

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## THE NEED FOR COAL HAUL ROADS

## HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation to provide \$200 million over the next 4 years to repair highways damaged by heavy energy traffic, particularly by the increase in heavy coal truck traffic.

Every report and recommendation on energy has concluded we face a serious problem—particularly in the Northeast—with damage to roads by coal trucks as we increase coal production. Most recently, the report of the National Transportation Policy Study Commission stated:

Local roads and other highways not designed for heavy coal traffic create road safety problems in the form of deterioration of roads and hazardous driving and passing conditions. Funds appear inadequate to correct this problem.

This is another case in energy planning where the lead must come from the Federal Government. To leave this to the States, or to urge them simply to use other highway funds for this purpose is a nice theory, but it is a theory that if adopted will mean that the problem simply never is solved.

The House of Representatives is already on record as wanting to solve this problem. Last year in the surface transportation legislation, through the leadership of Congressmen APPELATE and RAHALL and the subcommittee work of Chairman HOWARD and Minority Chairman SHUSTER, this amendment was adopted in the bill. Chairman JOHNSON backed the amendment and it was part of the bill approved by the House. Unfortunately, the Senate did not agree in the amendment. During the Conference Committee, the Transportation Department requested that the amendment be dropped from the bill so the Department could formulate its own recommendation. That recommendation was promised to us in January. Then, it was promised by June. Today, we are still without any recommendation and the latest report I have received is that an administration position is still being negotiated by the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Energy.

There has been considerable discussion that the final administration recommendation will be for a special severance tax on coal production to finance that work. While I personally oppose that as a solution, I would be pleased to see that or any recommendation made by the administration so the debate can begin again on this issue, and we can resolve a way to insure we have the transportation road system to move the coal our Nation needs.

President Carter has committed his administration and the Nation to increased coal use. That is a position I have supported for 5 years. To make that commitment a reality, there are a number of steps that must be taken, and insuring the proper transportation system is one of them. It is essential that we begin to move on improving energy impacted roads. It is a crucial step in our overall energy plan, and I am pleased to introduce this bill today to develop that debate further.●

## FEDERAL PROTECTION FOR U.S. PROBATION OFFICERS

## HON. ED JENKINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, it may surprise my colleagues to learn that U.S. probation officers and U.S. pretrial service officers are not afforded the protection of Federal law if victims of the serious crimes of murder and manslaughter. While 18 U.S.C. section 114 provides a Federal offense in the instance of murder or manslaughter of U.S. attorneys and their assistants, judges of the Federal judicial system, U.S. marshals and deputy marshals, and U.S. law enforcement officials including officers and employees in Federal penal or correctional institutions, the U.S. probation officer has been overlooked.

To remedy this oversight in our Federal Criminal Code I have introduced a bill, H.R. 4829, which would include the murder or manslaughter of a U.S. probation officer or pretrial service officer as a Federal criminal offense. This amendment would enable the U.S. attorney to prosecute the offender.

Under existing law the murder of a U.S. probation officer may go unsolved or even unprosecuted because the U.S. attorney has no offense for which to prosecute. State attorneys may hesitate to commit the resources of the State to prosecution where they believe that it should be a Federal matter.

It is estimated that U.S. probation officers are involved in a sizable number of hazardous incidents every year. The probation officer works under conditions of hazard equal to or exceeding those officials currently covered under title 18.

The shooting of two U.S. probation officers in their performance of their official duties—one in Memphis in May, 1973 and the other in the District of Columbia in June, 1974—demonstrate the need for this legislation. Last December a probation officer in Laredo, Tex., was killed from ambush as he approached the Federal building. I believe that the U.S. Government should prosecute these crimes and should be empowered to do so.

In conclusion I would point out for the RECORD that the U.S. Judicial Conference adopted at its meeting in March of this year a resolution that the U.S. probation officer receive this statutory protection.

I would urge my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee to include this provision in their revision of the U.S. Criminal Code.●

## HOME HEATING OIL AND FUEL OIL

## HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, 1979, I introduced legislation to reimpose price and allocation controls on home heating oil and diesel fuel.

In my own State of Pennsylvania and throughout the country, the price of home heating oil may well double by next winter. Simple social equity and economic justice require that we restore price and allocation controls if we are to avoid the problems caused by the increases in price and by potential severe shortages.

Because I believe this matter is of significant importance I have written to the distinguished chairman of our Democratic Caucus, the Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY, asking that the matter be placed on the agenda of the Democratic Caucus which is to occur on September 19, 1979.

Below are my "Dear Colleague" on the legislation and the letter to Chairman FOLEY.

I urge Members to consider this significant matter during the upcoming recess and to talk with their constituents about it and to be prepared to consider the resolution in the caucus and hopefully the bill in the House upon our return.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C. July 23, 1979.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Last Tuesday I introduced legislation to reimpose price and allocation controls on home heating oil and fuel oil. Although several of our colleagues have introduced resolutions or drafted letters to the President urging him to use his authority under existing law to reimpose controls, my bill would have the force of law.

The dramatic rise in home heating oil prices over the past year has been widely documented and many agree that home heating oil prices could reach \$1 per gallon by this winter.

In examining this situation, keep in mind these facts:

From April '78 to April '79 crude oil and product costs to refiners rose by 22 percent, reflecting OPEC price increases and purchases on the spot market. But during the same period, refiner profits rose by almost 90 percent, and this does not account for profit taking further down the distribution chain.

Despite the prospect of a 100 percent in-

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

crease in the price of home heating oil to consumers, the elimination of marginal customers, widespread shortages, and regional dislocations, DOE has only now just begun to evaluate its options with respect to crisis intervention and assistance to the poor and the elderly.

Deputy Secretary of Energy John O'Leary stated on June 25 that "price and allocation controls can be effective as a last resort during a severe shortage to prevent price gouging or inequitable distribution of supply." And Senator Russell Long has said, "... Unless we can come up with something better, the reimposition of controls will be necessary to avoid critical shortages and skyrocketing heating oil prices this winter."

Competition and market forces alone are totally inadequate to protect consumers from both shortages and inequitable prices. The Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act provides that the President may reimpose controls for, among other things, the "protection of public health, safety, and welfare," and the "equitable distribution of refined petroleum products at equitable prices among all regions and areas of the United States..." Please support this urgent task. If you would like to co-sponsor or if you have any further questions, please call me or Herb Sambol at x54276.

Thank you.  
Sincerely,

PETE.●

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., July 31, 1979.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,  
Chairman,  
Democratic Caucus,  
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR TOM: Pursuant to our earlier conversation, I am requesting that it be in order for the House Democratic Caucus to consider the following resolution at the September 19, 1979 meeting of the Caucus:

"Resolved, that it shall be the Democratic policy in the House of Representatives that mandatory price and allocation controls for middle distillates as established in the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act be reimposed."

Thanks for your attention to this matter.  
Sincerely,

PETE.

#### CLARIFICATION OF STATE ENERGY CONSERVATION PLANS

### HON. THOMAS A. LUKEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise as the House finalizes the 1979 energy legislation to again clarify the intent of section 635C(B) part 3, subpart C S-1030, "Approval of State Plan."

Similar language, "(B) that, taken as a whole, the plan is likely to impose an unreasonably disproportionate share of the burden of restrictions of energy use on any specific class of industry, business, or commercial enterprise, or any individual segment thereof," has been carefully placed in earlier energy legislation. My colleagues in both Houses have taken the same efforts I undertake today to make sure as the State plans to conserve energy are formulated that those local officials take notice of this section.

Mr. Speaker, it is most important that as energy conservation plans are drawn and implemented, efforts must be taken to avoid hardships on small businessmen such as those engaged in recreational business, roadside business, outdoor advertising, and general aviation.

If severe shortages should develop, then all segments of business should contribute to energy conservation in an equitable manner.●

#### HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE SOVIET UNION

### HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for publication into the RECORD copies of letters I have recently mailed to Soviet Secretary Leonid Brezhnev and Interior Minister Nikolai Shchelokov on behalf of a Soviet prisoner of conscience and a "refusenik" family. The plight of these individuals was called to my attention during my participation in "Intervention 96," a project sponsored by the National Council on Soviet Jewry. Labeled "the new adopting the old," seven freshmen Members each spoke on the House floor on behalf of Russian Jewish dissidents who were at that time incarcerated in Soviet jails.

Mr. Speaker, both the "refuseniks" and the prisoners of conscience have been subjected to a kind of terror few here in the United States can imagine. In the case of the Hess family, for daring to express his desire to leave Russia and resettle in Israel, Grigori Hess has spent 1 year in prison, has lost his job, and his family has been subjected to anti-Semitic reprisals that have intensified to a frightening level, particularly in the Minsk area where the Hesses now live. The safety of him and his family is in constant jeopardy.

Mr. Mendelevich was imprisoned after the notorious Leningrad trials; although all but two others arrested at the same time and for the same offense have been released, this man remains incarcerated, most likely for his insistence on faithfully observing the practices of his Jewish faith.

I am pleased to submit these letters for my colleagues' inspection. The letter on behalf of Grigori Hess was signed by 41 other Members who not only share my concern for him and others like him, but who also recognize the unique advantage our membership in the House of Representatives affords us to shape the course of human rights development in Soviet Russia. Using our position as a forum, we are advising the Soviet leadership that we consider them to be long past due in honoring internationally recognized human rights for their citizens, regardless of nationality or religion, and that we will continue to advise them until such time as their record no longer warrants it.●

#### CHRYSLER CORP. LOSSES

### HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the Chrysler Corp. announced yesterday that for the second quarter of 1979 it lost \$207.1 million. This represents one of the largest quarterly losses ever for an American business.

Since Chrysler's losses are in part caused by Federal regulations, I am inserting in the RECORD a statement released by John Riccardo, chairman of the board for Chrysler Corp., explaining the effects of these regulations. I am also inserting a consolidated statement of net earnings for Chrysler Corp., and Consolidated Subsidiaries.

It is possible that the Federal Government will be asked to assist Chrysler Corp. in the near future. I hope my colleagues will consider the comments of Mr. Riccardo and work toward easing the effects of Government regulations on all private sectors of our economy.

STATEMENT BY JOHN RICCARDO, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, CHRYSLER CORP., AT PRESS CONFERENCE, DETROIT, MICH., JULY 31, 1979

Before we open this conference up to questions, I'd like to make a brief statement about the losses we have just announced, and some of the causes for the current condition of Chrysler Corporation.

Our second quarter losses were not a great surprise to anyone who has been paying attention to recent events in the automobile industry. The recent hysteria about gasoline availability, and the sharp drop in van and truck sales, has left us with a heavy inventory of unsold cars and trucks. That's a short-term problem we are going to have to work out of. And we have some sales programs coming that should help to do the job.

But in addition, for a long time now we have been pointing out the effects that the heavy burden of regulation would have on Chrysler Corporation. And those effects are now beginning to show in a very real way as well.

It's now generally accepted by everyone who has studied the situation that government regulations have hit Chrysler a lot harder than they've hit the bigger manufacturers.

But even the best-supported facts don't always get the kind of attention they deserve. So we've decided to illustrate the anti-competitive effect of regulations another way—visually.

This bar chart shows the disproportionate effect auto regulations have on Chrysler, compared to GM—even though the regulations are theoretically imposed in an even-handed manner. The height of each bar represents total production volume, or the number of units each company produced in 1978. As you can see, Chrysler produces less than one-quarter as many as GM.

The bottom of each bar shows the per-unit cost of regulations for each company. These are estimated costs based on published material which was available in 1977 and are quite frankly very conservative. The illustrations are based on the recent Wainwright study of the relative impact of government regulations on the U.S. auto industry. Wainwright estimated the yearly fixed expenditures by GM and Chrysler for meeting government regulations between 1978 through 1985, and we calculated the cost per

unit using 1978 production figures for both companies. The point is, the cost per unit of meeting government regulations is twice as much for Chrysler as for GM. That's because GM produces a lot more cars than Chrysler to begin with, so they can spread their costs over a greater number of units.

I urge you to read the Wainwright report. If you would like further verification of the findings in that report, I suggest you read a copy of the Harbridge House study commissioned by the DOT. There are other studies as well, all pointing out the same effects of regulation.

The message is clear. Auto regulations are having a double-whammy effect on Chrysler's per-unit costs—and by virtue of our size, we're the company that is least able to afford the skyrocketing costs of regulations to begin with.

Over the past couple of years, we have pointed out that Chrysler was going to experience a very difficult period in the short term because of the massive expenditures required to meet Federal regulations for air bags, final emissions controls, and 2 m.p.g. fuel economy increments—all of which fall into place in the early 1980's. We made a special effort to point out the coming problems so there would be no surprise for anyone. We understood the dimensions of the

job required to meet the law and return Chrysler to a position of strength and profitability. And we were willing to take whatever actions were necessary to do the job.

The list of the steps we have taken in the past year or two is very impressive.

We have restructured all of our overseas investments so we could concentrate our resources on the North American market.

We have put in place a large share of the record financing we need to carry out our programs, through a series of ingenious and sometimes highly unusual financing arrangements.

Lee has brought on board some new, outstanding people who are doing a good job. Our new product programs are now on time, and they will stay on time. Our product quality is tremendously improved, and is the best we've had in years.

We have moved to restructure Chrysler so it will be as lean and effective as possible. We have taken over \$500 million in cost out of the company in the past year without sacrificing our long term goals. In other words, we have taken all the steps that could be taken to make our own way, and to pay the cost of government regulations.

But then just as we are finally on track with all the programs we can control, we're hit with two events over which we have ab-

solutely no control. First, we manage to develop a gasoline hysteria that's unique to the United States and that hurts the markets where we're strongest. There are no gas lines in Japan or Europe. And on top of that—we now are in a recession that makes all our problems worse.

You couldn't write a tougher scenario for the third largest auto company.

We're in a tough period, but we intend to make it. We've got the products and the people to do the job, and with a little time and patience, and a lot of money, we have the programs to bring us back to profitability.

#### REGULATIONS COST CHRYSLER NEARLY TWICE AS MUCH PER CAR AS THEY COST GENERAL MOTORS

	Total units	Estimated cost of regulation per car
General Motors.....	5,000,000	\$340
Chrysler.....	1,000,000	620

Source: Cost figures based on estimates from "The Impact of Government Regulations on Competition in the U.S. Automobile Industry," H. C. Wainwright & Co., Mar. 23, 1978. Production figures taken from MVMA "Motor Vehicle Facts & Figures," 1978.

#### CHRYSLER CORP. AND CONSOLIDATED SUBSIDIARIES—CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT OF NET EARNINGS, 6 MO ENDED JUNE 30, 1979, AND 1978

(Dollar amounts in millions)

	2d quarter		6 mo			2d quarter		6 mo	
	1979	1978 <sup>1</sup>	1979	1978		1979	1978 <sup>1</sup>	1979	1978 <sup>1</sup>
Net sales.....	\$3,154.6	\$3,754.1	\$6,456.2	\$6,733.5	Earnings (loss) before taxes on income.....	(\$214.5)	\$30.6	(\$273.5)	(\$130.7)
Equity in net earnings of unconsolidated subsidiaries.....	7.6	4.8	18.2	.5	Taxes on income (credit).....	(7.4)	.1	(12.6)	(41.4)
Net earnings from European and certain South American operations.....		10.5		26.0	Net earnings (loss).....	(207.1)	30.5	(260.9)	(89.3)
Total.....	3,162.2	3,769.4	6,474.4	6,760.0	Dividends on preferred shares (includes amortization of discount).....	7.2		14.5	
Costs, other than items below.....	3,030.7	3,389.3	6,050.5	6,220.1	Net earnings (loss) attributable to common stock.....	(214.3)	30.5	(275.4)	(89.3)
Depreciation of plant and equipment.....	41.1	39.4	84.4	79.2	Earnings (loss) per share of common stock (dollars).....	(3.31)	0.51	(4.26)	(1.47)
Amortization of special tools.....	50.6	53.5	101.2	106.2	Average number of shares of common stock outstanding during the period (in thousands).....	65,215	61,204	64,649	60,784
Selling and administrative expenses.....	136.4	152.0	278.3	282.1					
Pension plans.....	67.9	75.1	137.8	145.5					
Interest expense—net.....	50.0	29.5	95.7	57.6					
Total.....	3,376.7	3,738.8	6,747.9	6,890.7					

<sup>1</sup> Restated to reflect deconsolidation of European and South American operations.

Note: In 1979, the abnormally low tax credit is attributable primarily to the effect of losses for

which no carryback credits are available. In 1978, the tax credit was lower than would be indicated by the customary relationship of pretax losses and income taxes principally because of the impact of the investment tax credit. ●

#### GET CRACKING CONGRESS

### HON. CECIL (CEC) HEFTEL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. HEFTEL. Mr. Speaker, for all the recent oration about our "national malaise" and the "crisis of confidence" we have heard in the last few weeks, I am certain my colleagues concur in my belief that no more eloquent voice exists than that of the people directly. Despite the proficiency of self-styled experts and opinion makers here in Washington, it is from the letters of my constituents that I receive the most clear-cut, non-nonsense advice on the issues.

A case in point: Mr. Bert Fraleigh of Hawaii was recently kind enough to alert me to a letter in the July 26, 1979 Honolulu Advertiser from Mr. Walt Jones. I commend Mr. Jones' expression of frustration concerning this Congress to the attention of each of the Members:

#### GET CRACKING, CONGRESS

I am certain that the rest of the tax-paying, voting public was as relieved as I to read that our U.S. House of Representatives put aside trivial matters—such as energy, inflation and the nation's distrust of government—in order to debate and vote on the tremendously important principle of whether or not those dignified public officials (I wish I could say "servants," but I can't bring myself to it) can work in those hallowed chambers without a coat.

Isn't it about time that our Congress takes off its collective coat and rolls up its collective sleeves and gets down to solving some of our country's problems—many of which seem to have originated in their own little corner of the world? They have already proved to the country that they can't function in coats and ties.

Wouldn't it be wonderful if Washington were swamped with letters from millions of Americans telling them to forget ending this session until they can relieve the minds of their constituents that they have indeed put into motion positive solutions to many of our troubles? Something subtle like, Dear Congressman/Senator: Get cracking or don't come home!"—WALT JONES. ●

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the House of Representatives on Thursday, July 26, and Friday, July 27, 1979. Had I been present, I would have voted: "No" on rollcall No. 390, an amendment to H.R. 3000, DOE civilian programs authorizations, seeking to strike the authorization for the Clinch River breeder reactor; "no" on rollcall No. 392, an amendment to H.R. 2462, Maritime authorizations, seeking to reduce the construction-differential subsidies authorized under the measure; "aye" on rollcall No. 393, an amendment to H.R. 2462 seeking to prohibit the use of funds authorized for construction-differential subsidies to construct any vessel which will have

subsidized manning levels 50 percent above the minimum determined by the Coast Guard to be necessary for the safe operation of the vessels; "no" on roll-call No. 395, an amendment to H.R. 3633, making certain amendments to title VIII of the Public Services Health Act, seeking to reduce authorizations for special project grants and for nurse practitioner training; and "aye" on roll-call No. 396, final passage of H.R. 3633.●

**KEELER MCCARTNEY OF ATLANTA  
CONSTITUTION RETIRING**

**HON. BO GINN**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, I know we all recognize that American journalists play a dynamic role in protecting the freedom of all of our citizens. By informing us of the news of our communities, our States, and our Nation, they provide Americans with the essential flow of information that is the foundation of our democracy.

The work of our news reporters is most closely linked to our citizens at the local level, and I would like to take this opportunity to recognize one of our Nation's most distinguished local news reporters, Mr. Keeler McCartney of the Atlanta Constitution. Mr. McCartney is retiring after some 37 years in journalism, and I believe the following column by Ms. Celestine Sibley, which appeared in the July 26 edition of the Atlanta Constitution, provides a valuable insight into the life of one of America's truly outstanding citizens. I ask that this column be reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

**99 PERCENT COP, REPORTER GETS FOND  
SO-LONG**

(By Celestine Sibley)

One day about a week ago some of his pals in law enforcement invited Constitution reporter Keeler McCartney to have lunch with them. He was busy and usually eschews lunch time sociability but Sara Passmore, who does public relations for the State Department of Offender Rehabilitation, used to sing in the church choir with his only daughter, Tona, and he has a soft spot in his heart for her.

So Sara and Bill Wilson, public information officer for the State Patrol and a long-time friend, picked Keeler up in front of the building. They thought, they explained to him, of having lunch at the police academy. Keeler was amenable. The food there is good, he said. What he hadn't counted on was a party there—the first police academy soiree he has ever attended and it was in his honor. Keeler, one of the most celebrated police reporters in the country, is retiring today.

**NOTHING HE COULD DO**

He is appalled and uncooperative about attentions of this kind but there wasn't a thing he could do about the State Patrol, the Georgia Bureau of Investigation, or the Peace Officers Association. Their members came in from all parts of the state to do honor to a man they have valued and respected for more than 35 years. And grinning sheepishly, Keeler accepted their tributes with the same equanimity with which he has accepted their jibes and cries of outrage all the times in the past when he has offended them.

There was a plaque from the State Patrol which he admitted, he reread when he got

home. It said "Keeler McCartney 99 percent cop, 100 percent reporter, 200 percent human being." And after all these years he now has his own badge from the GBI bearing his name and the legend: "Our favorite reporter until July 1979 and always our friend."

The wonder is that Keeler McCartney, the last of the old-time police reporters, never intended to cover police and never really liked it. The youngest of 11 children growing up on a Louisiana farm, he intended to study medicine. But when he arrived at Emory University he realized he didn't have enough money. He went back to LSU and turned his attention to his second love, journalism. He arrived to work at The Constitution in 1942 and ran afoul of nasty coincidence. Time Magazine had just run a piece saying The Constitution had a woman on the city desk (me) and a copy boy on the police beat.

"Mr. McGill read it and didn't like it," Keeler recalls. "He came out in the newsroom and saw me and said, 'You go to the police station tonight. We'll hire a police reporter Monday.'"

**TO THE "COP SHOP"**

Keeler had to ask directions to the old Decatur street "cop shop" and when he got there the police, ever wary of a new boy in the press room, wouldn't have anything to do with him. Disgusted and disconsolate, he wandered out into the street walking as far as Peters Street where he ran into a big gun battle involving the police. Somehow the reporters back in the press room at police headquarters never got word of it. The Constitution scored a clean beat and the next day publisher, Major Clark Howell, said happily, "I've got me a police reporter now!"

A non-drinker and a devoted churchman, Keeler never fraternized socially with cops or robbers and somehow won the confidence of both. To the trade cliché that old police reporters come to think like old policemen, Keeler has one answer. His stories exposing their misbehavior have put more policemen in jail than his stories doing the same for crooks. But he has never had much patience with editorial mentality which doesn't attempt to understand the problems police face daily.●

**DEFENSE PRESS CORPS RATES OUR  
14 SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE—  
MEL LAIRD RATED NO. 1**

**HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an article in the August 1979 issue of the Armed Forces Journal reports on a poll of Defense Department Press Corps on the effectiveness of our 14 Secretaries of Defense. The article covering this poll was written by Benjamin F. Schemmer and Robin J. Stein. The poll shows that our former colleague, Mel Laird, who served nine terms in the House of Representatives as clearly the most effective Secretary in the history of the Department. Mel served as Secretary of Defense from 1969 to 1973. His training here in the House as a ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Committee for many years speaks well for Mel and for the Congress.

**THE REPORTERS WHO BRING YOU THE DEFENSE  
NEWS—AND HOW THEY RATE THE MEN  
WHO MAKE IT**

Founding the beat in search of a front page headline or opening spot on prime time

TV news are the 37 men and one woman who comprise the Pentagon press corps. An average of 49 years old, the reporters who cover DoD regularly represent 14 daily newspapers, eight magazines and 13 news services. All three major television networks and one radio network have correspondents assigned to the Pentagon.

The 38 journalists have career and educational backgrounds as varied as the media they work for.

Roughly half of them have had military service, averaging about two years each, experience that undoubtedly gives them an edge deciphering acronym-loaded DoD memorandums. The number who served in commissioned and enlisted ranks is split about evenly. Six of the reporters have published books whose subjects range from press censorship to reminiscences about former presidents.

The nucleus of the Pentagon press corps consists of the 15 or so regulars who show up on Tuesdays and Thursdays for DoD spokesman Tom Ross' 11:30 a.m. on-the-record briefing sessions. Dubbed "the follies" by its frequenters, the half hour briefings usually consist of Ross' answering reporters' questions or promising to "get back to you on that one."

*The secretaries*

		Rating
Forrestal	47-49	7
Johnson	49-50	1
Marshall	50-51	6
Lovett	51-53	6
Wilson	53-57	3
McElroy	57-59	3
Gates	59-61	4
McNamara	61-68	-3
Clifford	68-69	-2
Laird	69-73	46
Richardson	73-73	0
Schlesinger	73-75	30
Rumsfeld	75-77	-8
Brown	77-Present	24

How do these professional Pentagon watchers, several of whom have been on the beat long enough to see six or seven Defense Secretaries come and go, rate the men who have followed James Forrestal's footsteps? What do they think of their spokesmen, the assistant secretaries of defense for public affairs?

AFJ asked the reporters to rate the last 14 Secretaries and their spokesmen, noting which one (or ones) they considered to be the MOST (and LEAST) Competent, Candid, Honest, Likeable, Effective, Forthcoming, Trustworthy, and Strong. The majority of reporters answered the survey (AFJ refrained from voting in its own poll); many added comments with their own characterization of the Presidential appointees who run or have run the US national security establishment.

Harold Brown's appointment as Secretary of Defense has been widely lauded by many commentators as one of Jimmy Carter's better Cabinet choices, and by some as his best. The Pentagon press corps seems to concur with that opinion. Those responding to AFJ's anonymous survey give Brown high marks for competence, candor and honesty.

Overall, however, Brown was rated only third best of the 14 men who have served as Defense Secretaries.

The Secretary with the highest rating from the press was Richard Nixon's Melvin Laird. Laird was endorsed as the most effective (by a nine to one margin over Brown), likeable (by a factor of three over Brown), trustworthy (roughly two to one over Brown), strong (by a factor of five), and forthcoming (seven times more so than Brown). Laird, it also turns out, was the only

SecDef who won nothing but positive comments.

Behind Laird in the poll was another Nixon appointee, but one of Carter's least popular—current Energy Secretary James Schlesinger. While Schlesinger got less than a third of Brown's votes for competence as SecDef, the press named him by far the most candid of the recent Secretaries and also rated him highly for being strong, forthcoming, and trustworthy. He was also found to be twice as likeable as Brown.

In total voting, Laird received 46 positive votes, Schlesinger a net of +30, and Brown a net of +24.

The three worst Defense Secretaries, according to the reporters, were Robert McNamara, Clark Clifford and Donald Rumsfeld. McNamara was seen as a weak leader and called "experimental and dangerous." Clifford was characterized by one reporter as "a tool of LBJ" and found to be "suffering from tunnel vision" by another. Rumsfeld, Brown's predecessor, got good marks for being candid and likeable. He was rated twice as high as Brown on both of those qualities—but got only negative votes on every other attribute. Elliott Richardson, who served for five months during Nixon's 1973 Cabinet shake-up, was called "aloof" and "a mistake." In fact, Richardson was the only Secretary to get as many negative votes as positive ones. Overall, Rumsfeld led the negative voting with a net score of -8, subtracting such votes as "Least" competent, for instance, from his positive votes as "Most" likeable and candid.

McNamara and Clifford were next, with -3 and -2, respectively.

Opinions were far from unanimous, but they were strong when expressed. One correspondent summoned up thusly:

"While Laird was open, he was not effective. While Schlesinger was effective, he was arrogant. While Rumsfeld was a simple yes-man, Brown is a bigger yes-man and even more arrogant than Schlesinger."

The incumbent Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, Tom Ross is, by far, the press' favorite of recent Pentagon spokesmen. Ross was picked as the most honest, likeable, forthcoming, competent, candid, trustworthy, and strong.

#### Their spokesmen

	Rating	
Seaton	53-55	3
R. Ross	55-57	0
Snyder	57-61	-7
Sylvester	61-67	5
Goulding	67-69	-8
Henkin	69-73	16
Friedheim	73-74	21
Beecher	74-75	24
Laitin	75-75	14
Greener	75-76	15
Woods	76-77	-7
Tom Ross	77-Present	46

On the other hand, William Greener, Rumsfeld's spokesman, was rated as the most effective spokesman—even though his boss was voted the least effective SecDef. Ross was named "the best" by one reporter who added that "Republican spokesmen have been worthless." Running second to Ross was one of the five spokesmen who served during the Nixon era, William Beecher, like Ross, left journalism to take the public affairs post. (Beecher is now back on the other side of the podium as a reporter for the *Boston Globe*, and his profile appears below.)

In sum, Ross received a landslide of positive votes—46-50% more than his boss. Ross was followed by Beecher with 24. Coming in third with 21 was Jerry Friedheim, whom one reporter called "as honest as the institution

allows." Former AFJ editor Dan Henkin ranked next, with 18 positive votes and no negative ones.

Sixty-four percent of all the comments about Phillip Goulding, Assistant Secretary from 1967 to 1969 under Secretaries McNamara and Clifford, were negative. Tied for second place as the worst Pentagon spokesmen were Murray Snyder and Alan Woods as incompetent and untrustworthy. Arthur Sylvester, spokesman for Robert McNamara (a man who liked to speak his own piece), was the next least popular; it's a tribute to the man, since he held the hot seat for six years, almost twice as long as any other.

Caution: This survey may be somewhat askew statistically because many of the correspondents polled had no experience with early defense secretaries and their spokesmen. However, AFJ believes it's a credible montage of the men who've been running our defense establishment since 1947 and of their spokesmen, painted by professionals whose job it is to interpret their stewardships for the American public.

Two Pentagon regulars, ABC-TV's William Wordham and free-lancer Hugh Lucas, did not answer AFJ's questionnaire and therefore could not be included in the profiles that follow on the next page.●

#### SOVIET "PRISONER OF CONSCIENCE" LEV BLITSSTEIN

#### HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, "Alone in Moscow," that is the fate of long-time refusenik Lev Blitshtein, who ought to be celebrating his 25th wedding anniversary on August 8 with his beloved wife Buma in the secure circle of his family that includes a son and a daughter, both married this past year, and an expected grandchild.

But it has been nearly 4 years since Blitshtein last saw his wife when she and their son Boris were finally given permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union in 1975. Their daughter Galina followed 6 months later, and today the family is settled on Long Island, N.Y.

Forbidden by the Soviet OVIR authorities to emigrate because he knows "too much about the time of storage of canned meats" and "how to make sausage without meat," Blitshtein endured the humility of a divorce unwanted by both partners in a brave effort to allow his family to seek refuge and freedom without him.

Stripped of his position as chief administrator in the Ministry of Meat and Dairy and without meaningful work, Blitshtein, age 49, waits and suffers silently as he longs to overcome his government's forced separation of husband and wife, parent and child.

So it is we who must speak for him. We must tell the world repeatedly that the Soviet Union is clearly in violation of the Helsinki accords of 1975 which affirm the right of reunification of families. We must ask the Soviet Government to restore to its citizens the basic human rights that are guaranteed in its constitution. Now more than ever it is crucial for that nation to show its willingness to live up to its commitments.

Perhaps, with my colleagues' support, Lev Blitshtein may rejoin his family in America as well as symbolize a new faith in United States-Soviet relations built on mutual trust, honor, and belief in the decency and dignity of man.●

#### TESTIMONY OF HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT ON CRUDE OIL WINDFALL PROFITS TAX ACT OF 1979, H.R. 3919, BEFORE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE ON JULY 19, 1979

#### HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, as we begin our August district work period, most of us will be faced with the unpleasant task of explaining our Nation's energy policy. The questions will range from: "Do we have an energy policy?" to "Why are the major oil companies reporting higher profits when consumers are suffering on long lines at service stations?" Irate constituents will tell us: "If the oil industry's profits are so large today, then surely they will skyrocket when price controls are lifted."

We face a major educational task this August. For the sake of our Nation's energy future we must convince our constituents (as well as those who are writing about the energy situation for the news dailies and weekly magazines in our districts) that: First, decontrol will not mean higher prices at the gas pump—quirks in the DOE's cost recovery formulas have already enabled refiners to charge world prices to their service station customers for years; second, oil industry profits are not excessive when compared to other industries, indeed their efficiency in earning profits as measured by "return on total invested capital" is below the national average; and third, higher profits do not necessarily mean higher prices, in fact they can mean lower prices if they are the result of technological advances which have lowered production costs.

The questions I will counterpose to my constituents are: "If big oil's profits are so large then why is not Congress considering a tax on profits? Why is the House passed version of the President's tax proposal a tax on revenues, but not a tax on actual profits?" The answer is abundantly clear to both questions: "The Congress is greedy for revenues—from any source. Big Government strikes again."

In my testimony before the Senate Finance Committee on July 19, I raised these points and even went as far as recommending a less pernicious tax that could be applied to both OPEC oil as well as domestic oil. We do not need new taxes on oil production. But the administration and the free spending Congress thinks that we do. I can already hear the pork barrels rumbling down the hill. The least Congress can do is pass a tax that is not destructive of American oil production. As I pointed out in my testimony,

Since the House-passed tax bill will not be applied to the sale of imported oil, domestic oil producers will continue their flight from the lower forty-eight states.

They will produce and market less expensive oil from outside the continental United States. In short, the President's proposal as amended and passed by the House will, without a doubt, result in the flight of American investment capital to foreign shores and the American economy will continue to rely heavily on foreign crude oil production.

I offer my colleagues my Senate Finance Committee testimony, which includes a summary of my statement before the House just prior to the vote on the so-called windfall profits tax. The summary is entitled "Burning the 'Oil Witch'." I believe that both offer a dimension on analysis that will assist in shaping a new energy policy predicated on sound economic grounds, and not on the shifting sands of political faddism.

My testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you to express my views on H.R. 3919—the Crude Oil Windfall Profits Tax Act of 1979.

It is a misnomer to call the House-passed measure a tax on windfall profits. By definition, a tax on profits is a tax on money left over after all business expenses have been paid. The bill under consideration levies a tax on revenues which are received before business expenses have been calculated. The assumption underlying the tax is that there will be a huge increase in oil company revenues when price controls are lifted. The belief is that revenues will skyrocket and somehow oil producers will reap huge profits.

In actuality, integrated producer-refiners are already receiving roughly 90 percent of the world price for price controlled oil they bring to the market. The catch is that to get world prices for this oil, producer-refiners must produce less domestic oil while importing more foreign oil—an unusual profit maximizing production constraint to be sure.

Like a baker mixing a precise amount of sugar with a precise amount of flour, milk, butter, and eggs to bake a cake, integrated oil companies have been mixing roughly one part price controlled oil with about 4 parts imported or uncontrolled oil to receive world market prices for their oil despite price controls at the well-head. When price controls are lifted the prices integrated producer-refiners receive will rise only about \$2.00 per barrel because they have found a way to partially circumvent price controls.

This surprising result is a byproduct of the DOE's entitlement system which subsidizes refiners to import oil. The system works roughly this way: Refiner A, a distiller of low priced domestic oil literally writes out a check to refiner B, a distiller of foreign oil. In exchange refiner B sends to refiner A a ticket stub permitting A to distill domestically produced controlled oil. These tickets are distributed by DOE each month to all refiners based on the volume of price controlled and uncontrolled they distilled the prior month.

The purpose of the entitlements system is to equalize any competitive imbalance that might arise because of unequal access to price controlled oil. The buying and selling of entitlement tickets results in a situation in which all refiners pay the same average price for a barrel of crude oil notwithstanding whether the oil originates from a price

control well, or from a domestic uncontrolled source. Naturally, producer-refiners are importing oil to get entitlement tickets which they can sell to themselves instead of purchasing these tickets from non-affiliated refiners. The less the producer-refiner pays out to other refiners for the right to refine his own oil, the closer he comes to receiving the world price for that oil. What the producing division loses under controls, the refining division almost makes up through the entitlement system.

Independent producers are not so lucky. Because they are not integrated through the refinery stage of production, any lower tier oil they sell now is priced at roughly \$6.00 per barrel. Independents are not able to recoup more of the market value of their lower tier oil by tinkering with the entitlements system. They are suffering disproportionately more under price controls than are integrated companies. When controls are finally lifted the incremental increase in revenues they will receive per barrel of lower tier oil sold will exceed the incremental revenue increase per barrel going to integrated companies.

After controls are lifted, integrated oil company revenues obtained from lower tier oil are likely to increase by only about \$2.00 per barrel based on DOE's April estimates of the dollar value of the entitlement tickets changing hands in the refinery marketplace. More significantly, the number of barrels of lower tier oil brought to market will increase significantly. Revenues will increase, but any increase in profits that are earned by integrated oil companies will be earned because revenues rose roughly \$2.00 per barrel—not \$12-\$14 per barrel.

In comparison, independent producers will receive \$12-\$14 more per barrel of lower tier oil sold, but of course they are not recouping any of the lost value of their oil through the refinery stage of production at the present time. There is a question of equity here. Under current controls independent producers are being taxed disproportionately more on the marginal barrel of lower tier oil they produce in comparison to integrated companies. They are, in effect, subsidizing refiners who are buying this cheap oil and mixing it with enough imported oil to minimize cash payments to non-affiliated refiners.

It seems reasonable that independents should at least be able to obtain as much value for their oil as integrated companies are obtaining right now. If the independents were integrated through the refinery stage, then decontrol would result in a revenue increase of about \$2.00 per barrel instead of \$12-\$14 per barrel. Despite all the political rhetoric against bigness and vertical integration, the system is severely biased against the small guy.

Decontrol will not help if the Congress passes an oil industry tax in excess of \$2.00 per barrel. An integrated producer-refiner's production of lower tier oil will decrease—his taxes having been increased. And independent oil company production of lower tier oil will continue to taper off—since incremental revenues under decontrol will be substantially reduced because of royalty payments and various state excise taxes which are tied to the price of the oil.

If raising revenues is the objective then a \$1.00 excise tax on all oil, both foreign and domestic, could raise twice the amount of money now being transferred from one refiner to another through the buying and selling of entitlement tickets. \$2.5 billion will be transferred through the mail this year alone. A \$1 excise tax on all oil would raise roughly \$5.5 billion and would be less harmful to domestic production in comparison to the present system of controls and entitlement payments.

Mr. Chairman, if there is to be a tax, I sincerely hope that it will be an even-handed one. It should apply to all oil, including oil

coming into this country, as well as all imported refined products. The cause of our energy problems, OPEC, should share any tax burden levied by the Congress. A one dollar per barrel excise tax at the well-head or the port entry for foreign product will result in about a 5¢ increase in the cost of a gallon of gasoline. I do not believe that the American people will be willing to pay much more at the gas pump.

Of course, if the Congress was really interested in imposing a windfall profits tax, it would do just that. It would tax profits, and not sales revenues from production. In so doing, it would be surprised to learn after the fact, that increases in production costs have already wiped out almost all of the windfall profits that might have accrued to oil companies. Why?

When the OPEC cartel began raising prices in 1973, the demand for drilling and oil producing equipment quickly escalated as nations around the world began exploring for crude oil to reduce their reliance on OPEC. Naturally, as demand increased, manufacturers of oil field equipment began selling their products at higher prices to take advantage of conditions in the marketplace. The price of drilling and production equipment has been rising with increases in the price of crude oil in almost lock-step fashion. In other words, crude oil is worth more today because of OPEC's price increases, but it also costs more to produce because of the rise in equipment costs.

In addition, labor costs have also risen dramatically since OPEC first became a world price-setter. American laborers are receiving "battle pay" because of the adverse conditions that they must work under in Alaska. Production costs have also risen because oil production is "energy-intensive," and is therefore an "energy-expensive" business.

In sum, the justification for imposing a windfall profits tax rests heavily on the actual existence of abnormally high profits. Historical data and economic price theory suggests that increases in production costs have already wiped out virtually all of the windfall profits that might have been caused by OPEC inspired price increases. In fact, in comparison to American industry as a whole, oil companies are nearer to the lower rung of the profitability ladder than they are to the top when we measure profits by return on equity, or by return on total capital employed. Integrated oil companies are not abnormally profitable even though they are already capturing almost 90% of the world price for their domestically produced oil.

The Congress seems determined to tax the sale of domestically produced oil as if real world dynamics in the marketplace do not exist. Since the House-passed tax will not be applied to the sale of imported oil, domestic oil producers will continue their flight from the lower forty-eight states. They will produce and market more oil from outside of the continental United States.

As OPEC continues to raise its prices, domestic production costs will also continue to rise, but the total sales revenue received by domestic producers will be lessened by the amount of sales tax. As long as the costs of transporting foreign oil to domestic markets is less than the sales tax, then everything else being equal, oil companies will earn more gross revenue and hence profit by producing oil on foreign soil.

In short, the President's tax proposal as amended and passed by the House will, without a doubt, result in the flight of American investment capital to foreign shores and the American economy will continue to rely heavily on foreign crude oil production.

The targets of the new House tax, the major integrated oil companies, are likely to avoid the penalties by sitting on their domestic oil reserves. They will find it less profitable to develop domestic supplies than

to market imported oil—since foreign oil will not be covered by the tax.

With U.S. production bound to decline, it is only a matter of time before the increased demand for imports equals the President's import quota ceilings. When this happens, prices will rise dramatically since demand will overwhelm total domestic and foreign oil supplies available to American consumers. Perhaps, then, synthetic fuels will become economically profitable to produce. The cost to the American consumer will be very high.

The ultimate victims of the new tax, along with the consumers, will be the 10,000 or so independent oil producers who are not integrated through the refinery stage of production. These producers rely exclusively on domestically produced oil as their sole source of revenue. As costs rise, but sales revenues do not keep pace, they will be put out of business or at best be forced to sell out to some major oil producer who can better afford to wait in hopes that the tax will be repealed.

Such "fire sales" will lead to increased concentration in the oil industry. The major companies will get larger at the expense of the small independent producers. This prospect is not what the gas-starved American consumer has in mind when he writes to his Congressman or Senator and demands a solution to the oil crisis.

The House, in its zeal to raise revenues, is overlooking fundamental economic theory and documented history. It is trying to sneak a tax on the American people by burning the "oil witch." Unfortunately, the new tax enhances OPEC's ability to raise prices by destroying a market competitor—U.S. domestic oil production.

Let me encourage you to review a summary of my remarks before the House on June 28 entitled: "Burning the Oil Witch."

#### BURNING THE "OIL WITCH"

Since 1973 OPEC's prices for crude oil have skyrocketed in comparison to prices for domestically produced crude oil. Despite these higher prices we find ourselves importing almost twice as much crude today as in 1973, when OPEC first embargoed oil from the western world. Why hasn't consumption of OPEC oil decreased as OPEC's prices have risen? Why has domestic crude oil production declined in the face of higher prices?

One often cited, but incorrect explanation for our increased reliance on OPEC is that the United States is running out of crude oil. Geologists across the country tell us that there are huge amounts of crude oil and other hydrocarbon fuels which have yet to be included as part of "proven" domestic reserves.

Much of this fuel is going to be expensive to produce because it is either located deep beneath the ground, or, because it is located in areas where traditional drilling will not work. At the present time oil is very expensive to buy because the nations of the OPEC cartel control so large a portion of the world's readily producible supplies that they can raise prices by reducing output in the face of rising world demand.

The OPEC finance ministers do not set oil prices capriciously. These men are trying to find a price that will support their authority over the marketplace. To find that price they must carefully estimate the changing capability of the rest of the world to produce oil in response to the lure of higher prices. One of the key variables in their calculations is what the production response of the United States oil industry will be as the price of crude oil rises.

American producers are the unquestioned leaders in oil exploration and drilling technology. If and when they shift into high production gear, the amount of new oil produced will not be trivial and the OPEC nations know this. Why hasn't U.S. production been

increasing to meet the challenge of OPEC? The answer can be summed up in two words: Price controls.

Consider the following: In 1970 domestic crude oil production reached historically high levels of production. Since then it has dropped 10 percent—from 9.6 million barrels per day in 1970 to 8.7 million barrels per day in 1979. Meanwhile, imports of crude oil have skyrocketed from 12.1 percent of consumption in 1970 to 42.7 percent in 1979.

The table follows:

SOURCES OF U.S. CRUDE OIL: BEFORE AND AFTER PRICE CONTROLS  
(In millions of barrels per day)

Year	Average daily domestic production	Average daily imports	Imports as a percent of total crude oil needs
1965	7.8	1.2	13.7
1966	8.3	1.2	12.9
1967	8.8	1.1	11.4
1968	9.1	1.3	12.4
1969	9.2	1.4	13.2
1970	9.6	1.3	12.1
1971 <sup>1</sup>	9.5	1.7	15.1
1972	9.4	2.2	19.0
1973 <sup>2</sup>	9.2	3.2	26.0
1974	8.8	3.5	28.4
1975	8.4	4.1	32.9
1976	8.1	5.3	39.4
1977 <sup>3</sup>	8.2	6.6	44.4
1978	8.7	6.0	41.1
1979 preliminary	8.7	6.5	42.7

<sup>1</sup> Wage and price controls imposed in August 1971.

<sup>2</sup> OPEC cartel embargoes crude oil, November 1973.

<sup>3</sup> Alaskan North Slope oil begins flowing to market, March 1977

Source: Data from the U.S. Department of Energy.

The reasons behind the acceleration in the growth of oil imports are apparent. Since price controls were imposed in 1971, the Federal government has discouraged domestic oil production by, in effect, telling oil producers to "milk their assets." Under the price guidelines, and later under specific rules engendered by the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 (EPAA), the sale of most domestically produced oil has been controlled at prices below the world market.

Unfortunately, the cost of bringing oil to the marketplace has been rising faster than the controlled price of oil. Prices for oil field equipment have been rising almost lock-step with OPEC's price increases because of the world-wide increase in the demand for drilling and producing equipment. In addition the oil business is "energy-intensive" and therefore "energy-expensive."

With prices controlled, but production costs escalating to wipe out any windfall profits that might have accrued to the industry, oil producers were quick to realize that if the trends continued they would be forced out of business. They were faced with three choices: 1) stop pumping their reserves and wait until controls were lifted, or 2) pump dry existing wells until profits turned negative (using the funds to get into another business where they could make more money), or 3) do some combination of both while looking for oil in places not governed by price controls—places like Arabia, Equador and Indonesia.

Given the choices, it is not surprising that domestic oil production has fallen off as the spread between the world market price and the DOE below market controlled price has widened. Instead of "milking their assets", much of the oil industry has shifted its drilling and exploration efforts overseas because oil produced there can be sold at world market prices.

#### DOE ENTITLEMENTS—SUBSIDIZING REFINERS TO IMPORT OIL

Once price controls were in place, the DOE bureaucracy had to find a way to assure

that lower prices would be passed on to consumers while maintaining competitive equality in the marketplace. DOE realized that refiners who were able to purchase controlled low price domestic crude were in a position to undersell refiners who relied exclusively on higher priced foreign crude. Therefore, it developed the entitlements program.

The genius behind this program is that refiners of domestically produced oil must pay importing refiners roughly one-half the difference between the price tag on foreign oil and the price tag on domestically produced oil. Payment is made by refiners of domestic oil to refiners of foreign oil for "entitlement" or "right to refine" tickets which are distributed by DOE. In this way, all refiners pay the same average price for crude oil.

Where does the money come from? Most refiners of domestically produced oil are also crude oil producers. The money originates from the same pocket. Most of the loss to U.S. producers is shared with refiners of imported oil. The rest goes straight to OPEC. None of it has been going to consumers.

#### WHY DECONTROL IS INEVITABLE

With the crude oil price paid by refiners rapidly approaching the world price, the President has been forced to recommend decontrol. Without decontrol domestic production will continue to decline and imports will continue to rise. As this happens, the entitlements program will fall apart, and all refiners will find themselves paying the world price for crude oil. In the end, price controls will have contributed to increased reliance on OPEC without saving consumers one dime. Consumers have been paying the "world" price for gasoline at service stations for five years. How is this possible when everyone knows that gasoline in Europe costs far more than it does in the United States?

#### PAYING THE WORLD PRICE FOR GASOLINE DESPITE FIVE YEARS OF PRICE CONTROLS

In actuality, the retail price paid for gasoline in Europe, includes steep taxes. The prices we should be looking at in making comparisons across continents are pretax, wholesale prices for refined gasoline, and not retail prices.

#### AVERAGE ANNUAL WHOLESALE PRICES FOR REGULAR GASOLINE ACROSS CONTINENTS

Year	[In cents per gallon]		
	New York Harbor spot price <sup>1</sup>	Rotterdam, Holland spot price <sup>1</sup>	Average U.S. dealer tank-wagon price (excluding tax) <sup>2</sup>
1974	33.2	35.4	30.5
1975	33.4	32.6	35.8
1976	35.5	37.1	39.0
1977	38.4	36.4	42.5
1978	42.8	42.6	43.7

<sup>1</sup> Spot price—The price for a cargo of gasoline sold on a daily basis.

<sup>2</sup> Dealer tank/wagon price—The wholesale price charged to deliver gasoline from the refinery to the service station.

Source: Data from the Platts Oilgram Price Service.

The virtual equality of wholesale spot prices across continents strongly supports the "paying-the-world-price" position advanced by two economists, Charles Phelps at the Rand Corporation, and Rodney Smith at the University of Chicago. Two years ago they said the DOE's complicated formula, which enables refiners to raise prices to cover costs, also enables refiners to sell their products at world prices.

In support of this position, Phelps and Smith cited the existence of the "banks" of unrecouped costs which are reported each month by the Department of Energy. These

"banks" represent cost increases which refiners are permitted to pass through in the form of higher prices directly to their service station customers. Even higher prices have not been charged because of competition in the marketplace for the consumer's dollar.

In other words, until recently when the "banks" began to be depleted as refiners and service stations raised prices to meet increased demand, their very existence has meant that refiners have been charging as much as consumers have been willing to pay. All this changed when market conditions, resulting from the reduction in Iranian oil production collided head-on with Federal price controls and allocation rules to create "The Great California Gas Shortage."

#### CALIFORNIA'S CRISIS: SPREADING ACROSS THE NATION

The shortage hit California first because the total demand for gasoline has been rising there much faster than in the rest of the nation due to California's higher-than-average economic growth during the past year (800,000 more vehicles on the road). In contrast the supply of gasoline available to California has not been keeping pace. In the wake of the Iranian upheaval, the DOE told refiners not to purchase high priced crude oil on the spot market. Inadequate production of domestic crude due to price controls, strict environmental standards, and especially DOE allocation rules which do not allow refiners to shift the flow of gasoline from areas of low demand to areas of high demand, also contributed to the shortage. These allocation rules guarantee localized shortages whenever supplies tighten in the face of rising demand.

The growing imbalance between the forces of supply and demand finally erupted in a series of rapid price increases in California in the months of April and May. These price increases were followed by shortages and long lines at service stations everywhere when prices at gas pumps bumped against maximum Federal price ceilings. DOE's inflexible allocation rules lengthened the lines. With the marketplace no longer signalling to consumers how much to consume, Federal and state governments were forced to step in and adjust gasoline allocations while consumers were forced to wait in line. Unfortunately, consumers will have to get used to the lines because the new oil industry tax virtually guarantees increased reliance on unstable OPEC supplies for years to come.

#### THE WINDFALL PROFITS TAX: BURNING THE "OIL WITCH"

The new tax will be on sales revenues. It is not actually a tax on windfall profits although it has been heralded as one. To avoid the tax, domestic oil producers will at first try to pass it on to refiners by raising prices. They will not be successful. Refiners will instead purchase less costly foreign oil. The producer's second and more profitable option, is to sit on their unpumped reserves while marketing imported oil—since this oil will not be covered by the tax.

Tax revenues are likely to decrease, and not increase, as domestic oil production continues to falter under the heavy yoke of new taxes. Naturally as production decreases, OPEC's stranglehold on the market will tighten. The new tax enhances OPEC's ability to raise prices by destroying a market competitor—U.S. oil production. The Congress may burn the "oil witch" but it is guaranteeing higher consumer prices at the gas pump.

The ultimate victims of the new tax, along with the consumers, will be the 10,000 or so independent oil producers who are not integrated through the refinery stage of production. These producers rely exclusively on domestically produced oil as their sole source of revenues. As costs rise—but sales revenues do not keep pace—they will be put out of

business or at best be forced to sell out to some major oil producers who can better afford to wait in hopes that the tax will be repealed.

Such "fire sales" will lead to increased concentration in the oil industry. The major companies will get larger at the expense of the small independent producers. This prospect is not what the gas-starved American consumer has in mind when he writes to his congressman and demands a solution to the oil crisis. ●

### SOVIET DAY OF SHAME

#### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress will be in recess for its August district work period, I would like to take this time to direct the attention of the Members to the 11th anniversary of the "Soviet Day of Shame," August 21, 1968. On that day, the Soviet led armies invaded Czechoslovakia, and crushed the reform-minded government of Alexander Dubcek.

Although the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the military forces of the Soviet Union contravened the independence of a sovereign state and denied its people the right of self-determination, it is important to note that there exists a strong yearning for freedom and a strong nationalistic spirit of the people of Czechoslovakia. This is especially evident by the continued activities of those brave men and women who continue to oppose the violations of their human rights by the Soviet-imposed government of Czechoslovakia. They demanded restoration of their fundamental civil and political rights in a manifesto, "Charter 77." This was followed by "Petition 78," which was developed for the practical purpose of supporting the signers of Charter 77.

The signatories of these two human rights manifestos and their supporters are still being persecuted by the Communist government. Based on reports from Western European newspapers, the Czech regime is highly displeased with the Charter 77 document, and is monitoring the actions of the nearly 1,000 signatories. To express an unpopular view in any Soviet-occupied country is to invite retaliation in the form of physical abuse or imprisonment. Reports have verified that such action is being used on those signers of the human rights manifestos.

Czechoslovakia, between World War I and World War II was a progressive and thriving democracy. But this democratic structure of government was eliminated by the Communist takeover in 1948, when the Reds seized absolute control.

In 1968, the Soviet Army and forces of Eastern European satellite states occupied the country to crush any resurgence of Czechoslovakian democracy. This day dealt a deathblow to the liberalization that was developing in that small country.

It is of paramount importance for us to encourage the brave people of Czechoslovakia in their ongoing struggle for fundamental rights. We must continue to publicize and object to the heavy-handed reprisals which are a way of life under Communist regimes.

In conclusion, I wish to insert a statement by the Czechoslovak National Council of America, Chicago, Ill., listing the violations of the United Nations Charter by the Soviet Government, and a press release by Amnesty International regarding the trials of a Czech human rights group:

#### CZECHOSLOVAKIA NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA, Chicago, Ill., August 21, 1979. FREEDOM IS INDIVISIBLE

On this sad occasion of the eleventh anniversary of the brutal Soviet-led invasion and occupation of peaceful and freedom-loving Czechoslovakia, we American citizens of Czech, Slovak and Subcarpatho-Ruthenian descent, again remind the entire world of this Soviet violation of key principles of international law incorporated into the Charter of the United Nations:

The brutal Soviet aggression and occupation:

(1) violated the sovereignty of a member state of the United Nations (Article 2, Section 1);

(2) was carried out in violation of Article 2, Section 4, which prohibits the use of military force in the relations between individual members of the United Nations;

(3) violated the principle of self-determination of peoples (Article 1, Section 2);

(4) was in conflict with Article 2, Section 7, which prohibits outside intervention in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state;

(5) was in conflict with a number of resolutions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, particularly with Resolution 2131 (XXI) adopted at the meeting of December 21, 1965, upon the Soviet Union's own motion, prohibiting any intervention in the domestic affairs of any state and guaranteeing its independence and sovereignty.

The continued Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia is another crime against the right of a small country to determine its own destiny and aspirations. The invasion was an intervention by the forces of reactionary communism to prevent the Czechs and Slovaks from establishing their own social order that did not endanger anyone and sought to contribute to the building of bridges across the discords of a divided world and to lend aid to a better understanding and cooperation among all nations on the basis of true progress and humanity.

The people of Czechoslovakia have not resigned themselves to these aggressive plans of Moscow. The day of August 21, is being commemorated in Czechoslovakia as a Day of Soviet Shame in a mighty and disciplined resistance against Soviet pressure. We are joining our friends in Czechoslovakia in asking the entire civilized world to support the people of Czechoslovakia in their effort to achieve "The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia."

#### AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL, New York, N.Y., June 27, 1979.

#### AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL SEEKS TO OBSERVE CZECH TRIALS

Amnesty International today (Wednesday, June 27, 1979) announced that it would ask the government of Czechoslovakia for permission to observe the forthcoming trial of 10 members of an unofficial Czech human rights group who are now in pre-trial detention in Prague, facing possible prison terms ranging from one to 10 years.

The defendants, who were arrested on May 29, are all members of the Committee for the Defense of the Unjustly Prosecuted (known in Czechoslovakia as VONS). The committee, formed in April 1978 by signatories of Charter 77, had issued 113 statements on human rights violations in Czechoslovakia up to the time that its members were arrested.

One of the 10, Peter Uhl, is reported to have been charged under Article 98 (2B) of the Czechoslovak Penal Code with conducting subversion on a large scale. He faces a sentence of between 3 and 10 years' imprisonment.

The other nine face possible prison terms of up to 5 years on charges of conducting "activities inimical to the interest of the Czechoslovak state."

According to a statement issued by the committee when it was founded, its purpose has been "to monitor the cases of people who are prosecuted or imprisoned for the expression of their convictions or who have become victims of arbitrary actions by the police or judiciary."

Amnesty International said it believed the detention of the 10 men was in breach of Article 29 of the Czechoslovak constitution which gives citizens the right to submit suggestions and complaints to the authorities.

"We have adopted them as prisoners of conscience. Their detention infringes the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights which Czechoslovakia has ratified," said Amnesty International.

The defendants are Otta Bednarova, Jarmila Belkova, Dr. Vaclav Benda, Jiri Dienstbier, Vaclav Havel, Dr. Ladislav Lis, Vaclav Malý, Dana Nemcova, Dr. Jiri Nemec and Petr Uhl.

Vaclav Havel and Petr Uhl have previously served terms of imprisonment and been adopted by Amnesty International as prisoners of conscience. Vaclav Havel was sentenced in October 1977 to 14 months' imprisonment, suspended for 3 years and, if found guilty in the forthcoming trial, may have to serve this previous sentence of 14 months' imprisonment in addition to any fresh sentence imposed on him.

Dr. Vaclav Benda and Jiri Dienstbier were spokesmen for the domestic human rights movement Charter 77 at the time of their arrest. ●

#### FOOD FOR FUEL?

### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, two recent editorial page opinions of Midwestern origin merit nationwide attention and support and I commend them to the reading of my colleagues. I strongly endorse the viewpoint that to try to use our food exports as a leverage against OPEC would not only be futile but in fact would be damaging to farmers, to consumers, and to the hungry millions of the developing countries.

The first editorial is from the respected Midwestern farm publication, *Prairie Farmer*, dated July 7, 1979:

NO NATIONAL GRAIN BOARD

This National Grain Board idea should be shot down quickly. Essentially the bill creating the board—HR 4237—would nationalize grain merchandising. USDA's Commodity

Credit Corporation would be the sole sales and marketing agency for all exports sales of US grain and oilseeds.

The idea is patterned after the operation of grain boards in Canada and Australia. Both have been reasonably successful. But they don't deal with the variety of products of the tonnage we do in the US.

The world's grain marketing complex probably could stand some reform. But we don't figure that the National Grain Board is the way to handle that reform.

In the same vein is the opinion of U.S. Senator RUDY BOSCHWITZ of Minnesota which echoes my oft-expressed view. Senator BOSCHWITZ's comments appeared in the Outlook Section of the July 29 Washington Post:

"FOOD FOR CRUDE" PROPOSAL HAS TOO LITTLE LEVERAGE

Cheaper crude or no more food! That gauntlet is being flung at OPEC members by American wheat farmers in an attempt to raise wheat prices at the same time and rate that OPEC raises oil prices. The message is: It's a barrel of oil for a bushel of wheat.

The challenge has considerable justification: While our farmers pay OPEC ever-increasing prices for energy products (and much is used in food production), they find themselves giving those same OPEC countries bargain basement prices on wheat.

However, I'm afraid that OPEC's answer to wheat farmers will be: okay, then no more food! Unfortunately, I believe we still need them more than they need us, at least when oil and wheat are compared.

My understanding of international markets suggests different conclusions than those reached by "food for crude" proponents. Their position was outlined in an article in the Washington Post Outlook section on July 8.

Those who believe that America could effectively tie the price of crude to wheat base their contention on conditions that exist now, namely, that the United States is presently supplying OPEC with over half of the 10 million tons of wheat imported each year.

This contention overlooks a major factor: While you can't produce oil if you don't have it, virtually every country can grow wheat or expand its production.

If this country imposes a higher and fixed price for wheat, changes in the production levels of other countries could occur. Such changes would doom either our fixed prices or our exports.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that an additional 12 to 20 percent of land would come into production outside of the United States by 1985 if we raise the market price of wheat to around \$6 a bushel. Much of this land would be in Africa, Latin America and eastern Europe.

An increase in crop yields in many countries would be aided by investment in irrigation, fertilizers, mechanization and new cropping techniques—investment attracted by the promise of higher returns.

We must also take into account the reallization that four-fifths of the world grain output is consumed in the countries in which it's grown. If we were successful in raising the worldwide price to \$6 a bushel, other countries would be encouraged to export some of that four-fifths, cut world prices and undersell us internationally.

Thus, I fear American farmers would suffer from consequences that are being overlooked in an unduly optimistic analysis of the "food for crude" proposal. In actuality, it's likely they would see their foreign markets dwindle. Also, broad government

acreage and production controls would need to be imposed to enforce the fixed price, an extent of government control over farmers I find it hard to believe they really would want.

Meanwhile, the present world grain market, now expanding rapidly in both price and demand, would be undermined. So would our balance of trade and the value of the dollar.

"Food for crude" proponents have little economic leverage for another reason. In 1978, 64 percent of the oil imported by the United States came from four OPEC nations, Saudi Arabia, Libya, Nigeria and Algeria. This represented \$17 billion worth of petroleum imports.

However, these four countries imported only 1.8 million tons of wheat from us. That amounted to a value of \$240 million, only 1.4 percent of the amount of our oil imports.

The United States grows only 15 percent of the world's wheat supply; total wheat production worldwide in 1978 was 437.6 million tons. The amount imported by those four OPEC countries is just four-tenths of one percent of world production. They could buy elsewhere. Our leverage against them with grain is not impressive.

We must keep in mind, too, the potential part which could be played by Russia. The Soviet Union is one nation that could upset any pricing system devised by a U.S. grain board. In a normal crop year, the U.S.S.R. grows about twice as much wheat as does the United States. In the Soviet Union, however, wheat is used as animal feed as well as a food grain. If the U.S. raised its price to \$6 per bushel, the U.S.S.R. could easily undercut that price by selling abroad that portion of wheat normally used for feeding livestock and then importing corn or sorghum to use instead.

If we were successful in raising the worldwide price to \$6 a bushel, a cruel tax would be levied upon the hungry and poor of the world, a similar burden to that they're currently suffering from OPEC prices.

For these reasons, I doubt our efforts to control OPEC through our wheat would be successful. We do have potential strong leverage against OPEC with respect to their defense and technological needs.

However, the most effective route we can pursue to help our wheat farmers is to work to develop new markets overseas for our grain. This path would assure us of a consistently high demand from one year to the next. ●

#### TAIWAN AND THE OLYMPICS

### HON. GERALD B. H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, next summer, athletes from across the globe will converge on Moscow to take part in the Olympic games. The Olympics have, in the past, symbolized international unity and good will, but during the recent past they have become increasingly politicized.

During the 1972 Munich Olympics, Palestinian terrorists thrust the games into the international political spotlight, when they murdered members of the Israeli national team. The 1976 Montreal

games saw the International Olympic Committee (IOC) buckle under to international pressure and ban the Taiwan delegation from the games. The United States acquiesced in this shameful episode and, I fear, may do so again.

If the United States once again remains neutral while the IOC yields to international pressure and excludes Taiwan, the effect will quite likely further politicize the Moscow games. It is quite evident already that the Soviet Union plans to use the Olympics to enhance its global image. Thus the danger and likelihood that the 1980 Olympics could be politicized is real. If we, in the United States, sit idly by while Taiwan is again excluded by the IOC from the 1980 Olympics, we signal those forces who oppose Taiwanese participation that our will to resist increased politicalization of the 1980 games is weak.

Although the United States, to my regret, has dropped diplomatic recognition of Taiwan the use of this episode as a political tool against a legitimate government—an ally of 30 years standing—is both immoral and corrupt. Taiwan is recognized by 21 countries. It has its own flag and national anthem and has every right to full representation in the 1980 Olympics, regardless of political issues.

Some argue that because Taiwan is not a member of the United Nations, it does not have a right to participate in the games. But in the past, the IOC has allowed West and East Germany to field separate teams, even though neither were represented at the U.N. and even though the West German Constitution called for the ultimate reunification of the two Germanies. The two Chinas issue should be accorded the same fairness.

Mr. Speaker, we in the United States must voice our solid support for Taiwan's Olympic participation. The issue of fair play and justice for all nations is too high a point to be sacrificed on the altar of political expediency. ●

#### PATIENTS AND POLITICS

### HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 5 years the National League of Nursing (NLN) has offered nursing students the opportunity to learn about and become involved in the processes of Federal health policy formulation. Funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, 10 summer study fellowships in public policy were awarded to nursing students this year. The fellows were selected, from nominations submitted by deans, on a competitive basis for leadership abilities, academic performance, interest in political affairs, and poten-

tial for maintaining an active role in health policy development.

Nurses, as direct health care providers, have special knowledge and expertise to contribute to health policy formulation. Recognizing this fact, the NLN Robert Wood Johnson Fellowships are designed to provide nursing students with an overview of the political process and to introduce them to the many opportunities available for participating in health policymaking. Thus for 10 weeks in the summer, the fellows work full-time as professional staff in congressional and administrative offices. During this summer experience the fellows are actively involved in such activities as analyzing bills, developing proposals, researching issues, as well as writing reports, testimony, and briefings. In addition to learning, the fellows are also able to teach those with whom they work, so that they may gain a better understanding of nursing and the contributions this profession can offer the health care system.

This year's fellows, representing baccalaureate (BSN), master's (MSN and MPH), and doctoral (Ph. D.) level students, have been involved in all of the health issues confronted by Congress this summer.

Their experience as public policy fellows promises to increase the number of nursing leaders contributing to Federal health policy development. Pamela Maraldo, R.N., NLN public affairs director, Martha Driessnack, R.N. and Betsy Emerson, past fellows and current program consultants, are to be commended for their efforts to strengthen nursing's contributions to health policy formulation. The fellows also are to be congratulated, and I would like to take this opportunity to publicly recognize them. This year's fellows and their assignments are: Charlene Connolly, R.N., MSN candidate at the University of Maryland, House Subcommittee on Health and Long-Term Care; Carol Crawford, R.N., MSN candidate at Yale University, minority counsel staff, Senate Finance Committee; Janet Dean, BSN candidate at the University of Michigan, office of Representative TIM LEE CARTER; Constance Gillett, BSN candidate at South-eastern Massachusetts University, Food and Drug Administration; Barbara E. Hanley, R.N., Ph. D. candidate of Health University of Michigan, Office of Health Maintenance Organizations; Charlotte Hughes, R.N., MPH candidate at the University of North Carolina, House Select Committee on Aging; Paula Mason, R.N., MSN candidate at the University of Maryland, Office of the Assistant Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service; Lynn T. Rinke, R.N., MSN candidate at the University of Michigan, Office of Legislation, Health Services Administration; Sally Solomon, MSN candidate at Yale University, Office of Health Policy, Health Care Financing Administration; and John Tatarakis, BSN candidate at the University of San Francisco, Office of Senator DANIEL INOUYE. ●

#### JUVENILE JUSTICE

### HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned with the question of how best to deal with juvenile offenders so as to protect society without abandoning the goal of rehabilitating these youth before they fall into a lifetime pattern of repeat offenses. My concern has grown in recent years as the number of serious offenses committed by juveniles has reached critical levels all across the United States.

Though our colleagues in the State legislatures of this country are more directly confronted with this issue than are we, we may nevertheless have to face this problem head on during this Congress as we consider the issues of Criminal Code reform, LEAA reauthorization, and reauthorization of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

It is for this reason that I am today including in the RECORD an excellent article I recently read in the Saturday Review entitled "The Search for Juvenile Justice." I believe that this article, authored by Michael Serrill, provides a concise perspective on the continuing changes in our juvenile justice system.

The article follows:

#### THE SEARCH FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE

(By Michael Serrill)

"These are the armies of the night!" blares the advertising slogan for the controversial film *The Warriors*. The "armies" are made up of youthful thugs, some as young as 12. In New York City, the film tells us, there are tens of thousands of them wandering the streets and subways in loosely federated packs. Given half a chance each one of them will happily kill.

The *Warriors* is only the latest in a long series of media presentations, fictional and factual, that seem designed to depict young criminals, and sometimes teen-agers generally, as ogres. As always, it is hard to tell whether the media are molding the public mood or merely reflecting it. But there is little doubt that the public mood as regards juvenile crime is sour, even venomous. The people—at least those who influence state legislatures—want children accused of violent crimes locked up and locked up for a good long time.

Legislatures in at least a dozen states have obliged. They have passed laws making it much easier for serious juvenile offenders to be tried and sentenced in the adult courts, lowered the age of majority for those accused of a variety of crimes, and stipulated that certain juvenile offenders must be sent to secure state institutions. They have effectively dismissed the traditional belief that children are less responsible for their acts than adults.

While this harsh line has been capturing the headlines, a much quieter but equally powerful countermovement has succeeded in gaining the release from state institutions of thousands of children who are neglected, abused, or minor criminal offenders. The efforts of "child advocacy" groups have ranged from massive class-action lawsuits—one suc-

ceeded in having the entire Texas juvenile corrections system declared unconstitutional—to a Colorado suit in which a teenager has charged his mother and father with "parental malpractice."

But the get-tough forces and the children's rights' groups will agree on one point: The existing juvenile justice system has no consistent standards for the treatment of any juvenile in trouble, whether he is a murderer or an orphan, whether he has committed assault or been victimized by it. In several states, conservative and liberal groups have joined in an effort to rewrite the juvenile laws so that they define specifically the rights and obligations of juveniles in trouble, and the rights and obligations of the courts and other agencies that attempt to redirect their lives. The most comprehensive new statute took effect in Washington State a year ago and is widely regarded as a model for juvenile law reform.

The target of every effort to rewrite the juvenile laws is a single institution: the juvenile court (also known as "family" and "domestic relations" court). Its sustaining beliefs have been that troubled children must be treated differently from their adult counterparts, that they bear little or no responsibility for their acts, and that the state's obligation is to do everything necessary to resolve the social or familial problems that brought them to court. The court's mandate in almost every state has been to look at each individual case and take whatever action is in the "best interest" of the child. The word "punishment" has been anathema. Juvenile court judges have thus come to see themselves as administrators of social-service agencies rather than courts of law.

The broad discretion of the juvenile courts has been under relentless attack for many years now. The anti-institution forces claim that judges have always taken the easy way out by sentencing too many of their charges to training schools. The pro-institution forces charge that the judges, obsessed with fulfilling juveniles' social needs, have lost sight of their obligation to protect the community.

Until just a few years ago, the United States relied almost entirely on large public institutions for the imprisonment and treatment of juvenile offenders of all kinds. The entire legal and philosophical justification for the existence of these institutions—many of which were, and are, operated directly by juvenile courts—has been that they are rehabilitative. It is technically illegal in many states to send a child to an institution if it is not in his "best interest."

But in the late Sixties and early Seventies, a reform movement revealed many juvenile institutions as brutal, dehumanizing places where children had their heads shaved, were marched around in formation, were assaulted and held for years without hearings to determine if they could be released. There was a tide of revulsion against these conditions in the late Sixties that depopulated both adult and juvenile jails.

The culmination of the movement to get juvenile offenders out of public institutions came in 1971 and 1972, when Massachusetts Department of Youth Services Commissioner Dr. Jerome Miller stunned the juvenile justice community by closing down all of the state's juvenile training schools, which once held more than 1,000 children. The youngsters were sent home or were placed in privately operated "group homes"—small residences for eight to 12 children—or were placed in foster care. By 1974, almost all of the major states had reduced their juvenile institution populations by over half. Experiments were launched with a dozen different kinds of community programming.

But the anti-institution movement has run up against several obstacles in recent

years. A controversial seven-year study of the experiment in Massachusetts by the Harvard Law School concluded that the children treated in community programs in 1973 were just as likely to commit new crimes as those released from institutions in 1968. A more recent and even more hotly debated study of community programs for hard-core delinquents in Chicago came to a still more discouraging conclusion: Teen-aged offenders sent to institutions or other highly structured programs were less likely to commit new crimes when released than those held in more therapeutic programs.

Even if the reformers could prove that community programs are effective, they would be fighting an uphill battle against the many politicians who are determined that violent juvenile criminals be locked up, whether it does them any good or not. Between 1960 and 1975 the number of juveniles arrested for FBI Index crimes increased 283 percent. More than half of all arrests for serious crimes are of youths under 18. While 20 years ago juvenile delinquents confined their criminal activity to shoplifting, car theft, and burglary, they now commit robbery, rape, arson, and murder.

There is no scientific evidence that this explosion of juvenile crime has anything to do with juvenile court or corrections procedures; sociologists, in fact, are at a loss to explain why it has happened. But the angry political response was predictable. (It is ironic, however, that it has come now, since crime rates among both adults and juveniles have been declining since 1976.) New York and California, along with a growing number of smaller states, have stiffened penalties for juvenile crimes or lowered the age at which juveniles can be prosecuted as adults. There are several teen-agers among the 500 men and women on death rows around the country.

New York, which has a reputation as the state that is softest on juvenile criminals, passed a law last summer mandating that all 13-year-olds charged with murder and all 14- and 15-year-olds charged with murder and 14 other crimes be initially prosecuted in the adult courts. Maximum terms in institutions were expanded from 18 months to as long as life. (At least with respect to convicted offenders, New York's reputation for leniency is undeserved. It is one of only three states that send all 16- and 17-year-olds, whatever their crime, to adult prisons. On a given day, New York has more than 2,000 offenders aged 16-18 in adult jails, compared with about 40 in California.)

The anti-institution reformers have held their own against this tide of reaction, but not without some abandonment of their own ideals. The new laws which they have proposed effectively sacrifice the serious offenders to the brutalities of institutions while allowing—in Washington, mandating—lesser penalties for minor offenders and "status" offenders—runaways, truants, "ungovernable" children, and all others whose offense would not be punishable in an adult court.

While a number of states, under pressure from various interest groups, have made piecemeal reforms in their juvenile codes and procedures, only Washington has attempted to restructure the entire system. On July 1, 1978, a new juvenile code went into effect in Washington that glistens with modernity. It includes almost all the elements that reform groups have advocated.

The new law diverts all status offenders and many minor offenders out of the criminal justice system altogether. They will be dealt with by community agencies that will mete out both sanctions and social services. Chronic and serious juvenile law violators must be sent to institutions under the new law. The judges no longer have a choice. Every ounce of their discretion has been

taken away from them, at least as far as dispositions are concerned.

The state now operates under a point system, with each juvenile offender receiving a certain number of points based on his age, prior record, and current offense. Those who accumulate more than 110 points are committed to the state for a fixed period of time based on the same three factors. They cannot be paroled; parole release has been abolished. Those with less than 110 points cannot go to institutions, but they are not let off scotfree. They must make restitution to their victims, pay fines of as much as \$100, and do as much as 150 hours of "community service"—work in local government or private programs for no pay. If they fail to live up to the terms of their restitution and community-service agreements, they can be locked up in the local juvenile detention center for as long as 30 days.

The new code comes as close as that of any other state to constituting a "bill of rights for children. Children are no longer the chattels of their parents. If they run away from home and are picked up by police, they can refuse to go back home. When the new structure is fully in place, those who refuse to go home will be taken to non-secure "crisis residential centers," where they can stay up to 72 hours while counselors negotiate between the parents and children to resolve the family problem that caused the child to leave home. If the problem is not resolved within 72 hours, the case will be taken to court. But the judge cannot order the child to go home if the child doesn't want to, as he could before the new law was passed, and as judges in other states still can. If the child refuses to cooperate the judge cannot declare him "ungovernable" and send him to an institution. Parents, judges, probation counselors, and community workers can recommend counseling or therapy for both delinquent and nondelinquent youths, but the youngsters have the right to refuse it. Those who are delinquent enough to be sent to institutions also have the right to refuse counseling and therapy; they cannot be punished for not cooperating and, since their terms are fixed, they cannot be denied release.

The Washington law is being held up as a model by reformers inside and outside the state. But for all its virtues, it has yet to squarely confront the problems raised by serious offenders. The new law provided no additional funds to expand school and counseling programs for the 625 children (down from 1,500 in the late Sixties) in Washington's seven institutions. The main emphasis of the law was to expand services for the minor and status offenders who were diverted out of institutions by the law. The hard core of juvenile offenders are locked up at places like the Green Hill School in Chehalis. Green Hill includes two maximum security units. These are new and clean, but very prisonlike buildings where serious offenders are required under Washington's new juvenile law to spend at least 90 days. Most spend much longer there—some as long as a year. Some of them go to school a few hours a day; for the rest of the day the staff has to scramble to find something for them to do. There are no vocational education programs they can attend, according to "group-life" counselor Allie Thurman, and the counseling they get is minimal. "It makes me sick—the waste," says Thurman angrily, waving his hand toward the 16 boys meandering aimlessly around the narrow day room at Fir Cottage, one of Green Hill's two maximum-security units.

The inmates are quick to second the point Thurman was making.

"They don't do nothin' for you here," said one boy in Fir Cottage matter-of-factly as a half-dozen of his fellow inmates nodded agreement. Asked what they could do for him, the boy, convicted of armed robbery

and assault and serving 40 months, said they could teach him a trade. He could think of nothing else. He said he didn't need "treatment"; he wasn't sick.

Thurman and many other staff members at Green Hill denounce the "determinate" sentencing and absence of parole of the new juvenile code. Green Hill, the state's oldest and most secure facility, currently holds 112 boys, most of them convicted of violent crimes. Before the new law went into effect last July, most delinquents spent less than a year in the institution; now they are being sentenced to terms as long as four years.

Law enforcement officials respond to criticisms of harshness by pointing to the gross deficiencies, as well as the injustice, of the old system. The determinate-sentence aspect of the law, for example, was pushed—in fact, written—by officials of the King County (Seattle and environs) prosecutor's office and the Seattle police department. Like their counterparts in most cities, the police and prosecutors in Seattle had long been angry at the fact that the seriousness of a teenager's crime and the length of his criminal record seemed to have nothing to do with the disposition of his case. Seattle Assistant Chief of Police Elmer E. Knechtel, who spent more than 20 years in the department's juvenile bureau, can tell countless "horror stories" about juveniles who committed crime after crime with seeming impunity. "We had a kid who had been arrested 64 times," Knechtel recalls, "35 of them for felonies. And he had never done time in an institution." Knechtel says that 30 years ago juveniles comprised 20 to 25 percent of those arrested for burglary and 33 percent of those arrested for car theft. By 1977, he said, the respective percentages had risen to 63 and 82 percent. At least some of this change, said Knechtel, "has got to be due to the fact that we didn't do anything about it."

But the ire of law-enforcement officials was aroused not merely by leniency but by an almost wild inconsistency in sentencing, apparently unrelated to the severity of the crime involved. Jay Reich, head of the juvenile division of the King County prosecutor's office, describes an example of this "bizarre" process. "We had back-to-back cases before the same judge. The first case was a young girl who had been convicted of prostitution at age 14 and had tremendous dependency problems. She was committed to the state institution. . . . The next case before the judge was a 16- or 17-year male who had been convicted of rape in the first degree. He was given four weekends in detention, because he was amendable to the social services available in the community. . . . There was no sense of proportionality or predictability. I don't know what the message given to the kids was about committing crimes."

Though grave injustices of this sort appeared to provide adequate justification for a more rational, and harsher, system of punishment, even enforcement officials expect the new toughness to have little or no effect on juvenile crime rates. Warren Netherland, director of the Division of Juvenile Rehabilitation, which runs the state institutions, admits, "As near as I can tell, there is nothing that any part of the criminal justice system does that affects crime rates. The thing we [in the juvenile system] have going for us more than anything else is maturity. A lot of credit we take for programs would probably happen if we did nothing."

In fact, it is hard to find anyone, in Washington or elsewhere, who thinks he has found a method of rehabilitating criminals, juvenile or adult. The advantages of the new system, says state Representative Mary Kay Becker, one of its principal backers in the legislature, are not that it will reduce crime or rehabilitate more offenders, but that it is more fair and more honest. The juveniles who are sent off to institutions should be the first to know, she added, that "we are not sending [them

there] to do them any good. We're sending them there because their behavior has demonstrated that they are a menace to society."

The trend to deal more seriously with serious offenders and less harshly with others is likely to continue. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, created by Congress in 1974, has adopted regulations forbidding any state or county agency that receives its funds from placing nondelinquents or status offenders in secure institutions. It also forbids the mixing of delinquents and nondelinquents and the mixing of adult and juvenile offenders in any program. At stake is more than \$100 million annually in federal juvenile-justice funds. There was great indignation among local officials at this federal attempt to coerce them. But in the end the money was too attractive to ignore, and most of them are making grudging attempts to comply. The number of juveniles in state correctional institutions has been steadily declining since at least 1965, when there were about 43,000, to 26,000 today; this decline has continued in the past few years despite an increase in the number of serious offenders sent to institutions.

Furthermore, the effort to expand the due process rights of juveniles got a powerful push on February 12, when the House of Delegates to the American Bar Association approved no less than 17 volumes of "standards" for the operation of juvenile courts and correctional systems. Portions of the standards have already been incorporated verbatim into the Washington State law and into proposed new laws in several other states. The ABA recommends a "due process model" in which juvenile defendants are entitled to the full panoply of due process rights now provided for adults, including open hearings (all are now closed, to protect the child from the glare of publicity) and jury trials, which no state now permits. Perhaps the most radical ABA recommendation is that the sentences of juvenile offenders be standardized according to the severity of the offense, the age of the child, his criminal record, and that his "social history" play no role in deciding a disposition.

Although the object of these recent reforms is a more fair and just juvenile system, there remains the danger that the agencies of government will see their entire mission as the imposition of legal justice and forget about the equally pressing imperative of social justice. While it may not be the courts' proper role to address the history of poverty, discrimination, abuse, and deprivation that most defendants carry with them to the courtroom, it is certainly someone's responsibility. If the new juvenile sentencing systems mean that delinquent youngsters' individual problems and needs will be ignored, then this attempt at reform, like those before it, will be a failure. ●

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the 1979 Captive Nations Week has passed and along with it the 20th Anniversary of Congress' Captive Nations Week Resolution. However, the purposes of Public Law 86-90 continue to be realized as Americans raise their voices against Soviet Russian imperialism and its long record of conquest of nations. As in previous observances, the recent one emphasized not only the past record of Moscow's exploitation of nations—a valuable

reminder in itself—but also the strategic importance of the captive nations for the future of our national security and that of the free world. The continuing hope that this Captive Nations Week tradition provides to over 1 billion captives in the Red totalitarian world is of incalculable worth in itself.

In addition to the manifestations and expressions of the '79 Week that already are on record, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following items: First, proclamations by Gov. Dick Thornburgh of Pennsylvania; Mayor Charles A. "Pat" Fose of Chattanooga, Tenn.; and Mayor Elerth S. Erickson of Garden Grove, Calif.; Second, an article on "Kremlin Fears Growing Nationalism," by Patrick Robinson, appearing in the July 16th, Spotlight; Third, a Polish-American radio statement over stations in New Hampshire and Vermont; and Fourth, the address by Dr. Ku Cheng-kang at a Captive Nations Week luncheon in the Rayburn Building:

#### [PENNSYLVANIA PROCLAMATION]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—JULY 15-21, 1979

Twenty years ago, President Dwight D. Eisenhower issued a proclamation declaring the 3rd week in July as Captive Nations Week. This week was designated as a time when Americans could take part in activities that recognize those millions of people around the world who are denied their basic human rights.

Though the world has changed immeasurably since 1959, here in the United States we are still committed to the ideals that our Founding Fathers stated so eloquently in the Declaration of Independence and continue our respect and support for those individuals around the world who strive for freedom and justice in their own lands.

In recognition of the gains that have been and continue to be made in the achievement of universal rights of all mankind, I, Dick Thornburgh, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do hereby proclaim the week of July 15-21, 1979 as Captive Nations Week. May this week serve as a time when the American public can reaffirm its support for the ideals of liberty and justice for all.

#### [CHATTANOOGA PROCLAMATION]

Whereas: The republican form of government—based upon "the consent of the governed"—which has existed in the United States of America for 192 years, has resulted in the development of a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations for freedom of peoples everywhere and in the recognition of the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and,

Whereas: The enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful co-existence between nations and constitutes an impediment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and,

Whereas: Since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of the vast military depots of International Communism have resulted in the creation of a constant threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and,

Whereas: The imperialistic policies of the Communist regimes have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turke-

stan, North Vietnam, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Cuba, and others; and,

Whereas: It is vital to the national security of the United States and the other free nations of the world that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive,

Now, therefore, I, Charles A. "Pat" Rose, Mayor of the City of Chattanooga, do hereby proclaim the week of July 15 through 21, 1979 as "Captive Nations Week" and urge that all citizens support this annual recognition of the intent and purpose of the Communist dominated and oppressed peoples of the world to regain their freedom.

#### [GARDEN GROVE PROCLAMATION]

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Now, therefore, I, Elerth S. Erickson, Mayor of the City of Garden Grove, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 16, 1979, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Garden Grove and call upon all citizens to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

[From Spotlight, July 16, 1979]

#### KREMLIN FEARS GROWING NATIONALISM (By Patrick Robinson)

Ukrainian nationalist and separatist sentiment is gaining strength behind the Iron Curtain, a development informed observers say may be the key to breaking up the Kremlin's empire of Captive Nations.

The Kremlin's growing fear of Ukrainian Nationalism was evident in the April 27 "release" (expulsion) of Valentyn Moroz. Moroz, a leader of Ukraine's nationalist movement was sent to the West with four other Soviet prisoners in exchange for two captured Soviet spies (SPOTLIGHT, June 4).

Moroz's escape from the USSR was described by the Establishment media as a great victory for "human rights," and as evidence of the Soviets' compassion.

Perceptive analysts however, charge that the Soviets' purpose was to undermine Ukraine's nationalist movement by expelling its leader. Moroz, they note, is now thousands of miles from his homeland and people, unable to inspire and lead them.

#### INDEPENDENT UKRAINE

Ukraine, the largest non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe, has been described as the most important of the USSR's Captive Nations because of its large population, productive economy and fertile land.

Russia conquered Ukraine in the mid-1600's, and for 260 years Ukraine was under czarist Russian domination.

After World War I, however, Ukraine regained independence during the turmoil which accompanied the two revolutions which swept the Russian Empire following the collapse of the czarist government.

Amid the upheaval of the revolutions, and the subsequent civil war, many nations in the Russian Empire in addition to Ukraine secured independence; most received diplomatic recognition as independent states

from Western powers and the Bolshevik government of Soviet Russia.

Very few Americans realize there was no "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" until the mid-1920's, although there was Soviet Russia.

Thus, Ukraine secured independence following two centuries of Russian colonial domination; significantly, the Soviet Russian government recognized Ukraine's independence.

In 1918, however, Soviet Russia attacked Ukraine; in 1922-23, Soviet Russia organized itself, Ukraine, and every other independent nations it had also recognized, then conquered, into the USSR.

In addition to imprisoning Ukraine and its people in a slave empire of Captive Nations, Soviet Russians are systematically destroying Ukrainian culture and the nation's heritage.

"Russification" is the term describing the imposition of Russian culture on non-Russian ethnic minorities in the USSR; the purpose is to homogenize and standardize the empire's subject peoples, making them more easily controlled.

Soviet Russian fear has intensified the policy of cultural genocide in recent years; the Soviet Russians are frightened because they themselves are most likely already a distinct minority in their empire.

#### RUSSIANS MINORITY

The Soviet Russians' official census says they (Russians) constitute 53 percent of the population of the USSR; other observers, however, say Russians may be as little as 42 percent of the empire's population (SPOTLIGHT, June 27, 1977). Significantly, even the Soviet Russians do not deny that their proportion of the USSR's population has been shrinking since at least the 1940s.

Russian cultural imperialism was the major factor in Ukraine's renaissance of the late 1700s and 1800s. Many authorities trace today's nationalist movement to those years.

Taras Shevchenko, Ukraine's greatest poet of that time, is today honored throughout Ukraine; Shevchenko's works set the nationalist pot bubbling, and stirred in Ukrainians an independent national consciousness.

Significantly, the czarist Russian government sent Shevchenko into exile, just as the Soviet government did Moroz.

#### HERITAGE DESTROYED

Moroz's exile follows years of imprisonment. Moroz was jailed for four years in the late 1960s for "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation," a euphemism for his nationalist efforts.

"I beg you not to call me a Russian dissident," Moroz said to reporters upon his arrival in New York. "I am a Ukrainian dissident." He spoke of forcing the "occupiers" of Ukraine from his homeland with "bayonets."

Moroz's major works deal with the attempted "russification" of Ukraine through the wholesale destruction of centuries-old manuscripts, art, entire libraries, and priceless religious artifacts and icons.

Moroz was returned to prison in 1970 after a closed trial for his works exposing the annihilation of Ukraine's heritage.

He will participate in Captive Nations Week observances in the U.S.

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Once again in the second part of July we will observe "Captive Nations Week". Captive Nations Week became a part of American history, and there is no hope in sight, that the captive countries will be free again. There is a saying, what the communists have they never give up. This should be a reminder to the people of the United States. From coast to coast in the United States, refugees from

the enslaved countries, their American friends, and also many American leaders bring freedom to the foreground by observing Captive Nations Week. Their pleas will reach the hearts of many freedom loving Americans and tell them about the misery people have to endure under communism. We are here to remind every American and people of the Free World about the enslaved brothers by the Communist Regime and communist tyranny.

Once again, we are appealing to all Americans, to young and old, men and women, girls and boys, red, yellow, white and black, to highschool or college students, to all Americans of different origin, clergy, to everyone who desires to live in freedom with liberty, justice and peace, join me to save the United States from the Red Tyranny from communism.

In this Captive Nations Week observance, we are asking you to pray for those who have lost their lives in communist labor camps and prisons. To pray for many families who live behind the Iron Curtain, and who are persecuted by the Communist Regimes. To pray for those who are longing to be free. Pray to keep our country free and that freedom may come soon to all captive nations. Remember freedom is the greatest gift and blessing for all kind and today we are demanding freedom for the captive nations. Look at the map of the world. In the last ten years you will notice that the communists have gained countries, territory and people! I think it is a right time for you my friends to examine this before it will be too late! God Bless America, God be with our brothers behind the Iron Curtain. Help us destroy the communist influence and protect our beloved country that it may never fall prey to communist tyranny.

[From the China Post, July 20, 1979]

#### NEW STARTING POINT OF USA-ROC RELATIONS (Speech by Dr. Ku Cheng-kang)

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Representatives:

Twenty years ago when the U.S. Congress initiated Captive Nations Week, the torch of New York Statue of Liberty turned brighter in the eyes of those kept in chains under Communism. Freedom and democracy-loving people everywhere were encouraged. The moral courage displayed in line with America's national spirit won wide-spread acclaim.

A decade thereafter when I was invited to this country for the 10th Captive Nations Week Anniversary, my visit covered this Capitol Hill. The intense enthusiasm with which American supporters of captive peoples marked the occasion convinced me that as long as the United States stood firmly with all other freedom forces, the state of a half free and half slave world would end before long.

Another decade has passed and here I am again, this time for the 20th Anniversary. The District of Columbia unfortunately has added a flag that stands for Communism and enslavement. But the righteous voices ringing out from the Capitol since mid-December last year have powerfully reflected the noble spirit of this Congress in support of freedom and democracy. As such, the voices have brought echoes of admiration from those others who are similarly for freedom and democracy. It is a great honor for me to be with you Members of the House today. My heartiest respect goes to everyone of you.

#### PAINFUL ROARS OF 800 MILLION CAPTIVE PEOPLE

More than a billion people are kept enslaved by Communists in the world today. The plight of the 800 million on the Chinese mainland is particularly lamentable. Washington's recognition of the Chinese Communists no doubt was a heavy blow to the fight for freedom, democracy and human rights waged by those people. Their endeavor

reminds us of the U.S. Declaration of Independence that says it is the right of the people to alter or abolish a government when it becomes destructive of the people's rightful goals. When the Chinese mainland people heard the U.S. government decision to recognize the tyrannical regime that had kept them in servitude, their grief was understandably very poignant.

But the 800 million people have not given up their fight for inalienable rights. Their roars for freedom, democracy and human rights are ever louder and stronger.

Young people are surging back to cities with demands for freedom of schooling, occupation and marriage.

Workers at every factory are asking for the right to choose works and remain free from exploitation.

Farmers at every commune want assurance of freedom from hunger.

Masses of people throughout the Chinese mainland are waging fierce struggles for human rights and democracy.

The Chinese mainland is an extreme case of closed society. Most people there today have grown up under Communist propaganda, education and ideological control. And yet, they are rising for freedom, democracy and human rights. With concrete steps they are spelling the total failure of Chinese Communist mobocracy and providing that even those raised with Communist milk cannot tolerate tyranny and enslavement.

This fact also is a proof of the following three points:

First, the Chinese Communists have failed to rule the Chinese mainland effectively and therefore cannot represent the 800 million people there.

Second, those who are opposed to the Chinese Communist rule of slavery are the very masses of 800 million people that the regime has been brandishing in its attempt to bluff international circles.

Third, the call "Learn from Taiwan," issued by people on the Chinese mainland, shows that the Chinese behind the Iron curtain share the anti-Communist and anti-slavery determination of the Chinese in Taiwan.

#### FRIEND THE UNITED STATES CAN TRULY TRUST

The United States and the Republic of China have basked in lasting friendship. The 17 million ROC people in Taiwan think in terms of freedom and democracy just as the Americans do. The Three Principles of the People that guides the Republic of China embodies the ideal of "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" that the American forefathers enunciated.

The way of life of the ROC people in Taiwan, like that of the Americans, is on the basis of freedom and democracy.

Free economy is practiced in the Republic of China just as in the United States. The ROC is America's eighth trade partner. The two-way trade total between the U.S. and the ROC is expected to reach 12 billion dollars in the early 1980s, and the six-year total from 1980 to 85 is likely to top the 100-billion-dollar mark. All the sharp objective American entrepreneurs regard the Republic of China as a place of great potentiality where investment is safe and profitable.

The strategic position of Taiwan makes the ROC island a shield for American's bases in the Western Pacific. As the Russians are fast stretching out into the region by sea and air, Taiwan stands as a strong ROC base in the passage from the Sea of Japan to the Indian Ocean and in the way from the Taiwan Straits to Guam and Hawaii. The Republic of China is a friend the United States can truly trust.

#### MAJOR DETERMINING FACTOR OF ASIA'S FUTURE

The 800 million people on the Chinese mainland account for a fifth of the world

population. Their fate is a major factor in setting Asia's course, be it for the better or worse. If this vast manpower is further used as a tool of aggression, Asia and the whole world will never be peaceful. But the entire situation will be tremendously improved the moment those people join the free camp. If free nations are really to have global equilibrium through a system that can truly restrain Communist forces of enslavement the Chinese mainland populace must not be kept as capital of Red aggression.

Through building of democracy and improvement of social well-being, the Republic of China has built Taiwan as a beacon of hope for the Chinese mainland inhabitants and as a correct model for future rebuilding of all of China. As many people on the Chinese mainland have clearly indicated, what the ROC has accomplished in Taiwan is to them an object of envy and emulation. This being the case, preservation of security in the Taiwan area and support to the ROC endeavor to uphold freedom and democracy are in the interest of the Chinese mainland people's struggle for freedom, democracy and human rights. This in other words is the only effective safe way to win over the vast Chinese mainland manpower as a major stabilizing force for Asia.

#### OUR NEW RELATIONSHIP

Since the Republic of China and the United States of America have so much inseparable common interest, the two nations must as a matter of course seek expanded relationship and enhanced cooperation to promote the common interest.

To establish the present new relationship, our two nations had to tread a tortuous path. The relationship should be viewed as a new starting point rather than a mere substitute of what used to exist. On this new basis of ours, we should strengthen our economic cooperation, develop our mutual trade, further our cultural ties, and promote exchange of visitors. We must enhance our joint endeavor for the defense of freedom and democracy and for the checking of Communist expansion. Above all, the new status should be developed into indissoluble friendly ties of the two peoples.

Our common stand on freedom and democracy is such that cooperation between the two nations will certainly be mutually beneficial. If we are to drift apart from each other, we will be playing into the hands of the Chinese Communists who want to estrange us by all means. Because of this understanding, the government and people of the Republic of China, despite their difficult situation have continued to cherish their traditional friendship with Americans. I am certain that because of our common political philosophy, life patterns and concepts of value, our two peoples will be with each other forever.

Distinguished Representatives: The Republic of China was among the first to respond to the call for Captive Nations Week observance and has in the subsequent two decades consistently striven with the United States for the goal of Captive Nations Week. This is an unmistakable indication of our lasting friendship. The noble sense of justice you have shown for the ROC people has added much brilliance to America's long-standing national spirit. Now that we have started a new relationship, all of you who have been elected to reflect U.S. public views will we hope, exert ever greater influence and accomplish ever more importantly as regards promotion of U.S.-ROC relations. This is the earnest desire of my people. Allow me once again to express my sincere respect for all of you. ●

#### THE CABINET SHAKEUP

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for August 1, 1979, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### THE CABINET SHAKE-UP

Sunday, July 15, opened the most tumultuous week of the Carter Presidency. It was without doubt an extraordinary seven-day period. The President began it with a compelling speech on the crisis of confidence in America and the relation of the energy problem to that crisis. On Monday, he followed with the details of a new energy program. Mr. Carter then broke the spell with the mass resignation offer of his cabinet and the senior White House staff. Five of the 12 cabinet secretaries were out within a matter of hours, and important changes were made in the White House staff. Public and congressional reaction was swift.

The public's view of the week was generally critical. After the Sunday speech, which appeared to galvanize a faltering government to action, the feeling nearly everywhere was that the President might have lost a great initiative in the turmoil of the cabinet shakeup. The confidence renewed by the urgency of Mr. Carter's words seemed to give way to concern for his actions and doubt whether he really could rally the nation. His administration suddenly looked as if it were in disarray, spinning out of control. The President gave assurances that the transition to a new team would be orderly, but the public was right to express its misgivings. It will be months before the vast federal bureaucracy recovers from the week's events. Fresh staffs will have to get into place, uncertainty about the continuation of old policies will arise, and ongoing legislative negotiations will have to be started again. Key policy and planning decision will inevitably be delayed as the new team gets its bearings in Washington.

The reaction of the Congress seemed sharper than that of the public. Legislators with whom I spoke used words such as "unwarranted" and "detrimental" to describe the week's events. Many of them saw the President's problems in the senior White House staff, not in the cabinet, and they could not help but ask what was going on. Why a cabinet shakeup 30 months into the President's first term, perhaps only weeks away from the anticipated announcement of presidential candidacy? No one denied that a President should feel free to arrange his top appointees in the way that suits him best, or that he should probably have a chief of staff whom he knows well to handle administrative chores. After all, an administration can be unevenly staffed or improperly organized. Efforts to make policy can be dissipated by too much debate or too little coordination. Mr. Carter may indeed have thought that his administration had such problems, but an extensive shake-up so far into the term made members of Congress wonder why the President took so long to establish the order he wanted among his top lieutenants.

All during that turbulent week, I found myself wishing that the President would make it clear why he was shaking up the cabinet. What did he hope to achieve? What did he think was wrong with his administration? I also felt a bit uneasy with his

dismissal of some of the most independent and strong-minded cabinet secretaries. It seemed to me that the move could dampen meaningful dissent within his government. The fact that the shake-up did not foreshadow any major change in policy only added to my bewilderment. Mr. Miller for Mr. Blumenthal at Treasury, Mr. Civiletti for Mr. Bell at Justice, Mr. Duncan for Mr. Schlesinger at Energy, and Ms. Harris for Mr. Callifano at Health, Education, and Welfare just did not suggest to me a substantive redirection of the President's policies.

I am certain that one must look for political motives in the President's move. For example, Mr. Schlesinger may be a scapegoat for the recent gasoline shortage. Also, Mr. Callifano has caused trouble in the South with his anti-smoking campaign and his rulings on school desegregation. His replacement, Ms. Harris, would be the first black to head the largest domestic department of the federal government, a department in which blacks have an enormous stake. Beyond politics, however, the question of loyalty to the President must be considered. Every President, especially when he falls on hard times, yearns for subordinates who are fiercely loyal. Those advisors who are closest to him usually set the standard by which loyalty is measured. Friction between senior White House staffers and individual members of the cabinet may have prompted Mr. Carter to say to the latter, in effect, "get along or get out." If loyalty was in fact at issue, then the so-called "Georgia Mafia" won the argument hands down.

Everyone in Washington is commenting on the President's own reaction to the week's events. He has rocked his administration to its very foundations, but he seems secure and relaxed. He appears to believe that his objectives were well worth the disruption of recent days. He has said that he is pleased with his work, and he has no qualms or apologies. In his opinion, the fuss will die down in a few weeks, his administration will be stronger in backing his programs, and the Congress will quickly enact most of the elements of his new energy plan. The greatest change of all in the past weeks may just be the President's self-confident attitude.

Ever since the Sunday speech, I believe most Americans have been hoping that the President might breathe new life into his administration. They want to believe that he is "getting his act together," even if belatedly, and that he will summon the strength to lead. We should remember that Mr. Carter was, and still is, in deep trouble with the voters. Business as usual was not working, and there was no indication that it was going to work. Everyone was asking the President to get tough. The cabinet shake-up was a sign that he intends to try. The key to success will be the effectiveness of the new team. Extensive cabinet shake-ups have been politically costly in the past, but it is only with big risks that one reaps big rewards.●

#### HANDGUN MISUSE

### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic results of handgun misuse in the United States requires a prompt legislative response by the Congress. The latest monthly bulletin issued by Handgun Control, Inc. reports that in June, 635 Americans died in media-reported, handgun related deaths, bringing the total this year to an incredible 3,816.

Mr. Speaker, a number of bills have been introduced in the House and the Senate to curb the escalating misuse of handguns. I strongly urge my colleagues to give serious consideration to these proposals. We cannot stand idly by while, each month, the statistics continue to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that the Members of this body must act now. The Handgun Control, Inc. list follows:

#### ROLL OF HANDGUN DEAD

##### ALABAMA (9)

Phillip Adams, Birmingham, Gulanze Falconer, Mobile, Jack Gillespie, Ashville, Donald Hill, Tuscaloosa, Bennie Mays, Mobile, Mahaley Mays, Mobile, Lovell Nolen, Overton, Earleen Sudduth, Roanoke, and Melba Wren, Fort Payne.

##### ARIZONA (7)

Manuel Gonzales, Tucson, Howard Gregory, Sun City, Sally Gregory, Sun City, Manuel Hernandez, San Simon, Robert Horton, Phoenix, Michael Locke, Tucson, and Janet Reasons, Phoenix.

##### ARKANSAS (13)

Harold Collins, Hot Springs, Milan Drobac, Hot Springs, Larry Fields, Pine Bluffs, Robert Gunstone, Hot Springs, Kenneth Murray, Little Rock, Rita Noland, Fort Smith, James Paul, Jacksonville, Wilson Ross, Pine Bluff, Moses Samson, Little Rock, Harold Shelton, Fort Smith, Kenneth Skinner, Judsonia, David Waldo, Jasper, and William Wyant, North Little Rock.

##### CALIFORNIA (96)

George Acey, Union City, Rudy Agullar, Los Angeles, Cherie Al-Aobaiddi, Bell Gardens, Anselmo Alvarado, Los Angeles, Bonnie Amaro, Oceanside, Jose Amaro, Oceanside, Miguel Avalos, Woodville, Burel Beaver, /mador County, Leslie Bell, San Diego, John Biro, Torrey Pines, Milton Blackman, Los Angeles, Willie Brannan, Brea, Armando Cardenas, Pico Rivera, James Carmichael, Long Beach, Alejo Castaneda, Oxnard, Thomas Chavez, La Puente, Richard Cordeiro, Orosi, Noah Cotsen, Beverly Hills, Michael Cromer, Sanger, Vernon Dedmon, Inglewood, Jerry Dennard, Chowchilla, Richard Durst, Orangevale, Dianne Endess, Arleta, Michael Ewing, Concord, Ricky Franco, Highland Park, Gary Funk, La Palma, and Norman Gainey, Oakland.

Ruben Gastelum, Los Angeles, Pasqual Gentilcore, San Diego, Benny Gifford, Atascadero, Garrie Goodyear, Vacaville, Lydia Goodyear, Vacaville, Paul Griffith, El Monte, Jose Guajardo, San Gabriel, Ismael Guzman, Lodi, Prentice Harrison, Oroville, Joe Hernandez, Watsonville, Beatrice Hunt, San Jose, Mary Jackson, Los Angeles, Clydie Jefferson, San Diego, Harry Johnson, Rosemead, Ellen Jordan, Santa Barbara, and Bill Kafantaris, Fresno.

Vicki Keller, Concord, Thomas Kohout, Los Angeles, Rufus Hightower, Los Angeles, Russel Kruse, Bishop, Frank Lamas, Fair Oaks, Linda Lamas, Fair Oaks, James Lang, San Diego, Jeffrey Loflin, Boony Doon, James Loken, Buena Park, Mario Lopez, Fresno, Stanley Lumbo, San Francisco, Ester Manuel, Torrance, Jose Maradiaga, Los Angeles, Samuel Marcantonio, Prunedale, Julian Marin, Oxnard, Ruben Martinez, Oxnard, Nora McGee, Oakland, David Monreal, Santa Fe Springs, Henry Munoz, Hollywood, Chris Myles, Fresno, and Dennis Nagle, Yucaipa.

Allenchery Nambiar, Torrance, Danny Ogdon, Palm Desert, Katherine Parrott, Santa Ana, George Petros, San Pedro, Sam Redford, Los Angeles, George Rivas, Los Angeles, John Robinson, La Plata, Joe Rocha, Escalon, Angel Rodriguez, Highland Park, Robert Rodriguez, Los Angeles, Rudy Rodriguez, Highland Park, Robert Rosales, Riverside, Lamont Sacadels, La Palma, Patricia San-

ders, Westminster, Gerald Shane, Los Angeles, Ahamd Sharifadi, Los Angeles, and Hurley Shearer, Los Angeles.

Craig Stell, Riverside, Alfred Talavera, Harbor City, Richard Wagner, Brea, Fraidoun Vallzadeh-Afshar, Westwood, Randy Watkins, Modesto, Victor Weiss, Los Angeles, Jonathan Whitecomb, Pomona, Michael White, Riverside, Hermann Wolf, Monterey, Anthony Young, San Francisco, Unidentified Male, Fresno, Unidentified Male, La Puente, Unidentified Male, Panorama City, Unidentified Male, San Francisco, and Unidentified Male, Westwood.

##### COLORADO (23)

Oral Addie, Denver, Adam Albert, Fort Morgan, Anthony Anderton, Lakewood, Martha Brunhoff, Littleton, Kathleen Buczek, Boulder, Jeffrey Burford, Denver, Lionel Chavez, Denver, Thomas Compton, Jefferson County, Joni Femmer, Denver, Richard Gomes, Denver, Kenneth Grier, Denver, Thomas Jackson, Aurora, Donna Maestas, Denver, Roger Nell, Wheat Ridge, Charles Orindgreff, Loveland, Francis Price, Denver, Jimmy Puterbaugh, Trinidad, Allison Ramadnan, Chama, John Robinson, Durango, Sandra Rushing, Lakewood, John Shelton, Denver, Milton Stovall, Fort Collins, and Michael Thomas, Denver.

##### CONNECTICUT (3)

Lewis Glynn, Hartford, Anthonia Raibikis, Wolcott, and Allen Randall, Jr., New Haven.

##### DELEWARE (2)

Marcel Devaux, Newark, and Julius Wilson, Wilmington.

##### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (4)

John Bowman, Linda Garner, Robert Jurek, and Stanley Washington.

##### FLORIDA (33)

William Adcock, Zephyrhills, Joann Bradley, Hallandale, Richard Brewer, Brandon, George Brower, Fort Myers, Valerie Brower, Fort Myers, Fred Burns, Jacksonville, Renford Campbell, Fort Lauderdale, Willie Dunlap, Hollywood, Robert Eller, Fort Lauderdale, Daniel Golden, Miami, Larry Helfrich, Lauderhill, Robert Hillard, Orange County, and Robert James, Altamonte Springs.

Robert Kotleski, Lehigh Acres, Betsy Little, Goulds, Mario Martinez, Fort Pierce, Orian Moony, Orlando, Gaye Lynn Parks, Bonita Springs, Franklin Pierce, Pensacola, Emma Reid, Miami Beach, Mario Riveron, St. Cloud, Fitzhugh Rollins, III, Miami, Juan Sanchez, Miami, Nathaniel Sholtz, Highway Park, Jack Smith, Zephyrhills, Andrew Stone, Panama City, Roy Stone, Panama City, Jce Swain, Miami, William Thomas, Gulf Breeze, Charles Williams, Fort Lauderdale, Unidentified Male, Bonita Springs, and Unidentified Male, Miami.

##### GEORGIA (13)

Eddie Barnard, Collins, Margaret Bell, Americus, Randy Brown, Albany, Guy Fish, Atlanta, Ronnie Jinks, Glennville, John Jones, Macon, Hiram Polk, Griffin, Larry Powell, Lyons, Phyllis Rolland, Macon, Lawrence Shreve, Atlanta, Marc Tetalman, Atlanta, Richard Van Horn, Marietta, and Unidentified Male, Atlanta.

##### HAWAII (2)

John Dutro, Hilo, and Paul Featherman, Hanalei, Kauai.

##### IDAHO (5)

Douglas Blakenhorn, Iowa City, Orville Ross, Idaho Falls, Richard Shaffer, Sandpoint, Dennis Spurlock, Coeur d'Alene, and Troy Vance Jr., Caldwell.

##### ILLINOIS (23)

Ot's Bailey, Chicago, Marling Back, Jr., Bushnell, Thomas Brown, Chicago, Fred Delle, Cicero, Charles Drake, Chicago, Robert Fields, Chicago, Roberto Galaviz, Chicago, Mark Hamilton, Chicago, Ben Hemell, Chicago, Otis Mcelya, Cairo, Russell McKibben, Chicago.

Lonni McKinney, Chicago, Timothy Melsner, Springfield, Andrew Mink, Moline, Carolyn Nelson, Chicago, James Norals, Chicago, Nagdie Noush, Chicago, Scott Oedewaldt, Bartonville, Ronald Snyder, Chicago, Judith Stamm, Alton, Wilhelmina Wade, Chicago, Barbara Williams, Chicago, and unidentified male, Chicago.

## INDIANA (7)

Brian Lesley, Monon, Janice Lewis, Gary, Roy Newton, Weiser, Virgil Reburn, Evansville, Gregory Runyon, Gary, unidentified child, Gary, and unidentified male, Gary.

## IOWA (2)

James Goslee, Council Bluffs, and Lacie Taylor, Waterloo.

## KANSAS (9)

Jacqueline Burnett, Kansas City, Wallace Daniels, Jr., Kansas City, Clifford Dinges, Hays, Michael Harper, Kansas City, Douglas Jones, Kansas City, Darin Mach, Scandia, Willie Mitchell, Topeka, Rodney Nichols, Goodlands, and Jeanie Trickel, Hutchinson.

## KENTUCKY (8)

Roger Anderson, Pikeville, James Hinkle, Lexington, Esta Howell, Pikeville, Jack Matney, Pikeville, James Starks, Everts, Pamela Stevens, Fort Gay, James Vice, Mt. Sterling, and Gerald Wallace, Richmond.

## LOUISIANA (23)

David Band, Mandeville, Mark Barquet, New Orleans, Kyer Brown, New Orleans, Darnell Collins, Monroe, Don Davis, Tallulah, David Dickerson, Independence, Tena Dickerson, Independence, Aubrey Diked, Abita Springs, Caroline Ezeb, New Orleans, and William Hardy, New Orleans.

Harold Henry, New Orleans, Randall Herblin, Baton Rouge, Glenn Holmes, Harahan, Shirley Holmes, Harahan, Andrew Miller, Kenner, Marjorie Mohl, Camppti, Jimmie Joyce Morrow, Slidell, Edward Rousell, New Orleans, Henry Simmons, Belcher, Earl Summers, New Orleans, Joseph Ward, New Orleans, Richard Wilburn, Baton Rouge, and Lionel Williams, New Orleans.

## MARYLAND (17)

Alvin Fullard, Baltimore, Charles Gilchrist, Seat Pleasant, Leon Gordon, Baltimore, Gloria Grant, Baltimore, Blair Green, Silver Spring, Isaac Handy, Baltimore, Charles Henson, Baltimore, Raymond Kent, Baltimore, William Mills, Jr., Brookview, Lillian Monroe, Baltimore, Sherman Monroe, Baltimore, Patricia Morgan, Baltimore, William Reel, Riverdale, Gall Sine, Galtersburg, Myron Thomas, Rhodesdale, William Walker, Baltimore, and Rodney Winder, Baltimore.

## MASSACHUSETTS (2)

Epifano Acaco, Roxbury, and Robert Hames, Clinton.

## MICHIGAN (2)

Phillip Fields, Detroit, and Vive Gains, Saginaw.

## MINNESOTA (5)

Teresa Hoffman, Mankato, Javier Mancho, Bixby, Duane Morben, Thief River Falls, Emmanuel Rogers, Minneapolis, and Unidentified Male, Minneapolis.

## MISSISSIPPI (16)

Sandra Blakeney, Taylorsville, Lee Carothers, Okolono, Richard Craig, Gulfport, Pam Cupstid, Lawrence County, Buford Dedeaux, Gulfport, Robert Fields, Amory, Larry Graham, Gulfport, Robert Karl, Waveland, M. C. McCarver, Ryans Well, William Miller, Sandersville, Thomas Perry, Columbus, James Puckett, Jackson, David Shows, Laurel, Mark Stephens, Wesson, Ralph Teague, Pascagoula, and J.T. Trest, Walnut Grove.

## MISSOURI (18)

Keith Cain, St. Louis, Salvatore Fedele, St. Louis, Sandy Henderson, Kansas City, La-keitha Hobbs, St. Louis, Dan Krato, St.

Charles County, Maurice Langston, St. Louis, Michael McClatchery, St. Louis, Leroy Meekle, Bell City, Donald Rich, Carthage, Robert Nolan, Kansas City, Willdine Nolan, Kansas City, Vernon Poggemoeller, St. Louis, John Smith, St. Louis, Michael Taylor, St. Louis, Martha Terry, Windsor, Bertha Thomas, Alton, Norman Wallace, Collinsville, and unidentified male, Kansas City.

## NEBRASKA (3)

Randall Hotler, Lincoln, Lloyd Johnson, Bluffs, and Larry Newell, Omaha.

## NEVADA (4)

Donald Brown, Reno, Henry Greathouse, Las Vegas, John Grundy, Reno, and Michael Jones, Las Vegas.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE (1)

Unidentified female, Hooksett.

## NEW JERSEY (5)

Kevin Butler, Whiting, Frank Fullerton, Moorestown, Elmer Krauss, Hasbrouck Hts., Thomasina Krauss, Hasbrouck Hts., and Donald Stanton, Eatontown.

## NEW MEXICO (8)

Richard Gutierrez, Albuquerque, Richard Horton, Albuquerque, Nina Jones, Ruidoso, Virginia Mata, Carlsbad, Rick Russell, Albuquerque, Martin Sanchez, Albuquerque, Jose Trujillo, Albuquerque, and unidentified male, Albuquerque.

## NEW YORK (22)

William Byrd, New York City, Archimedes Cervera, Hauppauge, Ted Donald, New York City, Michael Doyle, Mineola, Jesus Figueroa, Brooklyn, John Flynn, Suffolk County, Angel Gonzalez, Brooklyn, Darryl James, Bronx, Joenell Johnson, Sag Harbor, Bruce Kay, New York City, Paola Licastri, New York City, George Manz, Brooklyn, Brian Mulhern, New York City, Sonya Naegely, Lansing, Willard Nichols, Lansing, Angel Niedo, Bronx, Adam Scepaniak, Lansing, Henry Tan, Queens, Juan Vives, Brooklyn, A. C. Young, Geneseo, Unidentified female, Beacon, and Unidentified male, Bronx.

## NORTH CAROLINA (7)

Dennis Bugg, High Point, Odell Casteen, New London, Jeffrey Corriher, China Grove, Anthony Hillier, Benson, Robert Kincaid, Charlotte, John Simpson, Rock Hill, and Lester White, Charlotte.

## OHIO (41)

Benton Allen, Hartville, Rosalie Allen, Hartville, Debra Baragona, Reynoldsburg, Elta Biles, Columbus, Willie Burns, Cleveland, Manuel Byers, Cincinnati, Lois Carter, Columbus, Herman Ciers, Cleveland, Thomas Class, Columbus, Carl Ennis, Columbus, Carol Freeman, Columbus, William Gordon, Cleveland, Charles Hossman, Bellaire, John Hubbell, Cleveland, Barbara Jones, Cleveland, Robert Jones, Columbus, Abraham King, Cleveland, and Paul Kitchen, Zanesville.

Connie Martin, Columbus, Thomas Mays, Toledo, Roy McDonald, Mount Vernon, Richard Myroniak, Cleveland, Buddy Neal, Steubenville, Elaine Poulas, Youngstown, Dewitt Powell, Toledo, Ronald Richey, Cleveland, Nicholas Santoriella, Cleveland, Benjamin Smith, Columbus, Michael Smith, Columbus, and Roosevelt Smith, Columbus.

Ricardo Todd, Cleveland, James Vines, Cleveland, Ira Wallace, Columbus, Robert Whisner, Columbus, Dennis White, Cincinnati, Richard Widner, Galloway, Diana Wiegele, Cincinnati, Betty Wooten, Toledo, Unidentified Female, Middleburg Heights, Unidentified Male, Middleburg Heights, and Unidentified Male, Cleveland.

## OKLAHOMA (7)

Patsy Faught, Oklahoma City, John Fields, Seminole, Vernon Guiley, Del City, Debra Sullivan, Tulsa, J. W. Weaver, Oklahoma City, Elloyd West, McAlester, and David Weidemann, Oklahoma City.

## OREGON (3)

Sharon Brooks, Portland, Fathi Khatar, Portland, and Anthony Marcott, Coos Bay.

## PENNSYLVANIA (11)

Barry Bernick, Norristown, Kathleen Bernick, Norristown, Anthony Brown, Philadelphia, Daniel Canteras, Philadelphia, James Hatch, Philadelphia, Albert Izzo, Pittsburgh, Robert Loader, Norristown, Gordon MacMaster, Pittsburgh, Iva MacMaster, Pittsburgh, Andrew Thomas, Philadelphia, and Joseph Thomas, Philadelphia.

## RHODE ISLAND (1)

William Keenan, Central Falls.

## SOUTH CAROLINA (13)

Stephen Baldwin, Williston, Andrew Brown, Lugoff, Randy Dyar, York, Ruby Lewis, Anderson, Barry McCoy, Columbia, Willie Peeples, Walterboro, James Sharpe, Columbia, Charlie Smith, Rock Hill, Robert Starling, Lugoff, Richard Thompson, Fountain Inn, Jean Vachon, North Myrtle Beach, Thomas Vachon, North Myrtle Beach, and Johnny White, Spartanburg.

## TENNESSEE (27)

D. C. Chafin, Memphis, Charles Chumbley, Nashville, Elbert Faulkner, North Claybrook, Jerry Greenhill, Nashville, Carleae Grissom, Memphis, Lillian Henig, Memphis, Arthur Holmes, Memphis, Randy Houston, Memphis, Phil Jackson, Chattanooga, Lonnell James, Collierville, Ronnie Jones, Chattanooga, Patricia Kilgore, Nashville, Horace King, Whitehaven, Marcia King, Nashville, Carolyn Love, Jackson, Orbra McCoy, Dunganon, Jeffrey Miller, Caryville, Aloah Pipkin, Kingsport, Geneva Pritchett, Maryville, Jack Smith, Chattanooga, Fannie Spight, Memphis, Pamela Twiddy, Memphis, Jesse Walsh, Memphis, Lawrence Weatherbee, Hixson, William Webb, Memphis, James Winters, Nashville, and unidentified male, Memphis.

## TEXAS (106)

Claudell Adams, Houston, Salm Audi, Houston, Juan Baca, San Antonio, Willie Ballou, Beaumont, Merlene Bass, East Mountain, Herman Beesley, Hurst, Jimmy Bobo, Santo, Gregory Booker, Dallas, Abel Borrejo, San Antonio, Cleotha Bragg, Houston, Richard Bridges, Durant, Winniford Brigham, Houston, Itaspa Britton, Fort Worth, Frank Bryan, Denison, Xa Duc Bui, Houston, Walter Butler, Sweeney, Raymond Campo, Houston, Michael Cardoree, Dayton, and Robert Carona, San Antonio.

Joe Carreon, San Antonio, Robert Carter, Elgin, Ofelia Castillo, El Paso, Ofelia Castillo, Jr., El Paso, Juan Castillo, El Paso, Jose Castillo, El Paso, Alan Clemons, Amarillo, Glenn Collins, Houston, Eugene Cordry, Fort Worth, Benjamin Culberson, Wichita Falls, Aurea Debarrera, McAllen, Earl Erving, Azle, Farris Flowers, Houston, Richard Franklin, Houston, and Leonardo Gaonaa, San Antonio.

Gilbert Garza, Houston, Leonardo Gona, San Antonio, Chomas Gordon, Fort Worth, Santos Granados, San Antonio, Gary Hamilton, Houston, Chrystal Hansen, San Antonio, Joe Henson, Ladonia, Angel Hernandez, Houston, Ascension Hernandez, Hearne, Clemente Hernandez, Houston, Myrtle Hinze, Carmine, Perrie Hinze, Carmine, Charles Hopkins, Galveston, Todd Hopkins, Galveston, Moses Jefferson, College Station, Craig Johnson, Dallas, Eugene Johnson, Fort Worth, Samuel Knotts, Houston, Herbert Lammpann, Bridge City, and Jose Landeverde, Houston.

Arturo Leal, Corpus Christi, Margarito Lopez, Fort Worth, Wayne Lucas, Texas City, Arturo Martinez, Corpus Christi, Julian Martinez, Cameron, Dwayne McGowan, Midland, Mario Medellin, Laredo, Robert Miller, Sansom Park, Dana Mills, Orangefield, Jose Moreno, Houston, Jon Moss, Galveston, Vincent Neil, Dripping Springs, Robert Orsburn,

Clarksville, Langford Outlaw, Beaumont, Geraldine Paine, Houston, Solono Palomo, Houston, and Wanda Parson, Lubbock.

Van Hue Pham, Amarillo, Doyle Pittman, Fort Worth, Ruben Ramirez, McAllen, Larry Rankin, San Antonio, Francisco Reyes, San Antonio, Berry Reyna, San Antonio, Bob Rhoades, McDade, Olivia Richardson, Houston, Thomas Richardson, Houston, Bruno Rios, San Antonio, Lois Roberts, Waco, Wanda Roberts, Fort Worth, Elizabeth Schattel, Big Spring, and Jeraldeen Scurry, Texas City.

Merlina Shippey, Manor, Santos Silva, Houston, Darryl Speed, Dallas, Karl Stevens, Arlington, Harry Stewart, Houston, Michael Stuart, Dallas, Michael Tarver, Beaumont, Cathie Taylor, Fort Worth, Jack Thompson, Borger, Chester Underwood, Marshall, Anita Valdez, Dallas, Joe Valdez, Fort Worth, Raul Vidales, Houston, Tony Walls, Taylor, and James Weatherford, Ft. Bend County.

Clarence Webb, Fort Worth, Robert Wright, Houston, Unidentified Child, Austin, Unidentified Female, Houston, Unidentified Male, Houston, June 11, 1979, and Unidentified Male, Houston, June 29, 1979.

#### UTAH (4)

Retta Heath, Hill Air Force Base, Robert Miller, Hill Air Force Base, John Pyne, Provo, and Harry Schlickeiser, Tremonton.

#### VIRGINIA (9)

Richard Childress, Franklin County, Woodrow Hudson, Bon Air, Thomas Jacques, Alexandria, Otis Johnson, Providence Forge, Alton McIntyre, Norfolk, Eric Roop, Roanoke, Blaine Stewart, Richmond, Lawrence Wilson, Richmond, and Unidentified Male, Christiansburg.

#### WASHINGTON (10)

Kay Handsborough, Tacoma, Danny Lerou, Wapato, Dennis Milford, Seattle, Ronald Nowicki, Tacoma, Theodore Sawyer, Puyallup, Ricky Wheeler, Tacoma, Michael Whittenberg, Seattle, Robert Willis, Spokane, Edward Wilson, Tacoma, and Stacy Wilson, Tacoma.

#### WEST VIRGINIA (1)

Pamela Stevens, Fort Gay.

#### WISCONSIN (7)

Dennis Berhow, Dresser, Timothy Bird, Dresser, Bruce Genke, Greenfield, Roger Hoeff, Hurley, Wayne Noe, Milwaukee, Jimmy Walker, Milwaukee, and Andrew Watkins, Milwaukee.

#### WYOMING (3)

Mayne Miller, Casper, Jack Peltomaa, Gillette, and Robert Rush, Rock Springs. ●

### POPULATION PLANNING: CONGRESS NEEDS TO ACT NOW

#### HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to declare a national policy of population stabilization and to establish a White House Office of Population Policy to guide Federal planning toward that goal.

This bill contains no prescription for specific measures of birth control. It addresses sweeping demographic trends that already are changing the face of the Nation. Although couples are having smaller families than ever before, the U.S. population grows by about 2 million people each year. More and more people from other countries are moving into the United States illegally, while mil-

lions of Americans are leaving metropolitan areas to resettle in rural communities. Together, as a people, we are becoming an older population.

These kinds of dramatic population changes will have a profound impact in every sector of society: Health care, education, transportation, housing, employment, environmental protection. They will deeply affect every Federal effort to advance human well-being.

Yet, the Federal Government persists in ignoring these changes which are reshaping our lives and our children's futures. The House Select Committee on Population wound up its year's work with the finding that—

The United States has no explicit policy outlining goals relating to the over all size, growth, and distribution of the population; and the benefits and disadvantages of those policies and programs that do affect the U.S. population are not assessed in terms of their impact on population.

Ignoring population growth and change will not stop them from reshaping our lives. Only conscious efforts at every level of government to understand them and plan ahead will make a difference. Balance with our environment and the improved well-being of every citizen must be our goal. That is why I believe Congress should act now to make population stabilization the Nation's goal and to establish a White House Office of Population Policy to coordinate Federal planning for it.

In seeking a commitment to planning ahead for population stabilization, we are asking for nothing new. President Franklin Roosevelt's administration raised the need to plan ahead in 1938 and President Nixon's Commission on Population Growth reiterated it 34 years later.

We are not asking for anything which we do not already advocate to the less developed nations of the world. In our foreign aid programs and in our participation in the United Nations World Population Conference in 1974 we urge other nations to develop their own population policies.

Nor are we asking for anything which Americans themselves have not said they will not support. Repeated private and public surveys during the past decade have found the great majority of Americans support an end to U.S. population growth.

We need to face up to the population realities of today and tomorrow—to debate them, understand them, and commit ourselves to influencing them to the benefit of all Americans. The time is right for Congress to act by passing this legislation.

The text of this legislation follows:

#### H.R.—

A bill to declare a national policy goal of national population stabilization, and to establish an Office of Population Policy

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

#### PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The purposes of this Act are—  
(1) to declare a national policy of coordinated planning for the Nation's approach

to population change and declare as a national goal eventual population stabilization;

(2) to attain a balance between the environment and human demands made upon it;

(3) to permit sound adjustments in Federal, State, and local programs directed at education, jobs, and senior citizens based on realistic projections of the population that will require these services;

(4) to allow greater opportunity and a high standard of living for all; and

(5) to establish an Office of Population Policy to coordinate the Federal Government's population-related activities.

#### DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) Congress recognizes the negative impact of continued, unplanned population change on the Nation, particularly as that change affects national ability to fulfill needs for education, training, and jobs, to provide needed health care, to maintain adequate energy supplies, to conserve natural resources, to produce food and agricultural goods, to protect the environment, to provide income maintenance for retired and disabled persons, and to control government expenditures. Congress recognizes further the economic, social, governmental, and environmental advantages of a stabilized population.

(b) Congress declares that the Federal Government has responsibility for coordinated planning for population change and declares as a national goal eventual population stabilization. It is the continuing policy of the Federal Government, consistent with other essential considerations of national policy and in cooperation with State and local governments as well as other concerned public and private organizations, to use all practicable means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to foster and promote the general welfare by creating and maintaining conditions under which it is possible to stabilize the Nation's population voluntarily at a level which is consistent with a high standard of living relative to available resources and without incurring major social or economic dislocations, at the earliest possible time.

#### OFFICE OF POPULATION POLICY

SEC. 3. (a) There is created in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Population Policy headed by a Director appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Office shall employ such officers and employees as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions under this Act. It shall be the duty and function of the Office—

(1) to assist and advise the President in the preparation of the National Population Change and Planning Report required by section 6 of this Act;

(2) to gather timely and authoritative information concerning the conditions and trends in current and foreseeable population change; to analyze and interpret such information for the purposes of determining whether such conditions and trends are interfering, or are likely to interfere, with the achievement of the policies set forth in this Act; and to compile and submit to the President and Congress studies relating to such conditions and trends;

(3) to review and appraise the various legislation, regulations, programs, and activities of the Federal Government in light of purpose and policy of this Act to determine the extent to which they are contributing to the achievement of such purpose and policy, and to make recommendations to the President and Congress with respect thereto;

(4) to develop and recommend to the President and Congress national policies to plan for population changes, as well as to foster and promote population stabilization to meet the environmental, social, economic,

health, and other requirements and goals of the Nation;

(5) to conduct investigations, studies, surveys, research, and analysis relating to population change and eventual national population stabilization;

(6) to document and define changes in the Nation's population and to accumulate necessary data and other information for a continuing analysis of these changes or trends and an interpretation of their underlying causes;

(7) to prepare the report required in section 6 of this Act for submission at least once a year to the President and Congress on the state and conditions of population change; and

(8) to make and furnish such studies, reports thereon, and recommendations with respect to matters of policy and legislation as the President may request or the Congress authorizes.

(b) (1) In exercising its powers, functions, and duties under this Act, the Office shall—

(A) consult with such representatives of science, industry, health, education, agriculture, labor, conservation, social welfare and population organizations, State and local governments, and other groups, as it deems advisable; and

(B) utilize to the fullest extent possible, the services, facilities, and information of public and private agencies and organizations, and individuals, in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided, thus assuring that the Office's activities will not unnecessarily overlap or conflict with similar activities authorized by law and performed by established agencies.

(2) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including any independent agency, is directed to furnish the Director such information as the Director deems necessary to carry out the functions of the Office under this Act.

(c) (1) Directors of the Office shall serve full-time and shall be compensated at the rate provided for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after paragraph (37) the following new paragraph:

"(38) Director, Office of Population Policy."

(d) In carrying out the functions of the Office under this Act, the Director is authorized to—

(1) appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary to perform the function now or hereafter vested in the Office and to prescribe their duties;

(2) obtain service as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not to exceed the rate prescribed for GS-18 under section 5332 of such title; and

(3) enter into contracts and other arrangements, subject to prior appropriation of funds, for studies, analyses, and other services with public agencies and with private persons, organizations, or institutions, and make such payments as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(e) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act not to exceed \$800,000 for the first fiscal year commencing after the date of enactment of this Act, \$1,200,000 for the succeeding fiscal year, and \$1,600,000 for each fiscal year thereafter.

#### ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 4. The Congress authorizes and directs that, to the fullest extent possible—

(1) the policies, regulations, and public laws of the United States shall be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies set forth in this Act;

(2) all agencies of the Federal Government shall—

(a) utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary

approach which will insure the integrated use of reliable demographic research in planning and decisionmaking affecting population change and eventual national population stabilization;

(B) identify and develop, in consultation with the Office of Population Policy established by section 3 of this Act, methods and procedures which will ensure that population change and the goal of eventual national population stabilization be given appropriate consideration in decisionmaking along with other environmental, economic, and technical considerations;

(C) make available to States, counties, municipalities, institutions, and individuals, advice and information useful to planning for population change and eventual national population stabilization; and

(D) assist the Office of Population Policy established by this Act.

#### POLICY REVIEW

SEC. 5. All agencies of the Federal Government shall review their present statutory authority, administrative regulations, and current policies and procedure for the purpose of determining whether there are any deficiencies or inconsistencies therein which prohibit full compliance with the purposes and provisions of this Act. They shall propose to the President and Congress such measures as may be necessary to bring their authority and policies into conformity with the intent, purposes, and policies set forth in this Act within six months of its enactment.

#### ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 6. (a) The President shall transmit to the Congress annually a National Population Change and Planning Report (hereinafter referred to as the "report") which shall set forth—

(1) the status of national population change;

(2) current and foreseeable trends in national population change;

(3) the adequacy of available natural resources for fulfilling human, environmental, and economic requirements of the Nation for current and foreseeable population change;

(4) a review of the legislation, regulations, and programs and activities of the Federal Government, State and local governments and nongovernmental entities, or individuals, in relation to their effect on and planning for population change and eventual national population stabilization; and

(5) a program for remedying the deficiencies of existing legislation, regulations, and programs and activities consistent with the purposes and policies of this Act.

#### DEFINITIONS

SEC. 7. For the purposes of this Act, the term—

(1) "national population stabilization" means that stage in population change when births and immigration approximately equal deaths and emigration from one generation to the next in the United States; and

(2) "population change" means changes in fertility, mortality, immigration, emigration, and immigration which affect the number of people in the population, their age structure, and their geographic distribution as well as their health, education, employment, income, and resource needs. ●

#### THE SS-19 AND THE NEW SOVIET ICBM'S VIS-A-VIS SALT II

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the evolution of U.S. knowledge of the SS-19

ICBM is important to examine, because there may be similarities between how U.S. knowledge of the SS-19 unfolded and how U.S. intelligence will determine the characteristics of the four or five new fifth generation Soviet ICBM's. One of the key claims made in defense of the SALT II Treaty is that it will constrain all but one of these new Soviet ICBM's from being deployed. Yet, in SALT I, there was a similar intent to constrain new Soviet heavy ICBM's from replacing light missiles, and this attempted constraint failed utterly. The Soviet SS-19 was, in fact, a heavy ICBM, and it successfully replaced the Soviet light SS-11 ICBM's in large numbers, despite the SALT I prohibition.

The story of the SS-19 has now been revealed by several unnamed Defense Department officials. Most of the story was already public in bits and pieces, but was never put together.

USAF intelligence warned in 1971 that it was likely that the Soviets would replace their small SS-11 missiles with a much larger, heavier throwweight missile. Yet, this warning went unheeded, and in 1971, the U.S. intelligence community estimated that the SS-11 replacement missile would be a "new small ICBM." The judgment that what was to become the large, heavy SS-19 was a "new small ICBM" persisted through the May 1972 negotiations.

In early May 1972, the Soviets gave us some interesting information on their new SS-11 replacement missiles. According to Ambassador Gerard Smith in the New York Times (January 1976), the Soviets informally told U.S. SALT negotiators that they had two new missiles then under development. Further, they indirectly implied that these new missiles, now known as the SS-19 and SS-17, were somewhat larger than the SS-11.

How much larger and how committed the Soviets were to these new missiles were the crucial questions, however. On these two key points, it is clear that the Soviets actively misled the United States. First, they implied that the SS-19 was not much larger than the SS-11, when in fact they knew the SS-19 was indeed much larger. By suggesting that it was not their intention to approach the midpoint in volume between the old SS-11 and the old SS-9, as Ambassador Smith reveals, they were exploiting United States uncertainties about the volumes of these earlier missiles as well as complete United States ignorance of the volume of the then still unflight-tested SS-19. The Soviets knew that the SS-19 was much larger. Second, and more significantly, the Soviets also hinted that they might be able to agree to a total ban on any larger missiles replacing the SS-11. This suggestion was, however, diametrically the opposite of their probable true deployment intentions for the SS-19, as revealed by their later large-scale deployment of the SS-19. Both of these little-known Soviet ploys were deliberately misleading and each constituted negotiating deception.

The Soviets knew all along that the SS-19 was a large, heavy ICBM and that it was their top priority as the SS-11's replacement.

Further evidence of Soviet deception is

the fact that the SS-19 was not flight-tested until early 1973, so there probably was no feasible way that the United States could have known in May 1972 about its large size and heavy throw-weight. Also consistent with this is the fact that in the fall of 1972, before the SS-19 was flight-tested, the U.S. intelligence community was still referring to the SS-19 as the "new small ICBM," further evidence that the United States did not know the facts and that the Soviets misled the United States about the large SS-19.

A final interesting question is what other evidence U.S. intelligence had of the SS-19 in May 1972, and what became of this evidence. According to William Beecher (in the Boston Globe, October 10, 1976, "United States May Reply to Soviet Rays," p. 7), the United States had eavesdropped on Soviet communications in Moscow. Beecher stated in 1976 that—

By way of example, one source noted that in May 1972, in the hours immediately preceding agreement on the SALT I pact in Moscow, a conversation was intercepted in which Soviet Party Chairman Leonid Brezhnev check with a top weapons expert to get assurance that an about-to-be concluded formula covering permissible silo expansion would allow the Soviets to deploy a bigger new missile than under development. That intercept provided the first solid information that the SS-19, as it is now known, was destined to replace some of the relatively small SS-11 missiles, which comprise the bulk of the Soviet ICBM force. The SS-19 has three to four times the throw-weight of the older missile.

The question we should ask is what happened to this evidence? Did it suggest that the SS-19 was a heavy, larger missile destined to replace the SS-11 on a large scale? If so, why was U.S. intelligence still referring to what became the SS-19 as the "new small ICBM" in the fall of 1972? Why did Dr. Kissinger tell Congress on June 15, 1972, that "there is the safeguard that no missile larger than the heaviest light missile now existing can be substituted" and that we had "adequate safeguard against a substantial substitution of heavy missiles for light missiles?" The contradiction between Dr. Kissinger's statements and what may have been revealed in the intercepted conversation is puzzling. Was any vital evidence ever suppressed within the intelligence community, and did Dr. Kissinger have any role in this? The answers to these questions may also have some bearing on the credibility of the U.S. intelligence community.

In sum, if it took from early 1973 to early 1975 for the United States to learn the characteristics of the SS-19 with sufficient confidence to protest to the Soviets, how long will it take us to find out the capabilities of the four to five new Soviet fifth generation ICBM's? In the 1973-75 period, we had the benefit of the Iranian listening posts, the above evidence, and there was little encryption of ICBM telemetry. Now, we have lost Iran and encryption is allowed.

We should also remember what happened in early 1975, we did protest to the Soviets. We immediately conceded to the Russians that the SS-19 was a

light missile, while all along the Soviets have regarded it as a heavy ICBM. Will we similarly concede in 2 or 3 years that all of the five new fifth generation ICBM's do not violate the "10 percent tunnel" or the 5-percent increase allowed in SALT II's new type ICBM provision, and therefore, can be deployed?

The administration has already acknowledged that the Soviets will not accept any definition of the size of a "heavy" or a "light" missile. The United States offered to define a "light" ICBM as one with a throw-weight not to exceed 3,600 kilograms; our current estimate of the SS-19. By way of comparison, the throw-weight of the largest U.S. light missile, the Minuteman III, is approximately 1,000 kilograms. The Soviets refused to accept any definition of a light missile. Hence, the United States has no basis for enforcing the provisions of SALT II on the modernization of ICBM's since the provisions which limit changes in several missile parameters are expressed in percentage terms of an undefined base. The Soviets have at least four new ICBM's currently in development which will be ready for deployment in the early 1980's. Due to the fact that U.S. negotiators did not insist upon having the Soviets agree to a data base that would enable the United States to enforce limitations on ICBM modernization makes this so-called limit a dead letter.●

CONGRESSMAN ROUSSELOT COMMENDS THE JEWISH COMMUNITY IN LOS ANGELES FOR AIDING FLEEING REFUGEES FROM VIETNAM

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the flight of the Vietnamese refugees from their homes to any country in the world that will take them is a reminder of events that took place just over 40 years ago.

While the world watched ambivalently, the holocaust of Nazi tyranny became a reality to millions of Jews in Europe who struggled to reach freedom by land and by sea and then were denied free passage at ports of entry around the world. They were the "boat people" of the last generation, but they and their sons and daughters have not forgotten how they expected the world to react to their own plight.

In accordance with their fundamental religious beliefs, as embodied in the precepts of "Pikuach Nefesh" the savings of lives, and "Pidyon Sh'vooim," redemption of prisoners, the Jewish community in Los Angeles is sponsoring 45 family groups of Vietnamese "boat people." Eleven synagogues in west Los Angeles will provide the financial sustenance these families will need to establish new lives in America.

The Jewish Federation Council, the umbrella organization for these syna-

gogues, and the Lutheran Social Service organization which has established the mechanism to bring these people into this country should be commended and recognized by all who sanctify life and charity.

I encourage my colleagues to read the July 26, 1979, Los Angeles Times article by Jim Schachter entitled "11 Synagogues Joint 'Boat People' Rescue" which describes in detail how the effort is being undertaken—an effort which I hope other communities will follow:

ELEVEN SYNAGOGUES JOIN "BOAT PEOPLE" RESCUE

(By Jim Schachter)

Eleven West Side synagogues are joining an area wide rescue effort aimed at bringing more than 200 Vietnamese "boat people" to Los Angeles from a refugee camp in Malaysia.

Shop owners, tradesmen, seamstresses and nurses—some with their families, some alone—will come to Los Angeles within the next month, said businessman Robert Feldman, coordinator of the program for Southland Reform congregations.

The refugees, mostly ethnic Chinese expelled from Vietnam aboard boats after the spring border war with China, will be sponsored by congregations. Working through "contact families," the congregations pledge to provide housing, furniture and clothing for the immigrant families, Feldman said.

Sponsoring synagogues also will help the refugees find jobs and language training and will provide financial assistance.

"Saving a life, that's what this project is all about," Feldman said. "It is our obligation to save lives whether they are Jewish or non-Jewish, rich or poor, European or Indochinese."

Reform, Conservative and Reconstructionist congregations have joined the effort, according to Norman Elchberg, chairman of the Council on Jewish Life and the Council of Synagogue Assns. of the Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles, which is providing overall coordination of the program. Orthodox and Sephardic temples also are expected to participate, he said.

"This is a joint effort of the federation and the synagogue community," Elchberg said.

The Los Angeles Jewish community, he added, is the first in the United States to organize a program for aiding the boat people.

"The Jews were the boat people of the last generation, and we feel an extra obligation to these people," said Feldman, referring to the Holocaust.

The 45 family groups and individuals who will come to Southern California are residents of a refugee camp on the Malaysian island of Pulau Bidong, Feldman said.

Between 45,000 and 80,000 boat people live on the island, which only a year ago the Malaysian government considered uninhabitable, he said.

The timing of the refugees' arrival in Los Angeles depends on several factors, Elchberg said.

"You never know when they are going to arrive," he said. "It depends on how quickly the paper work gets done and how soon they can be released from the camp they are in and how quickly a flight can be arranged for them."

Feldman said the State Department chartered the flights from Malaysia, but expects the Vietnamese immigrants to eventually reimburse the government for the costs.

The Jewish Federation-Council has contracted with Lutheran Social Services, an affiliate of the American Lutheran Church, to assist with social services for the refugees.

Based on the organization's experience in settling Indochinese after the American withdrawal from Vietnam, the refugees prob-

ably will become self-sufficient six months to a year after their arrival here, Feldman said.

The cost to sponsoring congregations is an estimated \$500 a month for each adopted family. Feldman said many synagogues are raising the funds from small contributions by members.

"Congregants are being asked to donate *chai* each month," he said. *Chai*, the Hebrew word for "life," has a value of 18 in Hebrew numerology. Thus, Feldman said, "for every 27 congregants who donate \$18, that's enough to bring a family" from Indochina.

One refugee, 19-year-old Phan Nguyet, has arrived in Los Angeles under the program. Adopted by a Van Nuys congregation, she reportedly spends her time studying English and looking for a job.

West Side congregations participating in the adoption effort are Temple Isaiah, Leo Baeck Temple, Temple Beth Am, Stephen S. Wise Temple, University Synagogue and Beth Chaim Chadashim in West Los Angeles; Temple Emmanuel in Beverly Hills; Temple Akiba in Culver City; Temple Beth Shalom in Santa Monica; the Jewish Congregation of Pacific Palisades; and Sinai Temple in West Hollywood. ●

### JANE FONDA—THANKS FOR THE MEMORIES

#### HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the recent repudiation by the California State Senate for a position on the California Arts Council, Jane Fonda has been flexing some political muscle in the State of California. She has accomplished an incredible feat. She has somehow managed to convince Gov. Jerry Brown, who lusts to become Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, to win for himself the undying enmity of virtually every veteran and POW group in the Nation by his appointment of former POW collaborator and stool pigeon Edison Miller to the Orange County Board of Supervisors. That was a weird move.

Rumors abound that Jane Fonda, southern California's chief contributor to "pop" Marxism, has mellowed. No way. So, for the edification of my colleagues, I would like to refresh their memories with an item in the Detroit Free Press of November 22, 1970, "Jane Fonda—An LP Record With a Socialist Sermon." I ask my colleagues to sample some vintage Fonda. She has not retracted or even watered down a single utterance from the early 1970's:

JANE FONDA—AN LP RECORD WITH A SOCIALIST SERMON

(By Lee Winfrey)

Barbarella has gone revolutionary.

Actress Jane Fonda, who only three years ago was playing the mindless role of an outer space sex doll, is now traveling around the country promoting socialism.

Miss Fonda swept through Detroit and East Lansing this weekend near the end of a 15-day speaking tour to raise money to defend American soldiers who get in trouble with the Army.

She's gone through a lot of changes within the last year. The girl who once played Cat

Ballou is now infatuated with the Black Panthers.

At 33, she is still more stunning, eyes iridescent, shanks slim, the whole of her lit from within by that kind of luminosity that people call presence.

But she talks like a long-playing record, her words a socialist sermon. It is as though the Weatherman faction kidnaped Barbarella and then turned her loose again with a Movement tape recording running in her throat.

"I would think that if you understood what communism was, you would hope, you would pray on your knees that we would someday become communist," she told about 2,000 students at Michigan State University.

The peace proposal of the Vietcong, she told them, "is the only honorable, just, possible way to achieve peace in Vietnam."

Black Panther Party founder Huey P. Newton "is the only man I've ever met that I would trust as the leader of his country," she said in an interview.

Probably the Pentagon wishes she would go back to making movies like "Barefoot in the Park." Her idea of a good soldier is nothing Gen. George Patton would want to recognize.

Discussing the kind of troopers she likes, Miss Fonda said: "They're a new kind of soldier. They're not John Wayne freaks over there. No order goes unchallenged."

"When they're sent out on patrol," she said, "they just go out a little ways. They lie down on a little knoll and blow grass and stargaze."

"They're good soldiers. We should be proud of them. They're not only doing what they're not supposed to do, but they're not even performing the basic functions of soldiers."

To defend soldiers who have gotten into trouble over pot or disciplinary things like that, Miss Fonda and Mark Lane, the attorney who wrote "Rush to Judgment," a book critical of the Warren Report, have set up an organization in Washington called the GI Office.

Miss Fonda's talk at Michigan State was her 22d on a tour of 32 college campuses this month.

She plans to wind up just in time to attend a Black Panther convention in Washington, at which the party plans to write a new constitution for the United States.

She's really going all out, she said, planning to sell her house and furniture and clothes to bankroll the GI Office and put up ball money for jailed Panthers and support another organization she likes, the Vietnam Veterans Against the War.

A student government leader said she got \$1,750 for speaking at MSU, money Miss Fonda said would go to these causes.

Once a fashion plate who began her career as a magazine cover girl, Miss Fonda now affects the uniform of the Movement—jeans and boots, no bra, no wedding ring.

Largely invisible in all of this is her husband of the last five years, French movie director Roger Vadim.

While she flies around the country, Vadim, once the bedmate of such beauties as Brigitte Bardot and Catherine Deneuve, is back home in California playing parent to their two-year-old daughter, Vanessa.

Things are apparently kind of cool out there, when Actress Jane Fonda brings her message to students at Michigan State University.

Vadim being quoted as saying things like, "I feel like I'm baby-sitting for Lenin." Asked at MSU if she still loves him, Miss Fonda said:

"I love him. He is my friend. I'm not in love with him, but I care for him very much."

So much for Vadim. Meanwhile, Miss Fonda marches on, heading forward on a crusade she began one year ago.

It all started, she said, with a three-week

trip to India last year. "It's impossible to go to India without being wiped out," she said, and the squalor of Calcutta made her want to check on how American Indians are doing.

After helping Indians on such projects as seizing Alcatraz Island, Miss Fonda then went to work on behalf of dissident GIs and defending repressed Panthers. Now she is full of concern for all the oppressed, including those in the Women's Liberation and Gay Liberation movements.

Sometimes it's hard making all the right connections, especially if you are Henry Fonda's daughter and have grown up rich.

"The hardest thing for me," she said in an interview at MSU, "is to take the subway instead of taxis. It's very hard for someone who has all the luxuries to understand people who are less fortunate."

As she attempts to grow accustomed to the subways, Miss Fonda is worrying now about the nurse who takes care of her daughter. "The fact that I have a governess means I can't relate to people who don't," she said.

Well, the life of a revolutionary was always hard, as Che's writings reveal. But there are occasional laughs along the way, like when Miss Fonda got arrested in the Cleveland airport Nov. 3.

As one of her sacrifices for the Movement, Miss Fonda has given up smoking marijuana on her current tour because she doesn't want to get busted for drug possession.

In Cleveland she was arrested nevertheless after she came in from Canada with 102 vials including a quantity of Dexedrine, which is an amphetamine, and Valium and Compazine, which are tranquilizers. The case has since gone to a grand jury.

Some of the pills were labeled B, L and D, which the Feds thought looked ominous. Her lawyer Mark Lane said, however, that the initials only meant "Breakfast, Lunch and Dinner," and that the pills were dietary supplements taken by Miss Fonda, who is a vegetarian and eats haphazardly.

Asked by a student if she is in any danger from political repression or police harassment, Miss Fonda said in reference to Cleveland:

"I'm afraid dope will be planted on me. When the FBI gave me back my belongings, I spread it out all over their office. I went through everything, every lining. I played all my tapes to see that they hadn't been erased. The FBI had to sit there and listen to all of them."

The MSU students laughed with her about that. She made a few mistakes in her speech—like saying that Venezuela and Colombia have fascist governments, which they don't. But the students were basically sympathetic toward her, particularly when she spoke against the unpopular war.

As a speaker she has one great advantage which is, paradoxically, also a handicap. She is not only a famous and beautiful star, but there is also about her an air of fragility, of a menaced walf who needs protection.

You look at her and at least partially you see Gloria, the doomed marathon dancer in "They Shoot Horses, Don't They?," her greatest role. You can't help being charmed.

At the same time, however, this advantage of her occupation makes it hard to take her seriously as a revolutionary. She sounds like she has only memorized a catechism, swallowed unquestioningly an entire philosophy.

It is hard to escape the cynical feeling that, despite her fervence and intensity, this is basically just another role, one she will grow bored with and eventually cast aside. Huey Newton's options are severely limited. Jane Fonda's are unlimited.

But she at least talks like the change is permanent. She says she's not going to make any more movies like "Barbarella," which she now calls "a sexist picture."

How much change there will be remains to be seen. In her next movie, "Klute," she plays a prostitute. In her second movie,

"Walk on the Wild Side," made nine years ago, she played Kitty Twist, who was a prostitute.

If she can't get further work in Hollywood, which she considers a possibility because of her present politics, she wants to act in revolutionary pictures, produced under a commune arrangement with no stars, and distribute them through a network of Movement theaters which will charge cheap prices.

Meanwhile, there is work to be done on behalf of the Vietcong, who she says are "driven by the same spirit that drove Washington and Jefferson, and whom she calls "the conscience of the world."

"I think," she said at her MSU stop, "that the majority of students are scared of the word 'socialism.' It's a good message (socialism), and the more people give it, the better." ●

#### STATEMENT ON FAIR HOUSING AMENDMENTS BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

**HON. CARDISS COLLINS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when Congress returns from the August district work period, we will have the opportunity to pass important legislation strengthening the Nation's fair housing laws. The Fair Housing Amendments Act, H.R. 2540, provides additional tools necessary to achieve equal housing opportunities for all persons. In addition, this bill, by moving us toward desegregated neighborhoods both in cities and suburbs, will lessen the need for school busing as a means of desegregating public schools.

I am inserting into the RECORD a statement issued by the Congressional Black Caucus in strong support of H.R. 2540. I hope that our colleagues in the Congress will carefully review this legislative proposal and support this significant civil rights initiative.

The Congressional Black Caucus statement follows:

#### CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE FAIR HOUSING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1979

The members of the Congressional Black Caucus strongly support the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1979, H.R. 2540. Nearly a dozen years after Congress outlawed discrimination in housing by enacting Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, black Americans and other minorities continue to confront a range of blatant and subtle discriminatory practices in their attempts to obtain decent housing, and are effectively precluded from exercising the freedom to choose where they will reside. The Fair Housing Amendments Act will remedy these problems by addressing the inadequacies of existing fair housing legislation.

The violation of individuals' fundamental constitutional rights of equal opportunity of access to decent housing is a matter of vital concern to the Black community. The impact of residential segregation exacerbates problems in many areas of our public life, including public schooling, access to health care, public services, access to employment opportunities, and access to many other facilities and services. Discriminatory lending policies and a multiplicity of other practices

have limited opportunities to buy housing in desirable inner-city neighborhoods and have continued segregated residential patterns, as the Kerner Commission predicted over a decade ago. Recent direct evidence of discriminatory practices is documented by a recent survey by the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing which found that Blacks responding to advertisements for rental housing were discriminated against in 29.1 percent of their inquiries, and when responding to advertisements for the sale of homes were discriminated against in 21.5 percent of their inquiries.

Without doubt, the housing problem is complex and its solution is dependent in large part on economics. Provision of new subsidized housing opportunities in central cities is equally important as enforcing constitutional rights; displacement of minorities as the result of housing rehabilitation and renewal which only the wealthy can afford is also a critical problem.

But restricting minority families to limited—and less desirable—housing choices is a critical aspect of the housing problem, and that aspect of the problem can be remedied in large part through the passage of the Fair Housing Amendments Act to give HUD the tools to enforce existing law and the Constitution.

#### CEASE AND DESIST POWER

There are several important provisions in the proposed legislation which the Congressional Black Caucus vigorously supports. Most vital is providing the Department of Housing and Urban Development with cease and desist power. The cease and desist power authorized by H.R. 2540 provides HUD with administrative powers to enforce fair housing laws within the mandates of Title VIII, which specifically charges that agency with the responsibility of ensuring equal opportunity of housing to all citizens. At present, the only mechanism available to HUD for enforcing Title VIII is the process of conciliation. The Congressional Black Caucus firmly believes that a purely voluntary process of "conference, conciliation and persuasion" is clearly an ineffective means of investigating and remedying violations of the law, and that lack of adequate enforcement power is the major impediment to the development of an effective fair housing program within HUD. The extremely small percentage of complaints that have been satisfactorily resolved through the conciliation method is further justification for strengthening HUD's enforcement powers.

The Congressional Black Caucus maintains that H.R. 2540, by authorizing the Secretary of HUD to issue cease and desist orders and to impose civil penalties against continued discriminatory activities, would enable HUD to act more effectively on behalf of the victims of discrimination. It would also provide the same legal tools to remedy housing discrimination as are available in many other areas of the law.

Cease and desist authority is essential to the rapid resolution of disputes. It will create within the administrative arm of HUD injunctive powers similar to those used by the courts. Also, the availability of administrative relief will provide the victims of housing discrimination with an expeditious and inexpensive alternative to time-consuming and costly litigation, and will simultaneously ease the burden on the court system. The existence of additional forums in which to seek relief will also increase, in the long term, the total number of cases that can be heard. Finally, the authority of the Secretary to impose civil penalties where discrimination is found will create an important incentive to reduce the incidence of discriminatory practices.

The Fair Housing Act is too often misperceived as a statute primarily designed to

provide housing opportunities for those wealthy enough to live in suburban areas. In the first place, many aspects of the law directly and positively affect all residential opportunities. These include prohibitions against "racial steering", mortgage red-lining, whereby lending institutions refuse to provide mortgages in certain inner-city areas, and insurance red-lining whereby insurance underwriters refuse to prepare contracts for homes bought in neighborhoods of a certain racial or ethnic composition. In suburban areas, less costly, sound housing is frequently available, but it has been made unavailable to minorities through similar discriminatory practices.

The Congressional Black Caucus also believes that the inclusion of a prohibition against discrimination against the handicapped in H.R. 2540 bears an even greater significance than the obvious concern for protecting the disabled. Our laws cannot sanction and our society cannot tolerate invidious discrimination against any group of persons.

#### OTHER KEY PROVISIONS

There are several other provisions of H.R. 2540 which the Caucus specifically endorses. These include:

Lengthening the statute of limitations to three years, so that aggrieved parties may have sufficient time to file a claim.

Providing for the awarding of attorneys' fees to the prevailing party in either judicial or administrative proceedings.

Enhancing the Attorney General's power to intervene in cases raising major public issues.

Removing the present \$1,000 limitation on punitive damages, which would increase the seriousness with which those who might discriminate in the housing market would take their legal responsibilities.

Critics of broadening administrative powers for HUD cite the burgeoning bureaucracy and particularly the increase in the taxpayers' burden as reasons for defeating the legislation. What should be pointed out, however, is that the taxpayers are already bearing the costs of maintaining housing segregation and its impact on the real estate market. Thus arguments couched in economic terms lose impetus in the face of more compelling counterclaims.

In short, the Congressional Black Caucus endorses the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1979 as a crucial and indispensable extension of existing fair housing legislation. Without its enactment, Title VIII will continue to be crippled by deficiencies that will prevent it from fulfilling its promise of equal opportunity of housing to all Americans. Our civil rights laws, themselves, must be made equal to our other laws by the inclusion of the same provisions for enforcement and for sanctions that have discouraged and provided remedies for illegal conduct in many other areas of American life. ●

#### THE REPUBLICAN ECONOMIC PROGRAM OFFERS OPPORTUNITY AND A CHANCE TO END BOTH RECESSION AND INFLATION

**HON. JACK F. KEMP**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I have long been convinced that an American renaissance must begin with a revolution within the Republican Party, and I believe that today helps reaffirm the GOP's

reemergence as a party of ideas and renewed opportunity for all Americans.

I am proud to join my Republican colleagues today in introducing a Republican economic program to fight both recession and inflation. We renounce the mistaken and destructive theory that guides economic policy under the current administration—that higher unemployment is the cure for inflation. Because inflation is an imbalance between excess money and scarce goods, unemployment can only worsen inflation. Instead of imposing "austerity," and slowing the economy our plan is to tighten money and produce our way out of inflation and recession.

Unfortunately, Congress has only a short time to reverse past mistakes before they result as predicted in a costly and entirely unnecessary rise in unemployment. The Secretary of the Treasury estimates that current policy will raise the unemployment rate from 5.6 percent now to as high as 8.25 percent by next year. This is a tragedy we intend to prevent.

Unemployment is no way to balance the budget, because each 1 percent rise in unemployment widens the deficit by \$20 billion. Fiscal responsibility in Government begins with Government's responsibility to its citizens. Our society cannot prosper unless Americans can prosper individually by their own efforts.

Therefore, to restore growth and opportunity, to fight inflation, and to balance the budget, the first order of business must be to restore the incentives for initiative. The greatest barriers to more employment, saving, investment and production, I am convinced, are the excessively high income tax rates on working, saving, investing and general productivity. Under our tax code, a 13.2-percent inflation is raising income tax rates at 21.1 percent a year. We must immediately "inflation-proof" and continuously reduce income tax rates for all Americans. Today's proposal for an immediate 10-percent cut in income tax rates is only the first step toward restoring incentives lost since 1965 because inflation raised marginal tax rates an average of 65 percent.

At the same time, we must eliminate other perverse aspects of the tax code. Just as inflation pushes individuals into higher tax brackets, inflation creates phony business profits which are taxed under current tax law as though they are real. Accelerated depreciation of fixed business assets is essential to restore a healthy and efficient business climate.

Finally, by freezing payroll tax rates, we affirm that the best guarantee of the social security system's health is not an ever-higher tax on payrolls, but rather a more prosperous and expanding economy which can afford to repay the retired, survivors and the disabled the full measure of their past contributions to society.

Let this be a message to workers, businessmen, minorities, and to all men and women of initiative, the Republican Party is committed to the idea of opportunity for all and prosperity without inflation, in other words the restoration of hope.●

CXXV—1416—Part 17

## CHRISTIANE BUCHANAN: BRIDGE OF UNDERSTANDING

### HON. LAMAR GUDGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. GUDGER. Mr. Speaker, we have long known that one of the ingredients which has made America great is the introduction of new citizens from foreign lands. Next week, on Friday, August 10, 1979, it will be my privilege to participate with the residents of western North Carolina in a dinner honoring Christiane Roze Buchanan, commemorating her retirement after 28 years of service to the North Carolina public school system.

This native of Soissons, France, emigrated to the United States in 1946 after 3 years of teaching experience in her native land and was naturalized as a U.S. citizen in 1948. Graduated with honors from Appalachian State University in Boone, N.C., she has taught not only the language but the art, music, and literature of her native land to North Carolina school children until her retirement last June, first at Crossnore School in Avery County and later at Harris and Mitchell County High Schools.

Over the years, she touched the lives of thousands of students, providing a bridge of communication and understanding between the country of her birth and her adopted land. No nation has made stronger contributions to music, the arts, and letters than France and this leadership is reflected in the role of the French language as a leader in civilized dialog between nations and among individuals in the international community.

Madame Buchanan's love and command of her native tongue, her singular ability to inspire her students to share this love, have made her an unusually effective teacher. As an educator, she served as an unofficial goodwill ambassador for her native country, infusing her western North Carolina students and neighbors with an understanding of France that went far beyond mere language.

I take great pride in her accomplishments, which also include:

Helping to organize service groups to help American soldiers in France during World War II.

Serving as Conservation Director for NDEA Language Institutes at Appalachian State University for 6 years.

Preparing French instructional material and cultural materials for many North Carolina language teachers.

Organizing many student travel-study tours of Europe, Canada, and the United States.

Preparation of slides of every facet of life in France for use by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction.

Serving on the North Carolina Textbook Selection Committee.

And uncounted programs for civic and educational organizations.

The Mitchell County Chamber of

Commerce voted her Woman of the Year in 1978.

I look forward to sharing her neighbors' appreciation day for Madame Buchanan and only wish my colleagues here could join with me. I do expect that my colleagues in the U.S. Senate will be represented as well as leading offices of North Carolina, for in truth, Christiane Roze Buchanan has given more than she has received from her adopted land.●

## 60TH ANNIVERSARY FOR ALEX AND HELEN STATHIS

### HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I was once told that to succeed it was imperative to keep doing what it took to get started. Today I would like to commend two of the most successful people I have the pleasure to know.

On August 5th, Alex and Helen Stathis will be celebrating their 60th wedding anniversary. It is my honor to be part of this commemoration. The story of Alex and Helen Stathis is truly that of the American dream. Alex immigrated this country, began with nothing and built a successful business and homelife.

Born in Greece in 1895, orphaned at the age of 8, Alex Stathis' dream was to come to the United States. Working at odd jobs until he had saved the money for his trip, at the age of 19, Stathis embarked upon a journey to the proverbial land of milk and honey.

Penniless, he arrived in the United States where his hard life really started. He had no relatives or friends and he could not speak the language. Stathis got a job with the railroad and after a few years moved to Latrobe, Pa., where, on Easter Sunday, he met Helen Walchock. In August they were married and moved to Columbus, Ohio.

Once in Columbus, with the money he saved from the railroad, they opened a confectionary store. Two years later, they bought a second store. As a result of hard work, they next bought a candy shop and ice cream parlor and used these to supply the other two stores. Later, they moved to Greensburg, Pa., where they established a number of restaurants. They also purchased a Hotel in Confluence, Pa., which, after 16 months, they sold for a handsome profit. In 1954, they bought the Hotel Brenister in Ligonja, Pa., and after 8 years, in 1963, the Stathis' moved to San Bernardino where Alex joined his son in business until he retired in 1973.

The Stathis' are pillars of the Greek Nicholas, Georgia, and Mary Ann, who have all grown to be active in their communities. They also have eight grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

The Stathis' have three children, Community and their church in the San Bernardino area. Alex and Helen Stathis should be an example to us all. They have worked hard at what it took for

them to get started and their lives have been rich, full, and happy.

On the occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary, I wish Alex and Helen Stathis continued success and great happiness in all their years ahead.●

#### WHY WE NEED NUCLEAR POWER

### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, when the subject of nuclear energy comes up, so do the scare stories and the rumors. And Three Mile Island added enough fuel to keep those stories and rumors going for a long time.

Today in this country, we are in the process of becoming energy poor. There is no need to go into how much oil we import annually. We have beaten that to death. And no need to talk about how much coal we have got and how long it will last us. We have done the same to that topic.

The plain fact is, the United States is energy poor and in danger of getting poorer. We need to use every source at our disposal, and that means nuclear energy for electricity.

I have spoken numerous times on our energy deficiency, and that we need to bring more nuclear powerplants on line as soon as we can if our economy is going to grow and prosper. But now listen to an acknowledged expert, a premier authority in the field, Dr. Edward Teller. His words I would hope can bring some reason to the discussion of why we need nuclear power, and just what nuclear power is all about.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 31, 1979]

#### I WAS THE ONLY VICTIM OF THREE-MILE ISLAND

"On May 7, a few weeks after the accident at Three-Mile Island, I was in Washington. I was there to refute some of the propaganda that Ralph Nader, Jane Fonda and their kind are spewing to the news media in their attempt to frighten people away from nuclear power. I am 71 years old, and I was working 20 hours a day. The strain was too much. The next day, I suffered a heart attack. You might say that I was the only one whose health was affected by that reactor near Harrisburg. No, that would be wrong. It was not the reactor. It was Jane Fonda. Reactors are not dangerous.

Now that I am recovering, I feel compelled to use whatever time and strength are left to me to speak out on the energy problem. Nuclear power is part of the answer to that problem, only a part, but a very important part.

I have worked on the hydrogen bomb and on the safety of nuclear reactors. I did both for the same reasons. Both are needed for the survival of a free society. If we are to avoid war, we must be strong and we must help to generate the progress that makes it possible for all nations to grow and prosper.

And what is the greatest present-day threat to the prosperity and even the survival of nations! A lack of energy. Both developed and developing nations are threatened.

The citizens of the United States have just begun to recognize the impact of the world's growing energy shortage. Gasoline lines, electrical brownouts and higher prices are minor irritants. They are nothing compared to what may lie ahead. In a struggle for survival, politics, law, religion and even humanity may be forgotten. When the objective is to stay alive, the end may seem to justify the means. In that event, the world may indeed return to the 'simpler' life of the past, but millions of us will not be alive to discover its disadvantages.

When our existence is at stake, we cannot afford to turn our backs on any source of energy. We need them all.

When it comes to generating electricity, we especially need nuclear power. Contrary to what Nader and Fonda, and their friends such as Sternglass, Wald and Kendall, would have you believe, nuclear power is the safest, cleanest way to generate large amounts of electrical power. This is not merely my opinion—it is a fact. Due to the lessons learned at Three-Mile Island, the nuclear way of generating electricity will be made even safer.

I have attempted to respond briefly to some of the questions which people ask about nuclear power. The problems that these questions raise are problems because of political indecision or public fear. Technically, they are non-problems, because the dangers they imply either do not exist or else we have the know-how to solve them. I am absolutely convinced of this, after a lifetime of work as a nuclear scientist.

I was one asked how I would like for my grandson, Eric, to think of me and my life's work after I am gone. Eric is nine years old. He is a terrible guy—he beats me at the game of "GO." I am enormously fond of him, but I have not given much thought to what he will someday think of my life's work. I have given a great deal of thought to whether he will be alive in the next century, and whether he will be living in freedom or in slavery. If he is living under communism, he will know I was a failure.

I believe that we have reached a turning point in history. The anti-nuclear propaganda we are hearing puts democracy to a severe test. Unless the political trend toward energy development in this country changes rapidly, there may not be a United States in the twenty-first century.

The President has recognized the danger of the energy shortage. As yet, he has given only some of the answers. I think—I hope—that democracy has enough vitality to evaluate the risks and to recognize the great benefits of nuclear power to human health and well-being, and to the survival of our free society.

Q. Can a nuclear reactor explode like an atomic bomb?

A. No. Energy cannot increase fast enough in the reactor. Therefore, it is absolutely impossible for a nuclear power plant to explode like a bomb. For this to happen, the laws of nature would have to be repealed.

Q. What is the risk of nuclear power compared to other forms of producing electricity?

A. It is far safer than coal or hydroelectric power, but all three are necessary to meet our need for energy. It may sound strange to say it, because coal has been around so long, but we know more about controlling radiation than we do about controlling the pollutive effects of burning coal. And, of course, a dam has no backup system to protect those who live below it. Indeed many of these people have lost their lives and more their homes.

Q. I live within 50 miles of a nuclear power plant. What are my chances of being injured by a nuclear accident?

A. About the same as being hit by a falling meteor.

Q. What about the effect of an earthquake on a nuclear plant?

A. At the first sign of a tremor, the reactor would shut down automatically. Also, reactors are built to withstand enormous structural damage. The only man-made structures I can think of that are more stable are the pyramids of Egypt.

Q. Is it true that we still have no satisfactory way to dispose of nuclear wastes?

A. No. Ways do exist. What we have not had is a decision by our government on which way to go. Waste disposal is a political problem, not a technical problem.

Q. How much radioactive waste materials are produced by nuclear plants?

A. At the moment, about 12½% of our electricity is generated by nuclear power. If all of it were produced this way, the wastes from these plants over the next 20 years would cover a football field to a depth of about 30 feet. To dispose of this waste a mile underground would add less than one percent to the cost of electricity.

Q. How dangerous is the release of low-level radiation from a nuclear power plant?

A. If you sat next to a nuclear power plant for a whole year, you would be exposed to less radiation than you would receive during a round-trip flight in a 747 from New York to Los Angeles.

Let me put it another way: The allowable radiation from a nuclear plant is five mrems\* per year. In Dallas, people get about 80 mrems per year from the natural background of buildings, rocks, etc. In Colorado, people get as much as 130 mrems per year from the natural background. Therefore, just by moving from Dallas to Boulder you would receive ten times more radiation per year than the person gets who lives next to a nuclear power plant.

Q. How much radiation were the people around Three-Mile Island exposed to during the accident?

A. Let me put it this way. Your blood contains potassium 40, from which you get an internal dose of some 25 mrems of radiation in one year. Among the people not working on the reactor, a handful may have gotten as much radiation as 25 mrems.

Q. Should "spent" nuclear wastes be reprocessed to save the plutonium and other by-products?

A. Yes. Plutonium, for example, is as valuable as the original uranium fuel, because of its potential use to produce still more energy. In the end, reprocessing is needed to make nuclear energy abundant and lasting.

Q. Is there a danger that the plutonium produced by nuclear reactors might be stolen by terrorists and used to construct homemade nuclear explosives?

A. I believe that reactor products can be properly safeguarded from terrorists. This can be much more easily done than the guarding of airplanes. Also, any terrorist who puts his mind to it can come up with ways to terrorize a population that are less dangerous to himself than handling plutonium. The answers is not to get rid of the reactors—let's get rid of the terrorists.

Q. Will the expansion of nuclear power by other countries enable them to produce nuclear weapons?

A. Unfortunately, yes. This is already happening. Two-thirds of the reactors in operation in the free world today are outside the United States. Since we can't stop other nations from building nuclear plants or weapons, what we must do is find better solutions to international problems. An energy starved nation is much more likely to make and use nuclear weapons as a last resort to survival. The only way to prevent that is to

\* A "mrem" is an appropriate unit used to make comparisons.

see to it that there is enough energy to go around, and to strengthen cooperation and confidence among the nations.

Q. What have we learned from the accident at Three-Mile Island?

A. Two things. First, that nuclear reactors are even safer than we thought. Despite many human errors and a few mechanical failures at Three-Mile Island, the damage was contained. No one was killed, or even injured. We have also learned that a lot can be done by better educated, better paid and more responsible reactor operators, and by a more efficient display of the state of the reactor by modern instrument panels.

Three-Mile Island has cost \$500-million, but not a single life. We must pay for safety and, even after we have paid for it, nuclear energy is the cheapest source of electrical power. It is most remarkable that in the case of nuclear energy we are paying for our lessons in dollars, not in lives.●

#### GEORGIA'S MINUTEWOMAN

### HON. WYCHE FOWLER, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I applaud Congresswoman PAT SCHROEDER's "Minutewomen" series and am pleased to join her in celebrating the contributions of America's outstanding women. I wish to acknowledge the excellent assistance of Ms. Louise Shaw of the Atlanta Historical Society in cooperation with Dr. William L. Pressly, director, and Mr. Franklin M. Garrett, historian, in gathering the biographical information included below.

One Georgia woman in particular, Jane VandeVrede, was a distinguished pioneer in promoting health and welfare in the State. She devoted over 60 years of service to the people of the South and the Nation.

A nurse by profession, Ms. VandeVrede helped establish the first State public health clinics and later organized chapters of the Red Cross in Georgia. In addition to teaching home nursing and first aid, she was instrumental in recruiting nurses during 1918 for service in World War I and was subsequently appointed director of the Southern Division of the American Red Cross.

Among her many contributions to the advancement of health care in the State were her efforts to establish a Bureau of Public Health Nursing within the State Health Department. Development of the Georgia Nurses Association, the Georgia League of Nursing, the Georgia Hospital Association, and the National Organization of Public Health Nurses should also be attributed to Ms. VandeVrede. Serving as the first executive secretary of the Georgia Nurses Association and as the Governor's appointee to the board of nurse examiners, she worked tirelessly to advance the quality of nursing education in Georgia.

During the depression, Ms. VandeVrede was appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Works Projects Administration in Georgia, and in that capacity she continued to pro-

mote educational and health programs which provided work opportunities for Georgia's citizens.

Jane VandeVrede has earned a place of high regard in Georgia's history. I take great pride in sharing her accomplishments with my colleagues.●

#### OPEN AND CLOSED COURTS

### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Ashburnham Pilot & Westminster Times, published in north-central Massachusetts, sets forth very well the reasons why a recent 5 to 4 decision of the Supreme Court granting trial judges almost unlimited authority to close their courts to the public should be reversed.

I am happy to share this excellent editorial with my colleagues.

#### OPEN AND CLOSED COURTS

A recent decision of the Supreme Court, 5-4, establishes that a trial judge has almost unlimited authority to close his court to the public. The long, slow, centuries-old growth of the common law rule that civil and criminal proceedings be open to the public has been left to the discretion of the trial judge. Justice Stewart Potter wrote the opinion for the majority. In that opinion, Justice Potter said the history of the common law rule "falls to demonstrate that the framers of the Sixth Amendment intended to create a constitutional right in strangers to attend a pre-trial proceeding when all that they actually did was to confer upon the accused an explicit right to demand a public trial." Such an opinion, we think, tends to interpret the Constitution in complete isolation from the society that produced and lives under it.

As recently as three years ago, the Court was persuaded that an open courtroom played a vital role in our society. In a similar, but not identical, case, the Court then unanimously sustained this interpretation. Justice Potter then joined that opinion which stated: "Secrecy of judicial action can only breed ignorance and distrust of courts and suspicion concerning the competence and impartiality of judges. Free and robust reporting, criticism and debate subject (the criminal justice system) to the cleansing effects of exposure and public accountability." That view, most Americans might agree, is in harmony with the legal tradition in America and in the West generally. The present decision of the Supreme Court, 1,000 days later, is retrogressive.

In a dissenting opinion filed in the present instance, Justice Harry A. Blackmun, echoing the opinion of the Court three years ago, re-establishes the guiding principles that should govern in this vital area.

"The right to a speedy and public trial . . . reflects the tradition of our system of criminal justice that a trial is a public event" and that "what transpires in the courtroom is public property."

"More importantly, the requirement that a trial of a criminal case be public embodies our belief that secret judicial proceedings would be a menace to liberty. This nation's accepted practice of providing open trials . . . has always been recognized as a safeguard against any attempt to employ our courts as

instruments of persecution. The knowledge that every criminal trial is subject to contemporaneous review in the forum of public opinion is an effective restraint on possible abuse of judicial power."

"It has been said that publicity 'is the soul of justice.' And in many ways it is: open judicial processes, especially in the criminal field, protect against judicial, prosecutorial, and police abuse; provide a means for citizens to obtain information about the criminal justice system and the performance of public officials; and safeguard the integrity of the courts.

"Publicity is essential to the preservation of public confidence in the rule of law and in the operation of the courts."

We can but hope that, in its own good time, the Supreme Court will reconsider the significance for our society of its recent decision.●

#### BLOCH RECEIVES HUMPHREY AWARD

### HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, recently our colleague, Congressman CHRIS DODD of Connecticut presented the Peace Corps' Hubert H. Humphrey Award to Julia Chang Bloch. Congressman DODD is himself a recipient of the award. She richly deserves such recognition for her international humanitarian efforts. In addition to those of us who are privileged to call her a friend she is not only a distinguished public servant, but also a bright, charming woman of many talents. Ms. Bloch is currently serving as the International Communication Agency's Deputy Director for African Affairs. USICA's World recently devoted a few inches to her accomplishments. I include them in the RECORD at this point:

#### BLOCH RECEIVES HUMPHREY AWARD

Julia Chang Bloch, Deputy Director for African Affairs, received the second Hubert H. Humphrey Award in May in a ceremony at the U.S. Mission to the UN.

The annual Award and ceremony, cosponsored by USUN and the Peace Corps, recognizes the outstanding service of former Peace Corps volunteers.

Bloch, who served as a volunteer in the Peace Corps in Malaysia from 1964-66, held positions as Evaluation Officer for the Peace Corps in Washington, D.C. and Minority Staff Director of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, before assuming her present job in 1977.

A graduate of the University of California at Berkeley, Bloch has a Master's Degree in East Asian Government and Regional Studies from Harvard University.

She has been a member of the Young Political Leaders Delegation to the People's Republic of China and the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations.

Bloch has spoken widely on women's rights, U.S. participation in international organizations, nutrition and food assistance, and national health insurance. She organized the Congressional Symposium on International Women's Year in 1975 and, the following year, helped implement the U.S. Aid for International Development "Integration of Women in Development" program.

The Director of ACTION, Sam Brown, gave the official welcome at the award ceremony,

and Peace Corps Director-designate Richard Celeste delivered the keynote address.

Among the more than 500 invited guests were Ambassadors from a number of countries where Peace Corps volunteers serve, former volunteers, and members of the staffs of the United Nations and ACTION.●

#### RETIREMENT OF JUDGE DANIEL C. JENKINS

#### HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Judge Daniel C. Jenkins of New Lexington, Ohio, retired February 8, 1979, after 30 years of distinguished service on the bench. Judge Jenkins is the only lawyer to have served in both the probate and juvenile courts in Perry County, Ohio. He is also the longest tenured judge in Perry County.

Born in Shawnee, Ohio, on October 24, 1911, Judge Jenkins is a graduate of Denison University, Granville, Ohio, and the University of Cincinnati, where he received his law degree in 1936. He practiced law until 1941, when he volunteered for the U.S. Army as a private in infantry.

In 1942 he was commissioned as a second lieutenant at Fort Benning, Ga. He then served as a captain at Fort Jackson, S.C., and later graduated from the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. He had a distinguished military career in World War II in Europe as a major. Returning to the United States in 1945, he continued to serve as an instructor in the U.S. Army Reserve until 1955, when he resigned as a lieutenant colonel.

After the war, he resumed his law practice in New Lexington until 1948, when he was elected judge of the probate and juvenile courts, Perry County, Ohio, an office he held until his retirement.

Judge Jenkins and his wife, the former Katherine Jean Montgomery, are the parents of four children, Daniel, Katherine, Anne, and David. Judge Jenkins' civic activities are many. He has distinguished himself in the Methodist Church and in the Masonic Lodge, where he was elected Grand Master of Ohio in 1961.

Judge Jenkins has proven himself worthy of the high office bestowed on him and is held in high esteem and affection by his colleagues and by the community. His contribution on the bench has set a high standard for others to follow. His fairness in reviewing cases and his guidance to the youth of the community will long be remembered.

But perhaps best of all, he will be remembered for his kindness, his sensitivity, and generous spirit. He is well loved, and we all feel better for having known him. He is a true humanitarian. We wish him and his family well on a much deserved retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an article commemorating Judge Jenkins' tenure that appeared in the January 26 edition of the Columbus Dispatch, be printed in its entirety in the RECORD.

The article follows:

Jan. 26, 1979

#### 30 YEARS ON BENCH TO END: JUDGE JENKINS IS HONORED

SOMERSET, OHIO.—The Perry County Bar Association Thursday night paid tribute to Judge Daniel C. Jenkins, who retires Feb. 8 after 30 years on the bench.

Judge Jenkins is the only lawyer to have served in the probate and juvenile courts in Perry County.

His predecessor was a nonlawyer who served under a grandfather clause of a law which was passed to require that probate and juvenile judge be lawyers.

Veteran attorney Joseph C. Allen spoke in honor of Jenkins and praised him for his fairness, promptness and courtesy.

"He (Jenkins) was always up on the law, and his decisions were just and unversed," Allen said.

Allen said he was sorry to see Jenkins leave the bench, that he enjoyed practicing in his court and that he kept his court active and his docket up to date.

"He kept us on our toes," Allen concluded. Common Pleas Judge Robert G. Tague echoed Allen's comments and called it a "rare and honored privilege" to have served as a colleague on the bench for 16 years.

Tague said Jenkins was the longest tenured judge in Perry County, and that he served with dignity, integrity, sensitivity and scholarship.

"He has made an indelible imprint on Probate Court of the county," Tague concluded.

Jenkins was born in Shawnee, graduated from New Lexington High School, Denison University and the University of Cincinnati Law School.

He served in the armed services in World War II and has been active in veteran's organizations.

He also became active in the Masonic Lodge and served as grandmaster of the Ohio Masonic Order.

Tague said Jenkins has had a lifetime of service to others.●

#### IS THE PRESIDENT GETTING THE RIGHT INTELLIGENCE?

#### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, during his July 25 news conference, the President was asked if Nicaragua could become "another Cuba." He did not directly answer the question.

The New York Times, Sunday, July 29, 1979, told of the Sandinistas enforcing of a "new economy" in Leon, the nation's second largest city.

The Times quoted the Sandinista Director of the Office of Supplies for that region:

We don't want reform: we want socialism . . . there are a lot of people here who would like this to be a Marxist state.

One of the men chosen to head a Nicaraguan popular army is Humberto Or-

tega Saavedra. Mr. Ortega is prominently featured in a front page photograph in the New York Times, with Fidel Castro "holding open arms" to him.

Is the President a victim of such poor intelligence gathering that he really does not know what is going on in Nicaragua? Just by reading stories in the Times one can tell the direction the Nicaraguan revolution is taking. It is predictably following the "Cuban model." Why does not the President tell the American people the truth.●

#### NATIONAL ARCHITECTURAL BARRIER AWARENESS WEEK

#### HON. RICHARD NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the 78 Members of Congress who have already cosponsored my bill, House Joint Resolution 338, which would authorize the President to proclaim the third week in May 1980 as "National Architectural Barrier Awareness Week."

I recognize that our energy crisis demands the immediate attention of Congress. However, we should not lose sight of the fact that other national problems exist and in my view one of the most serious is accessibility for the handicapped.

Although some progress has been made in removing architectural barriers, a continuing national effort is imperative if millions of handicapped Americans are to enjoy the opportunity for development and achievement available for all citizens. One important way to continue this national effort is establishment of National Architectural Barrier Awareness Week next May.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee requires 218 cosponsors before consideration of legislation of this kind. I strongly urge you to add your name as a cosponsor and help end the present architectural double standards which allows access to the able-bodied and dead ends to the handicapped.

Following is a list of the 78 Members who are cosponsors of House Joint Resolution 338.

#### HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 338—NATIONAL ARCHITECTURAL BARRIER AWARENESS WEEK COSPONSORS

Mr. Moakley, Mr. Mitchell of Maryland, Mr. Santini, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Walgren, Mr. Winn, Mr. LaFalce, Mr. Green, Mr. Carr, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Gray, Mr. Flood, Mr. Dougherty, Mr. Simon.

Mr. McHugh, Mr. Natcher, Mr. Nichols, Mr. Forsythe, Mr. Coelho, Mr. Lehman, Mr. Murphy of Pennsylvania, Mr. Richmond, Mr. McDade, Mr. Hughes of California, Mr. Downey, Mr. Neal, Mr. Ford of Michigan, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Wolpe.

Mr. Bedell, Mr. Lowry, Mr. Frenzel, Mr. Treen, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Vento, Mr. AuCoin, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Guarini, Mr. Waxman, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Evans, Mr. Abdnor, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Thompson.

Mr. Brodhead, Mr. Corrada, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Holland, Mr. Hagedorn, Mr.

O'Brien, Mr. Erdahl, Mr. Sabo, Mr. Hall of Ohio, Mr. Mazzoli, Mr. Beard, Mr. Bonior, Mr. Miller of California, Mr. Won Pat, Mr. Fazio.

Mr. Murphy of New York, Mr. Maguire, Mr. Burgener, Mr. Fischer, Mr. Wampler, Mr. Daschle, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Russo, Mr. Mineta, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Skelton, Mr. Heftel, Mr. Hollenbeck, Mr. Jenrette, Ms. Oakar, Mr. Fowler, Mr. Lent, Mr. Blanchard.●

**PRESERVING CIVIL WAR HISTORY:  
EXPANDING MANASSAS NATIONAL  
BATTLEFIELD PARK**

**HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II**  
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to expand the boundaries of the Manassas National Battlefield Park in Prince William County, Va. The addition of approximately 1,715 acres to the 3,000-acre park would preserve several areas which have great historical significance relating to the two battles of Manassas, important engagements of the American Civil War.

The addition of this land would greatly enhance the historical importance of the current park. For example, one of the sites to be acquired is the opening scene of the second battle of Manassas, where Jackson made his decision to fight. One piece of land is the site of Portici, General Johnson's headquarters during the first battle. And, the historical Conrad House, used as a field hospital during both battles, is located on one tract. On another stands an imposing woods of trees imbedded with the shrapnel of Civil War battles. The park is one of the few remaining in the Nation where visitors can view the natural terrain on which such engagements occurred.

**PROVISIONS OF THE BILL**

The bill will add 1,715 acres to the 3,000-acre park by direct Federal purchase, donation, exchange, or easement from owners who could continue using their property for 25 years or until their death. Certain parcels would be purchased in fee through direct acquisition and others through acquisition of scenic easements. The acquisition program is designed to be completed within 2 years.

Under the legislation, all property within the 1954 boundaries of the park, not already acquired, could not be acquired without the owner's consent so long as the property continued to be maintained in its present use. It also gives the owner the right to a formal hearing on the record before an independent third party if the Secretary proposes to acquire the property because of a change in use.

I have carefully reviewed all the alternatives being considered by the Prince William County Board of Supervisors and the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation concerning the construction of the proposed Route 234 by-pass. Only one of the five alternative routes being reviewed would impact

on land being considered under my bill. The bill stipulates that if V.D.H. & T. chooses this alternative as the best course of action, the Secretary will make the land available for the right of way. Further, the Secretary is specifically prohibited from closing any State roads within the park without the consent of State officials.

The language of this bill reflects suggestions I have received during many meetings over the last 6 months with individual property owners, local officials, historical groups, and other interested parties.

**ENACTMENT NEEDED NOW**

Prince William County, just 30 miles from the Nation's Capitol, is one of the fastest growing counties in the Nation. From 1960 to 1970, its population more than doubled, jumping from 50,000 to 111,000. Today, Prince William County has more than 170,000 people, with every indication that rapid growth will continue. Residential and commercial development has seen a steady increase in the last 15 years, and the costs of land is constantly escalating. High housing costs in and around Washington, D.C., are leading many families to seek homes in the county.

Contributing to this growth is the completion of two major interstate highways that cross the county. Interstate 66, a major highway artery, is in close proximity to the current border of the park. This has created tremendous pressure for the development of highway-oriented uses, which threaten desecration of this historic and sacred land.

Currently, commercial development is encroaching on the park and several parcels bordering Interstate 66 are zoned commercial. A motel, gas station and a commercial cemetery are next to the park. We must act now to expand the boundaries of the park.

The expansion of the park is important for another reason—to provide necessary recreational opportunities and open space to this fast growing suburban area. The county is facing growing pains common to many of our suburban areas. With the rapid infusion of people in recent years, it has been difficult to provide adequate services. And as we all know, when services must keep pace with growth, sewers and schools often come first. Parks and recreation facilities are usually relegated to a lower priority. The addition of these 1,715 acres to the park will not only provide added historic lands for the park but will provide new and much needed recreational and open space areas for local citizens.

My efforts to preserve these properties are supported by such organizations as the Prince William Federation of Civic Associations, the Prince William League for the Protection of Natural Resources, the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, The Virginia Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and nationally, the American Legion and the Civil War Roundtable Associates. Protecting the park has been editorially endorsed by the Washington Post and the Washington Star as well as the Potomac News in Prince William County.

Congress must take the lead now in protecting our precious historical lands and monuments before it is too late. The adjacent lands to the Manassas National Battlefield Park are priceless and cannot be left to "fall as they may." I urge my colleagues to join me in preserving this important chapter of our Nation's history.

At this point, I include the text of the bill to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

H.R. 5048

A bill to amend the Act entitled "An Act to preserve within Manassas National Battlefield Park, Virginia, the most important historic properties relating to the battle of Manassas, and for other purposes", approved April 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 56; 16 U.S.C. 429b)

*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 "Manassas National Battlefield Park Amendments of 1979".*

SEC. 2. The Act entitled "An Act to preserve within the Manassas National Battlefield Park, Virginia, the most important historic properties relating to the battle of Manassas, and for other purposes", approved April 17, 1954 (16 U.S.C. 429b), is amended to read as follows: "That there is established as a unit of the National Park System in the Commonwealth of Virginia the Manassas National Battlefield Park, which shall contain within its boundaries the important historical lands relating to the two battles of Manassas. The total area of the park shall not be greater than 4,715 acres. The boundaries of the park shall be the boundaries depicted on the map entitled 'Boundary Map, Manassas National Battlefield Park', dated August 1979, and numbered 80,001; which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register, as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, a detailed description and map of the boundaries. Notwithstanding Section 7(c) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (91 Stat. 211), the Secretary may not make any changes in the boundaries of the park. The Secretary shall administer the park in accordance with laws, rules, and regulations applicable to the national park system.

SEC. 2. (a) In order to effectuate the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds or exchange, any property or interests therein which are located within the boundaries of the park, except that property owned by the Commonwealth of Virginia or by any political subdivision thereof may be acquired only by donation.

"(b) With respect to areas within the 1954 boundaries of the park, as identified on the map referred to in the first section of this Act, the Secretary may not acquire fee simple title to such areas without the consent of the owner so long as the lands continue to be devoted to their present use. Further, if the Secretary proposes to acquire fee simple title to such property because of a change in use, the owner of such property may seek a review of the proposed acquisition of his or her property and is entitled to a hearing on the record in accordance with Section 554 of Title 5 of the United States Code.

"(c) If the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation determines that the proposed Route 234 bypass should be properly located between the VEPCO power-line easement and Route 705, the Secretary shall make available the land necessary for such road.

"(d) The Secretary may not close any State roads within the park unless action per-

mitting the closing of such roads has been taken by appropriate officials of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

"Sec. 3. (a) Subsequent to the date of enactment of this section, the owner of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition of such acquisition, retain for himself and his heirs and assigns a right of use and occupancy of the improved property for noncommercial residential purposes for a definite term of not more than 25 years or for a term ending at the death of the owner or the death of the spouse of the owner, whichever is later. The owner shall elect the term to be reserved. Unless this property is wholly or partially donated to the United States, the Secretary shall pay the owner an amount equal to the fair market value of the property on the date of its acquisition less the value on such date of the right retained by the owner. If such property is donated (in whole or in part) to the United States, the Secretary may pay to the owner such lesser amount as the owner may agree to. A right retained pursuant to this section shall be subject to termination by the Secretary upon his determination that it is being exercised in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of this Act, and it shall terminate by operation of law upon the Secretary's notifying the holder of the right of such determination and tendering to him an amount equal to the fair market value of that portion of the right which remains unexpired.

"(b) No property owner who elects to retain a right of use and occupancy under this section shall be considered a displaced person as defined in section 101(6) of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1894). Such owners shall be considered to have waived any benefits which would otherwise accrue to them under sections 203 through 206 of such Act.

"Sec. 4. For purposes of this Act—

"(1) The term 'improved property' means a detached, one-family dwelling, construction of which was begun before January 1, 1979, which is used for noncommercial residential purposes, together with not to exceed three acres of land on which the dwelling is situated and together with such additional lands or interests therein as the Secretary deems to be reasonably necessary for access thereto, such lands being in the same ownership as the dwelling, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on such land.

"(2) The term 'park' means the Manassas National Battlefield Park established under this Act.

"(3) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior.

"Sec. 5. (a) From funds available for expenditure from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, as established under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, not more than a total of \$20,018,000 may be expended for the acquisition of property and interests therein under this Act.

"(b) It is the express intent of Congress that the Secretary shall acquire property and interests therein under this Act within 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Manassas National Battlefield Park Amendments of 1979.

"Sec. 6. (a) Authorizations of moneys to be appropriated under this Act from the Land and Water Conservation Fund for acquisition of properties and interests shall be effective on October 1, 1980.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, authority to enter into contracts, to incur obligations, or to make payments under this Act shall be effective only to the extent, and in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts."●

## DECLINING PRODUCTIVITY

### HON. STANLEY N. LUNDINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, Monday, the Department of Labor reported that productivity in the nonfarm business sector dropped at an annual rate of 5.7 percent during the second quarter of this year—the worst showing since the Government began keeping record in 1947.

Normally, I would not be unduly concerned by the measures for a single quarter, since indicators like productivity can be expected to fluctuate. But in this case, coming after more than 5 years of extremely low productivity growth, a decline of this magnitude is cause for alarm.

Productivity measures are sensitive to cyclical influences, of course. As administration officials pointed out, the quarterly data may primarily reflect the onset of a recession. But the unsatisfactory productivity performance that we have experienced has much longer-run implications for the health of our economy. Dramatic improvement is critical to our ability to achieve our central economic objectives in the years ahead.

This country does not need to settle for continued "stagflation"—the awful combination of high inflation and high unemployment we have experienced for much of this decade. A high rate of productivity growth will enable us to attack both of these problems simultaneously, and sustain a strong rate of economic growth.

The dimensions of the problem are very disturbing. From post-war rates of 3 to 3.5 percent a year, productivity growth began to decline in the mid-1960's, falling to 2.3 percent between 1975 and 1973 and to 1 percent between 1973 and 1977. Overall, productivity has ceased to improve much at all since 1977 and began to drop during the first quarter of 1979.

Even in manufacturing, U.S. productivity gains on the order of 2.5 percent a year compare unfavorably with those of other industrialized countries. In Japan, manufacturing productivity increased by 8.3 percent from 1977 to 1978; in Sweden, the rate was 5.4 percent; in France, 4.9 percent; in Canada, 4.2 percent; in Germany, 3.7 percent. Among the major developed countries, only Great Britain exhibited a slower productivity growth rate than we did.

These trends have not been fully explained. The 1974 recession, for example, had a major negative impact on productivity, but cyclical forces are thought to account for only about one-fourth of the drop experienced at that time. A number of additional reasons have been advanced, and experts argue about virtually all of them. Probably, some combination of the following factors is involved:

Sectoral shifts, such as movements of population out of agriculture into manu-

facturing and changes in the industrial composition of the economy;

Demographic changes affecting the quality and composition of the work force;

Lack of innovation and invention; Rising energy costs and instability of energy supply; and

Changes in the rate and nature of capital investments. Regulatory requirements, for example, have motivated substantial investments in pollution control equipment and other activities that do not directly raise output.

In examining investment policy, we have tended, in my view, to underestimate the importance of investing in our human resources. And while I am disturbed by signs that our technological superiority may be waning, I consider human investments equally critical. Unfortunately, this country has not paid sufficient attention to the skill and motivation levels of its workers, or really understood the potential for more effective utilizations of our human resources.

A survey of worker attitudes conducted by the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research found substantial declines in job satisfaction—among all groups except for the self-employed. In 1977, nearly 36 percent of those surveyed believed that their skills and talents were not adequately utilized in their current jobs. Eight years earlier, only 27 percent had reported such feelings of underutilization.

Only 21 percent of the workers surveyed in 1977 cited work as a main source of satisfaction in their lives. Increasingly, workers criticize their jobs as tedious and claim to have little control over both the content and scheduling aspects of work. While rising expectations may be part of the explanation for these developments, it also seems likely that for many people, the quality of working life has deteriorated.

It may sound simplistic to say that deeply dissatisfied workers would not be very productive. But to me, these survey findings underline the need for much more extensive efforts by business, labor, and government to improve the quality of working life.

In Washington, we have not fully faced up to the problem. Too often, there is complacent acceptance of discouraging productivity statistics, as if changing them were somehow out of the question.

Ironically, it often requires a crisis to impress upon us the need for change. We now face a crisis—involving far more than just energy supplies.

To alter our basic economic condition, we must make productivity improvement a major focus of national policy. We must call on our experts for a thorough examination of the causes of the problem. Business and labor must collaborate to develop mutually acceptable approaches. Both the administration and the Congress must be convinced of the need for new solutions.

In the months ahead, I intend to develop a set of comprehensive proposals and define the structure of such an initiative. If we succeed in reversing the patterns, the returns to our economy will fully justify the effort required.●

CONGRESSMAN BERKLEY BEDELL  
INTRODUCES GASOLIN TAX EX-  
EMPTION CLARIFICATION LAN-  
GUAGE

**HON. BERKLEY BEDELL**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to make it easier for producers and sellers of gasohol to obtain the benefits which Congress intended to give them in the Energy Act of 1978. While the bill deals with technical tax matters, correction of the problems it addresses is necessary to promote the production and use of gasohol.

Certain types of alcohol—such as ethanol and methanol—can be made from surplus agricultural and forestry products and wastes including urban wastes, and these alcohols can be mixed with gasoline in combinations of up to 15 percent alcohol to make a fuel which can be used by today's automobiles with little or no need for engine modification. Since use of gasohol can reduce the amount of petroleum products consumed by existing vehicles, Congress decided to encourage its development as an alternative fuel.

Thus, under the Energy Tax Act of 1978, gasohol—that is, fuel which is a blend of gasoline, or other motor fuel, and alcohol—that is at least 10-percent alcohol, other than alcohol derived from petroleum, natural gas, or coal, is exempted from the Federal excise taxes on motor fuels on or after January 1, 1979, and before October 1, 1984. The act provides that gasoline may be sold free of tax if it is to be used in the production of gasohol. The act also provides that, if the gasohol for which an exemption from the tax is obtained is later separated into gasoline and alcohol, the person doing such separation is to be treated as the producer of the gasoline, and thus would ordinarily be liable for the 4-cent-a-gallon tax.

Unfortunately, in what appears to have been a technical oversight, the Energy Tax Act made no provision for refund of the tax on gasoline if tax-paid gasoline is mixed with alcohol to produce gasohol.

The Technical Corrections bill (H.R. 2797), as it passed the House of Representatives, tries to remedy this problem by providing a credit or refund mechanism for the taxes on tax-paid fuel used to produce gasohol—and by providing a "recapture" mechanism to reimpose the tax if the gasohol is later separated. Unfortunately, the refund mechanism so provided requires that a person who acquires tax-paid gasoline and mixes it with alcohol to produce gasohol can obtain a refund of the gasoline tax only by a procedure which requires the consent and cooperation of the producer and parties in the chain of title between the producer of the gasoline and the person who mixes the alcohol and gasoline. Not only is this procedure cumbersome and somewhat time consuming, but also there is no provision of law which requires that these other parties cooperate in the refund process. They might well refuse to

cooperate in some circumstances for reasons such as the amount of paperwork involved.

To surmount this problem, the bill I am introducing today would provide that if a person mixes alcohol—other than alcohol derived from petroleum, natural gas or coal—and tax-paid gasoline to produce gasohol for resale or for use in his trade or business, that person may obtain a direct refund or credit of the Federal excise taxes paid on the gasoline. Such a person may obtain a refund of these taxes directly from the Treasury. These refunds may be obtained for each of the first three quarters of a person's taxable year if \$200 or more is payable with respect to gasoline purchased for use in gasohol in such quarter. With respect to any amount of Federal excise tax on tax paid gasoline for which a quarterly claim for refund is not made—because the amount payable for a quarter is less than \$200, a claim for refund is not made during a quarter, or the fuel is purchased during the last quarter of a taxable year—the taxpayer may claim the amount of taxes paid as a credit on his income tax return for the taxable year.

This credit or refund approach applies to sales of gasoline made after December 31, 1978, and before October 1, 1984. This is the same effective date as applies with respect to excise taxes on gasohol. In order to facilitate the refund process for pre-enactment purchases of gasoline, the bill provides that sales of gasoline made after December 31, 1978, but prior to the date of enactment of this provision would be treated as having occurred in the quarter of the taxpayer's taxable year in which the date of enactment falls.

To prevent the allowance of more than one credit or refund of the same taxes, the bill also provides that if a credit or refund of excise taxes on gasoline is allowable under these new provisions, no credit or refund is allowable for these taxes under other provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. Further, in order to prevent avoidance of the excise tax on gasoline, the bill provides that the "recapture" treatment that applies if "tax exempt" gasohol is separated should apply not only if the gasohol was obtained free of tax but also if a credit or refund of excise taxes had been obtained. This result is achieved by amending the provision which treats a person who separates an exempted gasoline-alcohol mixture into gasoline and alcohol as the producer of such gasoline—and therefore subject to the 4-cents-a-gallon tax—by providing that this treatment applies not only if the gasoline was originally acquired free of tax but also if a credit or refund of excise taxes had been obtained.

Mr. Speaker, in my home State of Iowa, nearly 6 million gallons of gasohol are sold each month. The executive director of the Iowa Independent Oil Jobbers Association has informed me that a very large percentage of these sales is done by relatively small jobbers who operate on a tight budget and with limited resources. The enactment of this legislation would insure that these

smaller operators would be able to obtain their tax credits by the use of form 843 on a quarterly basis, an allowance which will mean that they will not have to be subjected to extensive paperwork requirements and delays that could otherwise make it prohibitive for them to sell gasohol. Thus, the intent of Congress is honored: gasohol sales will be furthered by the 4-cent tax exemption, thereby promoting the use of an alternative fuel that is badly needed in this country.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to note that the Department of Treasury does not oppose this measure; in fact, the Department has suggested much of the technical language used in its drafting. I sincerely hope that my colleagues will give this legislation their wholehearted approval and that it can be given serious and expeditious consideration.

The bill follows:

H.R. 5044

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the credit or refund of the tax on any gasoline which is used in the production of certain alcohol fuels

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

SECTION 1. REFUND OF TAX ON GASOLINE USED TO PRODUCE CERTAIN ALCOHOL FUELS.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Section 6427 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to fuels not used for taxable purposes) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) as subsections (g), (h), (i), (j), and (k), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) GASOLINE USED TO PRODUCE CERTAIN ALCOHOL FUELS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (i), if any gasoline on which tax is imposed by section 4081 is used by any person in producing a mixture described in section 4081(c) for sale or use in such person's trade or business, the Secretary shall pay (without interest) to such person an amount equal to the aggregate amount of the tax imposed on such gasoline. The preceding sentence shall not apply with respect to uses described in such sentence after September 30, 1984.

"(2) COORDINATION WITH OTHER REPAYMENT PROVISIONS.—No payment shall be made under subsection (d) or (e) of this section or under section 6420 or 6421 with respect to any gasoline with respect to which an amount is payable under paragraph (1)."

(b) QUARTERLY REFUND ALLOWED WHERE \$200 OR MORE PAYABLE.—

(1) Subparagraph (A) of section 6427(g) (2) of such Code (as redesignated by subsection (a)(1)) is amended by striking out "or" at the end of clause (i), by inserting "or" at the end of clause (ii), and by inserting after clause (ii) the following new clause:

"(iii) \$200 or more is payable under subsection (f)."

(2) Subparagraph (B) of section 6427(g) (2) of such Code (as redesignated by subsection (a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) SPECIAL RULE.—If the requirements of clause (ii) or clause (iii) of subparagraph (A) are met by any person for any quarter but the requirements of subparagraph (A) (1) are not met by such person for such quarter, such person may file a claim under subparagraph (A) for such quarter only with

respect to amounts referred to in the clause (or clauses) of subparagraph (A) the requirements of which are met by such person for such quarter."

(c) TREATMENT OF SUBSEQUENT SEPARATION.—Paragraph (2) of section 4081(c) of such Code (relating to later separation of gasoline) is amended by inserting "(or with respect to which a credit or payment was allowed or made by reason of a use described in section 6427(f)(1))" after "this subsection".

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsections (a)(4) and (b) of section 39 of such Code are each amended by striking out "6427(h)" and inserting in lieu thereof "6427(i)".

(2) Subsections (a), (b)(1), (c), (d), and (e)(1) of section 6427 of such Code are each amended by striking out "(h)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(i)".

(3) Subsection (g)(1) of such section 6427 (as redesignated by subsection (a)(1)) is amended by striking out "(a), (b), (c), (d), or (e)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a), (b), (c), (d), (e), or (f)".

(4) Subsection (1)(2) of such section 6427 (as redesignated by subsection (a)(1)) is amended by striking out "(f)(2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(g)(2)".

(5) Sections 7210, 7603, 7604(b), 7604(c)(2), 7605(a), 7609(c)(1), and 7610(c) are each amended by striking out "6427(g)(2)" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "6427(h)(2)".

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on January 1, 1979.

(2) TRANSITIONAL RULE.—Any use on or after January 1, 1979, and before the date of the enactment of this Act which is described in section 6427(f)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as amended by this Act) shall, for purposes of section 6427 of such Code, be treated as occurring on the date of the enactment of this Act.●

### WHAT PRICE CHARISMA?

#### HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, much has been written recently about the crisis of leadership in America. Time magazine, in its cover story on "Leadership in America" this week suggested: "As much as any time since World War II, the occasion has called for leadership."

That, Mr. Speaker, may be the greatest understatement since World War II.

Across America, the people are concerned about the leadership gap in the White House. Typical of the concern is the following editorial that appeared July 26, 1979, in the Clintonville Tribune Gazette, in my district.

It effectively describes the leadership problem, and I am pleased to share it with our colleagues:

#### WHAT PRICE CHARISMA?

In our insulated view of national events there's a pattern developing that seems to indicate a profound lack of leadership in the White House and it may be due as much to the provincial attitudes of the Georgian palace guard as to the titular head of state himself. The country gets nowhere.

The president's showy meanderings from

empty event to empty event haven't changed the nature of our problems a bit. The Camp David exercise in headlopping seems designed not so much to correct leadership inadequacies as to divert attention from the policy vacuum that stymies government action.

Probably the most disturbing news we get here in the hinterlands is that there is no real attempt being made to bring the powerful, diverse forces of Congress to grips with what the administration sees as our major concerns. It appears that the White House wants its way regardless of what it takes to make cooperative effort possible. Congress, for all its ideosyncrasies is the people and no program will be available to the nation unless it comes from Congress. Why should we be left with the feeling that the Georgians so fear, disdain or distrust Congress that they will have nothing to do with it?

The 1976 presidential election campaign has been over for more than two and a half years but the presidency still has a pre-election preoccupation with image rather than performance. We get plenty of posturing and sermonizing, but no action.

It can be argued that the national spirit has suffered somewhat in recent decades, but there is no "crisis" of spirit in this land. We're no more materialistic than our grandparents were, perhaps less.

Yet we are dispirited, if that's what you call being tired of whining preachments when what we need is an executive team that goes to Congress with a measurable problem and asks for honest help in its solution. We're beginning to feel relieved that the election of 1980 is little more than a year away.●

### PROGRESS IN ST. LOUIS

#### HON. ROBERT A. YOUNG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the question of St. Louis' economic growth—present and future—has been much debated in the regional news media over the past decade. Within the past few months, this debate has spread to the national news media. The most authoritative discussion was provided in an analysis in U.S. News & World Report by Ted Gest, the magazine's prize-winning White House correspondent. The U.S. News report, as well as others, prompted a broadcast editorial by KMOX, the CBS radio station in St. Louis, which concluded that St. Louis is moving ahead with "signs of progress all around us." I would like to share the KMOX editorial, presented by Robert Hyland, CBS' regional vice president, with my colleagues. Following is the text of the editorial:

This past spring, Newsweek magazine named St. Louis as one of the nation's most obvious examples of urban decline. That publication accused our city of having "decaying everything."

KMOX Radio took issue with Newsweek in a broadcast editorial. We cited the many examples of progress in St. Louis—general business vitality and individual projects like the May and Gateway Malls, to name a few.

Now, another national magazine has come up with an evaluation of St. Louis. It is diametrically opposed to Newsweek's. The current edition of U.S. News & World Report

describes our city's neighborhood spirit, aggressive business leadership and booming commercial activities.

The U.S. News view is the correct one. There are signs of progress all around us, from the commercial and recreational developments in the downtown area, to the restoration of homes in older parts of the city. St. Louis is moving forward, not fading away in a fatal decline.

The geographic advantage St. Louis possesses is a major factor in this new growth, just as it was when our nation was young. With energy in short supply, the central location of St. Louis enhances its position as a manufacturing, transportation, and tourist center.

The City of St. Louis is the focal point for new strength in the entire metropolitan area. St. Louis County continues to be one of the most desirable suburban areas of the nation. And East St. Louis, under its new administration, is reversing its image as a "poor relation" welfare town.

We're gratified St. Louis is finally winning national recognition as a dynamic urban center. We knew it all along.●

### SALT II IS NECESSARY STEP ON PATH TOWARD MEANINGFUL ARMS CONTROL

#### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the national debate on the strategic arms limitation treaty signed in Vienna is an important part of the ongoing efforts to control the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Today, the nuclear arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union have the capability of destroying the world 15 times over, the equivalent of 15 tons of explosives for every single person on earth. Each year the world's expenditures for arms total more than \$400 billion.

The SALT process has been designed to restrict the proliferation of offensive and defensive nuclear weapons through the negotiation of successive agreements. These agreements seek to control the level of armaments while maintaining mutual deterrence through assured retaliation to prevent a nuclear war. The first negotiations between the superpowers on this subject resulted in the limited nuclear test ban treaty of 1963 which prohibited atmospheric testing. The first comprehensive strategic arms reduction talks began in 1969 and resulted in the first SALT agreement signed in 1972.

SALT I was designed to restrict the proliferation of both offensive and defensive nuclear weapons. Its ceilings were higher than those included in SALT II and left limitations on specific weapons largely undefined. The anti-ballistic missile agreement included in SALT I effectively banned the deployment of defensive missile systems, allowing only one system to each country. This provision has been honored as proof that the SALT process can achieve its desired results.

The interim agreement on strategic

offensive arms was less significant, as it merely froze the number of intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine launched ballistic missiles then in operation or under construction.

The Vladivostok agreement of 1974 sought to establish the framework for SALT II by adopting target ceilings of 2,400 for deployment of nuclear delivery systems, and 1,320 for launchers of ICBM's carrying multiple warheads.

#### PROVISIONS OF SALT II

SALT II provides for the first real numerical limits on the strategic arsenals of the Soviet Union and the United States. The treaty being considered for ratification at this time specifically defines limitations on certain weapons and includes unprecedented restrictions on the use of multiple warheads.

SALT II may be divided into three parts: First, the treaty itself which remains in effect until 1985; second, a 3-year protocol temporarily restricting the use of certain weapons; and third, a joint statement of principles expressing the commitment of both countries to the SALT process and to moving forward toward further arms limitations agreements immediately upon ratification of SALT II.

Today, the United States' strategic force consists of land-based intercontinental missiles, submarine based intercontinental missiles, and heavy bombers. The treaty calls for an equal ceiling of 2,250 on each side's strategic nuclear delivery systems beginning December 31, 1981. Until then, the Vladivostok ceilings of 2,400 will remain in place, followed by a series of interlocking subceilings on multiple warhead missiles and heavy bombers. An equal ceiling of 1,320 ballistic missiles and heavy bombers armed with long range cruise missiles will also be imposed. Multiple warhead ballistic missiles—ICBM's and SLEBM's—will be limited to 1,200 with a further limit of 820 on multiple warhead ICBM's for each side. Throw-weight is also limited under provisions of the new treaty as a way of controlling deployment of new models.

The treaty allows for only one additional new type of missile system to be tested and deployed, and a freeze on the number of existing intercontinental ballistic missiles. A maximum of 10 reentry vehicles will be allowed on the new system as well as on currently deployed air to surface missiles. No telemetry encryption will be tolerated that would interfere with either side's ability to monitor weapons tests, and other SALT related matters.

The protocol provides for a ban on testing and development of launchers equipped with ICBM's and long-range ground and sea launched cruise missiles. It prohibits the deployment of mobile ICBM launchers, places limits on the mobile ICBM's themselves, and bans the testing and deployment of air to surface ballistic missiles with a range in excess of 600 km. These restrictions are temporary and serve to slow down the process of weapons modernization while still allowing the United States to adequately deter any Soviet threat.

Perhaps the most important part of SALT II is the joint statement of principles which expresses the intent of each country to actively continue the SALT process and begin to work on SALT III.

#### WHY SALT II CAN WORK

The very real threat of nuclear war can never be forgotten when judging the merits of the SALT II Treaty. The case for arms reductions is overwhelming when one considers that we possess the capability to destroy the world 15 times, when one warhead on a Minuteman missile has more explosive power than 16 Hiroshima bombs, and when the world's nuclear arsenals have reached the equivalent of 15 tons of explosives for every person on earth. The vicious progression of nuclear proliferation must be reversed before control is lost. True security for the superpowers and the rest of the world can only be attained through the realization of the necessity of limiting the number, scope, and cost of nuclear weapons.

The treaty calls for the Soviet Union to destroy 300 nuclear systems while the United States will not have to destroy any operational weapons. It provides unprecedented controls on weapons with multiple warheads which will restrict the most threatening Soviet MIRVed ICBM's and for the first time, the agreement makes qualitative reductions by prohibiting new weapons in addition to making numerical cutbacks. A strategic balance will be maintained.

Without SALT II the Soviet Union could deploy at least 3,000 nuclear systems instead of the 2,250 with SALT II. Without the agreement the Soviet Union could arm each of their first line heavy missiles with as many as 40 nuclear warheads. With the treaty these missiles are limited to 10 warheads. Without SALT II each country would spend billions of dollars frantically trying to keep up with the perceived capabilities of the adversary, until it reaches the conclusion that true security can only be reached through mutual arms reductions, not escalations. In short, the treaty provides a new sense of stability, certainty, and a program less costly than unrestricted arms competition.

Of primary importance to the viability of SALT II is the ability of each country to monitor the other's compliance with the treaty provisions. Verification, under the terms of the treaty, is to be maintained by national technical means. This country's means of verifying the terms and conditions of the treaty remain highly effective, despite recent doubts that have been raised. Former CIA director, William Colby, has testified exhaustively on this point. Today, a photo-reconnaissance satellite can photograph the numbers on Soviet army trucks from an altitude of 100 miles. Our satellites can identify military objects that are camouflaged or buried underground. The United States is now using a new superpowerful radar station in the Aleutians that can "read" the characteristics of a Soviet missile and its individual warheads. A large sea and air tracking force can intercept and analyze signals from Soviet missile tests. All

these instruments of verification and many others form an intricate listening network to monitor all significant Soviet movements. Interference with such systems is banned under the Treaty.

Recent polls have indicated that a distinct majority of the American public favors ratification of the SALT II Treaty. Among our NATO allies, support for the treaty is strong. Many of our allies view ratification as tantamount to a restatement of U.S. commitment to the security of our friends around the globe.

SALT II will signal the Soviet Union and the rest of the world that the United States is willing and able to commit itself to the process of arms control. Failure to ratify the treaty will signal the Soviet Union that the United States is unwilling to proceed with further SALT talks at this time. Without SALT II, United States-Soviet relations would quickly become unstable and dangerous.

Nuclear war must never be considered a feasible option by the leaders of the two superpowers. To this end, our country must not lose sight of the worldwide devastation a nuclear war would inevitably bring. SALT II is a small, but important step in the process of arms control and disarmament. As the national debate continues over the SALT II agreement, it is my sincere hope that the overriding need for ratification of this accord will not be clouded by other issues.

As a member of the Members of Congress for Peace Through Law (MCPL) SALT II Task Force, I include for the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Boston Globe of June 20, 1979 urging ratification of the SALT II agreement. The editorial follows:

#### SALT: A SMALL BUT SOUND STEP

The fate of President Carter's foreign policy centerpiece, SALT II, now depends on 34 votes in the U.S. Senate. That's all the "no" votes it would take to scuttle the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty signed by Carter and Soviet President Leonid I. Brezhnev in Vienna.

The treaty is a small but sound step toward avoidance of sudden global incineration, and a slowdown of the race to possess a slight edge in the capability to create an Armageddon. The Senate, in its deliberations on the treaty this fall, should keep that in mind above all else. More steps should follow, but they are not likely to come if SALT II is botched.

At the moment there is a small core of senators that solidly favors the treaty. Sen. Kennedy is among them. Numerous others lean toward ratification but are technically "undecided." Sen. Tsongas is among them. Wooing those undecided senators and the conservative opponents is going to be an exercise fraught with peril for the Carter Administration.

The question is how much Carter will have to give to corral the necessary Senate votes. If he gives too much on the treaty and it is significantly altered, it will probably not survive Soviet ratification. If he holds fast on the treaty, but tries to pacify the opposition with political trade-offs, domestic programs like federal aid to cities and alternative energy initiatives could suffer. Carter should resist the temptation to be generous with trade-offs.

The President has already moved to muffle the cries of Senate hawks and other SALT II opponents by deciding to go ahead with

the proposed MX missile system. With an arms limitation treaty based largely on surveillance, a new missile system designed partially to confound surveillance creates an obvious conflict in concept and it caused Carter problems in last-minute SALT II negotiations.

If diplomacy is ever to catch up with technology, a SALT II agreement must not be allowed to languish through more years of negotiations for incremental advantages. Back-and-forth American and Soviet advances in the design of war machinery make such agreements harder to reach or quickly obsolete once they are reached.

The President deserves credit for having as the main pieces of his foreign policy program the making of treaties rather than international conflicts. And his SALT II treaty deserves ratification. ●

#### DIRECTING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT—A GLOBAL CHALLENGE

### HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, this body regularly makes multibillion-dollar decisions about research and development projects, generally with very little perspective on the alternatives or even the priorities that should be considered. We make other decisions, such as in regulatory or tax policy, which indirectly affects the research and development investments of private industry.

The concerns of this country are, of course, concerns which are shared throughout the world. The upcoming United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development will be one forum where these issues will be considered in the global context.

Among the most difficult questions we must consider is the role of military research and development in accelerating the arms race, and in diverting scarce intellectual and capital resources into nonproductive parts of society. Another difficult question we must consider is how capitalist economies can direct private investment toward the common good.

These major philosophical issues will not be readily resolved, but they really must be faced. One contribution to this discussion which I would recommend to my colleagues is a recent publication by the Worldwatch Institute, entitled "Knowledge and Power: Global Research and Development Budget." A recent article by the author of this publication, Colin Norman, appeared in the Los Angeles Times. For those who do not have time to read the full report, I commend this article.

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 1, 1979]

#### MORE R&D FUNDS SHOULD GO TO BETTER CAUSES

(by Colin Norman)

Nearly \$150 billion is now spent around the world each year on scientific research and development. This massive investment, made by governments and corporations with the express purpose of shaping future events, will

influence the physical, economic and political structure of the world inherited by future generations.

Yet there is little public knowledge of the world's research-and-development system—its aims, its priorities and its international dimensions. Much scientific work is cloaked in secrecy, either for military or commercial reasons, and few governments publish up-to-date figures on research and development conducted within their borders.

Nevertheless, we have enough information to know that most of that \$150 billion investment is not well geared to solving the major social problems facing the world in the coming decades. It is in fact, more attuned to the military needs of the 1950s than to the social needs of the 1980s.

More than \$35 billion a year, roughly one-fourth of the world's research-and-development investment, is swallowed up by military programs, and more than 500,000 scientists and engineers are believed to be working on the development of new weapons. Military programs soak up more research-and-development funds, and occupy the talents of more researchers, than do programs related to energy, health, food production and environmental protection combined.

As a result of these skewed investments, the United States has the ability to survey every square meter of the Soviet Union, yet world scientists have barely begun to survey the complex ecosystems of fast-disappearing tropical rain forests and the malignant spread of the world's deserts. The nuclear arsenal of the superpowers contains enough explosive power to reduce to rubble most of the cities on the globe, yet the more challenging task of providing clean, safe power to those cities has received far less scientific attention.

Today, almost six years after the Arab oil embargo clearly underlined the fragility of the industrial world's oil-based economies, investments in energy still lag far behind those devoted to military programs, and they are running about even with expenditures on space science and technology. Yet the development of a secure and safe energy supply is likely to be far more important to the security of most nations than is the development of more devastating weapons.

Although some governments have stepped up their expenditures on energy research and development in recent years, nuclear programs still claim the bulk of these funds. The British, Canadians, German and Japanese governments devote more than two-thirds of their energy research-and-development budgets to nuclear power, while renewable resources account for less than 7% of the energy research budgets of the major Western countries according to the International Energy Agency.

There are signs that priorities are beginning to change in some countries, however. The fastest-growing areas of the global research-and-development budget in recent years have been those concerned with non-military objectives, such as energy production, the development of new medical technologies and environmental protection. Such trends have been most conspicuous in the United States. But there are ample opportunities to accelerate this change in priorities, and to develop new ways to channel resources into socially beneficial areas.

One such avenue is greater cooperation between government and industry on problems that have been relatively neglected. The recent initiative by former Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams to bring government, university and industry scientists together in a major research effort to develop more efficient automobiles is a case in point.

Government regulations can also play an important role in directing industrial research toward socially beneficial goals. For example, government-imposed pollution-control and fuel-efficiency standards have led to

great increases in corporate research-and-development funds devoted to environmental protection and energy conservation in recent years.

In most Western countries, universities constitute a vast storehouse of scientific and technical expertise but, aside from agricultural extension services, this resource is not being tapped to help solve problems in nearby communities. Although much university research will necessarily continue to focus on the unearthing of knowledge that may not have immediate practical application, university scientists and engineers could get more involved in designing local transportation systems and energy-conservation programs.

Reordering research-and-development priorities by channeling more resources into neglected programs would not solve the world's problems by itself, but it would be a step in the right direction.

(Colin Norman is a researcher at Worldwatch Institute in Washington.) ●

#### THE DEMISE OF EUROCOMMUNISM COMES AS GOOD NEWS TO UNITED STATES

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues I wish to place into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared on the front page of Monday's Christian Science Monitor. The title conveys the good message: "Eurocommunism: The Threat Fades."

Of particular importance to me was the rapid ascension in the earlier part of the 1970's of the Italian Communist Party. When the party garnered more than 30 percent of the vote in elections in 1975 and 1976 many observers felt it was the prelude to a Communist government in Italy. However, in this year's elections the Communists suffered a major setback now setting off speculation that they have had their last hurrah.

The article I am inserting today also discusses declines in communist activities in other European nations. The news is encouraging but by no means should be deceived into thinking the threat has totally dissipated. We must continue to insure a strong Europe through our NATO commitments.

The memory of World War II and the cold war still lingers in the minds of millions of Americans. Let us hope that a new era of peace and freedom will be the order of the day for Europe.

The article follows:

#### EUROCOMMUNISM: THE THREAT FADES

VIENNA.—Eurocommunism—the terror of Western Europe just two years ago—seems to have lost its sting for both East and West Europe.

Western Europe's economic problems persist. But no one now blames the problems on Eurocommunism or sees Eurocommunists cashing in on these problems.

And Moscow has shelved its earlier fears that Eurocommunism might tempt East European Communist parties out of the Kremlin fold.

This year has seen a remarkable drop in Eurocommunism's ratings with:

A serious election setback to the move-

ment's founder and most effective protagonist, the Italian Communist Party.

Sharp differences between the Italians and Eurocommunists' other main adherents on style, ideology, and approach to international and East-West relationships.

Clear indications that the Soviet Union is shifting its concern to diplomatically building "Communist solidarity" among the bloc's own parties and with securing greater cohesion within the world movement against the possible Chinese challenge.

Yet not so long ago, the movement was riding high and looked set to go higher.

Its three main parties held a kind of baptismal conference in Madrid in March, 1977. Their leaders—Italy's Enrico Berlinguer, France's Georges Marchais, and Spain's Santiago Carrillo—adopted a manifesto tied to political and social pluralism and respect for individual liberties.

At that time, Eurocommunism was the most hotly debated—and often overrated—political topic in Western Europe. It became an obsession for the Soviets.

Now, it is scarcely talked about in either quarter.

"Eurocommunism," says a veteran European socialist who once sympathized but remained skeptical about its staying power, "can no longer be regarded as a 'wave of the future' for the socialist-labor-progressive forces in Western countries, nor for the mildly 'liberal' Communist parties of Eastern Europe."

Differences among the three Eurocommunists first appeared at the Madrid conference when the Spanish argued for an explicit statement of where they disagreed with Moscow.

The differences emerged more clearly as the French Communists—though going through the motions of dropping old doctrinaire labels—torpedoed the Left alliance with the Socialists in the run-up to France's March, 1978, elections.

At that time the Italian party was trying to build on its local election gains in 1975 and 1976. Communists were propping up Italy's Christian Democratic government in a kind of apprenticeship in responsibility that, hopefully, might take them into partnership in government later on.

Mr. Marchais's tactics—suggesting that the French Communists were interested in an alliance only as the dominant partner—may well have been one of the factors in the Italian party's loss of a significant 4 percent of votes last June.

In terms of numbers and standing on the Eurocommunist ticket, it was the French and Italian parties that really mattered. Now the two are divided by profound divergences of approach.

The French party has swung back to close accommodation with Moscow. It generally supports Soviet foreign policy, and this includes opposition "à la Russe" to an "imperialist" NATO and to France's involvement in it.

The Italian party has never courted any open break with the Soviets, and it no longer is so publicly critical as it was over the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968.

But it reserves a party's "right to dissent" within the movement and still does so, though more discreetly.

There are, however, deeper, more politically significant differences.

Following his election disappointment, Mr. Berlinguer quickly rejected any return to a lone-Left alternative. The Italian party, he said, would continue to fight for "broad democratic unity" in which the Communists still accept Italy's place in NATO and European economic integration as the realities of an essential balance in East-West relations.

So Eurocommunism as a movement (if

ever it really qualified as such) seems to be moving into history. In early July, at an ideological conference among 11 ruling Communist parties, Eurocommunism apparently was never mentioned—not even by the formerly most vituperative hard-liners.●

#### AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE UNDER WORLD GOVERNMENT

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, an essay written by a young constituent of mine, Mary Alessandro.

The subject, "American independence under world government" is one which has been debated for decades with good cause. The turmoil which would be created by various groups vying for power under such a world scheme, is effectively addressed in this work.

I find it extremely inspiring and refreshing to hear from young people like Mary, whose strong convictions and courageous stands shine bright amidst the negativism of our age. I am confident that our Nation's heritage and ideals will be preserved by young citizens such as Mary Alessandro.

Mary, a senior at Rolling Hills High School, placed second in the Herbert Albright Americanism Essay Contest for her succinct, well-thought-out literary piece. I was obviously very, very proud to present this award to Mary at the annual Palos Verdes Peninsula Fourth of July picnic.

Her essay, which I again request that you read, follows:

#### CAN AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE SURVIVE UNDER A WORLD GOVERNMENT?

American independence today flourishes under a form of government called a democracy. Democracy, by definition, is a government in which supreme power is held by the people and is used by the people. All Americans hold the belief that democracy is fair and just for the common man. A world government would have to make laws that would be applicable to all men. American independence cannot survive under a world government because the majority of Americans view democracy as the only kind of government that should exist.

Democracy is based on the belief that all men are created equal. However, since religions are different all over the world, governments of other nations adhere to many varying religious beliefs. In some nations there is a caste system in which all men are not created equal. This is in direct conflict with American independence which manifests the belief that all men should be treated equally and fairly. It is improbable that a world government could ever exist; people are not united towards a specific goal. Americans would have to share the same beliefs as those of other nations in order to have a world government.

Moreover, the United States' Constitution provides its democratic government with a special system of checks and balances. This means that no branch or faction of govern-

ment could ever gain more power than another. Checks and balances would be essential to a world government, but it would be very ineffective. An example of this problem is currently happening in Iran. A militaristic government has been overthrown and replaced by a religious one. Both groups are fighting for power, and this has caused turmoil in the country. A world government would have various groups or nations vying for power, and it would soon be in a state of anarchy and utter chaos.

Choosing the leadership of a world government also creates some problems. Each country would want direct representation of its own particular views. A communistic president could never work well with a capitalistic vice-president. Both the Soviet Union and the United States would not want to be treated as equals under a world government; each wants to become the dominant nation in the world. Also, it would be almost impossible to hold a world-wide election. Language would be a problem as well as the number of votes. It would be unfair to let one nation have a number of votes equal to the population of that nation because the population of countries varies widely.

American independence could never survive under a world government. There is no unity among people because countries and lifestyles are so different. Since there is a slight correlation between religion and government, one would have to share the same beliefs as others in order to have a world government. Hopefully, American independence will never have to suffer the evils of a world government. It definitely could not exist.●

#### POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which would amend title XII of the Higher Education Act. The Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education is nearing the end of the hearing process on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Many good, recommendations have been made by several higher education associations, among which is the bill I introduced.

This bill, which was drafted by the Education Commission of the States, provides for better opportunities for coordination between the Federal Government and the States in the area of comprehensive planning in postsecondary education. As we enter the decade of the 1980's, we are faced with several problems that educators and legislators did not have to consider when the Higher Education Act was first written in 1965. Declining enrollments, increased costs, severe competition for limited public resources, and continuing needs for expanded access and opportunities for underserved and underserved populations make better and more comprehensive statewide planning desirable.

I introduced this bill for the purpose of discussion and anticipated that the subcommittee will consider its merits, along with the many other worthy recommendations that have already been received. Thank you.●

## INFLATION BATTLEGROUND

## HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, last week the Labor Department interrupted the news that President Carter was trying to restore American confidence by firing his Cabinet to inform us that the inflation rate during the first half of 1979 was at a 13.2 percent annual rate.

When President Carter was elected in 1976, the annual inflation rate was under 5 percent. After 1 year, inflation had already grown to 7 percent. In 1978, it reached 9 percent. And now inflation is rising at a rate close to three times the rate when President Carter took office.

If inflation proceeds at an annual rate of 10 percent, which would require some success at controlling our present inflation rate, a dollar 5 years hence will buy only as much as 62 cents now buys.

Inflation is caused when the Government—to finance its debt—prints money faster than the Nation can produce new goods. In other words, the Government is taxing, spending, regulating, and printing money faster than Americans can produce.

Inflation is the battleground for two opposing philosophies. On one side, the no-growth, small-is-beautiful philosophy creates more inflation. This philosophy taxes and regulates products to make them more expensive. By making things more expensive, this mentality hopes to save us from our own gluttonous appetites. Advocates of this philosophy tax gas and oil to make it more expensive so we can afford only to use less. They regulate office thermostats to make sure we are not greedy. They tax away our income so we are sure to misuse our earnings. They create Government agencies to increase the cost of almost everything by imposing regulations.

All these taxes and regulations make it impossible for America to grow, or produce more at a faster rate. America no longer has the investment capital to build modern factories. Instead we get along with outdated equipment. Productivity falls. Inflation climbs. Clearly this philosophy has been winning the Government battle and causing inflation.

On the other side of the battle, a growth and progress philosophy strives to reduce inflation. This philosophy would cut taxes and regulations to allow Americans to produce more. By giving Americans capital and incentive to produce, this philosophy would permit every citizen to decide what and how much to produce and consume. Advocates of this philosophy would cut taxes and regulations on gas and oil to get the domestic wells flowing again. They would let individuals determine where to set their thermostats. They would cut taxes and let every family decide what to do with the extra income. They would

get rid of Government agencies that are producing nothing but costly regulations. Productivity would soar. Inflation would disappear. This philosophy will not continue to suffer setbacks. Americans have suffered too much inflation, too much taxation, too much regulation, and too much Government. They are ready to get the economy growing again.

The President talks about curbing inflation. Yet until he stops advocating windfall profits taxes, new energy bureaucracies, and dozens of new regulations daily, he is only talking. His actions are fighting for, not against, higher inflation. I hope the President can explain to our senior citizens living on fixed incomes why their dollar will only be worth 62 cents in five years.●

## DRUG ABUSE BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

## HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia has uncovered widespread illegal drug use and trafficking by Federal employees on the job in the Nation's Capital.

This is a most disturbing situation.

It is in no way helped by U.S. drug enforcement officials who have told news reporters that such drug abuse by Federal workers "reflects the increasing acceptance and general popularity" of drugs in society at large.

Instead of rationalizing such action, U.S. officials from the President on down should be taking firm action to stop the use of any illegal drugs by Federal workers, whether they be marijuana, cocaine, or whatever.

I have today written to the Administrator of the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration, asking for a report on the extent of illegal drug use and trafficking within Federal agencies in Washington, and what action is being taken by Federal officials in cooperation with other law enforcement agencies to stop this illegal drug activity.

I would like to include a news story about drug abuse at the U.S. Department of Labor, and my letter to the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration, at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, August 1, 1979]  
GETTING HIGH AT LABOR: ON-THE-JOB DRUG USE IS PROBED

(By Kathy Sawyer and Alfred E. Lewis)

The Department of Labor, acting on a complaint of widespread employee drug use in its restrooms and corridors, has called in the D.C. police force to help curb trading in marijuana and cocaine.

After a rare, 2½-month investigation by an undercover policewoman posing as a typist in Labor's black lung division, five employees have been arrested and charged with selling marijuana to their fellow workers.

Two others, one a typist at Labor and one

man presently unemployed, were arrested after the undercover officer bought some cocaine from them during a lunch-hour excursion to an apartment a few blocks away in Northwest Washington.

One police officer characterized the use of marijuana at Labor as "blatant." Other drug enforcement officials said the casual use of drugs on the job probably is no more widespread at Labor than at other federal agencies and reflects their increasing acceptance and general popularity.

Francis Kiley of the Labor Department inspector general's office confirmed that the agency requested the investigation after an employe complaint and said he "helped coordinate" the arrests. He declined further comment.

The undercover policewoman—who no longer is typing and filing at Labor—said she easily infiltrated the ranks of those getting stoned during the lunch hour.

"Basically, all you have to do is wear sunglasses and be able to talk their language," she said in an interview. Drug use is "a social thing, like a coffee break, only you smoke a joint instead."

The smokers, mostly young and single, often gathered around a noon-hour pipe of marijuana on the Labor Department roof or in a park across the street, according to the undercover officer referred to in police reports as "No. 244."

Then, for the rest of the day, the drug would make the workers "slow and drowsy" at their typing and filing, she said.

The sellers, not large scale operators, dealt mostly in amounts worth \$10 to \$30. A \$10 bag will make about 10 cigarettes, police said.

Protected by civil service rules and an active union, the arrested workers have been allowed to stay at their jobs, pending trial, although two reportedly left for other reasons.

"They'll probably just get their hands slapped," said a supervisor in the black lung division, who asked not to be named. "I told them it won't affect my feelings toward them, as long as they do their jobs."

Other employees in the offices where No. 244 worked, posing as a typist, and where the arrests were made, on the first, second and fifth floors, said they were "not surprised" by the arrests. Several indicated they were much more shocked by the fact that an undercover officer was planted among them. Some just giggled.

In keeping with police department policy, the undercover officer said she avoided using any drugs herself, coming up with various excuses when invited to "get high," or "get down."

The purchases were made in restrooms or in hallways, she said, and the marijuana was usually contained in a manila envelope about the size of an open book of matches, easily concealable in the palm of a hand.

Among those lower-echelon employees, whose pay is in the \$8,000 to \$10,000 a year range, there was little demand for the much more costly cocaine, which sells for about \$100 a gram, according to #244.

"If you wanted a large amount, you had to place your order a day in advance."

The maximum penalty the sellers could be assessed is a year in jail and a \$1,000 fine, police said.

The profits from the Labor Department trade probably amounted to a few hundred dollars a month in most cases, and a few hundred a week for one seller, according to a source on the narcotics squad. Of those arrested, only one employe had a prior record. She was believed to be a sometime heroin user, selling marijuana to support her occasional craving for heroin, he said.

The investigation grew out of a complaint by a disgruntled woman employe who re-

ceived an "unsatisfactory" job performance rating from her supervisor, police said. She retaliated by turning in a 14-page statement naming drug sellers around the office and complaining that many of her coworkers were stoned, yet they received "satisfactory" ratings.

The narcotics squad usually resists spending its time and money on such an investigation unless a large operation or hard drugs are involved, police sources said, but was persuaded to do so this time by an influential former District police officer now working at the Labor Department.

While a small number of high-ranking Labor Department officials, including Secretary Ray Marshall, reportedly knew of the presence of the undercover officer, her immediate supervisor, Jim Robinson of the black lung division, did not.

The officer took the civil service exam, made a score of 98, and entered as a GS3 through regular channels, she said.

"When I first started, it was a problem because my supervisor wouldn't give me any freedom. He complained constantly that I was out in the hall socializing instead of typing and filing. . . . I had to go over his head to get him off my back, so I could do my real job."

How did she like government work? "Terrible," she said. "I was glad to get back on the street."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1979.

Mr. PETER B. BENSINGER,  
Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, U.S. Department of Justice,  
1405 Eye Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. BENSINGER: I am most concerned about continuing reports concerning widespread use of illegal drugs by Federal employees.

There were reports earlier this year that officials of the White House staff routinely use marijuana, and that some have even used cocaine and other hard drugs. Now I understand that an undercover officer of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department has discovered widespread drug abuse on the job by employees of the U.S. Department of Labor. This problem is apparently widespread throughout the Federal government.

It is disturbing that U.S. drug enforcement officials are quoted as minimizing the discovery of drug abuse by Federal employees on the job, by stating that such actions "reflect the increasing acceptance and general popularity" of drugs in society at large. The fact is that drug use and drug trafficking are against the law, and U.S. Government officials should never minimize that fact or try to justify drug violations.

Please inform me what your agency knows about the true extent of drug abuse by Federal employees on the job, the availability of illicit drugs within Federal buildings and on Federal property, particularly in the department and agency headquarters in Washington, and the nature and extent of the Federal Government's official action to stop illegal drug sales and use by Federal employees.

I would appreciate knowing what action is being taken by all agency heads to inform their own employees of Federal laws and policies regarding illegal drug use, to investigate and stop such activities by employees under their jurisdiction in cooperation with other law enforcement agencies, and to discharge employees who use drugs on the job or are involved in the sale or purchase of drugs on Federal property.

Your prompt response to this inquiry will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

ELDON RUDD,  
Member of Congress. ●

## THE REAL CAUSE OF THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, one of our country's leading free-market economists, Dr. Hans Sennholz, has recently written an excellent analysis of the energy crisis for the Freeman magazine.

Dr. Sennholz, chairman of the economics department at Grove City College, deserves to be heard on the real cause of our energy problems. I would like to call his words to my colleagues' attention:

### A SYMBOL OF CHAOS: THE GAS PUMP

Until just a few years ago most people were indifferent to all questions of energy. They were as heedless of the very industry that produces heat and power as of many other industries meeting their daily needs. Surely they were aware of basic materials such as wood, coal, gas or oil burned to produce heat and kinetic energy. But the term "energy industry" was yet unknown. Even the dictionaries of economics designed to include the terms commonly used in college courses listed neither energy nor the energy industry. It was left to the 1970's to call attention to the industry and bring us the energy crisis.

In retrospect there were earlier indications of things to come. By 1970 there was a United States Department of Transportation, a Federal Power Commission, and an Atomic Energy Commission. In 1973 Congress added the Federal Energy Administration to centralize all regulatory functions relating to oil. The Energy Research and Development Administration came into existence in 1974. In October 1977, the Department of Energy brought all these governmental functions together into a single organization under the direction of a Secretary of Energy.

This observation of demonstrable facts raises a fundamental question: was the growth of government intervention in all matters of energy the cause or effect of the painful crises that developed during the 1970s? If it can be proven that government intervention brought about the dilemma in which we find ourselves today, the solution can be no other than early reduction and ultimate abolition of this harmful intervention. But if the causes are found to be elsewhere, and the growth of government was merely a reaction to a new situation, we need to search for other solutions.

### SURPLUSES AND SHORTAGES

Our search for an objective answer calls to mind a basic principle of political economy that may be applicable also to energy problems: whenever unhampered enterprise provides products and services, it tends to create surpluses that clear the market only through major sales campaigns. Its advertising message to the consuming public is to buy ever more and better products. Wherever government provides products and services, it invariably creates shortages that inconvenience the public and sometimes bring economic crises. Wherever government is in charge, its advertising message is always the same: consume less, eat less, drive less, let there be austerity! This has not changed from the wheat and bread shortages of 1918 to the gasoline shortages of 1979.

Where government is in charge and shortages inconvenience the public, we can observe yet another regularity. Through intensive publicity campaigns government officials

and politicians point the finger of blame at one or several culprits who are bitterly denounced for selfishly causing the shortages. In televised press conferences the President of the United States himself may make ugly charges against oil producers, or any other producers whose regulated services are in short supply. Or he may point at some foreigners, e.g., the Arabs, as the culprits who sinisterly inflicted the evil on us.

When unhampered individual enterprise generates surpluses, there are no press conferences, no headlines and no charges. The public looks at them with indifference in a mood of affluence that comes from choice and selection. The press ignores them although it prospers from the paid advertisements that seek to market the products. Radio and television thrive on advertisement campaigns that pay for the amusement and entertainment of the public.

But all such reflections may reveal mere coincidences that have no bearing on the energy crisis. Perhaps the politicians are correct in pointing at the OPEC countries for charging too much, at the oil companies for seeking ever higher profits, and at the public for consuming too much.

In that direction of deliberation lies a wide open sea of arbitrary judgments. What is "too much"? Millions of people are giving different answers to this very question throughout their busy days. They are making their choices as they are consuming oil and gas for heat, refrigeration and air conditioning, turning on electric lights, operating power tools, or driving up to the service station to tank up on gasoline. They are giving vivid answers to the question in long lines waiting to buy more fuel. We must not blithely ignore or reject their answers, nor those given by the oil companies or OPEC spokesmen.

If millions of people are said to be wrong wanting too much, is it not likely that the critic who is censuring them is judging too much? Is he proposing to change human nature by his criticism? Or, is he a would-be tyrant who is longing to impose his judgment and will on others? To explain the energy crisis in terms of value judgments or culprit condemnations is to open the gates for arbitrary judgment and political power.

### IS OPEC CAUSING THE FUEL CRUNCH?

Such an explanation also leads to puzzling conclusions that seem to contradict human nature. If the Arab oil producers are causing our dilemma, why are they not accomplishing identical, or at least similar, effects on other nations? It is an established fact that they are treating their customers equally, charging identical prices and surcharges. But we know of no energy crisis other than ours. There are no reports of empty gasoline pumps in Europe, Africa, Asia, or Latin America, no empty oil tanks anywhere, except in these United States of America.

This observation is all the more startling as most of the oil we consume comes from wells within our national borders, while most foreign countries, such as Germany and Japan, lack any domestic production. And yet, they are prospering although the price of Arab oil has soared in those countries too. Surely, they too feel the pinch of rising energy costs, which reduces their productivity and income by corresponding amounts. Rising oil costs necessitate many changes in goods prices and readjustments of production patterns. But they do not breed an energy crisis that threatens to disrupt economic production and reduces standards of living severely.

Our energy crisis is all the more mysterious inasmuch as OPEC is accepting the United States dollar as its primary medium of exchange. Other buyers of Arab oil must scramble to earn dollars first before they can

place oil purchase orders. But Americans can use their own currency for any quantity of Arab oil they may wish to acquire. Our monetary authorities may create any amount without cost, and thus facilitate the payment of Arabs with newly created money. That is, they can avail themselves of inflation as a tool of international finance, which partially shifts the burden of rising oil costs from the energy users to inflation victims. Thus the United States can victimize the Arabs themselves, who own large dollar balances, by exporting inflation in exchange for Arab oil.

It is obvious that such objectionable devices of international finance do not make for international peace and harmony. Since the United States was exporting inflation long before the oil producers combined to form an international oil cartel, we may understand the Arab reaction that led to OPEC. To them, joint action afforded the only way to adjust the price of oil to the ever-rising demand for oil payable in depreciating dollars. After all, there was no free and open Arab oil market on which the daily demand and supply determined the price.

#### UNDER GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL

The OPEC oil industry is a nationalized industry owned and managed by the member governments. They legislate every aspect of the industry from the allowable quota of production to the price of the product, and determine who may buy under what conditions, and so forth. There is a political process that is very slow to adjust. When compared with the market process that facilitates adjustments from day to day, yes, minute to minute, the political process of managing an industry and marketing its products may appear irrational although its political planners are deliberate in devising their plans and adopting their policies.

In such a world of politics that seeks to manage nationalized industries, there is confusion and chaos—unless the governments as owners agree on a common plan and act jointly to restore some semblance of order. The international cartel arrangement is a natural manifestation of a world economy in which export industries are government owned and operated. It also points up the growing danger of international conflict through world-wide socialism.

It is idle speculation to deliberate on the world market of oil if market forces were unhampered and free to determine prices. If there were no OPEC, no nationalized oil industry, and no Department of Energy regulating and fixing United States production—just unhampered markets and unrestrained competition—the energy world would be quite different. Surely, the price of oil would be much lower without the staggering costs of politics. And there would be no energy crisis.

#### ARE THE OIL COMPANIES GOUGING THE PUBLIC?

To many critics, Arab behavior alone does not explain the energy crisis. They are pointing at the oil companies whose profits have been rising in recent years. Most politicians and even the President of the United States are openly denouncing the "disgraceful" and "exorbitant" profits and are demanding a tough "windfall profits" tax. Some politicians even are clamoring for a speedy expropriation and nationalization of the companies.

It is difficult to ignore this crescendo of cheap demagoguery, which, when left unanswered, may lead to most harmful and regrettable legislation. Every effort must be made to refute and explode the political propaganda and repel the politicians who are anxious to extend their influence and power. Their attacks on the profits of one industry actually are attacks on the profits of all industries and on the profit system itself. Just listen to their charges against the energy

industry. You will search in vain for a difference between those charges and those leveled against the private property order by the professional socialists and communists around the world.

It is rather inconsistent and therefore most puzzling that American politicians should be the most vocal critics of an industry that has been under their careful supervision and control. After all, the Nixon price control edict of August 15, 1971, was never lifted from the energy industry. Even today the ceiling prices as set by the Department of Energy are posted on every gasoline pump in the country.

The political attacks on the very industry that, under a heavy barrage of regulations and denunciations, continues to provide us with energy remind us of some gruesome tales of human behavior during the Dark Ages. When the black death was stalking Europe, public sentiment was often aroused against those people who bravely sought to alleviate the suffering, comforting the dying and healing the sick. Thousands of aging women who survived the disaster were accused of precipitating the disease through witchcraft and were put to a cruel death. Similar forces of darkness now accuse the American oil industry, which provided the people with an abundance of cheap energy for most of this century, of creating the shortage in order to reap ever higher profits in a moment of national crisis. Surely, no person will be put to death, merely our economic order.

At the trial of the private property order the defense is pointing out that the Government of the United States is enforcing energy prices that are arbitrary and confiscatory. They are fixed below those prices free people would choose to pay if there were no mandated ceilings. That is to say, the Government is forcing energy producers to sell their products and services below their objective exchange values and thereby causes the producers to be gouged on a massive scale. If a company tires of this legislated plunder and for a moment should ignore the price edict, it is hauled into court and charged with consumer gouging. That is, the political gougers are taking the victims to court and accusing them of the very crime that is perpetrated against them. If there were justice in the court of public opinion, the charges would be promptly dismissed and the persecutors would be arrested for expropriating private property without due process.

#### GROUNDLESS CHARGES

The charges against the energy companies are based on the crude assumption that their profits are the evil fruits of worker exploitation and consumer gouging. Profits are the scourge of greed and egotism, which is the charge all socialists and communists are making against the private property order. A mere glance at the living and working conditions of the people in capitalistic countries vividly disproves the charges. When compared with the conditions in the socialist countries, the American people are living in a land of milk and honey, enjoying far greater material comforts and cultural opportunities. The steady stream of refugees and immigrants to American shores is illustrating the point.

Blinded by socialistic propaganda, the critics of the profit system fail to see its inherent benefits and justice. What is a profit, after all? It is the remainder of proceeds after all factors of production have been fully compensated. Businessmen may earn it through efficient management of their resources in the service of their customers. The most efficient producer earns the highest profits, which give him the means to expand his production and render even more services. Surely, the profits thus earned benefit the people through more and better

production. Similarly, the workers employed by profitable enterprises enjoy higher wages and more benefits than others less fortunate who happen to work for employers suffering losses.

Exceptionally high profits can only be reaped through the correct anticipation of changes. When a change in market conditions, e.g., in demand, supply, technology, institutional restrictions, international situations, and the like, necessitates quick readjustments in production, the most alert producer who correctly anticipates the changes and makes prompt preparations, may reap high entrepreneurial profits. His alertness and prompt action redound to the benefit of the public. In short, he who addresses himself to the most urgent needs of the public tends to earn the greatest rewards, which, as an economic principle of the market order, meets our criterion of justice. In an energy crisis, we expect the most efficient energy producer to earn the highest profits, as we would expect physicians and nurses to earn highest incomes in a public health crisis. To burn them at the stake of political demagoguery is preposterous.

#### IT IS SO EASY TO CREATE A SHORTAGE

The public hostility against business profits has brought chaos to the fuel pump. It has given rise to ever more government regulation, which is the root cause of the energy crisis. Politics has become hopelessly entangled in the production and distribution of energy.

In 1954 the Supreme Court set the tone by giving the Federal Power Commission control over natural gas prices in interstate commerce. These controls at first did not hamper production because they did not deviate by much from prices established by the demand and supply forces of the market. But during the 1960s, the United States Government legislated significant increases in demand and boosts in production costs. Environmental restrictions and pollution regulations that discourage the burning of coal, favoring the use of gas and low-sulfur fuel oil, mandated increases in consumption and made production much more expensive. In addition, the inflationary policies of the Government eroded the purchasing power of the dollars received by energy producers.

In 1971, President Nixon placed domestic crude oil under price control as part of his overall price-stop edict. While many other harmful controls were subsequently lifted, the price fixing of domestic oil and gas was continued. His successors continued to fix with vigor and force.

It is always much easier to prevent production and create shortages than to engage in productive activity. Every freshman economist knows how to create an energy shortage: impose rigid price ceilings, reduce the real price through monetary depreciation, legislate an increase in demand and raise the costs of supply. To make matters worse, he would impose substantially higher taxes on crude oil production, on the use of natural gas by industry and utilities, and boost the Federal gasoline tax. To intensify the pain of shortage and compound the confusion, he would entrust government officials with administering a ration coupon system that would allocate the scarce supply according to their rules of "fairness." And finally, to prolong the chaos he would create an economic incentive for hoarding the given supplies. For instance, on every first day of the month he would permit gasoline producers to raise their prices by less than they anticipate earning through storing their supplies until the controls are lifted. He would openly announce his program and pursue it for 28 months in order to assure maximum hoarding for 28 months. If it were not for the limitations of storage facilities he would

cause all production to be withheld from the market.

Unfortunately, this is not just a theoretical exercise for freshman economists. This is the official policy of the United States Government, or at least the loudly touted program of the present administration. It touches 200 million Americans and threatens their way of life. It is an efficient policy in creating shortages, as our experience at the gasoline pumps so clearly demonstrates. As a policy designed to improve economic conditions it is counterproductive. The resultant chaos and damage is just as real, whether the policy is the poisonous fruit of socialistic thinking, or just a relic of the Dark Ages.●

**ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY LACROSSE  
ALL STARS**

**HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, 52 boys from Anne Arundel County, Md., have just returned from 2 weeks of lacrosse competition in England, where they distinguished themselves as representatives of our country and as athletes.

Three teams with maximum age limits of 15, 13, and 12 made the trip. They played a total of 15 games against comparable English teams without a loss. They have arrived home after compiling a record of 14 wins and one tie game.

I am proud of these Anne Arundel County lacrosse all stars and I invite the House to share my sense of pride in them. I am also grateful to the Southport Lacrosse Club of England for the splendid hospitality they showed to our team. The boys were boarded with English families near Manchester, and they will cherish memories of their friends across the sea.

The 15-year-olds were coached by Robert T. Lewald of Annapolis, Gene Reckner of Crofton, and Dr. Bill Barnett of Annapolis. Coaches of the 13-year-old team were Gilbert Bellistri of Severna Park and Mark Lehner of Annapolis. Coaching the 12-year-olds were Kevin Fidgeon of Annapolis and John Cooper of Annapolis.

The 15-year-old team included the following boys: Chip and Christopher Bullen, David Lewald, Michael Greene, Jeff Larcher, John Cox, Jim Gyory, Charles Turner, James Noble, Roger Hall, David Jones, Michael Bender, William Barnett, Daniel Bresnahan, and Donald Gayhardt, all of Annapolis; Doug Trettin, Greg Bannon, Jeff Belistri, and Doug Appleton, from Severna Park; Paul McAllister of Arnold; and Michael Brandenburg of Crofton.

The following participated with the 13-year-old team: Steven Bradford, John Hawley, Michael Budowski, Christopher Caramanico, and Jason Faust, all of Crofton; Mark Wanamaker, Michael Keough, Jeff Williams, Derek Holtman, and Douglas Smith, of Annapolis; Paul Connor and Thomas McClelland of Severna Park; and Steve Truffer and Sandy Engelke from Arnold.

Playing with the 12-year old team

were: Buzz Priddy, Gregory Awalt, and Joshua Summers of Severna Park; Thomas Probst, Michael Fidgeon, Ralph Lively, Jack Cooper, John Rivers, Shawn Benner, Jeffrey Feen, Keith Fleming, and Richard Cooper, all from Annapolis; and John Hollerbach and Andy Ferguson of Arnold.●

**FURTHER EVIDENCE OF THE  
CARTER ADMINISTRATION'S DU-  
PLICITY ON NICARAGUA**

**HON. ELDON RUDD**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, increasing evidence is becoming known about the Carter administration's duplicity on Cuba's active role in the Marxist Sandinista takeover in Nicaragua.

Throughout the final months of President Somoza's constitutionally elected government, top U.S. officials were aware of intelligence reports and U.S. eyewitness accounts that Castro functionaries were orchestrating, arming, and directing the terrorist Sandinista assault against the Government and people of Nicaragua.

Yet knowing the role and objectives of Fidel Castro and the Soviet Union in Cuba's support of the terrorist overthrow of Nicaragua, President Carter and his administration officials actually took steps to prevent Nicaragua's National Guard from being resupplied with arms, munitions, and other supplies so that the country could be successfully defended against the Castro-supported Sandinista takeover.

Every government of the world now knows the true extent of the Carter administration's action to allow the fall of the pro-U.S. Government of Nicaragua to probable Marxist control.

Many countries may also view the President and the U.S. State Department as silent accomplices in the Sandinista overthrow of Nicaragua, which has now fueled further Castro-supported terrorism aimed at undermining other Latin American countries throughout the hemisphere.

This should be viewed by all Americans as a foreign policy scandal of major proportions.

The State Department is now shedding "crocodile tears" over the probability that a Communist tide is sweeping over Latin America, following the Sandinista victory.

But where were these officials long before the fall of the Nicaraguan Government, when they had solid evidence of Castro Cuban involvement and objectives in order to take firm action to protect U.S. interests and free governments from the threat of Communist takeover?

Congress also had adequate information about what was happening, reported independently by many of its own Members who were concerned about the administration's role in ousting President

Somoza and bringing in the Castro-supported Sandinistas.

But Congress failed to call the administration properly to account for its disastrous foreign policy actions leading up to the fall of the Nicaraguan Government and the Marxist terrorism that now threatens other countries of Central America.

A report by columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, detailing some of the intelligence information and U.S. eyewitness accounts that the Carter administration refused to act upon prior to the Sandinista overthrow of the Nicaraguan Government, appeared today in the Washington Post.

I include the report at this point in the RECORD:

**LATIN DOMINOES**

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

A few hours before President Carter declared over prime-time television July 24 that "I do not attribute at all the change in Nicaragua to Cuba," teletype wires into the Pentagon clattered out another link in the chain of evidence to the contrary.

The pilot of a U.S. Air Force C130 in Managua that day transmitted to Washington this most interesting travel note: Members of the Sandinista junta governing Nicaragua were seen piling into a Cubana Airlines plane en route to Havana.

A few days earlier, a U.S. intelligence report teletyped into Washington reported an even more fascinating detail. A ranking official of DGI—the Cuban secret police—played a key role in masterminding the Sandinista takeover. Julian Lopez, DGI's chief of covert operations for Costa Rica, was present in the Sandinista command bunker (located over the border in Costa Rica) during the height of Nicaraguan fighting.

This buttressed a detailed CIA report of May 2 on Cuban military aid to the Sandinistas. It also fits another piece of intelligence that the Carter administration has not publicized: Command elements of a Soviet brigade have been introduced into Cuba. In addition, some 2,000 Soviet military personnel—brigade-sized, though there is no information that they are formed into an organic military unit—are in Cuba.

While intensification of Soviet-Cuban interests in the Caribbean is either ignored or overlooked by Jimmy Carter, its meaning is well understood by his own professional analysts in national security and intelligence: Central America is going red. Only the time, not the eventual outcome, is in question, unless there is a reversal of U.S. policy.

Specifically, the president's most sophisticated advisers do not doubt that, sooner or later, the Sandinista regime will be overtly communist. Present cordiality from Managua is, like Fidel Castro's smiles in 1959, an effort to shake down Uncle Sam before the true colors are shown.

Nor is there any doubt about what's next on the agenda: extension of the Soviet-Cuban thrust into El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras over an undefined but probably protracted period. However slowly, Central American dominoes are falling.

Havana's aims were described July 20 by Ramon Sanchez, Cuba's top envoy to Washington in an exposition of chilling candor that has received too little attention. He told a breakfast sponsored by Foreign Policy magazine that Cuba will send aid "of all sorts"—including weapons—to guerrillas in El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras just as it had in Nicaragua.

Sanchez issued no denials about Soviet military reinforcements in Cuba. Ties between Moscow and Havana, Castro's man in

Washington proclaimed, "will continue to increase in all fields, including military collaboration."

Tomas Borges, interior minister and Marxist strongman of the Nicaraguan junta, has been similarly candid. In leaflets that appeared in Honduras immediately after the Sandinista victory, Borges promised to join forces "with the revolutionary organizations of Latin America" and hailed "development of the Central American revolution." On the leaflet's first page, a photo shows Borges in Havana with Castro.

Panicky leaders in the targeted Central American countries fix U.S. visitors with one question: Will you help us? One indirect reply came from Carter July 24 when he said, "We worked as closely as we could without intervening in the internal affairs of Nicaraguans" to let them decide "what form of government they should have."

In that, Carter administration policy was decidedly interventionist against Anastasio Somoza's regime and for the Sandinistas. U.S. pressure stopped military aid for Somoza's National Guard from Israel and Guatemala. U.S. officials refused to supply weapons to the National Guard even in return for Somoza's resignation. The National Guard ultimately gave up, not for a lack of will but for a lack of arms.

The rationale for Carter's policy is the view, long cherished by revisionists, that Castro, Ho Chi Minh, Mao Tsetung and maybe even Lenin would have been fond friends of the United States had not Washington rebuffed them. The theory is now being put to the test in Nicaragua.

To a worried segment of U.S. officials, including some in senior positions, this is madness. They believe the United States should have braved the propaganda barrage from the left at home and abroad, held its nose and supported the unsavory Somoza. Nicaragua is gone, but there will be further demands for tough-mindedness in Washington as the Central American dominoes slowly fall.

#### ANOTHER LITTLE-KNOWN ATOMIC ACCIDENT

### HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, with the long but little-known history of atomic accidents in this country, I offer for my colleagues' review the following excerpt from Leo Goodman's "Catalogue of Mishaps Involving Nuclear Materials":

#### 1945 ATOMIC ACCIDENT

September 1945—Harry Dahlen, Los Alamos, N. Mex.

Source: Excerpt from ORNL-2748 Part A ("Radiation Accidents: Dosimetric Aspects of Neutron and Gamma-Ray Exposures") Page 3.

The first nuclear accident occurred at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, in August 1945. In a criticality experiment involving a metal system a nuclear excursion occurred and two people were exposed to the mixed radiation field from this assembly. Dahlen, who died following the accident, was touching the assembly when the chain reaction occurred, and so received a very high dose to his hands and a smaller dose to the bulk of his torso. He was exposed to considerable gamma radiation from fission products while dismantling the experiment and would possibly have survived had he left the room immedi-

ately. His actions during this period are not well known and the total dose received is correspondingly uncertain. Neither he nor the other person exposed was wearing a film badge at the time of the accident. Since the number of fissions which occurred in the assembly is not known accurately, the best index of his neutron exposure is the Na 24 activity induced in his blood.

Source: Excerpt from TID-5360 ("A Summary of Accidents and Incidents Involving Radiation in Atomic Energy Activities, June 1945 through December 1955") Page 2.

#### Description of Operation:

In the process of making critical mass studies and measurements, an employee was stacking blocks of tamper material around a mass of fissionable material.

#### Details of Incident:

Employee was working in the laboratory at night alone except for a guard seated 12 feet away.

As the assembly neared a critical configuration, employee was lifting one last piece of tamper material which was quite heavy. As this piece neared the set-up, the instrument indicated that fission multiplication would be produced, and as the employee moved his hand to set the block at a distance from the pile he dropped the block which landed directly on top of the set-up.

A "blue-glow" was observed and the employee proceeded to disassemble the critical material and its tamper. In doing so, he added heavily to the radiation dosage to his hands and arms.

#### Nature of Injuries or Loss:

Employee who performed the experiment received radiation dosage sufficient to result in injuries from which he died 24 days later.

The guard was exposed beyond the established daily limit, but suffered no observable permanent injury.

### JOHN F. KENNEDY HIGH SCHOOL MARCHING BAND AND COLOR GUARD

### HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, today the John F. Kennedy High School Marching Band and Color Guard from Sacramento, Calif., visits our Nation's capital. We of Sacramento are proud of this group and it is my privilege to welcome the supporters and musicians as they commence their musical performance on the steps of the Capitol. They have arrived in Washington following their appearance in Canton, Ohio, at the Hall of Fame Football Game and Parade.

Each of the students participating in this trip has assumed financial responsibility for himself. With the support of parent organizations and the alumni association funds are raised to contribute to uniform and instrument needs. Their support is an effort of love and admiration. The John F. Kennedy Marching Band and Color Guard for many years has had an outstanding reputation and enjoys national recognition for its excellence.

Especially we acknowledge the significant role in the band's history of Mr. Nick Angiulo, director, and Mr. Richard

Gury, business manager. Through the years they have devoted themselves to creating and sustaining the quality of the band. It is a continuous challenge, for, as in this year, they face the loss of many graduating seniors whom they have trained and assisted over 3 years.

A few of the band's many memorable performances include: Sacramento Wheel Chair Basketball Benefit at California State University; California State Fair and Exposition; San Francisco 49er's Half-Time Show; Portland Rose Festival, Portland, Oregon; Mentally Gifted Olympics Half-Time Show; San Francisco St. Patrick's Parade; Philadelphia Bicentennial Parade (190 special performances in 1976); Queen's Birthday Parade, Victoria, British Columbia.

It has been the experience of those associated with the musical organization throughout the years that the students who participate in the band are industrious also in scholarship. Many go on to college and continue to utilize their musical talent. The discipline of band performance and the qualities of character demanded by such participation are the qualities that serve the students so well in their total lives.

I salute the citizens of my community whose efforts through the years have secured the continuation of the John F. Kennedy High School Marching Band and Color Guard. To the following members of the band, I welcome you to Washington, D.C., and congratulate you for your accomplishments:

#### LIST OF MEMBERS

John and Marsha Ackerman, Kris and Lori Adams, Joyce Akiyama, Matt Allbee, Kayleen Allman, Todd Appleman, Karla Barrett, Mark Barrett, Ken Bauder, Marta, Richard and Robert Benson, Rich Bergdahl, Joel Bettencourt, Ellen Boothby, Kim Borcaili, Doug Boyce, Gordon Brown, Kelly Buchanan, Tami Calbo, Helena Carley, and Jenny Ceccato.

Beverly Chan, Jennifer Chan, Ken Chan, Lorraine Chew, Casey Clark, Scott Clifford, James Colgrove, Jim Collier, Scott Cruik, Marilyn Cumming, Lisa Davis, Diane and Matthew Davis, Joey De Kellis, Patrick Duncan, Aaron Ellison, Warren Evans, Vicki Feliz, Beck and Terri Fong, Denise Fong, Linda Ford, Michael Fujii, Brian and Tim Fukuda, Janet Gaither, Jeannie Gee, Elaine Gister, Tom Gonzales, Angela Gordon, Scott Gunderson, and Ron Hall.

Dan Harris, Susie Hasegawa, Andrew Hironeba, David Hulbert, Adriane Jackson, Marcia Jackson, Geoff Jumper, Ames Kanemoto, Debbie Kauffman, Dale Kramer, Roger Kuroda, Mitchell Lehman, Diane Lew, Susan Little, Scott and Lori Loberg, Karen Louise, Brett Lovell, Eric Mar, Wendy Matsuo, Kathy McHugh, Debra Montiero, Kathy and James Morris, Nancy Murakami, Kevin Murdock, Beth Myers, and Mike Mynsted.

Brian Nagai, Kristine Nelson, Trudi Nodohara, Cindy Nuse, Kendra Ota, Greg Owyong, Laura Palmer, Chris Parrott, Mark Phillips, Kim Pihers, Stacey Pompei, Brian Powell, Steven Reeder, Greg and Jon Richardson, Dan Ridens, Edwin Sakauye, Carolyn Sanborn, Gary Sands, Sandy Shahbazian, Michelle Shepard, Teri Shikasho, Glenn Shintaku, Aliza Shubb, Shelly Smith, Coleen Spradley, Linda Svilich, and Karl Tadamaru.

David Traversi, Lori Uemura, Tracy Van Cleave, Julie Waterbury, Tracie Wessler, James White, Reggie White, David Whitted, Sally Wiegell, Selma and Steve Wiget, Steve Willey, Brooke Wolf, Wayne Wong, Nick Angiulo, Director, and Dick Gury, Business Manager.

THEY GAVE A D----

**HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in a June 1979 publication of the "New York Urban Coalition" concerning a Queens community I represent.

This article illustrates the residents' deep-rooted sense of involvement to save their community. They agree there is a crisis and they are cognizant of the fact that money alone, whether it be city, State or Federal, will not answer to all the problems. The citizens responded and formed community-based organizations to deter the tide of neglect, abandonment, commercial strip deterioration and reduced city services. This article quotes from many of these community leaders and I am proud to share its contents.

The article follows:

YOU CAN CALL IT SOUTH JAMAICA, SOUTH-EAST QUEENS, BALSLEY-SOUTH OZONE, OR JUST PLAIN 11434

(By Thomas Glynn)

Whatever ails Manhattan, Brooklyn, and the Bronx, it has always been thought that Queens has the cure. Forgetting about Staten Island for the moment, Queens offered what the other three lacked: a chance to see the sky, a house instead of an apartment, trees and grass in places other than parks.

As far as Queens was concerned, there was the "city," which was Manhattan, and the only reason you went there was to work. As far as the tourist to New York City was concerned there was no such place as Queens. And as far as the City Fathers were concerned, there were no concerns in Queens.

The Bronx had housing problems, Staten Island development problems, and Brooklyn just had problems; but everything was rosy in Queens. Oh sure, once in a while they got a little upset when the snow wasn't removed as fast as it might have been. But by and large, Queens was fairly quiet, and best left alone. If you had a moderate income, had to work in the "city" but didn't want to live there, couldn't afford to send your kids to private school but were concerned about their education, Queens wouldn't disappoint you. The schools were good, the streets quiet, the homes sturdy and well maintained.

As one Queens resident who moved from the Bronx said, "We were all looking for greener pastures, because we had children and we wanted a better environment to raise our children. We were impressed with the local schools and the other nice things about the area. And I was thrilled with what I saw out here, so I moved to South Jamaica in 1950."

Many of the Blacks that were moving into the area were city employees or veterans on the GI Bill. Queens was a low density community that provided them with an opportunity for homeownership. There was few problems, and little friction. As Blacks moved in, Whites moved out, helped by realtors who blockbusted (on a one-block stretch of Hillside Avenue there are at least a dozen realtors). As one resident said, "It's the subtle way it's done, as soon as they see the color of your skin, then the tradition continues."

By 1960, the Black and Puerto Rican population of South Jamaica was 78 percent of the total. By 1970, the Black population was 91 percent. It was a hard-working popula-

tion of moderate-income people who found in Queens part of the American dream that had been denied them in Manhattan, Brooklyn and the Bronx. While the population of the area had increased from 25,892 to 34,749, the average persons per household decreased slightly from 3.8 to 3.7 (1960-1975). While the population of eighteen to sixty-four year olds decreased by 4 percent from 1970 to 1975, the number of those sixty-five and older increased by 28 percent from 1960 to 1975. Many of the original residents had mortgages which had been paid off by 1975. But by 1975 not enough younger Black families were moving in. Some of the elementary schools were underutilized. Young people, especially those who were career oriented, wanted to leave the area.

Problems appeared. Who was buying the homes of those who couldn't continue their mortgage payments? Or of those who moved further out on the Island? Or of those who retired and moved down South?

South Jamaica was still a stable area of well-maintained, well-kept up homes. But problem pockets too numerous to ignore began to sprout. Local residents were concerned. If these "rust spots" were left unchecked, they could spread and threaten the entire community. Moreover, community residents knew it was cheaper to correct them now, rather than later.

In the early seventies, a further complication was introduced. Redlining appeared, as it did in the rest of the city. Mortgages from banks and savings and loan institutions began to dry up, as did remodeling loans. Absentee landlords, among them real estate speculators, banks, insurance companies, or people who moved elsewhere and couldn't sell their homes, became a factor in the area. Some of them bought up houses for next to nothing, or took over defaulted mortgages, or got stuck with defaulted mortgages, or turned them over to realtors to rent out. Many charged exorbitant rents and moved in welfare tenants, doubling up occupants. Most of the housing had been built before 1940; they were largely two- and three-story wooden residences. Many of them were in need of major maintenance and repair.

Then a new phenomenon appeared—the boarded up house. Part of it was a legacy from the HUD scandals. But whatever the circumstances that caused a home to become abandoned, it had a terrible psychological effect on stable blocks. People were upset at these boarded up houses, frustrated when they couldn't do anything about it, and then just furious. These empty houses were a threat to their homes—homes that many of them had sunk their life savings into.

In 1969, the median family income was \$9,702 in South Jamaica. But from 1970 to 1976, there were 30 percent more welfare cases, and the number of taxlots in arrearage four or more quarters increased 44.6 percent from 1972 to 1975.

As the city's fiscal resources sild to a new low, maintenance and repair of the neighborhood's parks, sewers, lighting, and streets went on the skids. Potholes became the feature attraction of Sutphin Boulevard. A badly needed sewer and drainage system, as recommended by the 1969 Hoberman & Wasserman South Jamaica Community Development Study for the Housing and Development Administration of New York City, was ignored. When streets flooded during heavy rains, the water hid the potholes, and the only happy people were the owners of auto repair shops. Empty lots, piled high with garbage, were ignored by the Sanitation Department, despite many complaints. But service to the area, operated by a private company, left a lot to be desired (this was confirmed by a survey of neighborhood residents). And bus service was crucial—to get to and from the subway lines, to get to supermarkets and drugstores and shopping and hospitals—none of which were in the neighborhood.

When Macy's left Jamaica Avenue, the community was shocked, but it merely highlighted the downhill slide of Jamaica Avenue as a retail shopping center. As one resident put it, "The East Indian-type shop doesn't help the area. We need drugstores, supermarkets, department stores." Another resident stated, "Jamaica Avenue is a disaster if you want to shop. Now they have nothing but discount stores selling cheap, shoddy merchandise which is overpriced because of the high insurance rates they have to pay since they get ripped off so often. Middle-class working Blacks who work in Manhattan shop in Manhattan because they want quality merchandise, merchandise that reflects the jobs they have and the positions they hold."

And where jobs are concerned, when Manhattan sneezed, Queens had a fit. As companies moved out of the city, many residents in Queens, and especially those in South Jamaica, often did not have the option of following them. This accelerated mortgage default, and resulted in vacant homes. And those who could follow the jobs and leave the area were often replaced by people without jobs.

The seventies marched through South Jamaica leaving problem pockets of abandoned homes, flooded, potholed streets, and the tattered remnants of anti-poverty corporations that had spent much of their time in power struggles and petty bickering. Recognizing the problems in the area, and recognizing that most of the area is still stable and thus the rough spots can still be saved at a relatively modest cost, the neighborhood between the Long Island Rail Road tracks and North Conduit, New York Boulevard and the Van Wyck Expressway, has just recently been designated a Neighborhood Strategy Area.

The community has substantial assets. The most obvious are the people. They are hard-working homeowners and the pride they feel is reflected in their homes. Most of the housing in the area is owner-occupied, and most of the homes are in good condition. Pride is also measured by civic spirit, and community involvement is high—reflected by a number of strong community organizations. One of these is the Better Community Civic Association. It covers a fifty-three-square block area, bounded by Linden Boulevard, the Van Wyck Expressway, Foch Boulevard, and 157th Street. Most of the homes are detached one-family bungalows in good condition. It is a neighborhood that likes to be called Balsley-South Ozone (in reality, two neighborhoods).

## THE BETTER COMMUNITY CIVIC ASSOCIATION

In 1954, in the neighborhood that M. Louella Saunders had moved to, a service station on the corner of 116th Avenue and 149th Street planned to put in a car wash. Several neighbors, among them M. Saunders and Livingston Chrichlow and several others, stopped the car wash from opening, and then decided that South Jamaica needed a civic association to deal with the emerging problems of the area, and to allow newcomers to get to know one another. So, the Better Community Civic Association was formed.

After the proposed car wash had been scrubbed, the newly formed Better Community Civic Association (BCCA) began to attack some of the problems of the fifties. They went after the city to upgrade the streets and curbs, improve the street lighting and sewers, and provide better sanitation. They wrote letters and made phone calls, but sometimes neglected the necessary follow up. They met with mixed success. As they admit, "We were not as organized as we were later on." Some street lights were improved, especially with the block cleanups that BCCA helped to organize. They helped in the formation of block associations and

block parties, and held an annual Miss BCCA contest (one year it was a Mr. BCCA contest) which got them publicity in the local papers. Politicians and public officials began to notice the fledgling organization. Later, when anti-poverty corporations came into being, they submitted a number of proposals, only to see them turned down. The same thing happened to the proposals they submitted to the Community Development Agency. Politics, and not the merits of their proposal, they believed, was the reason.

During this time, urban renewal came into the area and set in motion a series of events which greatly influenced the effectiveness of BCCA.

The urban renewal effort was associated with York College. The Jamaica Steering Committee set up some training programs with the college, and as Livingston Chrichlow says, "The Urban Training Studies Program at York caused a number of civic leaders in the community to sit down and look at some of the theories they should be interested in. It gave us an opportunity to get back into our communities and focus better on how to deliver the services we should be getting. I think we all would agree that these programs were somewhat of a turning point."

This took place in the late sixties. They still relied on volunteer help, as they do today, but the training programs helped to give them a sophistication about the way New York City worked that helped them in their struggles to improve the community.

After meeting in homes, the American Legion Building, and the Lemuel Haynes Congregational Church, BCCA purchased their own building on the corner of Sutphin Boulevard and 115th Drive in 1970. Buying the building was really an expression of faith by the community in BCCA. The community lent them the five thousand dollars they needed for a down payment. Two years later, it had all been paid back, with interest. (Funds to support the building came from fund raising events such as a dinner/dance which raised twenty-five hundred dollars.)

In 1968, they started Teen Action Corps, a youth program that involved youngsters in recreational and cultural activities. Despite some shaky time (volunteer supervision, BCCA admits, was a problem), very good proposals were developed around youth leadership and career development (these were turned down because the emphasis on funding from the anti-poverty corporations centered around recreation). The youngsters ran their own program, and helped BCCA with the surveys that provided the basis for some of their community action programs.

Then, in quick succession, BCCA achieved a number of significant victories.

When the franchise of the Green Bus Line came up before the Board of Estimate (Queens has private bus lines that supplement the MTA), the residents of the community had some longstanding complaints about the kind of service they were (or were not) getting. But rather than just complain, BCCA used teenagers from the Teen Action Corps and conducted a survey among bus riders. The results were announced before a surprised Board of Estimate, with the result that franchise approval, usually an automatic affair, was put aside for further study. This resulted in concessions from the bus company and improved service.

When the library was threatened with a cutback, BCCA mobilized the community to show support for the library. A plan to increase circulation succeeded so well they had to print a notice in their newsletter asking people to please return the books they had borrowed.

As crime in their neighborhood increased, they formed a civilian patrol in conjunc-

tion with the local precinct, and rode around in cars equipped with CB radios. Much of the equipment was paid for with their own money. In a conversation with the 103rd Precinct, they learned that crime statistics in their area dropped after the patrol began.

When urban renewal came to South Jamaica and the city wanted to put five skyscrapers of housing into an area that was composed of one- and two-family home, they went into action. An alternative plan was prepared, and presented. Rather than have just low-income people in the buildings, they requested that a mix of incomes be represented in the projects. Second, they said, "Don't make them all high rises. You'll destroy the character of our neighborhood." Third, they asked for shopping centers and youth recreation areas to service the people who would be brought into the area and for people already in the area. It was an intelligent, well thought out response, gently blunting what could have been an aggressive intrusion into the community.

To get traffic patterns changed, BCCA went to the Traffic Department with a proposal, changed some things in discussions with officials, then went back to the community and got approval of the plan—before it went through. The Traffic Department thought so highly of their plan and approach, they used it in surrounding communities.

These incidents were typical of the way BCCA works. Take the negative and turn it into something positive. Don't just complain. Be prepared to do some of the work yourself. Build alliances. And back up your proposals with facts—statistics to document the problem and community surveys to highlight how the neighborhood feels about the problem.

Their BCCA Newsletter not only includes the latest neighborhood news, but contains articles on how the city operates and outlines the responsibilities of neighborhood people. These responsibilities they've taken to heart.

Their members are on the Board of Directors of Neighborhood Housing Services on Community Planning Board #12, and on the Community School Board. They are constantly down at Board of Estimates meetings, at the City Planning Commission, and have made several trips to Albany. Congressman Addabbo and City Councilman Archie Spinger are well aware of their presence.

They've had Summer Youth Corps Programs, presented scholarship medals, helped several youngsters go to summer camp, and with money from the Molly Parness Dress Up Your Neighborhood Contest, they helped blocks put lights up, paint trees and curbs, put out litter baskets and signs identifying block associations, and planted flowers and grass.

BCCA works basically on a committee structure, and one of their most important committees is the Urban Action Committee. The first project they tackled was a master plan for their community. Building upon the Hoberman & Wasserman Plan of 1969, they conducted a thorough study of their fifty-three-square block area and not only outlined six areas for improvement (curbs and streets, drainage, street lighting, street signs, traffic control, and vacant lots) but actually pinpointed the specific areas where these improvements were most needed. This was done in 1972, and updated in 1977. They made a movie of their neighborhood that dramatized the plan. Volunteers conducted block-by-block surveys, and the results of their findings were coordinated by Livingston Chrichlow. It would have cost the city thousands to come up with such a plan—and they were offering it to the city free. Unfortunately, while everyone applauded the plan, the city has seen fit to implement little, if any, of it. To underscore the priorities of the plan, they conducted a bus tour of the area in 1972.

Another bus tour in 1977 showed that nothing had changed.

One of the problems they pointed out on the bus tour was housing. A survey they've made shows that as many as three hundred homes may be abandoned or vacated in the area bounded by Van Wyck, 111th Avenue, New York Boulevard and North Conduit Avenue (this covers a 250-block area within which is BCCA's fifty-three block area). Who owns these homes—banks, other financial institutions, real estate speculators or private individuals? They intend to find out.

They would like to set up a nonprofit neighborhood preservation unit to deal with the problem buildings in their area. Building code enforcement is high on their priority list. Plans also call for the establishment of a local development corporation for revitalizing Sutphin Boulevard, which is now composed mainly of vacant storefronts, mom and pop candy/varietal stores, "after-hours" clubs, storefront churches, cleaners and a supermarket. Most shopping, by necessity, takes place outside the community.

"To do all these things," says Dorothy Washington, president of BCCA, "we need a full-time staff person to answer phones and conduct the right follow-up." And Livingston Chrichlow adds, "Our representatives must fight to get our compensatory share of the budget. We must hold them accountable."

They've come a long way with volunteer help. Just imagine the good they could accomplish with some paid staff!

#### THE RUSH TEMPLE A.M.E. ZION CHURCH

Who in their right mind would spend over eight hundred thousand dollars on one building on Sutphin Boulevard?

Only someone with a lot of faith—and a lot of spirit—in the community. The Rush Temple A.M.E. Zion Church.

But the story of the marvel they have wrought on Sutphin Boulevard begins in 1951 with the Reverend Eldridge Gittens. Having been overseas in the Army, educated in Washington, D.C. and New York, he moved to South Jamaica from Manhattan and felt the urge to organize a church. He went from door to door, found eleven adults and twenty children who were of like mind, and they began holding services in his living room at 155 115th Street. Later, he rented a loft behind a bar for \$115 a month. In 1955, the expanding congregation needed new quarters, and they bought the Assembly of God Church on the corner of 119th and Sutphin for fifty thousand dollars. It was a big gamble for them, but they secured loans from several sources that had faith in the future of the congregation and in the area. By the early seventies, they had outgrown their present quarters. It was time to move again. But this time the church decided to do so by staying put and expanding their present church. They entered upon an ambitious remodeling program, one that would enlarge the church to almost twice its size and include a separate building at the rear for a day-care center. They included the day-care center because they had been promised city funds to operate it. Unfortunately, when the fiscal crisis hit, they were left with a beautiful day-care facility and no funds to operate. But that, as is turned out, was the least of their problems.

Halfway through the \$881,000 reconstruction, the general contractor walked off the job. The bank had paid him all his money, so he simply left. Now, Rush Temple had to pay all the subcontractors. During all this time they were meeting temporarily in a vacant supermarket. Even in these temporary quarters, they continued to grow. When the construction loan was used up and the church still wasn't finished, church members rolled up their sleeves and pitched in. They worked day and night, finishing the building themselves.

Today, except for some landscaping on the outside, the remodeling is done—after five years, \$881,000, and much effort on the part of church members. With over one thousand members on the church roll, and an interior that can fit eight hundred, Rush Temple A.M.E. Zion Church is a thriving, positive force in the community. Along with the Lemuel Haynes Congregational Church and the Baisley Park Neighbors, they are part of a group called the Baisley Park Coalition that will soon bring into being the 210-unit Baisley Gardens, a low-rise housing project that will vary from three to eight stories and will reserve 20 percent of its units for senior citizens, with the remainder for middle-income residents. It will be produced with a combination of public and private funds, and the Coalition will screen prospective tenants, serving as a representative of the community.

"The churches took a lot of flack from some people in the anti-poverty corporations during the years they were formed," said the Reverend Gittens, "but look around you," and he waved his hand, "and ask yourself, who's left? I don't see them. But the churches are still going strong. There's a lot of strength in the Black church."

#### NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING SERVICES OF JAMAICA

As housing deterioration began to grow in South Jamaica—with homes abandoned, boarded up, neglected—people in the community got nervous. What could be done? Many in the area were first-time homeowners with no background or experience in owning or caring for a home. This was a phenomenon they were ill-prepared to deal with.

Norman Hunt, the street banker from Citibank, who was working with the community at the time, saw the problem. Through the Ford Foundation, the community had learned of a new program in Pittsburgh called Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS) that might help them. So, Norman joined with a group from South Jamaica (among them Jo Golden, Fern Hurst, John Cuff, Sherman Brown and Lois Phillips) who went down to look at the program. What they found was a neighborhood that had been turned around through an unusual coalition of neighborhood people, banks, and the city. This coalition had an impressive track record of saving a lot of housing in the area by making rehab loans, giving technical assistance, and pressing the city to enforce code violations, among other things. Most important, they had helped the community care about, and for, itself. And amazingly, they had come into being during the late sixties, at a time when violence and chaos in the cities seemed to be the norm.

There were certain parallels between the neighborhood in Pittsburgh and the one in Queens. "When we look at the Baisley Park community, we see that 67 percent of the housing stock is owner-occupied," said Norman Hunt. "Also, it's 98 percent Black, and the median income is about eighty-five hundred dollars. There are pockets of housing deterioration that we would like to isolate and correct and thus keep from spreading into surrounding communities. This way, we not only help Baisley Park, we also help St. Albans, Laurelton, and what have you."

But seeing a solution for South Jamaica in a neighborhood in Pittsburgh and being able to replicate that solution are two different things. The problem facing the community in Baisley Park was: How do we duplicate it? The answer was simple. They convinced (some say stole) the man largely responsible for the success of NHS in Pittsburgh to come to Queens. So, in 1974, Jim Cook came to South Jamaica.

"The first thing I wanted to do was to get a feel of the neighborhood," Jim said. "The intensity of New York was like being in Vietnam. I wanted to find out what were people's concerns, where do you launch your

program, where are you going to get your exposure, where are you going to get your back-up support. And we had to start very soon, and show positive results right away. People in this neighborhood had been burned too often."

The Board of Directors of Neighborhood Housing Services of Jamaica (composed of several bankers, among them Norman Hunt from Citibank, Sherman Brown from Chase, and John Cuff from Immigrant Savings Bank, along with neighborhood people such as Dorothy Washington, Reverend Gittens, and Lois Phillips) had their job cut out for them. They had to steer Jim through the intricacies of how Jamaica "worked," and of city politics, and how New York City "worked." It was basically a process of education. "He'd ask the questions," Norman said, "and we'd give him the directions."

Jim knew what he had to do to make the NHS program work. NHS acts as a neighborhood catalyst, a sort of facilitator. He had to get the people in the community to commit themselves to the program, and get the banks and the foundations involved, and then bring the city along to see that it did its part. It was, and is, the bringing together of these three elements that makes the program work.

The first thing Jim decided to tackle when he came here was to establish credibility. "I wanted to rehab one of the worst houses I'd seen in the area." He learned in his street conversations how disappointed people had been with the "war on poverty." "There was just controversy after controversy, and anything that looked like a storefront operation was looked down upon." A lot of money had come into the area, and disappeared, without doing much.

He found the house he was looking for. It was a little house, sitting on a corner, that probably should have been torn down. NHS rehabbed it, moved their office in, and started to work. "It created a real stir in the community, people would walk down and see this house and say, 'Where'd that come from?' and then, 'Oh, I'd love to have that.' Very few people in this neighborhood knew about the nomenclature of their houses. They'd say, 'I wish my walls were like that, I wish my floors were like that,' and these were the things we wanted to help them with." People came in off the streets and Jim began to get a good idea of what the community wanted. And, his office was the best demonstration of what they could have.

As people dropped in, they often became clients, and asked for a rehab loan or technical advice. Jim began developing an idea of what people in the neighborhood wanted, and what they needed. The two weren't always the same. It was difficult to tell people who wanted facade improvements on their house that they may need rewiring or re-plumbing. That was something they couldn't see. Many were first-time homeowners who had to learn what it meant to take care of a house.

Of course, along with rehab work to be done, there was a need for someone to do it. This meant jobs. It's a long term goal of NHS to build up local economic development, so whenever possible, they would bid jobs to local craftsmen. "You find a lot of craftsmen here, I mean good craftsmen, who never got a five thousand dollar job," he said, "but they're getting it now, and they're from the community."

NHS's office was on a block with many absentee landlords who were pulling the block down. There was no code enforcement. Instead of fixing up, the landlords were waiting to see how much more they could sell their houses for now that NHS was in the picture. In looking for a way to halt that attitude, Jim decided to focus on blocks that were relatively stable, with a majority of owner residents.

He talked to residents on 121st Avenue

and they were all troubled by the same abandoned house—160-16. NHS bought it, put in twenty-four thousand dollars to renovate it, and moved in. It was like a signal. Sixty thousand dollars worth of home improvements appeared, as if by command, on the block.

"You always look for the positive spin-off effect your work is going to have on the rest of the block . . . the next door neighbor fixing gutters and leaders, someone deciding to put in a new stoop, someone else painting the outside of their house or putting on a new roof."

In order to stretch their budget, NHS altered the way they worked. They would no longer do everything that was needed in a house. Along with this change (instilling a new sense of responsibility on the part of homeowners) there was now a need for maintenance classes. "We got a call from a little old lady who said a new boiler we put in wasn't working," Jim said. "We went out and checked the furnace and found that all she had to do was turn up the thermostat." So, they went to their Board and told them there was another component that went along with rehabilitation—home maintenance courses—educating the homeowner to care for his home. Now, they teach basic carpentry, plumbing, wiring and several other things in a twelve-week course. This allows the homeowner to deal with minor repairs, and to be knowledgeable if a contractor has to be called in. Queens, and especially areas where the unknowing first-time homeowner lives, is prey to unscrupulous contractors—who all seem to live out on Long Island. (Their signs are plastered all over Queens.) Now, when NHS puts up sheetrock, they tape and spackle but frequently don't paint. If the owner complains, NHS tells them, "We'll teach you how to paint."

Harvey Hodge is the construction specialist with NHS. It is his job to estimate what a rehab will cost. He listens to what the client wants, usually pares it down, sees what must be done in terms of basics, estimates what the total price of the job should be and puts it out to bid. "People make requests for improvements on their home, and frequently they have no knowledge as to what they really need. Often they can get what they want for much less than what a contractor quotes them. It's a big job combating the shady contractors. Education is essential in turning a neighborhood around."

The maintenance program has been in operation for about three years, and though emphasis is on the NHS boundary area, interest is great from the surrounding areas. Curriculum guidelines for the course were established by York College, and enrollees are taught the basics of how their house works: the heating system, the boiler, plumbing, electricity, etc.

"All our activities are geared around stabilization," Jim said, "and it just doesn't happen through brick and mortar alone. The whole point is, why did it fall into disrepair, and how do you keep it in repair?" NHS feels that they are giving people in the area a whole new sense of awareness, a feeling that there is a resource they can call on, and that if NHS can't loan them the money for renovation, at least they can advise them on what they need for their own house—including the best and cheapest way to go about getting it.

"We've made a lot of mistakes," Jim said, "but we are slowly turning things around. People are calling us. It seems they think that we are going to be responsible for bringing back all of southeast Queens. But that's a little too much for us to chew."

Currently, NHS is starting up a vacant homes program. Since one vacant home on a block can sometimes tip that block, if they can acquire it, rehab it, and sell it, then a block in danger of tipping can remain stable.

But finding out who owns the house, and what is a fair market price can take time.

While the vacant homes program will take care of that house in the good area that requires attention, another component of the program will address itself to the house in the blighted area that may require gut rehab. This is called SHIP—Small Home Improvement Program. These homes, even if acquired for two to three thousand dollars need at least twenty-five thousand dollars worth of rehab to bring them back. But they'll never bring on the open market what it costs to bring them back. Who will make up the difference?

NHS hopes the city will. They've just been approached by the city to manage a SHIP program to bring back houses that, theoretically, should have been leveled. It may take as much as thirty thousand dollars per house to complete the job—from acquisition to turnkey rehab—and the market value of the house may still be only twenty thousand dollars or so. Someone has to make up the difference. If the city does, they could put someone in a virtually new house for about ten thousand dollars—someone who's going to pay taxes on that house and return it to the tax rolls, someone who is going to take care of that house, relieve the city of that responsibility, and contribute towards the betterment of the block. Anyway you look at it, it's a bargain for the city.

NHS hopes to rehab as many as four or five houses on a block under this program, and has already built up an inventory of people who are interested in homes.

"But you've got to be systematic," Harvey Hodge says. "You start with a survey, then go into feasibility selection, acquisition, estimating, evaluating and appraisal, reinsurance and construction, financing and marketing, screening applicants, getting them into the house and then reeducating them, making sure a full NHS program is available to them to guarantee the success."

"Harvey hit on a beautiful point," Jim added. "Each and every one of the homeowners we've gotten ourselves involved in—with a major rehabilitation or other technical service—we stick with them. We are a member of this community. We provide follow-up service. You have somewhere to go, someone to call, somebody that's going to be concerned. You know, we're starting a tool library, and next year, we're going to have Phone-An-Expert."

Currently, NHS offers counseling, community organization, loan programs (the high-risk loan fund is contributed to by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, the Taconic Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Astor Foundation, the Klingenstein Foundation and the New York Community Trust; operating expenses are contributed to by the banks—Chase Manhattan, Citibank, Bankers Trust, the New York Savings Banks Association, Manufacturers Hanover Trust, and the New York Life Insurance Company), technical assistance for construction, contract referral, maintenance training, and vacant home acquisition and resale. About 40 percent of their time and the backbone of their service is their loan program. As a financial resource they have money to lend, but only lend it if the applicant exhausts all local resources. At times, they can push someone to a bank, and indeed, 50 percent of their clients eventually get their loans through banks. Those who can't are subject to a financial survey to set up a realistic payback schedule. The NHS loan committee is made up of two bankers and three community residents. If the loan is approved, NHS makes a survey of the house and ascertains what work is necessary and what it will cost to do it. They act as the general contractor, and keep 10 percent of the money until the job is done to their satisfaction. NHS can be seen as a sort of

combination bank and general contractor—except that they are willing to take risks that most banks won't, and their general contracting goals are not profits but a good job efficiently done, and the positive spin-off they can have on a block.

Since they started four years ago, they have been responsible for rehabbing about 150 homes, ranging in size from several hundred dollars to a construction loan for a brand new house.

Have they succeeded in turning the neighborhood around?

A cursory inspection of the Baisley Park area still shows vacant homes (the problem seems to be more acute on the South Ozone side of Baisley Park where there are more absentee landlords). And the rate of increase is not comforting. But if it weren't for NHS, the community would now be in need of intensive care—and while Baisley Park isn't back where it should be, the momentum is in the right direction.

More money would certainly help NHS expand and accelerate their program. But money alone isn't the answer. The success of the program requires the involvement of the community, and the cooperation of the city.

Unfortunately, of the eighty-five NHS programs operating throughout the country, the program in New York City is the only one that does not have the solid backing of the municipal government. But maybe that will change now that this neighborhood has been included as part of the Neighborhood Strategy Area.

#### BAISLEY PARK NEIGHBORS (BPN)

Lois Phillips, a board member of the Neighborhood Housing Services and one of the people responsible for bringing it to South Jamaica, remembers how the Baisley Park Neighbors was formed. A crime wave had hit the area. People's homes were being robbed, and angered community residents got together, went out, and got five thousand signatures to petition the city to do something. "Something really wasn't quite right with the police at the time," says Lois Phillips, director of the Baisley Park Neighbors, "but they did bring vans in at 119th Avenue and start to arrest the loiterers on the corner." Of course, they were released soon after, but the message was loud and clear.

That was in 1966. The newly formed group realized they would soon have to deal with other issues. They petitioned the city for improved streets, curbs, and sidewalk repairs. "The petitions from the community gave us more leeway in dealing with the commissioner," said Lois Phillips, "because they came to us to find out our needs. And we met with them constantly, and they began to do a number of things."

In 1969, an anti-poverty corporation, the Jamaica Community Corporation, funded them for the first time. They became a housing agent and started dealing with social and tenant problems. And the more they dealt with tenant problems, the more they saw that landlords also had problems. Through surveys, they found that many home improvements were needed. Urban renewal was then coming to Jamaica, and they tried, without luck, to get a 312 program for the area.

The Baisley Park Neighbors is a certified HUD counselor, and the bulk of the cases they deal with are people who are in the process of losing their homes. It is a painful process to watch. As jobs leave New York, the people whose jobs left are stuck with mortgage payments they can't make. Sometimes, they can pick up other jobs, but often, these are not comparable to what they had before.

Since most of their clients are behind on mortgage payments, the first thing that BPN does for them is a budget analysis. Then,

they call the bank and try to work out some type of arrangement. Frequently, banks sell the mortgage to mortgage companies. When that happens, even if someone is two months behind and scrapes up a month's payment, the mortgage company will not accept it. Mortgage companies rarely have a commitment to keep the owner in the house. "If the bank is still involved," Lois said, "we work with the bank and make out a payment schedule which will give the client a chance to catch up." If they see that it is a real hardship case, they request the bank to send out a "number 3 letter"—the final letter the banks sends out—and the bank also sends them an application stating that they feel they can no longer carry the mortgage. The form asks for a HUD takeover of the mortgage.

HUD works out a reduced payment schedule or tacks on the arrears at the end of the mortgage contract.

BPN tries to do this before foreclosure proceedings have begun to take place and substantial legal fees have been generated. Often an owner can catch up on missed mortgage payments, but the added expense of legal fees makes the incurred debt too great. Lois also finds that help from welfare takes too long, with too much redtape, so that by the time welfare acts, the delay has generated too much additional expense in legal fees. In some cases, homes could be saved if it was the mortgage alone that had to be made up.

In addition to assisting in housing problems, ranging from helping to prevent foreclosure, to eviction assistance, relocation, mortgage counseling, and senior citizen counseling, they offer technical assistance to block associations, and youth programs that include high school equivalency programs and special summer trips.

BPN is funded, in a spartan fashion, by the Community Development Agency. The five staff members are paid marginal salaries, but there is little money for travel, consumable supplies or telephones.

In addition to joining with other groups to get Neighborhood Housing Services in Jamaica, Baisley Park Neighbors, is a co-sponsor, along with two other groups, of a housing project—Baisley Garden—that will provide 210 units of Section 8 housing.

#### AREA-1 CIVIC FEDERATION

Fighting among community groups before the local community planning board can be disastrous. How can the planning board make recommendations to the city when the community can't even decide what it wants?

With this in mind, Area 1 of Community Board No. 12 in Queens (there are five areas in No. 12) decided to get together and take care of all their dirty laundry in private, so they could present a united front before the community board. The 250-block area—Van Wyck to North Conduit to New York Boulevard to 111th Avenue—is comprised of 130 different civic groups, not all of whom are members of the Federation.

This year, they went before the Board as a single body and recommended five projects, all of which had been incorporated in the master plan for the area for several years: (1) South Jamaica street and drainage improvements; (2) the commercial revitalization of Rockaway Boulevard, Sutphin Boulevard and New York Boulevard; (3) the rehabilitation of Baisley Park and Lake and the construction of Baisley Park Extension; (4) institution of the Neighborhood Preservation Program to rehabilitate over three hundred deteriorated and abandoned houses; and, (5) the acquisition of a site for the construction of a community multi-service center.

#### SOUTHERN QUEENS PARK ASSOCIATION (SQPA)

Imagine fifty-five acres of grass, shrubs, trees, sports fields, a lake, and an energy

park in the middle of an area of Queens threatened by blight. A utopian vision? A mistake? Or the chance to revitalize a neighborhood, a community, and perhaps an area the size of two community planning boards.

The Southern Queens Parks Association believes it is the latter—if, certain key elements can be put together.

In 1973, St. Albans Naval Hospital, a 119.4-acre complex, was phased out. The Veterans Administration retained sixty-six acres, including the major hospital facilities, and the excess property, 53.4 acres, was declared surplus by the GSA. In 1977, the federal government transferred the excess land to a reluctant New York City, which was having trouble taking care of its own parks. Subsequently, a number of organizations in the area got together and formed the Southern Queens Park Association to develop and oversee the property.

It was a unique opportunity for the city, for Queens, and for South Jamaica. Nowhere else could a parcel of such a size be assembled in New York City with such ease . . . and for an area that was in desperate need of health and recreation facilities. With four hundred thousand dollars in Community Development IV funds to repair an existing building for recreation, two hundred thousand dollars from the New York City Youth Board for youth programs, and twenty-eight thousand dollars from the New York State Division of Youth for work demonstration program in which ten kids aged sixteen to twenty are paid three dollars an hour to rehabilitate some brick housing on the site, SQPA is on its way towards creating an exciting catalyst for the surrounding community. The thrust of SQPA's proposal centers around recreation, with facilities for basketball, baseball, football, jogging, biking, ping-pong, swimming, soccer, tennis, and track and field events. "The most pressing need is for funds to repair Building 82," said Solomon Goodrich, executive director of SQPA. "The prospect for funds looks good. By 1980, we hope to have the outdoor playgrounds resurfaced and begin working on Building 82. We will probably move our offices there. By 1981, we hope to occupy Building 82. By 1983, we hope to have the energy park and the health/sports complex in place."

It's an ambitious plan, and a rare opportunity for the area and for New York City. If everybody does his part, it will not only serve as an inspiration to help revitalize Jamaica, it will serve as a buffer to prevent blight from spreading from Jamaica to St. Albans. But at this point, the plan requires additional funds, and a commitment on the part of New York City to fulfill certain obligations toward caring for this unique park.

#### THE FUTURE

The problems in South Jamaica are both smaller and larger than in other areas of the city. Smaller in the sense that single family rehab is easier than rehabbing multiple dwellings. Larger in the sense that the cost for the drainage and sewer system needed for the area is estimated at \$500 million. So far, the city has been lucky. The people in the area are concerned, aroused, informed, and willing to work. The civic associations are strong. And Neighborhood Housing Services is one of the best things that ever happened to Queens. But now, it's the city's turn to do something. As one neighborhood resident says, "No longer can they ignore the filthy vacant lots, the potholed streets, and weed-clogged Baisley Pond. Now, they've got to provide back-up service to Neighborhood Housing Services, and to the community. For too long, the community has been crying for help—and the city has done everything it can to ignore them. This neighborhood could have a domino effect in Queens—and the city ignores South Jamaica at its peril."

It's cheaper to save a still stable and

viable community like South Jamaica now, instead of waiting until the problem pockets get worse and more expensive to save later on. And New York City cannot afford to lose any working-class neighborhoods.●

#### WAGE-PRICE CONTROLS—OR BUST

### HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the inflation crisis continues to undermine our economy and to impose severe hardships on millions of Americans.

The current annual rate of increase in the cost of living is 13.2 percent, a level not reached since the end of World War II. Clearly, Congress must address this critical situation immediately and in an effective manner.

Giving the President authority to establish mandatory wage and price controls is now the only course of action that can stop the inflationary spiral before it stops our economy. I would like to comment to the attention of my colleagues an article appearing in the July 22 Fort Lauderdale News and Sun Sentinel written by our distinguished colleague from Florida, Congressman EDWARD J. STACK.

Mr. STACK presents his own historical perspective and analysis of how the Nation reached the terrible straits in which we now find ourselves. While one may have differing perspectives, I find his solution to our economic ills to be unassailable. The text of the article follows:

#### WHY MANDATORY WAGE-PRICE CONTROLS?

(By EDWARD J. STACK)

Before I answer my question, allow me to portray, in broad outline, the background which has created the present double-digit inflation. The current inflationary trend stems from the decision of President Johnson to continue his Great Society programs and to finance the war in Viet Nam without a tax increase. This Guns and Butter policy started the inflationary spiral—which continued under President Nixon, until, for a short time, he imposed mandatory controls which worked well during their imposition, but which, in the long run, failed because they were removed too soon and too precipitously. In addition, the problem of inflation has been compounded, more recently, by the oil embargo, world wide crop failures, devaluation of the dollar resulting from our continued and massive negative foreign trade balance, and, of course, the current energy crisis.

Two years ago last April, President Carter stated that the energy crisis constituted "the moral equivalent of war". His appraisal was, in fact, an understatement. The country is literally at war—not as yet a shooting war, but an economic war. The weapons are not missiles and tanks, but oil rigs and oil drums. The Fifth Column is our national refusal to come to grips with our dependence on imported oil. The OPEC nations have brought us to our knees—we have already lost control over foreign policy decisions. When the Congress voted three weeks ago not to lift sanctions against Rhodesia, it was very clear that the recommendation of the House International Relations Committee, which the House adopted, was to continue sanctions in order not to offend Nigeria which supplies the United States with about 10% of our imported oil. An even more bla-

tant attempt to dictate American foreign policy was the statement by Sheikh Ahmed Zaki Yamani, the Saudi-Arabian oil minister, that unless the United States pressured Israel to agree to a Palestinian State on the West Bank, we had better be prepared to "face the consequences", which, he suggested, would be OPEC oil at \$50 a barrel. This, in turn, he said, would precipitate an economic depression which would make that of the 1930 period pale by comparison into insignificance. He added that he would not be at all surprised if the frustrated Palestinians did not sink one or two super tankers in the Strait of Hormuz, between the Persian Gulf and the Gulf of Oman, which would cut off the 20 million barrels of oil which daily transit the Strait. That statement virtually invites the terrorists to take this action.

Have a happy Fourth of July in 1980 folks, but don't forget to fly your OPEC flag.

If anyone does not believe this country is facing its most critical economic crisis since the War Between the States, let me dissuade him.

The current rate of inflation, annualized, is about 13%. Since the first of the year, oil prices have increased by 60%. This will increase the rate of inflation annually by 2%, more or less. Additionally, we are heading into a recession. The economic pundits are predicting that in 1980, unemployment will increase to 7 or 8%. This will trigger increased unemployment insurance payments, reduction of income tax collections and other tax receipts. Discussion is already rampant in Congress to cut taxes, especially from the Republican side of the aisle. Other counter-cyclical programs will be put into place to check unemployment. In consequence government budget deficits will increase and the Federal Reserve System will increase the money supply. The net result will be that we will pour additional fuel on the fire of inflation by discarding responsible fiscal and monetary policy. The concept of a balanced budget will go out the window. Inflation will escalate at an unprecedented rate.

The only sensible course of action to reverse the process, I suggest, is to impose mandatory wage-price controls.

Mandatory controls will have two immediate consequences:

1. They will buy us the time we need, as a nation, to achieve energy independence. In his speech on Sunday, July 15th, the President talked in terms of achieving energy independence by 1990—what, may I ask, do we do in the interim to check inflation? If the current rate continues until 1990, our energy independence will come too late—every savings account, government bond, insurance policy, long-term mortgage and other fixed dollar investments, will be virtually worthless.

2. Controls will have a psychological impact, which may shake the American public out of its lethargic state and make people aware of the seriousness of the situation.

Americans must understand that our national independence—our national survival—is at stake.

The imposition of mandatory controls would prove to the public that somebody is minding the store in Washington, that someone is in charge. Confidence in the ability of government would be restored.

Admittedly, no one likes price controls—but if, indeed, as Mr. Carter restated on July 15th, we are at war, we have no choice. Price controls can work. They did work in World War II, Korea, and during the Nixon Administration.

There are two basic conditions which must accompany the imposition of mandatory controls to avoid the creation of a large bureaucracy and to make controls effective:

1. Control prices only in basic industry,

the 1000 or so corporations in the United States which do 60% of the nation's business. By controlling the prices and wages of steel companies and other corporations in heavy industry: autos, chemicals, electronics, insurance, banks, as well as the large labor unions, will avoid the necessity of imposing price controls in small business.

For example, General Motors gross annual business is about \$70 billion. The company employs over 500,000 people. It has many small companies from which it buys components. Prices & wages in these small companies need not be controlled. Control of the major industry will have a trickle down effect on the smaller companies.

2. To work successfully, mandatory controls must be of long duration. Certainly, at the present, they should be retained until we have achieved energy independence. When controls are removed, the process must be gradual and tied to constant dollar increases in productivity. If prices tend to rise above that level, controls should be reinstated.

This is no time for half-way measures. What is needed is the bold type of action which was taken during the first 100 days of F.D.R.'s administration—mandatory controls may cause a measure of pain, but the alternative is the death of our economic system.●

**ROBERTA WEINTRAUB ON  
SCHOOL BUSING**

**HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, Roberta Weintraub is a representative of parents all over the United States who are struggling to reclaim their rights as parents. She recently won an overwhelming victory with her election to the Los Angeles City School Board. Her win was a triumph for all people who are victims of a social scheme profoundly affecting the lives of America's children and parents: Forced busing.

Mrs. Weintraub successfully led a campaign to recall a school board member who, once elected, performed an about-face from his anti-busing campaign stance. She endured the usual lies and slurs directed at people who oppose the time-consuming counterproductive transportation of schoolchildren great distances to achieve racial quotas in the classroom. Fortunately, the people of her district would not accept lies. Mrs. Weintraub won convincingly.

Mr. Speaker, in light of this body's vote last week on Mr. RON MOTTI's resolution, I would like to direct your attention, and the attention of my colleagues, to an article from the Los Angeles Herald Examiner by one of southern California's most popular columnists, the best selling author Ben Stein. Mr. Stein recently met Mrs. Weintraub before the taping of former Mayor Sam Yorty's weekly television show. He came away impressed. His reaction is shared by all who have encountered or worked with her. School board members recently elected Mrs. Weintraub their new president. I only wish that my colleagues on the floor could have the chance to meet with this dynamic and super-informed new leader

in education. In lieu of this, I present Mr. Stein's article:

**BUSING UNDERDOG WOULDN'T PLAY DEAD**

(By Ben Stein)

A few days ago, while I was sitting in a windowless room at a TV studio, in walked a tall woman with a halo of frizzy red hair and a big, innocent smile.

"I want you to meet the woman of the hour," said former Mayor Sam Yorty. Since I had never seen the woman before, I had no idea who she was until everyone started to call her Roberta and ask her questions about busing. Then I figured out the woman was Roberta Weintraub, our new school board member, and an amazing person.

I spent a long time talking with Roberta Weintraub, and I came away with a feeling of elation. Roberta is a housewife from an obscure part of the San Fernando Valley who has never held elective public office, whose means, while comfortable, are not enormous, who has no national or local political ties of any significance, who carries an ideological message which made her own mother embarrassed. She took on the massive liberal establishment of Los Angeles and in the life-or-death struggle for the future of Los Angeles schools, she won.

Roberta Weintraub first emerged on the scene as a champion of the right—a simple, little right—of children not to be kidnapped by the state and taken away from their homes to schools far away because of the whims of an ignorant and militant judiciary. She was a leading organizer of people of every race and religion who wanted to be allowed to keep their children in their neighborhood schools. When former school board president Howard Miller engineered a program to destroy the public schools of Los Angeles by forced busing last fall, Roberta Weintraub was always at every meeting and rally, full of facts and figures on just how poorly busing worked and how deadly an effect it would have on an already seriously ill school system.

When Howard Miller lied time after time about the true significance of busing, about white flight, about empty buses, about bus accidents on the streets of Los Angeles, Roberta Weintraub began her campaign to recall him from office and to replace him with herself.

In the course of that campaign, Roberta Weintraub was shunned by many of her longtime friends. Her son was publicly taunted by a teacher during religious training. The rabbi of her synagogue repeatedly criticized her from the pulpit.

Roberta Weintraub walked and drove all over the city to campaign for a school system which would provide parents with the same rights to guide their children's lives that would have been taken for granted a generation ago, but which are relentlessly being taken away today.

Roberta Weintraub relied for her campaign on the efforts of volunteers and the contributions of hundreds of the ordinary citizens of Los Angeles. She ran a perfectly straightforward campaign on a shoestring budget—which ran her and her family deeply into debt.

She faced Howard Miller, who had the backing of the well-heeled, politically active Hollywood community. Miller received more in contributions from two wealthy show business types than Roberta spent in her entire campaign, from all sources.

But as we all know, Roberta Weintraub won, and won big.

The victory of Roberta Weintraub is extremely similar to the victory last year of Proposition 13. In both cases, the established power centers of society fought bitterly against the will of the people. In both cases, the electorate was thoroughly outraged by the examples of a wasteful and overbearing

government. And in both cases, untrue smear campaigns were waged against the representatives of the ordinary citizen in the condescending belief that the ordinary California or Los Angeles voter is too stupid to see through obvious lies.

Roberta Weintraub wants to have a school system in which children get good educations, regardless of race. She wants a society where parents—not the state—control a child's life. She does not want race to be a factor at all in deciding who goes to what school. She does not want children's lives wasted by being on buses all day. She does not want children to be in a state of constant terror from violence by their totally undisciplined classmates and outsiders.

When I think that there are leaders emerging from the people who have the sense and the courage of Roberta Weintraub, it gives me hope for the future.●

**A NEW DIRECTION FOR  
GOVERNMENT**

**HON. GUY VANDER JAGT**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post contained a very interesting commentary on the direction of this Nation. The eight concerned citizen who apparently paid for this one-page advertisement have sent President Carter an extremely well reasoned message on steps that should be taken to get this country progressing once again through efforts to get Government, industry, and labor working together.

President Carter's recent effort at Camp David to bring together some of the principal forces in America was a first step in the right direction, but he just did not go far enough. Building a consensus on the Nation's energy policy should be of the highest priority, but we are unfortunately still hearing rhetorical attacks on the country's largest energy producers coming from the White House instead of more effective proposals for cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, during the first week in March I called for the President to convene a high-level energy summit conference to bring together all the major interests and policymakers to develop a consensus on a realistic energy program. I called on the President to bring together the key congressional leaders from both parties, energy industry representatives, consumer group representatives, Government officials, and other important opinion makers. This was not done.

The President missed a golden opportunity at Camp David to have more than a self-examination and public relations exercise. The public's reaction to the President's nationwide address indicates that the American people are ready for a realistic plan for dealing with the Nation's problems of energy and inflation and are ready to be led. However, the confusion and warmed-over rhetoric which followed the Camp David exercise signals that President Carter is really not leading this Nation on a new direc-

tion. I want to share with my colleagues in the House the commentary which was printed in today's Washington Post and provides a meaningful outline of the kind of philosophy we need in the Federal Government:

[Advertisement from the Washington Post, Aug. 1, 1979]

A STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE TO THE  
PRESIDENT

President JIMMY CARTER,  
White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We know that you appreciate citizen input. Responding to the spirit of Pittsburgh and Martinburg, this letter is our means of communicating with you regarding a subject of deep mutual concern—the future of our country. We believe your faith has set your priorities and purposes for life in the correct order, which equips you to give our country the truly unselfish leadership it needs.

HOW DOES ONE LEAD?

Besides natural aptitudes, all great leaders have a compelling vision or goal that possessed them. Some examples are:

Socrates: The immortality of the soul.  
Napoleon: The domination of Europe.  
Lincoln: The preservation of the Union.  
Jesus Christ: The Kingdom of God.

Mr. President, your past statements indicate you have a vision and goal of a "Strengthened and Revitalized America," both spiritually and materially. Your vision and goal are shared by us. Materially, it translates into an inflationless economy, competitive with all other nations. Please hear us on that one subject.

NATIONAL GOALS

Our people feel we must regain leadership in exports of manufactured products—steel—TV sets—automobiles. It is a little embarrassing and quite damaging that we are importing so many foreign goods because our products are not competitive here at home. Continuation of this trend will increase inflation, destroy the dollar, and assure us a position as a second-rate nation.

We must rebuild our industrial base. For years now we have spent billions on environmental considerations. The pendulum has swung entirely too far. We can't afford to continue to divert so much of our assets to non-productive facilities. Investment in modern production facilities must be encouraged with a more balanced approach to environmental regulations. How do we revitalize and make competitive our basic industries? It starts with your leadership and the cooperation of the Congress. It starts with a New Direction For Government and its policies toward business and industry.

A NEW DIRECTION FOR GOVERNMENT

You have called for our people to work with you to help solve our problems. Our people in universities, labor, and industry have everything we need to solve our problems—if we add a "cooperative" government. The day is past for government and industry to remain adversaries. National policies must be developed (with the Congress) that will set goals of revitalizing our basic industries—not because we favor anyone, but because it is vital to our nation. Antagonism must give way to cooperation because it is in the enlightened self-interest of our country.

Past is prologue. The present approach to the oil companies reminds us of another President who made a scapegoat of the steel industry. We now are reaping the benefits of that type approach and attitude. Steel is basic. We can and should be producing this commodity for less than our foreign competition. We believe we are second-rate in steel because other governments have set a national policy of working with their steel

industries to encourage modern up-to-date steel mills.

We suggest that you seek agreement with Congress that we should have a government policy of strengthening that industry. Then call together the producers—both industrial leaders and labor leaders—and discuss with them what it takes in governmental cooperation to make our nation No. 1 in steel again. Then ask the Congress for the legislation. We could then export steel again, and our whole country would benefit.

ENERGY—INCENTIVES VS. DISINCENTIVES

What happened years ago to steel we feel developing again in energy. Mr. President, the oil companies are not any more greedy than the independent truckers or the gasoline station owners or most of the rest of us. Castigating them, and punitively taxing them is a "disincentive." We need "incentives" rather than disincentives. These are the people who can best do what we need done—produce energy.

The government isn't going to produce any energy. Based on past history, we can expect only more bureaucracy and higher taxes, and probably larger deficits to pay for it. Can't we call together leaders of the oil industry, labor leaders, and our appropriate university people, and ask them how we can solve our energy problems? Our country does have tremendous energy resources. It is our people and not our government that have made our nation great and can solve this problem, too. A clearly developed governmental policy that cooperates with industry to develop additional energy out of its earnings without additional bureaucracy or government spending would be in the public interest. With the cooperation of Congress, you can make this a matter of governmental policy which serves to hold in check big government to the benefit of all of us.

INFLATION

The American people are being universally hurt by inflation. We are getting wiser about the causes. Most people don't really believe that OPEC, oil companies, or wasteful citizens are really the main causes of our troubles. (Japan imports 97% of its oil needs.) We really think the root cause of our inflation problem is the Federal Government and its:

1. Deficit spending.
2. Excessive monetary growth.
3. Cost of bureaucratic rules and regulations.

We strongly support your commitment to control inflation, and urge you to stand steadfast concerning the above three items, or else we lose by default your vision of a Strengthened and Revitalized America.

GREAT EXPECTATIONS

We have a tendency to raise the expectations of people falsely. We suspect that this is because we are running the biggest business (United States Government) in the world like amateurs, and we do not really know what the future expectations can and should be. For instance, do we have a five-year budget of expected income and expenses? Even medium-sized companies have one. If so, what does it indicate? What can we really afford? Can we balance the budget with inflationary increases in the future? Can we really afford a new National Health Plan? Can we really expect to have \$1.00 a gallon gasoline while other nations pay \$2.50, and have conservation by our people? People understand about what they can and cannot afford. You can talk to them about it. In our judgment, the American people are ready for some straight talk on expectations for the future, and will join you in austerity if it moves us toward the goal of a Strengthened and Revitalized America.

YOU AND CAMP DAVID

You have had some notable successes at Camp David when you had people there who

were experts on the problem and also part of the solution. This was not the case in the most recent past. Mr. President, go back to Camp David and develop policies for cooperation between government and industry that will put us in first place again. Ask the people to visit with you who can really contribute to the solution of the problems and can do what we need done.

THE MAIN GOAL

The folks in the country frequently get the impression that in Washington the main goal is to get re-elected. In business, this would be called letting the "sales department" run the company. It isn't good enough for our country today.

You are a man with a vision for our country far beyond 1980. We believe that you would rather do what is best for our Nation and put re-election second, rather than operate under political expediency. Some of your staff may not feel that way.

THE NATION WILL RESPOND TO A NEW DIRECTION: GOVERNMENT, INDUSTRY, LABOR WORKING TOGETHER

Our nation's people are becoming more sophisticated. We sense when someone is doing or saying something just to gain votes and it is a "turn off." We believe that the majority of voters will respond to a "new direction" for our government and our country—even though it is tough and upsets all kinds of special interest groups. Yes, we must have an inflationless economy competitive with other nations. Even if it makes some folks unhappy today—they'll be pleased tomorrow.

You have been placed by God in a position of unparalleled opportunity to be His servant and the servant of your neighbor—the American people. It is time for A New Direction For Government. We will continue to pray for you that you will have His Wisdom, Courage, and Strength. As you deal openly with our people, and work for a Strengthened and Revitalized America, you will earn the long term appreciation of all the American people, and a unique place in history.

God bless you,

Eight Concerned Citizens,  
Charles I. Babcock, Jr., Chairman, Development Firm; James M. Brown, Retired Phone Company Executive; Paul Belardino, High School Principal; R. Ray Goode, President, Building Company; R. Douglas Hazen, Air Conditioning Distributor; David Hume, Advertising Agency Executive; Al Palmer, Attorney; and Ralph Renick, Television Journalist.●

CONSERVATION—OIL HEAT RETROFIT PROGRAM

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the Science and Technology Committee last year adopted my amendment for \$5.4 million to initiate a comprehensive oil heat R. & D. and marketing program. That money was appropriated for fiscal year 1979 and this year DOE requested \$3.85 million for their followon activity. This is a vital program for people in the Northeast who depend heavily on oil to heat their homes.

The \$500,000 of the DOE request was set aside by our committee from the im-

portant oil-fired unit demonstration to the space conditioning in research project activity at Brookhaven National Laboratory. This demonstration activity was designed in three phases, the first two of which require Federal stimulation.

The redirection of funds in this program will speed the introduction of advanced combustion concepts and furnaces to raise efficiency 40 to 50 percent. This is a vital R. & D. program for the Northeast and deserves strong support.

**FOSSIL ENERGY (COAL-OIL COMBUSTION RESEARCH)**

This \$250,000 is for restoration of the university research on coal-oil mixtures which was funded last year under advanced research and supporting technology but was not included in the fiscal year 1980 request. The coal-oil mixtures program was reduced by \$2,950,000 in fiscal year 1980 and there are insufficient funds to complete important activity on contracts outside the energy technology centers. This set-aside is specifically for Adelphi College Center for Energy Studies and complements a smaller program sponsored by EPA which is directed at reducing emissions by coal/oil combustion. The work consists of coal desulfurization during combustion of coal-oil water emulsions. This is an economic alternative to clean liquid from coal.

**SYNTHETIC FUELS PRODUCTION**

This bill, as the Moorhead bill before it and the DOE authorization, H.R. 3000, is a genuine energy supply bill. I recall 3 years ago when our Science and Technology Committee struggled vainly to push major initiatives for synthetic fuels production.

Outside of projects at the pilot plant scale, this country has made little progress since then because industry has not been given the incentive. I believe that setting production goals of 500,000 barrels a day by 1985, as in H.R. 4930, is the incentive that should catalyze the synthetics program.

In the Northeast we are particularly interested in major liquefaction projects but advanced gasification techniques cannot be ignored because they are a vital source for petroleum substitutes.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I also want to congratulate Mr. McDADE and Mr. YATES for bringing it to the floor. It is a genuine energy supply bill. ●

**ONE MAN'S ANSWER TO THE PRESIDENT**

**HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, we have read numerous editorials and commentary by syndicated columnists concerning President Carter's demagogic attacks against the oil companies. But perhaps it would be helpful if we could hear from

someone who works for one of the major oil companies in order to understand how he sees his role.

It so happens I received a copy of a letter an oil company lobbyist sent to President Carter. The lobbyist has given me permission to place that letter in the RECORD. I believe this letter gives us a different perspective on the President's views. At any rate, I think it is only fair to add to the public record the view of one person who represents only himself and who believes in what he is doing.

At this point I wish to insert a letter written to the President the day after his televised speech on energy:

The PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am an oil lobbyist. I have been for the past 3½ years. Before that, for 15 years I was a farm lobbyist.

I am a member of a profession that has become a necessity around seats of government—whether that's Washington or Atlanta.

I am proud to be a lobbyist. I am proud to be an oil lobbyist. As a farm lobbyist, I always felt I was playing an important role in helping to keep this nation's farm industry in a position to feed not only this country, but half of the free world. While it is the American farmer who does the production job, we lobbyists play an important role in making sure that his ability to produce is not inhibited by government actions.

The same is true in the domestic energy field. Our members are the producers of energy, but they have hired me and others to look after their interests in Congress and the regulatory agencies.

My job is a legal profession. I am required by the rules of the game to file and report regularly to the Secretary to the Senate and the Clerk of the House. These filings are a matter of public record.

I work for a 501c(3) organization. As such, its annual tax return, including details of income and expenses is open to the public at the Internal Revenue Service.

I can say without exception, to my knowledge I have never professionally done anything which was illegal or improper.

Yet again last night, you went before the Nation and told millions I was wrong, greedy, not to be trusted and that I was about to help "rob" \$54 billion from the windfall profits tax. I am not a "robber" and I resent your insinuation. That is like suggesting that you "robbed" Georgians of thousands of dollars in recent years because your farm and warehouse have been underassessed.

If there is any "robbing" going on, it is being done by policies of the Federal government on the oil and natural gas industry through price controls which have "robbed" producers of income needed to find more oil and natural gas and have "robbed" consumers of needed energy supplies. Other government policies restricting the use of public lands, both on and off-shore have "robbed" this nation's energy users of additional supplies and made them more susceptible to the OPEC "robbers".

Personal and business income, contrary to what some would suggest, does not belong to the government. It is ridiculous to suggest that an industry or individual trying to keep as much of his or her income from ending up in public coffers is a "robber".

Which brings me to another point, one I admit is a bit emotional on my part.

I have a 19-year-old son who is having a real struggle with drugs—yet he is surrounded by illegal drug pushers and people

who in high places scoff at our drug laws. As he tells me, "Dad, it is easier to buy cocaine and PCP than it is to buy gasoline".

Where, in the name of God are our priorities? We have thousands of "Policemen" at work enforcing price controls. We are going to get more "police" to check thermostats. The Mafia is killing one another in the streets of Brooklyn. Organized crime is skimming millions from the poor. Drunken driving is a national disgrace.

Yet, you attack me—and my colleagues—repeatedly as if we were public enemies of the worst kind—but not one word about these other problems. How about the "robbers" at GSA and HEW? How about drug pushers and users in the White House?

Yes, I'm angry—but I'm honest. I do my job in spite of your attacks. I have my shortcomings, but I readily admit them. When I no longer have the will and desire to do my job or a willingness to admit my shortcomings, I'll quit—I hope I won't point my finger at everyone else and lash out at everyone around me.

You told me I lacked pride and confidence. I disagree. I'm proud to be an American, an oil lobbyist, a husband, a father, a contributor to my community—and I am confident that no problem faces this nation that is insurmountable. Not as long as we work together as reasonable people and are honest about our problems and all share our failures as well as our successes.

I have plenty of confidence—it's you, I think who lacks confidence—at least you don't instill much confidence in me when you continually attack those of us who you are supposed to represent.

Only two weeks ago, Stu Eisenstadt told you to attack OPEC—make them the bad guys. That's not what you did last night.

Forgive me, if I sound harsh. But you said you wanted to hear from "the people". I'm one of "the people" and I'm telling you to get off my personal back. I'll meet you and your policies on Capitol Hill. If your ideas and perceptions of our energy problem are better than mine and you can articulate them better—you win. If I do better, I'll win—but don't keep up these personal attacks on nationwide television if you want me and others like me to have any pride and confidence at all. They are difficult traits to maintain and enhance in the gutter of political rhetoric which you chose last night. ●

**TRIBUTE TO EWING JOHNSON,  
MEMPHIS PRESS SCIMITAR**

**HON. ED JONES**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to my dear friend, Mr. Ewing Johnson, of the Memphis, Tenn., Press Scimitar.

Today is the first day in many, many years that Mr. Johnson did not oversee the composition of that paper's editorial page. Today is the day that Ewing Johnson began his retirement after 61 years in the newspaper business. I know the Press Scimitar and its readers are already missing the dedication he demonstrated to his work. He provided them with many years of outstanding service putting together every day an editorial page that people would want to read.

I want to take this time to express to Ewing our very best wishes for a long and

happy retirement; a retirement that is long deserved and I want him to know that we shall miss him greatly. ●

GOVERNOR BROWN, EDISON  
MILLER, AND THE POW'S

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, like many Californians, I was awe struck and outraged at Governor Brown's appointment of former Marine Edison Miller, a POW who squealed on his friends and collaborated with his North Vietnamese captors, to the Orange County, Calif., board of supervisors. Miller becomes the first POW from the Vietnam war to be honored with a political office. St. Augustine, echoing the teaching of the Gospels, reminds us that it is in vain to seek for perfect justice in this world. Bowing to the wishes of Jane Fonda and Tom Hayden, the Governor of California displayed in his action an arrogance and insensitivity rarely found even among the most crass of cynical politicians. I say that this action was arrogant and insensitive because, more than anything else, it was a direct slap in the face of the brave men who served their country in Vietnam. The pain was greatest for those who were imprisoned by the North Vietnamese Communists and suffered almost every conceivable violation of the Geneva Convention concerning the treatment of POW's including watching beloved comrades tortured to death.

Who is best to judge the merits of the Miller appointment? Not I, or those of us who held our special order on the subject last week. The best judges of this appointment are those who were imprisoned by the North Vietnamese; those who experienced, painfully and directly, the cowardly, perfidious behavior of Miller. The Los Angeles Herald Examiner of June 30, 1979, published an excellent summary of POW opinion, "How POW's Remember Miller." I ask my colleagues to please give it their intense attention. Brown is a disgrace. He bragged of knowing all of this both before and after the infamous and insulting appointment.

How POW's REMEMBER MILLER

(By Mike Qualls and Carol Gulotta)

Navy Capt. David Rutledge pushed open his cell door in the "Hanoi Hilton" and slipped quietly toward the rear of the compound where the prisoners were allowed to bathe. But Rutledge wasn't going to bathe. He had a message to deliver, an important message.

The message had originated at the top of the POW chain of command, and was destined for a group of prisoners who, in the opinion of the top-ranking POW officers, were cooperating with the North Vietnamese.

Reaching a high woven-bamboo fence, Rutledge quickly scrambled to the top until he could see the open exercise yard on the other side. Seated there, according to Rutledge, were Marine Corps Lt. Col. Edison Miller, Navy Capt. Walter E. Wilber and Navy Cmdr. Robert J. Schweitzer.

"Hey, guys," Rutledge recalls saying. "If you stop all your antiwar activities, we'll take you under our wing. You are ordered to stop all your activities."

The trio looked at Rutledge and then yelled for the guards. He scrambled down from the fence and ran.

Rutledge made it back to his area without being caught, but later that day guards came and threatened to torture him if he tried to contact the trio again.

It was a day still fresh in Rutledge's mind nine years later.

Miller's conduct as a POW is something that many of his fellow prisoners have found difficult to forget, and now the entire issue has been thrust back into the public spotlight by his controversial political appointment to the Orange County Board of Supervisors.

Many POWs claim that Miller, who spent 5½ years as a POW, defied superior officers and cooperated with the North Vietnamese in return for special treatment, and they now challenge whether Miller should be given a position of public trust, particularly since he was censured by the Navy Department as a result of this POW conduct.

Miller admits that he made anti-war tapes for the North Vietnamese, but claims he did it out of a heart-felt conviction. He also claims he underwent severe hardship as a POW (including being denied medical treatment, denies receiving any special treatment and maintains that he never refused to obey a legal military order.

The Herald Examiner has interviewed 15 former POW's who lived with or around Miller during his captivity. Their recollections about Miller's conduct as a POW raised a number of allegations, including:

Shortly after Miller was imprisoned, he abandoned military zeal he had exhibited as a squadron commander prior to capture and began defending the communists to fellow POW's. He advised other prisoners to adopt a less aggressive attitude toward the North Vietnamese.

He apparently made an anti-war tape during his first year of captivity, which was two years before he said he made his first recording.

Miller, who maintains his public statements as a POW were "anti-war" and not "anti-American," made tapes that claimed the socialist system was superior to the American form of government.

He received as much medical treatment as other POW's, including penicillin tablets for infection, sulphur powder for his wounds, medication for dysentery, and surgery.

Miller received numerous special privileges, including a cell with an open window, access to an open exercise area, shoes, books, a fish aquarium, a Vietnamese-style bed and meals with meat, fruit and beer.

He repeatedly ignored direct orders from POW senior officers to cease his activities and obey the Code of Conduct.

Miller was once present in an interrogation room, "nodding his head in agreement" while North Vietnamese guards threatened another POW with torture for trying to persuade Miller to stop cooperating with the communists.

As a result of his activities and repeated refusals to obey orders, the senior ranking POW officer stripped Miller of his military authority in 1971, and ordered prisoners to ignore any orders he might give.

Tensions between Miller and other POWs became so great in 1971 that a group of prisoners wanted to kill him.

Those are some of the allegations raised by former POWs. Here is their story:

It begins Oct. 13, 1967, with the recollections of James Warner, now a lawyer in Detroit. On that day he was a Marine lieutenant flying as a radar operator, or "back-seater," with Miller.

Miller, an 18-year veteran who had flown 50 combat missions in the Korean War and 70 more in Vietnam, was commanding a squadron of F-4 Phantoms based at Chu Lai. Although Miller had been in South Vietnam less than two months he already had a reputation as a gung-ho officer intent on moving up the military promoting ladder.

A few minutes out of Chu Lai, Miller and Warner began their attack run near the DMZ separating North and South Vietnam. As the F-4 screamed out of the first run, Warner recalls that Miller suddenly announced that they had lost the aircraft's flight control hydraulic system.

Warner waited for Miller to break off the attack, as prescribed by standard operating procedure, and head for an open area where they might be rescued. But, to Warner's amazement, Miller brought the F-4 back around for another attack on the same target.

"It was that sort of 'headwork' that was the reason I was flying with Miller in the first place," Warner recalled, referring to Miller's reputation. "Nobody else would fly with him."

"When we were hit I said, 'Let's get over the water,'" Warner recalled, "but he (Miller) said, 'Oh, no. I've still got six bombs and I'm going back again.'"

Moments later, Miller and Warner found themselves hanging in their parachutes, drifting down toward the DMZ and awaiting enemy soldiers.

Miller says his parachute failed to open properly and when he reached the ground he found he had suffered a broken vertebra, broken shinbone and crushed ankle. Warner landed uninjured about three miles away.

Miller says he was forced to walk long distances with his injuries, and Warner confirmed that their captors "did make him walk about three miles to a place where I was being held. But thereafter I tried to carry him, or at least let him lean on me."

They were force-marched six to eight miles to a North Vietnamese artillery emplacement. It was night by that time. Then they began a torturous 40-day trip by truck and on foot to Hanoi where they were to be cellmates until July 18, 1968.

"He (Miller) got pretty infected and was very sick by the time we got to Hanoi," recalls Warner. "He had lost 20 or 30 pounds and he was infected everywhere. But, they did give him something—they told him penicillin. He suffered frequently from dysentery, and occasionally they would give him something for that."

Air Force Lt. Leon Ellis, another cellmate who is now a major stationed at Randolph AFB in Texas, also remembers that Miller "got medical treatment—about the same as everybody else."

Miller claims he was physically abused and put in solitary confinement before he began cooperating with the North Vietnamese, but neither Ellis nor Warner recall being aware of it, or ever seeing any physical signs of torture while they were with him.

"He didn't undergo any torture that I knew of," said Ellis. "He never told us of any physical abuse whatsoever."

However, Ellis remembers that he and the fourth man in their cell, Air Force Cpt. Kenneth Fisher, were abused by interrogators during that period when they refused to fill our biographical forms.

After more than 24 hours of torture, Ellis recalled that "I ended up eventually filling out their form. I put in a couple of bases I had been assigned to and lied about the rest."

At this time, according to Warner, Miller was being frequently being taken alone to interrogations and didn't appear to mind going.

During this period two other POWs—Air

Force Maj. George Day and Navy Lt. Cmdr. John S. McCain III—recall hearing a biographical tape recording condemning the war that they believe was made by Miller although the speaker did not identify himself by name.

Said McCain, "It went on with a whole lot of statements condemning the United States government. He (the speaker) didn't identify himself by name, but he identified himself in every other way."

Day, a congressional Medal of Honor winner for his actions as a POW and now a retired colonel living in Florida, said the tape "wasn't the sort of thing the Code of Conduct had in mind."

The tape was played for McCain, now a captain assigned to the Navy Department's congressional liaison staff in Washington, by an interrogator who identified the speaker as a senior Marine officer and demanded that McCain make a similar recording. McCain, who at the time was seriously ill with a bayonet wound, two broken arms, a fractured leg and a broken shoulder, refused.

Both Warner and Ellis recall having heated political discussions with Miller while they were roommates.

"Miller would often go out to interrogations and come back and explain to us how the communist side was correct and we were wrong," said Warner.

"I did realize something was wrong," Ellis added, "when I, as a young first lieutenant, told him on one occasion that I didn't think that, based on what he was being told in a communist camp, that he should be changing his opinion on the war and our leaders. He just sat there and didn't say anything."

In October 1968 Miller and Schweitzer, an aviator who was shot down on Jan. 5, 1968, became cellmates in a Hanoi stockade known as the "Desert Inn." Schweitzer died in a car crash near Sacramento after his return to the United States. Shortly after he and Miller began sharing a cell, other POWs began hearing over camp PA systems an hour-long tape which became known as "The Bob and Ed Show."

Miller says the tape was made as they sat in a room carrying on what they thought was a private conversation.

Former POW's described the tape as basically saying that America's Vietnam involvement was deplorable, that the undeclared war was illegal, that their captors had every right to call them criminals and prosecute them as such. Other POWs were appalled. Many initially refused to believe that the voices on the tape were those of captured American pilots.

By late February 1970 the first order was passed via the forbidden communications network to Miller and his cellmates by Navy Cmdr. Jerry Denton.

Denton later recalled during interviews with the authors of "POW," a Reader's Digest book published in 1976, that the message said, "Stop writing, stop taping. Communicate with us." He also recalled that there was no response.

That was followed by a series of similar orders passed to Miller and his various cellmates for the next two years.

It was the summer of 1970 when Rutledge, who was chief communications officer for a succession of senior POW officers, scaled the bamboo fence to directly confront Miller, Wilber and Schweitzer and had to flee when they called the guards.

Earlier in 1970, Rutledge, who is now a captain in charge of the Naval ROTC program at the University of Oklahoma, had been moved from the camp known as "Alcatraz," where he had spent an entire year in irons, to the "Hanoi Hilton," where Miller was confined. Rutledge was struck by the fact that Miller seemed to have special privileges. For example, he saw Miller and his

cellmates "out in the sunshine in the courtyard (while) there were some people stuck in some pretty dark, grungy cells."

"They (Miller and his cellmates) knew that," said Rutledge. "We told them that. They knew there was inequality in the treatment and that we were trying to get some form of humane treatment for everybody. But they ignored us."

During mid-1970 McCain, his health improved, encountered Miller and Wilber in the section of the "Hanoi Hilton" known as "Little Las Vegas."

McCain said, "For a period of about four months—August through November in 1970—I saw them, Miller in particular, with their arms around the gooks."

"They'd come out in the morning and they'd embrace the guards. I saw them drinking beer, eating fruit of all kinds—such as oranges and bananas. I saw them getting plates full of meat. I saw them getting all the bread they could possibly want... My diet at the time was a small bowl of soup and a piece of bread twice a day."

McCain said he also overheard Miller making tapes "on numerous occasions."

"They were not just in opposition to United States involvement in Vietnam," McCain said. "They were in opposition to the United States as a country—that the United States was degenerate, that the government was degenerate, that the American Congress didn't represent the people; that the socialist system was far superior, and that the system in North Vietnam was far superior."

In the fall of 1970, Miller, Wilber and Schweitzer were transferred to the camp known as the "Zoo" where they took up residence with four other POWs including Air Force Maj. Roger D. Ingvalson, who lived around Miller until early 1972.

The seven men became known as "Outer Seven" because guards kept them isolated from other POWs.

Ingvalson and the other four POWs, eventually managed to separate themselves from Miller and Wilber after they were ordered by senior POW officers to join the overall camp organization.

Ingvalson, now retired and living in Tennessee, also recalled the special treatment Miller received.

"They (Miller and Wilber) had things like leather shoes and tennis shoes, and a Vietnamese-style bed while we slept on concrete," said Ingvalson. "They even had a fish aquarium in their cell."

Another POW, Col. John Stavast, who also was near Miller in 1972, added, "When the wake-up-gongs went off in the morning, their (Miller and Wilber) cell door was opened. Nobody ever saw their door locked, as a matter of fact."

"I also saw Miller involved in a volleyball game with the North Vietnamese."

Finally in 1971 Navy Cmdr. James Stockdale, then the senior ranking officer and the man who would file formal charges against Miller and Wilber upon his release by the North Vietnamese, shouted direct order for Miller and his cellmates to stop cooperating with their captors.

With Stockdale at the time were Rutledge and Navy Cmdr. Harry Jenkins, both of whom related the episode in separate interviews.

Stockdale attempted communication by shouting out the back window of a cell to Miller and his cellmates who were located out of sight, but within hearing, in a room about 80 feet away. Stockdale kept shouting for several days though the guards repeatedly came running to try to find the culprit who was violating the no-communications rule.

"At first, the admiral (which Stockdale later became) yelled out questions, and we got a lot of Bible verses in return," recalled

Jenkins. "This went on for several days," added Jenkins. "Finally, the admiral gave him the direct order to stop. Miller did not stop."

Rutledge recalls that Miller and his cellmates passed a written reply "that quoted a passage from James—about how everybody ought to love joy and peace."

It was in 1971 Miller made his "Mother's Day Message" tape which was sent to his mother in Clinton, Iowa. The lengthy message declared at one point that "America's mothers must face the fact that their sons are killing fellow human beings and destroying foreign countries for an unjust cause, making our actions not only illegal, but immoral."

Shortly afterwards, Stockdale issued an order to all POWs under his command: "Write nothing for the V. Meet no delegations. Make no tapes. Are you with us?"

Then when Miller and Wilber continued to make a series of tapes, the POW leaders decided to strip Miller of his military authority. The order made its way through the covert communications network, being passed on slips of paper hidden in rice bowls, tapped through walls in Morse code and shouted from one stockade to another. Finally, it reached Ingvalson, who delivered the message to Miller face-to-face. "He was very quiet," recalled Ingvalson. "The only thing I could get out of him when I'd talk to him was that the war was wrong."

It was also in 1971 that other POWs in the stockade, which contained 26 prisoners, decided that Miller had to be killed to end his activities. The group approached Ingvalson who was in charge of the stockade. "It was a serious situation," Ingvalson said. "They wanted very much to impose physical abuse on him—to kill him. But, being in charge, I decided not to. And, I told my men that we would take evidence home when we were released, and then it would be taken care of."

Meanwhile, Ingvalson continued trying to talk Miller into ceasing his activities. On several occasions after contacting Miller, Ingvalson would be threatened with torture by the communist guards.

Ingvalson remembers that during one such session Miller was in the room "not saying anything, but he was nodding his head in agreement with them."

Another POW who lived with Miller from the fall of 1970 until the spring of 1972 was then Marine Lt. Paul Brown, who had been shot down July 25, 1968.

After the Stockdale order, Brown recalled that all the members of the "Outer Seven" except Miller and Wilber wanted to obey it.

"Miller and Wilber did not," said Brown. "Miller was very vehement about it, saying he wanted nothing to do with communicating with the others and requested that we go along with him. We refused."

Brown said he recalls that Miller would taunt the men and "say, very sarcastically, 'Now listen to your leader. Be a good little boy and obey all the rules' to the junior officers."

Then came 1972 and, although the POWs didn't know it, they were nearing the end of their long ordeal. More orders were sent to Miller and Wilber but they continued their activities.

Stavast said, "We told them, in effect, that if they would come over to our side and stop collaborating with the North Vietnamese, we would think about forgiving them. But, they absolutely refused."

"In fact, there were some very derogatory things that came out of them—that we were the losers and they were the winners."

On April 16, 1972, the bombing of Hanoi commenced again. A few days later, Miller,

Wilber and others held a news conference with correspondents from Hanoi, the Soviet Union, China, Germany and France and denounced the American escalation of the war.

In July 1972 Jane Fonda visited Hanoi and met with Miller and Wilber and other POWs. In August 1972 Miller met with Ramsey Clark, who later returned to the United States and lauded the POWs living conditions, treatment and health.

After the peace agreements, Miller returned to the United States in February 1973.

"Wow, it's great to be back on Marine Corps property," Miller was reported to have said when he was driven through the gate at Camp Pendleton.

Shortly after Miller's return, he and Wilber became the target of formal military charges.

The charges included conspiracy, solicitation, failure to obey an order of regulation, mutiny, aiding the enemy, misconduct as a prisoner and causing and attempting to cause insubordination and disloyalty.

The resulting inquiry was conducted personally by then-Secretary of the Navy, John Warner who finally announced his decision on Sept. 27, 1973.

"Secretary Warner concluded that the convening of a pre-trial investigation under Article 32 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice was warranted by the evidence," stated the official news release issued by the Department of the Navy. "He further concluded, however, that any beneficial purposes would be more than offset by the disruptive effects such proceedings would be bound to have upon the entire community of former POWs and their families."

The same day, Warner dismissed the charges brought by Stockdale and issued administrative letters of censure to both Wilber and Miller.

The news release ended, "Secretary Warner also announced that both officers will be retired. The secretary determined that both retirements would be in the best interests of the Naval service." ●

## MILITARY JUNIOR COLLEGES

### HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, our Army Reserves and National Guard are facing a shortage of over 4,000 junior officers. This projected shortfall could have a serious impact on our Nation's ability to mobilize effectively in the event of an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, there are unique American educational institutions which can make a significant contribution to reducing this shortage. These are our Nation's six military junior colleges. These institutions have been turning out superior officers for our Nation's military forces for an average of 109 years. Their graduates have learned self-discipline, they accept responsibility and they have practiced leadership. Because of the total military environment and the intensive training offered, these are the only schools authorized to commission a person at the end of the sophomore year after only 2 years of military training.

However, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to awarding ROTC scholarships to po-

tential students, the military junior colleges are at a distinct disadvantage when compared to 4-year colleges and universities. To win a scholarship at a military junior college, a student is required to attend basic ROTC camp at Fort Knox, Ky., and compete for a scholarship. At Fort Knox he is often competing against students with 1 or 2 years of college. That same student, however, may receive an ROTC scholarship to a 4-year college or university directly out of high school.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation which would enable us to better utilize the ability of the military junior colleges to produce highly qualified, highly motivated junior officers for our reserves and national guard in only 2 years. H.R. 3308, currently pending before the House Armed Services Committee, provides scholarships for cadets at any of the military junior colleges in return for not less than 6 years service in the Army Reserves or Army National Guard. The military junior colleges are capable of increasing their production of officers, and this bill will give them a tool with which to do it. The result will be in the best interest of our reserve forces and our national defense. ●

THOMAS HOOKER

### HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mr. Gene Buck, of Monterey, Calif., has brought to my attention the deeds of a very important American from the past who has not, in Mr. Buck's view, received adequate credit for his contribution to our democratic traditions. The gentleman to whom I refer, who apparently is an ancestor of Mr. Buck, is Thomas Hooker.

Hooker was an English puritan pastor and preacher who became one of the builders of colonial New England. Born in Leicester, he was forced to flee England for Holland in 1630 because of his popular presentation of puritan ideas. Then, in 1633, he followed many of his former parishioners to Massachusetts.

From Massachusetts, Hooker led his constituents to Connecticut, where he founded the city of Hartford in 1636. It was there that his democratic ideology formed the basis of the fundamental orders, which served as the Connecticut colony's constitution. This contribution to democracy in America has often gone unheralded, and it is for this reason that I am addressing my colleagues today.

I hope those who hear my words now, and who later read them in the RECORD, will take some time to consider the contributions made by Thomas Hooker to our colonial history. Certainly, we owe him a debt of gratitude, as we struggle with the problems of our own day, for helping to establish the traditions under which our national debates take place. ●

## TELEVISION COVERAGE OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

### HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, most Members of the House agree that it was a wise and proper decision to open our proceedings to television and radio. Our debates and discussions now reach millions of residents around the Nation and world through the cable system, and network news programs also make use of the floor action.

In this regard I would like to submit for publication in the RECORD an article written by a constituent, Edward Branca of Nanuet, N.Y., who more than a year ago had his views on televising the House proceedings published in the Nyack, N.Y., Journal News.

I think my colleagues will find the article both interesting and prophetic; Mr. Branca having proposed, in March of 1978, that the Congress arrange with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to use the communications technology satellite to broadcast live gavel-to-gavel coverage, and noting that satellite-to-home radio, is presently used in Canada.

[From the Rockland Journal-News, Mar. 8, 1978]

RADIO VIA SATELLITE

(By Edward J. Branca, Jr.)

NANUET.—Recently, many in the nation's radio audience listened intently to the first congressional floor debate allowed to be broadcast live from the U.S. Senate chamber.

This debate on ratification of the proposed Panama Canal treaties was broadcast by National Public Radio. Many Americans such as myself wish to hear more live coverage of congressional sessions. We also wish to hear other programs that attract too small an audience to be profitable on commercial stations. National Public Radio, at its current low level of funding, is simply unable to afford to program such high quality programs regularly. I wish now to suggest a way that new satellite technology can be used to revolutionize radio and give birth to a new age of broadcast-excellence.

My proposal is that Congress arrange with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) to use the Communications Technology Satellite (which is now in orbit) to broadcast live gavel-to-gavel coverage of House and Senate debates directly to the home. Contrary to widely-held belief, this is possible with today's technology.

Since the satellite is being used for many communications experiments, the time it will be available to broadcast the debates will be limited. (It should be noted that the satellite has many radio channels and the congressional experiment would only use two of them). The debates will be able to be received by simple inexpensive receivers costing no more than AM-FM sets now in domestic use.

These transmissions will be received only by radios tuned to receive the higher satellite frequencies. This will no doubt mean that most people will choose not to purchase receivers so tuned. This does not mean that satellite-to-home radio will never be popular. This conclusion may be drawn by taking into account the following two factors:

The future introduction of commercial and non-commercial programs will encourage the public to buy sets. It should be noted that the American people purchased FM TV, color TV and FM stereo sets all after the introduction of AM radio in the 1920s.

There are many parts of the United States that have only one or two radio stations. Satellite-to-home (with its many channels) would be considered a godsend.

Once the initial experiment is completed, Congress may want to begin a regular satellite service. This service can be paid for by Congress passing a law giving the federal government a monopoly on the ownership of broadcasting satellites. If a broadcasting satellite had the capability to transmit on 50 channels (I picked this number out of my head), Congress would lease perhaps 42 of them to commercial users who would air programming and sell advertising the same way they do now.

The fees commercial broadcasters paid the government for use of the satellite would go into a trust fund (similar to the highway trust fund) to pay the costs of airing the congressional debates and non-commercial programs on the other eight channels of the satellite.

It should be pointed out that it is not unfair to require commercial satellite users to pay the government to use the satellite. After all, the right to have advertising messages reach a potential audience of all the nation's homes—without having to divide the profits with affiliated stations—will be an extremely lucrative proposition. It is only fair that the holders of such a franchise should pay fees for the privilege. After all, if the sportsman wishes to hunt or fish, he is required by law to purchase a license to do so.

Up to this point, I have written of satellite-to-home radio only. This is because, with the present state of the art technology, it is not possible to transmit television to home receivers without requiring the viewer to purchase augmentation costing up to \$1,000. But by 1980, it is expected that technology will have advanced to the point that augmentation will not be necessary.

Many readers may now be asking themselves why, if broadcasting satellites are so advantageous, have they not yet been introduced. The answer is that the broadcasting monopoly (i.e., ABC, CBS, NBC) has used its muscle to have the Federal Communications Commission and Congress not allow broadcasting satellites to be introduced in the United States. (It should be noted that satellite-to-home radio is used in Canada as well as in a number of other countries.)

Let's hope that Congress will soon end this prohibition and we will soon begin an era of broadcast excellence via satellite directly out of the sky.●

#### HOMEBOUND PROGRAM MUST BE SAVED

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a program which is vital to some of the residents of my district—the Queensborough Community College external education program for the homebound. Unfortunately, this program faces possible expiration at the end of this month if new funding is not approved.

The homebound program was initiated in 1973 as a service for severely disabled students in the New York metropolitan area who qualify for college courses, but who are unable to participate on campus because of physical limitations. Instead, students take courses via telephone hookup.

At first, the program was funded by the Queensborough Community College Student Association, but as the service grew, funding responsibilities were assumed by the HEW Office of Education under their Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. The program was a huge success by all standards, and in fact, it was so successful that HEW began using it as a model for other universities across the Nation.

Due to shifting allocations within HEW, funding for homebound will expire at the end of August 1979. The Queensborough program has submitted new funding proposals to HEW's special programs for the disadvantaged division, but no action has been taken.

Homebound offers hope and opportunity to those who might otherwise be without hope. It would be a tragic mistake to curtail this vital service. If funding is not approved soon, we will lose a valuable humanitarian service.●

#### HEMPSTEAD TOWN COUNCILMAN URGES ADMINISTRATION ACTION TO THE PROBLEM OF NORTHERN IRELAND

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the efforts of Peter T. King in helping to bring the problem of Ulster to the attention of the Carter administration.

Peter King is a town councilman in Hempstead, Long Island, N.Y., where he succeeded in collecting over 1,000 signatures from his fellow residents of Hempstead on a petition which he sent to President Carter, as well as Senators JACOB JAVITS and DANIEL MOYNIHAN of New York. The petition, which was presented to me last month by Councilman King himself, reads as follows:

We the undersigned, call upon the United States Government to take whatever political and economic measures are necessary until Great Britain ceases its violation of human rights in Northern Ireland.

As chairman of the 130-member Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs, I am always heartened to see efforts, such as those of Peter King and his fellow residents, which enhance the work of our own committee. We have long been involved in bringing to light the continuing violations of human rights in Northern Ireland and as a result of the presence of Great Britain there. These violations have been documented time and time again, by the Nobel prize

winning Amnesty International as well as the Bennett Commission, which was a British-appointed group. This Commission confirmed the fact that these human and civil violations continue to exist in Ulster.

Most recently, our own State Department sanctioned the sale of over 3,000 weapons to Great Britain for use in Northern Ireland. In response to this unjustified action on the part of our own Government agency which preaches human rights the world over, I offered an amendment to the 1980 Department of State appropriations bill to prohibit such actions in the future. This amendment eventually was withdrawn in exchange for the promise of hearings by Chairman Clement Zablocki of the Foreign Affairs Committee on this action. I am heartened by this acknowledgement by this committee of the urgent need for inquiry into this issue and will continue to press this Congress and the administration to take action in Ulster to help bring an end to these human rights violations.

Mr. King is to be commended for his own activities in making the administration ever aware that the human rights violations in Ireland at the hand of the British must cease. This country has committed itself to human rights, here and abroad. Our cumulative efforts to advance the cause of peace and justice in Ireland can only be intensified with the continued help and support of dedicated people, such as Peter King.●

#### PREDICTING 1980 DIESEL SHORTFALLS

### HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have placed in the RECORD the following remarks relating to an amendment that was offered by my colleague, Mr. TAUKE.

I believe the gentleman from Iowa has accurately addressed the recent problem we have witnessed regarding the diesel shortage in the Midwest. The amendment he offered will go a long way in making sure that adequate supplies of middle distillate will be available for next year's agricultural crop. The gentleman from Iowa and I know all too well the disaster that was barely averted this year. Our offices became virtual hotlines for farmers and jobbers who were either running out, or completely out of diesel fuel. We simply cannot ask the farmers in the Midwest to face the instability and confusion that surrounded this year's planting season.

The gentleman's amendment will identify supply-short States by way of a monitoring service, and correct as quickly as possible that shortage. This, I feel, is badly needed. The Department of Energy has made no attempt in the past to monitor or even predict where those shortfalls may occur. As would be required by this amendment, much of this responsi-

bility will be placed on the State energy offices to help alleviate the problem. It is time to stop this guessing game, and assure the farmers and jobbers that next year, we will indeed know where a shortage will occur and what is being done to relieve it.●

### SAM BROWN OF "ACTION"

#### HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, the President has announced that the top level firings are completed and that all of those who were requested to submit their resignations can now breathe easier. Carter has allowed the Director of ACTION, Sam Brown, to be among the reprimanded. This means that in ACTION, an agency dedicated to the alleviation of human suffering at home and abroad, this Nation is represented by someone who is on record as praising a regime, Communist Vietnam, that has caused and is causing untold human suffering.

With this in mind, I cannot believe that President Carter with his constant public statements on human rights would not have picked up Sam Brown's resignation when it was recently tendered to him. The Director of ACTION's insensitivity and failure to live up to the high standards of humanitarian concern that his Agency stands for together with his contemptuous disregard for the millions of victims of totalitarian genocide, are reasons enough for the President to take such action.

The President in his nationally televised address after coming down from the mountain, and his subsequent statements asserted he was taking some of the actions that he did because he did not feel that he was receiving the full support of some members of his team. Sam Brown certainly is one in question.

Over 2 years ago as a Presidential appointee Brown went to New York City to greet the Communist Vietnamese representatives to the United Nations. His praise of them was overwhelming, tears staining his strained face.

Since then, of course, the world has learned the truth of those before whom Brown and others have fawned and prostrated themselves. Joan Baez, who like Brown was instrumental in the propaganda war waged against the South Vietnamese Government, has properly criticized the atrocities of the new masters of Vietnam. But Sam Brown is unethically silent.

The boat people are dying by the thousands but Jimmy Carter's appointee will not even admit that anything is wrong in Vietnam. He will not publicly or even privately admit that his praise for the genocidal criminals who now rule Vietnam was a sign of political and moral idiocy.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a column by Andrew

Greeley which puts into sharp perspective the ignominious story of Sam Brown. SAM BROWN, JOE CALIFANO AND THE BOAT PEOPLE

(By Andrew M. Greeley)

Genocide is going on again, and the world barely notices. The offending country is the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the victims are the ethnic Chinese, who are being forced to buy their way out of the country so their government can confiscate their wealth. They are loaded onto ships and put to sea, with maybe a 50/50 chance of making it alive to some port, where they may or may not be permitted to get off the boat.

According to some observers, Vietnam is making \$20 million a year on genocide, which makes them much better merchants of death than even the Nazis, who at least didn't make the Jews pay to go to concentration camps.

Over 90,000 "boat people" may well have died last year, or will die this year—or maybe next year—until the Vietnamese have gotten rid of all the ethnic Chinese in their country and have confiscated all the hard-earned income of these diligent and industrious people. The rest of the world is apparently prepared to absorb some of these refugees, but by no means all of them. In America, HEW Secretary Califano is helping the situation by setting up control centers to make sure no sick "boat people" get admitted to the United States. One wonders how many of Secretary Califano's ancestors or the ancestors of any of the rest of us could meet the current HEW health standards.

What's 90,000 more people in Indochina? The Cambodian government murdered a couple of million before it was driven from power. So some of the 90,000 are old men and women and children. So some of them drown at sea or starve to death or die of disease in an overcrowded ship as they watch freedom fade from view just a few yards away at the port where their ship is docked. Why is there anything so special about the "boat people"?

They are the victims of racism—every bit as much as the Jews slaughtered by the Nazis, the Tasmanians wiped out by British settlers, the white Catholic missionaries slaughtered by Rhodesian guerrillas (who are partially funded by the World Council of Churches), the blacks who are brutalized in Soweto by the South African police. The "boat people" are being killed off because they are racially different from the Vietnamese. Their crime is that their ancestors were Chinese, in a country that doesn't want the Chinese around anymore.

I wonder where are all the great supporters of the Vietnamese republic? As far as I can figure out, Jane Fonda hasn't spoken out to condemn the genocide of the boat people; nor has Sam Brown, the Carter appointee to direct ACTION—a man who attended the celebration welcoming the Vietnamese delegation to the U.S. George McGovern, who at least had the decency to condemn the genocide in Cambodia, has yet to speak out against the persecution of the ethnic Chinese in Vietnam.

There are occasional articles in newspapers, but the religious, political, cultural and intellectual leaders of the American republic remain silent. The same folks who raised hell when a thousand people were killed in the so-called "Christmas bombing" of Hanoi (which, it now appears, was indeed aimed at military targets) seem not to find their consciences at all pricked by the deaths through drowning, disease or starvation of 90,000 boat people. If they ever get around to saying anything about it, I suppose they will blame the United States, just as they blamed the U.S. for the genocide committed by the Pol Pot regime in Cambodia.

In a way, maybe they would be right—though for the wrong reasons. The boat people would be an asset to any nation that would admit them. For generations they have been an industrious, hardworking, resourceful, gifted people. The United States and the other nations of the free world could easily ring Vietnam with ships that would pick up these people and take them into nations that would offer them new homes and new outlets for their energy and ambition. Those who would be admitted to America would quickly become as important an asset to our society as the hundreds of thousands of Cuban refugees we admitted in the 1960s.

It would be a marvelous act of political public relations showing the world we still are a humane nation and also showing up our sometime-Vietnamese enemies for the nasty monsters they really are.

It won't happen, of course, because America's currently going through one of its periods of viciously nativistic anti-immigrant mania. It is a neat but convenient irony that some of those who are enthusiastic supporters of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam are also the most vigorously anti-immigrant. Too bad for the boat people.●

SIDNEY S. BARTH—33 YEARS OF SERVICE WITH THE LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT

#### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on August 19, 1979, Sidney S. Barth will be honored at the Los Angeles Police Academy for his 33 years of faithful service to the city's police department. Today, I want to share with my colleagues a review of his career accomplishments. It is a record of dedication to exceptional public service that illustrates why this special day of recognition is one he truly deserves.

Sidney Barth joined the Los Angeles Police force in 1946 after serving 3 years in the U.S. Army. His rise in the Los Angeles Police Department was a steady one. He was promoted to the rank of sergeant in 1951, lieutenant in 1956, captain in 1960, and to the position of commander in 1970, the rank in which he will retire.

Throughout his police career, the Los Angeles Police Department made full use of his education and work experience by placing him in numerous and varied assignments. Some of the most recent are worthy of special note. From 1962 to 1966 he was commander of the Los Angeles Police Academy, responsible for conducting all formal training given by the department. In the years 1972-76, he carried a position of great responsibility as administrator of discipline in the office of Chief Edward Davis. His final assignment was as assistant to the commander of operations, South Bureau. Here, he supervised law enforcement all along the vast Los Angeles coastal area.

In each of his assignments, this man performed admirably, reflection on the LAPD. His abilities were recognized through his appointment by both Mayor Tom Bradley and former Mayor Sam

Yorty to the emergency preparedness commission for the county and city of Los Angeles. He served as chairman of this group in 1975.

Sidney Barth has also generously devoted much of his spare time to civic affairs making him a valued member in his community. The Indian Guides, American Legion, Alumni Association of the Delinquency Control Institute, B'nai B'rith Justice Lodge, and the Los Angeles-Bordeaux Sister City Affiliation are just some of the organizations that have benefited from his participation.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Lee joins me in congratulating Sidney Barth on completing a most outstanding career as a law enforcement officer and administrator. Having known him as a friend for over 20 years, we share the pride his family must feel at this high point in his life. We look forward to his continued participation in the many community activities that make life here in the South Bay area a better place to live. To his wife, Margaret, and their sons, Robert and James, we send our best wishes for a prosperous future. ●

#### WILLIE MAYS TO BE HONORED

#### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, this week-end Willie Mays will be inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame.

Today, Willie's friends and fans, including New York State and city officials, baseball officials and players, business, industry and community leaders and just plain baseball fans, will honor Willie by designating an area for a plaque commemorating his exploits on the field. The Polo Grounds, where Willie played, is no longer there, having given way to a low and moderate income housing development.

Baseball observers have said: "to watch Willie play was to watch Rembrandt paint or hear Caruso sing." His excellence on the field was unparalleled. He was, indeed, a national hero. Yet, Willie Mays did something special for my community, Harlem. He came to Harlem in 1951 and became a part of us. His enthusiasm was infectious; he instilled pride; he radiated confidence; he put a premium on excellence; he set an example for our youngsters. I, for one, can never forget newspaper photos of the greatest baseball player in the world playing stickball with poor, inner city kids.

An article in Sunday's New York Times captures much of the life and meaning of Willie Mays. It was written by Charles Einstein, the author of Willie's biography, "Willie's Times." I want to share this article with my colleagues.

Willie, thank you for all you have done and what you have meant to so many.

[From the New York Times, July 29, 1979]

#### SAY HEY, WILLIE MAYS IS GOING TO THE HALL OF FAME

(By Charles Einstein)

If historians of the future ever unearth a time capsule containing the 1972 baseball results, specialists may have to be called in to interpret the evidence. The record will show that the '72 Mets finished 13½ games behind in a lackluster National League East. Yet those same Mets that same year led both major leagues in both home and road attendance.

To more contemporary scholars, so outrageous-seeming a paradox is less mystifying, for on May 11, 1972, New York traded a minor league pitcher to San Francisco for a 41-year-old outfielder. The Giants instantly farmed out their new acquisition. No less thoughtfully, the Mets decided to keep theirs. He was Willie Mays. Overnight, the average attendance at Shea Stadium jumped by more than 12,000 extra spectators per date.

That a Mays in his 40's could attract a crowd was no more than an inevitable extension of two solid decades preceding. A week from today, Mays will be inducted into the Hall of Fame at Cooperstown, N.Y., holder not only of the largest vote total in the Hall's history and more individual records than any other player but well-established as the game's biggest fan attraction.

I saw him play on perhaps 700 occasions, and the sense you had was always the sense of the crowd: something was going to happen. In Willie's case, and in Willie's case alone, that something could happen anywhere on the field at any moment.

#### COULD HIT, THROW, RUN

Mays could hit: a lifetime batting average of .302. Mays could throw: a record number of times he led his league in double plays for an outfielder. But he could also steal and run bases. Ty Cobb said that Mays had single-handedly restored the art of base-running to the game; the Cobb observation came after a season in which Mays stole third base 13 times in 13 attempts.

And he could catch the ball—Lord, could he catch the ball! People traveled hundreds of miles just to see that. For a man who could score from first base on a bunt, who got more than 3,000 hits, who hit four home runs in one game and 660 lifetime, who in one game made four throws that beat four runners at all four bases—first, second, third, and home—the most extraordinary and arresting testimony is that he made more than 7,000 catches in the outfield.

Nobody is likely to match or exceed that total, ever. Henry Aaron played one year longer and recorded some 1,500 fewer putouts. Nobody ever paid to watch Babe Ruth catch a ball. Mays's total reflects not just the longevity of his career, which began in 1951 and ended in 1973, but the sheer fact his putout total included a few hundred catches that no other human being was going to make. More than once, he made a catch with his bare hand. Tommy Henrich, a longtime teammate of Joe DiMaggio's, saw Mays make a catch in Pittsburgh, then found himself being asked if DiMaggio could have made that same catch. "No way," Henrich responded. "Joe might have got to that ball. But no man except Willie could have held onto it." When Mays won the 1959 All-Star Game for the National League with a triple, Bob Stevens, a sportswriter, summed it up: "The only man who could have caught it," he wrote, "hit it."

#### REMBRANDT AND CARUSO

"To watch Mays play," wrote another veteran baseball observer, Bob Broeg, "was to watch Rembrandt paint or hear Caruso sing."

"If Plato's Theory of Forms had included

a baseball player," said a reviewer in the scholarly Library Journal, "that player couldn't have been any better than Willie Mays. Mays graced a baseball diamond like some kind of existential god—everything in front of him was contained within his field of energy." And yet another journalistic appreciation, in a small-city California daily, would say: "Thomas Carlyle wrote that all greatness is unconscious. Nothing could better describe the genius which Mays brought to the baseball diamond. His was the purest form of athletic beauty, a rare and magnificent talent tempered by nothing and excited by a love for the game matched by no man before or since."

Upon his election to the Hall of Fame last January, The Sporting News, venerable bible of the game, had a headline that said simply: Mays Was the Soul of Springtime. No problem there: baseball itself is the soul of springtime.

And baseball had no clock on it, so Mays again did what baseball does: he made time stand still.

#### SYMBOL OF CHANGE

Yet he symbolized the game's internal change, and the change of this country as well. Mays more than anyone, including Jackie Robinson, represented the end of segregation in baseball. His coming to the Giants in 1951 meant that not just a black, not just a token black, but a young black could make it in the majors. Almost overnight, the country's Negro Baseball League went out of business.

His career would symbolize further change. The New York Giants represented baseball's immutable geographic format, unchanged for more than half a century. The San Francisco Giants represented its Westward migration. The Mets represented expansion. Those were the teams Mays played with.

A recent poll named him the greatest player in the history of the All-Star Game. "They invented that game for Willie," Ted Williams said, and indeed Mays holds the All-Star records for times at bat, hits, runs and stolen bases. He also robbed Williams blind with an incredible catch in 1955.

Another poll, undertaken by Sport magazine during the 1960's, called Mays far and away the greatest clutch hitter in the game. Here, too, some sound credentials exist. In the eighth inning of the final game of the regular season in 1962, Mays came to bat with the score tied. In the ninth inning of the third and final playoff game that year, he batted with the Giants trailing by two runs. In the ninth inning of the seventh and final game of the World Series he came up with the Giants trailing by a run. Left to right on those three occasions Mays went home run, single, double.

In a more relaxed setting—spring training at Phoenix in 1958—the Giant manager, Bill Rigney, assembled his rookie infielders and said: "If they hit a ball to the center fielder, please go to a base. Don't confuse the issue by asking me why. Just go there."

This may have sounded a trifle visionary, or so it could have appeared to a rookie first baseman, Orlando Cepeda. In the course of that day's exhibition game, with a man on first and one out, an enemy hitter propelled a sharp, sinking line drive to center field. Cepeda turned and thrilled at the sight of the Giants' center fielder as he somersaulted while making an impossible catch. "The next thing I knew," Cepeda reported afterward, "there was a baseball in my face. I threw up my glove to protect myself. Nobody could make a catch like that and come up throwing!"

The ball ricocheted off Cepeda's glove. The runner advanced. The official scorer, an understanding man, gave the error to Mays. ●

## TRIBUTE TO ADAM E. ARNOLD

**HON. GLADYS NOON SPELLMAN**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mrs. SPELLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all agree with England's Izaak Walton that good health is a "blessing money cannot buy." I rise today to say a few heartfelt words about one known to all of us who has played a key role in insuring that we in Congress are blessed with this priceless gift.

That individual, Mr. Speaker, is Adam E. Arnold, who, for the last 13 years, has managed the office of the Capitol's Attending Physician in a truly exemplary manner. It was with mixed emotions that I learned recently that this dedicated public servant will be leaving us soon to take up retirement in St. Petersburg, Fla.

To be sure, I was delighted that this former Navy man who has served in an extremely sensitive post with two different Attending Physicians would be starting a well earned and most well deserved retirement August 31. At the same time, I know the Physician's Office will not easily replace one who is at once so efficient and so compassionate.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, Adam's job is one that not just anyone can handle. It takes a special kind of person with a special kind of talent to help with the medical needs of 100 Senators, 435 Members of Congress, nine Supreme Court Justices, and assorted Cabinet members and other high government officials. Adam—or perhaps I should say "Arnold" since that is how most of us know him—has the qualities needed for the job and more.

Of course, Adam needs no introduction to anyone in this Chamber. He enjoys a truly unparalleled reputation among the Members of the House and Senate he has served. We all know of his initiative and industry. We all know of his dedication and concern. We all have felt the warmth of his smile at times when we most needed his cheerful competence.

Adam's caring attitude is such that, although I was touched, I was not really surprised when he appeared at my door during my own recent stay in Bethesda Naval Hospital. We was not working. He had no official reason to be there. He came by simply to say, "hi," and ask how I was doing. He was truly concerned and it is difficult to put into words how much I appreciated it at the time.

What may be news to some of my colleagues is that, before becoming manager of the Attending Physician's Office, Adam completed some 24 years' service with the U.S. Navy, retiring in 1966 as a senior chief hospital corpsman. He obviously showed the same exceptional qualities in his naval service as he has on Capitol Hill. He saw action with Marine units in the Pacific in World War II, earning a Purple Heart for wounds received during the Battle of Peleliu. He met his wife, Mary, while serving at the Navy Finance Center in Cleveland and was assigned to the Washington Naval

Dispensary before joining the Attending Physician's staff.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues here today will want to join me in acknowledging the many fine achievements of Adam E. Arnold. I know, too, they will want to join me in wishing him, as they say in the Navy, "fair winds and following seas" in retirement. And most of all, Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will want to join me in offering heartfelt thanks and sincere appreciation to Adam Arnold for 13 years of truly extraordinary service to the Members of Congress. Throughout his assignment in the Attending Physician's Office, he has brought the priceless blessing of good health a little closer to each of us.●

## TRIBUTE TO THELMA THOMAS DALEY

**HON. MICKEY LELAND**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is highly satisfying for me to join my colleagues in honoring an outstanding citizen—Mrs. Thelma Thomas Daley. I make these remarks in behalf of 95,000 college-educated women who comprise the predominately black organization that Mrs. Daley represents—Delta Sigma Theta, Inc., a public service sorority with 700 chapters distributed among 48 States and three foreign countries.

It is fitting that we recognize the outstanding public service accomplishments of Mrs. Daley and Delta Sigma Theta as she relinquishes her duties as its president. While in office, Mrs. Daley led the organization into avenues of service completely foreign to its past endeavors. In addition to annually giving \$1,250,000 in awards and contributions to college students and other groups, the organization, using its own funds, courageously produced a film, "Countdown at Kuisini," starring Ossie Davis and Ruby Dee. The film reversed the traditional stereotype approach to themes about Africa, black America, and black women.

Mainly because of Mrs. Daley's personal efforts and the reputation of the organization for competent performance, Delta Sigma Theta received more than \$5,200,000 in 1978 to provide services affecting more than 100 communities. Some of their major efforts include a women's educational equity training and assessment program designed to combat sex stereotypes and promote educational equity for women. Recognizing the need for continuous financial support of black colleges, Delta established a unique trust—the Distinguished Professor Endowed Chair; and, to increase the number of scientists and engineers from minority and low income groups, established a resource center in science and engineering. In its direct search for talent project in Baltimore, Md., and North New Jersey, Delta identifies and provides counseling, tutoring, career testing, and financial aid services to stu-

dents from selected high schools. The organization has designed a program to increase the awareness of black people to public television in eight selected cities; and, in Washington, D.C., it has received a \$5 million grant to provide housing for senior citizens and handicapped persons. Using the power of the pen, Delta has also impacted selected legislation. It wrote 4,000 letters in support of ERA, 700 letters in support of full voting representation for the District of Columbia, and 900 letters to HEW Secretary Joseph Califano encouraging increased funding for black colleges.

I am proud to salute Thelma Thomas Daley, who spearheaded these accomplishments during a time when she also served as president of the American Personnel and Guidance Association. Today's tribute is only one of the many tributes and honors she has and will likely receive for turning a traditionally social-oriented organization into one of public service.●

## NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

**HON. GUS YATRON**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, August 4, a conference entitled, "Your Health and Well Being, Why National Health Insurance" will be held in Reading, Pa. This conference is sponsored by the AFL-CIO Community Service Committee of the United Labor Council of Reading and Berks County AFL-CIO and the legislative and education committee of the United Steelworkers of America, Reading subdistrict.

The United States falls far behind many countries on several of the statistical measures of health, such as infant mortality and life expectancy as compared to other industrialized nations which have health insurance programs. Many Americans do not have access to proper health care, and are not able to obtain the quality health care that citizens of other nations receive, despite the fact that the United States offers many Americans the best medical attention in the world.

It has become obvious that our present system of health care is expensive, inadequate and to some segments of the population—unattainable. One of the most poignant examples of the hardships caused by our present health care system is that one severe illness can financially ruin the average American family. Clearly, action must be taken and the need for adequate health care must be one of the major priorities of our country.

I know that all my colleagues will join with me in commending the efforts of my good friend, Mr. Jack Unangst, chairman of the legislative and education committee of the United Steelworkers of America, Local 3733, and the members of this committee, and the members of the AFL-CIO Community Service Com-

mittee of the United Labor Council of Reading and Berks for their efforts to arrive at comprehensive solutions to our health care problems by holding a conference to discuss the validity and the need for national health insurance. The conference will include representatives from government, labor, the medical profession, insurance companies and hospitals.

This kind of seminar not only allows individuals to hear all sides of the national health insurance question, but it also brings to the attention of the community the need to provide Americans with protection and security against the high cost of health care, as well as improving the efficiency of our Nation's health system.

Because I believe that this initiative is one whose example should be followed by many communities and organizations across the country, I have introduced a resolution in the House to designate August 4 as National Health Day. ●

#### ARKANSAS EXPERIENCE WITH REFUGEES

### HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the nine of us you appointed to form a bipartisan congressional mission to survey the refugee situation in Southeast Asia will leave for Vietnam and other Far Eastern nations.

Although the plight of Vietnamese refugees tugs at nearly everyone's humanitarian instincts, the citizens of the city of Fort Smith, Ark., have personal experience with the refugee situation dating back to the use of nearby Fort Chaffee as a refugee processing center in 1975.

In the August 6 issue of U.S. News & World Report, Paul Recer of their Houston bureau filed a report reflecting on the changing relationship between the refugees and the townspeople, from a perspective of 5 years later.

Tonight, on the eve of our departure to investigate the handling of the more recent exodus from Vietnam, the article entitled "An Arkansas Town That Took In 2,000 Refugees," is included in the RECORD and recommended to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Aug 6, 1979]

#### AN ARKANSAS TOWN THAT TOOK IN 2,000 REFUGEES

FORT SMITH, ARK.—Life has been so good for Vietnamese refugees living in this commercial center at the junction of rivers and railroads that others are flocking to join them.

So far, 2,000 Indo-Chinese have settled in the community of 68,000 nestled in the foothills of the Ozark Mountains near the Oklahoma line. And if the past is any guide, still more will arrive in the coming year as the United States admits at least 168,000 additional refugees to join the more than 210,000 already in America.

Like many communities in the U.S., Fort

Smith initially had mixed emotions about helping Vietnamese refugees. When the federal government turned nearby Fort Chaffee into a resettlement camp in 1975 to house and process 50,000 of the first wave of refugees, some local citizens were irate. Said one woman at the time: "I hope they all catch pneumonia and die."

But seeds of acceptance already existed in the community first settled by French traders in 1780. At the meeting where the woman complained about refugees, a wheelchair bound veteran who had lost both legs in Vietnam challenged: "If I can accept them, why can't you?"

When the first planeload of refugees arrived in this former governing center for surrounding Indian territories, the Indo-Chinese were met by enthusiastic church groups—and a man bearing a sign with a swastika. "There was a feeling among some people that they were losers," say Jack Moseley, managing editor of the *Southwest Times Record*. "We gave them American soldiers, lives and weapons. The attitude was, 'We've done enough for them.'"

But hostility has gradually given way to acceptance. Churches organized aid. The newspaper published feature stories. Local teenagers volunteered to work in the resettlement camp—amusing the children, strumming guitars, playing volleyball. The community college organized an orientation course for the new immigrants. An FM radio station broadcast information in Vietnamese throughout the manufacturing and agricultural trading center.

"We had a neighbor who was unhappy about us moving in until they talked with us," recalls Van Bich Le. "Now, they're our friends."

And another refugee woman says: "Many thought that the Vietnamese would be something else until they saw us and got used to us."

Reversal of problem. Early fears that sponsors would be hard to find have given way to an abundance of them. Local people were fearful that "we'd have a refugee camp out there [at Fort Chaffee] for years," recalls Sue Chiolino, regional director for United States Catholic Conference, which helped to settle 60 percent of the refugees. "But in seven months, they were all gone."

The problem developed into one of oversponsorship: "The sponsors would not let the refugees do anything for themselves."

Paying their way became a point of pride for the refugees, who have a higher employment rate nationwide than native Americans. Notes Kim Ben Wilson, a Vietnamese woman who recently married an American language instructor: "I tell people we better not be on welfare. They feel ashamed to get it."

Local employers are finding the Vietnamese to be hard workers and loyal—a valued asset in a community where furniture, scissors, brick, mirrors and auto bodies are manufactured.

Life has been so attractive that the original refugee population of 1,000 has doubled as Vietnamese in other parts of the country learn of the community's reputation and move here.

"The attitude generally has become rather positive," notes the editor of the local newspaper. "That's one reason there was a natural migration to Fort Smith. They haven't seen the prejudice here they felt elsewhere."

Another attraction is that the weather more closely resembles the warm, humid climate of Indo-China than the Northern states where many refugees first settled.

Although most of the Vietnamese are enjoying a greater sense of personal security and freedom from want and war than they ever knew before, problems do exist. An occasional ugly comment surfaces. "From time to time," says one Vietnamese woman, "people talk and it hurts us. But not often."

Adds Le Nguyen, owner of the Diamond Head Restaurant: "Almost 90 percent of the Americans were glad to have us and wanted to help us."

"Pain of loss." A more subtle and potentially longer-lasting problem may be the yearning for home felt by elderly Vietnamese now that the immediate needs of food and shelter have been fulfilled. "Physically, they're better off," says one Vietnamese. "But many still have family back in Vietnam, so their emotional life is very hard for them. There's an emotional pain of loss."

Ha Doan, 22, who fled Vietnam in 1977 by boat, says simply: "I want back in my country. . . I wish they'd let my people go."

Vietnamese parents see their children adapt quickly to American ways, dressing in American styles and learning English with an Arkansas accent. Youngsters already are losing fluency in Vietnamese. Others desperately try to keep alive old-country traditions in a new land. Thiep Duc Nguyen, for example, publishes books about Vietnamese history and culture.

Anxieties about the homeland are unremitting as refugees recall missing relatives and friends, lost traditions and culture. A sadness colors the outlook of many Vietnamese even as they speak enthusiastically of their hopes and dreams in their new country.

Widely shared, whether spoken or unspoken, is the dream of Van Bich Le: "I wish I could go back home," he says. "Even if it not free, I like go home to die in my Saigon." ●

#### KABC AND THE SALT II DEBATE

### HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, the survival of the United States as we know it is now being debated in the other body. I am speaking, of course, of the SALT II Treaty. I have seen no public commentary that does a clearer job of summarizing the pitfalls of SALT II than that of Bruce Herschensohn of KABC-TV in Los Angeles. The crux of his argument is simple. If the opponents of the SALT II Treaty are wrong, the cost to the United States will be a temporary diplomatic setback in relations with the Soviet Union, and an increase in the Nation's defense budget. If the proponents of SALT II are wrong, the cost of their miscalculation could very well be our survival as a free people. I commend this superb commentary to my colleagues:

#### BRUCE HERSCHENSOHN COMMENTARY

The SALT Treaty has many complexities, many descriptions of weapons systems, and many numbers to memorize. Please do it. All of them are worthy of your study, because you're here now, alive, while this Treaty is being debated and whether or not the U.S. agrees to it could well decide the fate of your family, of this Nation and in fact, no exaggeration, the world. It's that important. The primary question must be, do we or do we not want this Nation to be superior in strategic arms to any other nation. This Treaty prohibits our superiority. That's fact.

Further, from talking to those who attended SALT negotiation sessions and from studying their reports, I'm convinced that it will give the Soviet Union superiority. Ap-

parently the President thinks so too, though he says the opposite. In my opinion he let that knowledge slip less than 2 weeks ago, April the 26th when, in saying that under the agreement systems would have to be destroyed by the Soviet Union, he explained, "Naturally the Soviets will choose to phase out their older systems but those systems are still formidable. The missiles, for instance, to be torn down are comparable in age and payload in our Minuteman II and to our Polaris missiles, presently deployed." Minuteman II and Polaris are some of the best operational systems that we have.

If he admits that they'll choose to destroy systems comparable to them, then the ones they choose to keep must be better. They are. Much better. 308 of them are heavy missiles with which we have nothing to compete and SALT prohibits our building them. We, incidentally, will have to destroy 35 of our best bombers, the B-52. Their Backfire bomber, superior to our B-52's won't even be counted under the agreement, nor will their mobile, SS-20 missiles, be counted. We have no mobile missiles.

Secretary Brown estimates that if we don't sign the SALT agreement it can cost us as much as \$30 billion over the next decade. That's 3 billion a year. That's a lot, but remember, HEW can't even find \$7 billion that they lost last year. And so in short, if those who oppose SALT, like me, are wrong, then it can mean that at worst, our Nation will spend \$3 billion more a year, to become superior or equal. But if those who endorse SALT are wrong, then it can mean that at worst, our Nation will no longer exist. That's the issue. ●

#### SAVE THE MONTREALER

### HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, Senator George D. Aiken, the dean of the U.S. Senate for many years, worked hard to have train service resumed along the Montrealer route. He succeeded in this task, with the able assistance of the late Senator Winston L. Prouty and Senator ROBERT STAFFORD, then Vermont's Congressman. Senator Aiken has continued since then to fight for retention of the route. I have placed the following statement of his into the RECORD. He delivered it during a recent public hearing at Burlington, Vt. on the value of the Montrealer to citizens and businesses in the State held May 11, 1979, by the Senate Select Committee on Small Business and hosted by Senator LOWELL WEICKER.

Senator Aiken, formerly ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee, very eloquently and simply points out that a national commitment to rail transportation services, especially linking the Nations of this hemisphere, is a necessity in these days of uncertainty.

I now quote to you the words of Senator Aiken.

On Christmas Day 1977, I read that Mr. Haswell, a new nominee for the Amtrak Board, had recommended to the Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams that the Montrealer train be dropped in favor of a route from Albany north.

Mr. Haswell was consistent anyway since he had opposed the Montrealer in 1971 and it

was evident that he had not followed the ridership records of the two routes in the meantime.

Fortunately, for the Country, Mr. Joseph MacDonald, a native Vermonter who knew railroading to the nth degree, but who was then a resident of Chicago, became a member of the Amtrak Board about the time the Montrealer was restored to service on September 29, 1972.

It was because of Joe MacDonald's interest in maintaining this very important railway passenger service that parties most concerned, including myself, were kept informed of the records of Amtrak services throughout the Nation.

I don't mean that Joe leaked the information—it was public anyway to those who wanted it.

Unfortunately, Joe MacDonald, to whom we owe so much, passed away last year.

Since the records are already in the hands of this Committee, I will not go into them in detail but will simply say that the Montrealer has been one of the most popular and essential trains of the entire system.

Having been an advocate of the Montrealer since its beginning, I was naturally pleased to learn that Committees of both Houses of Congress have recommended that this train be kept in operation after October of this year.

One of the most important functions of the Montrealer is the maintaining of our good relations with Canada.

Montreal, the largest population center of Canada, and Washington, D.C., the Capital of the United States, are now only a comfortable overnight trip apart, with no change of train necessary and from Montreal it is a short trip by train, car or air to Ottawa.

Many more people now make the trip from New York or Washington or even further south to Canada on the Montrealer than take the train from Albany north.

Mr. Haswell is reported to have said, in effect, "Let Canada take care of her own business and only run one day train to St. Albans."

This is a ridiculous proposal. No one would want to walk or ride a bicycle the last fifty miles.

With the world in a state of turmoil and uncertainty today, it is more essential than ever that we maintain the best possible relations with adjoining nations of the Western Hemisphere, namely, Canada and Mexico.

Food and energy are perhaps the most important needs of the world today.

Canada has both—food for the hungry people of the world—and energy from all sources of production.

More than once while I was Chairman of the Senate Interparliamentary Committee, which met with the Canadian Committee twice a year, I had to appeal to Canada to help us on power shortages in Northern New England.

And never once did the Canadians fail to help us out.

To even suggest stopping train service at St. Albans is a ridiculous and unneighborly proposal.

In this unsettled world of ours, we can take little for granted.

Disturbances are the order of the day. There is the threat of a shortage of gasoline and oil.

War clouds are gathering again and may or may not develop into crises.

Inflation is generating prices beyond the reach of millions of people and also the taxpayer.

I am not predicting disaster, but the better prepared we are to meet one the less likely one is to occur.

We are putting billions of dollars into highways, but highways alone cannot meet a critical need.

In the event of a gas shortage, highway and air travel would be crippled.

Again I say, I do not predict disaster, but let's be prepared for it.

Preparedness may scare it away.

At this time, I wish to thank those who have risen to the defense of the Montrealer passenger train.

Almost the entire force of New England's Congressional Delegation has risen to defend our States and our Nation.

They have been joined by people from the South, East and West.

It looks now as if Congress will insist on the continuance of the Montrealer.

We cannot take this for granted, however, and must continue to oppose all efforts to abandon it.

Again, thank you Senator Weicker for arranging this hearing today.

Keep up the good and necessary work.

Mr. Speaker, I will now add my comments. A functioning train route through western New England to Montreal has been a nearly constant feature of this Nation's transportation network since the advent of the rail age.

In 1972 the Montrealer made its first run as an Amtrak train. Brass bands, schoolchildren, boards of selectmen, and thousands of citizens lined the platforms of the stations as the new Montrealer made its maiden run through the State. I feel confident in saying that nowhere else in the Nation was the public support for a rail route as warmly demonstrated.

This public support has continued in the form of ever-increasing numbers of fare-paying passengers. About 26 percent of all Amtrak customers are within one of two low-income groups—the elderly and students. Amtrak is more than a convenience for the businessman, tourist, or shopper; it is an essential means of providing equal mobility to the lower income residents of Vermont and many other locales. It is more than a mere convenience to the touring family that needs and desires moderately priced, spacious, and comfortable transportation for long-distance trips.

The Montrealer is an international route. The very time in the history of United States-Canadian relations when clear expressions of American concern about the economic and political well-being of our neighbor to the North are necessary is decidedly not the occasion to restrict or limit the ties that have united us for so many years.

The mandate Congress gave to the Department of Transportation in the Amtrak Improvement Act of 1978 was unequivocal in its emphasis on the need for public input into the restructuring process, as well as the need for an optimal intercity rail system. Indeed, over 50 hearings were held around the country. But no hearings were conducted in Vermont, New Hampshire, western Massachusetts, or Connecticut. Vast regions affected by the termination of passenger rail service proposed in the DOT final report has no advance notice and no opportunity to be heard. This situation was certainly contrary to the spirit and plain meaning of the Amtrak Improvement Act.

The preliminary report on Amtrak restructuring, published in May 1978, in-

dicated that the Montrealer should be continued. As late as a few weeks before the Department of Transportation's final report was made public on January 31 of this year, the Montrealer was still on the list of routes to be continued. I suspect that only last minute arm twisting by the Office of Management and Budget obliged the Department of Transportation to eliminate the Montrealer, and other long and short distance trains as well, not on the basis of its own analysis, but rather as a result of an arbitrary budget limitation. The Nation's railway system is being forced into a procustean bed where its body and limbs will be truncated to satisfy not the people, nor even transportation experts, but rather the faceless bureaucrats with green eye shades. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 24, 1979, pp. 20447-20450.)

DOT asserts that the portion of the Montrealer's route north of Springfield should be cut out of Amtrak's system because that portion records fewer riders at most stations than the ridership witnessed in the middle of the Northeast corridor, say between Philadelphia and New York. But the plain fact is and has been for several years that the portion of the Montrealer's route north of Springfield accounts for two-thirds of the route's total business. The average trip length for a passenger using the northern portion of the route is about 413 miles per trip and increasing. The average trip length for those traveling only from and to points between Washington and Springfield on the Montrealer is about 100 miles. This is why in terms of both service rendered and passenger revenues, the portion of the Montrealer doomed by DOT, and likely resurrected by this bill, is in reality the stronger, not the weaker, part of the route.

Ridership on the northern leg of the Montrealer's route has increased significantly in recent years, while the southern leg's ridership has remained relatively stable. However, DOT continues to belittle this growth by reducing the Vermont ridership figures to the small numbers of passengers which board or deboard at a given station. In fact, the number who board and deboard as a total in Vermont is more than 160 per day, which is more than impressive considering Vermont's rural nature, the hours of arrival, and the fact that the 160 figure is larger than the total boarding and deboarding in New York, the population of which outstrips the entire State of Vermont by a factor of about 20 to 1. The Montrealer is not a marginal route and the portion north of Springfield is well worth saving.

Amtrak's own statistics support this assertion. A detailed avoidable cost projection made by Amtrak's chief financial planner at the request of the Vermont congressional delegation concluded that on a car mile basis the avoidable cost of continuing the train from Springfield to Montreal would be about \$2.35 per mile. The total route cost per mile would be about \$2.60 and the segment south of Springfield, by our calculations, would be \$3.33 per car mile.

Cutting off the portion of the Montrealer north of Springfield is equivalent to amputating a head and telling the body to keep functioning. Chickens may be able to run around with their heads chopped off, but I do not think that a railway can.

Taken together, the facts speak for themselves; the Montrealer should be maintained. In terms of ridership popularity, revenue generated from customers, and cost to the public, the Montrealer is one of Amtrak's best performers. It is not a marginal train route. Recent actual performance data from Amtrak itself proves that the opposite is the case.

Beyond doubt the actual ridership aboard the Montrealer increased significantly from a first quarter fiscal year 1978 level of 128 PB/TM to a level of 150 for a similar period 1 year later. During the 7-month period ending with April—the most recent period for which Amtrak has compiled ridership statistics—the Montrealer averaged 166 passenger miles per train mile. The April monthly ridership, which occurred just before the recent scourge of gas station lines and scarcity, shows the PM/TM figure for the route was 195, 36 percent higher than April of last year. The year to date ridership for the route is running 17 percent ahead of last year, ranking the Montrealer fourth highest among long distance Amtrak trains, and substantially above the long train average of 130 PM/TM. Ridership has been increasing on the Montrealer for several years.

These most recent figures honestly portray the service rendered to the traveling public. The earlier DOT-developed figures are simply out of date. First, and perhaps most importantly, the Montrealer was transformed from a train of conventional aging cars that often broke down and ran off schedule, last spring, into a train composed of modern Amfleet equipment. This new equipment is much more reliable and comfortable. On-time performance has increased significantly from 32.3 percent on-time runs in December, 1977 to an 83.3 percent on time for November, 1978. The route was on time 72 and 76 percent of the time in March and April of this year, compared to 43 and 49 percent for all long distance trains. Along the portion of the Montrealer scheduled for discontinuance by the DOT, north of Springfield, the train was on time 83 and 92 percent of the time during these 2 recent months, according to Amtrak.

Amtrak President Boyd has already testified in Congress that new Amfleet equipment improves service and cuts maintenance costs. The customer reaction to outfitting Amtrak with modern locomotives and passenger cars has been proven by the Montrealer. Passenger use of the Montrealer has increased for other reasons as well, notably the spiraling price of gasoline and periodic gas shortages throughout New England.

The passenger miles per train mile factor measures the average number of passengers carried by a train over its entire route. The Montrealer stands out in its greater than average performance in

this regard, especially during fiscal year 1978 and the most recent data available for the first 7 months of fiscal 1979. Actual ridership on the Montrealer has been above the average for all long-distance Amtrak lines for several years and recent trends only increase the gap between the average of the long-haul routes and the Montrealer's overall performance.

Significantly, the Montrealer during 1978 enjoyed a higher ridership factor than two-thirds of the long distance train routes now operating and better than 5 of the 11 long-distance routes that are scheduled for continuation under DOT's route restructuring plan. The latest figures released by Amtrak reveal that Montrealer ridership during the first and second quarter of fiscal year 1979 continued to increase and is expected by Amtrak officials to rise to a level of 170 PM/TM during fiscal year 1980. This ridership projection is higher than the 156 PM/TM break point used by DOT for continuing long-distance trains after October 1, 1979.

Passengers on the Montrealer are paying some of the highest per train mile prices for this valuable service and the Montrealer is a high performer in terms of revenue generated. In this connection I might add that historically the Montrealer has outproduced many, and sometimes, all of the long-distance routes in passenger revenue yield per passenger mile.

The Montrealer's growing popularity has brought down the public subsidy for this service, so much so that in the first quarter of fiscal year 1979, it ranked fourth among all long-distance routes in the amount of train revenue paid by its passengers as a share of total train costs. These figures were obtained by simply dividing total train route revenues by total train route costs for comparable periods. All of the data was released by Amtrak's financial planning office in the form of regularly issued route performance reports.

The decision to cut a train route depends not only on how it compares to other routes in terms of ridership and revenues but also on how much of a loss could be eliminated by dropping the route. This amount is calculated by Amtrak and is called the avoidable loss. During the fiscal years 1977 and 1978 the Montrealer's avoidable loss per passenger mile dropped from about 6.5 cents to just over 5 cents. This most recent level of avoidable loss, like the ridership and route profitability data, illustrates that the Montrealer should logically fall within the group of lines that DOT has recommended for continuation. It is not on the edge or even near the edge. In fiscal year 1980 Amtrak estimates the figure at about 6 cents, which is less costly than many of the trains to be continued under the DOT plan.

I am not unmindful of the need to economize. However, simply lopping off strong, well-utilized routes is not the way to proceed. Cutting costs and increasing ridership by making available services that are well used by the public are the ways to better Amtrak's fi-

nancial position. The Montrealer has proven by any standard that it is one of the stronger long distance rail lines. It offers a service that is enjoyed by ever increasing numbers of riders.

Amtrak must be given the bargaining power it needs to eliminate the vestiges of featherbedding that remain along various routes. For instance, the Montrealer, over its 670 miles of track currently uses six different crews of five to six persons each to operate it. These crews are well paid. Often these crews work for only several hours on the Montrealer over a fraction of its length and yet Amtrak pays them nearly a full day's wages. I am informed that the crews operating upon Amtrak's own Northeast corridor track between Washington and Springfield contain firemen whose duties have long since disappeared. The train runs on electric current through New Haven and on diesel fuel the rest of the way. I am informed that one crew takes the train from White River Junction, Vt., to Springfield, a trip of 80 minutes, receives a full day of pay and then backs the train into the Springfield station and receives another premium payment for this task, on top of its wages. Perhaps the Montrealer can be run with two or three crews of four persons each. If this were done I am told the route could cut its labor costs by \$1 million a year.

Currently, both the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice and the Department of Treasury's Customs Bureau each employ two officials who board the Montrealer every night as it crosses the border into the United States. These four individuals spend approximately a half-hour satisfying themselves that the passengers and goods on the train are entering this country legally. Because of the Montrealer's schedule their work is undertaken on an overtime basis for which they are paid double time. And these costs must be borne by Amtrak by law. The overtime and other incidental costs relating to border crossing could be lowered if the INS and the Customs Bureau entered into an agreement, similar to that utilized elsewhere, for dual inspection under which employees of one agency are empowered to fulfill some of the duties of the other agency. Pre-inspection by Immigration and Customs of passengers as they board the train in Montreal might also serve to reduce costs. These possibilities should at least be given serious consideration as part of a concerted effort to lower costs. The law does not require trucks, buses, ferries or private autos to pay premium overtime at the border crossing.

Revenues might be raised by encouraging the U.S. Postal Service to make greater use of the Montrealer, and other trains, for mail transport. In recent years revenues from the Postal Service have decreased sharply. The Montrealer has a largely underutilized capacity to carry mail and packages. The recent construction of an impressive regional mail handling center in White River Junction, on the Montrealer's route, makes a reassessment of the potential of

rail transport for some mail even more logical.

These are some steps which could be taken in the near future if the administration would make a concerted effort to coordinate Government activities with the goal of creating a vibrant, and financially viable, and extensive national rail passenger system.

There can be no doubt that we are entering a phase of our history in which energy must remain a paramount concern of our public policy. The President has recently underscored this. We must look to the future and attempt to reduce our use of scarce resources. The Department of Transportation's environmental impact statement points out that the Montrealer in Vermont uses about half of the energy which would be necessary if its passengers were obliged to travel by private automobiles. An even greater loss of energy would be caused by diversion to airplanes, Amtrak's chief competition, but the DOT has not estimated this gap. The elimination of the Montrealer is a poor policy choice from the standpoint of energy conservation in a region chronically plagued by high fuel prices and supply shortages.

According to the Vermont State Energy Office, a shift from the Montrealer to private autos would result in an increase in use of gasoline by automobiles in the State of 0.3 percent. This is a significant figure for a State in which gasoline consumption is increasing while allocations have dropped 7 percent during the last year and are likely to decrease even further, since the DOE has recently urged oil companies to divert up to 5 percent of rural supplies to gas-starved urban areas.

Using the Office of Technology Assessment's 1979 report on the Nation's automobile transportation system and DOT's report entitled "Trends and Choices in the Year 2000," I note that the average intercity car trip includes 2.2 people and the average fuel economy of the Nation's passenger car fleet is 13.5 miles per gallon. Because interstate highways closely follow the track route it is fair to compare fuel consumption of the Montrealer with the private car over the 670 miles from Washington to Montreal. According to our calculations the Montrealer is twice as energy efficient as the automobile at present ridership levels.

The Montrealer and just about every other Amtrak train is demonstrably much more energy efficient than air travel. Likewise according to the Department of Energy's report, "Energy and Related Parameters of Selected Transportation Modes," the potential energy savings of the train are larger than those of the bus. While the comparative energy efficiencies vary from route to route, one important issue here is the relative fuel efficiency of the Montrealer. Based on actual ridership, fuel use by the Vermont Transit Bus Co., a competing bus service, during calendar 1979, averaged about 90 passenger miles per gallon. Projections indicate that, with its substantially growing ridership, the Montrealer will increase its fuel efficiency to 96 passenger miles per gallon in fiscal 1980.

More than half of the oil we use in America does work for us by moving people and goods. Oil is becoming scarce and its refined products are rapidly approaching the high retail price that has long been prevalent in the energy importing nations of Europe. Therefore, our people and our Government must reconsider how we live and find answers to the question: "How can we do the things we want and use less energy?" Using less energy means conserving precious oil and gas as well as saving money. The potential energy savings from a modern, speedy, comfortable passenger rail network are very substantial. That is basically what Congress is up to today; assuring that our people can take advantage of the potentially great energy savings promised by a modern Amtrak system. This is true especially during our seemingly perpetual energy crisis which, by all accounts, is not soluble very soon and can only be managed over the long pull while we make the fundamental changes in our society that are required. One of the basic changes that we must make is to develop alternative energy sources. At the same time we must develop and encourage the patronage of alternative transportation means.

Amtrak's day has come and the people are telling us this in the strongest possible terms. It is a fact that Amtrak has been so deluged recently by requests from our people for long-distance train reservations that more calls are not answered than are answered, despite the fact that the company hired an additional 200 reservations clerks to handle the sudden demand for train service of the last several months. Even before the gas shortage that has driven many thousands to travel by train instead of by personal auto or airplane, Amtrak ridership figures prove that the public's demand for train service has grown substantially faster than the Department of Transportation or even Amtrak expected as late as last fall.

All of this comes down to one simple imperative that we face today. We must give a vote of confidence to our peoples' developing choice in favor of trains. We should maintain and even expand that part of Amtrak's nationwide train system that is being used to capacity or to near capacity. Everyone seems, at long last, to agree that the train routes that are strong, those that the public chooses to ride in large numbers, are not only worth saving but worth improving. We should outfit the Amtrak system with the proper equipment to keep these new-found customers, to improve the service to our people. We can make Amtrak trains more cost efficient, more convenient, and less susceptible to breakdowns and delays. Congress can restore the low morale within the ranks of Amtrak's employees, and more importantly, within the ranks of the American traveler.

Mr. CONTE's amendment to the Transportation appropriation bill, in combination with the Amtrak Reorganization Act passed by this House on July 25, 1979, are intended clearly to accomplish these aims. ●

UNCONSTITUTIONAL RESTRAINT  
OF THE PRESS

**HON. TED WEISS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, on March 26 of this year U.S. District Court Judge Robert W. Warren issued an unprecedented ruling restraining the Progressive from publishing an article entitled "The H-Bomb Secret: How We Got It, Why We're Telling It." On June 15, in a secret opinion, Judge Warren reaffirmed his earlier decision in response to the Progressive's motion to lift the injunction. This ruling is the first case in the history of this country in which a Federal judge has imposed prior restraint on the press on national security grounds.

This case generated three major constitutional concerns. The first, and possibly most important of these is when, if ever, the Government can justifiably resort to prior restraint in order to halt the publication of potentially harmful materials.

Advance censorship is the most serious attack on freedom of expression possible. It puts the burden of proof upon the person who desires to communicate information instead of upon the Government officials attempting to suppress it. It forces the defendant to comply with the censor or to be found in violation of the law. And it corrodes the right to freedom of expression, even if the suppression order is eventually overruled, because it delays the thought's timely expression. In past decisions the Supreme Court has ruled that prior restraint may be appropriate in a few narrowly defined situations such as one in which a member of the media intended to publish the number and location of troops in a time of war. However, until this decision, that rigorous standard has never been satisfied.

The second constitutional issue dealt with in this opinion is whether the definition of "restricted data" as "all data concerning: First, design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; second, the production of special nuclear material; and third, the use of special nuclear material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the restricted data category pursuant to section 2162 of this title" is unconstitutionally overbroad. In effect, the vagueness of this definition presupposes all nuclear information to be restricted unless otherwise specified. This stands one of the most basic precepts of the Constitution on its head; all information should be available to the public unless the Government can prove that it should not be, not vice versa.

The third question generated by this case is whether the concept that ideas can be "born secret" is a constitutionally viable one. In this case all the information used in the article was in the public domain. The Government contended that even though the facts used were public knowledge, they were combined by the

author in such a way that they created "classified concepts." The danger of assuming that certain original ideas should not be expressed because the thought ought to have been a secret, is obvious. The "born secret" concept, if upheld on appeal, could conceivably be used to stifle much of the scientific inquiry in this country.

The controversial nature of Judge Warren's ruling has been compounded by the recent finding that documents revealing "the essential secret of the H-bomb" had been erroneously declassified and on the public shelves of the Los Alamos scientific library for 4 years. Discoveries such as this one critically weaken the Government's contention that the publication of this article would have devastating effects on our national security. In fact, the Justice Department's refusal, after such a discovery, to withdraw their request for advance censorship of a markedly less informative article, shows a basic misunderstanding of the concept of prior restraint, and of the tremendous care and reluctance with which it should be imposed.

In a case such as this one, in which such basic constitutional issues are at stake, it is important that Congress not fail to exercise its oversight functions. Every day that the publication of this article is delayed constitutes a further violation of the fundamental right of freedom of expression. It is our responsibility to insure that the most basic rights of our citizenry to speak and to be heard, are not violated. ●

THOUGHTFUL CONSIDERATION  
NEEDED FOR LARGE ENERGY  
PROGRAMS

**HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, today I received an extremely thoughtful letter from Frank von Hippel and Jeremy Stone, president and director, respectively, of the Federation of American Scientists. In their letter they review some of the potential pitfalls of the President's latest energy proposals and provide some excellent insights on their preferred short-term alternative, conservation, and productivity.

Messrs. von Hippel and Stone have spent a great deal of time in pondering our energy needs and seeking appropriate ways to solve our problems. I would like to share their letter with my colleagues, and that it be inserted in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS,  
Washington, D.C., July 26, 1979.  
Congressman RICHARD L. OTTINGER,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Energy Development and Applications, Committee on Science and Technology, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is, in our view, incontrovertible that the various proposals for

subsidizing a crash program of synthetic fuel production need more study, and at every level. Extensive hearings are clearly indicated.

At the level of feasibility, we find that the President is proposing that \$88 billion would lead to the production of 2.5 million barrels of oil substitutes per day. But the largest user of synthetic fuel plants in the world, South Africa only produces tens of thousands of barrels of oil per day! Thus the President is proposing a hundred-fold increase from what is being done today. No person in the world can grasp the various financial, environmental, legal, and procedural implications of this effort. In particular, the real price of the various kinds of synthetic fuel are quite unknown. Newspaper reports, and the way in which the proposal has surfaced, reveal only too clearly that analyses of sufficient weight to support a program do not exist.

On the contrary, the Administration proposals attempt to finesse the need for environmental, and legal, analyses by embedding in their provisions, sweeping methods of neutralizing such existing legislation as the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA). This act, painfully legislated to protect important environmental rights, also includes a requirement to weigh alternatives. It is significant that the synfuels supporters seem to believe that this legal lobotomy has to be performed on the body politic to give the synfuel program a chance.

Consistent with the awareness of impending difficulties, the Administration clothes its proposals in the rhetoric of a "war." If we were really in a situation justifying that kind of rhetoric, proposals like these would deserve crisis consideration. But if we were in a war situation, much easier, more reliable, and more immediately effective proposals such as gasoline rationing, or higher gasoline prices, would already be instituted. The Administration is proposing a "business-as-usual-type-war" in which giant leaps of technological faith are put forward to disguise political weakness. In the Alice in Wonderland world of Washington politics, higher gasoline prices are a "hard" decision and an \$88 billion investment in untried technologies is an "easy" way.

The fact of the matter is that America can make do with much less energy use than is customarily realized and that such conservation, often with no lifestyle changes, is by far the cheapest way to "increase" supply. Conservation methods require no untried technologies and far less massive investments. Once instituted, they work indefinitely with much less cost to the environment. They require no destruction of existing legislation. And they give the world much more confidence that America is getting its house in order than these long-range airy predictions of future technological fixes. Conservation will work.

The main ingredients in such conservation measures are these: (1) an intellectual awareness of the sources of unnecessary waste, and (2) full cost energy pricing to motivate elimination of that waste. Today, in stark contrast with the war rhetoric, America has about the lowest prices for gasoline in the industrialized world, far lower than in Europe or Japan. Can it really be efficient for our society to invest \$88 billion in synthetic fuels while keeping real fuel prices artificially depressed? This seems ludicrous.

To justify the kind of subsidies involved in the synthetic fuel program, analyses would have to make it plausible—among many other things—that the program could be terminated at some future point when synthetic fuels became cost-effective in their

own right. Obviously, we do not want to discover, in some future year, that we have an \$88 billion investment in synthetic white elephants which must be subsidized year after year for the indefinite future. But this is obviously possible, and, it would seem, even likely if national fuel prices are kept artificially low.

In two recent cases, the Government has gotten into financial and political difficulties by artificially stimulating research and development activities—much less the full-scale construction here involved. These were the cases of the Supersonic Transport and the Clinch River Breeder Reactor. It was supposed that, with Government stimulation, the SST would eventually make it. After a titanic battle, the Government got out of the SST subsidy business, and history has completely vindicated that decision by the failure of Concorde to sell. The assumption that the Clinch River Breeder would be needed when ready—an assumption that underlay that subsidy—was based on unrealistically high projections of nuclear power growth and unrealistically low projections of Breeder capital costs, among other things. Here also, we learned the limits of man's ability to project his technological future.

By contrast, the Administration, in its synfuel program, is pushing the technological future far further, and pushing its legislative program far faster, than any program we have ever witnessed. Without even hearings on the implications of this program, important parts of the Congress want to pass it! Our own quick-to-react organization is itself so short of time to examine the implications of this unprecedented and major effort that we are unable to consult all of our intellectual resources and must send, instead, this reminder of basic principles.

No good can come of passing legislation like this without, at the least, the most detailed and prolonged scrutiny. After all, the program will take years to mature and its effects will be with us for decades. We therefore wish, in the strongest terms, to urge extended hearings on all aspects of this legislation.

Sincerely,

FRANK VON HIPPEL,  
Chairman,  
JEREMY J. STONE,  
Director. ●

#### THE UNISEX MILITARY

### HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1979

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker with dangerous recruitment shortfalls and discussions of reinstating the peace time draft many citizens are wondering just how we can maintain our military strength. Suggestions have surfaced that America should become the first military power in Western history to use women in direct combat with enemy troops if necessary.

I hope to make information available to my colleagues both pro and con on this most sensitive topic as we debate the registration of our younger citizens during this 96th Congress. As the available manpower pool continues to grow smaller, we as a nation will have to develop policies to meet this situation. We cannot run from this. However, we

should formulate a defense policy with our eyes wide open.

I urge my colleagues to read the "Wacs in Combat," an article taken from the Army Times magazine February 23, 1976. The article follows:

#### WACS IN COMBAT

By Joseph E. Revell/Second of two parts

Army SFC Jim Adams is one of those professional noncommissioned officers for whose services an experienced infantry company commander would trade his last case of cleaning patches, two spare machine gun barrels, and most any other three NCOs in the company. Adams is commandingly competent. He's a drill sergeant in Company C, 1st Basic Training Battalion, WAC Center, Fort McClellan, Ala.

I met him in a classroom crowded with young women learning how to assemble, adjust and wear the Army's field pack. I wasn't at ease there. It was my first real close-up look at those fatigue clad, booted females. Recognizing Sergeant Adams as the only refuge in the room, I sidled over and stood near him as he helped a student with her pack.

When we got a chance to talk, I asked him what special consideration he had to give to his female charges, what changes he'd had to make in the normal way he dealt with soldiers.

"None!" he replied. "They are soldiers and I treat them like soldiers!"

"Come on now, Sergeant Adams, I know something about soldiering. You can explain it to me."

He did. Reiterating his first statement, he then added, "So far as the Army is concerned, these women are soldiers."

But are they? The sergeant's statement implies a male-female equality of soldiers that doesn't quite exist. As I reported in the first part of this article two weeks ago, the Army doesn't train its women for combat as well as it trains its men. However, the Army's assignment policies are putting women in combat support units overseas where they need to—and should—have the same training as the men in their units.

This placing of women in units in possible combat theaters causes practical and philosophical problems. The practical concern, the quality and fairness of training and assignments, as well as the attitudes of the sexes toward each other. The philosophical concern, the probability of Army women sharing in the killing and dying in the next shooting war.

When pressed for an answer to whether or not Army women will find themselves in combat in the next shooting war, Army personnel officials admit that they would. Although the Army knows women in combat will be killed, its public position implies very strongly that they will not become casualties. The Army's standard answer is that it doesn't want women in combat, thus doesn't assign them to combat units or give them combat jobs. However, any person assigned to a combat theater is liable to be killed, wounded or captured, and the Army knows this.

But there has been no substantial discussion of this real possibility either in Congress or, as best I can tell, in the Army. More importantly, this issue of women in combat has not become one for general public discussion in the news media and elsewhere. Press coverage of military women too often deals with superficial issues, such as barracks partitions and separate toilets.

The Army's official policy of the woman as soldier has acquired a life of its own. "The women are on the move now that the male foot is finally off their necks," a male officer

told me at Fort Jackson, S.C. "Anyone who stands in their way is going to get run down."

Unless the American people are made aware that Army women will be shooting and dying in the next war, it could be the Army itself will "get run down" by a surprised public.

When the Times magazine suggested this probability to Army personnel officials, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Reserve Affairs Paul D. Phillips, a retired Army brigadier general, had a frank answer:

"You know, your premise may be very correct—that the American public doesn't know women are going to get killed if we go to war. And I think you can do us a great service if you tell them they are."

Phillips speculated that about 10 percent of the women assigned and working behind the front lines in a combat theater would become casualties, in addition to those who would be injured or killed in "emergencies" in the front lines.

Whether or not the American people are told, the Army has got a tiger by the tongue. Equality can't mean a patronizing equality for women at the expense of men. The men, after all, have fought America's wars until now—all 10 of them—and likely will constitute a majority of any future force committed to battle, regardless of how America and the Army decide the issue of women in combat.

Reports that the Army is considering the adoption of an equal, unisex basic combat training program merely confirm what I believe is the next step: women serving in the combat arms as full-fledged soldiers. In what follows I explain how and why this will happen.

Throughout the semi-peace-time era since World War II, when the threats to America's security haven't been as obvious as on Dec. 7, 1941, the nation's young men generally have avoided the Army. Life in the combat arms isn't all that glamorous, it's usually uncomfortable, and it can be hazardous. Until 1973, therefore, we got most of our combat soldiers by military conscription.

The Navy and Air Force, offering skills, schools, and safer and softer service, have had little trouble attracting draft-induced volunteers. The Marine Corps has had enough response to its recruiting challenge to need the draft only during the heat of wartime expansion. But the draft was the Army's lifeblood, and the arrival, on July 1, 1973, of the all-volunteer armed forces put the Army into a recruiting crisis.

"The Army Wants to Join You," a slogan that somehow didn't carry the galvanizing urgency of the actual requirement for soldiers, shouted from magazine ads and billboards. Bounties of up to \$2,500 were offered for service in combat arms. The news media soon were carrying reports of recruiters, pressed to meet impossible quotas, turning to questionable practices and outright fraud while trying to get the warm bodies demanded by the Army.

Somewhere along the way, the Army remembered the pool of available warm bodies were nicely divided, about down the middle, into male and female.

"We may as well be frank," said Phillips, "the first few months of the all-volunteer Army . . . we missed some of our recruiting objectives—month after month we missed them. So we started casting about. . . ." He also said there was "pressure on the Army, from outside sources, from OSD [Office of the Secretary of Defense]. 'Can't you find places to use more women?'"

"We were here all the time," Maj. (Flora) Jerry Thompson said, "and could have done fantastic things." Major Thompson, 22 years in the Army, the executive officer of a basic training battalion at the Fort McClellan

WAC Center, added, "Someone got smart. The all-volunteer armed force is the greatest thing that ever happened for the WACs."

First Lt. Andrea Kapolka told me, as we watched her women trainees running an obstacle course at Fort McClellan, "The Army's where it's happening for women!"

It hasn't always been so. The social barrier against women serving in the armed forces didn't fall easily. A few thousand women served in the Navy and Marine Corps, in World War I. It became hundreds of thousands in the national abandon of WWII as all four services enrolled women. The guiding philosophy then was "free a man for combat." Officially noncombatants, the WWII women did everything short of fighting that was needed to win the war.

Members of the Women's Army Corps, first formed during WWII, served throughout the U.S. and in every military theater overseas. As one woman sergeant major told me recently, "This is no big deal! Everyone has forgotten that we did all this before, during WWII, and no one got excited about it." She's almost correct; WWII women in the WAC were not combat soldiers.

After WWII and before 1967 the WAC was limited by public law to not more than two percent of the Army's total strength. That year Congress changed the law, giving the service secretaries authority to recruit women as needed by the military departments. The stage was set for a giant leap for Army women, far beyond what even the women could imagine.

An Army pamphlet, published in 1972 when WAC strength was about 12,000 looked ahead to all-volunteer days and made a glowing prediction of "a 50 percent increase in [WAC] strength by 1978-79," or a corps of 18,000 women. It was a bad call; WAC strength is now over 40,000 and the new 1978 forecast is 50,000.

Col. Edith Hinton, Deputy Director of the WAC, also believes the all-volunteer force has been responsible, along with "changes in the civilian culture and the Army's traditional role in providing equal opportunity," for the rapid increase in women's strength. What's the Army doing with the added women?

Colonel Hinton, after noting that all but the combat arms specialties are now open to women (415 of the Army's 451 occupational fields), explained the assignment policy by giving percentages of women to total strength in the field army's combat support units.

U.S.-based combat support units may have as many as 25 to 50 percent women, Colonel Hinton said. Overseas, including units in combat theaters, the Army has set up a sliding scale based on a unit's closeness to combat outfits (those that usually are a part of combat brigades).

Support units serving directly behind brigades would have no more than 10 percent women. Units farther back (in Army terms, from division to corps) would have from 15 to 30 percent women. Behind the corps area, or very distant from the front lines in a combat theater, women would make up 25 to 45 percent of a unit.

"But," Colonel Hinton added, "there is no magic percentage of women to men in the combat support units. These are the figures being kicked around. In the next year or so we'll . . . validate these unit percentages and what the total figures on women's strength should be. It might be above 50,000; we consider our goal of 50,000 women in the Army is a floor, not a ceiling."

How much above 50,000? With planned Army strength in the years ahead set at around 785,000, 50,000 women amounts to 6.36 percent of the Army's total strength. The nation's female population can easily supply that many, and more.

Is the Army laying a foundation for a

wider role for women? Will the all-volunteer recruiting problem be solved by enrolling more and more women? Not even the Army manpower planners know. No modern nation ever has maintained a volunteer force on the scale we're attempting, nor in an "equal opportunity" environment.

But to see the problems—overseas rotations is a major one—related to women in the volunteer Army, look at two other services. Adm. James L. Holloway, Chief of Naval Operations, recently explained the Navy was limited in assigning its women by two factors, in an interview in *US News & World Report*.

"One," he said, ship "billets must [by law] be filled with men, and secondly, we must preserve some billets ashore for those men at sea to rotate to. Otherwise, we would be putting our men on open-ended sea duty."

Army Lieutenant Kapolka was for three years an officer in the Marines, got out and taught school for several years, then joined the Army. Why didn't she go back to the Marines? "Women in the Marine Corps are more of a fringe," she said.

It's apparently by calculation. Maj. Ruth Woldyla, administrative assistant to the director of Women Marines, said that, "Marine planners are taking a careful, conservative approach to women's assignments. We have a lot of specialties open that we don't put women in because we're trying to avoid interfering with normal male Marines rotation and assignments."

The Army already has an imbalance in its male assignments, caused by the women already serving. One male field grade officer at Fort Jackson said, "I really hate to see these women coming in and taking our men's jobs."

When he realized how imprudent that sounded in an Army going all-out to integrate women, he asked that I please not attribute it to him, then spent more than five minutes explaining how the restrictions against women serving in combat has upset the system. Male soldiers, according to that officer, are getting the undesirable, unaccompanied assignments while the women are getting the plush assignments.

Commanders who have troops they can't, by policy, take everywhere the unit goes are commanders with problems. As a Marine CO, I was faced many times with sorting out the male undeployables—the 17-year-olds, the soon-to-be-discharged, the temporarily physically unfit, men under other administrative or legal holds—while we packed hurriedly for possible combat commitment. I can sympathize with Army commanders who now must add women to their undeployable rosters.

How, for example, would the Army handle a 45 percent-woman unit that had been working far behind the front lines and suddenly was needed near a front line brigade? How would field commanders have applied the Army's women-assignment policy in Vietnam? Did a behind-the-front zone have any meaning in that war? Hardly. Having women soldiers who can't go near the battle is an unmitigated can of worms.

What prohibits female assignments to combat units and duties? "An Army regulation," said Colonel Hinton. "There's nothing in the law that says that women in the Army may not serve in combat. Congress does restrict women in the Navy and Air Force; they may not serve on combat ships and aircraft [Title 10, U.S. Code]. It's really by extension that the Army has adopted the no women in combat rule. [We feel it's] the sense of Congress."

Donald G. Brotzman, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, is a former congressman and was a WWII infantryman. He and his deputy, Paul D. Phillips, were asked to explain the Army's assignment policies regarding women.

"There is a clear-cut national policy that we shall not discriminate against women—

that's the law of the land," said Brotzman. Then, after explaining that the Army is studying how women can be assimilated without reducing the effectiveness of Army units, he added, "The Air Force and Navy have laws expressly prohibiting [women serving in combat], but just as clearly it is the policy of the Department of the Army that women not serve in a combat capacity."

I suggested that he was talking around the problem. When women are assigned to combat support units operating throughout a combat theater, up to the rear boundaries of combat brigades, they are in combat, especially considering the modern threats of parachute drops, helicopter-borne assaults, guerrilla attacks, and so forth.

In response, Brotzman cited a "three-tiered policy" that had been recommended by the Army's Training and Doctrine Command and accepted by the Department of the Army:

Women will not be assigned, one, to "combat arms units;" two, to "units whose primary mission is to engage and inflict casualties on the enemy;" nor three, to "other units that habitually operate in areas where close combat is likely—forward of the brigade rear boundaries." He added, "I don't want to see women in combat and I think I could speak generally for the leadership of the Army. I don't know any exceptions to that particular rule."

But Phillips addressed the exceptions: "There could be women in there [forward of combat brigade rear boundaries], no question about it. All we can say is the general rule which says, 'which habitually work forward of the brigade rear boundaries.'"

"Now, you know, emergencies? Sure they're going ahead of the brigade rear-boundaries. Are they going to get killed? Damn right! In the same proportion as they exist in these zones, and as the men get killed in these zones, so will they."

Apparently, the Army is under no legal restraints—other than its own—from making women combat soldiers. It seems to be abiding by the "sense of Congress" as expressed in Title 10. As to what the future "sense of Congress" might be concerning women, Brotzman said, "We cannot comment on what congressmen might think or what they might say."

Will Congress buy sending women into combat? Rep. Samuel Stratton (D-N.Y.), chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Compensation, answered that question in *Navy Times* (Oct. 1, 1975). Stratton said he was impressed by former Army Secretary Howard "Bo" Callaway's report the Army had found that "a woman could do about anything a man could." After the Congress gets used to the idea of women in "something other than the secretarial role," said Stratton, the legislators could "approach this issue in a less emotional light." They don't think we need women in rifle squads, he said, but it would "make good sense to assign women to general combat areas."

Later reports out of Stratton's subcommittee indicate that his might be the conservative congressional view. Some members of his committee are urging abolition of all restrictions against combat assignments for women now.

The Army apparently is preparing for that change by Congress. As the numbers of women soldiers grow, the rotation-assignment relationship will get further and further imbalanced. Specifically, men in some specialties will be finding themselves spending more and more time on the outposts of the world, while the women hold the U.S. and overseas rear area jobs in those same specialties.

The Army is painting itself into a corner from which there's just one exit short of a return to the draft: unrestricted combat assignments for women.

Are American service people themselves

ready for that big step? I think there's a generational disagreement on that question. Most Americans of my generation don't cotton to that sort of treatment of our women-folk.

Reading Zane Grey, we were properly shocked when a cowboy hero in some minor gunplay with a mysterious stranger he met on the trail—a stranger who unbeknownst to the hero and the reader would prove to be a woman—drilled her clean through. When he then made a damage assessment and found a small, blue-edged, blood-oozing hole beside a creamy white and throbbing breast, shivers of revulsion ran straight through that cowboy and stabbed us in our hearts.

It might be fit treatment for a Ma Barker, or a Bonnie who ran with a Clyde, but for God's sake, says my generation, keep our women—our sisters, wives, daughters and the girl next door—out of the world of bullet holes, gut shots and dismembered limbs.

Two important differences are at work, though, in the present generation. First is the blurring of sex roles that's come from the easier, less formal relationships existing between younger males and females. While my generation was too preoccupied with its own hangups to see what was happening, our sons and daughters formed easy friendships across the sexual barrier. Most of them see one another first as fellow human beings, something we never could quite pull off.

Second, especially in the Army, males and females compete as equals. With equal ranks and pay, and equal opportunities to work at most jobs in the Army, young people of both sexes now believe they also should share the hazards.

Army Sp4 Vickey Mouze told me, "Women should be required to serve in combat." Army Sgt. Tom Block said, "Men and women should pull their fair share." Army CSM John Sanderper, just returned from Europe where he supervised both male and female soldiers, said, "The young male soldier today doesn't expect the women to be treated differently." Army 1st Sgt. Ted Daw said, "I hear young men asking the question: 'Why don't women have to fight?'"

I didn't find any Army women demanding the right to kill, kill, kill. Many, however, brought so tantalizingly close to being full-fledged soldiers, recognize that final step, abolition of combat restrictions against women, as the move that would ensure their individuality. Women recognize the Army's

present use of women as basically inequitable. They are ready for a change.

The women's present split into half soldiers, half traditionally protected females, is frustrating for both the women and the men. The strain manifests itself everywhere, sometimes thoughtfully, sometimes bitterly, sometimes humorously. Items:

On the question of women's assignments: Col. Edith Hinton said, "I really think that the Army has moved pretty cautiously on this. I think we're looking and evaluating as we go along." A male sergeant major said, "The Army's possibly not looking carefully enough at some of the occupational specialties now open to women. DA [Department of the Army] might have to go to the field to see what's really required, considering each specialty on a case-by-case basis."

On special privileges or considerations required for women: A male officer at Fort Jackson said, "The women want hot and cold running privacy." A young woman drill sergeant, scornfully dismissing the tendency of her trainees at Fort McClellan to cry when they found the training tough said, "After all, they've been 'Daddy's Little Girl' all their lives; you can't expect them to change overnight."

A senior female officer, responding to my question, "What, if any, special provisions do you make for basic trainees having their menstrual periods?" replied curtly, "None. We don't even mention it. Does your wife stop doing the housework?"

The same question was answered by a male NCO running a Fort Jackson training course: "Of course, if one of these little gals is having her monthly time, we let her stand aside. She'll be able to [complete the training] tomorrow, or when she feels better."

On how men and women see women in the Army: A female field grade officer said, "Women are making greater progress in the Army than in the civilian world." A female sergeant major said, "It will be a long time before we're accepted!" A junior woman NCO said bitterly, "We'll never be accepted!"

A male captain, explaining why he's glad to have women working for him: "In the early '50's I'd have taken a black over a white; now I'd take a female over a male, for the same reason. They have something to prove."

Colonel Hinton said, "Throughout this whole thing it takes some sensitizing of both men and women. Women do tend to see themselves in the traditional women's roles

... it's the cultural influence... as girls they played with dolls. And maybe it still has a lot to do with the civilian community. [A woman] comes in to get training in a particular skill and she looks for something that's marketable on the outside. If she's a Hawk missile mechanic..."

When I ignore the emotional and ask myself the professional question, whether we can accept women combat soldiers, I believe the answer is clear: We can't afford to accept half soldiers. We must either get our women completely out of the traditional man's world of soldiering, back to a well-defined "fringe"—even if it means returning to the draft, or we must abandon tradition entirely and lift virtually all combat limitations from the women.

If we choose the latter course, I believe recently retired Air Force Maj. Gen. Jeanne M. Holm's idea, that women can do all the combat related jobs "except where sheer brute force is essential to ensure victory," can be the only realistic, equitable criterion for excluding anyone. It should be as impartially applied as, say, height requirements for selecting and rejecting aviators.

Deputy Assistant Secretary Phillips had another angle: "I think we're going to have to come to a place where there will be a physical aptitude test for every skill: Can she lift 55 pounds—or he—five times over her head and push it in a truck 10 times a minute, if that's what the job requires? And everybody will have to pass it, men and women. Maybe that's where we're coming to."

Meanwhile, I think it's time the nation deal with the issue of women warriors realistically, considering all the ramifications. The nation and the Army should stop marveling at it like small boys examining some new creature found by a brook on a warm spring afternoon—see little Private Sally drive her big Army bulldozer; see Lieutenant Jane fire her Army rifle—and make the hard decision of whether or not we want or need our women to help fight our wars as combat soldiers.

Following the present course, the Army's sneaking into it by the back door. In the national agonizing that will follow the first female combat casualties, the Army will be asking itself how in the hell it happened, and why didn't someone think to ask Americans whether they were ready to send their women into the brutishness of war. ●

## SENATE—Friday, August 3, 1979

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 21, 1979)

The Senate met at 9 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore, Hon. HOWELL HEFLIN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

### PRAYER

The Reverend James David Ford, Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we thank You for Your act of creation whereby You made us one people to dwell on the face of the Earth. Remind us of our common heritage in the human family and of the opportunities we have to show forth Your goodness to every person.

Forgive us for our arrogance of seeing only a part of Your creation, and not

sharing with others. May Your spirit strengthen our minds and open our hearts that we may be faithful stewards of Your grace, and by our deeds witness to the unity we know in You.

In the name of the Lord, we pray.  
Amen.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the majority leader is recognized.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Jour-

nal of the proceedings be approved to date.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### METHANOL FROM COAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent statement prepared by Dr. James Sawyer on one of the most promising technologies for making synthetic fuels—namely, production of methanol from coal. Dr. Sawyer is a Congressional Budget Office expert on synthetic fuels who has provided my staff with a great deal of useful information on methanol.

There being no objection, the state-

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