citizenship to marry a native of another country, and later find their circumstances changed because of divorce or death of their spouse.

Many other countries place former citizens in a different category from those who are seeking citizenship for the first time. Several countries, including Ireland, require only an application to the appropriate ministry for full reinstatement of citizenship. Scandinavia and several Latin American nations require an application and 2 years' residence.

The benefits of this bill and this procedure would not, however, be available to persons who lost their citizenship through denaturalization.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to establish an additional procedure for the reacquisition of United States citizenship by former United States citizens

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 324 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1435) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any individual who is not less than 18 years of age, who is certified by the Secretary of State as a former citizen of the United States, and who renounced or otherwise lost his or her United States citizenship (other than pursuant to any proceeding under section 340 of this Act) may reacquire such citizenship—

"(A) by submitting an application to reacquire such citizenship—

"(i) if such individual is abroad, to a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States, or

"(ii) if such individual is in the United States, to a judge or clerk of a naturalization court;

"(B) by submitting with such application an affidavit declaring allegiance to the United States and, if such individual is abroad, the intent to begin residency in the United States within 6 months after such citizenship is reacquired; and

"(C) by paying a reasonable fee to cover the administrative expenses of carrying out this subsection with respect to such individual.

The Secretary of State shall, within the 6-month period beginning on the date such application is submitted under subparagraph (A), certify whether such individual was at any time a citizen of the United States.

"(2) Beginning on the date an individual reacquires United States citizenship under this subsection, such individual shall have the status of a native-born or naturalized citizen of the United States, whichever status such individual had before renouncing or otherwise losing such citizenship. Such status shall not apply retroactively to any period during which such individual was not a citizen of the United States." ●

CHINA TIES: WHAT ABOUT HUMAN RIGHTS?

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article by John Lofton, Jr., which concerns President Carter's decision to recognize the People's Republic of China. I share Mr. Lofton's conclusion that the recognition of China is another in a series of actions which undermines the President's oft-repeated goal to forge a foreign policy around a "human rights" doctrine. The recognition of a regime which has, as Mr. Lofton reports, killed between 34 to 64 million of its own citizens has serious implications for the credibility of this country's efforts to encourage respect for human rights around the world.

The article follows:

CHINA TIES: WHAT ABOUT HUMAN RIGHTS? (By John Lofton, Jr.)

A week before he "normalized" relations with Communist China, President Carter told a group of religious and civil rights leaders that "human rights is the soul of our foreign policy." Speaking at the White House in a ceremony marking the 30th anniversary of the passage of the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, Carter vowed:

"Our human rights policy is not a decoration. It is not something we have adopted to polish up our image abroad, or to put a fresh coat or moral paint on the discredited policies of the past. Toward regimes which persist in the wholesale violations of human rights, we will not hesitate to convey our outrage—nor will we pretend that our relations are unaffected."

Now, if ever there was a nation where it could fairly be said that human rights have been violated on a wholesale basis, it is Communist China.

According to Richard L. Walker, professor of international relations at the University of South Carolina, the government of Communist China has killed anywhere from 34 million to 64 million human beings. This total is arrived at by adding together the number of individuals who died during China's first civil war (1927-36); the Sino-Japanese War (1937-45); the second civil war (1945-49); land reform prior to "liberation"; various political liquidation campaigns (1949-53); the Korean War; the "Great Leap Forward" and the Communes; struggles with

minority nationalities, including Tibet; the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" and its aftermath; and in forced labor camps and frontier development.

In a 1971 study for the Senate subcommittee on internal security, Walker wrote:

"The Communist movement in China, despite its proclaimed high ideals, must be judged on performance, and, as regards the human equation, there is little to commend it. Those who wish to rationalize public assassinations, purges of classes and groups or slave labor as a necessary expedient for China's progress are resorting to the same logic which justified a Hitler and his methods for dealing with economic depression in the Third Reich. . . .

"It is my considered judgment, after following Communist China closely for more than two decades, that the cost of progress achieved under Communist rule is too high for the conscience of the world to absolve its perpetrators. In terms of human life and human suffering and in terms of destruction of moral and cultural values, this cost cannot be condoned by any rationalization. The high Chinese Communist Party leaders who sit down at convivial banquets with visiting Americans may be guilty of as great crimes against humanity and their own people as were Hitler and Stalin and their followers."

Just last month, Amnesty International issued a 176-page report that documents Communist China's constitutional, legal and penal systems under which suspected political dissenters are detained, interrogated, tried and punished without access to fair trials and without safeguards against maltreatment during detention.

The report criticized the Chinese legal system, under which certain categories of people, defined as "class enemies," can be deprived of political and civil rights solely on the basis of "class origin" or political background. AI notes:

"The continuous 'mass mobilization campaigns' since the early 1950s have been used to identify people dissenting from official policy. These campaigns have broadened the range of political offenses to the extent that each of them has defined new types of offenders according to the politics of the period."

AI also voices concern that under Chinese Communist law pretrial detention is unlimited and a trial does not normally begin until the accused has "confessed" in writing. The accused is usually tried in secret or by "mass public trials" where no defense is possible, AI says, with the trial being "a mere formality; rather than 'trials,' they are, in fact, meetings to announce the sentence." Punishment ranges from imprisonment to execution.

So, with that clear record, the question naturally arises: Was human rights one of the things upon which President Carter made his "normalization" of relations with Communist China contingent? The answer is no. In fact, during these particular negotiations, the Carter administration did not mention human rights at all. In an interview, Jack Gordon, public affairs director of the State Department's Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, told me:

"No, human rights was not a focus of these particular negotiations. Human rights was not a cornerstone of these negotiations." When I asked, Was it any of the stones at all? Gordon replied: "No, no, no," observing: "We're hopeful however that they will cut down on human rights abuses in their country. Human rights is a deep and fundamental aspect of our foreign policy."

AFL-CIO President George Meany has sharply criticized the way in which Jimmy Carter has chosen to recognize Red China, noting: "What we cannot understand is how this president, who made human rights a

world issue, could so suddenly and callously reject the human rights concerns of both those enslaved in mainland China and those on Taiwan who fear such enslavement."

A good question. ●

NURSE TRAINING AMENDMENTS OF 1979

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to extend Federal support for nurse training programs for 2 fiscal years. In addition, this bill would require a study of our Nation's nursing needs, authorize funds for the training of nurse anesthetists, and make minor amendments to health manpower legislation. Except for the slightly reduced authorization levels in this bill, its provisions are essentially the same as those in the Nurse Training Amendments of 1978. As you know, that measure was passed overwhelmingly by the House and Senate last year, and was later pocket-vetoed by the President on November 10, 1978. As a result, nurse training programs are now being funded through fiscal year 1979 under a continuing resolution adopted at the end of the 95th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as ranking minority member of the Health and Environment Subcommittee which wrote the original Nurse Training Act and recently reviewed its authorities, I believe that continued Federal support for nursing education programs is necessary. Any substantial reduction in Federal funding would have a severe, adverse effect on the quality and availability of nurse training programs. Moreover, without adequate student financial assistance through nursing scholarships, traineeships, and loans, many students—particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds—would find it very difficult to enter nurse training programs.

Recently, there has been a great deal of debate regarding the Nation's supply of nurses both now and in the future. Personally, I have never found there to be a surplus of nurses, especially not in rural areas such as the district I represent in Kentucky. Yet, even in certain large urban areas demand for nurses frequently exceeds supply, as in the Chicago area where 2,000 unfilled nursing positions were reported last year, according to testimony before our subcommittee. Moreover, according to a May 1978 Congressional Budget Office report "[t]he geographic distribution of nurses remains uneven." In addition to the geographic maldistribution of nurses, other surveys report a lack of nurses with advanced training to fill administrative, clinical, and faculty positions. Nevertheless, a clear consensus about our Nation's nursing needs has not emerged.

I believe the study required by this legislation will provide a definitive assessment of the need for continued Federal

financial support for nursing education, and will be of great value to the Congress in making decisions about the future role of Federal support in this area.

Mr. Speaker, in drawing up this legislation, I have kept in mind the budgetary concerns of the administration and the Congress; and after consultation with nursing representatives, I have reduced the authorizations as far as practicable. The total authorization for 2 fiscal years in this new proposal is \$364 million in contrast to \$417 million in last year's nurse training legislation which was overwhelmingly approved by the Congress. A breakdown of the specific authorizations in my bill appears below. If, after reviewing the legislation, my colleagues would like to join in cosponsoring this proposal, I would welcome their support. I look forward to working closely with Chairman WAXMAN and the other members of our panel to report nurse training legislation as soon as possible.

Nurse training amendments of 1979
[In millions]

	1980	1981
Capitation	\$45	\$45
Advanced nurse training.....	21	21
Nurse practitioner training.....	20	20
Special projects.....	20	20
Financial distress.....	0	0
Construction	20	20
Interest subsidies.....	1	1
Loans	30	30
Loan repayment ¹		
Scholarships ¹		
Traineeships	23	23
Nurse anesthetists		
traineeships	2	2
Total	182	182

¹ No line item.
Total 2-year authorization: \$364,000,000.
Vetoed 1978 Nurse Training Amendments: \$417,000,000.
Continuing resolution for fiscal year 1979: \$119,500,000.
Fiscal year 1980 budget: \$14,700,000.●

OUTSTANDING YOUNG PEOPLE

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize several outstanding young people from the Fifth Congressional District of Mississippi. Rebecca Bea Dana and Robert Lammarr Mangum of Biloxi, Cheshire E. I'Anson and William S. Wedgeworth of Long Beach, Candance Ivy McCoy and Kim Marie Frierson of Vancleave, and Thomas Weaver Griffin of Hattiesburg, who are here in Washington this week to participate in the 1979 Presidential Classroom for Young Americans.

I always enjoy discussing the operations of our Federal Government with the Presidential Classroom students and commend these young Americans for their interest and attitude toward our Nation's destiny.●

DAVID AND JOYCE SOUTH: LAWNDALE MAN AND WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Anthony and Cleopatra, Bogart and Bacall, Eleanor and Franklin—each of these three couples had one thing in common—they were all—for various reasons—famous husband and wife teams.

I would like to take just a few minutes to bring to my colleagues' attention, another husband and wife team who although, not as famous, certainly typify all that is best about community life in the United States.

David and Joyce South have been selected as the Man and Woman of the Year for the city of Lawndale, Calif., which I represent. For the past 6 or 7 years, Lawndale has chosen two people who have devoted a great deal of their personal time and effort to various community projects. It may come as a surprise to the more cynical in our society—but the city of Lawndale is fortunate since they have quite a few people who are willing to volunteer. So, the competition for this award is stiff and being selected as a recipient is definitely an honor.

When I received the list of accomplishments for David and Joyce South from the Lawndale Awards Committee, I was frankly surprised to read the lists were only highlights of some of the things they have done for the community. The list is very extensive and it is amazing that two people could find so much time.

Mrs. South has been very involved in community drives including the American Cancer Society, March of Dimes, and Muscular Dystrophy. Mr. South has served as vice-chairman for the Lawndale cleanup week, and as a member of the South Bay react radio emergency team.

Both have been extremely active in programs for young people. Each have been active on the special Youth Day Parade Committee with Joyce serving as both a cochairman and chairman.

David and Joyce have both been members of the local PTA's since 1963; board members and presidents of the Lawndale Little League; and scout leaders. And, if present organizations were not enough, Joyce South organized the Lawndale Athletic Association in 1969, an organization that both she and her husband served as president. In addition, she organized the Lawndale All City Band and the Stan Nichol Golf Tournament.

Even though David and Joyce have three children of their own, they also hosted a Japanese exchange student during the 1975 school year, and for 2 years, David South had a group of underprivileged children in his home for the Christmas season.

One program that would not be the same without them is the Santa's Sleigh sponsored each year by the Lawndale

Chamber of Commerce and the South Bay 25 Club. Without even stopping to eat their own dinner, both go straight from work to make sure that children in Lawndale and in two areas of Los Angeles get to meet Santa Claus. The scope of the project is even greater when you realize that approximately 7,000 suckers get distributed. I would suggest that if anyone does not know the true meaning of Christmas, they should contact David and Joyce.

Any child who has come in contact with the two of them could certainly attest to what outstanding community servants they are and how much they have helped so many lives. Working with youth is an investment in the future and I am sure that the investment from David and Joyce South has been more than worthwhile.

It is always a privilege for me to recognize the recipients of the Lawndale Man and Woman of the Year Awards and bring some of their accomplishments to the attention of the Congress. The contributions made by Mr. and Mrs. South deserve more than just recognition, however; they deserve a heartfelt thanks. The city of Lawndale is a better place to live because people like David and Joyce live there and work hard to make it that way.

As the U.S. Representative for the city of Lawndale, I would like to add my own congratulations to this fine couple and wish them continued success and good fortune in the future.●

LIAISON OFFICE FOR THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert a letter that all Members of the House and Senate have received. The purpose of placing it into the RECORD is to emphasize my support for the establishment of a U.S. Government liaison office for the Republic of China, and so that readers of the RECORD across the country will become aware of the view expressed by missionaries working on the island of Taiwan. The letter follows:

MARYKNOLL FATHERS,
Taichung, Taiwan, January 22, 1979.

DEAR SIR: I am writing on behalf of the Maryknoll, Taiwan Region (Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America) that consists of 45 Priests and Brothers living in Taiwan.

We are writing to urge your support in Congress for establishing an official government agency as the vehicle for future relations between America and Taiwan, and to urge that you oppose the creation of a non-governmental institution for this purpose. In particular, we urge your strong support for an official U.S. government liaison in Taiwan, similar to the one which existed in Peking prior to January 1, 1979. The fact that such government-to-government contact existed with Peking while America had full diplomatic relations with Taiwan has ample precedent for establishing such an office in Taiwan, now that we have full diplomatic relations with Peking.

Since America has no reason for not having a liaison office in Taiwan except that the Peking Government would "prefer" something of less stature, it becomes a matter of honor and international prestige for America to have one. The level of America's credibility in many parts of the world will be affected by her final decision on this matter.

Only a government liaison office can give credibility to the administration's claims that America intends to continue, as before, all relationships with the 17 million people of Taiwan, except that of full diplomatic recognition.

We urge during these coming weeks, that you strongly support such a liaison office and that you adamantly oppose the administration's proposal of a private institution becoming the symbol of America's interest in, and relationship with, the 17 million people of Taiwan.

We extend our sincere personal regards and our prayers and wishes for your important work in Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. KENNEDY, M.M.,
Regional Superior.●

PERSPECTIVES ON AMERICAN-CHINESE RELATIONS

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress begins the difficult tasks of assessing the impact of normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China and charting a path that will provide increased trade and friendship between our Nation and China, we would be wise to reflect on the history of this major diplomatic measure.

Certain basic principles must guide the ship of state as it travels the uncertain waters of international relations. Chief among those principles are the concerns for improved security and more prosperous trade.

The People's Republic of China is the world's most populous country. Its armies and armaments are massive, yet it is a nation that now seeks much outside assistance in major modernization efforts. As we welcome Vice Premier Teng to our country and begin to fully understand the meaning of normalization, it is not too much to ask that we remember the basic principles of diplomacy and how they apply to our relations with the People's Republic of China.

A recent editorial in the Brockport, N.Y. Post succinctly outlined those principles and their application to this complex and most important situation. I offer it to my colleagues in response to their growing interest in American-Chinese relations:

TAIWAN

How to gauge the "rightness" or "wrongness" of President Carter's decision to grant diplomatic recognition to the People's Republic of China and to drop official ties with Taiwan?

The articles by Charles L. Rumrill which will run on this page for the next few weeks will give the insights of a perceptive local observer who has spent considerable time in Taiwan.

As he says, the situation is more complicated than it might seem to a casual observer.

No one can pretend to any great insights (least of all a small town editor), yet it should be obvious that Taiwan itself, possibly unfortunately, can be only a small factor in American foreign policy.

Let's go back a little.

What should be the goals of American foreign policy and what should motivate it?

Stating the obvious—

1. America's security should be protected, and Americans should have reasonable right to travel, study, do business or whatever in most of the world without undue hindrance—so long as they do not injure host countries.

2. The United States should try to insure that major power blocs are not created in the Western Hemisphere which could injure our nation.

3. To the extent possible and recognizing our limitations, we would like to help insure decent, democratic governments and adequate economies throughout the world. There is perhaps a measure of self-protection and self-interest in this.

4. Special links of our peoples to other nations and regions (Europe, Israel, and latterly parts of Africa) are recognized, and draw our sympathies and aid.

Not much mention of ideology in such a listing.

To go on.

For much of this century, the United States felt that goals such as the above could be attained through Western democratic alliances.

This policy was most visible in World War 1, World War 2, and in the effort to contain the expansive Russian Communists after World War 2.

All this came to disaster in Vietnam. An isolated America, more or less deserted by its Western democratic allies, found itself trying to contain what many viewed as additional Communist expansionism.

And as the "containment" policy was proving militarily unworkable, it became apparent to many policy planners that Western democratic alliances were of limited value.

All this coincided with the rise of the Chinese republic.

Both Russia and China, actually or potentially, had the masses and ability to control the Eurasian land mass—the world's principal island.

Americans, through the oil crisis and many other factors, were coming to realize that they could not flatly dominate world policy. They also live on a much smaller "island."

The proper route, many now began to think, was to develop a balance of power role, playing Russians against Chinese.

Richard Nixon saw this, and used it to end the Vietnam fiasco.

To make the policy fully operative, however, the United States had to develop closer relations with China. This meant diplomatic recognition, and that, in turn, meant lessening the ties to Taiwan.

Not a very palatable decision to many, but who has a better world strategy for our country?●

THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, since 1973 when the Navy left Newport, the

economy of Rhode Island has been struggling. The bill which I am introducing today would assist States and communities in a similar situation to avoid the economic turmoil which Rhode Island has experienced.

When the Federal Government closes facilities upon which the economy of an area is dependent, it has an obligation to do whatever possible to assure that the area finds some other economic base. One way in which this can be achieved is to make surplus Federal property available to the State or some agent of the State at less than fair market value, in order that this property can be used for economic development purposes.

It is crucial that such a transfer take place as expeditiously as possible, in order to minimize the deleterious effects of the removal of Federal facilities. The bill I am introducing requires that the prospective purchaser submit an economic development plan subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce and provides that if, over a period of at least 20 years, the property is not used for the purposes it was conveyed, the property will revert to the United States.

This legislation addresses an urgent need for many parts of the country which have already been harmed by a pullout of Federal facilities and will provide a cushion for other areas which may experience a similar event in the future.●

SOME REFLECTIONS ON AMERICAN POLITICS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report for January 31, 1979, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SOME REFLECTIONS ON AMERICAN POLITICS

The period from the inauguration of President Kennedy to the present has been a turbulent one in American politics. It has seen one President assassinated, another driven from office, riots in the cities, unrest on the campuses, the Vietnam War, the Great Society, the ups and downs of the economy, the civil rights, women's, and environmental movements, and a host of foreign policy problems from the Cuban missile crisis to the recognition of China. These events and others have had a profound impact on the American political system. After such momentous years it might be helpful to identify the circumstances which are shaping American politics today. Among these circumstances I would emphasize several.

First, the authority of the Presidency has eroded. Most of us today look upon the Presidency with more doubt than trust. We once believed that if a President wanted something, he ought to have it. He was, after all, the President. Nowadays our attitude seems to be that if a President wants something, we had better examine it very closely. The result of this erosion of authority is that any President is handicapped, if not incapacitated, in his efforts to fulfill the expectations of the American people. I myself think that we have carried our skepticism of the

Presidency too far, and that we must re-establish a strong Presidency as the best means of pulling together the diverse strands of our national life.

Second, the Congress has reasserted its constitutional prerogatives and has become more independent of the Presidency. The Congress is now a force to be reckoned with (especially when it is intent on frustrating a President's legislative program), but it is still not the dominant branch of government. There is no "Imperial Congress" to replace the "Imperial Presidency" of the past decade. The reason is that members of Congress are individualistic in outlook and responsive to their own constituencies. Recent congressional reforms have disbursed legislative power widely among members. The diversity and independence of matters and the fragmentation of power make party leaders strain to form even the most uneasy consensus. The Congress is, in short, a remarkably representative and democratic institution.

Third, the influence of political parties has declined, especially in connection with the nomination and election of Presidents. The parties have not disappeared altogether, but despite major reforms they command less loyalty from the voters. There is much less voting of straight party tickets. Although the parties may still give guidance to a large number of voters, the average voter is only loosely affiliated with a party when he identifies himself with one.

Fourth, the private special interest group, long a feature on the American scene, has gained a new voice in politics. There are currently 1,100 such groups registered with the Congress. In addition, many highly knowledgeable people in the federal bureaucracy, on congressional staffs, and under contract to the government are in a position to make their mark on policy. The problem with special interest groups and government experts is their frequent reluctance to compromise on their issue even when the common good would be served by compromise.

Fifth, several views prevalent among Americans today are changing the course of politics. One is the view that the level of taxation is high enough, perhaps too high, and that additional taxation is simply unacceptable. Another view is that the government does not have solutions to all the problems on the national agenda, that there are limits to what the government can do, and that more government is not necessarily better. Yet another view is that the government does not work well, and that there is too much bureaucracy, too much regulation, too much paperwork, and too few incentives for good performance.

One final circumstance is having a far-reaching effect on American politics today: inflation. Inflation has been assigned the highest priority among problems on the national agenda, and the people have made their feelings about it very clear. They know that inflation must be controlled before other worthy goals can be reached.

These are the central realities of American politics, at least as I see them. They will put their stamp on our political system and its products for years to come. They show us that it is time for the government to pause and set aside its old habit of throwing money at problems. They show us that it is time for consolidation and restraint, not innovation and experiment.

(This newsletter was prompted by a book entitled *The New American Political System*, published by the American Enterprise Institute, and a recent speech by Mr. Stuart Elzenstat, the Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs and Policy.) ●

NATIONAL DIGESTIVE DISEASES PREVENTION, CURE, AND CONTROL ACT

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, today the National Commission on Digestive Diseases presented Congress with a long-range plan to organize and strengthen our national resources to improve the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of disorders of the digestive tract. These diseases, known collectively as digestive diseases affect 20 million Americans and represent the third largest component of the total economic burden of illness in the United States. As for incidence, more Americans are hospitalized because of diseases of the stomach, intestines, liver, pancreas, and other parts of the gastrointestinal tract than because of any other group of disorders. Moreover, it is estimated that 190,000 Americans die each year from digestive diseases ranging from gallstones to cirrhosis of the liver.

Today I am introducing legislation to carry out three key recommendations of the National Commission on Digestive Diseases which was created by Congress in 1976 under Public Law 94-562. The other major recommendations can be implemented through appropriation and executive actions. More specifically, my bill would:

First. Establish a National Digestive Diseases Education and Information Clearinghouse to serve as an information resource for the public as well as health professionals with respect to these diseases;

Second. Establish a National Digestive Diseases Advisory Board to oversee implementation of the Commission's long-range plan; and

Third. Authorize a grant program through the National Institute for Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases to strengthen medical education in digestive diseases.

Total 3-year authorization: \$5.665 million.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of this new legislation would fulfill the national commitment Congress made to combat these diseases when it enacted Public Law 94-562 in 1976. I hope that the 96th Congress will support this bill with the funding necessary to carry out that commitment. To do so would improve the health of millions of Americans, help moderate our rising health-care costs, and most important, lead to significant advances in preventing these afflictions.

I am enclosing the text of the legislation for consideration by my distinguished colleagues:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a clearinghouse for information respecting digestive diseases, to authorize grants to strengthen educational programs in digestive diseases in medical schools, and to establish the National Digestive Diseases Advisory Board

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Digestive Diseases Prevention, Cure and Control Act".

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that:

(1) digestive diseases (A) are an extremely serious and important category of illness in the United States, (B) are the major reason for and the leading cause of major surgery in the United States, (C) are the cause of chronic illness in 20 million Americans, 14 million of whom have episodes of acute illness annually, (D) are the cause of almost 20,000 deaths each year in the United States, and (E) are the second most common reason for disability in American workers;

(2) digestive diseases are the cause of one-tenth of the total economic burden of illness in our country;

(3) inadequate levels of public awareness of the importance of digestive diseases to our society are coupled with inadequate efforts and expenditures on public information and a low level of support for research in digestive diseases; and

(4) a major improvement in the health of persons with digestive diseases, and important advances in the prevention of such diseases, could occur through intensified and improved efforts in the education of the public and professionals about digestive diseases, through better use of current resources and procedures involved in the diagnosis of those illnesses, through translating existing medical information into more effective treatment, through greater support of ongoing clinical programs in federally-supported hospitals, through the augmentation of current research efforts including both basic and applied clinical investigations, and through expanded research, education, and more intense study of currently neglected areas such as epidemiology and the exploration of the environmental, emotional, and nutritional causes of digestive diseases.

SEC. 3. Part D of title IV of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

"NATIONAL DIGESTIVE DISEASES EDUCATION AND INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSE

"SEC. 440B. The Secretary shall establish a National Digestive Diseases Education and Information Clearinghouse to identify, collect, analyze, and disseminate information respecting digestive diseases and to serve as a national educational resource for patients with digestive diseases and their families, physicians, and allied health professionals. For the establishment and operation of the Clearinghouse there are authorized to be appropriated \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, \$1,150,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and \$1,250,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981.

"EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS IN DIGESTIVE DISEASES

"SEC. 440C. The Secretary, acting through the Institute and after consultation with the National Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases Advisory Council, shall make grants to schools of medicine to strengthen their education and training programs in the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of digestive diseases. For grants under this section there are authorized to be appropriated \$360,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, \$450,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and \$555,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981."

SEC. 4. Part D of title IV of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding after the section added by section 3 of this Act the following new section:

"NATIONAL DIGESTIVE DISEASES ADVISORY BOARD"

"SEC. 440D. (a) The Secretary shall establish a National Digestive Diseases Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board') to be composed of 24 members as follows:

"(1) Eight members shall be appointed by the Secretary from individuals who are scientists, physicians, and other health professionals, who are not employed by the Federal Government, and who represent the specialties and disciplines relevant to digestive diseases.

"(2) Two members shall be appointed by the Secretary from individuals with an interest in digestive diseases and who, as a group, have knowledge and experience in the fields of medical education, health education, and public information and who are not employed by the Federal Government.

"(3) One member shall be appointed by the Secretary from individuals who are members of the National Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases Advisory Council and who are experts in the field of digestive diseases.

"(4) Five members shall be appointed by the Secretary from the general public. At least three of such members shall be persons who have experienced significant personal or family involvement with digestive diseases.

"(5) The following shall be ex officio members: The Assistant Secretary for Health or his designee, the Director of the National Institutes of Health or his designee, the Director of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases, the Director of the Division of Digestive Diseases of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases, the Director of the National Cancer Institute or his designee, the Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases or his designee, the Director of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism or his designee, and the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration or his designee.

"(b) The members of the Board shall select a chairperson from among the appointed members.

"(c) The Secretary shall, after consultation with and consideration of the recommendations of the Board, provide the Board with (1) an Executive Secretary and two clerical staff members and (2) such administrative support services and facilities, such information, and such services of consultants, as the Secretary determines are necessary for the Board to carry out its functions.

"(d) Members of the Board who are not employees of the Federal Government shall receive compensation at rates not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate in effect for grade GS-18 of the General Schedule for each day including traveltime they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Board. While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Board, members shall be allowed travel expenses including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code.

"(e) The appointed members of the Board shall be appointed to serve until the expiration of the Board (as provided in subsection (h)).

"(f) The Board shall:

"(1) review, evaluate, and advise on the coordination of Federal agencies' efforts in digestive diseases in the implementation of the long-range plan of the National Commission on Digestive Diseases under section 301(g)(2) of the Arthritis, Diabetes, and Digestive Disease Amendments of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 289a note);

"(2) maintain liaison with other advisory

bodies related to Federal agencies, involved in the implementation of such long-range plan, the Coordinating Committee for Digestive Diseases, and with key non-Federal bodies involved in activities affecting the control of digestive diseases;

"(3) develop recommendations for the implementation of such long-range plan;

"(4) hold regular quarterly meetings and provide an annual report to the Secretary and to the Congress dealing with the progress of such long-range plan, including a summary and analysis of expenditures and implementation by the Federal Government of such plan.

In carrying out its duties the Board may appoint subcommittees, appoint consultants, convene workshops and conferences, and collect data.

"(g) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this section \$300,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, \$300,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and \$300,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981.

"(h) The Board shall expire on September 30, 1982." ●

**ERNEST C. WULLBRANDT NAMED
'1978 CARPINTERIAN OF THE
YEAR'**

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I submit to you the name of Ernest C. Wullbrandt who was recently selected "1978 Carpinterian of the Year" by the Carpinteria Valley Chamber of Commerce.

Ernie Wullbrandt has earned this honored title by serving his community over a span of many years. His is an impressive record of public service, from the local community as mayor, to the national community as a member of the U.S. Navy. A city councilman since the formation of the city, he has twice been chosen as mayor, the office he currently holds. A volunteer fireman, boys club director, Explorer Scout leader, VFW and GI forum, and special deputy sheriff are other community offices held by Ernie.

He further served the County of Santa Barbara on the local agency formation commission, the area planning council, the Carpinteria-Summerland General Plan Advisory Committee, the SCOTS Advisory Committee, and the air quality advisory board. On the tri-county level Ernie served as a member of the regional coastal commission, having served as chairman. Further, he has presided over the California League of Cities as president of the organization.

Ernie recognizes the special needs of senior citizens and has worked toward the betterment of their welfare. He can always be seen on official holidays putting out the American flag on the city streets. Ernie is a regular contributor to the blood bank. He gives of his time and support to the Carpinteria High School football team by filming the games at his own expense.

Ernie Wullbrandt's total commitment to his country by personal dedication to his own community is worthy of the

special recognition bestowed upon him by the city of Carpinteria. ●

**NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL
FOUNDATION**

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, 1979, I introduced H.R. 806, to establish a National Zoological Foundation. This is the same bill which I introduced on March 3, 1978, as H.R. 11295. The National Zoological Foundation would be empowered, among other things, to: Award scholarships and fellowships for the training of professional and paraprofessional staff for zoos and aquariums; initiate and support programs to promote the developments of methods to improve the welfare of animals at zoos and aquariums; establish recommended standards of accreditation; make grants for pilot projects to serve as models for zoos or aquariums; make grants for the purpose of establishing survival centers for the captive breeding and preservation of endangered species; and support new programs to enhance the educational and scientific value of zoos and aquariums.

There is a precedent for providing such funds for zoos and aquariums, since the recently established Institute of Museum Services, operating within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has a limited amount of money for this purpose. However, the maximum grant available from the Institute would be \$25,000, and it would be for operating expenses only; this is completely inadequate for the kinds of programs that zoos and aquariums need to develop. It seems to me that zoos and aquariums should be funded under a separate program entirely, and this is one of the reasons for my introducing H.R. 806.

In the 91st Congress, we passed the Animal Welfare Act of 1970, which gives the Department of Agriculture the responsibility for insuring that at least minimum standards of housing, feeding, and care are met by zoos. This is fine as far as it goes. However, zoos and aquariums are, or should be, far more than simply places where animals are housed and fed.

As our society becomes ever more urbanized and crowded, zoos and aquariums will provide the only available exposure to the world of nature for increasing numbers of children and their parents. The hundreds of thousands of citizens who visit these facilities every day across the country make it clear that people enjoy being able to see a wide range of animals. However, while one function of zoos and aquariums is of course to provide visitors with a means of enjoyment and recreation, their major purpose is conservation and education. Thus zoos should be much more than prisons of concrete and steel that most have been in the past and some still are; they must attempt to provide facilities that are appropriately similar

to the natural habitats of the animals. The sad thing is that while many other cultural, scientific, and educational facilities are able to obtain considerable Federal assistance in recognition of their value to the people, zoos and aquariums must in large measure continue to struggle to meet their conservation and education responsibilities entirely on their own. This is an uphill battle indeed.

There are many people who feel that zoos should be phased out, that television can somehow replace them, and that all the animals should be set free. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a number of articles on this subject that have appeared over the years. Space does not permit them to be reprinted here, copies can be obtained from the Library of Congress for anyone who wishes to read them. One, entitled "Why Zoos?" was written by Emily Hahn and appeared in the February 25, 1975, issue of the New York Times magazine. Another appeared in the April 17, 1975, edition of the Washington Post. Entitled "National Zoo Has a Farm Club," it was written by Robert Barkdoll; it was reprinted in the RECORD on page E1834 in the April 18, 1975, issue. Many of the animals now found in zoos either no longer exist at all in the wild or will be gone within the next generation, and thus the zoos are their last, and indeed only, refuge. On page 17096 of the May 30, 1974, RECORD, I included a fine article from the Christian Science Monitor by Frederic Hunter which further reinforces my contention that zoos and aquariums must be upgraded. Another of my RECORD statements, on page E1848 of the April 12, 1978, issue, provides additional information in this regard.

One of the finest books on the subject of zoos in recent years is "Lifeboats to Ararat," by Sheldon Campbell. It was published by Times Books in 1978, and I commend it enthusiastically to the attention of my colleagues. Sometimes deeply serious, sometimes hilariously funny, it is a book that I hope will receive a wide reading. Permit me to insert Mr. Campbell's preface at this point:

Zoos are among mankind's oldest institutions, dating back at least 4,500 years, and probably more. Across the world they have brought together and displayed live wild animals for people to look at and over the years hundreds of millions have. Any institution with so long a history and so universally attended must reach something in people deeper than idle curiosity. Since it is fashionable to speak of roots today, it might be suggested that zoos allow us to stay in touch with our most primitive roots in a primeval world where human survival depended on knowing the shapes and habits of wild animals. So important were wild creatures to our distant ancestors that they were the most frequent subjects of paintings on cave walls, formed the basis for virtually all early religions, and were in numerous instances worshiped as gods.

Now our survival is threatened more by what we ourselves have wrought, and by the stresses of living among these creations, than it is by wild animals to whom we relegate less and less living space with each passing year. In this world the need for good zoological gardens is urgent. The exponential growth of human population and the ever-increasing sprawl of cities does more than rob land from wildlife: it pushes the animals farther away from city dwellers. People live

in brick, concrete, and glass environments where they lose all touch with wilderness; children grow up who have never tried to catch a frog, never seen a hawk soar or a deer step daintily into a forest clearing—let alone watched a herd of elephants amble across the savannah or a pride of lions stalk prey.

People who have the time and money can take an occasional trip to the remaining wilderness and find, in places where wild animals still live, the renewal of spirit that comes from prolonged visits to wild country. For millions of others who are unable to leave the cities or can't afford to, good zoos laid out among plants and trees can bring what conservationist Ian Player calls "a taste of wilderness." Perhaps more important in the long run, zoos can help give deprived people an awareness that we share the world with many other animals and should have a decent regard for their worth and right to live. If zoos did no more than accomplish these two ends, they would serve a noble purpose.

As it happens, however, today's zoos can do far more. They can become breeding centers for those wild species whose continued existence has become precarious. The term "captive breeding" has been used to describe this new role of zoos, and this book describes the effort—the most important task that zoos have yet undertaken.

Behind the stories of zoos and captive breeding lies the assumption that we who are lords of the earth and challenge the heavens must do all in our power to keep our fellow creatures alive on this planet—for it may be our last chance. Arguments for saving wild animals from extinction can be set forth at great length. In short, they go something like this: First, whenever we humans cause a sharp decline in any wild animal population, we may be doing something to the environment that also threatens us. Second, life on a barren planet largely denuded of wildlife would be worse than dreadful; it would very likely cause irreparable damage to the human psyche. Third, our willful destruction of animal species is immoral—unless we accept the Hobbesian notion that the true state of nature is one of general war in which the possession of power, and that alone, determines what is right or wrong. Finally, though, the arguments vanish and we are left with intuition. In the words of Henry David Thoreau, "Every creature is better alive than dead, men and moose and pine trees, and he who understands it aright will rather preserve its life than destroy it."

All this may sound quite stuffy and serious, or even worse, philosophical. Fortunately, much of what goes on in zoos is funny, at least in retrospect, and for those who feel as I do that the world has enough sadness, any vein of humor is worth mining. I have, I hope, mined a rich lode here.

One should always write about what one knows best; so much of the material in this book is drawn from my forty-three years of intimate experience with the San Diego Zoo and later, the San Diego Wild Animal Park. Because these two institutions get frequent mention I should differentiate them. Both are managed by the nonprofit Zoological Society of San Diego (of which I am one of twelve trustees). The zoo, set on nearly 100 wooded acres of Balboa Park in the heart of San Diego, was founded in 1916. The Wild Animal Park, opened in 1972, is a breeding reserve open to the public that is situated on 1,800 acres of foothills along the San Pasqual Valley some thirty miles north of San Diego. The zoo's exhibits are built on traditional lines, with extensive use of open moated enclosures. The Park on the other hand emphasizes open space, with enclosures that average 80 acres each where animals live in mixed groups as they would in the wild (except for their natural predators).

Visitors walk or ride buses around the zoo, but see the Park from a ground monorail that travels for five miles among the exhibits.

There are many fine zoos in the world, and a few other wild animal parks. Each has as much to offer in the way of anecdotes and stories as the ones I know best. Some (and I could wish more) that appear in this book I gathered in trips to many of the world's zoos, quite a few of which are moving seriously into the exciting realm of captive breeding.

Let no one think this book is an apology for zoos. For every good zoo in the world there are bad ones that no defense can justify, and they get none here. With proper care and good environments wild animals thrive in captivity. Improperly kept under poor conditions they languish in misery and boredom. This situation should never be, and any zoo or parts of zoos where animals are impoverished should be changed or abolished. The zoo of the future, to borrow a phrase from Dr. Heinrich Dathe, director of the Tierpark in Berlin, should be a paradise for animals.

SHeldon CAMPBELL,
SAN DIEGO, CALIF., March 20, 1978.

Mr. Campbell's book goes into particular detail on the subject of captive breeding, a project which deserves to be better known and understood, and he underscores the need for the kind of provision which I have included in H.R. 806, although his book does not deal with my legislation in any way.

As what we like to call civilization continues to encroach upon the natural habitats of many animals, more and more will be driven over the brink to extinction. It seems to me that since zoos and aquariums are in effect today's Arks, it is incumbent upon us to make them the best possible refuges for the few members of these endangered species that are left, so that future generations may have at least a small sample of the magnificent creatures that we have been able to take for granted. Making this a reality with the best possible facilities and care is the purpose of H.R. 806. ●

OUR DEAL WITH PEKING: ALL COST,
NO BENEFIT

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, the President's recent decision to recognize the People's Republic of China and abandon Taiwan diplomatically and politically has, quite correctly, raised a number of questions about the credibility of American commitments around the world. The following article by George Bush investigates the possible repercussions of the decision to abrogate the 1954 defense treaty with Taiwan.

OUR DEAL WITH PEKING: ALL COST, NO
BENEFIT

(By George Bush)

The airwaves are filled now with glad tidings from the White House, proclaiming that President Carter's China initiative has brought us much closer to peace on earth, good will to man.

How joyous it would be if that were true, but, unfortunately, nearly every Christmas story has its grinch—and this one is no exception.

The tragic fact is that the price our government has paid in recognizing the People's Republic of China has not only diminished American credibility in the world but has also darkened the prospects for peace. And I would venture that in the privacy of the Great Hall, the Chinese are acutely aware of that.

Let me explain by first introducing a bit of history. When I arrived in Peking in 1974 as the U.S. representative there, the Nixon and Kissinger trips and the Shanghai Communiqué were already on record. The United States was committed to eventual recognition of the People's Republic.

Moreover, ordinary Chinese citizens were intensely emotional in their desire for reunification with Taiwan. I remember in the early days how Chinese workmen refused to hang a map of Asia on my office wall because it showed Taiwan in a different color from the mainland. Not long thereafter, at sporting games that drew provincial teams from all over the mainland, the stands exploded with cheers when the announcer identified one squad as "our brothers from Taiwan." Government propaganda reflected much the same sentiment.

Yet, in private conversations the rulers of the People's Republic took a very different view. They were committed, of course, to the "liberation" of Taiwan, but that was always a distinctly secondary issue. "You have time; there is no hurry," they said over and over again.

When President Ford, Secretary Kissinger and I met with chairman Mao Tse-tung in October 1975, he repeated that settlement of the Taiwan question might take the United States and China "one year, ten years, or even a hundred years" to achieve. He clearly expected to die before it happened, and he was equally clear that if the United States wanted more time to modify opinion at home, that was readily acceptable.

What concerned Mao far more than the Taiwan question—and has since preoccupied his successors—was the gathering strength of the Soviet Union. The leaders in Peking are terrified that one day they may be encircled by a Soviet empire, eager to gobble them up. Forty-five Russian divisions are already poised on their northern border, and in recent months their security has deteriorated along their southern rim as well.

To the Chinese, the key to peace is for the United States and its western allies to act as a firm, reliable counterweight to Soviet pressures. Only if the United States remains a credible world power—one that honors its commitments and lives up to its responsibilities—are they themselves secure.

BREAKING A TREATY WITHOUT CAUSE

Here, then, is the situation that Jimmy Carter found when he entered the Oval Office:

On one hand, Peking was transfixed with the idea that the Soviet Union sought "hegemony" in many parts of the globe and was already convinced that the West was growing "soft."

On the other hand, while continuing to pay lip service to "normalization" of relations with the United States, the Chinese quietly accepted the fact that the two sides were deadlocked on that issue. For several years, Peking had insisted on three preconditions before there could be "normalization": The United States had to abrogate its mutual defense treaty with Taiwan, had to withdraw troops there, and had to withdraw recognition from Taiwan, acknowledging Peking as the sole, legitimate government of China. The United States had consistently balked at those terms, insisting that it would not formally recognize Peking until there was a firm, explicit commitment to settle the Taiwanese issue peacefully. And there the negotiations were stuck.

Because of the importance of the Russian threat, however, the questions of full "nor-

malization" and of Taiwan were never a major barrier to progress on commercial and strategic issues. China and the United States had entered a de facto political relationship that had two great virtues: It permitted both sides to begin working harmoniously together, and it also allowed the United States to maintain the integrity of its commitment to Taiwan. In an imperfect world, that was a major accomplishment.

It was in this context that President Carter's Dec. 15 announcement was such a bombshell.

The immediate question was not whether we should recognize Peking. Many Americans now agree that a close, working relationship between Washington and Peking should advance the cause of peace and world trade. Personally, I have long felt that in spite of the totalitarian nature of the Chinese government, it was in our own national interest to improve relations with Peking.

But the critical question was the terms on which the recognition was negotiated. Incredibly, it turns out that the United States has now accepted all three of Peking's original demands—and has capitulated on its own demand for a guarantee on Taiwan, abandoning a faithful friend in the process. For the first time in our history, a peacetime American government has renounced a treaty with an ally without cause or benefit.

A FIGLEAF FOR RETREAT

By the administration's own admission, it never received—or even asked for—specific assurances from Peking about a peaceful solution to the Taiwanese question. In Peking's eyes, the Taiwanese matter continues to be strictly an internal issue, and in its constitution the "liberation" of Taiwan remains an unchallenged goal.

In response, the administration argues that the mainland will wink at future U.S. arms sales to the Taiwanese. But in the same breath, administration officials say *sotto voce* that those sales will be "restrained."

The administration also argues that Peking has neither the capability nor the incentive to conquer Taiwan. But any student of Chinese history—remembering that during the Cultural Revolution, only 10 years ago, some of today's Chinese leaders were driven down Peking streets with sticks—can properly ask: Who knows with certainty what lies ahead? It is true that armed conquest by the mainland does not seem imminent, but because of unilateral action by the United States, the 17 million people on Taiwan are now hostage to the changing whims of the Peking leadership.

The terms that the Carter administration has accepted, and even trumpeted, are the same terms that have been available for the past seven years. But they were always refused before because we knew—just as the Chinese knew—that in the absence of sufficient guarantees, they were but a figleaf for an abject American retreat.

The terrible truth is that the United States now stands exposed to the world as a nation willing to betray a friend—even when there is no apparent gain.

There is, of course, room for reasonable men to disagree about the benefits that might now accrue to China and the United States in trade and investment. Contrary to administration claims, however, I believe the gains that are likely to occur undoubtedly would have occurred anyway under our existing relationship.

Over the past year and a half, before these negotiations had even begun, the Chinese were ardently seeking western technology and our sales to China were rising dramatically. Over the past four months the commercial pace has accelerated, and many American companies have begun making serious plans for trading with the mainland and investing there. But it has always been apparent in the commercial field that China needs us more than we need them. Indeed,

it was precisely China's growing eagerness for trade that gave the United States greater leverage in our diplomatic bargaining than we had ever had before—leverage that we carelessly tossed aside.

MORALITY AND STRATEGY

At its heart, however, the China question is not one of trade and technology but of fundamental morality and international strategy.

As sociologist Peter Berger wrote earlier this year, "If there is one universal, indeed primeval principle of morality, it is that one must not deliver one's friends to their enemies." Berger was writing of refugees fleeing from Vietnam in their small, makeshift dinghies. "These boats," he said, "bear a message. It is a simple and ugly message. Here is what happens to those who put their trust in the United States of America."

For President Carter, who professes a strong belief in Christian ethics, it should be a tormenting thought that by his hand, the United States has put an entire people adrift in a cruel, hostile sea—and for scarcely any purpose.

The moral question is closely linked to the strategic issue that is causing perhaps even greater consternation in many chambers of the world.

Throughout the postwar period, America's credibility—joined with America's military might—has been the glue that has held together the non-communist world. Justifiably, both friend and foe alike are now asking, however, whether the United States can still be counted on to keep its word. Increasingly in recent years the United States has staked out a clear, unequivocal position, has invited others to join us, and then, as counterpressures have built up, has suddenly, inexplicably buckled.

In Africa, we committed ourselves to support the forces of moderation. But when black moderates in Rhodesia arranged with Prime Minister Ian Smith for the transfer of power and free elections, we threw in our lot with Marxist radicals.

In recent negotiations in the Middle East, the Israelis announced that they were prepared to accept a final plan drafted with American help. But when Egypt raised the ante, we modified our position to accept the new Egyptian proposals, and when the Israelis refused to go along, we publicly kicked them in the shins.

In Europe, President Carter convinced our German and French allies that we would build a neutron bomb, and Helmut Schmidt courageously supported him. But then, in the face of a Soviet propaganda campaign, the administration knuckled under and shelved the project. Even now, as contradictory signals emanate from Washington, our NATO allies wonder whether the United States will honor its pledge to raise defense expenditures by about 3 percent a year.

In Iran, the Carter administration placed considerable pressure on the shah to accelerate his liberalization program—sometimes, according to reports, against his better judgment. But when trouble broke out, our government disappeared over the hill. The world recognizes, even if we do not, that the United States could have been demonstrative in its support for the shah, issuing firmer statements, engaging in naval deployments, and responding with something more than timidity when the Russians warned us to stay out of it.

To friends of the United States, who have been chilled by these recent events and by our posture on SALT, the mindless abandonment of Taiwan thus comes at a particularly inopportune time. Why now? And why would the president act so unilaterally, without consulting with the Congress, especially after the Senate had insisted by a unanimous 94-to-0 vote upon such consultations? Unfortunately, there are no easy answers.

Understandably, Peking has been promi-

ment among those worried about America's deteriorating position in the world. It has been particularly dismayed about Cuban intervention in Ethiopia, the major Soviet role in Afghanistan (a neighbor to both China and Iran), the pro-Soviet coup in South Yemen, as well as the hesitant U.S. response to Soviet claims with regard to a role in Iran. Indeed, this area of the world—including Southern Asia, the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean—is just as important strategically to the Chinese as to the United States.

The ultimate irony, then, of this "normalization" is that China, whose primary interest lies in a strong, steadfast American presence in the world, has now seen just how easily we can be pushed around. The Chinese realize that we have given all and gained nothing, and while they engage in self-congratulations, they know in their hearts that by our actions, we have also made the world a more dangerous place than it was only a few weeks ago. ●

SMALL BUSINESS REGULATORY RELIEF ACT

HON. ANDY IRELAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, today, along with 76 cosponsors, I am introducing legislation entitled the Small Business Regulatory Relief Act. This bill provides regulatory flexibility for small business in certain instances so that the effects of the regulation match the size of the business regulated.

Small businesses, by their very nature, are less capable than larger firms of discovering, understanding and complying with what Government regulators expect. When regulations are the same for large and small business, the effect may be disproportionate and unfair.

My bill would make Government agencies analyze the impact of any proposed rule or regulation on small firms. If the agencies find that their action would be harmful to small businesses, they would be required to find some way to ease this impact either by exempting small businesses completely or by setting different, less burdensome standards for them.

I introduced this bill last year, with over 84 cosponsors, and the Subcommittee on Special Small Business Problems, of which I am a member, held a number of hearings and heard from dozens of witnesses. Additional hearings are scheduled for early this session, and I am confident that we will have positive action in the full committee shortly thereafter.

A similar measure was adopted by the Senate last session, and Senator NELSON, chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, is optimistic about passage again this session.

I plan to reintroduce the Small Business Regulatory Relief Act with additional cosponsors in the next few weeks, and would be pleased to have many more of our colleagues join with me at that time.

A copy of the bill, and testimony I gave last year explaining the legislation are included here for your information.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

The material follows:

H.R. 10632

A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide regulatory flexibility for small business in certain instances so that the effect of regulation matches the size of business regulated

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Small Business Regulatory Relief Act."

FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(e) Further, it is the declared policy of the Congress that the scope and volume of Federal regulations causes disproportionate and often unnecessary impact on small businesses and the Government should make a concerted effort to reduce such impact."

DUTIES OF THE OFFICE OF ADVOCACY

SEC. 3. Section 634c of title 15, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection and renumbering accordingly:

"(4) consult with the agencies of the Federal Government prior to issuance of proposed regulations that substantially impact small business, for the purpose of minimizing such impact."

ASSISTANCE OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 4. Section 634e of title 15, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new section and renumbering accordingly:

"Sec. 206. Prior to the issuance of a rule by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government, such department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government shall incorporate, as a part of the general statement of the basis and purpose of the rule required to be published in the Federal Register, a written analysis of whether it is lawful, feasible, and desirable for the agency to exempt small businesses or small organizations, or a class of small businesses or small organizations from the effect of the rule or whether the agency may and should promulgate a rule which sets lesser standards for compliance by small businesses.

"(a) The analysis required by this section shall include the following factors:

"(1) the nature of any reports and the estimated cost of their preparation by small businesses or small organizations which would be required to comply with the new rule;

"(2) the nature and estimated costs of other measures or investments that would be required by small businesses or small organizations in complying with this rule;

"(3) the nature and estimated cost of any legal, consulting and accounting services which small businesses or small organizations would incur in complying with the rule;

"(4) the ability of small businesses or small organizations to absorb the costs estimated under (1), (2), and (3) without suffering economic harm and without adversely affecting competition in the marketplace;

"(5) the additional cost, if any, to the agency of administering or enforcing a rule which exempts or sets lesser standards for compliance by small businesses or small organizations; and

"(6) the impact on the public interest of exempting or setting lesser standards of compliance for small businesses or small organizations.

"(b) The agency prescribing such rule shall—

"(1) transmit such rule to and obtain the comments, if any, of the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration with respect to the impact on small businesses or small organizations resulting from implementation of such rule;

"(2) include such comments of the Office of Advocacy in the record made in connection with consideration of such rule;

"(3) make such comments of the Office of Advocacy available to each officer or employee of the United States who, after such date, reviews such rule; and

"(4) incorporate a summary of such comments of the Office of Advocacy with the general statement of the basis and purpose of the rule.

"(c) Subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall not apply to any rule if such agency, after consultation with the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration, determines that such rule will not, if implemented, have a substantial effect on any significant number of small businesses or small organizations. Notice of such determination shall be incorporated in the general statement of the basis and purpose of the rule.

"(d) Whenever the results of such analysis by an agency indicate that it is lawful, desirable, and feasible to exempt small businesses or small organizations, or to set lesser standards of compliance by small businesses or small organizations, the agency shall issue a rule containing an appropriate exemption for such small businesses or small organizations, or setting lesser standards for compliance by small businesses or small organizations.

"(e) Whenever an agency establishes by regulation the meaning of small business or small organizations, such regulation may apply to either a single rule or regulation, a set of rules and regulations, or every rule and regulation issued by the agency: *Provided*, That the regulation establishing the meaning of small business or small organization shall have been transmitted to the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration in accordance with subsection (b) of this section: *And provided further*, That the size, industrial classification, or performance standard established by such regulation shall consist of objective measurement and to the extent consistent with the purposes of this Act, uniform with standards previously established by regulation.

"(f) In any action to review the compliance of an agency with subsections (a) through (e), no order shall be entered by a court to enjoin enforcement of such rule with respect to anyone or any concern that is not a small business or small organization. No one other than a small business or small organization shall have standing to review the compliance of an agency with subsections (a) through (e).

"(g) Each agency shall, during the five-year period beginning with the date of enactment of this subsection, review agency rules which were published for comment, issued, or in effect prior to such date and make the determinations referred to in subsections (a) through (e) with respect to each rule.

"(h) The Program Analysis Division of the General Accounting Office is authorized to furnish, upon request, advice and assistance to agencies making determinations under this section.

"(i) Except as otherwise provided by statute, no agency may issue a rule or regulation, however denominated or described, which does not comply with the provisions of this section.

"(j) For the purposes of this section, the term 'small business' includes those businesses as defined under the provisions of section 632 of title 15, United States Code, and the term 'small organization' includes unincorporated businesses, sheltered workshops, not-for-profit enterprises which are not dominant in their fields, and such other groups and enterprises as the agency shall establish by regulation."

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE ANDY IRELAND

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to be here today to have the opportunity to discuss the impact of federal regulations on the small business community with you and my colleagues on the subcommittee.

Small businesses have several unique characteristics which make them especially important to our economy and our nation. For one thing, small businesses tend to react to changes in the market place more rapidly than larger businesses, and are thus in a better position to develop and exploit new ideas. Secondly, they are "labor intensive," that is to say, more of their dollars tend to go to hire people rather than to purchase machinery. Thirdly, they are often the initial point of entry for people who are entering the job market for the first time. Finally, as small businesses succeed and expand, they broaden the tax base and benefit society by carrying a larger share of the tax burden. So, in a very real sense, small business is the ideal "threshold" for people building a better life and a more productive society.

In addition, small business constitutes a much larger role proportionally in our economy than most Americans realize. For example, according to the most recent statistics, small businesses constitute 48 percent of the nation's G.N.P., employ 58 percent of the private, nonagricultural work force, generate 73 percent of the total dollar volume in retailing, and comprise 97 percent of the country's business community.

Quite clearly then, any action by the federal government which impacts substantially on small business will likely have enormous ramifications for all segments of our economy. And from the testimony that this committee and others have heard, it seems clear that very few things have had or are likely to have as big an impact upon small business as government regulation and overregulation.

Since the early 1970's, the federal government has created seven new regulatory agencies, including the Environmental Protection Agency, O.S.H.A. and the Consumer Product Safety Commission. Between 1970 and 1976, the number of pages in the Federal Register has tripled, from 20,000 per year in 1970 to 60,000 per year in 1976, reflecting the enormous increase in rulemaking and regulation by the federal government. The best available figures indicate that there are more than 65,000 federal employees involved in regulatory activities, at a total cost of about \$130 billion annually.

As severe as the impact of government regulation is, it affects small business much more adversely than larger concerns.

Small business, by its very nature, is less capable than larger firms of discovering which government regulations affect its operation, and less able to respond to these rulings. In most cases, small businesses are simply not equipped, either in terms of personnel or expertise, to keep up with the proliferation of federal regulation.

One particularly painful illustration of this fact is the plight of a small retailer who learned in September of 1977 that the F.C.C. had issued a ruling months earlier which prohibited the sale of twenty-three channel C-B radios after December 31, 1977. Unfortunately, this individual had many thousands of dollars worth of twenty-three channel radios which he could not possibly sell by the deadline. When his case was brought to the attention of the F.C.C. by the National Federation of Independent Business, the F.C.C. held that the retailer had no recourse since the rule was promulgated and printed in the Federal Register well in advance of the deadline.

Obviously, the F.C.C. assumed that the retailer read the Federal Register regularly, and that if he did, he was able to interpret the rules and assess its impact on his opera-

tion. Unhappily, however, experience has shown us that in the case of many small businesses, neither assumption is warranted.

Regulatory difficulties of this nature do not necessarily mean that all government regulation is unnecessary or counterproductive, or that small business should be exempted from regulation simply because they are small. There is a fundamental assumption peculiar to a democratic society that all groups in society ought to be treated equally by their government, and that no single group ought to be granted special preferences without first establishing the existence of extenuating circumstances.

However, as Senator Culver noted during hearings on this question last year, "Uniform treatment under regulation does not always result in . . . equal treatment."

For example, if a regulation imposes the same cost of compliance across the board, the larger firms, with their greater operating budgets and specialized personnel are often able to absorb these costs, while most small firms cannot. Thus, while the intent of the regulation is uniform, the effect is quite disproportionate, resulting in a reduction of the ability of the smaller firm to compete effectively in the market place.

It is my firm belief that regulations can and should be tailored to the size and the resources of those being regulated. That is why I introduced H.R. 10632, and that is why I am here today. My legislation would require government agencies to analyze the impact of any proposed rule or regulation on small firms likely to be affected by that regulation.

If the agencies find that their action would be harmful to small businesses, they would be required to find some way to ease this impact, either by exempting small businesses completely or by setting different, less burdensome standards for them.

The concept of flexible or "tiered" regulations is not new—Congress has long exempted certain small firms from minimum wage and some of the paperwork required by other laws. Even O.S.H.A. treats large and small firms differently. The purpose of my bill is to require all federal agencies to exercise this type of flexibility.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my prepared statement.

Thank you. ●

NURSE TRAINING AMENDMENTS OF 1979

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 18, 1979, I introduced H.R. 1143, the Nurse Training Amendments of 1979. This legislation is virtually identical to the conference report (H. Rept. 95-1785) to accompany S. 2416, the Nurse Training Amendments of 1978, which passed the House in the closing hours of the 95th Congress but was pocket-vetoed by the President after the Congress had adjourned.

The Nurse Training Amendments of 1979 represent a simple extension of existing authorities supporting schools and students of nursing through fiscal year 1980 at the fiscal year 1978 authorization level of \$206 million. It would require the Secretary of HEW to arrange for a study of the need to continue a specific program of Federal financial

support of nursing education so that the Congress will be better able to determine the appropriate Federal response to the training of professional nurses. It includes one new authority which would authorize \$5 million over the next 2 fiscal years to assist in the training of nurse anesthetists. Finally, it contains minor, yet important, amendments to existing health manpower authorities respecting area health education centers.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the President's commitment to fight inflation, and I share that commitment. I have introduced this legislation as a simple extension of existing law, not in an attempt to initiate confrontation but to initiate what I am sure will be an effort to effect a compromise between the Congress and the administration. I assure my colleagues that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will carefully consider every aspect of this legislation in a manner which will lead to an appropriate response to the concerns of the administration, the Congress, and the needs of the American people.

Many of my colleagues have already expressed interest in cosponsoring this legislative proposal. In view of the caveats outlined above, other Members who may wish to cosponsor this legislation should notify Mrs. Jordan in the committee's professional staff office at extension 53147. ●

CLASSIFIED HEROES

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, in the grand old secretive tradition of the Central Intelligence Agency, one Leslie C. Dirks, rumored to be the CIA's deputy director for Science and Technology, was recently awarded a National Security Medal by President Carter for an undisclosed reason.

This has led me to speculate as to the cause for this mysterious action. Did Leslie Dirks, if that be his (or her) real name, draft the recently passed CIA appropriations bill which contain a classified dollar amount? Or Leslie Dirks actually an alias for John Paisley, the CIA agent who supposedly died while on his boat in the Chesapeake and whose death is surrounded by intrigue? If so, where has he been for the last couple of months and why has he now surfaced? If, for instance, he has arranged for the Skylab to fall on the Kremlin, Congress has the right to know. (This latter explanation would account for the awards ceremony being kept off-limits to reporters and photographers. While the White House did release a photograph of a person supposed to be Mr. Dirks, it has been noted by several persons that the White House has previously distributed that photograph with other names.)

The truth about this event must be

made known. For, in this period of open Government and sunshine, it seems curious that we would now begin classifying heroes. ●

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON DIGESTIVE DISEASES

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, the National Commission on Digestive Diseases has just made its report to the Congress, which was mandated by legislation passed in 1976. I want to commend those men and women who served for nearly 2 years. They held hearings in many parts of the Nation to determine how to develop a plan for the prevention, control, and cure of digestive diseases. These diseases afflict 20 million of our citizens.

Today, the Commissioners reported to us on their findings and recommendations. In order that my colleagues may have the opportunity to study them, I include their executive findings and recommendations below. I also include a summary list of the recommendations with the Commission's estimates of the required appropriations to carry them out.

Today I cosponsored, with my colleague Dr. TIM LEE CARTER, a bill which would make law the three recommendations which need authorizing legislation. It is my understanding that the other recommendations can be effected by administrative action, by appropriations alone, or by other legislation more properly tied to a national health insurance program.

I hope that the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment will consider this bill, so that funds can be appropriated as soon as possible to carry out those recommendations.

The material follows:

SUMMARY REPORT TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON DIGESTIVE DISEASES

The National Commission on Digestive Diseases was established by Congress in 1976, by P.L. 94-562, to accomplish three major tasks:

Study the medical, social, and economic problems attributable to digestive diseases. Evaluate the present use of resources to control the problems identified.

Develop a long-range national plan for the organization and effective use of national resources to deal with digestive diseases.

In the course of its work, the Commission found that digestive diseases account for a major—and largely unrecognized—cost to the nation's health and economy. Moreover, the Commission's findings show that the impact of these diseases, both in terms of health and economics, on individuals and on the nation as a whole, can be reduced in the foreseeable future.

The long-range national plan to combat digestive diseases must include the immediate expansion of the basic and applied research programs directed at the underlying causes of digestive diseases and the development of new and effective measures for prevention and treatment. The Commission recommends a concurrent program of education and translational research which offers realistic promise of an early and substantial im-

provement in the control of digestive diseases.

FINDINGS OF THE COMMISSION

While digestive diseases vary in severity from brief, self-limited illnesses to chronic, disabling, and some universally fatal conditions, their total social and economic impact is enormous. Measured in terms of morbidity, mortality, and cost, they constitute the *third largest component of the total economic burden of illness in the United States*, being outranked only by circulatory diseases and by the combined category of accidents, poisonings, and violence.

Digestive diseases collectively represent: 10 percent of the total economic burden of illness in the United States, as defined by the National Center for Health Statistics.

The primary reason for major surgery. The leading cause of hospitalization. 15 percent of all hospital utilization (43.4 million hospital days each year)

The second most prevalent cause of disability among the employed. 20 million chronically ill individuals.

14 million persons who suffer acute episodes of illness each year.

190,000 deaths each year (counting only those for which digestive diseases are identified as the *immediate* cause of death).

\$17 billion in direct health care costs. \$35 billion in total annual economic loss, or approximately 1.5 percent of the gross national product (1978 projection).

Digestive diseases are highly detrimental to Americans in their peak years of productivity and responsibility. Seventeen of every 100 individuals between the ages of 45 and 64, most of whom sustain family income in whole or in part, have some form of diagnosed digestive disease. At the same time, the absolute importance of digestive diseases as causes of serious illness, hospitalization, and death is highest among the aged.

Digestive diseases abound in all strata of our society and in all parts of the United States. Their diagnosis and treatment often depend upon the ready availability of sophisticated instruments and highly trained personnel. Thus, the burden of digestive diseases can be expected to fall more heavily on our rural population, where the low population density cannot support expensive equipment and specialists, and where physical distances between physician and patients are often great.

The figures cited above, however, fail to convey the social and financial devastation experienced by people afflicted with the most severe and chronic forms of digestive diseases. For these people, frequent consequences may be prolonged debility, malnutrition, unemployment, denial of insurance protection, and lifetime medical expenses as high as \$500,000 for an individual patient.

In contrast to the magnitude of these problems, *efforts to control digestive diseases have been tragically inadequate* and needlessly fragmented. This is due in part to public attitudes and to minimum public awareness of preventive measures and the consequences of neglect. The digestive tract and its functions are viewed through veils of ignorance, embarrassment, taboo, and inappropriate humor.

Efforts of concerned voluntary organizations which have worked hard and long to increase patient and public understanding of digestive diseases are noteworthy. They have demonstrated over the years that changes in public attitudes through education are both possible and vitally necessary.

As a subject of academic concern, digestive diseases are underrepresented on the faculties of medical and other professional schools, and the number of active researchers in the field is not only relatively small, but is also declining. The decline is related to current limitations on the level and the stability of support for digestive disease research, which

has discouraged talented young physicians and scientists from pursuing research careers in this field. Meanwhile, established investigators have left research in the digestive diseases and are not being replaced.

Despite the relatively low level of research support, significant advancements have been made in the state of knowledge about a number of common digestive diseases, their treatment, and their prevention. Major benefits have been achieved for patients with hepatitis, peptic ulcers, gallstones, infectious diarrhea, diseases of absorption, reflux esophagitis, gastrointestinal bleeding, aspirin-induced stomach injury, and colonic polyps, as well as for patients requiring parenteral nutrition and major surgical intervention. Much work remains to be done, however, in terms of both prevention and treatment of these disorders, and there are still many diseases for which effective modes of diagnosis and treatment are entirely lacking.

THE NATIONAL PLAN

The National Commission on Digestive Diseases strongly believes it is time for the nation to mount a vigorous and well-coordinated attack on digestive diseases. The national plan presented in Volume I of the report of the National Commission on Digestive Diseases includes a series of interrelated goals and strategies. They incorporate the most promising leads in research and needed new directions in health care delivery and education. All components of the plan can and should be implemented without delay, with the expectation that benefits to the public will be evident and measurable in varying stages in one to 10 or more years.

Since so much remains unknown about the causes, mechanisms, and factors influencing digestive diseases, the essential foundation of the long-range plan is a well-coordinated, expanded research endeavor. Research offers the surest and most cost-effective means of substantially reducing the suffering and the economic burdens resulting from digestive diseases. In the meantime, as research progresses, the immediate needs of patients with digestive diseases must not be overlooked; these needs are addressed directly in the long-range plan.

The Commission has developed the long-range plan to achieve two major goals:

Reduce the suffering of all Americans afflicted with digestive diseases.

Reduce the costs associated with digestive diseases.

In an era of escalating health care needs and limited resources, only a well-organized, detailed, cost-effective program directed at a clearly identified social goal can justify sustained public support. The long-range plan developed by the Commission, we believe, is such a program. Minimum budget increments to implement these programs are proposed.

The recommendations listed below have been carefully considered for their feasibility, cost, and expected benefits. They represent, in essence, the Commission's conclusions in terms of: (1) immediate action that promises early and lasting benefits, (2) programs that are imperative for the public good in the long-range effort to combat digestive diseases, (3) proposals that are aimed solely at problems related to digestive diseases but are inclusive of other major national health needs, and (4) steps essential to the coordination and organization of the long-range plan.

THE SCOPE OF DIGESTIVE DISEASES

The digestive tract, which includes the esophagus, stomach, intestines, gallbladder, liver, and pancreas, is affected by a wide range of acute and chronic diseases, including infections, cancers, intoxications, and diseases of unknown origin. Digestive diseases are disorders of any of these organs. Some of them are commonly known, such as ulcers, hepatitis, and gastro-intestinal can-

cers; others, such as biliary atresia, cystic fibrosis, inflammatory bowel diseases, and pancreatitis, occur less frequently but with devastating long-term effects.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION

The National Commission on Digestive Diseases recommends that Congress and concerned agencies, public and private, take the following actions immediately to provide early and continued benefits in the national effort to combat digestive diseases.

Measures to improve the provision of information and training to patients, health care personnel, and the public:

1. Establish and fund a National Digestive Diseases Education and Information Clearinghouse to improve wide distribution of available knowledge in prevention and control of digestive diseases.

2. Promote the establishment of standards for the education and training of specialists in digestive diseases.

3. Strengthen and, where necessary for this purpose, fund educational programs in digestive diseases in American medical schools.

Measures to improve medical care of patients with digestive diseases:

4. Standardize the nomenclature, diagnostic criteria and methodology, and guidelines for measuring disability caused by digestive diseases.

5. Develop guidelines for the sequence of performing diagnostic tests in the digestive diseases.

6. Increase funding for the study of risk-benefits and cost-benefits related to health care services for patients with digestive diseases, and for translational research—the translation of known medical knowledge into effective treatment.

7. Expand programs in digestive diseases in the Department of Defense.

8. Expand clinical research in the digestive diseases and programs for the treatment of these diseases in the Veterans Administration.

Measures to promote research in needed and promising areas:

9. Enlarge and strengthen Federal training programs in research on digestive diseases to increase the number of teacher-researchers and to encourage the interest of larger numbers of young scientists in this vital area of research.

10. Increase funding for applied (clinical) research on such topics as adverse drug reactions, alcoholic liver disease, cirrhosis, colonic disorders, functional gastrointestinal diseases, gallstones, gastrointestinal bleeding and vascular disorders, gastrointestinal surgery, hepatitis, infectious diarrheas, inflammatory bowel diseases, maldigestion and malabsorption, malignancies (cancer) of the digestive organs, pancreatitis, pediatric digestive diseases, peptic ulcer, reflux esophagitis and esophageal motility disorders.

The Commission recommends that simultaneously with the actions in Recommendations 1 through 10, Congress and the respective concerned agencies take the following specific actions to ease the national burden caused by digestive diseases in the foreseeable future and to establish a long-range, national program of continuing and coordinated research in digestive diseases:

11. Increase funding for basic research in digestive diseases to lay firmer foundations for their prevention, diagnosis, and treatment.

12. Fund cooperative research in digestive diseases when scientifically necessary and cost-effective.

13. Expand the intramural digestive disease research programs at the National Institutes of Health.

14. Determine epidemiological patterns of digestive diseases to formulate a comprehensive understanding of their impact on the

population's physical, emotional, and financial well-being.

15. Study the effects of environmental and industrial pollutants on organs of the digestive system.

16. Fund research on the critical role of diet as a cause of digestive diseases.

The Commission recommends that the Congress or appropriate agencies undertake the following steps with regard to diseases in general, but with specific emphasis on digestive diseases:

17. Survey manpower requirements for the prevention and treatment of digestive and related diseases and study the cost-effectiveness of various forms of professional training.

18. Assure that the cost of educating patients about their digestive diseases is a direct reimbursable expense by Federal and private insurance programs.

19. Enact legislation to provide catastrophic health insurance coverage for all citizens.

20. Exempt from the Office of Management and Budget clearance procedures those medical and behavioral research projects which are conducted in accordance with specified protocols which are approved under DHEW regulations for the protection of human subjects, and which call only for voluntary participation; and exempt the digestive diseases workshops recommended in this report from the DHEW policy which reduces the number of conferences.

The Commission recommends that the Congress and/or appropriate Federal agencies, in order to organize and coordinate the long-range plan outlined in this report, take the following actions:

21. Establish a National Digestive Diseases Advisory Board responsible to the Congress and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

22. Appoint knowledgeable representatives concerned about the problems associated with digestive diseases and the implementation of solutions to those problems to the Advisory Councils of the National Cancer Institute, the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, and the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.

23. Enhance the status of digestive diseases within the National Institutes of Health by forming a Division of Digestive Diseases within the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases.

For further information, write to: NIAMDD Information Office, Building 31, Room 9A04, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md. 20014.●

ENERGY AND INFLATION

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, inflation has become the major enemy of the American public. President Carter clearly stated that inflation must be brought under control. Yet, as long as our National Energy Policy allows OPEC to influence domestic crude oil prices, no war against inflation will be won.

Current inflationary pressures combined with OPEC's 14.5 percent price increase and Iran's internal strife continue to force oil prices up. This year, in New England alone, price increases will amount to at least \$350 million, bringing New England's oil bill to over \$8 billion. This increase is small when compared to the catastrophic increases in oil prices

that will occur if domestic crude oil price controls are allowed to expire on May 31, 1979. Domestic oil prices now set at an average of \$9.12 a barrel will rise to approximately \$16 a barrel, if deregulated, equaling the price of OPEC oil. Present attempts at controlling inflation will be rendered useless if deregulation takes place.

For these reasons, I have joined my colleagues Mr. HARRIS and Mr. MAGUIRE in writing the President, urging him to hold the line on domestic crude oil.

In addition, I have joined Mr. STUDDS in cosponsoring legislation which will continue domestic crude oil price controls for 24 months beyond their May 1979 expiration date. The price controls remain flexible enough to encourage new domestic oil exploration. They are not aimed at penalizing the oil industry but instead, as a way of protecting consumers from the ravages of inflation.

This legislative body must work closely with the President to bring inflation under control. A sound national energy policy fair to all sectors of the economy must be a part of the plan. Continued domestic crude oil price controls will provide additional time needed to meet our pressing energy problems without fueling inflation.●

TEN WAYS TO BREAK OPEC

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, since the oil embargo of 1973, our Nation's reliance on energy from the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) has steadily increased, now constituting almost 50 percent of U.S. crude oil requirements. Clearly, the United States has demonstrated no sense of national resolve on the energy issue, and is more vulnerable to the whims of foreign governments than at any other point in recent history.

If anything, the United States has aided and abetted the economic interests of OPEC over the last 5 years. We have legitimized the artificially high world price of oil through domestic energy price decontrol; we have rejected policies which would require our Government to bargain down OPEC prices as the sole importer of petroleum to the United States; and we have moved only glacially in completing a Strategic Petroleum Reserve—containing both crude and residual oil—which is the Nation's primary insurance against a repeat of the 1973 embargo.

In this regard, I highly commend the following article by Craig S. Karpel, executive director of the Council on Energy Policy, which appears in the January issue of *Harpers*:

TEN WAYS TO BREAK OPEC

One evening last spring I dined with an assistant to the President of the United States, who, like so many of my fellow victims of the foreign oil cartel, did not know that OPEC can be broken. Toward the end

of the meal I explained to him that over the past two years, unremarked by the press and ignored by the Administration, the country's most eminent petroleum experts had testified before Sen. Edward Kennedy's Subcommittee on Energy to the effect that the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries is exceedingly fragile, that it could not exist without the aid and comfort of a complex of American financial and export interests, and that there are any number of ways that the U.S. government could act to dismantle its monopoly. I noted that according to a study published by the M.I.T. Energy Laboratory, the cartel's price per barrel has been fixed at \$7 to \$10 more than the price that would prevail in a competitive market. The foreign oil cartel, I observed, sells for \$13 a barrel oil that costs less than 25 cents a barrel to produce. I suggested that at a time when the dollar would appear to be going the way of the Hungarian pengo, it is arguably improvident to remit a subvention to the Saudi royal family amounting to \$8,000 per annum for each of its subjects.

I had taken my dinner companion by surprise. Between courses he had felt called upon to defend his employer, but now, over coffee, he could not bring himself to defend the indefensible. With evident dismay, he agreed that the cartel's leeching on the American economy constitutes the most critical problem confronting the country, and that it compromises the nation's capacity to make good its commitments in the world. "Why," he said, palpably anguished by the inaction of the Administration of which he is a part, but sufficiently in command of himself to return the ball to my court, "hasn't a constituency assembled to insist that we do something about OPEC?"

The answer to his question is that the unassembled constituency slumbers at the center of a thorn forest of myths about energy that has been raised up around us by the wizardry of those who profit from OPEC's make-believe omnipotence. It cost this writer the better part of two years of his life to get out of the woods. By night, I puzzled over abstruse monographs and \$650-a-year newsletters. By day I corresponded with distant institutes and ministries of foreign powers. I shuttled to and from Cambridge, New York, and Washington. I journeyed to London, to Rotterdam, to Tel Aviv. I sat across the desk from a distinguished professor of the economics of petroleum who, with avuncular patience, explained to me the innermost meaning of the phrase, "nominations in excess of prorated equity share." In the dining room of a great Wall Street bank, I digested hearts-of-palm vinaigrette and charts showing that over the next five years new non-OPEC oil production will increase by 8.5 million barrels a day, while global consumption will rise by only 5.5. Sunk into the burnished-leather sofa of a senior Senator, I learned how American corporations that benefit from high oil prices overseas pressure their suppliers to join them in lobbying against policies that would break OPEC. I brunched at a mountain resort with an authority on the oil-bearing formations of the Yucatan. I revolved atop a Hyatt House with a value-free-resource econometrician. I lunched at the Harvard Club with a wildcatter from Namibia. Ever so gradually the darkness lifted, the mists parted, and Mobil Corporation's op-ed barrage thawed, melted, and resolved itself into a dew.

While the less well-informed among our nation's bartenders, and the Secretary of Energy, may continue to tell us that a physical shortage of oil impends, no reputable petroleum economist does so. Though latter-day votaries of T. E. Lawrence, campaigning for Arab consultancies upon their

departure from the State Department, may wish us to believe that the Persian Gulf is the only major repository of oil, I found no independent petroleum geologist who agrees. If Sheikh Yamani would have us imagine that the lines at gas stations in the winter of 1973-74 were the result of an effective and reproducible oil embargo against the U.S., all those who have studied the matter conclude that the queuing was caused by a combination of federal bungling and media-induced consumer panic.

The notion that there is an energy shortage that requires us to salaam before OPEC, I discovered, is a canard promulgated by the cartel, its domestic clique, and a credulous press. Bernardo F. Grossling, a geophysicist with the U.S. Geological Survey, has performed a study for the World Bank that estimates total global petroleum reserves as high as 6,000 billion barrels—ten times the figure for proven reserves lugubriously cited by James R. Schlesinger and his retinue. This is 281.6 years' supply at the current rate of consumption, and does not include the prospect of enhanced recovery from conventional fields, heavy crudes such as those from Venezuela's huge Orinoco Belt, and oil from Antarctica, the continental slopes and rises, and the ocean floor, the latter three exceptions comprising 74.7 percent of the earth's surface. "It also appears likely," Grossling has said, "that the real costs of the new oil to be found will be significantly smaller than the price set by OPEC or the marginal cost in the U.S."

OPEC is not, then, the only prospective source of foreign oil. Huge untapped structures exist in such areas as La Brea-Paríñas, Peru; northwestern Argentina; the Paleozoic play of northwestern Brazil; the Chad Basin; the Congo Basin; the Etosha Basin in Namibia; the Paris Basin; northern Italy; the Thrace Basin; the Baluchistan folds of Pakistan; Bangladesh; Burma; South Australia; Bonaparte Gulf, Australia; the Arctic Islands; the Mackenzie Delta in Canada; the Yukon subsalt play, and so forth and so on. OPEC has been able to force a suspension of the law of nations, but not of the law of supply and demand. Quadrupled oil prices have stimulated exploration and resulted in startling discoveries. When OPEC seized power in 1973, Mexico's proven oil reserves were considered to amount to no more than 2.8 billion barrels. In September, 1978, Petroleos Mexicanos announced proven reserves of 20 billion barrels. Industry sources say this figure is "very conservative" and tally proven reserves at 30 to 50 billion barrels. Dr. Sevinc Carlson, of Georgetown's Center for Strategic and International Studies, now indicates that "Mexico's reserves might be second only to those of Saudi Arabia," which now stand at 151.4 billion proven barrels. Grossling places total Mexican reserves at 160 billion barrels or more. Other estimates run twice that high. The Abu Dhabi daily *Al-Ittihad* describes Mexican oil as "a real threat and a dangerous competitor."

OPEC knows that we quake in unreasoning terror at the merest threat of a second oil embargo. Lately the cartel has begun intimating that it will cut us off if we do not eliminate quotas and tariffs on imports of petroleum products, impediments that discourage OPEC from moving downstream into the refining, marketing, and manufacture of petrochemicals. "It may not be long," All Khalifa al-Sabah, oil minister of Kuwait and chairman of OPEC, said in October, 1978, "before the removal of such practices becomes a condition of supply of crude oil." This is an implicit demand that we shut down an appreciable portion of two American industries. Were we to accede to such bluster, one wonders how long it would be before OPEC was requiring that it be al-

lowed to manufacture penicillin for the U.S. as a precondition for supplying us with gasoline.

For there to be a second embargo, however, there would have to have been a first. What we experienced in the winter of 1973-74 was a pseudo-embargo. The flow of non-Arab OPEC oil to Western countries continued as usual. The flow of Arab OPEC oil did not continue as usual: It increased. According to *British Petroleum Statistical Review of the World Oil Industry 1975* and the International Monetary Fund's *International Financial Statistics*, November, 1975 Arab oil exports in 1973 increased by 12.6 percent—twice the growth rate in each of the previous two years. Saudi production rose by 26 percent in 1973. During the last quarter of 1973 Saudi petroleum exports were 3 percent higher than during the same trimester of the previous year, while during the first three months of 1974 they were 9 percent higher. According to Prof. Robert S. Pindyck of M.I.T., "an oil embargo cannot really be directed against the U.S. or any single country. Oil-producing countries can dictate the quantity of oil to be produced, but they cannot dictate where that oil will ultimately be shipped. For this reason, the announced Arab oil embargo against the U.S. and the Netherlands in the fall of 1973 had little impact upon those countries' imports. Gasoline lines in the U.S. were really caused by price controls and the misallocation of regional supplies by the FEA [Federal Energy Administration]." During a Saudi trade mission to the U.S. in 1975, Farouk Akhdar, director of the technical affairs office of the kingdom's central planning agency, told a Los Angeles audience that the announced embargo was "psychological" and "a paper tiger."

An embargo is even less likely today. It is often noted that Saudi Arabia, without whose participation even another pseudo-embargo would be impossible, could afford a substantial cutback in its annual oil sales of \$37.8 billion because it has \$55 billion in cash reserves. But the Saudi regime has yet to receive the bills for most of the \$142-billion Second Five Year Plan for national development that ends in 1980, after which it has bought its subjects' tenuous loyalty and with the promise of an even more costly program. The Saudis can no more withstand a drastic reduction in income than could an executive with \$55,000 in the bank who makes \$37,800 a year, is building a \$142,000 house that must be paid for in cash by 1980, and has promised a wife with whom he is on precarious terms then to begin building an even more expensive vacation home. The oil-sharing plan of the industrial countries administered by the International Energy Agency, and OPEC's fear that the monetary reserves its members have deposited in New York and Euromarket banks since 1974 would be frozen if an embargo were declared, combine further to dampen the power of the oil weapon.

Perhaps the most paralyzing myth is that, aside from attempting to conserve energy and switch to alternatives, the U.S. is helpless before OPEC's shutdown of the industrial economies. Quite to the contrary, so many techniques are available to diminish OPEC's monopoly control that the cartel's elite must consider us to be a nation of fools and weaklings for not having implemented them.

1. ADOPT A STRATEGY OF OIL PROLIFERATION

The approach that enjoys the most enthusiastic following on Capitol Hill among those who appreciate the need for—and relative technical ease of—disengaging from our waltz with OPEC is what William C. Lane, Jr., formerly on the staff of Sen. Frank Church's Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, has called "a strategy of oil prolif-

eration." Lane points out in a privately circulated paper that there are twice as many oil wells in Kansas as in all of South America, three times as many in Arkansas as in all of Africa. He urges more exploration and development of oil and gas outside of OPEC.

The world "overhang" of oil—the difference between what can be produced and what actually is produced—is currently 20 percent of world production, or about 11 million barrels a day. According to S. Fred Singer, professor of environmental sciences at the University of Virginia, "an increase of overhang of only 4-5 million barrels a day may be enough to influence the cartel price. (Once certain cartel members find that they must cut back on their production [to maintain OPEC's posted price], they may be anxious to sell under the table at a reduced price.) The overhang can be raised by increased oil production anywhere in the world, and by greater conservation measures including also switching to other energy sources."

Several encouraging initiatives are already being pursued in the area of oil proliferation. Last year the World Bank, which previously had a policy against lending to less-developed countries [LDCs] for oil drilling, made a modest loan to India to finance wells in the Bombay High field. The World Bank is also now considering the possibility of encouraging legislation within LDCs that would be favorable to oil exploration; financing the assembly of additional information on potential oil resources in such countries; funding geological studies for foreign national oil companies to determine whether formations merit exploration; and financing additional study of untapped discoveries.

Sen. Daniel P. Moynihan intends to press for legislation that would direct the government to use all available tools, including the creation of special foreign-aid programs and the use of its dominant influence in the World Bank and regional banks, to expand world oil production. The bill would require the U.S. to diversify its sources of foreign oil by limiting the percentage of imports that could come from any one country.

There are many additional measures the U.S. could take to promote the proliferation of non-OPEC oil supplies, including:

Revoking all IRS rulings allowing foreign tax credits for OPEC oil. The U.S. Treasury continues to wink at what oil insiders call "the golden gimmick," a system of creative accounting under which OPEC governments dub the bulk of the price they charge for oil "income taxes." American oil companies are thus permitted not merely to deduct their payments for OPEC oil purchases from the total income on which U.S. taxes are levied, but to credit such payments dollar-for-dollar against their U.S. tax liability. These rulings were originally granted in the 1950s at the behest of the State Department as a means of channeling funds to bolster the Iranian and Saudi regimes without the need for Congressionally appropriated foreign aid. They force taxpayers to subsidize OPEC to the tune of \$1 billion a year. Rep. Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Democrat of New York, has fought successfully for revocation of the tax credits for oil purchases from Saudi Arabia and Libya, only to find that the Treasury intends to allow the companies to apply enormous past credits against future purchases from those countries. Petroleum economist Paul Davidson, of Rutgers University, would go beyond rescinding the tax creditability of OPEC oil. He proposes that oil companies not even be allowed to deduct from their taxable income "any payments to any members of a cartel who are deliberately using economic power and threats of embargo to extort income or wealth" from the U.S. He points out that to deny either tax credit or deduction treatment for bogus in-

come tax payments to OPEC would induce the companies either to bargain for better terms from OPEC, or to reduce their purchases from cartel members and increase production elsewhere.

Expanding U.S. Export-Import Bank financing for exploration in non-OPEC countries. The bank now guarantees loans for the purchases of drilling equipment and pipe, but not for the payment of labor at the drilling site or other expenses.

Augmenting the U.S. Overseas Private Investment Corporation's program of insuring American oil exploration and development investments in non-OPEC countries against expropriation, now at a token level, while pressing non-OPEC governments to honor contracts with U.S. oil companies on which the security of their investments depends.

Reversing the U.S. Agency for International Development's policy against loans or grants for wildcat oil exploration.

Creating a special U.S. fund to finance non-OPEC oil exploration and development where economic and political risks are too high for private capital to assume.

Supporting the creation of a new international agency to provide technical and financial assistance to non-OPEC countries in developing their oil and gas resources, as has been advocated by Prof. Peter R. Odell of Erasmus University, the Netherlands.

Purchasing oil for U.S. military and other governmental needs through long-term contracts with non-OPEC suppliers, to encourage development efforts in those countries by guaranteeing a market for their oil.

Filling our anti-embargo Strategic Petroleum Reserve exclusively from non-OPEC sources submitting sealed bids. A spokesman for the Department of Energy told me that that agency has "no policy as to the countries from which the oil for the reserve is to be acquired." So far, under this policy of having no policy, much of the stockpile has come from such OPEC members as Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, and Iran.

Imposing a quota on oil imports, but exempting Mexico and Canada by creating a "North American free-trade zone" for hydrocarbons, as has been proposed by Dr. Arnold E. Safer, vice president for economic research and planning of New York's Irving Trust Company and one of the world's leading petroleum authorities.

2. SUPPORT A FUTURES MARKET IN PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Trading in futures contracts for heating and fuel oil has been initiated by the New York Mercantile Exchange. If contracts for future delivery of oil products come to be traded actively, prices of gasoline and fuel oil will fall in a slack market. As the major oil companies saw the prices of their refining divisions' products declining, they would have no choice but to press OPEC to cut crude oil prices. There has been some question in the trade as to whether existing storage facilities are ample enough to meet the futures market's needs. The federal government could remove this reservation by building storage facilities for the exchange as part of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which traders would fill with oil products at no cost to the taxpayer. To prime the exchange's pump, all government procurement of oil products could be channeled through the market.

3. IMPLEMENT AN OIL IMPORT QUOTA AUCTION SYSTEM

M.I.T.'s M. A. Adelman, generally considered the foremost petroleum economist, regards breaking OPEC as both necessary and possible. He has proposed that the federal government estimate the number of barrels of imported oil needed each month, and print that number of import authorization tickets.

"No barrel could be imported without a ticket," Professor Adelman explained to me. "The tickets would be sold at monthly auctions by sealed bids. If our import needs for the current month were under- or overestimated, the next month's printing of tickets could be adjusted accordingly."

"The tickets would have no scarcity value—only a small convenience value, since importers and exporters would need them to bring oil into the U.S."

"Secrecy would be achieved by letting anybody bid for the tickets, with no requirement except a certified check for the deposit. A lawyer or broker deposits a check for several dozen million dollars, without revealing whom he's acting for. There would be a second barrier to knowing who the real bidders are because there would be a resale market for the tickets. A given shipload of oil arriving here could be covered by tickets issued to various people at various times."

"Once even one government began paying more than a few cents for tickets bought covertly, every other OPEC member would be under the gun: either buy tickets or lose your whole market in the U.S. For instance, Libya, Indonesia, Venezuela, Algeria, and Nigeria sell us, respectively, 31, 36, 45, 72, and 49 percent of their production. They'd have to bid for tickets or face drastic sudden losses in income. If they tried to sell their oil elsewhere in the midst of the current world glut, the OPEC price would crumble."

"Also, cheating on price to get a bigger slice of the U.S. market would be very tempting to any OPEC country wanting extra revenue. To do this, they'd need to buy more tickets, and the competition among the OPEC cheaters and the OPEC countries struggling to maintain their U.S. market share would drive the price of tickets higher and higher."

"The revenues from the auctions would amount to rebates to the U.S. Treasury by OPEC countries for the privilege of access to the American market. The official price of OPEC oil might remain the same, but the real price paid by the U.S. economy would be reduced by the proceeds of ticket sales. These revenues could be refunded to all consumers, or used to subsidize low-income consumers, public transportation, or energy research and development."

4. ANNOUNCE A CONTINGENCY PLAN FOR SUPPLY DISRUPTION

As proposed by Arthur W. Wright, of the University of Massachusetts, this could include a commitment to allow oil prices to rise temporarily if necessary to clear the market, and a standby excess-profits levy, refundable to consumers, to tax away from oil companies any windfall profit received from a sudden temporary price rise. Announcement of such a plan, by making it known to OPEC that there will be no repeat of the 1973-74 consumer panic, would deter another pseudo-embargo.

5. INCREASE THE SIZE OF THE U.S. STOCKPILE

Prof. Robert S. Pindyck has pointed out that the planned one-billion-barrel Strategic Petroleum Reserve will hold only three months' supply of imported oil. A year's supply would be the best deterrent. The stockpile goal should be expanded to at least four billion barrels.

6. ACCELERATE THE CREATION OF THE STOCKPILE

"The one-billion-barrel level is not scheduled to be reached until 1983. They should fill that stockpile as fast as physically possible," Professor Adelman says, "and hang the expense."

LICENSE EXPORTS TO OPEC COUNTRIES

The federal government has statutory authority to license exports of U.S. goods when necessary for the national security. One way

of strengthening our bargaining position with OPEC—as well as reducing the vested interest of exporters of heavy machinery, transport equipment, and construction services and high oil prices overseas—would be to require licenses for exports to oil-producing countries, as was recommended by the General Accounting Office in January, 1978. Fees for such licenses could vary from nominal to prohibitive according to the responsiveness of each country to U.S. energy needs.

The issue of *Business Week* dated August 28, 1978, featured a colloquy with Arthur Burns that has added to speculation as to the reason for his departure from the Federal Reserve chairmanship. "You would favor an effort to try to break the OPEC price?" he was asked. "Why, of course I would," Burns replied. "I was in favor of that in November, 1973, and urged that on Mr. Kissinger and later on Mr. Ford. I got a little group started working, but in the end nothing came of the effort, I'm sorry to say. . . . You can exert economic pressure by restricting certain exports that are essential to the economies of those countries. I felt that by holding up certain exports of machinery, planes, and military equipment something significant could be achieved."

8. DENY ARMS TO COUNTRIES THAT RAISE PRICES OR CUT PRODUCTION

John C. West, the U.S. Ambassador to Arabia, said that as a result of supplying the Saudis with our most sophisticated war planes "two things will follow automatically. We will keep an oil-price freeze through 1978, and Saudi Arabia will [remain] on the dollar basis indefinitely." It is astounding that all we could wring from the Saudis in exchange for supplying them with warplanes in the 1980s was a promise to hold the line on price for seven-and-a-half months in 1978. U.S. weapons are the most advanced in the world and OPEC countries covet them, blather about their taking their custom elsewhere notwithstanding. Arms sales to oil-producing countries should be contingent on their long-term performance in meeting U.S. energy needs.

9. LIMIT THE PRICE OF FOREIGN CRUDE OIL IN THE UNITED STATES

Under an ingenious plan proposed by Dr. Arnold E. Safer, the price at which oil could be imported into the U.S. would be set at an amount somewhat lower than the world price—say, \$10. An "import price differential payment" representing the approximate difference between the set figure and the OPEC price of about \$13 would be negotiated directly between the U.S. government and the individual oil-producing governments. The oil companies are now incapable of bargaining OPEC down because they compete with one another in appeasing its members in the hope of maintaining "preferred access" to each country's oil. If this plan were adopted, the companies would be removed from negotiations with producing countries over prices and be replaced by the U.S. government, which would be susceptible to voter pressure to keep the differentials the Treasury would pay as low as possible. Such payments could be used further to dilute the cartel's cohesiveness by making them higher for those countries that agree to increase their oil production and lower for those that restrict it in an attempt to maintain OPEC's artificially high price.

10. RECTIFY DOMESTIC POLICIES

The mismatched mélange of domestic energy policies now in place amounts to a sort of Project Dependence, including a moronic "entitlements" program that pays refiners an incentive to import OPEC oil. An official from the Department of Energy, devoted more to the well-being of the country than to that of his agency, suggested to me, not altogether facetiously, that the most effective

way of breaking OPEC would be to eliminate the Department of Energy. "Aside from OPEC there's no real energy problem," he said. "If OPEC were out of the picture there'd be no need for an energy department. We manage to get along without a steel department, after all. The existence of the DOE means that 17,000 hungry, cunning people in this town depend directly on OPEC for their livelihood."

This survey by no means exhausts the possible components of an international energy policy designed to diminish OPEC's power. The current Administration, however, consciously rejects any such strategies. In a recent article in *Bankers Monthly*, George W. McKinney, Jr., senior vice-president of Irving Trust Company, accuses the Carter Administration of "continued support of OPEC obligopoly pricing capabilities." Carter's transition economic task force specifically recommended the Adelman plan, noting that "a trial period is practically costless, and anything that would contribute to the permanent lowering of oil prices is to be welcomed." The plan was conspicuously absent from Carter's energy program.

The dramatic upward revision of estimates of Mexican reserves in 1978 would lead one to hope that the Administration would respond by using every economic and diplomatic lever at hand to encourage Mexico to become a major hydrocarbon supplier to its most natural customer. Instead, the Administration has refused to pay \$2.60 per thousand-cubic-feet for Mexican natural gas, while agreeing to purchase liquefied natural gas from Algeria at \$4.50. An article in the *Wall Street Journal* of July 5, 1978, by Lawrence Goldmuntz, president of Economics and Science Planning, Inc., formerly assistant director of civil technology in the Executive Office of the President, and an authority on Mexican oil, created widespread interest in Mexico's energy potential. The following month an Administration source was cited in another article in that newspaper as comparing Mexico's "breakneck expansion of oil sales to a derelict selling his blood in the morning to buy an afternoon bottle of wine," no doubt an example of the delicacy with which the Administration intends to cater to Mexico's sense of national pride in future energy negotiations. For the tone of Administration policy, hear Harry E. Bergold, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Energy for international affairs: "To the extent that the things we did in 1973 or 1974 aimed at attacking or breaking up the cartel, we have changed our policy. We're trying to let the key producers know we're prepared to work with them."

The Administration has been influenced to stay away from Mexico, Adelman, et al., by the State Department, whose old Arab hands fret that were we to put OPEC out of business, the result could be "destabilization" in the Persian Gulf—revolutionary takeover or invasion by neighbors. The countervailing view, that in the first place OPEC is destabilizing our societies (e.g., Italy), and in the second, escalating revenues are turning narrowly based oil-producing regimes into ever greater prizes for overthrow from within and incursion from without, is rejected out of hand, as is the fact that such ultraradical regimes as Libya and Iraq remain exceedingly anxious to sell their oil to us. Great weight is accorded the notion that Saudi Arabia, whose most recent change of government was effected by the assassination of the head of state while sitting on his throne and which feels compelled to maintain two separate armies—the mission of one of which is to guard the regime against the other—is a paragon of stability. The Arabists have the last word at State, and State has the last word on U.S. international energy policy.

The political support for the State Department's position comes from a coalition within the U.S. that benefits from high oil prices

overseas: manufacturers of heavy machinery and transport equipment, who last year exported nearly \$13 billion worth of goods to OPEC countries, five times as much as before the price rise in 1973 but less than half what we pay out for OPEC oil; international construction companies engaged by OPEC governments, which are undertaking projects like the petrochemical complex at Jubail, Saudi Arabia, the most expensive single building project in the history of civilization; banks that serve as depositories for more than \$50 billion in OPEC surpluses and that have loaned OPEC governments more than \$12 billion that can be repaid only if oil revenues remain high; oil companies, which see each OPEC price escalation as increasing the eventual value of their domestic reserves; weapons manufacturers that are selling to OPEC amounts of military matériel unprecedented in the annals of the arms trade; and a caravan of lawyers (e.g., Clark Clifford, J. William Fulbright) and publicists hired by OPEC governments to look after their interests at the petrodollar wellhead.

Outside of this coterie of direct beneficiaries of OPEC, there is no one among us whose life is not diminished by the economic, political, social, and moral dislocations caused by the foreign oil monopoly. That our institutions have failed to come to grips with this epochal issue is a challenge to those who recall that the founding of this nation was instigated by an unconscionable tax on a commodity not nearly so basic as petroleum is today. The time for rallying the constituency whose quiescence up till now so perplexed and disturbed my White House friend is ripe. There are men and women among our nation's energy policy makers who perceive that OPEC's monopoly exaction is a global tea tax, eroding the economic underpinnings of liberty worldwide. They can only move if the most far-seeing of their countrymen make it known that they are with them. To dump a shipload of Libyan oil in Boston Harbor would make the point nicely but the environmental impact would be lamentable. More circumspect avenues of expression must be pursued if the industrial and developing worlds are not to languish, needlessly, in subjection to petrocratic tyranny. ●

SOME IMPRESSIONS OF THE 95TH CONGRESS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report from November 1, 1978, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SOME IMPRESSIONS OF THE 95TH CONGRESS

The 95th Congress has come to an end, but several impressions of it will remain strong in my mind.

The strongest impression (which I may have because I write these lines after 31 hours of continuous floor action) is that the 95th Congress worked at a frantic pace, particularly in the last few months of the session. As the moment of adjournment approached, weary Congressmen voted on scores of major bills within a few hours. The House finished up with a record of 834 roll call votes, more than in any previous session. Some turmoil at the end of the session is unavoidable, but it is not good legislative practice to schedule a "log jam" of bills just before Congress goes out. It is apparent to me that the volume of business in Congress

has simply become too great. There are too many agencies to oversee, too many programs to reauthorize, too many projects to study, and too many proposals to consider. In the years ahead Congress is going to have to learn the lesson of restraint when it debates proposed legislation.

My second impression is that the President finished the session with a much better record of congressional support than I had thought possible just a few months ago. The President had his notable failures, but his overall score card was good. One thing of interest to me was the support the President received from the Republican minority in Congress. On several occasions the Republicans conspicuously stepped forward to help him, especially when it came to foreign policy. During the year the President and his aides learned a great deal about Congress and the methods to be used to win over skeptical legislators.

The President took firm stands in foreign affairs and defense policy and pushed his views very hard on Capitol Hill. The Senate ratified the Panama Canal treaties and the Congress approved the proposed sale of airplanes to Egypt, Israel, and Saudi Arabia. In other developments, the arms embargo against Turkey was lifted and the veto of the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier was upheld. The President suffered scarcely a single major setback in these important legislative areas.

On the domestic side, the President's record was mixed. He secured passage of civil service reform, airline deregulation, and much of his economic program. He won approval for social security reform, a college student aid package, and a wide-ranging farm bill. Virtually all of his executive reorganization plans were accepted and his veto of inflationary water projects was sustained. With respect to the two most critical bills of the session—energy and taxes—the final products were adequate for him even though they differed substantially from his initial recommendations. His taxes on crude oil and on business use of natural gas and oil were dropped from the energy bill, but the other parts of the proposal survived. His tax reform measures and his attempt to maintain the capital gains tax rate were voted down, but the size of the final tax cut (\$20 billion) was satisfactory to him. However, the President failed to convince Congress to follow his lead on hospital cost control, welfare reform, a new Department of Education, a new agency for consumer protection, and various election reforms.

The 95th Congress has already been dubbed the "middle-class Congress" by the press. This, too, was my impression. The problems of the middle class clearly overshadowed the social issues that have dominated the congressional agenda for so many years. For example, the tax bill departed from recent tradition by giving most of the benefits to middle and upper income taxpayers. Congress also reined in government spending, slashed the federal deficit, and supported large outlays for defense. A conscientious attempt to respond to the tax revolt, rising inflation, and the new wave of fiscal restraint lay behind much of the activity of the 95th Congress.

In the constant give-and-take between labor and business, labor came in second. Labor lost not only on its top priority—the labor law reform bill—but also on a common situs picketing bill, a cargo preference bill to help the maritime unions, and a bill to permit government workers to participate in partisan politics. Labor did get a minimum wage increase, but the increase was not as large as labor wanted. Business, on the other hand, succeeded more often. It won new tax incentives to encourage investment, postponed stricter automobile emission standards, slowed the onslaught of government regulations, and helped bring about a reduction in the number of public service jobs.

Environmentalists were generally pleased with the work of the 95th Congress. They favored the strip mining law, the expansion of national parks, and the elimination of unnecessary water projects. However, they were deeply disappointed in the failure of Congress to set aside 100 million acres of parkland in Alaska. ●

INTELLIGENCE FAILURE—S. 2525

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in the proposed legislation to establish charters for the various intelligence agencies of our Nation, and particularly in the measure titled "The Intelligence Reorganization and Reform Act" (S. 2525) the potential for further damage to our intelligence capabilities should not be minimized.

A recent editorial in the Wall Street Journal issue of January 18, 1979, criticized the performance of the so-called Pike and Church committees of the last Congress. As the ranking minority member of the Pike committee, I agree that this criticism is fully justified. However, the time for inflicting damage on our intelligence agencies by legislation or hearings must come to a halt as we work to rebuild confidence in the support for these vital agencies of our Nation which are so essential to our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I am attaching hereto the Wall Street Journal editorial for the further enlightenment of my colleagues.

INTELLIGENCE FAILURE S. 2525

It sometimes happens that events bypass proposed legislation before it can be enacted into law. Something like this seems to have happened to S. 2525, the Intelligence Reorganization and Reform Act reported out of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, a new committee created in 1977. This bill, designed to protect our civil liberties against the "invisible empire" of an omniscient CIA, is the committee's response to public fears and images of wrong-doing created back in 1976 by the accusatory hearings of the Church committee, the Select Committee's predecessor.

The committee has been busy these years fine-tuning the bill in search of an appropriate mix between civil liberties and the Attorney General's prerogatives on "intelligence intrusion." And now Vice President Mondale and the American Civil Liberties Union are completing their negotiations over which circumstances permit what information to be collected in which way on which individuals, thus permitting the committee to mark up the bill for presentation to the Senate.

In the meanwhile the public has been learning of a long string of intelligence failures, of which the unanticipated collapse of the shah's position in Iran is the latest, and is wondering why the CIA's intelligence is so far off the mark. The public's concern has shifted from fear that the agency's activities will pre-empt civil liberties to fear that the agency lacks competence.

The time spent fine-tuning the bill has served a purpose. It has permitted more important facts about the nation's intelligence capabilities, or lack thereof, to come out before Congress could pass a bill and claim to have disposed of the intelligence problem.

That an analysis of Soviet open-source material by a single outside researcher could force the CIA to double its estimate of Soviet military spending; that the CIA could grossly underestimate the size, scope and purpose of the Soviet strategic buildup; that the CIA could not perceive the brewing instability in Iran—these enormous intelligence failures are what concern the American public today. The Intelligence Committee's bill does not address this concern. Indeed, to this day the committee has never held hearings on the fundamental issues of what intelligence does the U.S. need and how is the U.S. to acquire it.

The hearings sponsored by the Pike and Church committees were themselves intelligence failures. These circus-like performances bequeathed a one-sided concern to their successor committees, a concern that has prohibited them from dealing with the real intelligence problem.

Today the credibility of the U.S. is strained, both with its allies and its enemies. We cannot afford any more extravagant misperceptions. There will always be intelligence failures, but the goal should be to minimize them. Before the Senate passes a bill reflecting outmoded concerns, it ought to investigate the requirements of an effective intelligence service. Perhaps some hearings in this direction would be an appropriate new venture for the Select Committee on Intelligence. ●

TOP NAVY RECRUITERS HOSTED ON CAPITOL HILL

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed a pleasure for me to co-host with the Non Commissioned Officers Association of the USA (NCOA) a tour of the Capitol and a reception and luncheon on January 24, for the Navy's top recruiters of 1978.

The reception and luncheon were held in the Rayburn House Office Building with 59 guests present. Attending were Senators STROM THURMOND and JOHN WARNER, and Congressman BILL FRENZEL.

Sending representatives were Senators ROBERT MORGAN and HARRISON WILLIAMS, and Congressmen WILLIAM CHAPPELL, MENDEL DAVIS, DAVID E. SATTERFIELD, and BOB WILSON.

Other guests were: Rear Adm. Thomas Kilcline, the Navy's Chief of Legislative Affairs, representing the Chief of Naval Operations; Rear Adm. E. S. Briggs, Commander, Navy Recruiting Command; Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy Robert Walker; Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy Recruiting Command Charles Jackson; Fred Schwengel, former Member of Congress from Iowa and now president, U.S. Capitol Historical Society; Mr. Robert W. Nolan, Executive Secretary, Fleet Reserve Association; and representatives of the Navy League of U.S., Naval Reserve Association, Navy Office of Legislative Affairs, and Navy Recruiting Command.

NCOA's executive vice president Normand M. Gonsauls presented specially prepared certificates of achievement to the recruiters honored. He thanked each for their contribution to the Navy's effort in attracting qualified men and women to the U.S. Navy. Assisting Mr.

Gonsauls were Admiral Briggs and Master Chief Jackson.

Receiving certificates were: SMC Paul P. Covington, top enlisted recruiter from the Newark, N.J. recruiting district who was meritoriously promoted on Monday, January 22, to his present grade; BM1 Rufus L. Gibbs from Columbia, S.C. district; AG1 Michael J. Nelson, Minneapolis, Minn., district; TM1 Walter D. Trahan, Houston, Tex. district, NC1 James M. Eller, II, Pittsburgh, Pa. district, and RM1 Darrell R. Lanterman, Los Angeles, Calif. district.

Top recruiting officers, also receiving NCOA certificates, were: Lt. Cmdr. William H. Starnes, Raleigh, N.C. district, holding first place title in the officer category; Lt. Cmdr. Matthew D. Larson, Minneapolis, Minn. district; Lt. Charles J. Benway, New York, N.Y.; Lt. Thomas D. Snyder, Richmond, Va.; Lt. John E. Chalker, San Diego, Calif.; and Lt. John Robert Purket, New Orleans, La.

Honorary Navy Recruiter certificates were presented by Admiral Briggs to Messrs. Schwengel and Gonsauls. Gonsauls in turn gave "top recruiter" certificates to Briggs and Master Chief Jackson.

Also recognized were the wives of the top recruiters and the attending officers and enlisted men of the first place and runner-up recruiting districts for 1978. The Washington, D.C., area won first honors with San Diego and Jacksonville, Fla., as first and second runners-up respectively.

Earlier in the day, recruiters and their wives were treated to a tour of the U.S. Capitol. Acting as guide was our former colleague, Fred Schwengel, probably the most knowledgeable person today familiar with the building's history.

Acting as special hosts for the reception and luncheon were: "Mack" McKinney, master of ceremonies; R. W. (Dick) Johnson, Jr.; and John R. Butz; of the National Capitol Office; and Lt. Cmdr. Cecilia Brown USN and Lt. Andrea Nelson USN of the Navy's Congressional Liaison and Recruiting Command respectively.●

THE PHIL PORTNOY ASSOCIATION

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the important public services performed by the private sector. The citizens of the United States are the backbone of our communities and of the many nonprofit, voluntary organizations that provide needed assistance in many different ways.

In my hometown of Union, N.J., the Phil Portnoy Association annually recognizes an outstanding member of the community for the public services he or she has performed. The association's humanitarian award and dinner this year also will assist a hospitalized vet-

eran, Mr. Bob Baxter, a much admired and highly respected member of the community. For many years, until a tragic accident, Mr. Baxter was a photographer for the Union Leader, the community newspaper.

The Phil Portnoy Association's award this year will honor Mrs. Genevieve Pascale DiVenuto of Union, whose personal contributions to the community have been carried out over a period of 37 years, beginning with her volunteer service to the Nation in the World War II bond drive. The war bond sales played a significant role in helping the United States sustain our troops in Europe and the Pacific.

During that same wartime period, Mrs. DiVenuto joined many other young women as a staff worker for the USO, where she helped to rehabilitate our servicemen injured in combat.

In the postwar years, she became active in a day nursery program and in serving as the Union County, N.J., chairman of the March of Dimes. She also found time to serve as chairwoman of the Union Community Bloodmobile for the American Red Cross, and has been a leader in the Red Cross for many years.

Those of us who recall the scourge of polio during those years recognize that the work of volunteers like Mrs. DiVenuto helped to raise the funds to conquer polio.

Even after the breakthrough in the Salk vaccine had been achieved, Mrs. DiVenuto continued to direct the March of Dimes drive in Union County to help the victims of polio and to sustain the research into other childhood diseases that the March of Dimes took an interest in.

During the period of the sixties, Mrs. DiVenuto also became involved in promoting the cultural and historic aspects of community life through the Union Township Historical Society and the Union Township Symphony Concert Association.

These efforts also led Mrs. DiVenuto into new challenges in the business world. She was the charter president of the Women's Division of the Chamber of Commerce of Eastern Union County. The Union Township Chamber of Commerce selected her as Citizen of the Year in 1970, and she was the first woman to become the chairman of the Eastern Union County Chapter of the American Red Cross.

In the next few years, her many endeavors were further recognized by the Union Chapter of UNICO, which selected her as "Citizen of the Year."

Mrs. DiVenuto's compassion and sensitivity to the needs of the poor brought about her appointment to the Local Assistance Board of Union Township, and in 1978 she was appointed charter member of the Board of Directors of the Alcohol Intervention of Union County.

Mr. Speaker, this is an individual who has given her all to help the victims of accidents, injury, and other medical necessities.

She is truly a remarkable and outstanding woman whose service to the community and to our Nation is being recognized by the Phil Portnoy Association. I join the members of the associa-

tion and the citizens of Union County, N.J., in paying tribute to this outstanding American woman.●

WILLIAM YANDELL ELLIOTT

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished former member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Ambassador John Davis Lodge, has written me about the recent death of Prof. William Yandell Elliott of Harvard. Aside from his academic attainments, Professor Elliott also served as Chief of Staff of the Foreign Affairs Committee in 1947-48.

While I did not know Mr. Elliott well, I am aware of his reputation as a scholar, a teacher, and an outstanding public servant. On behalf of all of the members of the Committee on International Relations, I wish to take this opportunity to extend my deepest sympathy to members of Mr. Elliott's family.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point a eulogy about the life and career of William Yandell Elliott, which was composed by his close friend and admirer, Ambassador Lodge. The statement follows:

WILLIAM YANDELL ELLIOTT

The departure from our earthly scene of William Yandell Elliott removes a brilliant, constructive patriotic American at a time when his remarkable intellect, his alert understanding of the world scene and his irrepressible courage are sorely needed.

I knew him well, for he directed the staff of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives when I was a member. We had an excellent staff, small and of top calibre. It was a luxury to have as the chief of staff a professor of such recognized distinction as Bill Elliott. His credentials were such that he was able year after year to ride out the criticism for his vigorously anti-communist stance which he received at Harvard.

His assistance and wise counsel were greatly appreciated by the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee and in particular by me, for we had a stimulating meeting of minds which is rare in this turbulent world of dissension and strife.

He influenced many students, some of whom afterwards reached high positions. He prodded and provoked even those who disagreed with him to greater effort and superior accomplishment. He did not, as some do, confuse breadth of mind with a failure to hold convictions. He thought of the University not so much as an opportunity for the faculty to search for the truth, but rather as an institution for the development of the minds and the formation of the characters of the students.

He held to his beliefs, not out of a stubborn inability to face the facts, but rather because having faced the facts, he fell inexorably upon the truth.

He will be missed. Today, in 1979, with the cold war an almost nostalgic memory, as the world is put to the fire and the sword, it is sad that Bill Elliott is not here to help us. He knew the enemy, his methods and his goals. He understood in all its terrible significance the dreadful challenge of our time.●

DECLINE IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE STUDY

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I call to the serious attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on January 18, 1979. The editorial addresses a very significant issue in American education: The continuing decline of foreign language study at all levels in our school system.

As a member of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, I have become increasingly concerned about the trend away from foreign language study in the United States. And because the study of a foreign language should properly be viewed as a tool toward better understanding of other cultures, the concern I have goes well beyond foreign language study itself. The main issue is not really whether Americans have the technical ability to communicate effectively in another language (right now, of course, far too many do not); the main issue in my mind concerns a more fundamental question: To what extent are Americans today able to understand the world in which we live?

Recent events in Iran, to take an obvious example, suggest to me a number of propositions: First, that events in far away countries have a profound effect on our own society; second, that Americans, both within and outside the Government, were totally unprepared to appreciate the compelling attraction which tradition and religion can have in societies which move too rapidly toward modernization; third, that we are far too often culture-bound in our assessment of world events; fourth, that this ignorance (almost a blindness, really) points up dramatically and frighteningly our present shortcomings in dealing effectively with a changing world.

America today faces difficult decisions in a world environment which essentially invalidates the crusty and simplistic assumptions which were so popular only a few short years ago. America today must learn to meet the challenge of a world in which there are few, if any, certainties remaining, a world facing a population crunch, an energy shortfall, a food crisis, and a major military and political competition between two rival social orders. In this context, it is absolutely inexcusable for America to fail to educate its population, especially its youth, about the complexities of this world environment. Our survival demands a concerted effort on the part of every American to learn about the world, and Government has the responsibility to give every American an incentive to do so.

Before reading the editorial, let me leave you with the following thought: Given the inadequacy of present programs in foreign language and international studies, will it be possible for our Nation to discover and follow a path

which best meets the needs of our Nation in a world which will be dominated by the debate between the North and the South over a world economic order which is not working well for either party. Because policy decisions in democratic society are inextricably linked to domestic political considerations, is not it then in the national interest to insure that our population, the electorate and the future leaders of our society, are sensitized to the problems of the world? Absent this sensitivity, finding the proper course for our Nation will become a very difficult matter indeed.

The editorial from the Los Angeles Times follows:

ETUDIEZ, S'IL VOUS PLAÎT

Next to Mandarin, English is the single most widely spoken language in the world. It is the primary tongue of more than 370 million people, the second language of millions more. English has long since supplanted French as the international language of travel, commerce and diplomacy. That's an honor of sorts, we suppose, but it is one not without cost.

Our guess is that the fairly large numbers of English speakers in the world, combined with the immense international importance of our own country, is one reason for the sad state of foreign-language studies in the schools. A sort of unconscious linguistic imperialism seems to be at work. Why bother learning foreign languages when so many foreigners already speak ours? And, if they don't speak ours, then they damn well better learn to do so, or we'll take our tourism and our business elsewhere.

The larger and more demonstrable reasons for the decline in foreign-language studies are also the more obvious ones: the lack of student interest in them; the all-too-eager willingness of school boards to reduce or drop language requirements as an economy measure; the general softening of college admission and graduation standards so that a certain number of years of language study no longer are demanded.

Today, only 15 percent of all high-school students study a modern language. Fewer than 2 percent of that minority ever carry their studies to the third year. Only 1 percent of high-school students make any effort to learn Latin, a useful if not essential aid in learning modern languages. By contrast about 36 percent of secondary-school students were enrolled in foreign-language study programs in 1940.

Learning a language—any language—is hard. The limited proficiency with which so many "educated" Americans speak and write their own language helps illustrate the point. Yet we know of no credible evidence suggesting that Americans are inherently any more stupid than anyone else, at least when it comes to learning languages. People who have to learn a new language—in the military or government or private business—often are remarkably successful at doing so. One big reason, of course, is motivation. A second reason is that, under the spur of necessity, virtually full time can be devoted to foreign-language study. Such immersion is not practical in the normal schooling process.

Yet, if motivation cannot be assured among students, or lengthy time spared from other educational needs in the schools, at least some degree of exposure to foreign-language study can be required, and the earlier the age for beginning that the better.

A decade or so ago, the impression gained ground that foreign-language study isn't "relevant," which among other things meant that it isn't easy. True. But easy or not, it is rewarding, useful and, increasingly in a shrinking world, necessary, and the nation's

schools and colleges would be better serving their educational purposes if they once again began insisting that students spend some time studying the languages that most of the rest of the world gets by in. ●

THE CIVIL DEFENSE SHELL GAME

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, up until very recently civil defense was not considered to be important in the scheme of things. Over the years, the U.S.S.R., increment by increment, has built up its civil defense system, until it is a huge effort. Arguments rage about its effectiveness, but its effectiveness will only be known after a war starts. What is important is how the Soviet rulers perceive the effectiveness of their system in the overall strategic equation. If the Soviet rulers feel that their present system will enable the Soviet Union to absorb a nuclear exchange with the United States and be able to go on fighting, then, obviously, strategic planning in the U.S.S.R. will take this factor into account. The Soviet system is designed to have people and factories survive. American planning is simply based upon the thought that "nuclear war is unthinkable" and if it occurs no one can win it. However, if our planners are wrong, there will be no loving cup for second place.

Leon Goure, a long-time authority on Soviet civil defense efforts, wrote an editorial that appeared in Strategic Review for Winter 1979 entitled: "The Civil Defense Shell Game," which I think addresses the problem we face in a succinct manner. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE CIVIL DEFENSE SHELL GAME

On November 13, White House Press Secretary Jody Powell announced that the President had decided to strengthen the U.S. civil defense program by developing plans over the next five years for the "relocation of population during time of crisis." This decision was said to be the result of a year-long interagency study, directed by the National Security Council, of U.S. civil defense policies and programs. The study also took into account the "civil defense efforts of the Soviet Union, among other factors."

On the basis of the recommendations of this study, Powell said, the President had decided upon a civil defense program "which basically states that civil defense is an element of the strategic balance in conjunction with our offensive and defensive forces and can serve to enhance deterrence and stability." On the surface, this decision appears to reverse earlier reported views of Secretary of Defense Harold Brown and the then Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), Paul Warnke, who had argued that the Soviet civil defense capabilities—and consequently also U.S. civil defense—did not affect the U.S.-Soviet strategic balance and the effectiveness and credibility of the U.S. deterrence posture.

Indeed, the Presidential decision, as reflected by Powell, seemed to hark back to the warnings that former Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld sounded in the *Defense Department Annual Report*, published on January 17, 1977. In it Rumsfeld took note

of the "magnitude of Soviet civil defense efforts" and warned that this capability, when "coupled with high accuracy and more reliable missiles, could adversely affect our ability to implement the U.S. deterrence strategy." Rumsfeld foresaw the possibility that a Soviet first strike "could conceivably eliminate most of the fixed U.S. ICBM forces, all the non-alert bombers (and perhaps even some on the alert), and all of the SLBMs in port" so that the "U.S. second-strike retaliatory forces would have a much lower damage expectancy," while "Soviet damage expectancy against the U.S., by contrast, would remain almost constant."

An implication of such an asymmetry was cited in a letter, also in January 1977, from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General George S. Brown, to Senator William Proxmire, in which he noted that in a "worst case scenario a fatality ratio of 10 to 1 [U.S. as against Soviet fatalities] might occur." At the present time, it is estimated that a massive Soviet first strike could inflict on the unprotected American populace something on the order of 140 million fatalities. With the continuing build-up of Soviet strategic capabilities, this number may climb to 160 million by 1985. Meanwhile, Secretary Brown has acknowledged the existence of a growing threat to the survival of U.S. ICBMs.

The timing of the Administration's announcement of an enhanced civil defense program, which Powell described as providing for "an increase in the number of surviving members of the population and for greater continuity of government, should deterrence fail," inevitably led to speculation that it is primarily intended to influence Congressional attitudes toward the ratification of a soon-to-be-concluded SALT II Agreement. The Administration has denied these allegations. Yet, if the Administration is as serious about launching a new long-term civil defense program as it claims to be, it has been remarkably inept in making a case for the plan.

First of all, the Administration had weakened its arguments in favor of the program by publishing in July a CIA report on Soviet civil defense, which purported to represent the findings and conclusions of a crash effort by the intelligence community to assess the scope and implications of the Soviet civil defense program. Actually the study was based on a small sample of Soviet cities. Moreover, because of bureaucratic in-fighting, the intelligence analysts were forced to make use of a mere portion of the available evidence and to agree to a report which was intended to preclude "alarmist" findings. As a result, the report makes sweeping but unsubstantiated conclusions which were favored by the ACDA and State Department representatives on the Drafting Committee.

As published, the report not only seriously underestimates Soviet civil defense capabilities, but is rife with obvious contradictions and inconsistencies. Thus, the report found that "the Soviets almost certainly believe their present civil defense would improve their ability to conduct military operations and would enhance the U.S.S.R.'s chances for survival following a nuclear exchange," as well as "speed recovery from the effects of a nuclear war," and that given time to implement its civil defense measures in a crisis, the Soviet Union "could reduce casualties to the low tens of millions, about half of which would be fatalities." At the same time, however, the report concludes that the Soviet leadership "cannot have confidence" in the degree of protection provided by civil defense and therefore would not be emboldened by it "deliberately" to risk a nuclear war. Various critics of a stronger U.S. defense posture have been quick to cite these conclusions in support of their arguments that

the United States does not need to improve its civil defense capability.

The way in which the Administration's announcement was presented also fueled skepticism—as well as suspicions that the proposed program may represent more a palliative intended to dispose of the civil defense issue than a real effort to develop a meaningful capability. While announcing that the program would emphasize crisis relocation of the urban population, the Administration appeared unprepared to describe the elements and basic requirements to be included in the program and the levels of expenditures that were being contemplated. In the absence of such information, the proposed program lacks credibility and, as could be expected, led many commentators to express doubts about the feasibility of implementing the plan in a crisis. For example, Mr. Warnke immediately added expertise in traffic control to his law and arms control credentials by claiming that the proposed plan would merely result in an insoluble traffic jam.

In fact, the Administration, having embraced crisis relocation as a civil defense program, has a choice between a mere planning exercise, which at best might reduce U.S. fatalities by some 40 per cent in the event of a war, and a more comprehensive program that would include preparations for fallout protection for the evacuated population and other important survival measures to hold out a reasonable hope for the survival of 80 per cent or more of the American people in the event of a nuclear attack. The crisis relocation program which had been prepared for consideration by the Secretary of Defense envisaged such measures at an approximate total expenditure over five years of a little under \$2 billion in current dollars, or at an average annual cost of some \$1.70 per capita.

In his November 30 press conference, however, President Carter said that "press reports about a \$2 billion civil defense program have been completely erroneous," and asserted that "no proposal has ever been made to me for a civil defense program of that magnitude." One may wonder what sort of program had been proposed to the President that would meet the strategic objectives cited by Powell. Apparently, having announced the new civil defense program, the Administration has yet to decide what sort of program it is willing to buy. According to Powell, the Administration is thinking about a "moderate increase" in the civil defense budget, which in the past year amounted to some \$92 million, of which 70 per cent went for salaries. "We are talking about a plan here" said Powell on November 13 and "final decisions will have to be made in the budget-making process each year." Such an approach does not augur well for a sustained five-year effort, during which the Office of Management and Budget will decide in large measure how much to spend on war survival insurance for the American people.

Given the President's reaction to press reports of a \$2 billion five-year program (the CIA report estimated that it would cost the United States \$2 billion per year to duplicate the annual Soviet level of effort in civil defense), one is led to suspect that the Administration has in mind a "paper" program for crisis relocation rather than the development of a real capability to ensure the survival of the largest possible number of American citizens. Should this be the case, the proposed program will not make an effective contribution to the maintenance of the strategic balance, nor will it "enhance deterrence and stability." Rather, it will merely perpetuate the existing and still growing asymmetry between the United States and the Soviet Union in war survival capabilities.—Leon Gouré.●

MOST VIETNAM VETERANS HAVE MADE SUCCESSFUL TRANSITION TO CIVILIAN LIFE

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, a veteran of the Vietnam era is entitled to the same veteran's rights and benefits as veterans of all wars. Many have complained that Vietnam-era veterans are not receiving adequate educational benefits and assistance as compared to veterans of previous wars. This statement does not stand up under close scrutiny. To the contrary, it is generally agreed that veterans of the Vietnam-era conflict are receiving comparable assistance under the present GI bill as was provided veterans of previous wars.

It is pleasing to note that there are more and more news stories appearing in the press which recognize that the majority of Vietnam-era veterans have taken advantage of the benefits Congress has made available for them and have made a successful transition from military to civil life. In this regard, I call to your attention an article entitled "Vietnam Veterans," dated January 10, 1979, which appeared in the Brainerd Daily Dispatch, Brainerd, Minn.

VIETNAM VETS

Vietnam era veterans, who participated in an unpopular war, may feel betrayed, but they don't fit the negative perception many people have of them. The average Vietnam veteran has taken advantage of federal education, is married and has a better income than many in his age group.

Many Americans who have wanted to forget Vietnam and the veterans of that period are still inclined to lump them as drug-crazed killers, dopers or prison inmates. William Kroger, writing in the December Nation's Business, however, gives a different picture entirely. Most Vietnam veterans have made a successful transition to civilian life.

There are 8,734,000 living veterans from the Vietnam era and 2.6 million actually served in Vietnam. About 80 percent of them had completed high school, making them the best educated veterans in history. And 64 percent of them have used the GI Bill for further education since they left the service.

The Veterans Administration reports the median income for a Vietnam veteran and his family in 1976 was \$15,790 compared to \$14,620 for comparable nonveterans. Loans for the purchase of homes have been made to 1.8 million veterans. Other statistics show they are productive and involved in society.

The Vietnam era also was a time of the civil rights movement, hippies, increasing unemployment and slow economic growth. The war divided families and inspired all kinds of demonstrations, particularly on college campuses.

Television and movies helped depict the Vietnam veteran as addicted to drugs and with deep psychological problems. Studies show that dependence on narcotics among men who served in Southeast Asia from 1970 to 1972 was no greater than for nonveterans in the same age group. A White House study estimates 20 percent of the Vietnam veterans still face readjustment problems. Alcohol abuse is a greater problem than drug abuse.

Society as a whole is to blame for how it

has treated the Vietnam veteran, says Dr. Peter E. M. Beach, director of veterans affairs for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. "Society wants to sweep that whole era under the rug. It cannot look objectively at Vietnam and it will be many more years before it can."●

**H.R. 80—FAIR TREATMENT
FOR DAIRY FARMERS**

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the first bill I have introduced in the 96th Congress is H.R. 80, a bill to extend the 80 percent minimum price support level for milk for 2 more years and continue the semi-annual adjustments for inflation through September 30, 1981.

Under current law, the minimum support price for milk is scheduled to drop from 80 percent of parity to 75 percent on October 1, 1979. The milk price support level is set annually by the Secretary of Agriculture to assure an adequate supply of milk for consumers and an income level for dairy farmers that will allow them to continue to produce sufficient quantities of milk to meet anticipated demand. Although there is no indication at this time what Secretary Bergland will decide to do this year, it is clear that unless Congress acts to extend the existing provision for 80 percent of parity as the lowest support level the Secretary may set, there will be pressure on him to drop the support price to 75 percent. And that would be not only unfair to dairy farmers, but also potentially disastrous for the Nation's dairy industry.

The most practical policy goal for the dairy industry at this time should be to prevent a return of the "boom-bust" cycle that could wipe out recent modest gains dairy farmers have made and cripple efforts to stabilize the farm economy in States like Wisconsin as well as other rural areas throughout the country. For the past 2 years, the dairy price support program has been working to improve the income level for dairy farmers at the same time it has provided an adequate supply of milk at reasonable prices for consumers. The most encouraging aspect of this situation has been that the fears of those who were opposed to a higher support price for milk have not been realized. Dairy farmers did not glut the market with huge increases in milk production. The Federal Government did not have to continue to buy up and store enormous amounts of surplus dairy products at a heavy cost to taxpayers.

In fact, milk production has actually declined slightly as a result of the improved price support program and other factors. In fact, Government purchases of butter and cheese actually ceased last summer and small amounts were sold back to the industry in the fall at a price 10 percent above the original cost to the Federal Treasury. During the milk marketing year ending September 30, 1978, dairy surplus purchases were 54 percent

less than the amounts brought up the previous year.

In fact, since last summer, favorable market conditions have boosted milk prices to about 5 percent above the support price, making it unnecessary for the Government to purchase manufactured dairy products in order to maintain an adequate market for milk.

But forecasters predict at least a seasonal decline in milk prices in early 1979, and of course, inflation may continue to erode whatever small gains dairy farmers have made recently.

The legislation I have introduced will have no appreciable effect on the price consumers now pay for their dairy products, since milk prices are above the support level. But it will serve as a badly needed insurance policy for dairy farmers so they can plan to meet future needs without worrying that they will have the rug pulled out from under them just because they are a political minority in this country.

The milk price support program does not guarantee a dairy farmer any more profit for his efforts. But it can work to insure that a farmer will not lose everything if the market drops sharply.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that Congressmen AL BALDUS, ROBERT KASTENMEIER, LES ASPIN, CLEM ZABLOCKI, and JIM JEFFORDS joined me in cosponsoring H.R. 80. We want to continue to hold the bottom line on milk price supports at a decent level and urge other Members of the House to join us in this effort.●

**QUIET EVOLUTION OF
SRI LANKA**

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, in a day when we are constantly bombarded with news of international rivalries, tensions and violence, economic hardships and social conflict, peace, relative prosperity and harmony easily can escape our notice. Disorder seems to be the order of the day in many countries around the world and commands public attention.

One exception which I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues today is the country of Sri Lanka. The fact that many people still know Sri Lanka as Ceylon is convincing testimony to that nation's quiet evolution as the gemstone of the Indian Ocean.

On February 4, Sri Lanka will mark the 31st anniversary of its independence from Great Britain. That same day will conclude the first year in office of His Excellency J. R. Jayewardene, the country's first Executive President.

The people of Sri Lanka will have good reason to celebrate. Their country is a stable, functioning democracy, a rarity in today's world in which we can all take heart. Because of that stability and dedication to representative government, the Sri Lankan experience has received little attention in the American national media.

Their economy continues to gain strength and the government is taking steps to further liberalize the economic system.

Respect for human freedom is a fundamental and practical commitment in Sri Lanka.

In the international system, Sri Lanka has provided positive leadership as a member of the movement of nonaligned nations. The country often has been the voice of moderation, seeking compromise rather than confrontation in promoting nonaligned interests.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the example of Sri Lanka, whose people will celebrate their independence on February 4. They deserve the recognition, not only of this great body, but of the entire international community as well.●

CIVIL LIBERTIES IN LITHUANIA

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, 6 months have passed since the trial, conviction, and sentencing the Lithuanian dissident Viktoras Petkus, and nearly a year has gone by since fellow Lithuanian, Balas Gajauskas' arrest and sentencing.

Under the illusion of an open trial these brave men were sentenced to terms of 15 and 10 years, respectively. Mr. Petkus was called to task for his involvement with the Lithuanian group to monitor the Helsinki accords. Mr. Gajauskas' sentence centered on the charge that he had managed funds for Alexandr Solzhenitsyn for the support of Soviet dissident activities. Such flagrant exhibitions of callous disregard for both the judicial process and human rights have even incurred the condemnation of the Communist Parties of Italy and France.

Soviet repression extends not only to the individual right to dissent but also to the squelching of all religious influence in a state which professes unfettered freedom of religion. The vast majority of the Lithuanian people have fiercely clung to their Catholic faith and traditions for nearly a millenium. Even though subjected to a course of continual harassment, the Catholic Church survives and is said to even flourish in Soviet Lithuania, particularly among the youth.

Pope John Paul II, in his recent discussions with Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko is said to have broached the subject of relaxing restrictions against Catholics' profession of faith as well as the Church establishment. The Pope, a strong supporter of renewed human rights issues, is seeking to restore the five ancient Lithuanian dioceses with bishops and increased numbers of clergy to administer the faithful. We can only hope that his good offices and his familiarity with Communist suppression of religion help alleviate the tremendous burden carried by these proud people.

The sorry state of civil liberties in Lithuania serves as a living reminder to the Western World of the great open society we enjoy; one in which our freedom to worship or express our dissent with official policy remains unabridged. I ask my colleagues to join with me in expressing their support for the heroic struggle of the Lithuanian people. ●

ELI ISENBERG—COMMUNITY LEADER

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues a man who has been, throughout his remarkable career as a newspaper reporter, editor, and publisher, an exemplary citizen of the community of Monterey Park and the congressional district which I represent. Eli Isenberg's life typifies the great American success story, marked by numerous achievements throughout his climb from small town newspaper reporter in Lynn, Mass., to editor and publisher of a chain of newspapers in southern California, and president of the parent company of the newspapers, San Gabriel Valley Publications.

In 1947, the year following Eli and Josephine Isenberg's arrival in Monterey Park, Calif., Eli acquired the Monterey Park Progress, serving as its editor and publisher until October 1978. As president of San Gabriel Valley Publications, Mr. Isenberg was also responsible for the publication of the South San Gabriel-Rosemead Progress and the East Los Angeles-Montebello Progress.

During the years when Eli was publisher of the Progress, the newspaper received numerous awards for editorial excellence, including awards from the California Newspaper Publishers Association for best special issue (weeklies) in 1974 and best editorial page (weeklies) in 1957, several awards from the Pacific Coast Press Club and awards from the national Suburban Press Foundation and California Press Women. Mr. Isenberg was honored personally by the Pacific Coast Press Club for meritorious service with the Arnold J. McCourtney Memorial Award.

Not content to rest on the acclaim which had been showered upon him by other members of his profession, Eli Isenberg continued to strive for excellence and greater achievement in his field. Thus, in 1975, San Gabriel Publications acquired title to the Alhambra Post-Advocate, and succeeded in turning a failing publication, strapped by financial problems, into a thriving, highly respected newspaper.

As evidence of Eli Isenberg's ability to develop a newspaper business which meets the industry's highest standards, the San Gabriel Valley Publications company was recently purchased by Scripps-Howard Newspapers, one of the

largest and most widely acclaimed newspaper empires in the country.

Remarkable and commendable as Eli Isenberg's newspaper career has been, it is his contributions to the community for which we are thankful and for which he will be best remembered. Throughout his 32 years of residence in the area, all during Mr. Isenberg's successful climb to the top of his profession, Eli never lost sight of the needs of his fellow citizens and neighbors in Monterey Park, and has contributed greatly to improving the quality of life in his community.

Despite the many obligations involved in running a newspaper business, which demanded most of his attention, Eli Isenberg always found time to help the community in every way possible. Because of his dedication to helping those around him, Eli Isenberg was honored in 1961 as the man of the year by the Alhambra area B'nai B'rith lodge, and in 1967 as Monterey Park's most valuable citizen by the Monterey Park American Legion Post. In addition, Mr. Isenberg has been awarded a Paul Harris fellowship by the Monterey Park Rotary Club. He is currently the senior member of the Presidential Advisory Board of California State University, Los Angeles, and has served on the Monterey Park Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors. Mr. Isenberg served as president of the chamber in 1956. Eli Isenberg is a founding member of City Beautiful in Monterey Park, and has contributed greatly to the community in this capacity. In all of these activities he has had the priceless support and help of his wife, Jo.

On February 9, 1979, the citizens of Monterey Park will once again pay tribute to Eli Isenberg, at a testimonial dinner given by his many friends. While the newspapers formerly owned by San Gabriel Valley Publications will miss Eli Isenberg as head of the company, they will continue to benefit from his talents in the field, as Scripps-Howard has appointed him to serve as general manager of the papers. In this capacity, Eli will remain in the Monterey Park area, and will continue to serve the entire community. I share the pleasure of the citizens of Monterey Park in knowing that Eli and Jo Isenberg will remain with us, and am pleased to have this opportunity to salute Eli's many contributions to the community. ●

TRIBUTE TO CARL A. JOHNSON

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, this past November, one of the finest civic leaders in the Town of Norwood, Mass., passed away. Carl A. Johnson was a self-made man who built his automobile showroom to be one of the best in the State. At 82 it was not uncommon for Mr. Johnson to work 10- and 12-hour days at his business.

Although he worked very hard on his own business, he took the time to get involved in civic activities. Among his numerous town and State activities, he helped establish Norwood Airport as a community run venture instead of a business venture. Mr. Johnson also served as a vice president of the Boston Metropolitan Airport Corporation.

As a veteran of World War I, Mr. Johnson was very involved with the American Legion. He also helped establish the Norwood Rotary Club. As a member of the business community, he belonged to the 100 Club of Boston, the Automobile Organization Team and the Swedish Square and Compass Club of Boston.

The passing away of Mr. Johnson will be felt by both the town and his friends. In his honor, an annual scholarship has been set up at Norwood High School to begin with the graduating class of 1979. ●

SMALL VESSEL MANNING

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to provide the Coast Guard increased flexibility in prescribing manning requirements for small vessels.

During the 95th Congress, the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation held extensive oversight hearings on the Coast Guard's marine safety program. This comprehensive review, which evaluated the implementation and effectiveness of the navigation and vessel safety laws, highlighted some problem areas that require legislative remedies. One of these is the need to revise the antiquated and unclear manning requirements for small vessels carrying freight and passengers for hire, which have been codified at sections 224, 390, and 404 of title 46, United States Code.

The specific problem that the bill I am introducing today addresses involves the application of section 404. This section provides that no vessel of above 15 gross tons and in excess of 65 feet in length carrying passengers for hire may be navigated without a licensed engineer and a licensed pilot. The Coast Guard has, however, for some time allowed those vessels in this category that are not above 100 gross tons to navigate without a licensed engineer and a licensed pilot, regardless of their length.

They have done this on the authority of section 222 of title 46, which is a general statute authorizing the Coast Guard to prescribe such manning requirements as the Coast Guard finds necessary for safe navigation of the particular vessel.

Instead of a licensed engineer and a licensed pilot, the Coast Guard allows these vessels to operate as if they were subject to the so-called "Small Passenger-Carrying Vessel Act" in section 390 of title 46. In effect, that act—which applies to vessels that are over 15 and

under 100 gross tons and not over 65 feet in length—is being applied to vessels of under 100 gross tons that are over 65 feet in length.

I believe that this interpretation and application of the law is erroneous, and a recent court decision—*M.E.B.A. v. Brock Adams*, Civil No. C-77-370 (D.C.N.D. Oh. 1977)—supports my belief. In that case, the court agreed that the Coast Guard was not enforcing the so-called 8-hour or 3-watch system law, and enjoined administration officials to perform their statutory duty and enforce congressional mandates.

The court held that the specific requirement of a 3-watch system in section 673 of title 46 limited the application of section 222. I believe that the specific requirement of section 404 likewise limits the Coast Guard's use of section 222 in waiving licensed pilot and licensed engineer requirements on passenger vessels over 65 feet in length and between 15 and 100 gross tons.

While the Coast Guard's actions with regard to these small vessels may be appropriate and practical from the standpoint of safety and imposing minimum necessary manning requirements, they are not consistent with my view of the law. Neither the Coast Guard nor the Department of Transportation can ignore the law. The administration has recognized the confusion inherent in these antiquated laws, but it has not initiated legislation to clarify them. I am, therefore, introducing this amendatory legislation to accomplish that purpose.

The proposed bill will simplify existing law and give the Coast Guard more flexible authority to prescribe manning requirements for passenger-carrying vessels. It does this by removing passenger vessels of 15 to 100 gross tons and over 65 feet from section 404 and subjecting them to section 390 instead. It also deletes the specific requirement for licensed engineers and pilots in section 404 and, in lieu thereof, provides the Coast Guard with authority to prescribe by regulation for the manning of small vessels and for the duties and qualifications of their personnel. Other proposed changes are consistent with these.

It is my hope that enactment of this bill will be another step on the path of clarifying and updating our maritime safety laws. ●

LEGISLATION FOR FUTURE LEGAL HOLIDAYS

HON. ROBIN L. BEARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. BEARD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to require that all future legal public holidays fall on either Saturday or Sunday. This proposal will not affect the celebrations of existing national holidays.

According to the Office of Personnel Management, the personnel cost of a holiday to the Federal Government alone

is estimated to be \$194,500,000. While the Federal Government has no jurisdiction to propose national holidays for other than the District of Columbia and Federal employees, individual States usually follow its lead. The added personnel costs of such action, could result in 10 or 20 times the \$195 million estimate for the Federal Government. The cost is staggering.

In the 95th Congress, many bills were introduced to commemorate a famous person's birthday or eventful day as a legal public holiday. These included the birthdays of Susan B. Anthony, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Martin Luther King, Jr.; other proposed legal holidays were Flag Day, American Business Day, Election Day, and Inauguration Day.

I think we all will agree every one of these proposals deserves full and serious consideration by the Congress. My bill does not detract in any way from the merits of any of these proposed national holidays. It merely requires that they be celebrated on a Saturday or Sunday to avoid the terrific costs to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, at a time in our history when we are facing grim projections on the economic health of our country, and a large Federal deficit, it would be unwise for us to exacerbate this problem.

A great Nation respects its institutions and honors its leaders in special and appropriate ways. One of these forms of recognition is legal public holidays. This time honored practice should be continued. My bill does not alter this process.

COST OF LEGAL PUBLIC HOLIDAYS	
Cost of 1 work day (2.4 million employees)	\$173,000,000
Premium holiday pay	21,500,000
Identified personnel costs	194,500,000

SENIOR CITIZENS HEALTH INSURANCE

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of Mr. Brodhead's legislation concerning senior citizen health insurance. As we all know the cost of medical care is very expensive. The people that are hardest hit in this country are our senior citizens.

With inflation on the rise and senior citizens on a fixed income, protection should be provided for our elderly in the area of insurance abuses. Medicare, today, pays only a small part of senior citizens health care cost. This forces many of our elderly to buy supplementary insurance policies.

When presented with the problems of buying supplementary insurance policies, the senior citizen must be allowed every chance to buy a policy at the least cost. The Senior Citizens Health Insurance Standards Act of 1979 provides this op-

¹ Figure obtained from the Office of Personnel Management.

portunity. It would prohibit insurance companies from selling overlapping and confusing language. It also prohibits an insurance agent from using harsh tactics with our elderly.

I speak for the senior citizens of the Ninth Congressional District of Massachusetts, and for those of the Nation, when I say that it is high time that we stop these abuses. I want to urge all my colleagues to press forward on this most urgent issue:

JANUARY 17, 1979.

SENIOR CITIZEN'S HEALTH INSURANCE STANDARDS ACT OF 1979

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I invite you to cosponsor The Senior Health Insurance Standards Act of 1979, a bill to outlaw gross abuses in the marketing of so-called "medi-gap" insurance to senior citizens. Medi-gap is a term applied to private insurance which provides more than the minimal coverage provided to senior citizens under Medicare.

Recent hearings before the House Select Committee on Aging, chaired by Representative Claude Pepper, and hearings before the Senate Special Committee on Aging, chaired by Senator Lawton Chiles, have documented gross abuses in the marketing of supplemental health insurance to the elderly. Among them were the selling of duplicative and over-lapping policies, the sale of policies with misleading conditions and language (for example, policies which claim to cover nursing home expenses but neglect to inform purchasers that the type of care offered by three-quarters of the nation's nursing homes was exempt), sale of policies with clauses disqualifying beneficiaries who have a disease or condition within a specified period ("pre-existing conditions"), the use of scare tactics by agents to sell policies, and failure to disclose in clear understandable language the contents of policies sold.

The House Committee has estimated that senior citizens are being bilked to the tune of \$1 billion every year by unscrupulous companies and their agents. I believe this is a national disgrace and the federal government which helped create the problem through the gaps and limitations in Medicare has a clear responsibility to act. Some 15 million Americans over 65 purchase supplementary health insurance. Medicare covers only about 38 percent of the health care costs of senior citizens. It does not pay the difference between what Medicare calls "reasonable and necessary" costs and what the physician actually charges.

One of the best indications of whether an insurance company is taking unfair advantage of its clients is the company's loss ratio, i.e., the percentage of health insurance premium dollars a company pays out in claims. Blue Cross-Blue Shield and the best private companies return about 90 percent of premiums to the insured in claims. However, companies which have a clear track record of abusing the elderly have shockingly low loss ratios . . . some as low as 20 to 40 percent.

The bill which I have introduced today mandates federal minimum standards which companies selling medi-gap insurance to the elderly must meet. It also directs the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to make a comprehensive study of methods to assure that good quality health insurance is available to the elderly at a reasonable price.

Each state must submit a minimum standards plan to the HEW Secretary which will accomplish the following objectives:

1. insurance companies must return at least 75 percent of premiums in the form of benefits.
2. prohibition of the sale of insurance which duplicates Medicare coverage.

3. drastic limitation on pre-existing conditions.

4. requirement of full disclosure of all policy provisions to purchaser.

5. requirement that policies be written in plain and simple language.

The bill utilizes the existing state regulatory mechanisms by requiring each state to change its law and/or regulations to meet at least the minimum standards set up by the bill. If the states do not elect to regulate the insurance companies themselves, then the Secretary of H.E.W. shall enforce the minimum standards in that state. Except for some minimal administrative expenses, these vital reforms could be accomplished at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Despite the widespread evidence of abuse, it would be erroneous to conclude that all insurance companies are guilty of these abuses. In fact, most of the nation's insurance companies are reputable and market fair health policies.

I wish to extend my highest praise to Representative Claude Pepper (D-Fla.), Chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging, and Senator Lawton Chiles (D-Fla.), who conducted the Senate hearings, for the excellent work they did in uncovering these abuses.

If you have any questions or would like to cosponsor, please call Jim Boxall at x54961. Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD,
Representative in Congress. ●

U.S. RELATIONSHIP WITH TAIWAN

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, many excellent editorials have been written regarding the pros and cons of U.S. recognition of the People's Republic of China and the visit of Vice Premier Teng Hsiao-ping.

All of us have read a great deal about this major shift in U.S. foreign policy. I want to share with you and my colleagues, as well as the nation, an outstanding editorial from the *Marinette Eagle-Star*.

It strikes me that this commentary is fair to all viewpoints; it is a balanced analysis of an issue that requires thoughtful consideration.

I am pleased to submit it to my colleagues and opinion leaders across America for their consideration:

WHITE HOUSE DEFENDS TAIWAN DECISION

The challenge in the courts and opposition in Congress to the new U.S. policy toward the People's Republic of China and Taiwan appear to have been compounded by the administration failure to consult with congressional leadership or the foreign relations committees about the negotiations that led to the momentous diplomatic change. Establishment of full diplomatic relations with China and announced coming termination of Mutual Defense Treaty with Taiwan was legal in the view of the president. Whether or not the Carter view prevails in court, reaction by members of the newly convened 96th Congress suggests that the decision to exclude it from the diplomatic process may have been unwise.

The termination of official relations with Taiwan has become a particular target. The court action filed by Sen. Barry Goldwater and others challenges the president's author-

ity to terminate a treaty without the prior advice and consent of the Senate. The fact that China gained diplomatic recognition at the expense of an old ally has become a primary issue among opponents in the Congress.

President Carter made his momentous announcement of the new China policy on Dec. 15. That the administration would be forced to defend that decision became apparent immediately. No doubt in response to the court challenge and in anticipation of mounting animosity in Congress, early in January the White House circulated to the nation's press a background report entitled "China" and a fact sheet which it labeled "Taiwan—The Mutual Defense Treaty."

The latter document deals not with the terms of the treaty nor the consequences of its termination. It is devoted instead to a response to the court challenge of the administration's action without prior advice and consent of the Senate or other congressional action. It begins with a quotation by the president from a Dec. 19 interview in which he declared: "My constitutional authority in establishing relationships with foreign countries is clear and cannot be successfully challenged in court."

To support that firm opinion, the White House quotes from Article 10 of the Taiwan treaty which provides that: "Either party may terminate it one year after notice has been given to the other party." The president's announcement on Dec. 15 constituted that notice, the administration says, adding that the treaty makes no reference to the Senate or Congress or the need for approval of the Legislative branch in order for notice to be given of termination of the treaty. The administration adds its belief that the power of the Senate to advise and consent to a treaty is fulfilled when the treaty is made. It sees nothing in the treaty to indicate that the Senate anticipated prior consultation or approval before the termination clause could be exercised by the president.

The White House document cites a number of scholars and legal authorities to support its position. It also notes that while Article 2, Section 2, of the Constitution provides that the president "shall have the power, by and with the advice and consent of the senate, to make treaties, provided two thirds of the senators present concur" . . . it does not specifically address the question of treaty termination. If the pending challenge in the courts is carried to a conclusion, whatever decision is reached will be the first concerning the issue.

The White House background report on the recognition of China tends to lean on previous actions by others as justification for the president's decision to grant full diplomatic recognition to China. "The president's announcement was not an overnight development" it declares, but the result of a process of normalization of relations that has occurred over a period of years. It describes the Carter decision as the achievement of "a goal which had been sought with increasing intensity since President Nixon visited that nation in February 1972," and an effort continued by the Ford Administration.

The China policy is not the first touchy diplomatic issue faced by President Carter because it became his lot to terminate initiatives undertaken by his predecessors. The first was the controversial Panama Canal treaties which triggered bitter debate before ratification was achieved. That situation differed from the present, of course, in that there was no question that the advice and consent of the Senate was required.

There is little likelihood that the president will not have his way in implementation of diplomatic recognition of China, although confirmation of Leonard Woodcock as ambassador probably will be delayed. Opponents of the policy are expected to utilize the confirmation hearings as an opportunity for

public discussion of the administration decision. Given the manner in which they were ignored in the negotiating phase, it would not be surprising if members of Congress distrust White House assurances that it intends to establish a corporate organization in Taiwan to maintain full commercial, cultural, trade and other relations with that country. One would expect to see legislation to specify what the future U.S.-Taiwan relationship should be. ●

SALT VERIFICATION ISSUES CONNECTED WITH MAP AND MOBILE ICBM SYSTEMS

HON. ROBIN L. BEARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. BEARD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in an excellent and concisely written paper Mr. Roland F. Herbst discusses the strategic and SALT implications of the U.S. deployment of a so-called multiple aim point (MAP) ICBM system. The MAP system, more recently designated the multiple protective system (MPS), would consist of a proliferation of shelters within which our ICBM's and their launchers would be accommodated. The ICBM's and their launchers would be randomly moved between the different shelters. For the Soviets to successfully attack an MPS system they would have to expend many more weapons than they would destroy—thus diminishing any incentive to initiate any attack in the first place. By contrast, if we fail to proceed with the full-scale development of a different basing system for our ICBM's the Soviets by the early 1980's would have to expend less than a third of their ICBM's to destroy our entire ICBM force, and they could also destroy many of our bombers and submarines in the process. The emergence of such a predicament is contrary to the very essence of our deterrence and defense policy. For this reason finding a solution to the vulnerability of our ICBM force is considered the most important strategic modernization objective facing our Nation today by our defense community.

The proposed MPS basing system is the technically preferred solution to our ICBM vulnerability problem, and it is the most cost-effective. Critics, however, claim it poses SALT verification problems and the possibility of a breakout threat, were the Soviets to deploy a similar system.

Mr. Roland Herbst, an eminent and distinguished scientist in the U.S. defense community, in a logical and coherent manner, puts this issue in perspective.

The paper follows:

SALT VERIFICATION ISSUES CONNECTED WITH MAP AND MOBILE ICBM SYSTEMS

(By R. F. Herbst)

How serious is the effect of a MAP system upon the issues of SALT verification? From the very nature of a multiple aimpoint system, it is obvious that there is a problem with respect to counting ICBM launchers. However, is this a serious problem relative to national security? The answer to this

question depends upon the nature of the overall SAL agreement.

In view of the agreements presently being considered, agreements in which ICBM launchers are limited but stored ICBMs are not limited, the effect upon U.S. national security may not be very significant. Considering the possibility that the Soviets may wish to increase the total numbers of ICBMs available to attack the United States, it would appear that they would have at least two choices: the first, to illegally hide a number of ICBMs upon launchers, either in a MAP system or otherwise; or second, to legally store ICBMs, delaying the final preparations for launching until a time of crisis. This process is obviously feasible. ICBMs designed for silos are often tested from "pads"; modern technology makes the launch equipment relatively small and simple to operate and encapsulated missiles seem to make the process simpler.

If the Soviets were to store missiles in a number of warehouses at or near potential launch pads, some care with the transportation of the missiles can probably assure that the United States would not locate most of these sites. These missiles could be used in a first strike or for a reserve force. They could also be used for coercion if a few were "tested" from several areas not known to have ICBM launchers.

The Soviets can then probably by "legal" means achieve essentially the same advantages that they could by "illegal" deployment in a MAP system. Since in almost all circumstances one would expect national leadership to prefer legal routes to given ends, verification problems of MAP systems do not seem to have large implications to national security—given no limit on stored ICBMs.

One then might consider three levels of constraints upon missile storage and "balanced" constraints upon MAP systems.

(1) Unlimited legal storage—no constraints (or only cosmetic constraints) upon MAP.

(2) Limitation on the number of stored ICBMs with "collateral," nonintrusive constraints on that storage—modest limitations upon MAP (and other mobile) systems, the limitations with the purpose of roughly balancing the MAP risk with the overall risk.

(3) Intrusive limitations upon ICBM production and storage—similarly severe constraints upon MAP.

The second possibility appears to be more desirable than the first and more likely of accomplishment than the third. It will be emphasized below.

Without on-site inspection of production facilities, it would be difficult to have high confidence in the verification of a production or storage limitation; however, it might be possible to define storage procedures which would increase the chance of catching a violation.

A possible procedure would be to limit ICBM storage to say 15 percent or 30 percent of the number allowed on launchers. The fraction would be chosen by a trade-off between the strategic desirability of keeping the number low and the managerial and production inconvenience of keeping few spares. The agreement might further ask that the stored missiles be kept at a few small declared storage sites with only direct transportation links used between production, storage deployment and test areas. These limitations will not give high confidence in verification, but they are likely to increase the U.S. ability to recognize a violation if there is some HUMINT or COMINT data indicating stored missiles in violation of the agreement. While this situation is not a happy one, it appears better than a situation in which the Soviets can freely store as many missiles as they can afford.

Since such an agreement offers some deterrent to violation of the limitations, a MAP system may offer some advantages to a cheater for hidden "storage." Hence, some similar constraints relative to the MAP system seem reasonable. These constraints might involve some mode of inspection of aimpoints, some limitation of the process of insertion of the missiles (and decoys) into the deception process, or some monitoring of the missile production process or combinations of these.

Should the limitation on MAP be designed to be the same for the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.? While it is obvious that the U.S. should be prepared to consider as acceptable a Soviet mirror image of any U.S. proposal for control of a U.S. system, it is not at all clear that the most appropriate constraints for a U.S. system are the most appropriate for a Soviet system. The nature of likely Soviet systems, Soviet societal constraints and Soviet geography are quite different from those of the United States.

For this reason it would appear most reasonable for a U.S. MAP system to define procedures which are convenient for us and which would both be fair to the Soviet Union and appear fair to the public rather than attempt to find a symmetrical situation. The constraints upon a Soviet system can only be determined after understanding the Soviet system and after a negotiation which determines what is acceptable to both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. If then we are going to consider special constraints on new basing modes, each system is likely to be negotiated separately; the U.S. MAP system should be negotiated before a treaty is completed.

With this point of view it would appear reasonable to use on-site inspection with Soviet inspectors of a U.S. system, even if on-site inspection of a Soviet system with U.S. inspectors cannot be expected. For this reason this paper will suggest on-site inspection of U.S. systems when that procedure seems more convenient than dependence upon "overhead" means.

U.S. DECOYED VERTICAL SILO SYSTEM

The first system we will examine for reasonable SAL constraints is the M-X system with vertical silos and decoy canisters.

Aimpoint inspection

One might wish to verify the deployment level in a MAP system by inspection of the contents of the aimpoints; the inspection being performed by "overhead rational means" or by on-site inspections. The silos (and decoys) would be opened by the operators of the system for inspection by personnel or sensors of the other side.

Because of the large number of aimpoints needed in this system and the low ratio of missiles to silos (several percent), random sampling gives useful results only after a large number of inspections. Various special inspection procedures have been designed which are intended to mitigate the problem, and a discussion of the statistical issues is given in the appendix to this paper. Here two conclusions should be stated. First, over time many fewer inspections are required if one is only attempting to deter a slow build-up of illegal missiles than if the purpose is to deter a surge build-up. In a circumstance in which storage is illegal, a slow build-up in the MAP field may be desirable. It would avoid a large illegal external storage. This circumstance appears to be the one to design for—consistent with our "balanced approach." If the cheater was willing to store a large number of illegal missiles, then he could find a way to launch them independent of MAP.

The second conclusion is that problems will arise if an inspection is not completed during a continuous viewing by the inspec-

tors. Since low-altitude observation satellites only have a short viewing time, on-site inspections are more easily performed than overhead observations. If one were to require that silos and decoy canisters are opened promptly and reliably shortly after they are chosen for inspection, then significant costs are likely to be added to the system.

Insertion controls

Rather than attempt to examine aimpoints, one might attempt to control the insertion process, the process by which a missile is delivered to the field and "lost" in the multiple aimpoint array. The aim of this control would be to attempt to assure that extra missiles are not deployed in the field. The start of the process, and delivery of the missile and its preparation for deployment should be made very deliberate so that any deviation would be noticed by a large fraction of the personnel, thus introducing the possibility of defector information. The decoy canisters should be stored open so that they obviously do not contain a missile. When the "mixing" process is started, only one missile should be present, and when it is moved into the closed "mixing" facilities the decoy canisters should enter that facility open. It would be preferred that full-time observers from the other side be on-site to observe the process. However one could design the scheduling of this process and the canister storage so that they would be visible to overhead systems.

These measures probably limit straightforward entry into the system sufficiently that entry by the "back door" is more probable. Limitation upon the movement of large vehicles which could carry missiles is desirable. If some of the fields can be isolated from highways, border barriers such as ditches and plowed breaks could be useful. If, however, public highways run through a field, checkpoints for observers from the other side may be desirable.

These measures seem to yield a significant deterrent to introducing illegal missiles into a MAP field, although it probably could be done. However, it is difficult to believe that the control is poorer than that suggested for the stored missiles.

Combinations

Combinations of both deployment controls and aimpoint inspections give an opportunity for further reducing the risk.

Production controls

Rather than attempt to determine the number of missiles which are in a MAP system or the number brought into the system, one might attempt to monitor the production process. Full-time observers at missile production facilities should be able to keep good controls upon the number produced and if spot checks are made at the storage area of all missiles which could be useful in the MAP system, very good verification of the agreement should be possible. This proposal is only likely to apply to U.S. systems, but if it were used for the U.S. it might establish a good precedent for future agreements.

POSSIBLE SOVIET SYSTEMS

Mobile systems not normally deployed in the field

The Soviets have deployed some mobile missile systems which are normally kept at support facilities, only going to the field for practice exercises. If they should deploy ICBM's with this characteristic, then if the support facilities are either open or openable to overhead observations and if the times and areas of practice operations are limited to preannounced times and small areas, the problems for verification should be no greater than those connected with the basic storage problem.

Deployed, unsheltered mobile systems

For survivability, soft mobile systems must be deployed over large areas and must use local cover to hide. Any such system is bound to be difficult to count accurately.

Support area sizing can give some idea of the number of operational missiles; optical and radar satellites can locate an object in the field; and restrictions on covered storage and "out of area" operations can be of help. But in any case, the noise level is likely to be high.

The most helpful restriction on such a system would probably be to limit the total allowed payload to a modest amount and the size of the missiles to that of a small payload. For a system using missiles with Minuteman III payloads, it would take more than 3,000 missiles to double the Soviet ICBM payload.

Soviet MAP system

It seems unlikely that the Soviets would believe that they would require decoys in any MAP system. Under this circumstance, verification might be obtained by overhead observations of shelters which could be opened upon demand.

GENERAL COMMENTS

To the degree that verification of the level of deployment in a mobile ICBM system is of concern from a military point of view, a limitation of the amount of payload to be deployed in the system could probably help solve the problem. The ratio of the cheating level to the allowed level is likely to be one measure of the risks of cheating. Since most plans for the U.S. M-X system indicate deployments of less than or about one-fifth of the apparently intended Soviet ICBM payload, it would seem in the U.S. interest to limit Soviet mobile deployments to similar or at least not much greater amounts.

APPENDIX—AIMPOINT INSPECTION STATISTICS

In this appendix examples will be illustrated for a MAP system with 200 missiles and 10,000 aimpoints. The most straightforward sampling technique is random sampling of the field; for a case in which 400 samples were taken, the expected number of missiles to be found is 8. For a case with *no cheating* the probability of finding 12 or more is about 6 percent. A 6 percent false alarm probability does not seem unreasonable; and hence, for 400 samples, an apparent cheating fraction of 50 percent may be a reasonable threshold. With this threshold, there is about a 50-50 chance of recognizing a 50 percent cheating factor and a 90 percent probability of recognizing a 100 percent factor.

H. Cooper has suggested a two-step procedure which can give a more positive indication of cheating than the above and which gives higher probability of catching cheating. This scheme would have the authorities of the nation whose system was to be inspected give to the inspecting side groups of aimpoints (200 groups of 50 aimpoints each for our example). It would be stipulated that each group contained only one real missile and 49 decoy aimpoints. The inspecting side would be allowed to select one aimpoint per group for all of the groups or for some fraction of the groups. If a missile were found in any group, all the aimpoints of that group would be opened and if a second missile were found there would be a definite proof of a false stipulation on the part of the owing side.

In the case in which all groups had an inspection in the first move, 200 silos would have been opened. The expected number of missiles found should be four; hence the total number of inspected aimpoints would be 396—about the same as above. However in the case of cheating, this scheme has a 90 percent probability of catching cheating if

the cheating were at the 50 percent level and a 90 percent probability at the 100 percent level.

There appear to be disadvantages to the MAP system connected with these two inspection methods. Both involved showing the other side the location of real missiles. If the other side had some covert method of breaking the deception scheme, this procedure would allow him to check the validity of that procedure.

The two-step scheme has a second disadvantage; it identifies a missile with a set of decoys. This is an advantage to a potential attacker if he has some way to identify some of the aimpoints as containing real missiles. To give an example, if an attacker knew where 50 percent of the missiles were and that their decoy silos did not contain other missiles, then he could ignore all of those decoys, attacking only decoys connected with undiscovered missiles but if decoys were not connected with missiles they would all have to be taken into account.*

Both of these disadvantages only seem important at the margin; they both assume the deception process is failing but only partially. On the other hand, deception is the key to a MAP system—it should be given all possible advantages and one should be reluctant to give away any advantages in this matter.

An example of an inspection scheme follows which degrades the inspection but seems to eliminate one of these problems and reduces the second. The MAP system would be divided into four parts. The observing side would be allowed to pick one of these four parts for inspection during one period of time comparable to the rotation time of the missiles, possibly six months. He would be given the missile-decoy grouping for only that group, thereby only gaining the grouping advantage for one-fourth of the system, not all of it. He then can choose a number of groups to inspect, but all aimpoints would be inspected in these groups. The inspection will be done by removing all the decoys and missiles from their shelters and by showing the inspectors that only a legal number of missiles are present, but the canisters will be mixed up before opening so that there is no connection between missiles and aimpoints.

This system is very inefficient. If 10 groups were chosen from the 50 groups in one of the four fields for our example system, there would be 50 aimpoints opened up. The probability of catching a 100 percent cheating case would only be about 15 percent, and it would take two years (4 inspection periods) to raise that probability to near 50 percent.

This process might still be useful if used in connection with "insertion" process controls.●

HOPE HOUSE

HON. JAMES A. COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the invaluable work done by Hope House located in the 13th Congressional District of New Jersey. Hope House is a professional treatment center offering marriage and family counseling, alcohol and

*Similar problems arise in a "slow war"; if many of the missiles of the MAP system are fired early but a number are held in reserve, the survivability of the reserve missiles may be jeopardized by the grouping process.

drug therapy, group therapy, and psychological testing. It also provides special services to senior citizens and the Hispanic community.

Too often the people most in need of professional help are those who can least afford it. Hope House works to solve this unfortunate circumstance.

The unique aspect of Hope House is its family orientation. Under the direction of Father John O'Brien, Hope House helps to restore harmony in the family by recognizing that the extreme distress of one member of the family puts heavy stress on all family members.

In this time when so much is being written and discussed about the fragmentation of the American family structure, it is truly heartwarming to know that a center like Hope House is working to resolve common but serious problems of the individual with the help of the individual's family. I applaud the good work done by Hope House.●

TOMORROW'S LEADERS SERVICE ACADEMY NOMINEES

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most rewarding annual events which I enjoy is nominating students from my congressional district to our Nation's armed service academies.

I make it a practice not to nominate en masse, but rather to make the selection process as deserving as possible for the nominee. The criterion set down by my reviewing committee is rigid and demanding. This insures that the best and brightest will represent my district and its schools and communities at the service academies.

This year I have nominated 19 outstanding young men and women from my district for appointments to the service academies. I am sure that my constituents join their families and me in wishing them well. Whether they attend a service academy or not, these young people are a credit to their community and their country.

My nominees to the Military Academy at West Point are: Jacki L. Wray, Valley Christian High School; and Robert L. Richardson, Santa Ana High School.

My nominees to the Naval Academy at Annapolis are: Craig B. Malloy, Santa Ana High School; Thomas K. Brown, Sunny Hills High School; Steven J. Robinson, Bolsa Grande High School; Craig N. Connors, Garden Grove High School; Edward J. Lauth, Servite High School; Zoe Ann Kearney, Santa Ana Valley High School; Paul E. Johndrow, Jr., Westminster High School; and Richard G. Whitehurst, III, Western High School.

My nominees to the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs are: Suzy R. Hithe, Westminster High School; Christopher T. Gate, Buena Park High School; Jonalyn M. White, La Quinta High School; Christine L. Blalock, Kennedy High School; David A. Hykes, Cypress

High School; Joseph V. Jendrsiak, Magnolia High School; Kim M. Dee, Kennedy High School; Michael A. Perez, Los Amigos High School; and Paul D. Carrubba, Santa Ana College.●

RECOGNIZING REALITIES: THE 17 MILLION PEOPLE OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, how would you like it if you lived on a 100' x 100' lot next door to a neighbor who owned an estate of 10 square miles with whom you had been feuding for years and suddenly the local police department came around and said, "Folks, you've done nothing wrong but we are no longer going to patrol this area and incidentally the fence around your property must come down." You are further told that the owner of the 10-mile estate hopefully is dropping his desire to take over your property. If you get a little nervous, you are no different than the 17 million people of Taiwan who comprise the Republic of China.

In 1949, under the leadership of Patrick Hurley and George Marshall, American aid for the support of Chiang Kai-shek and the Republic of China was phased out. Our leadership at the time failed to understand the nature of communism and that in fact Mao tse Tung was a Communist who was determined to rule China. He and his ruthless revolutionaries, thought at the time to be agrarian reformers, soon thereafter succeeded in defeating the Nationalist Chinese and took over all of mainland China. Chiang Kai-shek removed to Taiwan, an island 100 miles off the Chinese coast. Since then the Republic of China on Taiwan has dreamed of returning to the mainland and resuming political control of the country.

In 1954, the United States adopted a mutual defense treaty with the Republic of China. It was ratified by the U.S. Senate. It pledged each nation to preserve the island of Taiwan as the home of the Republic of China.

On December 15, 1978, President Carter, acting with no prior consultation with Congress, unilaterally gave notice that the mutual defense treaty would come to an end on December 31, 1979. He did so at the insistence of Red China that such was a condition of the United States establishing diplomatic relations with Red China. Great uncertainty has developed since this precipitous action by President Carter.

When the Chinese nationalists came to Taiwan in 1949, the per capita income of the Chinese people was about \$150, but today for the people of the Republic of China on Taiwan it has risen to about \$1,300. There is no mystery as to why this happened. Communism as an economic system does very little for the common man in the sense of raising his

standard of living. Accordingly on the mainland, economic stagnation is the result. Taiwan has followed the free market system, and has prospered bountifully. The U.S. has invested \$5-6 billion on Taiwan. Fifty to sixty U.S. banks do business there, having extended loans of \$2½ billion. The United States has sold two nuclear plants to Taiwan, with four more on order. The United States has contractual commitments to supply the fuel for these plants.

In 1978, Taiwan and the United States engaged in mutual trade of \$7.3 billion. In fact, the U.S. trade with Taiwan was greater than our trade with all the other Communist nations of the world combined. (We recognized the Soviet Union in 1933 and in 1978 our trade with Russia was around \$2.5 billion.) Since 1973 and before December of 1978, the United States had a liaison office in Peking—that is government to government relations while we were maintaining diplomatic relations with the Republic of China. Now Red China is telling the United States, and President Carter has agreed, that since we now have diplomatic relations with Red China, the United States can no longer have government to government relations with Taiwan.

What happens to the U.S. investment in Taiwan? What happens to our mutual trade with Taiwan?

The Taiwanese are very uneasy about these questions and American businessmen are likewise deeply concerned. President Carter has proposed that the United States establish a private non-profit corporation to represent U.S. interests in Taiwan so that we would not offend the Red Chinese. The Taiwanese reject this as unworkable because they feel as the years go on that eventually Red China will establish conditions of trade and investment, and also tax it, which will slowly strangle the economy of the Republic of China and force Taiwan to come under the political domination of Red China.

Taiwan has an army of about 500,000. Red China has about 4 million in its regular army. The Air Force of Taiwan and Red China is similarly out of balance, heavily favoring Red China. Taiwan wants to buy at market value the F16 fighter to increase its ability to defend itself. So far President Carter has refused to sell them these aircraft.

The Republic of China has been a staunch ally of the United States in Asia. The frontier of the battle between the free world and the Communist world is the 100 mile strait separating the island of Taiwan from the mainland. Freedom of religion, a free economy, property rights, cultural diversity, exist in Taiwan. The economy is booming. There is no unemployment. All that the Taiwanese ask for is to be able to defend themselves for the sake of preserving their freedom.

In my judgment, President Carter committed a very serious error in judgment in December 1978, when he in effect told Taiwan that even though you are a freedom loving nation and have a good record of basic human rights for your

citizens, we are breaking diplomatic relations with you in order to establish diplomatic relations with a ruthless communist regime that denies all basic human rights to its citizens. It is another tragic example of failing to recognize what the true interests of the United States are.

Fortunately for all of us we do not have a dictatorship in this country. The President conducts foreign policy but Congress must pass legislation to implement our foreign policy. The wise course for our country at this point is for Congress to:

(1) Assure a continued government to government relationship between the United States and Taiwan in order to protect American investment and trade relations with Taiwan. Congress can achieve this result by appropriate amendments to legislation requested by President Carter.

(2) Sell to the Republic of China such military equipment as will give them a reasonable assurance of being able to defend themselves from attack.

Only in so doing will we give assurance to the uncommitted people of the world that the United States believes and practices a policy of helping to secure the blessings of liberty to any people who strive to achieve it. If we abandon a friend in the name of trying to reduce tension with an enemy, we run the severe risk of doing neither. In my judgment if the Congress does not achieve the foregoing this year, the attainment of these conditions will and should become a major issue in the Presidential election of 1980.●

UKRAINE'S INDEPENDENCE ANNIVERSARY CAUSES US TO STOP AND REFLECT

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1979

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, once again the commemoration of the anniversary of the Ukraine's independence causes us to stop and reflect upon the sad state of human freedoms inside the Soviet Union and throughout Eastern Europe. Sixty-one years ago an independent Ukraine briefly existed as a sovereign state before it was crushed by the Red army.

Unfortunately, only the memory of that independence rests in the hearts and minds of some 50 million Ukrainians. I rise now if only to remind them that we have not forgotten.

The President has found a salient issue with a worldwide audience in his human rights campaign. Even in Soviet-dominated Europe many ardent believers such as Mykola Rudenko, Oleksei Tykhy, Myroslav Mirynovych, and Mykola Matusevch in Kiev have organized ad hoc review groups to monitor violations of the Helsinki accords in Moscow,

Leningrad, Vilnius, and other major Soviet cities.

Constant intimidation and a policy of public harassment have not deterred these Ukrainian dissidents from insisting on greater human rights in connection with Basket Three of the Helsinki Final Act. The recent show trials of these courageous men and women only reinforce, in the eyes of the world, the stark image of a totalitarian state. I wish now to publicly register my own support for the vigorous efforts of these people. ●

RECOGNIZING GSA'S JAY SOLOMON

HON. JOHN L. BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. JOHN L. BURTON, Mr. Speaker, there are few jobs in town as tough as being head of the General Services Administration. The Administrator is landlord, builder, purchasing agent, transportation agent, deliverer of utility and communications services, information processor, property custodian and disposer, records manager, and archivist. All are major functions. None is a sideline task—not that the Administrator doesn't have some of those, too.

But the Administrator doesn't just furnish services. He must also guide and regulate. On top of all that, he has to administer and control the entire GSA complex, which has over 37,000 employees within its Central office and 10 regions.

The GSA has a select and demanding clientele: They are, for the most part, the departments and agencies of the Federal Government. Keeping them properly serviced is not easy. Keeping them happy or at least satisfied is even harder.

To take over this task, President Carter put a businessman and civic leader from Chattanooga, Tenn., in command back in April 1977. That man, Jay Solomon, started looking over his ship. He found it was basically a serviceable vessel as Congress had designed it.

But he also found it needed cleaning, overhauling, and modernizing. At the same time, he had to keep the ship operating on course and schedule.

He began to act with courage, conscience, and high purpose. He has taken firm charge. He has asked questions, ordered reviews, intensified inspections, and changed people and procedures. He has done everything he can to expose wrongdoing and waste, to correct these things, and to prevent their recurrence.

The Administrator is one who will question old bureaucratic ways and forms, and break with them if necessary. He does not hesitate to challenge doctrinaire or timid thinking. He doesn't suppress outrage at dishonesty and waste in GSA, and he has pointed the finger for past deficiencies where it belongs: At the top.

The Administrator has been open and above-board about his actions. For him,

public business is the public's business. His cooperation with me as chairman of the Government Activities and Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations has been as full as it has been excellent.

The President has given the present Administrator personal assurances of support for cleaning out dishonesty and waste. I understand that recruiting of additional audit and investigation forces is beginning and that funds for 100 more positions for the Office of Inspector General are being sought in the pending supplemental appropriation legislation for fiscal year 1979. I hope that whatever positions are needed can soon be filled.

Jay Solomon is a good thing for GSA. New vigor, responsibility, and effectiveness are coming into that agency.

Last October 15, the Administrator talked to a TV audience about the relatively short incumbent life of Administrators of General Services. According to a story told at GSA, he said, the life of an Administrator there is 2¼ years. Then he remarked, and I quote:

I'll be here two years in April 1979, so I'm almost coming to my normal life there. Maybe it will be my life. Maybe it will take someone else to come in behind me to put in all the systems and things that need to be done. But we're going to try.

That is just what the Administrator is doing.

Now, it seems that the White House is looking for a replacement for Jay Solomon. By specific provision of law, the Administrator functions subject to the direction and control of the President. And the President, by another provision of law, may prescribe overall policies and directives governing the Administrator. We must look to the President to carry out his own responsibilities here in a strong, affirmative, effective way.

Whatever change might be coming in GSA, I hope it would be at a time and in a manner that won't weaken or deflect Jay Solomon's present program of investigations, audits, and reform.

What he has started is already showing good results. When, on June 30, 1979, the General Services Administration celebrates its 30th birthday as an agency, I am sure we will all see it as a proud and taut ship, doing a more efficient and economical job than ever before to deliver its heavy general cargo of Government and public services. We—the Congress and the public—will owe Jay Solomon a special "Thank you" on that day. ●

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation which would amend title XX of the Social Security Act in order to permit the expenditure of Federal funds for

emergency shelters for adults, including victims of domestic violence.

Last year, I chaired very informative hearings on the problem of domestic violence. We heard the testimony of experts who reported that domestic violence, and especially wife beating, is one of the most overlooked crimes in our Nation. A recent study by the Washington Star indicated that one-half of the country's married women are, at some point in their marriages, subjected to physical abuse by their husbands, and that at least 10 percent receive severe injuries as a result.

Domestic abuse does not refer to simply slapping or other minor forms of assault. In California, it has been shown, almost one-third of all victims were murdered by their husbands. Nationally, one-fifth of all police killed on duty in 1974 were intervening in domestic disputes at the time of their deaths.

In preparation for the hearings by the Subcommittee on Select Education, I spent several evenings visiting homes for battered women, discussing the programs and the problems with shelter organizers and with victims, too. I also spent an evening riding in a police car with officers experienced in intervening in domestic violence situations. As a result of these experiences, I have learned the value police themselves place in having a shelter available in their communities. Police are generally grateful to have such a facility, because it provides them with a valuable resource to which they can direct victims. Victims of domestic violence have confided in me that, in many cases, they endured years of abuse, because they had no alternative living option to turn to on an emergency basis.

Within the last several years, a nationwide network of shelters has appeared, offering havens to thousands of previously victimized women. Often with no resources except those of volunteers and donations from the community, these shelters have been established and maintained for the victims of abuse. No one who has discussed the benefits of these shelters with the women who have come to them, as I have done, could doubt the great benefits they provide and the need for more such facilities.

It seems to me that, when we consider the role of the Federal Government in dealing with the subject of domestic violence, we must be extremely careful not to encumber existing community-based programs with bureaucratic red-tape and regulations which will do far more harm than good. We in Government did not discover the problem of domestic violence, and we will not invent the solutions. Our role should be one of aiding the community people who have exposed the epidemic, and who have developed their own shelters in response. One of the ways to do this is by eliminating those barriers which exist in Federal programs to the funding and support of shelters and related service programs for the victims of domestic violence. Witnesses at our hearings last year testified, for example, that facilities providing emergency shelter for adult victims of

domestic violence may not receive title XX funds under the Social Security Act.

The legislation I am introducing today would remove that unreasonable restriction, permitting these shelters to receive such funds. Payments to any one shelter would be limited to \$25,000 in any one year. At last year's hearings, we heard that women who flee battering husbands frequently arrive at shelters entirely without resources, even though they technically may come from affluent homes. The family's finances frequently are controlled by the very spouse from whom the shelter resident is seeking refuge. Therefore, it seems reasonable to me to impose no income eligibility test on victims utilizing title XX funded shelters.

I am hopeful that this legislation will be considered quickly, as similar language passed both Houses of Congress last year as part of the tax bill, but was dropped out of the final bill together with most other amendments to the title XX program. I invite my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this bill which will make substantial funds available to community people who have taken it upon themselves to meet a serious problem which exists throughout our country in very alarming numbers.●

LEGISLATION TO PERMIT ALL TAXPAYERS TO TAKE A DEDUCTION FOR CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I am joining with my colleague, JOSEPH L. FISHER, today in introducing the bill we introduced in the 95th Congress to permit all taxpayers to deduct gifts to charity on their individual income tax returns. In my opinion, this is an area which continues to require our attention.

In the interest of tax simplification and reform, we have unwittingly been reducing the tax incentives to charitable giving over the years until we have reached the point where soon only the very wealthy will receive any tax benefit from charitable giving. It is an easy step from that condition to the assumption that deductions for charitable contributions are only loopholes and that we would be better off letting the Government do the work of charities so that everyone can participate again in the good work of the world through his involuntarily donated tax payment. However, I for one do not want the Government running the Boy Scouts, or the churches, or all the universities, any more than I want only wealthy people to support them. As we see at every turn, Government control accompanies Government financing.

Let us look at some of the pertinent facts: In 1970, approximately 50 percent

of all American taxpayers used the standard deduction, and in 1977, approximately 75 percent of all American taxpayers used the standard deduction. Charitable organizations estimate that during that 7-year period they received about \$5 billion less as a result of the increased use of the standard deduction. In 1977 alone, the loss to the charitable organizations was approximately \$1.4 billion—\$615 million of that amount is attributable to the standard deduction changes enacted by the Tax Reduction and Simplification Act of 1977 (Public Law 95-30).

The pluralism which the private charities provide is a great strength in our society, and we should all be concerned about protecting and enhancing that diversity and strength. Certainly the major share of charitable giving is done for altruistic purposes, but the additional tax incentives are extremely helpful and appropriate, as well.

The expanded use of the standard deduction could be devastating to the voluntary sector. Contributions to public charities are certain to decrease, making it more difficult to meet the increasing demand for social services. The time has come to make a change that will offset the depressing impact of our recent tax decisions on the charities. Public policy should encourage and support the work of charitable organizations, not diminish it.

In my opinion, the only way to reverse this recent trend is to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit all taxpayers to take a deduction for their charitable gifts, whether they itemize their deductions or not. For each dollar lost to the Treasury as a result of this deduction, estimates are that charitable organizations would receive between \$1.15 and \$1.30.

Furthermore, these increased gifts to charities would have a multiplier effect—they would bring an additional amount in volunteer efforts. Recent studies indicate a strong correlation between giving and active participation in charitable endeavors. For each dollar donated to public charities, there is an equivalent dollar's worth of volunteer effort. Conversely, if charitable giving continues to decline, there will not only be a loss in the financial base of the voluntary organizations, but there will also be a significant loss in volunteer effort.

I do not believe that the enactment of this legislation would be a step backward in our efforts toward tax simplification. It would require only a simple computation on the front of the tax form, much like the personal exemption. There is ample precedent for this treatment. Child care expenses, political expenses, and alimony now receive above the line treatment without protest from taxpayers utilizing those provisions.

I am hopeful that my colleagues in Congress will recognize the uniqueness of the charitable contribution deduction and support this legislation to make it available to all American taxpayers.●

TAIWAN: CARTER'S TREATMENT OF AN ALLY

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the Carter decision to derecognize Taipei in favor of Peking fails every test of an effective and positive foreign policy. It alienates our friends. It violates the administration's own principles and the Constitution of the United States. And, most importantly, it is harmful to the best interests of the United States.

The President's hasty and unilateral action has further weakened that little semblance of a foreign policy he has. All nations of the world appraise Mr. Carter's derecognition of the Republic of China on Taiwan in terms of an indicator of U.S. resolve. That the administration has treated a country with unquestioned allegiance to the very principles we champion in such a cavalier manner calls into question our dependability with the rest of our allies.

Friendly nations, especially those in Asia, are shaken by Mr. Carter's actions and are reevaluating their policy options with the concern that American support in time of need may not be available.

Any nation either with treaties in force with the United States or contemplating them, looks at this administration's foreign policy record and views future relations with trepidation. If you betray your friends, you earn the contempt of friend and foe alike.

President Nixon's policy with regard to Taiwan was decidedly more cautious and careful. He sought a more plausible substitute for the Mutual Defense Treaty and preserving Taiwan's security. He planned to issue a joint Presidential/congressional statement after normalization with the People's Republic of China (PRC) was achieved to the effect that use of force by anyone in the Taiwan Straits would cause the United States to consider whatever military actions necessary to preserve peace. Further, the United States would continue to insure freedom of navigation in the straits, and that we would continue to sell defensive military equipment to Taiwan.

It seems clear to me that it is the government of the People's Republic of China which needs the formalized relations with America more than we with them. But the current People's Republic leadership is shrewd. They noted the Carter administration's foreign policy and international negotiating record. They perceived a weakness and increased the ante over the three original conditions (end diplomatic recognition of the Republic of China (ROC), terminate United States-Republic of China Mutual Defense Treaty, withdraw the remaining U.S. troops on Taiwan). They added two more. The People's Republic of China would

not accept a unilateral U.S. declaration concerning Taiwan's security, and that continued arms sales to Taiwan after normalization would not be allowed.

The administration, preoccupied with the vision of the media catching the colorful broadstroke of its foreign policy pronouncement to counter recent criticisms, forgot that the circumstances surrounding the United States-People's Republic of China discussions would allow them to improve relations with the People's Republic of China and obtain the kind of agreement necessary to preserve Taiwan's security. Mr. Carter could have obtained the terms which the overwhelming majority of Americans want, namely recognition of both Peking and Taipei as sovereign governments in their own territories (which they both obviously are) and guarantee that Peking will not use force against Taiwan (as manifested in a Louis Harris-ABC News survey of 1,500 adults nationwide, and American Conservative Union polls of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, which is reflective of the country).

Instead, the President announced that the People's Republic of China had made a great concession, forgetting, again, that Peking had added obstacles to protect the three original demands. Despite the fact that the United States enjoys more leverage over the Hua Ku-feng/Teng Hsiao-ping government in 1978 than President Nixon commanded in 1972, still President Carter was unable to obtain concessions reflective of long-term U.S. foreign policy goals. To say that the People's Republic of China is allowing America to terminate the United States-Taiwan Mutual Defense Treaty with a years notice was a concession on the part of the Chinese Communists is pure folly. The terms of that treaty provided for termination by either party with 1 year's notice. To have acted otherwise would have violated both the spirit and the letter of the treaty and made our other allies even more cautious about our reliability.

That the administration would construe events in that light is indicative of their concern for Taiwan as an entity. By their own admission, specific assurances from Peking that the security of Taiwan would be preserved were never even requested by the Administration. They readily accepted the Peking argument that the Taiwanese matter was an internal issue—period. Can the resolution of the two Koreans and two Germans situation be considered strictly an internal issue? I fear that the international community must believe that America is willing to betray a friend, and do so cheaply, for negligible cosmetic gain.

The decision also violates the administration's claim of conducting an open foreign policy. Throughout his campaign and his tenure in the White House, Mr. Carter has reassured the American people that foreign policy decisions would be arrived at openly and in consultation with the American people and Congress. Yet his total consultation with the Congress was to advise a few Members after

the decision was reached and without their advice being sought.

This clearly violates the law. The Stone-Dole amendment to the International Security Assistance Act of 1978 (Section 26(A)(4)) instructs the President to consult with Congress before taking action to terminate the treaty. That amendment passed the Senate by a 94-to-0 rollcall vote, was subsequently passed by the House of Representatives, and was agreed to by Joint Senate-House Conference Committee. Senator RICHARD STONE, a Democratic Member of the Foreign Relations Committee and the coauthor of this amendment, has stated that he was not consulted but only advised after the decision was made.

Thus the open foreign policy we expected was not present in one of the most important policy decisions of this generation.

Mr. Carter has oft stated the value of human rights as a key element in formulating his foreign policy. Shortly before his announcement concerning the two Chinas, he again reiterated that the principle of human rights was the cornerstone of his foreign policy. Yet he extended recognition, without preconditions, to a government that is universally recognized as disregarding human rights for its citizens. This is one more example that his policy is selective and capricious policy. The policy seems to apply only in those circumstances where the nation and government in question are completely dominated by the United States and are unable to bring effective counterpressure to bear. Once again, the credibility of American foreign policy is harmed by a hasty decision without the benefit of insight as to possible debilitating results.

In foreign affairs no activity takes place in a vacuum. We can only speculate on the effect the President's decision will have on the Soviet leadership. The possible strategic implications are staggering. It is easy to say that this action is not directed against anyone. But how it will be perceived in other capitals like Moscow, and how their leaders will react, is an additional uncertainty which we do not need. The decision does not seem to have been made with those thoughts in mind. It was neither cautious nor careful.

If the People's Republic of China is a military power capable of acerbating existing Soviet paranoia to station on the Soviet-People's Republic of China border approximately 45 divisions and support units (roughly 1 million troops) heavily equipped with armor, tactical air support, nuclear and offensive chemical weapons, how will the U.S. actions affect the situation? Further, how will our action influence Soviet-American arms control discussions?

Since the conclusion of the Second World War the United States has been the force which rallied and held together the noncommunist world. But the manner and tone of recent American foreign policy acts has led much of the free world to question the value of our word. When a nation says one thing, then suddenly

and inexplicably buckles under to counterpressure, the reaction is predictable. In recent years this course of action has been the hallmark of our foreign policies. In Europe it was the enhanced-radiation warhead or neutron weapon. In the Middle East it was the delicate Egyptian-Israeli negotiations and now the Iranian situation. In Southern Africa it was the issue of political principle. Now we have repudiated the defense of an ally.

In summation, the President's hasty and poorly prepared decision will be harmful to both the interests of the United States and the interests of our allies, and to stability in Asia and the world as a whole.

Rather this action signals yet another facet of the gimmicky foreign policy which has become the hallmark of the Carter administration and which has been implemented at the expense of the long-term relationship with our loyal allies. By taking this step, the Administration has laid all our cards on the table and sacrificed our last bargaining chip; it has consciously chosen to undermine one of the last bastions of anticommunism in Asia.

The U.S. Government has shown itself incapable of obtaining fair and equitable guarantees for a loyal ally (namely recognition as a sovereign state and protection against invasion). This is the guarantee which Congress and the American people have repeatedly insisted upon. The President by his unilateral action has ignored the long-held and often expressed views the great majority of Americans hold.●

OPPOSES TENG VISIT

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I made remarks on January 29, 1979, to openly oppose the state visit of Teng Hsiao-ping to these United States. At that time, I pointed out that Mr. Teng had been a part and parcel of the Communist regime responsible for at least 45 million Chinese persons. I do not wish to modify that opinion, but rather to point out a few of the interesting comments that the Communist Chinese Vice-Premier noted in an interview in the current issue of Time magazine.

While the Carter administration is cuddling up to the Chinese Communists it is also attempting to keep the Russian Communists from misrepresenting the White House foreign policy role. The Carter administration is continuing on its misguided hope for a SALT-II agreement and for a continuation of the catastrophic policy of détente. Teng has long been a fellow Communist with the Russian leaders and is not fooled by their apparent friendship. He knows that the Soviet Union stands as the major obstacle to world peace. He also knows

that détente is merely a Communist method of lulling the West into security while the Russian Communists arm for full scale war.

Teng correctly stated in the Time interview that—

We (the Chinese Communists) consider that the true hotbed of war is the Soviet Union.

He went on to relate—

At present the U.S. has no reason and no need to want to launch a war.

Such clear and precise logic is interesting considering the source. I wonder why some of our elected representatives have yet to recognize the truth of the Soviet menace.

The role of U.S. foreign policy should be to be on guard against foreign aggression from whatever source. At present, the Soviet Union stands as the greatest threat to peace and the Chinese Communists while attempting to catch up with the Soviets have yet to master the technology. In regard to capturing the needed technology for war, Teng stated in his Time interview that—

I have said this to a number of foreign friends: the nuclear arsenal of the Soviet Union and the constant development of their strategic weapons means that we can say that the Soviet Union is already on a par with the U.S. The Soviet military budget takes up around 20% of the gross national budget.

As Alexandr Solzhenitsyn has recalled in his "Warning to the West" Lenin once told the Communists in Moscow:

Comrades, don't panic, when things get very tough for us, we will give the bourgeoisie a rope, and the bourgeoisie will hang itself.

Then Karl Radek, who was a very resourceful wit, said:

Vladimir Ilyich (Lenin), but where are we going to get enough rope to hang the whole bourgeoisie?

Lenin effortlessly replied—

They will sell it to us themselves.

Mr. Chairman, the decision of the Carter administration to sell out the free Chinese on Taiwan will stand as a monument to short-run diplomacy and the visit of Mr. Teng raises questions of competence at the White House. Still, one Communist is often able to capture the essence of the politics of another and I believe that Teng is obviously correct in his assessment of the Soviets. ●

AMBASSADOR GARDNER EXPLAINS U.S. POLICY TOWARD ITALY

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Ambassador to Italy, the Honorable Richard Gardner, recently was interviewed by *Famiglia Cristiana*, Italy's largest circulation magazine and made a

clear, and I think, persuasive exposition of U.S. policy toward that country.

At a time when much press attention is focused on other areas of the world, the complexities of Italian politics are not always easily understood on this side of the Atlantic. There has also been some confusion over specific U.S. positions on a number of issues affecting our relationship with this important NATO ally.

Ambassador Gardner's comments, I believe, go a long way toward dispelling such misunderstandings and in articulating what the U.S. role vis-a-vis Italy actually is and what U.S. policy is designed to accomplish.

For this reason, I am including in the *RECORD* at this time the full text of the *Famiglia Cristiana* interview which I commend to the attention of my colleagues. I believe that the substantive portion of the article is a significant policy document. The interview follows:

WHY I ADMIRE THE ITALIANS

(By Franca Zambonini)

"I have come to know you and to appreciate your knowing how to live amid the terrible things that are going on."

The problem of the Communists:

"We grant entry visas to everybody, because we are sure of the quality of our system."

Carter's fight for human rights, in Communist countries and in other countries.

Two years ago three friends met to have dinner together and wait for the returns of the Presidential election. They were Professor Richard Gardner, Professor Zbigniew Brzezinski and lawyer Cyrus Vance. All three of them were members of the Trilateral Commission and of the Task Force which supported Jimmy Carter's candidacy.

For that special dinner, Danielle Gardner had prepared ordinary dishes but had made them sound important by giving them auspicious names: "Tagliatelle Trilateral," "Cutlets Secretary of State," "Diplomat au Chocolat". When, at three o'clock in the morning, television announced Carter's victory, the menu proved to be prophetic: today Vance is Secretary of State, Brzezinski National Security Adviser and Gardner Ambassador to Rome.

With the arrival of Gardner, the style at Villa Taverna, the official residence, has changed. "I wanted it to be less pompous," Gardner says, amiably polemical with the eight ambassadors who preceded him as tenants of the villa. Danielle Luzzatto, the Ambassador's wife of Venetian origin, has eliminated official luncheons and dinners with eight courses, replacing them with quick buffet luncheons and dinners. Their children (who are now studying in America: Nina, 18, is a first year student at Harvard University and Tony, 15, is in high school) give parties with dancing for their friends. And parties are given not only for politicians but also for celebrities passing through Rome, like actor Kirk Douglas, jazz player Gerry Mulligan or the Harlem Globe Trotters.

The Renaissance furnishings of the villa are supplemented by the presence of contemporary American art. There is a portrait of President Carter signed by Andy Warhol, an American flag painted by Jasper Johns; these two artists are known for being disrespectful: Carter's portrait is just a photo with contours roughly touched up and the flag is definitely a "non-regulation" one, it has fourteen stripes and one hundred stars.

Lying about are ceramic ashtrays painted in blue, with a funny inscription that has a story. When he first met the Italian press

Gardner avoided a tricky question by quoting a Venetian adage: "Prima de parlar, tasi" (before you talk, be quiet). His Venetian relatives had this adage painted on ashtrays and sent him a dozen. One of them is on the table in front of us. For those who are always looking, as we do, for auspicious signs, this is certainly not encouraging . . .

Q. Mr. Gardner, silence is the rule in your job?

A. No. "Prima de parlar, tasi" only means that, before you talk, you should pause and think. This is an old and wise Venetian saying that I learned from my wife. In my job I only speak in accordance with official policy. I don't make policy by myself.

Q. What instructions have you received recently?

A. There is nothing new. The policy of the Carter Administration remains today what it has been from the beginning: to do everything within our power to help Italy deal with its problems such as inflation and unemployment—which are problems we also have—and to work with our Italian friends and express solidarity with them.

FEW NATIONS ARE TRULY FREE

Q. Has Carter changed his mind with regard to the participation of the Communists in the Italian government?

A. Our policy is the same as it always was, as the President expressed it on May 2, 1977 during an interview granted to four European television journalists. I quote the text: "In the first place, it is not up to us to tell other nations how to vote or how to choose their leaders or who these leaders should be. In the second place, we favor the election of leaders who are committed to freedom and democracy and who are free from communist philosophy, which has quite often been dominated from the Soviet Union or other nations." These are two fundamental points, non-interference and preference, but at the beginning the press focused on the first one only. It is not for me to say why it did this. In any event, the position of my Government was enunciated by the Department of State on January 12, 1978; there has been no change in the policy described in that statement.

Q. On December 10 the 30th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights passed by the United Nations will be celebrated. In your opinion, in which countries are human rights not yet respected?

A. I used to be a member of the board of directors of Freedom House, the most important private group in America concerned with human rights. Freedom House has issued a world survey of freedom. It shows that out of 150 countries, only 40 are free and democratic, 50 are totalitarian dictatorships and 60 have some democratic aspects and some totalitarian aspects. We obviously can't impose our commitment to human rights on other countries by military force and we can't cut off relations with them. That would not serve any purpose. What we can do, and what we are doing, is to use our political, economic and moral influence to encourage improvements in the lot of the average man.

Q. Who gives America the right to impose its morality?

A. The desire for freedom is not an American invention. It is something men fundamentally need, it is the only great revolutionary cause. We can use our economic influence to protect human rights: in fact, the Carter Administration has decided not to grant economic aid to certain countries where there are severe violations of human rights.

Q. Between an out-and-out commitment to human rights and a breakdown in the process of détente, what would you choose?

A. President Carter has always insisted that raising the question of human rights is not inconsistent with detente. We are working with the Soviet Union on the SALT negotiations and I hope we shall reach agreement. The same goes for the ban on nuclear testing and I think we shall succeed. We are cooperating with the Soviet Union in solving some of the world's problems. We continue to sell wheat to Russia and to export technology . . . But there is another point: human rights and detente are mutually reinforcing, one helps the other. As we pursue detente, we create a climate of relaxation in which it is easier for the Soviet Union to grant rights to its citizens. If we were in a state of tension, in a cold war climate, it would give the Soviet Union a good excuse to oppress the population. Moreover, ignorance, fear, ideological ghettos are things that work against detente. No one expressed this better than Pope John Paul II when he said: "Open the frontiers, don't be afraid . . ."

Q. Ambassador Gardner, what was your relationship with President Moro? In the so-called Moro Memorial, he talks about you at length.

A. The section of the Moro Memorial that refers to me is authentic. There are details that concern me that only he could have known: for example, the fact that, while talking with him, I took out of my pocket a paper on which I had noted down some important points, since I didn't trust my Italian sufficiently. I was moved by the fact that, despite the terrible pressures that were operating on Moro during his confinement, he was sufficiently serene to provide an exact evaluation of our personal relationship. We had common interests: for example, combating inflation and unemployment and other areas in which Italy and the United States can cooperate. He wanted to encourage, as I do, the flow of students, of young leaders between Italy and the United States, to help us to know each other better. These are not the things that make headlines, but I can assure you that they will give a new meaning to the relationship between Italy and the U.S. a generation from now. Moro understood this very well.

Q. The number of communist leaders who visit the United States has also increased. What do you think of this? Do they go there to explain Eurocommunism to the Americans or to win their favor?

A. President Carter has been the one who removed the ideological bloc on the granting of visas. It doesn't mean that he has changed his views about Communism, but it means that today we are so secure about the superiority of our free system that we invite everyone to come and look. Our basic idea is that those who come will perhaps change their views once they are exposed to our system.

Q. As far as you know, are there communist leaders who changed their mind after having visited America?

A. You should ask them, not me. But we know, for example, that Khrushchev came to the United States with many misconceptions and that when he left, he didn't have them anymore. I go so far as to say that if Mussolini or Hitler had come to the U.S., history would have been different. Obviously, I can't prove that, because history does not disclose its alternatives. But, in order to better answer your question, there is no doubt that the PCI is anxious to make these visits and this is perfectly all right with us, though we would like to balance the presence of leaders of the PCI by visits of leaders belonging to other parties.

Q. When Berlinguer will apply for a visa, you will immediately say yes?

A. I would prefer not to answer about a particular case. It might seem that I am inviting Berlinguer to visit the United States, which is certainly not my intention. I will answer in a general way, saying once again that we grant visas to everybody, without any political discrimination.

Q. Talking about changing one's mind: about what things have you changed your mind since you arrived in Italy?

A. I have never felt a stranger here because, ever since Danielle and I were married in 1956, we have been coming here every summer. But then we stayed mainly in the large cities. Now I travel a lot, I think I am the most traveling Ambassador that has ever been in Italy. And I have discovered an Italy that is not known by the world's press and by the diplomats: an Italy of the common people, with their traditional Italian virtues, their good sense, their commitment to religious values, their love of family and work. I discovered another thing I didn't know: the Italians really know how to take life in the right way. The basic strength of Italy is its capability to survive in spite of the terrible things that are going on.

Q. Did you tell President Carter about these things so as to convince him to visit Italy?

A. Of course. And President Carter wants to come soon.

Q. What does soon mean? For Christmas? In spring?

A. It means soon. I cannot tell you exactly when, but he wants to come to Italy soon.

Q. There is another anniversary in addition to the one of the declaration of human rights: thirty years ago NATO was founded. How is NATO affected by domestic developments in member countries?

A. One always talks of what would happen to NATO should the communists come into the government in Italy. For once, let's see things from the American side. Imagine that someone were running for President in the 1980 elections with the following program: withdraw all our troops from Europe, stop all imports from Europe, cut our share of international military expense, eliminate foreign aid . . . Obviously that will not happen, but if it did I believe such a man would be seen as prejudicial to the interests of NATO members and the European Community, and you would consider his candidacy a reasonable subject of discussion.

Q. Is NATO different today from what it used to be thirty years ago?

A. Undoubtedly. The Soviet Union is much stronger. Thirty years ago, the USSR didn't have any missiles, and now it has them in abundance and many of them are targeted on Europe. It has built up its conventional arms far beyond its defensive needs: for example, it has 16,000 tanks facing 7,000 tanks of NATO in Central Europe. So there is need to strengthen NATO, which has been a major priority of Carter's foreign policy; we have reached agreements on this at the last two NATO summits.

Q. Mr. Gardner, we have talked a lot about human rights. How can the support given by Carter to the Shah, pretending not to see the Teheran massacres, be in keeping with the defense of human rights?

A. As I said earlier, we have to deal with a variety of countries and use our influence to encourage improvement in respect for human rights. Now the Shah is trying to bring his country from the feudal era into the modern era; normally, it takes many generations to achieve this goal. He is trying to do it in one generation. When he imposed martial law, he promised to hold free elections as soon as possible. We must encourage governments to move in the right direction and this is what we are doing with Iran.

Q. Would this encouragement be the same if the Shah didn't have his throne established on oil wells?

A. The only honest answer I can give you is that one has to be an idealist and a realist at the same time. Iran is a country of enormous strategic importance because of its geographic position and of enormous economic importance because it is a major supplier of oil to us and to Europe and Japan, which depend more heavily on Iranian oil than we Americans. It would not serve the interests of freedom in the world to have the oil of Iran fall under the control of the Soviet Union.

THE TRUTH ON THE N-BOMB

Q. One has the impression that President Carter works with one hand for peace (his mediation for peace in the Middle East) and with the other hand for war (the recent decision to build the main components for the neutron bomb). Is this so?

A. No. The so-called N-bomb is not a new weapon, it is an improvement of existing tactical nuclear weapons. There are thousands of them in Europe, on both sides, the Warsaw Pact side and the NATO side, ready for use in case of war in Central Europe. The so-called N-bomb differs from the existing weapons in Europe because it is more precise, it can destroy an invading army without destroying the civilian population around it. In short, it is a more rational weapon.

Q. Ambassador, do you really believe that there are "rational" weapons and "irrational" weapons?

A. I believe in complete disarmament, I worked for this as far back as the Kennedy Administration, participating in negotiations with the Soviet Union on the banning of nuclear weapons. I think war is obscene, that all weapons are obscene. But let's be logical: the Russians have the SS 16, SS 18 and SS 20 missiles (the latter is now being built) that are twenty thousand times more destructive than the N-bomb. Why are those who complain about the N-bomb totally silent about Soviet missiles which are twenty thousand times as destructive? Isn't this silence strange?

Q. You mentioned the Kennedy Administration. President Kennedy died fifteen years ago, his brother Bob ten years ago. What did we miss in connection with them?

A. The great hope that everything is possible, typical of the Kennedy years. I was thirty-three years old when I was invited to join the Kennedy Administration as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for United Nations. We all had the sense that one could re-make the world for peace and justice. Today we don't have that sense any more. Today I am older and perhaps wiser, but I miss that unique spirit.

Q. How do you define your political position?

A. One day the Italian press says that I'm too much to the left and the next they say that I'm too much to the right. I am a moderate progressive. We of the Carter Administration are part of a great tradition that extends from Franklin Roosevelt through Harry Truman and John Kennedy to Jimmy Carter. We are reformers. We believe in the renovation of society through non-violence, through law and through the democratic process. In my contacts with Italian politicians I prefer those who share these ideas. Of course, I also see members of the Communist Party. But since President Carter has clearly indicated what our preference is, I don't invite them to official functions at the Embassy. I see them outside, at dinner parties organized by others which I attend.

Q. One more question, Mr. Ambassador: Being used to making political analyses in a simple country like America, how do you deal with Italy's complexity?

A. It is not true that America is simple

and Italy complicated. They are both complicated countries. To understand America requires an effort which sometimes you Europeans are not prepared to make. The same thing happens to us with regard to Italy. We must practice a little reciprocal humility. I am trying to approach Italy with humility. I have never said, and I will never say, that I am an expert on Italian affairs. ●

INDEED, WHAT KIND OF PEOPLE ARE WE?

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, in the February 5 issue of U.S. News & World Report, editor Marvin Stone has written an excellent commentary on the present and future course of our Nation, salted with a few lessons from history. While we may not agree with every facet of Stone's analysis, I found the editorial to be extremely thought provoking, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

WHAT KIND OF PEOPLE ARE WE?

(By Marvin Stone)

What has happened to the America we knew?

That plaintive cry is sounded time and again in letters from our readers, by people we meet on our trips, by those close to home.

What kind of people have we become?

One description was offered in the recent farewell issue of *New Times* magazine:

"Come July it will be 10 years since Neil Armstrong stepped on the moon—and 10 years since Teddy Kennedy and Mary Jo Kopechne rode off Dike Bridge. Of the two events, Chappaquiddick far better presaged the decade ahead. It was so callous, so sloppy.

"We shrug off almost everything now, moving on—with a lot of help from the omnivorous media—to the next fleeting titillation. Fur ads in *Vogue* feature women being attacked by Dobermans. Shrug. Blanca Jagger, Billy Carter, Gary Gilmore—all hype, show, diversion. There's a new rock group called the Dead Kennedys. Shrug.

"It's as if we're beyond making distinctions, beyond caring. . . . Third graders are selling dope, White House aides are buying it. Our appetite for violence is insatiable. Sid Vicious is just a mixed-up kid.

"Exhausted from our exertions of the '60s, all we ask for now is relief. Six hours of TV helps to get us through the day—life once removed is close enough, thanks. The impetus to rethink-reform-transform has long since slid into the ennui.

"After two centuries, we have reached a consensus of indifference."

So we ask: If we have really come to that, is there any turning back?

The answer has to come from intangibles not readily calibrated. But the answer is crucial, because our future will surely be endangered if we continue aimlessly to drift.

Americans have not, indeed, put on an impressive show of unity in recent years. We can't even get together on saving gasoline and oil in the face of costly imports that are damaging the economy, or on controlling the inflation that threatens disaster.

What's wrong? There are clues.

The ennui of affluence can overwhelm a nation. In this condition, nothing seems to call for striving, or to demand common effort.

Lacking is the challenge that can be the basis of a strong civilization. Those Americans who do not have much are looking around them at the almost universal abundance and expecting to receive—or wangle—their share. The ripoff society.

A retreat from dominance, a softening of the martial spirit have also affected a mature and bountiful society. Along with the urge to relax and enjoy has come the false conviction that protecting national interests, a principal means by which big powers survive, is not worth personal sacrifice.

In the midst of plenty, the small symptoms of economic disorder depress and alienate the individual. The cartwheel dollar is only a collector's item, and quarters don't ring. A cup of coffee at 50 cents and up is a knife to the wallet. When Euro-peans turn up their noses at the dollar, when a drink costs \$8 in a Swiss bar, you don't feel welcome any more. And so Americanism, too, is devalued.

A person deals today with huge companies, not with people. It is hard to make friends with a computer or to cooperate beyond obeying its commands. Big government, faceless and remote, reaches out with incomprehensible forms and rules. How can one feel part of anything? Thieves and embezzlers can operate without the embarrassing thought that they are cheating someone they know, or will be arrested by a policeman who lives down the street.

Respect for government is further diminished by endless exposures of misfeasance. Until reforms are confirmed and confidence is restored, the weak-minded may conclude, "We might as well get ours too," and the honest may turn their backs in disgust.

This and the awful complexity of issues and political campaigning today have generated in people a feeling that they cannot better their condition by going to the polls. A television personality explains why he has no faith in politics:

"It's pretty much the same man, asking the same questions, and we're still stuck." Only about a third of eligible voters cast their ballots. People just don't care.

During a period of recent years, history and writing skills were neglected in school curricula. So we have a generation cut adrift without a compass or the means of communication. Respect for education sank to an all-time low. Teachers were attacked. Buildings paid for with people's tax money were vandalized. Other institutions regarded as foundations of society went down in the avalanche of change. The family suffered. The churches, long a rallying point for humane action, lost influence.

Meanwhile, huge new groups of immigrants arrived, different from former waves of newcomers: In many cases, they wished to maintain their transplanted culture and did not yearn to be "Americanized." Millions of illegal aliens, unable to acknowledge their existence, live outside the system.

Foreign-oriented lobbies have grown up to badger Congress on behalf of Greece, Israel, black Africa, Korea or what have you. These, alongside the domestic lobbies already operating for business, unions, lawyers, doctors, oilmen, dairymen and a host of others, serve to split the country into factions and hamper legislators trying to work for the national good.

Those are a few of the forces working against cohesion and concerted effort. It would be fatuous to suggest that anyone has a remedy. There is no single medicine.

Some of the trends may be irreversible. Some others, happily, are showing signs of

improvement. Organizations have grown up to defend the family. Trashing of schools and attacks against teachers are abating in some places. Colleges are restoring requirements for the study of history, government and language. Outwardly, at least, the dissidence of young people has calmed.

Yet Felix Rohatyn, the financier who helped to win time for New York City in its struggle for solvency, issues a warning: "Can a Western democracy only find leadership, nobility of purpose and sacrifice in a time of crisis, at the brink of disaster? . . . [If not] it could be the end of a form of government which, since the days of the French Revolution, has done more for more people than any other system ever invented."

Are we doomed, then? Surely we have endured social revolution before. The nation was born in it, and lived its first 50 years in so unruly a fashion that the strongest memory for Frances Trollope, the English visitor, was of men "incessantly" spitting in living rooms, dining rooms, theaters, the halls of Congress.

After the smashed china of Andrew Jackson's regime, we restored some decorum to the White House, and we eventually restrained his spoils system, at least for a while.

A hard lesson was learned from the bloody stupidity of the Civil War, but we were able, in its uneasy aftermath, to become a nation able to function together as never before.

As World War I drew near its close, suffragettes marched on the White House. During the Roaring Twenties, gin mills sprang up in massive, illegal protests, college students carried hip flasks, and flappers in knee-length skirts rode to perdition in rumble seats. Some thought society had collapsed. But prohibition was repealed, women got the vote, and young people went to work. Out of the travail we became more mature.

The Great Depression of the '30s shook every American. No sooner had the specter of starvation been exorcised than we began to worry about the way Franklin Roosevelt did it. Some groaned, "Socialism!" Others, "Communist!" What really happened was that we found ways to save ourselves from an upheaval like the French and Russian revolutions.

Troubles, then, do not necessarily destroy a nation. Arnold Toynbee, if we read him right, thought of troubles as the challenge necessary to maintain the vitality of a society.

Certainly we have the intelligence to understand that we are going through one more social revolution in this country, and the challenge is to preserve the best of the past and embrace the good in the new. But it will take leadership to define and inspire a common purpose, and desire by the rest of us to pursue it. ●

ASBESTOS SCHOOL HAZARD DETECTION AND CONTROL ACT

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday I introduced H.R. 1524, the Asbestos School Hazard Detection and Control Act of 1979, a bill which deserves the immediate attention of the Congress. Over the past several months, I have held several days of hear-

ings, in two subcommittees of the Committee on Education and Labor, on the broad subject of health hazards associated with exposure to asbestos. Expert testimony at these hearings established the fact that asbestos exposure greatly increases the likelihood of contracting lung cancer, mesothelioma and asbestosis, all fatal diseases. In conjunction with smoking, the chances of contracting lung cancer tremendously increases.

One of the most serious problems which was brought to the attention of the subcommittee earlier this month was that asbestosis materials were widely used in the construction of schools during the period 1946-72. One recent survey found asbestos materials in one-sixth of all schools surveyed. In some, the asbestos level in the air was 100 times the normal ambient level. Asbestos was used for fireproofing, insulation, and soundproofing, and was mixed in cement and tiles, used as pipe insulation, and sprayed on walls and ceilings.

Over time, some of this asbestos material has deteriorated and found its way into the air, where it can be inhaled by students and school employees. Especially when the asbestos materials have become friable, or are within easy reach of students, the likelihood of the release of asbestos fibers is very great. Additional problems are caused by broken insulation around pipes and water and air damage.

The problem in our schools is particularly severe because children, according to leading medical experts, may be especially susceptible to environmentally caused cancers. Asbestos related cancers also take as long as 30 years or more to develop. If a young child is exposed, therefore, his or her likelihood of surviving well into the post-latency period, when the cancer becomes manifest, is far greater than in the case of an older worker.

There are very inadequate controls governing asbestos in the school environment. There is currently no safety standard applicable to schools. Although the use of sprayed asbestos was banned by the Environmental Protection Agency in 1973, there is no program to survey schools and remove hazardous asbestos, except on a voluntary basis. Local school boards do not have the technical expertise to test their schools, nor the financial resources to pay for the containment or removal of hazardous substances. Although administrative relief is being sought under the Toxic Substances Control Act, resolution of the current petition may require years, and we cannot afford to wait. Doctors told our committee that there is no safe level of exposure to asbestos; cancers have appeared in people who were exposed for only a few weeks several decades in the past. I believe that my bill is a reasonable, fair, and effective way to responsibly provide Federal leadership in the resolution of a very grave danger.

The Asbestos School Hazard Detection and Control Act builds on the voluntary efforts begun by the National Cancer Institute, HEW, the Department

of Labor and several States to reduce the asbestos hazard to millions of schoolchildren. This bill would create an interagency Task Force to conduct information, education, and technical assistance programs for States and local units of government, including school boards, concerning the hazards of asbestos exposure, the means of detection and containment or removal. The bill also requires States to file a plan which details the means which they will use to conduct a thorough survey of all schools for the purpose of detecting the presence of hazardous asbestos substances.

If a hazardous situation is found, the local board could apply to HEW for a 50-percent reimbursement of the approved costs of a survey, detection, and testing of suspected materials. The reimbursement would be paid from a fund composed of contributions from those companies which manufactured asbestos during the years the substance was being installed in schools. Throughout all of the testimony at various hearings, I think a very strong case has been made to the effect that asbestos manufacturers did not exercise prudence or caution for many years regarding their product. Letters which were made available to the Subcommittee on Compensation, Health and Safety indicate that these companies were aware of the severe health hazards associated with asbestos exposure as early as 1933 or 1934. There was an enormous literature developed on the subject during the 1930's, 1940's, 1950's, and 1960's. At hearings 2 weeks ago, the attorney for Johns-Mansville told the subcommittee members that his company knew "decades ago" that exposure to asbestos in the workplace caused severe illness. Yet what did the company do? We also heard from a man who lost a lung, and now has other severe asbestos-related illnesses, who had worked in a plant in the late 1960's, and was never warned that his health was at risk.

Despite company protestations, there is very little evidence that asbestos manufacturers exercised diligence with regard to their workers' health. Nor did they adequately investigate the possible effects of exposure in nonindustrial settings. Knowing as much as they did 40 years ago, one would have hoped to see far more in the way of corporate responsibility than they have yet revealed.

Detecting and cleaning up asbestos hazards is not going to be cheap. I, for one, do not believe that the Federal Government ought to pick up the tab alone. This is a problem for which responsibility must be shared, and I firmly believe that the people who manufactured and promoted the use of asbestos for decades, and who made very profitable businesses out of that activity, should also contribute to the solution of a very serious problem.

The issues raised in the asbestos problem, and in the legislative response, are very far reaching. I believe that corporate responsibility simply cannot end with the sale of a product into the marketplace. I think there is a choice to be

made. Perhaps we will have massive Federal regulation in the future to prevent forever the introduction of any potentially hazardous substance, because if a danger does become known, the responsibility for picking up the bill for the corrective action always seems to be sent to the Government. Or, perhaps corporations will choose to exercise diligence and assume the responsibility for their products, even if hazards become known years after their introduction.

But that is not the kind of responsibility we have seen in the case of Tris, or Firestone tires, or Pintos, or now asbestos. Business wants no regulations, they oppose Toxic Substances Acts and other laws, and then they run to the Congress to pick up the multimillion dollar bills due to their errors and negligence. Well, I favor cutting back on wasteful Government spending, too, and I think a very good place to start is by ending the periodic bailing out of corporations which find that their products have not only produced profits, but also life threatening hazards for millions of Americans.

If hazardous situations are found, they should be mitigated, either by containment or removal. My bill would provide school districts with long term, no interest loans, but only for the mitigation of situations which pose an imminent danger to the health of students and school employees. I do not believe that we should hyperbolize this issue; we should not create the impression that every school in America is filled with asbestos. We should not create a loan program which will be used to refurbish every school building in the country. That is why loans, under this bill, will be for the mitigation of serious problems where the asbestos is friable, damaged, or within easy reach of students or employees.

There are several other provisions in this bill which are very important. All parties would reserve the right to take legal or administrative actions to recover losses. Employees would be protected from disciplinary action because of their activities regarding asbestos safety. All testing and mitigation efforts would have to be conducted in strict accordance with worker safety rules.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that this legislation receives swift consideration by the Congress. The asbestos problem in our schools affects every State in our Nation, and probably every congressional district. This legislation establishes a reasonable, cautious and fair approach to ridding our schools of a potentially severe health hazard. ●

REPRESENTATIVE MINETA ON
SUNSET

HON. JAMES J. BLANCHARD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, during last week's Democratic Caucus, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. MINETA, and I offered a

resolution urging the Rules Committee and the Ways and Means Committee to give full and serious consideration to sunset legislation. Our resolution was adopted, and I want to thank Congressman MINETA for his tireless efforts on sunset.

Time did not permit Mr. MINETA to offer his prepared remarks, so I would like to take this opportunity to bring them to my colleagues' attention. Mr. MINETA's statement shows very clearly the long legislative record and extent of the effort that has gone into the preparation of this important piece of legislation over the past 4 years.

The statement follows:

MINETA STATEMENT ON SUNSET RESOLUTION

This Resolution deserves the strong support of all the Members of this body. It is directed towards achieving a goal we can all agree on—improving the effectiveness of Federal spending. Passing this Resolution will not force anyone to do anything they do not want to do. It merely urges the Rules Committee to consider legislation to require review and reauthorization of spending programs on a systematic basis. Further, it asks the Ways and Means Committee to do the same thing with tax expenditures.

I want to point out to my colleagues that the sunset plan we are proposing is not a mere political gimmick cooked up to convince voters that we "got the message of Prop. 13." The five elements we have listed in our resolution which should make up the basis of a comprehensive review system are the result of four years of legislative study and refinement. A brief chronology of the legislative history of this idea will indicate that it is, indeed, a serious idea.

The bill embodying the sunset principle was originally introduced in July, 1975 by Jim Blanchard and myself. Subsequently, various similar bills were introduced in the House and Senate during the 94th and 95th Congresses. During that time the bill was the subject of numerous hearings in both the House and Senate:

In March and April, 1976, 7 days of hearings were held by the Senate Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.

In June, 1976, hearings were held by the House Rules Committee.

In June and July, 1976, hearings were held by the Budget Process Task Force of the House Budget Committee.

In September 1977, Senate Rules Committee held hearings.

In March, 1977, 7 days of hearings were held by the Senate Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.

September, 1977, hearings were held by the Senate Rules Committee.

October, 1977, hearings were held by the House Government Operations Committee Subcommittee on Legislation and National Security.

In the course of the last four years, that's a total of 24 days of hearings held by five committees.

By the end of the 95th Congress, various sunset bills which Mr. Blanchard and I introduced had over 180 co-sponsors in the House. Last October, the Senate passed their companion measure, 87-1.

Thus, the bill we are talking about is already in a refined form. It is possible to achieve a firm, yet flexible schedule with the approach we are suggesting. It is our hope that passing this resolution will convince the Rules Committee to put together a workable bill along the lines in this resolution. With the able leadership and extensive

expertise of the Rules Committee, a truly landmark piece of legislation will be possible. I urge you all to support this resolution. ●

PROTECTING OLDER AMERICANS AGAINST OVERPAYMENT OF INCOME TAXES

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, we live in an era of unprecedented inflation. Rapidly rising prices affect our senior citizens even more than other Americans.

Because our older citizens generally live on fixed incomes, it is very important that they take advantage of every allowable tax deduction, exemption and credit available.

Today I am submitting a revised Checklist of itemized Deductions for use in preparing 1978 Federal income tax returns. The checklist, prepared by the Senate Special Committee on Aging, is designed to cover many typical situations. It is not intended to be comprehensive for every conceivable tax situation.

Several new tax relief measures became law in 1978. Persons 55 years of age or older may now exclude up to \$100,000 from capital gains tax when they sell their home.

In addition, there is a new 15 percent tax credit of up to \$2,000 for energy conserving devices.

The checklist will be helpful in determining whether to itemize deductible expenses or claim the standard deduction. It can provide guidance in planning personal and tax affairs. The checklist may even be helpful for taxpayers who have already filed a tax return but overlooked allowable deductions, such as sales tax on an automobile or transportation for medical expenses exceeding three percent of adjusted gross income. These persons may still claim these items by completing an amended return, Form 1040X.

I hope our senior citizens will find this information interesting and useful:

CHECKLIST OF ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS FOR SCHEDULE A (FORM 1040)

MEDICAL AND DENTAL EXPENSES

Medical and dental expenses (unreimbursed by insurance or otherwise) are deductible to the extent that they exceed 3% of your adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040).

INSURANCE PREMIUMS

One-half of medical, hospital or health insurance premiums are deductible (up to \$150) without regard to the 3% limitation for other medical expenses. The remainder of these premiums can be deducted, but is subject to the 3% rule.

DRUGS AND MEDICINES

Included in medical expenses (subject to 3% rule), but only to extent exceeding 1% of adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040).

OTHER MEDICAL EXPENSES

Other allowable medical and dental expenses (subject to 3% limitation):

Abdominal supports (prescribed by a doctor).

Acupuncture services.

Ambulance hire.

Anesthetist.

Arch supports (prescribed by a doctor).

Artificial limbs and teeth.

Back supports (prescribed by a doctor).

Braces.

Capital expenditures for medical purposes (e.g., elevator for persons with a heart ailment)—deductible to the extent that the cost of the capital expenditure exceeds the increase in value to your home because of the capital expenditure. You should have an independent appraisal made to reflect clearly the increase in value.

Cardiographs.

Chiropodist.

Chiropractor.

Christian Science practitioner, authorized.

Convalescent home (for medical treatment only).

Crutches.

Dental services (e.g., cleaning, X-ray, filling teeth).

Dentures.

Dermatologist.

Eyeglasses.

Food or beverages specially prescribed by a physician (for treatment of illness, and in addition to, not as substitute for, regular diet; physician's statement needed).

Gynecologist.

Hearing aids and batteries.

Home health services.

Hospital expenses.

Insulin treatment.

Invalid chair.

Lab tests.

Lipreading lessons (designed to overcome a handicap).

Neurologist.

Nursing services (for medical care, including nurse's board paid by you).

Occupational therapist.

Ophthalmologist.

Optician.

Optometrist.

Oral surgery.

Osteopath, licensed.

Pediatrician.

Physical examinations.

Physical therapist.

Physician.

Podiatrist.

Psychiatrist.

Psychoanalyst.

Psychologist.

Psychotherapy.

Radium therapy.

Sacroiliac belt (prescribed by a doctor).

Seeing-eye dog and maintenance.

Speech therapist.

Splints.

Supplementary medical insurance (Part B) under Medicare.

Surgeon.

Telephone/teletype special communications equipment for the deaf.

Transportation expenses for medical purposes (7c per mile plus parking and tolls or actual fares for taxi, buses, etc.).

Vaccines.

Vitamins prescribed by a doctor (but not taken as a food supplement or to preserve general health).

Wheelchairs.

Whirlpool baths for medical purposes.

X-rays.

Expenses may be deducted only in the year you paid them. If you charge medical expenses on your bank credit card, the ex-

penses are deducted in the year the charge is made regardless of when the bank is repaid.

TAXES

Real estate.
State and local gasoline.
General sales.
State and local income.
Personal property.

If sales tax tables are used in arriving at your deduction, ordinarily you may add to the amount shown in the tax tables the sales tax paid on the purchase of the following items: automobiles, truck, motorcycles, airplanes, boats, mobile homes, and materials used to build a new home when you are your own contractor.

When using the sales tax tables, add to your adjusted gross income any nontaxable income (e.g., Social Security, Veterans' pensions or compensation payments, Railroad Retirement annuities, workmen's compensation, untaxed portion of long-term capital gains, dividends untaxed under the dividend exclusion, interest on municipal bonds, unemployment compensation and public assistance payments).

CONTRIBUTIONS

In general, contributions may be deducted up to 50 percent of your adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040). However, contributions to certain private nonprofit foundations, veterans organizations, or fraternal societies are limited to 20% of adjusted gross income.

Cash contributions to qualified organizations for (1) religious, charitable, scientific, literary or educational purposes, (2) prevention of cruelty to children or animals, or (3) Federal, State or local governmental units (tuition for children attending parochial schools is not deductible).

Fair market value of property (e.g., clothing, books, equipment, furniture) for charitable purposes. (For gifts of appreciated property, special rules apply. Contact local IRS office.)

Travel expenses (actual or 7¢ per miles plus parking and tolls) for charitable purposes (may not deduct insurance or depreciation in either case).

Cost and upkeep of uniforms used in charitable activities (e.g., scoutmaster).

Purchase of goods or tickets from charitable organizations (excess of amounts paid over the fair market value of the goods or services).

Out-of-pocket expenses (e.g., postage, stationery, phone calls) while rendering services for charitable organizations.

Care of unrelated student in your home under a written agreement with a qualifying organization (deduction is limited to \$50 per month).

INTEREST

Home mortgage.
Auto loan.
Installment purchases (television, wash-dryer, etc.).

Bank credit card—can deduct the finance charge as interest if no part is for service charges, loan fees, credit investigation fees, or similar charges.

Other credit cards—you may deduct as interest the finance charges added to your monthly statement, expressed as an annual percentage rate, that are based on the unpaid monthly balance.

Point—deductible as interest by buyer where financing agreements provides that they are to be paid for use of lender's money and only if the charging of points is an established business practice in your area. Not deductible if points represent charges for services rendered by the lending institution (e.g., VA loan points are service

charges and are not deductible as interest). Not deductible if paid by seller (are treated as selling expenses and represent a reduction of amount realized).

Penalty for prepayment of a mortgage—deductible as interest.

Revolving charge accounts—may deduct the separately stated "finance charge" expressed as an annual percentage rate.

CASUALTY OR THEFT LOSSES

Casualty (e.g., tornado, flood, storm, fire, or auto accident provided not caused by a willful act or willful negligence) or theft losses—the amount of your casualty loss deduction is generally the lesser of (1) the decrease in fair market value of the property as a result of the casualty, or (2) your adjusted basis in the property. This amount must be further reduced by any insurance or other recovery, and, in the case of property held for personal use, by the \$100 limitation. Report your casualty or theft loss on Schedule A. If more than one item was involved in a single casualty or theft, or if you had more than one casualty or theft during the year, you may use Form 4684 for computing your personal casualty loss.

MISCELLANEOUS

Appraisal fees to determine the amount of a casualty loss or to determine the fair market value of charitable contributions.

Union dues.
Cost of preparation of income tax return.
Cost of tools for employee (depreciated over the useful life of the tools).

Dues for Chamber of Commerce (if as a business expense).

Rental cost of a safe-deposit box used to store income-producing property.

Fees paid to investment counselors.
Subscriptions to business publications.
Telephone and postage in connection with investments.

Uniforms required for employment and not generally wearable off the job.
Maintenance of uniforms required for employment.

Special safety apparel (e.g., steel toe safety shoes or helmets worn by construction workers; special masks worn by welders).

Business entertainment expenses.
Business gift expenses not exceeding \$25 per recipient.

Employment agency fees under certain circumstances.
Cost of a periodic physical examination if required by employer.

Cost of installation and maintenance of a telephone required by your employment (deduction based on business use).

Cost of bond if required for employment.
Expenses of an office in your home if used regularly and exclusively for certain business purposes.

Educational expenses that are: (1) required by your employer to maintain your position; or (2) for maintaining or sharpening your skills for your employment.

Political Campaign Contributions.—You may claim either a deduction (line 31, Schedule A, Form 1040) or a credit (line 38, Form 1040), for campaign contributions to an individual who is a candidate for nomination or election to any Federal, State, or local office in any primary, general, or special election. The deduction or credit is also applicable for any (1) committee supporting a candidate for Federal, State, or local elective public office, (2) national committee of a national political party, (3) State committee of a national political party, or (4) local committee of a national political party. The maximum deduction is \$100 (\$200 for couples filing jointly). The amount of the tax credit is one-half of the political contribution, with a \$25 ceiling (\$50 for couples filing jointly).

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND

Additionally, you may voluntarily earmark \$1 of your taxes (\$2 on joint returns) for the President Election Campaign Fund.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

For any questions concerning any of these items, contact your local IRS office. You may also obtain helpful publications and additional forms by contacting your local IRS office.

OTHER TAX RELIEF MEASURES

Required to file a tax return if gross income is at least—

Filing status:	
Single (under age 65)-----	\$2,950
Single (age 65 or older)-----	3,700
Qualifying widow(er) under 65 with dependent child-----	3,950
Qualifying widow(er) 65 or older with dependent child-----	4,700
Married couple (both spouses under 65) filing jointly-----	4,700
Married couple (1 spouse 65 or older) filing jointly-----	5,450
Married couple (both spouses 65 or older) filing jointly-----	6,200
Married filing separately-----	750

Additional Exemption for Age.—Beside the regular \$750 exemption, you are allowed an additional exemption of \$750 if you are age 65 or older on the last day of the taxable year. If both a husband and wife are 65 or older on the last day of the taxable year, each is entitled to an additional exemption of \$750 because of age. You are considered 65 on the day before your 65th birthday. Thus, if your 65th birthday is on January 1, 1979, you will be entitled to the additional \$750 exemption because of age for your 1978 Federal income tax return.

"Zero Bracket Amount."—The "zero bracket amount" is a flat amount that depends on your filing status. It is not a separate deduction; instead, the equivalent amount is built into the tax tables and tax rates schedules. Since this amount is built into the tax tables and tax rate schedules, you will need to make an adjustment if you itemize deductions. However, itemizers will not experience any change in their tax liability and the tax computation will be simplified for many itemizers.

Tax Tables.—Tax tables have been developed to make it easier for you to find your tax if your income is under certain levels. Even if you itemize deductions, you may be able to use the tax tables to find your tax easier. In addition, you do not have to deduct \$750 for each exemption or figure your general tax credit, because these amounts are also built into the tax table for you.

Multiple Support Agreements.—In general, a person may be claimed as a dependent of another taxpayer, provided five tests are met: (1) Support, (2) gross income, (3) member of household or relationship, (4) citizenship, and (5) separate return. But in some cases, two or more individuals provide support for an individual, and no one has contributed more than half the person's support. However, it still may be possible for one of the individuals to be entitled to a \$750 dependency deduction if the following requirements are met for multiple support:

1. Two or more persons—any one of whom could claim the person as a dependent if it were not for the support test—together contribute more than half of the dependent's support.

2. Any one of those who individually contribute more than 10% of the mutual dependent's support, but only one of them, may claim the dependency deduction.

3. Each of the others must file a written

statement that he will not claim the dependency deduction for that year. The statement must be filed with the income tax return of the person who claims the dependency deduction. Form 2120 (Multiple Support Declaration) may be used for this purpose.

Sale of Personal Residence.—You may exclude from your gross income some or all of your gain from the sale of your principal residence, if you meet certain age, ownership, and occupancy requirements at the time of the sale. These requirements, and the amount of gain that may be excluded, differ depending on whether you sold your home before July 27, 1978, or on or after that date. The exclusion is elective, and you may elect to exclude gain only once for sales before July 27, 1978, and only once for sales on or after that date.

If you sold your home before July 27, 1978, and you were age 65 or older before the date of sale, you may elect to exclude the gain attributable to \$35,000 of the adjusted sales price if you owned and occupied the residence for 5 of the 8 years ending on the date of sale. If you sold the home after July 26, 1978, and you were age 55 or older before the date of sale, you may elect to exclude \$100,000 of gain on the sale if you owned and occupied the residence for 3 of the 5 years ending on the date of sale (or 5 of 8 years under certain circumstances). Form 2119 (Sale or Exchange of Personal Residence) is helpful in determining what gain, if any, may be excluded.

Additionally, you may elect to defer reporting the gain on the sale of your personal residence if within 18 months before or 18 months after the sale you buy and occupy another residence, the cost of which equals or exceeds the adjusted sales price of the old residence. Additional time is allowed if (1) you construct the new residence; (2) you were on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces; or (3) your tax home was abroad. Publication 523 (Tax Information on Selling or Purchasing Your Home) may also be helpful.

Credit for the Elderly.—You may be able to claim this credit and reduce taxes by as much as \$375 (if single), or \$562.50 (if married filing jointly), if you are:

- (1) Age 65 or older, or
- (2) Under age 65 and retired under a public retirement system.

For more information, see instructions for Schedules R and RP.

Credit for Child and Dependent Care Expenses.—Certain payments made for child and dependent care may be claimed as a credit against tax.

If you maintained a household that included your dependent child under age 15 or a dependent or spouse incapable of self-care, you may be allowed a 20% credit for employment related expenses. These expenses must have been paid during the taxable year in order to enable you to work either full or part time.

For detailed information, see the instructions on Form 2441.

Earned Income Credit.—If you maintain a household for a child who is under age 19, or is a student, or is a disabled dependent, you may be entitled to a special payment or credit of up to \$400. This is called the earned income credit. It may come as a refund check or be applied against any taxes owed. Generally, if you reported earned income and had adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040) of less than \$8,000, you may be able to claim the credit.

Earned income means wages, salaries, tips, other employee compensation, and net earnings from self-employment (generally amount shown on Schedule SE (Form 1040) line 13). A married couple must file a joint

return to be eligible for the credit. Certain married persons living apart with a dependent child may also be eligible to claim the credit.

For more information, see instructions for Form 1040 or 1040A.

ENERGY TAX ACT

The Energy Tax Act of 1978 is directed at providing tax incentives for energy conservation measures and for conversion to renewable energy sources.

A credit of up to \$300 may be claimed for expenditures for energy conservation property installed in or on your principal residence, whether you own or rent it. The residence must have been substantially completed by April 20, 1977. Items eligible for the credit are limited to the following: insulation (fiberglass, cellulose, etc.) for ceilings, walls, floors, roofs, water heaters, etc.; exterior storm (or thermal) windows or doors; caulking or weatherstripping for exterior windows or doors; a furnace replacement burner which reduces the amount of fuel used; a device to make flue openings (for a heating system) more efficient; an electrical or mechanical furnace ignition system which replaces a gas pilot light; an automatic energy-saving setback thermostat; and a meter which displays the cost of energy usage.

A maximum credit for renewable energy source property is \$2,200. Equipment used in the production or distribution of heat or electricity from solar, geothermal, or wind energy sources for residential heating, cooling, or other purposes may qualify for this credit.

Energy credits may be claimed by completing Form 5695 and attaching it your Form 1040. Credit for expenditures made after April 19, 1977, and before January 1, 1979, must be claimed on your 1978 tax return. Do not file an amended 1977 return to claim a credit for expenditure in 1977.

Examples of items which do not qualify for energy credit are the following: carpeting, drapes, wood paneling, exterior siding, heat pump, wood or peat fueled residential equipment, fluorescent replacement lighting system, hydrogen fueled residential equipment, equipment using wind energy for transportation, expenditures for a swimming pool used as an energy storage medium, and greenhouses.

For further information, consult the instructions for Form 5695 and IRS Publication 903, Energy Credits for Individuals.●

PUGNACIOUS "TWIG" NOW A TOP LAWYER

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, one of Arkansas' top lawyers, Oscar Fendler, of Blytheville, Ark., in my district, was paid tribute in the Arkansas Gazette last December. An article written by Doug Smith traced Oscar's colorful legal career. As the pugnacious "Twig" is well known in American Bar Association circles for his contribution to the legal profession, I wanted to share with my colleagues this article:

PUGNACIOUS "TWIG" NOW A TOP LAWYER

(By Doug Smith)

BLYTHEVILLE.—In his youth, Oscar Fendler was pugnacious, partly because of temperament, partly because of maternal pressure.

"I used to have a vicious temper," Fendler said. "It got me in a lot of fights—and I didn't win many of them. But I kept on fighting. If I told my mother I'd gotten whipped, she'd make me go back and fight him again. She was a fighter."

As the twig is bent, they say. Fendler grew into a pugnacious man, although his adult fighting has been of the legal sort, rather than hand to hand. Such as, the time he went into action against the Mississippi County Penal Farm, a frightening institution where—Fendler said—misdemeanants were routinely brutalized. Before the County officials finally gave up and closed the Penal Farm, Fendler had reversed the normal pattern of activities at the Farm. According to County officials, at least, who contended that Fendler had the deputies carrying wood and building fires for the inmates.

A Little Rock reporter remembers seeing Fendler do battle with Arkansas Louisiana Gas Company, and Ark La's crew of high-priced lawyers, in a rate hearing before the state Public Service Commission. At one point, Fendler demanded that Ark La produce every record, every scrap of paper, it had kept for the last 10 years. At another point, he asked the PSC to take judicial notice of the fact that one of Ark La's expensive expert witnesses was a fool. He also made some implications about Ark La's legal counsel that weren't taken kindly. Before the hearing was over, the Ark La people were almost as concerned about protecting themselves from Oscar Fendler as they were about the rate increase.

Fendler, 69, of Blytheville is one of the state's foremost lawyers, and one of the most colorful—the kind that other lawyers tell stories about. (Like the one about the Blytheville barber who made a practice of quizzing his lawyer-customers about his legal problems. When that happened to Fendler one day, he went back to his office, drew up a bill for 30 minutes of legal consultation, and mailed it to the barber.) He also is one of the most honored within the profession, which is a little unusual. Generally, the lawyers who gain the highest offices within the bar are conservative, board-room types. Fendler, despite his flamboyance, is a former president of the Arkansas Bar Association, and he is, or has been, a fellow in the American College of Probate Counsel; a fellow of the American Bar Foundation; chairman of the General Practice Section of the American Bar Association; a member of the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association, the ABA's governing body, and a member of the American Judicature Society, among other honors.

This is not to say that Fendler is universally loved within the profession. He is respected, but not loved. It is said that he doesn't always observe legal etiquette. A lawyer who has practiced in Northeast Arkansas described the pretrial conferences that are held between the judge and all the lawyers who have cases scheduled for trial. "Everybody else shows up on time and waits his turn, like you're supposed to. Fendler's always late. He comes in with half the cases, calls the judge by his first name, spreads out his stuff on the table and starts talking. Everybody else has to wait until he's through."

But all the lawyers admit that Fendler is a formidable adversary. They don't enjoy trying cases against him. "He's very aggressive," a lawyer said. "He'll plead you to death. He makes you want to settle just to get him off your back."

Fendler was born at Blytheville and reared at nearby Manila. His parents were Polish immigrants—from Cracow, the hometown of Pope John Paul II. They were dirt-poor at first, but his father opened a tailor's shop at Manila and eventually prospered and ex-

panded, going into the grocery business and then the dry-goods business. The elder Fendler sent Oscar and his two brothers to college (one of the brothers became a lawyer and the other a doctor), but not their sister. He saw no point in sending a girl to college, Fendler said.

Cracow belonged to Austria at the time Fendler's parents had lived there. At Manila, the family spoke a combination of German and Yiddish at home. The elder Fendler considered himself a German and was proud of it—his nickname was "Germany"—and he passed that on to his family. When the kids at Manila played soldiers, Fendler always took the German side. "I thought the Germans could beat anybody," he said. "Deutschland Uber Alles." When America entered World War I, pro-German sentiment became decidedly unfashionable, and that led to a frightening episode in Fendler's life.

"One night in 1918, some drunks wanted to lynch us," Fendler said. "Some good friends hid us that night. It's a hell of a feeling, I can tell you. I've had a terrible hatred of mobs ever since. I'm sure that's one thing that prompted me to be a lawyer."

Fendler remembers another time when a mob walked the streets of Manila. That was in 1933, during the Depression, when people were hungry, and angry. "Every merchant in town [including Fendler's father] had to close his store that day," Fendler said. The 1933 group had more justification for their actions than the one in 1918. "Their families were starving," Fendler said. "It was hard to blame them."

Being Jewish, Fendler also had difficulties—though not as serious—with members of the Ku Klux Klan. "I used to catch flak from the KKK," he said. "I went around telling them what a bunch of low-life * * * they were."

After graduating from Blytheville High School, Fendler went to the University of Arkansas. For two years, he was the chief editorial writer for the *Arkansas Traveler*, the student newspaper. He spent most of that time trying to get Fred Thomsen, the U of A football coach, fired. "I didn't care for him," Fendler said. He also found time to win a letter in tennis.

Then it was off to Harvard Law, where one of his professors was Felix Frankfurter and where Fendler distinguished himself, he said, as "the best home-brew maker that was ever up there." There were several Arkansans among his fellow law students—E. J. Butler of Forrest City, Richard L. Arnold of Texarkana, Albert Graves of Hope, Cooper Jacobway and E. L. (Buddy) McHaney of Little Rock. In fact, Fendler said, the member of his class who achieved the greatest fame in later life was an Arkansan—Wilbur D. Mills of Kensett.

Fendler maintained his interest in journalism, and put it to use during the summer of 1932, when he and some of his Harvard friends went to Los Angeles for the Olympic Games. Fendler paid for the trip by working as a free-lance reporter, selling articles to the Hearst papers and the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, among others. One of the athletes he wrote about was Bill Carr of Pine Bluff, who won the gold medal in the 400 meters.

While he was at Harvard, Fendler made speeches in New England for Al Smith, who had been the Democratic presidential nominee in 1928 and sought the nomination again in 1932. Fendler said that United States Senator Joe T. Robinson of Arkansas, who had been the Democratic vice presidential candidate in 1928, convinced Fendler and some of his classmates that Smith was to be preferred over Franklin D. Roosevelt. (Neither the Democratic Party nor the people shared that opinion.)

After graduating from Law School, Fendler returned to Blytheville to practice law in 1933. He has been here ever since, except for service with the Navy in World War II.

As with other small-town lawyers, Fendler's is a very general practice—probate, criminal, whatever is needed. And, another characteristic of small towns, he keeps crossing paths with the same people. As a young man, Fendler led a Boy Scout troop, once taking it on a trip to Hardy. Later, the man who drove the bus on that trip got in serious trouble with the law and Fendler defended him. Still later, he defended one of his former Scouts.

Fendler has filed a number of civil rights lawsuits; some are pending now. "It's just been sort of my hobby to help the guy who can't help himself," he said. That tendency led him, in 1971, to file a federal lawsuit to close the Mississippi County Penal Farm, after a teen-aged black prisoner drowned on a work detail. The Mississippi County suit was part of a broader effort against all the county prison farms in the state. Several lawyers were associated with Fendler in the effort. One of them was Richard S. Arnold of Texarkana, the son of Richard L. Arnold, whom Fendler had known in Law School. Richard S. Arnold recently was appointed a federal judge.

(Fendler first heard of Richard S. Arnold when Arnold took the Arkansas bar examination. Fendler was a member of the Bar Examiners Board that year. The examinations were identified only by number, so that the examiners wouldn't know whose paper they were grading. Fendler said that there was one paper that was brilliant. "He answered questions that I hadn't even known were in there—and I wrote the questions. I gave him 117 out of a possible 100." Later, he learned the paper was Arnold's.)

The Mississippi County Penal Farm was closed, after federal Judge G. Thomas Elsele imposed requirements that the Farm couldn't meet. The closing worked out well for everyone, Fendler said. He said Mississippi County now made money by leasing the farmland. The buildings are used for a work-release program in co-operation with the state Correction Department.

When Fendler first filed the suit, some Mississippi County residents were angry with him, especially some of the elected County officials, Fendler said. But much of that sentiment changed after Fendler discussed the Penal Farm with Mississippi County leaders, including the biggest landowners and taxpayers in the County. "They generally agreed that the County couldn't tolerate something as vicious as that," he said.

In connection with the Mississippi County lawsuit, Fendler had a hand in getting the West Memphis Jail "pretty well straightened up" and the Phillips County Penal Farm closed, he said.

Fendler and Richard S. Arnold worked together also as the attorneys for a group of taxpayers who alleged that Sheriff Marlin Hawkins of Conway County had converted County funds to his own use. Hawkins, a devoted Democrat, charged that the suit was simply Republican harassment. Both Fendler and Arnold are Democrats; Fendler has been a member of the Mississippi County Democratic Committee since 1948. Fendler said it was true that Governor Winthrop Rockefeller, who was the leading Arkansas Republican, financed the suit. But Fendler said he and Arnold were nonpartisan in the matter.

They took the case, he said, "because Rockefeller paid us money. We're lawyers." (The suit alleged that Hawkins had misappropriated more than \$200,000 in county money. The trial judge ordered Hawkins to pay \$10,082 to the county treasury, but the judge said he believed there had been no

willful wrong doing by Hawkins. Friends of Hawkins raised the money.)

Despite his Party affiliation, Fendler has refused to support Democratic nominees on a couple of occasions. In 1966, he was chairman of the Mississippi County Democratic Committee. He sent a telegram to the Democratic State Committee that year saying that he couldn't vote for the Party's gubernatorial nominee, Jim Johnson, because Johnson campaigned "on a platform of hate and bigotry." The Party took no disciplinary action against him, Fendler said. "They didn't like it, but what could they do about it? They'd have to kick thousands of people out of the Party."

FENDLER MOTIVE

That was the year that Rockefeller was elected to his first term as governor, but Fendler said his motive at the time was anti-Johnson, not pro-Rockefeller. Later, he became an admirer of Rockefeller. "Rockefeller was one of the nicest guys I think I've ever known," Fendler said. "The state of Arkansas pulled a boner when they didn't take more advantage of what he wanted to do."

Rockefeller appointed Fendler to the state Pardons and Paroles Board. Predictably, the two men then found cause to disagree. Fendler thought the whole parole system stank, and said so in his forthright manner. The Board granted and refused paroles without sufficient information to make intelligent decisions, he said. Rockefeller thought his appointee should have been more circumspect in his criticism. Fendler, no longer a member of the Parole Board, says that the parole system still needs reform. A committee appointed by Governor Pryor did a good job of recommending changes, he said, but "I think he (Mr. Pryor) filed the report where Pryor files all his reports—File X. Nothing's been done."

The present chairman of the Parole Board is James M. Gardner, another Blytheville lawyer, Fendler said that Gardner disagreed with him about the parole system. Fendler is accustomed to disagreement.

Fendler deserted a Democratic nominee again in 1972, when Senator George McGovern of South Dakota was the Party's presidential candidate. Fendler isn't the doctrinaire liberal that some think. Even when he denounced Johnson in 1966, he proclaimed himself a segregationist. (He's beyond that now, he says. He said he was a segregationist in those days for the same reason that most people were segregationists—because it was the custom.) "I don't go along with ideological trends," he said. He said he served gladly on the American Bar Association's Committee for Education Against Communism, and "that's about as reactionary a bunch of * * * as you can find."

Fendler said that he'd tried a couple of times to be appointed to the federal bench. Once, he worked through the late United States Senator John L. McClellan, a political friend, but the appointment went to someone else. The other vacancy occurred during the Republican administration of President Richard M. Nixon. Fendler was interviewed at the Justice Department, but he said he was told that as a Democrat who hadn't supported Nixon, his chance of appointment was slim. The appointment went to Elsele.

All for the best, Fendler said. "It would have been a bad thing for me to be a federal judge," he said. "I'm not temperamentally suited for it. I don't think I would have been happy."

Furthermore, Judge Elsele has been a good judge, Fendler said. Now that Judge Elsele has been joined on the federal bench by Arnold and by Judge Elsiene Trimble Roy, the federal bar at Little Rock is exceptional, Fendler said. He said that if Little Rock

lawyer William R. Overton was appointed—as Overton is expected to be—that'll really be a strong group."

AS JUSTICE

Fendler has served as a special justice of the Arkansas Supreme Court on occasion, by appointment when one of the justices disqualified himself. Usually, serving as a special justice is a fairly routine chore. Not for Fendler. The case he drew was one of the most sensational murder cases of recent Central Arkansas history—the conviction of James Dean Walker for the shooting of a North Little Rock policeman. "I didn't know anything about the case until I got down there [to Little Rock]," Fendler said. "Lightning always finds me."

Of course, when Fendler read the transcript of the trial, he was outraged. "What a lynch trial," he said. He wrote an opinion that blasted the trial judge so strongly the justices wouldn't let him publish it. However, they agreed with his conclusion that the conviction had to be reversed.

Walker was retried and convicted again. The Supreme Court upheld the second conviction. Fendler wasn't on the Court then, but he was on the Pardons and Paroles Board while Walker was an inmate seeking clemency. Fendler thought he should have it, but the other Board members didn't; there was strong opposition from law enforcement officers. Walker finally took matters into his own hands, by escaping. He is still at large.

Fendler is married to the former Patricia Shane of Blytheville. He has a stepson, Tilden P. Wright III of Fayetteville, also a lawyer, and a daughter, Frances Fendler of Little Rock.

"I don't think I'd change anything in my life," Fendler said. "Not even feeling fear from a mob. I think it served a good purpose." ●

AN UNREPAYABLE DEBT

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give recognition to three individuals who gave unselfish and courageous service in risking their own lives to help save another person from being burned alive in a vehicle accident.

Jean Powell, Jessie Quintanilla, and Greg Longcore were not afraid to get involved and each stopped at the scene of the accident to rescue a truck driver who was trapped unconscious in his burning vehicle.

Often times today we say people do not care anymore. But that is not always true, and the Grand Rapids Press of October 12, 1978, reports on the three unselfish rescuers. I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

RESCUERS IGNORED FLAMES TO DRAG DRIVER FROM BURNING TRUCK

(By Steve Grinczel)

Lawrence Hoover was alive Thursday thanks to three persons who dragged him from his truck, burning as the result of a head-on collision that cost the other driver his life.

Hoover, 32, of 525 Shirley St. NE, was listed in satisfactory condition Thursday at St. Mary's Hospital with multiple injuries, including a fractured pelvis.

Funeral services for the other driver, Arley M. Silsby, 22, of Sparta, will be at 2 p.m. Saturday at the Hessel-Cheslek Funeral Home. Burial will be in Blytheville Memory Gardens.

Hoover, driving a Frost-Pack Distributing Co. truck, was northbound on M37 to deliver food items to the Fremont and Newaygo areas. Silsby, who worked for Engineered Protection Systems as a guard at Steelcase, Inc., 1120 36th St. SW, was southbound on M37.

For some reason still unknown to Kent County Sheriff's Deputy Jim Duvall, Silsby's car drifted across the centerline and hit the truck head-on about 6:30 a.m. Wednesday.

The truck spun into a ditch, toppled on its side and, with the dazed Hoover trapped in the cab, the engine caught on fire.

But fortunately for Hoover along came Jean Powell, 33, from the Casnovia area, Jessie Quintanilla of Grant and Greg Longcore, 23, of Kent City.

Powell was on her way to work at the Sparta Foundry Co. when she saw the fire.

"I was the first one there," said Powell. "I stopped the car, saw fire and looked around, but it was so dark. I knew there had to be someone inside."

"The front end was on fire and the guy started to move around," said Powell, a press operator for nine years. "I hollered to two other guys who stopped and hollered that we've got to get a man out of the truck."

Powell, Quintanilla and Longcore pulled Hoover through the shattered windshield and dragged him across the street.

"Just then, the truck exploded," said Powell. "The whole front end was on fire. He was hurt too bad to get out himself."

Powell said she made it to work late, but her boss understood. "It went easy," she said. "But my nerves were kind of shot."

Powell said she really didn't think about her own safety when she was helping pull Hoover through the truck, but after the explosion, "I got scared."

Quintanilla, 23, a grinder at Sparta Foundry Co., said he left for work 25 minutes early for a change. Taking the headstart put him in the position of risking his own life for another man.

"I'm just glad it didn't blow up where we were getting him out," said Quintanilla. "I stopped and thought about it and said 'well, it's either take him out or see him burn.'"

"I couldn't live with that," he said. Longcore was on his way to work at Oliver Machinery Co., 1025 Clancy St. NE.

"I was scared," he said. "The truck was burning and after we got him across the street there was a big bang. Then the fire picked up faster."

Longcore said the truck exploded about a minute after they pulled Hoover from the wreckage.

"I'm glad I did it," said Longcore. "I'd want help if I needed it." ●

RAVENDEN SPRINGS: 187 STRONG

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, this Member of Congress has always believed that it is the small town that is the bedrock of our democracy. One such small town in my congressional district, Ravenden Springs, has a colorful past. In the January edition of Rural Arkansas, an article citing some of the particulars of Ravenden Springs' past gives some insight as to how the 187 strong who live

here view their hometown. I would like to share this article with my colleagues:

RAVENDEN SPRINGS

Edgar Allen Poe (1809-1849), an American short story writer, poet and journalist, wrote "The Raven." Many of you may remember this poem from early English Literature classes and probably remember the quote "Nevermore, Nevermore—" even better than his other writing efforts.

You may think Mr. Poe's writing had something to do with the name of the little village of Ravenden Springs. It didn't, but the ravens and some unusual springs did play a part in the name.

John Janes, originally from Virginia, settled in the western part of what is now Randolph County in 1809 near a small creek that still bears his name. "Janes' Store" became the center of the community of newly-arriving settlers and with two other small settlements—Kingsville and Walnut Hill—merged into the present location of Ravenden Springs in an unusual manner.

Hall's Creek winds in a serpentine fashion through a bluff-lined canyon with springs flowing from the rock walls in numerous places into the creek.

At a location northwest of the present town, a large opening in the bluff may be seen about 75 ft. above the creek bed. Ravens used this den as a nesting area from 1820 until 1861, when they left and never returned.

Shortly afterward, Rev. William W. Bailey, a Methodist minister, had a dream. He had suffered from dyspepsia, a stomach ailment, for years. In his dream he went down in the canyon of Hall's Creek, drank from a spring several times, and was cured.

The next day, he went to the location and drank the spring water. After a few days of drinking the water, he had complete relief of his stomach problem. His account of the "miracle" traveled like wildfire.

Millard Bailey, former principal of the Ravenden Springs High School and a descendant of Rev. Bailey, said, "In hearing this story, one must realize that in those days, they just didn't have the 'drop-drop-fizz-fizz' we hear so much about now for upset stomach."

"I checked the analysis of the water of the spring and found the alkaline content to be such that it could be a factor in giving relief. One must also remember that the Indians all over America had discovered that certain springs gave relief for many problems. Even the animals know which springs contained salt."

"People in those days went to the springs in increasing numbers, hoping to find a cure by either drinking the water or bathing in it. Eureka Springs and Hot Springs are good examples, and that is what happened here."

Rev. Bailey obtained his miracle spring and land around it in 1879 from the government. The land and spring are now within city limits.

In 1880, Capt. R. D. Walsh, a conductor on the Iron Mountain Railroad, obtained the land and spring from Rev. Bailey and laid out the plan for the present town of Ravenden Springs. It had already become well known, had a stage line, mail route, and the Kansas City, Ft. Scott and Memphis (now the Frisco). Ravenden Junction was only six miles away. He named it for the raven's den and the springs, because two more springs had been discovered that were said to be helpful for other maladies.

The town had now grown to about 1,500 citizens and a stock company was formed to finance a 40-room hotel called "The Southern." It was dismantled in 1942 and never rebuilt.

The first high school was built in 1906 and the Lone Rock Bank, named for a large

rock formation in the Hall Creek Canyon, was established in 1907. The bank became a victim of the 1930 depression. Another hotel, the Davis, was built in 1910. It also failed to survive the depression.

The little village continued to hang on, however, and the first bonded road improvement in Randolph County financed a graded and gravel road over the six miles to Ravenden Junction. It was taken over by the state highway department in 1940 and became designated Highway 90, which runs from U.S. 63 at Ravenden to Pocahontas.

According to Millard Bailey, three schools have been built on the site where the old abandoned high school now stands. Students from near Dalton areas now attend a new school near Dalton on the Nubbin Ridge Road. Mr. Bailey also said the town has hopes of placing some sort of industry in the old school building since it is still in fine shape, is large and has adjacent storage facilities.

Although there are only 187 residents now living in Ravenden Springs, and employment necessitates driving to Pocahontas or Walnut Ridge, a modern water system has been installed; and according to Mayor George Stephens, "everything is definitely looking up."

A Baptist encampment is located near the largest spring and is used extensively during the summer. Many new residents have moved into the area recently and the raising of cattle and hogs has increased.

Many towns and small villages throughout Arkansas have colorful and unusual names and the background of those names usually has some interesting facts.

So the ravens left for no apparent reason, but Ravenden Springs proudly carries on. Perhaps when the town is bustling with people and business again—the ravens may return. Who knows? ●

SOME OF US MAY NEVER DIE

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, under the able direction of Congressman Biaggi and my former House colleague, Congressman Sarasin, the Select Committee on Aging's Subcommittee on Human Services has been exploring the future needs of our increasing elderly population. One facet of the subcommittee's look at the future of aging is the new frontier of life extension. The first edition of *Omni* magazine (October 1978) contains an article entitled "Some of Us May Never Die," which is timely to the subcommittee's exploration and introduces to many of us some concepts and theories which may stretch our minds. I commend this excellent article to the attention of my colleagues.

SOME OF US MAY NEVER DIE

In October, 1976, Luna, the 16-year-old daughter of science writer Robert Anton Wilson, was brutally beaten and killed in a grocery store robbery. Helpless in the face of death, Wilson took the only action he could. He had the child's brain set immediately in cryonic suspension, frozen in liquid nitrogen at 320 degrees below zero (Fahrenheit). From this brain a part of Luna's identity may someday be reconstructed, or, from one of her stem cells, a new body cloned. Hers was the first brain to be frozen in this man-

ner. Now, however, a special cryonic cylinder for the brain has been made available for the purpose of future cloning or identity reconstruction of some other kind.

Cryonic preservation is undertaken on the premise that the infinitely more advanced medical scientists of the future might be able to revive the dead and repair whatever killed them. It's a long shot, to say the least, but the odds are still better with freezing than they are with cremation or burial. Some cryobiologists estimate that certain bodies could be preserved for several hundred thousand years without any deterioration.

However desperate, bizarre, or macabre an effort it may seem, cryobiological interest is growing and profit-making organizations such as Trans Time in Berkeley, Bay Area Cryonics, and the Cryonics Society of Michigan are forming around the country. Adherents of the practice include people such as Woody Allen and Columbia University physicist Gerald Feinberg, who conceived the hypothetical faster-than-light particle, the tachyon. It is rumored, although without confirmation, that Walt Disney is among those whose animation is cooling off until a better day.

Unlike Luna Wilson's body, most of the souls resting in cryonic suspension are intact. Immediately after death each body is packed in dry ice, drained of blood and filled with glycerol and DMSO (dimethyl-sulfoxide) an antifreezing agent, to prevent ice crystals from forming in the living tissue. The frozen body is then wrapped in aluminum foil and stored in a thermos-like insulated double-walled polished steel "cryonic storage capsule" until the millennium. The body is "buried" in a cryonic cemetery which uses auxiliary power sources to keep it frozen even in the event of a power shortage.

To keep the immortal fire burning, however, is no minor financial undertaking. For most people, the initial cost of interment amounts to about \$15,000 with a maintenance charge of \$1800 a year. At Bay Area Cryonics a \$50,000 insurance policy is said to cover the whole thing. And you have to plan ahead!

DEATH VS. THE PEOPLE

The obvious drawback to cryonic suspension is that you have to die in order to enjoy an extended life. But movements such as cryobiology point to the growing rebellion against aging and death. People simply want to live longer, better, and are less and less willing to "go gentle into that good night." And the cryonic refrigeration revolution with its "freeze . . . wait . . . reanimate" is not the only front on which death and aging are being attacked.

In Robert Anton Wilson's *Cosmic Trigger*, Paul Segall, Ph. D., a researcher in the department of physiology at the University of California, Berkeley, offers several approaches to longevity, which include:

Transplantation, which might allow us to continue replacing organs "until the point where 'we' are still there, but our entire bodies are new."

Prosthetics and cyborgs, machine-human combinations of which the Bionic Woman is a none-too-fanciful projection.

Identity reconstruction through cloning.

Regeneration, a process by which repressed genes are switched back on to renew cell tissue.

And at the heart of the matter is *gerontology*. This science investigates not only the chemical and biological processes of aging, but also the possibilities for extended healthy life. If gerontology research proves as promising as it looks, drastic measures such as freezing, cloning, and mechanizing humans in order to preserve your vital personality may not be necessary. Most efforts in the gerontological field are concerned with postponing senescence.

As early as 1962, Dr. Bernard Strehler, professor of biology at the University of Southern California, and one of the indefatigable warriors of the siege on death, announced that before long science will have understood aging's sources and that "toothless, wrinkled, mindless incontinent wrecks with Dorian Gray-like [sic] bodies—they will not exist!" In the absence of aging, Strehler said, the longevity of a healthy 21 year old could exceed 2000 years.

Following the startling hypothesis that aging could be curable, gerontologists have been piecing the puzzle together, moving closer to pinpointing the causes of aging, the sources of longevity.

Right now it seems quite possible that the underlying cause of aging may not be impossibly complex, but singular, primary. It may be that senescence is not a natural phenomenon, but a byproduct of social conditions. There may be, in fact, no biological limit to a healthy vigorous lifespan. To extend the accepted lifespan potential from 70-100 years to 120, 200, 400, 1000 and on up, may be part of *Homo sapiens* on-going evolutionary destiny.

With the tremendous explosion of knowledge of basic molecular biology and genetics, we are learning the secrets of life and in doing so, we're learning how to control aging, to extend life.

Data now are beginning to indicate that life-extension is inevitable. We may have some way of lengthening our lives before the year 2000. Some of us may never die.

An array of potentially useful drugs are in various stages of testing, drugs which may not extend the lifespan significantly, but which will stave off bodily wear and tear, perhaps rejuvenate the body and preserve energy and youthfulness past middle age. These drugs might contribute to a "synergistic effect" whereby one advance buys a person enough time to live well until the subsequent discovery prolongs his health even more.

Anti-aging therapies are being tested that combat free radicals, for example, those fragments of molecules which break off, caress about the body tissue wreaking havoc and contributing to the build-up of cellular garbage such as lipofuscins. Dr. Denham Harman, an internist-chemist at the University of Nebraska school of medicine is working on a series of antioxidants, which react with free radicals and minimize their effects.

Dr. Harman developed a number of compounds that increase life expectancy as much as 50 percent in mice. These include: Vitamin E; 2-MEA (mercaptoethylemine), a compound first used for radiation detection; BHT and Santoquin, commonly used as food preservatives; as well as sodium hypophosphite, an old drug used for the treatment of tuberculosis around 1900. These drugs all have extended life expectancy in mice, and Harman hopes this testing will now extend to larger mammals.

Another compound, DMAE (dimethyl-aiminoethanol), is showing promising results, reports Albert Rosenfield in his important book, *Pro-Longevity*. DMAE is a lysosome membrane stabilizer, and as such it strengthens cells against damage caused by lipofuscin accumulations. When lysosome membranes are damaged, harmful substances leak out and may be responsible for aging symptoms.

Dr. Richard Hochschild of the Microwave Instrument Company of Del Mar, California, found that by adding DMAE to the water of mice he increased their lifespans significantly. Other investigators have successfully employed centrophenoxine, a synthetic compound derived in part from DMAE, to delay lipofuscin build-up in the brain of guinea pigs. Centrophenoxine, which has almost no

toxic side effects, is already used experimentally with apparent success in France to improve the mental abilities of senile patients.

The first drug likely to pass through the FDA's interminable bureaucratic maze, however, is the well-publicized Gerovital, developed in 1945 by Dr. Ana Aslan of the Bucharest Geriatric Institute. In Romania it is possible to get "youth shots" of Gerovital's 2 percent procaine hydrochloride and hematinophyrin solution from government doctors.

Over the last 25 years, Dr. Aslan has claimed to have cured people of everything from heart disease and arthritis to impotence and gray hair. But few scientists are prepared to sing the drug's praises. Says Dr. Ruth Weg, of Andrus Gerontology Center of the University of Southern California: "We just don't know."

The list of potentially effective drugs, then, is growing geometrically, and the catalogue of agents that offer some chance of alleviating or postponing some debilitating symptoms are imminently testable. In the future, moreover, enzyme cocktails and genetic manipulation in pill form might be as commonplace as valium and birth control pills.

EAT LESS, LIVE LONGER

Since the 1930s, classic laboratory studies show that restricting an animal's diet in the first half of its life can double its lifespan—to the point where a 1000-day-old rat can be compared to a 90-year-old human with the body of John Travolta. These experiments have been conducted on everything from one-celled *Tokophrya*, to rotifers, worms, insects, mice, hamsters, and rats with similar results. This is a key concept in the theory of life-expansion. Restricting diet delays maturity and increases longevity.

Dr. Roy Walford, a pathologist at the UCLA school of medicine, a man with a reputation among his colleagues for meticulous research, recently has extended his nutritional study to include the testing of mental function. He will find out whether dietary restriction produces long-lived idiots or long-lived supermice. "It may well be the supermice," he says.

In a new development, Walford and his associate Dr. Richard Weindruck have discovered that when dietary restriction is begun in mid-life mice, the animals' immune systems seem to be rejuvenated. A chief researcher in immunological systems, and the author of the *The Immunologic Theory of Aging*, Walford has found that in aging not only do the immune cells lose their ability to fight off the body's enemies, but they actually go berserk and turn against the very tissue they are supposed to protect. There is increasing evidence that this autoimmune response is a fundamental symptom of aging, which involves certain self-destructive acts: "like an art performance," Walford laughs.

Two years ago, Walford traveled extensively throughout India to measure body temperature regulation among the yogis. He found that through their yogic practices some could lower their body temperature one-half to one-degree Centigrade.

Why lower body temperature? Walford and others have found that reducing body temperature of humans a few degrees could greatly extend lifespan. "A very minor reduction, about three degrees Fahrenheit," says Bernard Strehler, "could well add as much as 30 years to human life."

Neither Walford nor anyone else, however, has succeeded in lowering temperature in "warm-blooded (homeothermic) animals, although Walford has experimented with diverse substances, including marijuana, to determine to what extent they could do the job. Marijuana is the best substance for lowering body temperature," he says. Yet his mice developed a tolerance to the drug, and, after a few weeks of injections it had no effect on

their temperatures. "There might be an analogue or chemically similar substitute that could do it," he speculates.

Richard Cutler of the National Institute of Aging's Gerontology Research Center offers the bizarre, but workable, scheme of actually inserting a tiny ceramic device into the blood vessel preceding the hypothalamus (where temperature is controlled). A microwave unit also might be placed in the bedroom. At night during sleep, when the body's metabolic rate is slower, the microwave unit would beam on and the embedded device would, in turn, trick the hypothalamus into thinking the body was in a fever of one or two degrees. The hypothalamus consequently would lower the temperature a degree or so. In the early morning, before awakening, the microwave unit would switch off and the body temperature would be restored to 98.6° F. The user would not be bothered, but might live twice as long.

DEATH CLOCK?

As more is known about the genetic structure of life, biologists are coming to the conclusion that aging is not the result of slow "trashing" of all parts, but may be the result of a genetic program, coded along with the other instructions for the functioning of the cells in its DNA. The big question remains: Are we programmed to die? Is there a "death clock" that turns off the genes one by one? Or is nature simply indifferent to our fate we've played our part in perpetuating the species? Or does the program for growth and sexual maturity contain within it what Dr. Richard Cutler of the National Institute on Aging calls "pleiotropic processes"—necessary functions which have by-products which in the long run are harmful to your health?

Many investigators on the case are now "pro-clock." Opinions vary drastically and vehemently, however, as to where the timepiece is located. One group theorizes that the aging mechanism occurs at the cellular level. Molecular biologist Dr. Leonard Hayflick discovered evidence that there are only so many times (± 50) a cell can divide in vitro before its descendants age and die. Thus, Hayflick concluded, the cell has a built-in genetic limit. And ever since the revolutionary "Hayflick Limit" was announced, it has been the target of continuous speculation. Critics scour the territory for evidence to refute it.

Dr. V. J. Cristofalo of Philadelphia's Wistar Institute for instance has prolonged cellular life by adding the hormones cortisone and hydrocortisone to culture solutions, thus suggesting that it is hormonal balance that signals the termination of cell division, not tiny clocks.

Dr. David Harrison of Jackson Laboratory, Bar Harbor, Maine, believes certain cells may indeed be immortal (as they were thought to be prior to Hayflick's results). When he transplanted stem cells, which have a large proliferative capacity, from old animals into young, the old cells functioned as well as the young cells did when both were transplanted into young recipients.

Walford's rejuvenation of middle-aged mice's immunological response, as well as work he has done with congenic mice strains, leads him to believe that control of the entire immune system is located within a small region of genetic material—corresponding to the sixth chromosome in humans. He suspects that this control center is fundamentally involved in the aging process as a whole—that it may be "the man pulling the strings behind the scenes." These strings may involve only a few genes.

THE BRAIN, HORMONES & DECO

Many other scientists now think the program for aging is encoded in the hypothalamus-pituitary system. The hypothalamus, that tiny pea-sized node at the base of the brain, is the master regulator of hormone distribution, and, along with the pituitary and endocrine system, it com-

prises the regulation network affecting virtually all homeostatic systems as well as growth and sexual development.

The body flashes an uninterrupted series of response and feedback signals between the individual glands and the brain. Aging may disrupt the hypothalamus's ability to run the show. Years of evidence more than suggests that the hypothalamic control of hormonal release goes haywire with aging.

By stimulating the hypothalamus of aged female rats with electric impulses, Dr. Joseph Meites of Michigan State, has successfully reactivated their estrus cycles—put them back in heat. He also has reactivated the ovarian cycles of the old females by feeding them L-Dopa (a dopamine stimulator also used in the treatment of Parkinson's disease), and hormones such as progesterone, epinephrine, and iproniazid.

The exciting thing about this evidence is that the old ovaries still work and can be started up again when the "clock" in the hypothalamus is turned back. The implications for women past the menopause are astounding.

Dr. W. Donner Denckla, Associate Professor of Medicine at Harvard's Thorndike Laboratories, thinks he's close enough to hear the death clock ticking. An intense youngish man with collegiate horn rims and a wry sense of humor, Denckla explained recently to the large audience at a life-extension conference in St. Paul sponsored by the University of Minnesota, that he has "one very strong candidate for the demise of mammals."

Denckla's rather spectacular theory is based on the idea that humans have a built-in mechanism, not for aging, but for death itself. He believes the process of dying is built into our childhood; it starts around age ten.

Denckla proposes that at puberty the pituitary starts releasing an exceedingly powerful hormone, which he calls by the artful acronym DECO (for decreasing O₂ consumption). "This lovely little molecule," he says, "wanders out and progressively throws a block between the body's cells and its circulating thyroxin," the thyroid hormone vital to normal metabolism. Death comes as it does to the Pacific Salmon—by flooding the body with the "death hormone"—only more slowly; so insidiously as to seem not the cause.

In his super-realistic laboratories, Denckla removes the pituitaries (from whence, presumably, issues the DECO) of older rats. And, after adding hormone supplements to their diets, in a matter of months the old animals regain much of their pubescent glory.

One big hitch in the Denckla plan is that, although the pituitary-less rats are rejuvenated to adolescent physiological status, their lifespan does not seem to be prolonged. They die on schedule. It is possible, then, that DECO may serve an important life function.

THE LONGEVITY CLOCK

Richard Cutler is a man with a big plan, which, if it does not embrace all of the manifold theories of aging, is at least compatible with most of them. Cutler is looking, not so much for the causes of aging, as for reasons for the evolution of longevity.

There is no genetic program for death, he thinks, but an open-ended potential for unlimited lifespan.

In charge of the Program on Comparative Biochemistry of Mammalian Aging, Cutler constructs his architectonic ideas from sources as eclectic as his background. Cutler personally evolved from a Colorado farmboy into a helicopter designer to a copier company owner at age 18. He discovered college a few years later and proceeded to get degrees in aeronautical and electrical engineering, in physics, and biophysics.

According to Cutler, the rate of aging might very well be regulated by relatively few genes, which we can discover and eventually control. He has reached this conclusion after carefully studying the evolution of long lifespan in humans. It seems that our lifespan increased so rapidly compared to our apelike ancestors that no more than a few genes could have changed during such a brief evolutionary period. Hence, Cutler concludes that only a few genes may control the rate of aging.

Slowing down the aging process doesn't have to be a formidable task. We already know much about what genetic controls are involved. The deceleration is likely to be achieved first by biochemical manipulation of the neuroendocrine system via the hypothalamus-pituitary controls and, later, when more is known, by genetic engineering. "The 'scenario', as they say," remarked Cutler, "is that you'd take a child when he's young, administer hormones to slow down his development and give him an analogue in his food to stimulate anti-aging processes." A person might become sexually mature by 28, full grown at 45, and middle aged by 120.

"I think within ten years, depending on how much we concentrate on learning to manipulate the controls of development, the slowdown might be accomplished," he predicts.

A trickier problem than slowing growth is maintaining the body's level of intrinsic wear and tear fighters, what Cutler calls "continuously acting antibiosenescent processes." These include free-radical scavengers, antioxidants, DNA repair and so forth. Genetic engineering of the regulatory genes is too complex at the present time, so Cutler found a short cut: trick the cells with something like an anti-aging vaccine. One could inject a bit of "fake aging" and the body would alter its level of protective enzymes to combat this fake aging antibody. It works on a similar principle as the smallpox vaccine.

One could pop a pill that would diffuse into the cells and fool them into thinking "Hey, we've got a lot of DNA damage." The cells, consequently, might raise the level of DNA repair enzyme to match the needs of a longer-lived organism. "We might be able to stimulate a whole battery of repair processes," Cutler speculates, "by inserting a highly damaged piece of DNA, with everything imaginable wrong with it. And all the repair mechanisms would be stimulated by the artifact. You don't even have to know how it works to use it."

LOOK OF THE FUTURE

Cutler, unlike many gerontologists, has been willing to speculate a bit on the nature of *Homo longevus*. He says: "My guess is that it would be best, not only to double man's maximum lifespan potential, but also to double his brain size. Although doubling size is not likely to improve the quality of the brain, it might provide a greater redundant capacity for neurons and their supporting cells, thereby, perhaps, delaying the onset of senility even further."

By reducing a person's growth rate by one-half and doubling the time for the brain's development and maturation (it's growth rate would remain the same as now, and only one extra division of cells is needed to double its size), one might grow up to be an adult who looked much like a 12-year-old of today in terms of body and brain-size proportion.

When will it happen? Science writer and author of the soon to be published *Life-Extension Handbook*, Saul Kent, believes predictions are irrelevant. "It's inevitable, but the timing depends completely on the effort. I could give you a sliding scale in years before the breakthrough, depending on the effort put into it."

"If life-extension becomes a national priority like the space program," says Paul Segall, "if the Americans, the Russians, and the Japanese join hands, if there were a \$200 billion assault on aging and death, this could produce dramatic results in five years. Just \$200 billion, involving tens of hundreds of scientists, hundreds of thousands of technicians—in five years we'd have a program that would put such a dent in death we might wipe it off the face of the Earth. And a program such as this would cost no more than these countries are now spending on the maintenance of old age homes."

At present, however, there is no clear cut directive for life-extension research. The House Select Committee on Aging is holding hearings on the advisability of funding life-extension research. But as one committee member admitted privately, "we really don't know what we're doing. We don't know who to listen to."

Although NIA Director, Dr. Robert Butler, has officially stated that life-extension research is a "priority of the NIA," this priority is not reflected in the Gerontology Research Center's \$7-million share of the total 1978 NIA budget of \$37.3 million. And the entire NIA budget, moreover, pales beside the National Institute on Cancer's \$872 million for 1978. The irony is profound, especially as evidence mounts that cancer is predominantly an age-related disease. There may be no way to cure cancer without curing aging.

"A lot of resistance to life-extension comes in the form of questions about overcrowding the planet, population explosions, social security, jobs, etc.," explains F. M. Esfandiary, a normative philosopher who teaches courses at New York's New School for Social Research. "At its base the question is pathological. After eons of programming to accept death, we suddenly find we can conquer death. As we're getting closer to vanquishing it, people are getting up-tight—Elizabeth Kübler-Ross is a case in point. They are afraid to face the idea they can beat death. They are afraid to be disappointed. We still don't have the infrastructure for life, but in the demise of religion, guilt-orientation, and orthodoxy, we're moving toward a life-orientation."

So prolonged lifespan is inevitable. But is it advisable? "It is impossible to foresee what it will do to society," says Roy Walford. "I think it will be highly destabilizing, and I'm in favor of that."

Lots of senile triceratarians? Not so, says Rolf Martin, biochemist from the City University of New York. Martin designed a "survival curve" projecting that the proportion of nonproductive oldsters actually will be reduced by two-thirds if lifespan is doubled. People would die of other things before they got senile.

The biggest argument for life-extension, in some minds, is that the actual "advancement of civilization"—that sacred cow of the Western world—is imperiled by the exponential rise in knowledge.

The solution so far has been specialization. But as we become more and more specialized, our ability to communicate to people outside our field diminishes. Our awareness narrows. Fewer people are gifted with the ability to put it all together. We may simply require more time to learn.

"We need to investigate why man's lifespan evolved in the first place," Cutler says. "Because that is what made man what he is today. A longer lifespan allowed man to make use of a larger brain, become more self-conscious, see the world and learn. It is difficult for me to see why a continuation along the same lines wouldn't result in more of the benefits that accrued in the first place."

"In reality, the slowing down and cessation of the evolution of a longer lifespan might have been an artifact, a negative by-product of increasing civilization, and was,

in a sense, abnormal. Continued self-evolution of extended lifespan and intelligence is getting back to the biological norm—getting back on the road again."

Says Cutler: "If you ask me about the ethics of extending our lifespan along evolutionary lines, I must say that, if we do not evolve a longer lifespan—that is unethical." ●

JUVENILE CRIME FLOURISHES

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced two bills, which represent a much needed and new Federal approach for dealing with juvenile felony offenders. The first bill would lower to 15 the age under which juveniles can be prosecuted as adults for felony offenses. The second measure would provide for the fingerprinting of juveniles convicted of felony offenses and would prohibit the withholding of previous juvenile records to courts. These bills are identical to legislation I introduced during the 95th Congress, H.R. 1461 and H.R. 1462, which failed to receive full House consideration.

Evidence clearly indicates a substantial increase in juvenile crime. The arrests of persons under 18 years of age for the seven index crimes, including homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft, soared from 6,333 in 1957 to 62,427 in 1975. Homicides increased from 57 to 589 during this same period, and rapes went from 331 to 1,635. In 1977, when considering these same index crimes, 16 percent of all persons arrested in the Nation were under the age of 15, and 41 percent were under 18 years of age. Further, in 1977, the 13 to 18 age group comprised 27 percent of our Nation's total arrests, while this same age group made up only 12 percent of our Nation's population.

Much of the blame for this alarming rate of juvenile crime must be placed on our lenient criminal justice system. In 1975, only 2 percent of the 11,000 persons under 16 arrested for felony type crimes were placed in State institutions. These figures indicate the crucial need to strengthen our juvenile justice system, and I believe that my bills would effectively help to achieve this goal. Since many of those arrested were multiple offenders, it appears obvious that young criminals in this Nation have no real fear of punishment, no matter how serious their offense or the number of times they commit them.

As a member of the House Select Committee on Aging, I am especially concerned about the increase in juvenile crime against the elderly. In New York City alone, there were 64,728 reported crimes against persons over 65 years of age in 1977. Of these, 9,970 were robberies. The average victim was female and over 70, and shockingly, the average attacker was male and 16 years old. While these numbers are very alarming,

the major problem confronting the elderly today is the fear of being victimized by crime. In a 1974 Louis Harris survey, the elderly ranked fear of crime as a greater social problem than health, money, and loneliness. As a result of this fear, an estimated 100,000 elderly citizens have become prisoners in their own homes. Prompt action must be taken to improve this situation, and I support the passage of my legislation as an effective measure in this regard.

By placing cases of juvenile criminals aged 15 and older within the criminal court system and by fingerprinting those convicted of serious crimes, we would make juveniles more accountable for the crimes they commit, as well as cut down on juvenile recidivism. In order to protect the reformed juvenile criminal, my legislation does provide that fingerprint records may be expunged after a 2-year period following release from confinement, if there is no further criminal activity.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation must begin to effectively deal with the increasing juvenile crime problem. As a 23-year veteran of the New York City Police Department, I maintain that coddling criminals—young or old—is not right. A weak criminal justice system has allowed juvenile criminals to act with increasing impunity. In the past 15 years, juvenile crime has increased 10 times faster than the corresponding growth in population. If left unattended, this crime problem will flourish to the point where it will become uncontrollable. The time to act is now, and in this regard, I urge that my legislation be given prompt and favorable consideration.●

RECOMBINANT DNA RESEARCH

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the 96th Congress have already begun to review many of those important issues with which we must deal in the weeks and months ahead. In addition, to whatever agenda each Member may now have, I trust that all of my colleagues will also want to consider the critical importance of the studies and advances in the area of recombinant DNA research which are being made by American scientists.

The last several years have seen a dramatic explosion in fundamental knowledge gained through recombinant DNA research. This research holds our best hope for understanding those principles regulating genetic expression in man and in understanding abnormal growth such as cancer. Longstanding hopes for producing important biologically active materials such as hormones and insulin are now being realized. Less publicly recognized has been the application of recombinant DNA research to new diagnostic procedures. For example, it is now possible to diagnose certain hemoglobin

deficiencies at an early stage of life and from that knowledge to devise appropriate treatment measures. As the technique is refined and developed, and, as our knowledge of the fundamental mechanisms of gene expression increases, further important discoveries and applications may be confidently expected in the immediate future.

The technique of combining in the laboratory genetic elements from different species was first developed in the United States, and, of course, because of its vast potential, was soon extensively practiced worldwide. The principal American scientists who developed these new recombinant DNA methods, however, called for caution in plunging into an area of research which might pose hazards to mankind and the environment before these potential risks were adequately assessed. This initial questioning of the safety of using recombinant DNA techniques led to the development of safety guidelines by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) which were imposed on all federally supported research in July 1976.

Some scientists, however, felt that the NIH guidelines were too restrictive, or too inflexible to permit the use of innovative systems without long administrative delays. Thus, many went abroad to conduct their research in countries, such as Switzerland, where the rules were less restrictive. Other scientists contended that the guidelines were so restrictive as to demoralize young investigators and discourage them from pursuing careers in science. Similarly, uncertainties over the protection of confidentiality in legislative proposals to extend the scope of the NIH guidelines to private industry, or fears that the Federal Government would prohibit any large-scale recombinant DNA activities in the United States, led several companies to pursue their industrial applications in their subsidiaries in Europe and Japan, to the disadvantage of the American economy.

It is time to reverse this unfortunate situation so that such extreme measures are no longer necessary. The potential good to come from recombinant DNA research in such diverse areas as diabetes and cancer control cannot be overstated. These advances can and should be made by the American scientific community. Should we fail to develop a climate in which these vitally important research procedures can be conducted, we will find the research void we create rapidly filled by the scientists of Russia, Germany, Japan, and other world nations.

Since the first set of guidelines were issued, much information has been accumulated concerning the potential hazards of several aspects of recombinant DNA research, which, in the judgment and collective experience of scientists in fields such as epidemiology and infectious diseases, allow the original safety standards to be relaxed in many areas, and other recombinant DNA systems to be exempted from the guidelines altogether. This view has been subjected to intense and repeated scrutiny on the part of scientists, Government officials and

the general public during the development of the revised recombinant DNA research guidelines, signed last December by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and put into effect on January 2, 1979.

These new guidelines impose reasonable safety standards on research and require effective oversight of such research by representatives of local lay and scientific communities. They also have removed or greatly reduced the impediments, administrative delays and lack of flexibility which, in the old guidelines, frustrated so many scientists. I hope that those individuals who felt that they had to leave the country to conduct their research properly will now be eager to return home.

In other action, DHEW has proposed that regulations be written by the Food and Drug Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency to bring private industry under the new guidelines. If successful, this action will make specific recombinant DNA legislation unnecessary.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will continue to monitor the implementation of those guidelines with care. The committee must be assured that the implementation of these new guidelines does indeed protect the public's health and safety. In addition, the committee will be particularly alert to the establishment of any unnecessarily restrictive State or local requirements that could result in costly and pointless movement of research efforts away from the United States.

Finally, the committee will be watching anxiously for clear indications that under these revised guidelines American science will continue its original scientific preeminence, both in basic research and in the application of that research to human needs.●

U.S. AMBASSADOR WILLIAM V. SHANNON'S SPEECH AT THE ROBERT EMMET MONUMENT DEDICATION CEREMONY IN DUBLIN, IRELAND

HON. JOSEPH D. EARLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, last December 29, 1978, the Lord Mayor of Dublin and our own distinguished Ambassador to Ireland, William V. Shannon, joined together in dedicating a monument to the great Irish hero, Robert Emmet, who gave up his life in the effort to achieve Ireland's independence and to propel her to her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

As most Members are aware, Ambassador William V. Shannon is an internationally known author, a former New York Times editorial writer and one-time Washington journalist. I am sure that Ambassador Shannon's speech on this eventful occasion will be of particular interest to a great many Americans

and I am pleased to include it in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

DEDICATION OF A MONUMENT TO ROBERT EMMET AT ST. CATHERINE'S CHURCH, DUBLIN

It is one hundred seventy-five years since Robert Emmet, a youth of 25, led an unsuccessful rebellion to achieve Irish independence and paid for his failure with his life. He was hanged and his body beheaded on a makeshift gallows erected on the street in front of this church on September 20, 1803. His statement in the courtroom the preceding day was an appeal not to the judges but to history. His words have become part of the glory of the English language and are known wherever liberty is cherished.

"The grave opens to receive me, and I sink into its bosom. I have but one request to make at my departure from this world, it is—the charity of its silence. Let no man write my epitaph; for as no man, who knows my motives, dare now vindicate them, let not prejudice or ignorance asperse them. Let them rest in obscurity and peace! Let my memory be left in oblivion, and my tomb remain un-inscribed, until other times and other men can do justice to my character. When my country takes her place among the nations of the earth, then, and not till then, let my epitaph be written."

In 1803, Emmet's cause seemed doomed. But, it has been well said, "his cause, Ireland's cause, was never doomed. Darkness obscured it, doubt assailed it, traitors took a price for it; but it moved on inevitably, sacrificially, towards its own goal."

Emmet died young, but his memory lived on. He was celebrated in song, "BRAVE ROBERT EMMET." The poet Thomas Moore immortalized his love for Sarah Curran: "She is far from the land where her young hero sleeps."

His legend crossed the sea to America. His brother, Thomas Addis Emmet, one of the leaders of the rebellion of 1798, emigrated to the United States and had a distinguished career as a lawyer in New York. Irish emigrants named streets and towns for Robert Emmet from one end of America to the other. Thus, there is an Emmet, Idaho, an Emmet, Arizona, an Emmet, Nebraska, and an Emmet, North Dakota. When 200 Dubliners visited the state of Iowa last year as part of the Friendship Force exchange of visits, they nowhere received a warmer welcome than in Emmetsburg, Iowa.

On behalf of President Jimmy Carter and the American people, therefore, I am happy and honored to take part in this ceremony in honor of Robert Emmet. I bring special greetings from Mr. A. W. B. Vincent, president of the American Irish Foundation, and my other colleagues in the Foundation whose financial contribution, together with that of the Dublin Corporation, has made possible the erection of this monument. The "other times" that Emmet foresaw have arrived and those of us gathered here today are a few of the "other men" he dreamed of who can do justice to his character and attest that he was noble, fearless and far-seeing.

With young men both Protestant and Catholic being killed every week in Northern Ireland, Emmet's life still speaks to us today. He was a Protestant as were so many of Ireland's past heroes and spokesmen—Jonathan Swift, Henry Grattan, John Philpot Curran, Richard Brinsley Sheridan, Wolfe Tone, Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Charles Stewart Parnell, Erskine Childers, and Douglas Hyde. It is in the reconciliation of Catholic and Protestant and in the coming together of Ireland's many creeds and ethnic traditions that the fulfillment of Ireland's

true destiny must lie in our own time as in that of Emmet.

Moreover, the dream for which Emmet sacrificed himself has been achieved. Ireland has now taken her place among the nations of the earth. Ireland has problems as do all nations, but the resolution of those problems does not require the further shedding of blood. Ireland can speak for her interests at the negotiating table and in the European Court. She does not need the whine of bullets and the roar of bombs to make her voice heard. Emmet if he had lived would have become one of the great orators and statesmen of the nineteenth century. The young men and women of Ireland today should look for their inspiration not to the example of his death—brave and moving though it was—but to the promise of his talents, brilliant and unfulfilled as they were. Too many men have already died over the centuries for Ireland. Too many young lives have been blighted by the shadows of prison. What is needed are young men prepared to live for Ireland and to work patiently and peacefully for their ideals. There could be no better way to honor Robert Emmet. ●

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET CUTS IN FOREST SERVICE BUDGET

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. Au COIN. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Management and Budget presented a budget a week ago that is austere, and on the whole, fiscally sound. It is a conservative spending program that is badly needed in our war on inflation. Now that the initial cries of anguish about certain program cuts have begun to subside, it is time to reflect calmly on the handiwork of OMB in designing our inflation fighting strategy for the next fiscal year.

On the whole, the budget clearly meets some important tests for today's fight: Austere, lean, conservative yet sensitive to social needs. But what of tomorrow? Will this budget stand the test of our future needs? In one very important area, the answer is, unfortunately, no.

In proposing to cut the expenditures for the U.S. Forest Service by 15 percent, OMB has adopted a shortsighted and irresponsible strategy. In its rush to marshal our weapons against inflation, it in effect has said:

We'll use any weapon, even though it will cause us problems tomorrow.

The proposed cut in the Forest Service budget means reductions in its programs for reforestation and timber stand improvement, reductions that in practice will amount to between a quarter and a third over last year alone. This is a sizable and indefensible cut.

In its haste to slash the budget, OMB has forgotten a simple truth: Trees take time to grow.

From planting to harvest, the average Douglas fir takes from 30 to 40 years to grow to maturity before it can be cut. Science has done much to reduce the growth time and product an exceptional

quality of timber. Despite our best efforts, trees simply do not grow overnight.

The Resources Planning Act of 1974 recognizes this simple truth. A plan to fully use our national forest lands and provide a plentiful supply of timber for the forest products and homebuilding industries, the Resources Planning Act sets forth certain spending targets needed to meet this goal. The amount in the proposed budget for reforestation is fully 59 percent below the amount called for in the act.

This is money for planting trees, for research and fire suppression, for preparation of timber sales. This is not money spent with no eye to the future; it is an investment to guarantee a plentiful supply of timber in years to come.

In Oregon, there is currently a backlog of 177,119 acres of national forest land in need of replanting. The \$21.7 million cut in reforestation funds will mean reducing by half the number of acres that could be planted next year and adding another 25,000 to the existing backlog.

Two years ago, I led a delegation to OMB consisting of representatives from the forest products industry and organized labor to plead the cause that planting trees was not an expenditure, but a good investment. Evidently, we have got to make the same case again. We have got to make the point that reforestation is an investment that pays dividends to taxpayers, stimulates productivity, and holds down inflation.

The proposed cuts in reforestation and timber stand improvement will, I predict, ripple through the forest products industry and in the long run help to push home prices higher than they are today.

For the last year, I chaired an 11-member task force investigating the home price problem. We learned that one cause of higher home prices is poor management of our timber base. The recommended cuts do not give us much cause for optimism that our economic strategists have recognized this problem.

I remind my colleagues again of the simple truth: Trees take time to grow. We cannot, 5 or 10 years down the road, present a full budget to the Forest Service, expect it to replant cutover acreage and have the trees ready for harvest on schedule. It simply cannot be done. Every year lost in reforestation is a year's delay, and a shorter supply, in harvestable timber 30 years hence.

Timber from each acre of national forest land can build two average size houses. With a national backlog of more than 1 million acres in need of replanting, we are jeopardizing the building of more than 2 million homes down the road.

I commend the President and the OMB for holding down the deficit to no more than \$29 billion, but it must be done with an eye toward winning the war against inflation, not just one battle.

The cuts in the Forest Service budget are a short-term strategy to win a battle; but they sow the seeds for long term problems and will contribute to our eventual defeat in this fight. ●

COUPLE LEARNS ITALIAN CATTLE DO NOT GRAZE

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, last summer J. W. "Soapy" and Jean Thompson from Rector, Ark., in my congressional district, toured five European countries with People-to-People International, a nonprofit, private organization funded in 1956 by President Eisenhower to promote world peace.

While abroad they visited typical agricultural operations in Switzerland, Italy, the Soviet Union, Finland, and France to compare methods with those in the United States. In October the Paragould (Ark.) Daily Press carried an article sharing the Thompsons' experiences.

I would like to share this article with my colleagues as I think they will find it of great interest:

CATTLE DO NOT GRAZE

J. W. (Soapy) Thompson and his wife Jean learned a lot about agriculture around the world this summer.

For example, they found out that farming is a whopping investment in Switzerland. The average cow there is worth about \$6,000, and the acre of ground it stands on costs \$20,000. The country also cannot afford to lose a single farmer.

In Italy, cattle do not graze; rather, most farmers cut grass and take it to the animals to save their energy. Producers think it is a better way to utilize the grass, too, as the animals do not tramp it down.

The Thompsons, who raise cotton, soybeans and wheat and operate the Mounds-Neighbors Corner Gin, were part of a 26-member delegation of southern agriculture leaders who made a three-week goodwill tour in five European countries in August. The annual mission is sponsored by People-to-People International, a non-profit, private organization founded in 1956 by President Dwight D. Eisenhower to promote world peace through international understanding.

The purpose was to give the delegation an opportunity to visit typical agricultural operations in Switzerland, Italy, the Soviet Union, Finland and France and to compare methods and procedures with those in the U.S. This group also met various local agricultural representatives.

This was not the Thompsons' first agricultural-related trip to Europe. They visited Germany, Czechoslovakia and Austria two years ago as part of a cotton ginners group.

During this trip, the couple noted that Switzerland and Finland are most similar to the U.S. in agricultural production freedoms.

They saw a dairy farm in Switzerland, a progressive rice farm in Italy, an apple orchard and cotton farm in Russia, a small grains and livestock farm, cheese factory and trout farm in Finland and a grain farm in France. All five countries raised small grains, but none raise soybeans, a major source of protein, Mrs. Thompson said.

Switzerland, the first stop in the visit, is unique in several ways, she pointed out. One is that all meat eaten there comes from dairy herds. Male dairy offspring are slaughtered for consumption and females are saved for milk production. Wheat for feed costs about \$12 a bushel.

The government supports the farmer financially in order to keep him on the farm, Mrs. Thompson observed. Agriculture is the country's main source of income and it can-

not afford to lose any farmers. Switzerland wants to stay independent and its people want to support themselves, without the threat of takeover by another country, she said. The average size of farms is 22 acres.

Farm living is unique, too, she continued. On one farm they found that a barn containing livestock was attached to the home. The smell was atrocious, but they assumed the house's occupants were accustomed to it, she said.

Switzerland is also undergoing experiments with rockets used to disperse hail, a weather phenomenon which causes about \$40 million in crop damage each year, Thompson noted. Russian-built rockets are set up at different locations throughout the country, which is about the size of Arkansas. The rockets are monitored during the summer hail season when corn, wheat, small grains, hay and vegetables are growing.

Observing rice production in the Poe River Valley near Milan, Italy, was the group's next venture. They toured a 300-acre corporation farm owned by 12 people, reportedly the most progressive rice farm in the area.

Irrigation practices, using the Poe River as a source, were similar to those in the U.S., Thompson said. They grew a variety which is sticky to eat.

The farm had a "mixed" look. There were German-, Russian- and American-made tractors on the farm, and some buildings were new while others were old and in need of repair, Mrs. Thompson recalled, leafing through her travel diary.

Russia was an experience all its own—a disappointing one, the couple agreed. A detailed itinerary listing stops at cotton gins, a mill and experiment stations was changed when the group arrived. "It seemed as though when they found out you knew about a certain agricultural operation, they put the clamp on information about it," Mrs. Thompson remarked.

But they got to see a few things. In Odessa, a resort city on the Black Sea, the group toured farm-related museums, viewing photographs and displays of Russian farm operations. They were shown an apple orchard on an experiment station, but were not allowed to see small grains and other horticulture crops grown on the station.

They also visited Moscow. Corn is grown near the city, but due to cold weather, it will not mature. Therefore, it is used for fodder—dried stalks which cattle eat during the winter.

Farm land reaches to the edges of Moscow, unlike in the U.S. where cities are the core in a hub of suburban homes which are then surrounded by farms.

Russian farms are either collective or state operated. Both are owned by the government, but collective farms are operated by a board of governors and state farms, solely by the government.

After Moscow, the group flew to Tashkent, the major cotton-producing area and the most interesting part of the trip to the Thompsons.

Cotton is irrigated with water from snow and rain which runs from nearby hills and is ditched to the desert-like growing area.

Both spindle and stripper cotton was grown on one 7,500-acre farm, along with long- and short-staple varieties.

Over 1,300 people were employed on that particular farm, the couple recalled. Each family works for the state but is also allowed a plot of land to grow whatever they wish to sell at a local market.

Gins in Russia run eight months out of the year, the Thompsons were told, while in the U.S. they only run about 10 weeks. Russian gins are not started until all the cotton is picked, and during harvest, cotton is piled on the ground.

Several sights were cancelled. "We were scheduled to see a cotton gin and textile mill

but we were told when we got there that foreigners couldn't see the gins. We didn't even see one (gin), not in the distance, and we were flat looking," Mrs. Thompson said, smiling.

Agriculture in the Soviet Union is unusual in other ways, she pointed out, because farmers buy from the state and sell to the state. Therefore, they have no idea how much cotton costs on the world market or how much a cotton picker is worth.

Finland and France were more lenient in showing the group farming operations.

Mrs. Thompson said she was overwhelmed at how "sparkling clean" Finland was. Tour members visited Finland's largest small grains and livestock farm which covered 10,000 acres. An experiment station was located on the farm.

Finnish farmers belong to government-supported cooperatives similar to U.S. cooperatives. Trout fish farms are scattered throughout the country's hilly terrain.

A tour through the Emmental cheese dairy was a highlight of the trip. This type of cheese is similar to Swiss cheese but is light yellow and not as sharp, she said.

By the time the participants got to France they were "really tired," Mrs. Thompson asserted. Farms there were privately run and "looked productive," she said.

The Thompsons learned about the trip through Dr. George Burger, dean of Arkansas State University's College of Agriculture. People from Alabama, Tennessee, Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky and Arkansas traveled with them. ●

THE FOSTER CARE AND ADOPTION REFORM ACT OF 1979

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H.R. 1523 the Foster Care and Adoption Reform Act of 1979. The enactment of this comprehensive piece of legislation at the earliest possible date will have the effect of drastically reducing both the number of children in foster care, and the growing costs of this largely uncontrolled system. Two years ago I introduced another form of this bill, and this body reported it in very diligent fashion. In particular, I want to commend Chairman JIM CORMAN of the Subcommittee on Public Assistance and Unemployment Compensation, and the members of the subcommittee, who committed themselves to this program early in the 95th Congress, and became some of its strongest and most effective advocates.

Unfortunately, the bill was not enacted in the 95th Congress, despite its quick passage by the House. For months it languished in the Senate Finance Committee and then awaited action on the Senate floor. It finally did pass the Senate in a different form than the House version, but it was too late in the session to resolve the differences. Hopefully, all of the work of the 95th Congress, both in the House and in the Senate, was not in vain. I believe that we served to educate Members of the Congress, as well as State and local officials, national foster parent organizations and other advocacy groups, and the Carter

administration about the severe continuing crisis in our foster care system.

When I originally introduced this bill in 1977, I pointed out that it was the product of countless hours of discussion, debate, and negotiation with dozens of expert and concerned people from throughout the United States. Its contents are based upon the conclusive findings of respected studies of many States, by the Congress, the General Accounting Office, the Department of HEW, the Congressional Research Service, the New York City Comptroller, private research organizations and others. All of these studies concluded that as many as two-thirds of the children in foster care were placed inappropriately, mostly in overly restrictive settings. The costs of this inappropriate placement in New York City alone were estimated to be in excess of a quarter of a billion dollars. But there is nothing unique about the New York example. In each State studied, the same problems have been found over and over again.

We found that large numbers of children enter foster care before any types of preventive services have been offered to them and to their parents. In fact, in 90 percent of placements the problem is not with the child but with the parents. Yet the penalty for the breakdown of the family is paid by the child, who often enters indeterminate foster care. Studies have shown that once in care for 18 months, a child has better than an 80-percent chance of remaining in care until he or she reaches the age of 18.

Federal funding practices actually encourage this breakup of the American family by providing unlimited funds for maintenance payments, but strictly limiting the amount available for preventive and reunification services or for adoption subsidy payments. Yet each of these alternatives has been shown to be workable and highly cost effective. In Nashville, Portland, New York, and elsewhere, preventive programs have cut the rate of placement by as much as half, reduced recidivism by as much as 80 percent, and virtually eliminated costly institutionalization. Similarly, adoption subsidies have been shown to cost far less than maintaining a child in foster care, even if the payment is equivalent to a maintenance payment, because you almost entirely eliminate administrative costs. Such financial considerations make the reforms in my bill attractive enough; in addition, we must consider the very great emotional and developmental benefits to the child which come with living in a stable and permanent family setting as opposed to the continuing trauma of placement and removal in the foster care system.

This legislation has three major features, and they are all tied firmly together. We would provide greater funds for cost-effective preventive service programs; we would mandate that States institute accountability and due process procedures, which have been shown, by the National Council on Juvenile Court Judges, to substantially reduce the number and duration of placements, at tre-

mendous cost savings; and we would authorize the payment of adoption subsidies to adoptive parents of eligible children, subsidies which would include both maintenance and medical components.

Since this legislation was proposed 2 years ago, there has been a great deal of acceptance of the basic provisions of this bill. Several States have begun to amend their laws to stress preventive and reunification services and periodic reviews. The Children's Bureau at HEW similarly has promulgated draft regulations concerning title IV-B (Child Welfare Service) which go part of the way toward implementing the provisions of this bill. Many States have enacted adoption subsidy laws, but few children have been adopted under these laws because of the very limited funds. Most recently, President Carter has included in the 1980 budget a substantial increase in funds for title IV-B.

All of these efforts prove that the fundamental thrust of the reforms contained in this legislation were sound when I introduced H.R. 5893, 2 years ago, and were sound when the House passed those provisions as H.R. 7200 a little over 2 years ago. The only real difference is that, by failing to enact the law expeditiously, thousands of children have been forced into, or remained in a foster care system who should not be there. Because of our failure to enact this law 2 years ago, thousands of children will spend years in costly, inappropriate foster placements. We cannot again allow so vital a piece of legislation, affecting hundreds of thousands of children across our country, to languish or to be purposefully delayed for political reasons. This legislation transcends party and ideological boundaries. H.R. 7200 enjoyed the strong political support of both liberals and conservatives who recognized that its enactment would lead to a more cost-effective and more humane foster care system.

Over the past 3 years, I have placed articles and reports in the RECORD documenting the continuing crisis in foster care and the proven effectiveness of the approach contained in the bill I am reintroducing today. It is my hope that the House will again act swiftly to pass this bill and move it to the Senate so that we will not have to face again months of waiting for the enactment of a largely noncontroversial and thoroughly reasonable reform program. ●

BILL TO AMEND THE SHIPPING
ACT, 1916

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, to vest jurisdiction in the Federal Maritime Commission over complaints against shippers, consignors, and consignees and for other purposes.

The Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, was enacted to insure that American foreign commerce would proceed in an orderly and nondiscriminatory manner without undue advantage to carriers, shippers, consignors or consignees. It is this element of fair business practices that has long distinguished the competitive nature of our ocean shipping industry.

During the 95th Congress, I introduced H.R. 9518, a bill which was designed to strengthen the provisions of the Shipping Act, 1916, in combating and inhibiting use of illegal kickbacks or rebates by ocean steamship carriers. Although this bill was enacted by the Congress, it was pocket vetoed by the President.

The bill I am introducing today attempts for the first time to put the shippers of goods as well as the ocean carriers on the same footing, as far as responsibilities and obligations of the Shipping Act, 1916, are concerned. Fundamental notions of fairness would certainly require parity of treatment for these two vital parties in our ocean commerce.

Under existing law, the Federal Maritime Commission (FMC) has no jurisdiction over complaints filed by carriers or other persons against shippers for alleged violations of the Shipping Act of 1916, even though the FMC does have jurisdiction in the reverse situation where complaints are filed by shippers against carriers. (See 46 U.S.C. 821.) Thus, if a shipper, by misdeclaration of the weight or density of the commodity shipped or of the commodity itself, should pay less than the applicable charges contained in a carrier's tariff, the carrier must file a complaint against the shipper, not before the FMC, but before whatever local, State or Federal court which may possess personal jurisdiction over the shipper.

The requirement that these complaints against shippers which frequently involve complex issues of maritime policy, be litigated in forums all over the country, rather than before the expert agency entrusted with enforcement of the act, clearly prevents a coordinated formulation of such policy and needlessly ignores the accumulated expertise of the FMC. In addition, such requirement has imposed undue hardships on carriers and their neutral enforcement bodies, including: First, inability to secure local counsel to prosecute the complaint; second, inordinate delays in securing the filing of claims and decisions from the courts, and third, the raising of technical and frivolous defenses which solely impede the progress of the litigation.

It is therefore proposed to amend section 22 of the act to confer primary jurisdiction in the FMC to hear complaints against shippers. The procedure for judicial enforcement of an FMC order entered pursuant to the amended section 22 would be the same as that now contained in existing law. In addition, since it is important to the administration of the shipping laws that carriers' tariffs be strictly enforced according to their terms, irrespective of whether any

deviations therefrom are knowing or willful, it is also proposed that section 18(b) of the act be amended, by addition of a new paragraph (4), to make it unlawful for a shipper, consignee, or consignee to receive transportation at less than the applicable rates therefor, whether or not such receipt is knowing or willful.

This bill simply requires that shippers as well as carriers must abide by, and be responsible for, similar obligations and duties under the Shipping Act, 1916. The result of an ocean transportation system where both shippers and carriers must deal in a fair and competitive manner will be that American consumers will benefit from lower ocean freight rates and a more stable and strengthened American Merchant Marine. ●

AMERICA'S HERITAGE AND FREEDOM AWARD

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to announce the February 4 presentation of the 36th annual America's Heritage and Freedom Award, to 15 outstanding black women in the Nation. This award is sponsored in conjunction with Black History Month 1979, by the Elmer L. Fowler's Historic Gallery of Chicago, Ill., the first picture gallery of honored black Americans in the country. It has resulted in the State of Illinois' declaration of February 4 as Black Women's Day in America, a novel and important concept.

Among the outstanding American women chosen to receive this award is my friend and colleague Congresswoman CARLIS COLLINS of Illinois, the newly elected chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus. Carliss, beyond a doubt, deserves this meritorious award for her performance as an excellent politician, a fine mother, and a great humanitarian.

The 14 other distinguished women chosen to receive the award are:

Dr. Geraldine P. Woods, chairman of the board, Howard University.

Attorney Margaret Bush Wilson, chairman of the board of the National NAACP.

Dr. Dorothy I. Height, president of the National Council of Women.

Dr. Dorothy L. Brown, the first black woman surgeon in the South.

Mrs. Coretta Scott King, wife of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and president of the Martin Luther King, Jr., Center for Social Change.

Mrs. C. Delores Tucker, former secretary of the State of Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mrs. Vivian Carter Mason, outstanding human rights activist and club woman, Norfolk, Va.

Mrs. Alberta King, late mother of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. (awarded posthumously).

Attorney Frances Hooks, wife of Ben Hooks, executive director of NAACP.

Attorney Jewel LaFontant, Chicago, Ill.

Mrs. CARLIS COLLINS, Illinois, Member of Congress.

Ms. Lu Willard, the only Black woman diamond cutter and jeweler of New York City.

Mrs. Rosa Parks, precipitor of the Montgomery, Ala., bus protest.

Mrs. Clarice Collins Harvey, social, educational, and civil rights worker.

Dr. Ruth Love, superintendent of public schools, Oakland, Calif., and Assistant Director to Mrs. Carter on National Mental Health.

Throughout the history of the United States of America, black women have led the country in stamina, strength, and dedication. This country can never forget the Harriet Tubmans, the Sojournes Truths, the Barbara Jordans; the contributions of black women, in general, who have formed a strong coalition to push black Americans to excellence.

Mr. Speaker, I know that each Member of the U.S. House of Representatives will join me today in acknowledging this timely tribute to outstanding black women of America. ●

MOSCOW'S HAND IN THE IRANIAN CIVIL STRIFE

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, there is a move on by some of the administration's "new foreign policy" advocates to pressure the troubled government of Iranian Prime Minister Shahpour Bakhtiar toward concessions that are in fact a capitulation to the extremist and Marxist revolutionary forces that have coalesced around Ruhollah Khomeini, the 78-year-old Shiite Moslem leader who has been trying to organize the overthrow of the Iranian Government for the past 16 years. The mere fact that at the moment Khomeini, obviously believing that he will soon return to Iran in triumph to set up a revolutionary council to rule Iran, has remained intransigently and uncompromisingly hostile toward Bakhtiar does not mean that the "new foreign policy" activists in the administration, on Capitol Hill and outside Government will not intensify their efforts to sell Iran down the river.

Those who are arguing that the Iranian civil turmoil is merely "nationalist" or "religious" in character are deliberately ignoring the available public information about the role of the Soviet Union and its battery of agents and propagandists in these events. The prime apologists for Khomeini who have been coordinating support efforts both in Western Europe and in this country are the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) and its Transnational Institute (TNI). IPS and its TNI project have compiled extensive records of activity on behalf of Soviet and Cuban supported terrorist groups and of ties to the Cuban and So-

viet intelligence agencies. The staff of IPS/TNI has included leading members of the Weather Underground Organization, the Algerian FLN, the Trotskyite Terrorist Fourth International, and the so-called "Patriotic Front" of Rhodesia for which the Cubans and Soviets are training an invasion army in southern Angola.

As I pointed out to my colleagues 2 years ago, IPS is a consortium of Marxists organizing for a "new economic and political world order" and an America neutralized as a world power through a variety of tactics. Among those tactics have been an organized attempt to dismantle and cripple the U.S. foreign and domestic intelligence capability; organizing violent street demonstrations such as the 1971 May-day riots in Washington, D.C., that were supposed to "shut down the Government" in support of the Vietnamese Communists; organizing an "alternative public policies" program for State and local public officials which places them in contact with their counterparts in foreign Communist governments and parties; and a sort of subversion from the top in which IPS attempts to gain influence in Congress and the administration through "seminars" for staff members and middle level bureaucrats and cultivating direct contacts with officials and lawmakers.

Over the past year, IPS/TNI has coordinated meetings of activists, members of Western European Communist parties and assorted Marxist activists to set up a unified campaign to deny military equipment to the Iranian army and to coordinate publicity campaigns attacking the Iranian Government. In the United States, IPS has played a leading role in the U.S. People's Committee on Iran which I will discuss in more detail later in this report.

Iran is of vital strategic importance to the free world both for its geographical position on the southern border of the Soviet Union, as the eastern gateway to the Middle East, and as the major source for the oil imported by Western Europe, Japan, Israel, and South Africa, and as a significant source for U.S. oil imports.

During the past year, virtually all the natural gas produced in Iran has been sold to the U.S.S.R. The Soviets use the Iranian natural gas in their central Asian and Caucasus regions so that the natural gas supplies from those areas can be used elsewhere to power the U.S.S.R.'s heavy industrial and military production centers. Those who suggest that Iran's status as a trading partner with the U.S.S.R. somehow makes it "immune" from Soviet intervention and subversion are ignoring the Soviet Union's consistent pattern. More particularly, they are refusing to consider the successful Soviet-backed coups in the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen (Aden), in Afghanistan, the attempted coup in Iraq and other recent Soviet moves in the Middle East.

Iran occupies a strategic location, controlling with Oman, the entrance to the Persian Gulf through which passes 70 percent of the oil that powers the economies of Western Europe (and thus NATO), 90 percent of Japan's oil im-

ports, and increasingly significant amounts of U.S. oil imports.

A destabilized Iran also poses a direct threat to Oman which borders on the Soviet Union's new Red Sea satellite, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen (PDRY). Since the pro-Soviet coup headed by Abdul Fatal Ismail took over Aden last June, approximately 7,000 Cuban troops have been transferred there from Ethiopia. The Cubans have joined 2,000 East Germans in the PDRY and have a divided responsibility. The East Germans train and command the local secret police, intelligence, and police forces while the Cubans drill, train, and control the "people's militia." The PDRY has made the island of Socotra available as a ballistic missile base to the Soviets who have used the island to install missiles removed from Somalia.

The PDRY provides terrorist training bases for the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Rejectionist Front faction headed by George Habash's Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), and for related terrorist organizations such as the "Carlos group." Members of the two chief Iranian revolutionary terrorist organizations, the Organization of Iranian People's Fedayee Guerrillas (OIFPG) and the Organization of Mujahedin of the People of Iran (OMPI), have received training in these and other PLO terrorist centers in Iraq, Lebanon, and Libya, as well as Cuba.

The PDRY also provides a land base and haven for the Marxist terrorist Popular Front for the Liberation of Oman (PFLO) which originally called itself the Popular Front for the Liberation of Oman and the Arab Gulf (PFLOAG). The name change was made because the United Arab Emirates, which provides generous funding for the PLO, raised strong objections to their being included as an open target of the PFLOAG revolutionaries. The PLO prevailed upon the PDRY to alter the group's name. This in no way has curtailed the PFLO's strategy to seize control of Oman and the UAE and set up a Marxist regime. Iranian Student Association (ISA) marches in this country have frequently contained small groups of Omani militants carrying PFLO placards. These student militants and PFLO literature and position papers candidly admitted that before the PFLO could claim victory, the destabilization and overthrow of the Shah's government and removal of Iranian counter-insurgency troops would be necessary.

Clearly, with either a Quaddafi-style Islamic fundamentalist or an openly pro-Soviet Government in Iran, the lightly armed, feudal governments on the Persian Gulf are up for grabs, and the stability of Saudi Arabia threatened.

Over the past year, factions of the Iranian Students Association (ISA) and several of their U.S. support groups, have been using the slogan, "Don't let Iran become another Vietnam," by which they mean the United States should not send military assistance to the Iranian Government. It is scarcely a coincidence that this was the theme of a November 19, 1978, interview in Pravda given by Leonid Brezhnev when he said that any

foreign involvement in any country on the U.S.S.R.'s southern border—obviously Iran—would be considered as a "security matter." This veiled threat followed a long series of stories in Tass and other Communist bloc media that the United States was planning to "interfere militarily in the internal affairs of Iran."

The administration has demonstrated a chaotic lack of a coherent policy toward Iran to such an extent that even the U.S. carrier task force initially ordered to sail for the Persian Gulf, where among other things, it could have been useful in evacuating U.S. dependents and civilians caught by the closing of the Iranian airports, was ordered almost immediately to remain in the South China Sea, a week's sail from the place where it would demonstrate legitimate U.S. concern with the events in Iran.

Whether or not the carrier task force was ordered back because of Soviet pressure on the Carter administration or because of chaotic, indecisive administration policies toward Iran, the effect was to demonstrate American weakness in the face of Soviet supported aggression.

In a recent study by Robert Moss, "The Campaign to Destabilize Iran," published by the prestigious Institute for the Study of Conflict in London, Soviet efforts to destabilize Iran and undermine its military were detailed. Two particularly notorious cases were revealed a year ago that involved an Iranian general whose responsibilities included supervising all of the Iranian army's planning and logistical services, and a top level civil servant. The general and the civil servant had sophisticated espionage devices including a false pocket calculator that received transmissions in code from a Soviet satellite and a "burst" transmitter that broadcast a half-hour recorded message in thirty seconds to a receiver in a Soviet Embassy vehicle cruising in the neighborhood. The technological sophistication and effort put into that operation by the U.S.S.R. indicates the importance of Iran as a Soviet target.

As this study indicates, the KGB and GRU not only use as spies Soviet citizens who use as their "cover" positions in the Embassy, in the consulates in Isfahan, Tabriz, and Mashad, the Soviet trade mission or their positions as technicians and engineers at such installations as the Aryamehr steel mill; but also infiltrate as deep cover "illegals" Parsi-speaking Soviets from Azerbaijan who are indistinguishable from northern Iranians, and Afghans.

The KGB has taken over the Afghanistan secret intelligence service, and has set up training camps for Iranian revolutionaries in that country. Furthermore, Iranian Foreign Minister addressed Iranians who were receiving training in terrorism in Cuba during his recent visit.

The Soviet KGB also makes use of a number of other agencies as cover for its spies and recruiters including the Soviet press agency Novosti, a Soviet-owned transport company, the Soviet hospital in Teheran and the Irano-Soviet Cultural Society. In the long established tradition of Lenin's stricture to reject no tactic, no matter how "immoral" or degrading,

the KGB has blackmailed Iranians who have relatives living in the U.S.S.R. into acting as their agents.

It should not be forgotten that a Soviet army occupied northern Iran during the Second World War and that that army was withdrawn only after considerable British and U.S. pressure on Stalin. A Communist-run regime that was set up in Iranian Azerbaijan was deposed only with difficulty and the 1946 Iranian Government had three Communist ministers.

During 1978, the official Soviet Media (rather than clandestine radio stations) generally repeated attacks on the Shah and his government and calls for its overthrow made by leaders of the Tudeh ("masses") party, as the Moscow-line Communist party in Iran is called, only after they had first been published in the Western Communist press. In June 1978, for example, a pamphlet published by Navid, the organ of the Tudeh Party, entitled "The Tudeh Party and the Muslim Movement," was distributed in Teheran which repeated the Tudeh Party call for formation of an "antidictatorial broad front" with the Islamic mullahs playing a "vanguard role" in the struggle to overthrow the Shah's government. Navid, which is believed to be produced on a printing press inside the Soviet Embassy in Teheran, said that the Tudeh party was prepared to put at the disposal of "our friends from other political groups," all of its propaganda, political and technical resources in the campaign to overthrow the Iranian Government. This call from a "broad front" became the theme for repeated Moscow broadcasts.

The Soviet-line Tudeh Communists have been trying to form a coalition of Muslim, Communist, and liberal forces in opposition to the Iranian Government at least since 1973. The combination of Marxism with Islam is also the goal of the OMPI terrorists who are known to have ties with Moscow, Libya, and the PDRY. As far as can be determined, it was the OMPI terrorists who number an estimated 4,000 in Iran, who first began calling themselves "Islamic Marxists," a phrase often dismissed by media commentators in this country as an invention of the Shah. The Marxists have developed a "liberation theology" for Christians that has involved priests and nuns joining terrorist revolutionary groups, particularly in Latin America. Why should anyone be surprised that a "liberation theology" should not also be developed for Moslems?

The Tudeh party leaders spelled out their support for the Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini in an article that appeared in December 1978. The article, signed by Tudeh head Iraj Eskandari and published in World Marxist Review, also known as Problems of Peace and Socialism, the "theoretical journal of Communist and Workers' Parties" published in Prague, claimed that Tudeh "has always respected the religious beliefs that are solidly rooted in the vast majority of the Persian population." The article spelled out support for Khomeini in these terms:

When Moslem leaders like Ayatollah Khomeini oppose imperialism, declare that the

Shah's regime is anti-popular and anti-Islamic, and say that it must be overthrown, then we consider this a positive occurrence.

In other words, as long as it weakens the West, the Communists will support it, try to direct it, and eventually try to take it over.

As for Ruhollah Khomeini, he has expressed his anti-Western, pro-Communist sentiments on a number of occasions. As long ago as December 1968, in the magazine, *The Middle East*, Khomeini affirmed that the purpose of an "Islamic republic" of the sort he envisages for Iran, would be to completely eliminate Western influence. During the past year he has repeatedly said that in his "Islamic republic," the Communists will be considered as a legitimate Iranian political force so long as they do not represent "foreign interests." But since the interests of the U.S.S.R. and the goals of Khomeini in abolishing all Western influence and interests in Iran coincide, one may expect that the Tudeh Communists and the Soviet Union's covert agents in Iran would take pains not to alienate the Khomeini group until they had consolidated their power.

On January 21, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union newspaper, *Pravda*, directly endorsed Khomeini and his Islamic revolutionaries because they have "a long established reputation as opponents of tyranny" and because they appeared to be riding "on the crest of the wave of events."

Pravda coupled its favorable comments on the Islamic revolutionaries in Iran with a report of an interview Khomeini gave to the Beirut newspaper *As-Safir*, that was broadcast from Moscow on January 20. In part, Khomeini said:

The present struggle in Iran against the Shah's regime is being conducted in the interests of broad sections of the Iranian people," Khomeini went on. "And though it is headed by religious leaders, they do not seek to form of them political cadres for governing the country. But this does not mean, however, that we shall leave room for pro-American leaders."

"Iran will not play the role of a policeman in the region," the opposition's leader said. "The forces that plundered our oil wealth, that made us buy armaments from them, and that set up their military bases in our lands turned Iran into the gendarme of the region in their own self-seeking interests. We hold that 'security' American-style was ensured by the Shah to the detriment of the interests of the Iranian people. We are able to protect ourselves. We believe that the questions of security of the Persian Gulf must be decided by the peoples of the region." * * *

Khomeini said that Iran will not participate in any military blocs since they contradict the interests of peoples. "We shall be conducting the policy of non-alignment and friendship with other peoples, of non-interference in their internal affairs. * * * We shall not side with one power against another."

Touching upon the relations with Israel, he said, "Israel is our enemy not only for the reason that it seized Palestinian lands and tramples underfoot the rights of our Arab friends, but also for the reason that it committed a number of grave crimes against the Iranian people. The torture that was practiced by the secret political police SAVAK was made with the use of Israeli torture implements. Israeli 'experts' and 'instructors'

trained the Shah's supporters in methods of the struggle against Iranian patriots, participated directly in violence and brutalities. * * * Therefore, it is our sacred duty to conduct the struggle against [Egyptian President] Sadat and his flunkies and against Israel."

The official Soviet news agency Tass carried also on January 20 an account of a New York City demonstration by the Iranian Students Association who were supported by members of a variety of U.S. Marxist-Leninist sects, parties, and support groups for a range of terrorist groups including the Palestine Liberation Organization. As Tass reported, chanting "Victory to the Iranian People," and "U.S. Out of Iran," the demonstrators protested "U.S. interference in Iran's home affairs."

In the United States, both the Moscow-line Communist Party, U.S.A. (CPUSA) and the U.S. section of the Trotskyite Fourth International have endorsed Khomeini's revolutionary effort in Iran, as have a number of activist groups whose leaders were previously known for their efforts in organizing support for the Communist aggression in Southeast Asia. Chief among these is the U.S. People's Committee on Iran (USPCI), headquartered at P.O. Box 7782, Philadelphia, Pa. 19101, but in which associates of the Institute for Policy Studies and its Transnational Institute play leading roles.

The USPCI was formed on November 14, 1977, at the commencement of Iranian Student Association riots in Washington, D.C., at the start of an official visit by the Shah of Iran. The USPCI was an outgrowth of the ad hoc support committee to send a team of legal-medical international observers to Iran, organized earlier in 1977.

The chairman of the USPCI is Richard Falk, who teaches international law at Princeton. Falk will be remembered as having been a member of the national council of the (National) Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, a well-known Communist Party front, and for playing a leading role with his long-time collaborator, Richard Barnet, cofounder and director of IPS, in the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam set up by some of the "Old Left" lawyers in the NECLC which aided in the kangaroo-court "Commission of Enquiry" on alleged U.S. war crimes in Vietnam that was run by the North Vietnamese and two international Soviet fronts, the World Peace Council (WPC) and the International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL). Following his 1968 and 1971 trips to Hanoi and Paris to meet with North Vietnamese and Vietcong officials, Falk returned to publicize the "need" for concessions to North Vietnam. In 1969 Falk was among the U.S. delegates to the World Peace Council's Stockholm Conference on Vietnam, and became an endorser of the so-called "people's peace treaty" with the Vietcong.

With this public record for support for the Vietnamese Communists it was not surprising, though morally shocking, that Falk, Barnet and Don Luce of Clergy and Laity Concerned were among the handful of signers of an advertisement in the New

York Times on January 30, 1977, that congratulated the Vietnamese Communist conquerors of South Vietnam for holding 40,000 political prisoners—incidentally a far smaller figure than the estimated 300,000 political prisoners in forced labor camps in the "new economic areas" as well as in jails. According to Falk, Barnet, Luce, and company "such a number is surprisingly small considering the several million Vietnamese involved in Saigon's war effort." In other words, every Vietnamese who opposed Communist aggression, who worked in the South Vietnamese civil service or served in the ARVN could justifiably be imprisoned as, in their words, "Saigon collaborationists."

The members of the USPCI policy and advisory committees include two leading members of the IADL's U.S. affiliate, the National Lawyers Guild, Jack Levine of Philadelphia and John Thorn of San Jose; Linus Pauling and Noam Chomsky whose activities in sponsoring Communist causes are too numerous to detail here; Dr. Pierre Noyes of the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center; J. Pirnazer of the University of California at Berkeley; Margaret McQuade, a registered nurse; and Michael Klare, a fellow of the IPS Transnational Institute.

Michael Klare is the head of the of IPS and of the Disarmament and Arms Sales task force of the Mobilization for Project on Militarism and Disarmament Survival (MFS), a coalition collaborating with the World Peace Council in promoting Western disarmament and nonintervention against Communist aggression. Klare was a founding member of the North American Congress on Latin America (NACLA), set up following the tricontinental conference in Havana as the "intelligence-gathering arm" of the U.S. revolutionary left. Havana apparently thinks so highly of Mike Klare that the Tricontinental magazine published by OSPAL has published his material and he regularly travels to Havana to lecture on U.S. arms sales policies.

The USPCI's goals include to "support Iranian resistance to repression;" "to bring international public pressure to bear on Iran;" and "to oppose American military aid and intervention in Iran."

How the USPCI puts those goals into practice is indicated in their newsletter. The premier edition for the spring of 1978 featured emotional tributes to members of the OIPFG terrorists and to the small, virtually extinct Maoist Communist terrorist organization, the revolutionary organization of Tudeh (ROT) which split away from the Soviet-line Tudeh in the late 1960's. The OIPFG, as I have documented in previous reports (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, November 18, 1977, pp. 37800 ff; and September 23, 1978, pp. 31179 ff), is a Marxist-Leninist group whose principal tactic is terrorist "armed struggle." OMPI, which is the outgrowth of the armed gangs organized by the Iranian National Front party during the 1963-64 civil turmoil, has also announced that it has "joined the Marxist-Leninist struggle."

Tudeh Party militants have been working in both terrorist groups, but have

been concentrating on the OMPI because it is the larger armed group and because of Tudeh's efforts to cement another alliance with the National Front forces. Tudeh collaborated closely with the anti-Western, pro-Soviet government headed by Prime Minister Muhammad Mossadeq who was deposed by the Shah, with U.S. support, in 1953. Before it was outlawed in 1953, Tudeh and its controlled labor fronts had an estimated 400,000 members. Thus the 1973 State Department estimate of 500 Tudeh members and current U.S. press reports citing "intelligence source" estimates of 1,000 Tudeh members are clearly unrealistic. Intelligence analysts knowledgeable on Iran now believe that many Tudeh members "went underground" and that despite the problems of age, with their younger associates are returning to active roles in the Iranian revolutionary disorders on behalf of the Soviet Union.

USPCI leader Richard Falk; Don Luce, director of the "anti-imperialist" Clergy and Laity Concerned (CALC); and former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark held a press conference in New York on January 23d at which they discussed their 8-day tour of Iran and their meeting with Khomeini near Paris, France. Clark asserted that "99 percent" of Iranians opposed the Bakhtiar government—but gave no indication of how he took his "poll"—and expressed hope that the United States would take no action regarding Iran so that Iran could "determine its own fate."

It is remarkable that Mr. Clark, the USPCI, the various U.S. Communist groups, the Tudeh party and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union are all very much concerned that the United States might "interstate" or "intervene" in the Iranian turmoil, but that they are uniformly unconcerned about the Soviet Union and its agents interfering in that nation.

Let us consider one of the examples of such interference: The terrorist arson at the Abadan movie theater in which several hundred men were killed.

ABADAN THEATER TERROR ATTACK

Following the burning of the Abadan theater, the Tudeh publication Navid immediately appeared with the charge that the men had been murdered by agents provocateur from the Iranian intelligence service, SAVAK. Within days, the Iranian Students Association (ISA) in this country was on the streets with violent demonstrations to publicize the allegation. The speed of transmission of the charge to the ISA groups here is not surprising considering the fact that several colleges have been expelling ISA members for running up hundreds of dollars in telephone calls to Iran and Western Europe charged on college telephones.

Suspects in the arson fled to Iraq where they were apprehended by Iraqi authorities. Since the Soviet-supported attempted coup by Iraqi Communists a year ago and the expulsion of Soviet diplomats, Iraq has been less hostile toward its traditional rival, Iran. As a result, a 19-year-old construction worker named Hashem Menyshedpur was returned to Iran on August 31, 1978. Menyshedpur confessed that he had been a

member of a sabotage team led by Abraham Nazarian Lodricheh who worked for the Abadan mosquito eradication department. Prior to his job as an exterminator of mosquitos, he had been a guard at the Aryamehr steel mill in Isfahan where 1,000 Soviet technical experts and engineers, including a number of identified KGB and GRU agents, work.

Using the alias "Jamshid," Lodricheh assembled a sabotage group whose members received cash bonuses averaging about \$750 per person. Just who gave "Jamshid" this money has not been positively determined, but the Soviet secret agents at Aryamehr steel mill are strong suspects. Incidentally, this single small sabotage group carried out arson and fire bombings of small shops, gas stations, banks, and other targets.

One might hope that Ramsey Clark might have some concern for the human rights forever denied the charred corpses at Abadan, men who were burned alive to serve the purposes of the Soviet Union and its KGB.

With sensible support from this country and the Western powers, Iran can still find an equilibrium and encourage formation of a coalition of Iranian moderates from the small farmer and middle classes who will take from the West what their country needs, without undermining their social and religious traditions of society. It is up to us as Americans not to abandon the Iranian people; for whose distress we bear at least moral responsibility. Without question the Soviet Union will continue its efforts to destabilize Iran and other Free World nations, and therefore a firm U.S. policy must form the basis for the resistance to Soviet aggression.●

ELDERLY CRIME VICTIMS MAY FACE IMPRISONMENT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1979

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the first in a three-part series of articles written by Michael Daly of the New York Daily News, documenting one of the most serious problems currently facing our Nation—the severe psychological hardships experienced by elderly crime victims.

While the numbers are shocking enough—in New York City alone, there were 64,728 reported crimes against persons over 65 in 1977—the major problem confronting the elderly today is the fear of being victimized by crime. As a result of this fear, an estimated 100,000 elderly citizens have placed themselves under a self-imposed house arrest.

As a member of the House Select Committee on Aging, I have conducted several hearings in New York City on this issue, and have helped to prepare a comprehensive report on this issue, entitled "In Search of Security: A National Perspective on Elderly Crime Victimization."

My extensive investigation into this matter makes me realize, all too clearly, that the life of Jennie Kelly, as described in Mr. Daly's article, is lived by a very substantial portion of our Nation's elderly population.

Perhaps the best evidence of this tragic situation is revealed in a 1974 Louis Harris survey. When asked for their perception of various social problems, the elderly ranked fear of crime as the most serious problem they experience; more serious even than health, money, and loneliness.

In an attempt to help correct this problem, I have reintroduced two bills to provide a much needed and new Federal approach for dealing with juvenile criminals, who are responsible for a large percentage of all crimes against the elderly. The first bill would lower to 15 the age under which juveniles can be prosecuted as adults for felony offenses. The second measure would provide for the fingerprinting of juveniles convicted of felony offenses and would prohibit the withholding of previous juvenile records to courts.

I have also reintroduced H.R. 957, legislation to provide Federal assistance to States for compensating victims of crime. My bill gives special consideration to the needs of elderly crime victims, who are very vulnerable to serious financial injury. I welcome your cosponsorship of these measures.

I believe that my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD will be able to more fully appreciate the severity of this problem and the need for prompt corrective measures after reading Mr. Daly's article:

JENNIE HIDES BEHIND HER DOORS

(By Michael Daly)

"More than 18% of the people living in this city are over 65. In 1977, there were 64,728 reported crimes against these 1.5 million older citizens. Of these, 9,970 were robberies. The average victim was female and over 70. The average attacker was male and 16.

"Although police say that they have cut the number of attacks on the elderly by almost 25% since 1976, the fear of being robbed, raped or murdered keeps an estimated 100,000 older persons virtual prisoners in their homes.

"Newsmen Michael Daly spent three days recently with one of those prisoners in her Coney Island apartment. The last name has been changed, but the events and emotions recorded in her diary of fear are painfully real."

Her flannel robe drawn tight at the waist Jennie Kelly pads into the kitchen and takes down the 24 Budweiser cans stacked in front of the window.

"They're my burglar alarm," the 83-year-old widow tells you as she parts the blue cotton curtains, letting the early morning light creep into the room. Three inches of snow have fallen during the night, and a white shroud covers the vacant lot that sprawls below Jennie's window.

"Children," Jennie says, her breath clouding the glass. Two children, a girl in a blue parka and a boy wearing red rubber boots, dash into the lot. The boy scoops up two handfuls of snow as the girl ducks behind a pile of rubble and timber.

"Look out," Jennie says, laughing. For 20 minutes, she stands motionless by the window. This 2-by-3-foot sheet of glass is the closest Jennie Kelly gets to the world outside

her apartment. It is 7:29 a.m., Saturday, Jan. 6, and Jennie Kelly is beginning the 119th day of her incarceration in a third-floor cell comprised of two rooms, each measuring 18 feet by 20 feet.

Unlike Rikers Island, there are no cellmates or exercise periods in Jennie's \$98-a-month prison. There is only a radio, a window, and a nephew who visits once a week for 10 minutes, leaving five tins of condensed milk, a box of tea, four cans of tuna, six carrots, five pounds of potatoes, two loaves of bread, a quart of tomato juice, and a jar of raspberry jelly.

There are no bars on the window of the rooms in which Jennie serves a life sentence. The three locks on the door open from the inside. The walls that hold Jennie Kelly captive are made of fear—terror as real as brick and mortar.

"Hey, lady," a young voice shouted. As Jennie turned, a fist caught her in the stomach.

"I'M GOING TO DIE"

"I'm going to die," Jennie remembers thinking as she pitched forward onto the sidewalk. A boy who looked no more than 13 snatched her purse. Grabbing \$11 from the change pocket, the boy tossed the pocketbook into the air. Gasping for breath, Jennie crawled across the wet concrete, feeling in the darkness for her personal papers, her makeup, and a roll of stamps. Jennie Kelly no longer went out after sundown.

Then, two months later, another boy, this one about 17, knocked her to the sidewalk on Surf Ave. After taking her money, the boy squeezed both of Jennie's breasts, hard, his lips rolling back from his gritted teeth. Jennie Kelly was now cut off from her morning walk on the boardwalk.

Last September, the terror struck in Jennie's building. She heard the footsteps behind her just as she turned the key in the lock. A hand snaked around her neck and clamped over her mouth, the thumb digging into her right eye. A second hand pushed open the door. Slipping his left leg in front of her, the attacker hit her once, square in the back.

"The money," the attacker said. "Where is it?" Her cheek pressed against the floor, Jennie Kelly stared at the pair of blue sneakers. The right shoe went back, and Jennie closed her eyes, waiting for the blow she knew would crush her face. Instead, the toe dug in between the carpet and her nose, lifting her face.

"The money," the attacker said again.

"In the napkins," Jennie said, her hand raising from the floor and pointing toward the kitchen counter.

Folding her arms over her head, Jennie listened to the attacker tear through the apartment. Coat hangers scraped in the closet. Drawers tumbled to the floor. Clothing tore. A bottle of tranquilizers rattled in the bathroom. Finally, the door slammed, and Jennie Kelly heard feet pounding down the stairs.

"I had wet myself," Jennie now tells you as she stands by the kitchen window looking out at the snow. "I sat there wet and looked at the door and know I would never go outside again. I knew I would not be brave enough to ever stand in that hallway alone again."

"Did you call the police?" you ask Jennie.

"No," Jennie says, "I was afraid. I have to live here after the police are gone."

"Why don't you move?" you ask her. Jennie walks to the bathroom door and points to the deep cast iron tub.

"After working, my husband soaked and smoked cigars and we talked." Jennie says, her fingers rubbing the edge of the tub. "That table you're sitting at is where we ate. I laugh sometimes when my nephew tells me

I should move to a home, like this isn't my home. He means an old folks home. What does your real home die before you do?" The home he wants me to go to. I would wake up in the morning and know that after 84 years on this earth, all I had was what was hanging in the closet. That would kill me."

"What do you do for money?" Jennie is asked.

"I don't like to talk about my money," Jennie says. "It's private. I get my Social Security and the pension from my husband mailed right to the bank. My nephew uses it to pay rent and utilities. He doesn't charge me for the magazines he brings sometimes. It doesn't cost much to keep an old lady alive, and my husband when he died had worked all his life as a plumber and it worked out."

Walking into the kitchen, Jennie strikes a safety match and lights a stove burner. The spigot coughs and sputters as she fills the aluminum kettle.

"IT SOUNDS LIKE ME"

"It sounds like me on a bad morning," Jennie says.

Like a priest preparing for Mass, carefully Jennie lines up a cup, a box of black tea, and a tin of Carnation milk. When the kettle whistles, she washes out the pot with the boiling water and measures out three even tablespoons of tea.

Dripping the milk slowly into the cup, Jennie watches the swirls of white mix with the tea. She brushes her hair back and holds her head an inch over the cup so the steam can roll up her cheeks.

"I do this sometimes and dream," Jennie says.

"What do you dream of?" Jennie is asked.

"People I knew, things I've done," Jennie says. "More memories I guess than dreams. Dreams are when you're young. Who dreams past 60? At 60, you have memories, at 60 you're old. And I've been old since 1955." Tipping the cup, Jennie let a puddle of tea dribble into the saucer. Holding the cup in one hand, she blows on the saucer to cool the tea and lifts the plate to her lips.

"Delicious," she says. "I make delicious tea." Reaching across the white enameled table, Jennie flicks on the radio. A maintenance man, the newscaster said, had been stabbed to death in front of St. John's University in Queens. The Vietnamese were pressing on to Phom Penh. Mayor Koch defended a \$12 million raise for managerial staff.

"Things go on," Jennie says. Pouring a second cup of tea, Jennie recalls a hot afternoon on the beach at Coney Island in August 1951. Struck by a stomach cramp, a boy in the water called for help. Half the men on the beach dived into the surf. A man in blue and white trunks dragged the boy onto the sand and pumped his chest.

"Sometimes I feel like I'm drowning," Jennie says, moving to the window.

"What do you think would happen if you leaned out the window and shouted help? she is asked.

"Nothing," Jennie says. There was nothing done, Jennie tells you, when landlords started packing year-round welfare families into the summer bungalows. There was nothing done when the fire started. There was nothing done when neighbors fled one after the other. There was nothing done when all but three of the 31 buildings on her block stood empty. For 33 of her 48 years in this apartment, Kelly tells you, Coney Island was "a working man's paradise." In the past 15 years, she says, parts of Coney Island has become a poor man's hell, where children prey on elderly women.

"Everybody knows about ladies like me," Jennie says. "Everybody knows and they just accept it. It is a jungle down here and I'm the weakest animal in the jungle. What can I do but hide?" ●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of all meetings when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in meetings as they occur.

As an interim procedure until the computerization of this information becomes operational the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, February 1, 1979, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 2

10:00 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold closed hearings on proposed military procurement authorizations for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Defense, with testimony on funds for Air Force programs.

212 Russell Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 108, to simplify the truth-in-lending laws, and on S. 37, proposing repeal of the section relative to financial privacy of P.L. 95-630, to extend the authority for the flexible regulation of interest rates on deposits and accounts in depository institutions.

5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 233, to extend programs administered by the U.S. Travel Service through fiscal year 1980.

235 Russell Building

Joint Economic

To receive testimony on the employment-unemployment situation for January.

1202 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 5

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

To review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1980 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee.

4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on U.S. export policies.

5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Conservation and Regulation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the plans of the Department of Energy for emergency energy conservation and gas regulation.

3110 Dirksen Building

Finance

Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the status of foreign debts owned to the United States.
2221 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to continue current trade and economic relations with Taiwan.
4221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the effect of pension fund investment policies on individual contributors.
2228 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

To receive testimony from Director of the Office of Management and Budget McIntyre on the state of the U.S. economy.
1202 Dirksen Building

Select Small Business

To resume hearings on the issues of the safety, effects, and medical use of Darvon.
5110 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 6

9:00 a.m.

*Human Resources

Child and Human Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 4, proposed Child Care Act.
6226 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Environment, Soil Conservation, and Forestry Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the economic implications of the Department of Agriculture's RARE II wilderness proposals, and on the Nation's outlook for timber and lumber supplies.
322 Russell Building

Finance

Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on extending and possibly increasing the temporary limit on the public debt.
2221 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue oversight hearings on U.S. export policies.
5302 Dirksen Building

Budget

To hold hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1980 budget.
6202 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

To continue hearings on proposed legislation to continue current trade and economic relations with Taiwan.
4221 Dirksen Building

*Government Affairs

Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on GSA's methods of procuring contracts.
1114 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

To continue hearings to examine the President's economic report.
357 Russell Building

10:30 a.m.

Human Resources

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA), P.L. 93-406.
4332 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 7

9:30 a.m.

Budget

To resume consideration of committee rules and budget requests.
6202 Dirksen Building

*Commerce, Science, and Transportation Surface Transportation Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation by the ICC of provisions of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act (P.L. 94-210).
235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Energy.
3110 Dirksen Building

Human Resources

To continue hearings on proposed legislation to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA), P.L. 93-406.
4232 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

To review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1980 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the budget Committee.
4200 Dirksen Building

Veterans' Affairs

To resume hearings on S. 7, proposed Veterans' Health Care Amendments.
412 Russel Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to receive testimony from N.Y. State officials on the progress being made by N.Y. City toward balancing its budget and regaining access to the credit markets.
5302 Dirksen Building

Budget

To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1980 budget.
6202 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

To mark up proposed legislation to continue current trade and economic relations with Taiwan.
4221 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

To continue hearings to examine the President's economic report.
6226 Dirksen Building

3:00 p.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue hearings to receive testimony from N.Y. State officials on the progress being made by N.Y. City toward balancing its budget and regaining access to the credit markets.
5302 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 8

9:00 a.m.

*Human Resources

Child and Human Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 239 proposed authorizations for FY 1979 for ACTION.
6226 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Environment, Soil Conservation, and Forestry Subcommittee

To resume hearings on the economic implications of the Department of Agriculture's "RARE II" wilderness proposals, and on the Nation's outlook for timber and lumber supplies.
322 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of the Interior.
3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

To review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1980 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it

will make thereon to the Budget Committee.

4200 Dirksen Building
Human Resources

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA), P.L. 93-406.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to extend for two years through 1981, the Council on Wage and Price Stability.
5302 Dirksen Building

Budget

To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1980 budget.
6202 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nomination of Leonard Woodcock, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the People's Republic of China.
4221 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine safety problems in the transportation and storage of liquefied energy gases.
235 Russell Building

FEBRUARY 9

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue hearings on proposed legislation to extend for two years, through 1981, the Council on Wage and Price Stability.
5302 Dirksen Building

3:00 p.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue hearings on proposed legislation to extend for two years, through 1981, the Council on Wage and Price Stability.
5302 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 19

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

To review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1980 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee.
4200 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 20

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

To review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1980 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee.
4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on present U.S. monetary policies.
5302 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to receive legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1980 from Disabled American Veterans.
318 Russell Building

FEBRUARY 21

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed fiscal year 1980 authorization for NASA.
5110 Dirksen Building

- *Human Resources
Child and Human Development Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 4, proposed Child Care Act.
4232 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Budget
To resume hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1980 budget.
6202 Dirksen Building
- FEBRUARY 22
- 9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed fiscal year 1980 authorization for NASA.
5110 Dirksen Building
- 9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to provide for a judicial review of decisions made by the Veterans' Administration in matters involving claims for veterans.
318 Russell Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Budget
To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1980 budget.
6202 Dirksen Building
- Commerce, Science, and Transportation Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed fiscal year 1980 authorizations for the U.S. Railway Association and the Office of Rail Public Counsel.
235 Russell Building
- FEBRUARY 23
- 10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To resume oversight hearings on present U.S. monetary policies.
5302 Dirksen Building
- Joint Economic
To receive testimony from Advisor to the President on Inflation Kahn on the state of the U.S. economy.
1202 Dirksen Building
- FEBRUARY 26
- 10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 85, proposed Monetary Policy Improvement Act.
5302 Dirksen Building
- Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the objectives that a national policy on tourism should seek to achieve.
235 Russell Building
- FEBRUARY 27
- 9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to assess Government and industrial potential needs for powered "lighter-than-air" vehicles used for surveillance and reconnaissance.
235 Russell Building
- Human Resources
Child and Human Development Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed authorizations for FY 1979 for ACTION.
4232 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To mark up S. 108, proposing simplification of the truth-in-lending laws, and on proposed legislation to extend for two years, through 1981, the Council on Wage-Price Stability.
5302 Dirksen Building
- FEBRUARY 28
- 9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed FY 1980 authorizations for NASA.
235 Russell Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Budget
To resume hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1980 budget.
6202 Dirksen Building
- Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To resume hearings on the objectives that a national policy on tourism should seek to achieve.
5110 Dirksen Building
- MARCH 1
- 9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings to assess Government and industrial potential needs for powered "lighter-than-air" vehicles used for surveillance and reconnaissance.
235 Russell Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Budget
To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1980 budget.
6202 Dirksen Building
- MARCH 2
- 9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed FY 1980 authorizations for NASA.
235 Russell Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To resume hearings on the objectives that a national policy on tourism should seek to achieve.
5110 Dirksen Building
- MARCH 5
- 10:00 a.m.
Budget
To resume hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1980 budget.
6202 Dirksen Building
- MARCH 6
- 11:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to receive legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1980 from Veterans of Foreign Wars.
318 Russell Building
- MARCH 7
- 9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of P.L. 94-282, establishing the Office of Science and Technology Policy.
2355 Russell Building
- 9:30 a.m.
Human Resources
Child and Human Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to coordinate programs designed to prevent domestic violence.
4232 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Budget
To resume hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1980 budget.
6202 Dirksen Building
- MARCH 8
- 9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To consider recommendations which it will make to the Budget Committee in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act.
412 Russell Building
- MARCH 12
- 10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science and Transportation Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed fiscal year 1980 authorizations for the National Rail Passenger Corporation (AMTRAK), and on proposed route restructuring of AMTRAK.
235 Russell Building
- MARCH 14
- 9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed FY 1980 authorizations for NASA.
235 Russell Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Budget
To resume hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1980 budget.
6202 Dirksen Building
- MARCH 15
- 9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed FY 1980 authorizations for NASA.
235 Russell Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Budget
To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1980 budget.
6202 Dirksen Building
- MARCH 16
- 10:00 a.m.
Budget
To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1980 budget.
6202 Dirksen Building
- Commerce, Science, and Transportation Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the Northeast corridor improvement project.
235 Russell Building
- MARCH 20
- 9:30 a.m.
Human Resources
Child and Human Development Subcommittee
To mark up S. 4, proposed Child Care Act, and proposed legislation to coordinate programs designed to prevent domestic violence.
4232 Dirksen Building
- MARCH 21
- 9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearing on the implementation of P.L. 94-282, estab-

lishing the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

235 Russell Building

MARCH 29

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to establish an Earth Data and Information Service which would supply data on the earth's resources and environment.

235 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to receive legislative

recommendations for fiscal year 1980 from AMVETS, paralyzed Veterans of America, Veterans of World War I, and blinded veterans.

6226 Dirksen Building

MARCH 30

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed legislation to establish an Earth Data and Information Service which would supply data on the earth's resources and environment.

235 Russell Building

APRIL 10

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the role of the Federal government in providing educational, employment, and counseling benefits to incarcerated veterans.

6226 Dirksen Building

MAY 1

9:30 a.m.

Human Resources

Child and Human Development Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Older American Volunteer Program Act (P.L. 93-113).

4232 Dirksen Building

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, February 1, 1979

The House met at 11 a.m.

Chaplain James David Ford, B.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, give us always the spirit of humility, both in our prayers, and in our lives.

Grant that no one be captured by his sense of position or place, but that each person be aware of dependence upon Your power and providence and upon the need for forgiveness.

Give us renewed understanding that through service to others will come true fulfillment in life. Grant us respect for all people, whatever station or position, that we may truly serve You each day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Chirton, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on January 22, 1979, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 1. Joint resolution to extend the time for filing the Economic Report.

MODIFICATION OF EXECUTIVE AND CONGRESSIONAL TERMS OF OFFICE

(Mr. SCHULZE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a very important piece of legislation which would amend the Constitution of the United States. Passage of this resolution would result in five significant changes. These changes would: First, limit the number of consecutive terms Representatives may serve; second, provide for 3-year terms for Representatives to the Congress; third, limit

to three 6-year terms for Members of the Senate; fourth, establish a single 6-year term for the Presidency; and fifth, provide an age limit for elected officials.

While the Constitution as it was originally written did not specify a maximum length of service for Members of Congress or the President, there is a definite need to insure that all Americans are represented equally and fairly in our Republic.

Many Pennsylvanians have expressed to me the feeling that those elected to participate in the Federal Government have lost touch with their constituencies. They believe Members of this institution no longer view themselves as citizens temporarily on leave to the Government but as permanent legislators living in the city of Washington.

I must say, however, that I do not take lightly any attempt to amend our Constitution. I do feel, however, that we must establish constitutional limits on both number of terms and the age of our elected officials.

My resolution amends the Constitution to provide that no elected official can serve indefinitely and that within a specified time frame every elected person will again become a private citizen regardless of his or her political skills. This would continue the process initiated with the 22d amendment to the Constitution which limited the President's tenure in office. This amendment was widely received and was based on the premise that a term limitation would allow a President to concentrate less on the politics of being reelected and more on important questions of national policy.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and to initiate some meaningful public debate on the role of elected officials and their relationship to the American people.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1105

U.S. CREDIBILITY RESTS ON ACTION TO HONOR DEFENSE COMMITMENTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

(Mr. RUDD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a 5-day visit to the Republic of China, where I participated with elected representatives from many other nations in commemorating the 25th anniversary of "World Freedom Day."

While the administration is this week celebrating the new relationship with Communist China, I must report to my colleagues that I encountered unanimous strong resentment—and even hostility toward the United States—from our elected counterparts throughout the free world.

The President's egregiously wrong precipitous unilateral abrogation of our treaty with the Republic of China has destroyed our credibility with every nation.

It has made the United States a tool of Chinese and international communism's intended march to enslaving the nations of the world.

If Taiwan falls, you will once again see the slaughter of every responsible free Chinese citizen.

Is this the human rights doctrine the President projects?

World Freedom Day was a solemn but joyous anniversary—a time for remembering that 25 years ago this month more than 14,000 Communist Chinese soldiers fighting with the North Korean armies, who had been taken prisoner of war in South Korea, chose freedom on Taiwan and refused to return to the Communist slave camp of mainland China.

During my visit, I was able to meet and talk with many Republic of China officials, including Premier Sun Yun-suan, Minister of Foreign Affairs Tsiang Yen-si, Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs Frederick F. Chien, Vice Minister of Defense Gen. Cheng Wei-yuan, Marine Corps Deputy Commandant Lt. Gen. Tu, and others.

I also met and talked with a number of prominent elected representatives from national assemblies and Parliaments of Australia, Japan, New Zealand, France, Canada, the Netherlands, India, Brazil, Portugal, the Philippines, South

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House Proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

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