

for the College of Micronesia, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 51

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

—Page 66, after line 8, insert the following

new paragraph and renumber succeeding paragraphs accordingly:

"(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Secretary shall determine whether the siting and construction of any LNG facility are in compliance with standards prescribed under paragraph (1) of this subsection if such facility is one for which initial construction was completed at least four years prior to the date of enactment of this Act but which has not been placed in operation by such date. With respect to

any such facility, the standards relating to location established under subparagraph (1) (A) of this subsection shall require such location to be in a remote area in order to minimize the dangers to persons and property from discharge, explosion, or other malfunction. If the Secretary determines that the facility is not in compliance with such standards, no application for the operation of such facility shall be approved by the Department of Energy."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A REPORTER'S VISIT TO VIETNAM

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, during the recent congressional recess the New York Times ran a series of articles on present-day Vietnam by the noted investigative reporter Seymour Hersh. Having visited Vietnam last month, I applaud the tone of these articles and request unanimous consent to insert them in the RECORD.

Mr. Hersh, who spent 10 days in Vietnam speaking with top government officials, United Nations and other relief officials, and Vietnamese citizens he had known as a war correspondent, depicts a Vietnam in severe economic need, and a political leadership angered by the U.S. commitment to the "China card" of international politics—which apparently precluded normalization of relations between our two countries last fall. He also reports that over 2 million Cambodians are threatened in the immediate future with massive starvation.

While our visit was not as long as that of Mr. Hersh, my observation is that the Hersh articles and vignettes portray the country well—its politics, its economy, its security concerns, and the flavor of the daily life. I commend the articles to my colleagues.

As a member of Members of Congress for Peace through Law, I think the series will be of special interest to MCPL members.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 7, 1979]
HANOI SAYS U.S. DIDN'T FOLLOW THROUGH AFTER REACHING ACCORD ON TIES

(By Seymour M. Hersh)

HANOI, VIETNAM, August 3.—Vietnam's Acting Foreign Minister said in an interview this week that his Government and the United States reached full agreement on normalizing their relations during secret talks in New York last fall, but that the Carter Administration did not follow through on the agreement.

Nguyen Co Thach, who holds the title of Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, said that the breakthrough in the negotiations came last Sept. 28 when Vietnam dropped its demand that the United States agree to a major aid commitment before normalization.

[In Washington, Richard C. Holbrooke, an Assistant Secretary of State who led the American team, confirmed subsequently that the United States and Vietnam had settled

the aid issue in meetings last fall. Washington's subsequent decision to slow normalization, Mr. Holbrooke added, was solely in response to questions involving Cambodia, the refugee exodus and a Soviet-Vietnamese economic accord, and had nothing to do with Washington decision to recognize Peking, as Mr. Thach charged.]

Once the Vietnamese demand for an American aid commitment was dropped, Mr. Thach said, "everything was agreed upon, except for the writing down." He and the American side had settled such matters as the size of the diplomatic missions in Washington and Hanoi and had even begun discussions over who would be assigned as heads of mission, he said.

The Vietnamese official said, however, that he left New York after waiting in vain for a final meeting to conclude and sign the agreement.

"THE CHINA CARD PREVAILED"

Instead, he said, the United States extended diplomatic recognition to China and later accused Vietnam of making normalization impossible because of its position on the outflow of refugees, its pending military involvement in Cambodia and its signing of a long-term economic aid agreement with the Soviet Union.

"I think they would like to arrange normalization with China and normalization with Vietnam," Mr. Thach said, "and the China card prevailed above the normalization of Vietnam. This is my assessment."

Mr. Thach has emerged in the last six months as one of his nation's leading spokesmen to the outside world, and Western and nonaligned diplomats here believe that he exerts great influence on Vietnam's foreign policies. Handsome and self-assured, the 56-year-old official made himself available for more than six hours of interviewing over two days in what seemed to be a major attempt to explain his country's policies directly to the American people. Mr. Thach speaks excellent English.

Among the other key points stressed by the Secretary of State during the interview were these:

Vietnam "has stopped and will continue to stop" the unauthorized flow of refugees from its shores.

Hanoi "categorically" rejects any assertion that the central Government has profited, directly or indirectly, from the illegal exodus of refugees, many of whom paid enormous amounts to be allowed to flee.

Vietnam is opposed to any international conference on the neutrality of Cambodia because the new Cambodian government headed by Heng Samrin "has its own destiny in its hand." No role for Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the former Cambodian head of state, is possible.

Cambodia is now facing a desperate famine that threatens the life of its four million people.

Thailand has been permitting troops of the former regime headed by Pol Pot to operate within its borders and to maintain the

"sanctuaries" needed to sustain their guerrilla operations against the Heng Samrin government. Vietnam does not consider the action of the Thai Government to be "wise."

Vietnam's economy has suffered severe setbacks because of the border wars with China and the fighting with the Pol Pot forces in Cambodia, and the Government needs to import three million tons of food this year, a figure it does not expect to achieve.

As for renewed warfare with China, Vietnam is "prepared for the worst" and the Chinese "must think it over before they launch another invasion."

CARTER POLICIES CRITICIZED

The extended interviews with Mr. Thach took place in a simply furnished living room in the Government's guest house in the center of Hanoi. Throughout the interview Mr. Thach, dressed casually, as everyone is in hot and humid Hanoi in midsummer, repeatedly criticized the foreign policies of the Carter Administration, but he distinguished between what he called the Government and the American people.

"It is very bitter for the Government to swallow the defeat" in the Vietnam War, he said, "but for the American people it is another thing. They are proud of their support of Vietnam during an unjust war."

He accused China and the United States of conspiring to manipulate the refugee issue for international political reasons. "They would like, through the bias of the refugees, to solve the question of Cambodia," he asserted. "That is the biggest reason behind the noise about refugees."

"Who is criticizing Vietnam?" Mr. Thach asked. "First it is China and secondly the U.S.A. They are the most critical. The other nations are honestly very emotional about the refugees, but it is a realistic emotion. But, you see, the United States and China have encouraged these emotions."

The non-Communist countries in Southeast Asia—principally Thailand, Singapore, Indonesia and Malaysia—"have a right to be sensitive" about the refugee issue, Mr. Thach said. "It is a very great burden for them," he acknowledged. "But you see, nobody is excited about the fate of the four million Cambodian people who are starving and the three million Cambodians who were killed by Pol Pot with the help of China."

"DOUBLE STANDARD" ON REFUGEES

The Vietnamese minister repeatedly complained during the interviews about what he termed the double standard applied by the United States against his Government. "We have stopped the exit of refugees since 1975," he said, "but we were criticized because we had not given the people freedom to go away. Then we decided to let them go freely and we are criticized by the West for exporting refugees."

"And now we have agreed to channel them through legal exits in part through the United Nations High Commissioner on Refugees and to stop all illegal exits. But now the Seventh Fleet is coming in and encouraging the people to go illegally."

Repeatedly turning to the refugee issue, he said there were two broad categories of people fleeing the country. The first group, he said, consists of "the 1.5 million people who cooperated with the U.S. Army." He went on: "There was no bloodbath. We have shown our humanity to them, our clemency. But they could not stay. Why? Because they have guilty consciences and, secondly, they were used to the easy life under American aid. They cannot work hard, so they would like to go with the Seventh Fleet and so on."

After the Communist victory in the spring of 1975, many inhabitants of the former South Vietnam were sent to so-called re-education camps, where an attempt was made to instill Communist principles. The austere life represented a sharp change for many.

"The second group of refugees," Mr. Thach said, "are the Chinese. There are two reasons they left. First, you should know that I have been in New York and I have talked with the Japanese. They told me that after Pearl Harbor the Japanese were all concentrated into camps and all their property confiscated."

"Here the Chinese are free. You can see them in the streets. But they have the difficulty of being caught in a crossfire. If they support the Vietnamese against the Chinese, the Chinese are suspicious. If they support the Chinese against the Vietnamese, the same. If they are neutral, they are doubted by both sides. So it's very difficult for them to stay. Secondly, they are mostly big businessmen and they don't like the socialist reformation of South Vietnam. They would like to go away."

Regarding the question of forced payments from the refugees, Mr. Thach again complained of a double standard. "Some people say that we have taken money from these refugees, and at the same time they say that they are forced to go," he said. "So it is contradictory: If they are forced to go, why must they pay money? If they must pay money to go, so they are not forced to go."

The minister, emphatically denying allegations that the central Government collected refugee funds, said: "There is no such policy. I can reject it categorically."

EMIGRES RESTRICTED ON VALUABLES

Mr. Thach said that Government policy called for punishment of those who took bribes but that illegal departures had an obvious advantage, because those who left could carry all their valuables with them, in contrast to the sharp restrictions on the valuables that those emigrating legally were permitted to take.

Discussing Vietnam's economy, Mr. Thach acknowledged that most of the agricultural and industrial goals had not been met because of the wars with China and the fighting in Cambodia. "But this is not the most difficult time for Vietnam," he said. "The most difficult time for Vietnam is over. And if during the American war we can stand and we can produce, why can't we now produce and stand?"

The failure to meet industrial and agricultural quotas has been far more damaging to the former South Vietnam and especially to Ho Chi Minh City, formerly Saigon, than to the north, Mr. Thach said. He acknowledged that many people were out of work in Ho Chi Minh City and still slept and begged on the streets.

"They are having trouble, yes," he said, "but it is because they don't want to work hard. They would like to have an easy life."

[From the New York Times, Aug. 8, 1979]

2.25 MILLION CAMBODIANS ARE SAID TO FACE STARVATION

(By Seymour M. Hersh)

HANOI, VIETNAM, August 3.—United Nations and Red Cross officials said in inter-

views here and in Ho Chi Minh City this week that 2.25 million Cambodians were facing starvation.

The officials, who agreed to discuss their recent fact-finding trip to Cambodia after being promised anonymity, also described the widescale starvation, shocking as it was, as only one element of what seemed to be the near destruction of Cambodian society under the regime of the ousted Prime Minister Pol Pot.

"I have seen quite a few ravaged countries in my career, but nothing like this," one official said. He added that as much as \$100 million in food and medical aid was urgently needed.

PLIGHT HELD WORSE THAN REFUGEES'

The officials, representing the International Committee of the Red Cross in Geneva and the United Nations Children's Fund in New York, expressed dismay that the concern of many Western nations over the plight of the Vietnam refugees had overshadowed what they said would be a far greater tragedy in Cambodia.

Relief efforts in Cambodia have been slowed in part because of suspicion over the authenticity of the new Cambodian Government headed by Heng Samrin, which was installed by Vietnam after the invasion of Cambodia early this year.

The relief officials also said that during their visit to Cambodia they had seen evidence of systematic torture in chambers operated by the Pol Pot Government at a prison near Phnom Penh, the capital. Members of the Pol Pot regime, they said, carefully logged the names and titles of their victims and the types of torture each suffered. The officials said they knew of one large burial site where the remains of perhaps hundreds of the torture victims had been found after the Vietnamese invasion.

The relief experts said that the former regime had not only forced citizens to evacuate Phnom Penh, and other cities to work in the fields, as had been earlier reported, but also had destroyed all vestiges of intellectual life and whatever they could find of 20th-century civilization in the country.

The Pol Pot Government took over Cambodia on April 17, 1975, after the defeat of the United States-backed Government of Marshal Lon Nol. Mr. Pol Pot believed that the salvation of Cambodia was possible only through the expulsion of all foreigners and foreign influence and through "purification," or evacuation, of the cities in an attempt to reconstruct Cambodia's war-damaged agricultural system.

SOME FOOD SUPPLIED BY VIETNAM

Since the fall of his Government and its replacement by the Vietnamese-backed regime of Mr. Heng Samrin early this year, Vietnam, itself faced with a deficit in food, has diverted some of its supplies to Cambodia.

Cambodia's social welfare apparatus has been left in shambles, the relief officials said, citing demolition of hospitals, schools, water supply facilities and sanitary systems. The destruction of such facilities has been on a scale far wider than previously believed, they asserted.

Intellectuals were systematically purged, the officials said. Survivors reported that all people who were known to speak foreign languages were hunted down, imprisoned and, in some cases, beaten to death with sticks. One doctor told the relief officials he had decided to hide his eyeglasses during the four years of Mr. Pol Pot's rule for fear of being revealed as an intellectual, and punished.

Of more than 500 doctors known to have been practicing medicine in Cambodia before the defeat of the Lon Nol regime by the Communist forces in 1975, the relief officials said, only 40 have been found. The rest are presumed to have been slain or to have died

while working in the fields in the last four years.

OFFICIALS BESIEGED ON ARRIVAL

The relief officials told of having been besieged by Cambodians on their arrival in Phnom Penh * * * with many of them asking the visitors to mail letters to family members and friends abroad.

In one such letter, dated June 20, and written to a doctor in Australia, a Cambodian nurse, after explaining that only 6 of the 14 persons in her family had survived, pleaded: "Please, doctor, would be sure taking my family to work in your country?"

The woman added: "Sorry of my poor English, because I never read for four years ago. My life always upset, no ideas, darkness in mind."

The officials said they had read many of the public accounts of the isolation of Phnom Penh under the former regime, but they still had been unprepared for the extreme destruction they saw during their visit there.

"It cannot be understood," one experienced official said. "It's a dead city. I saw only one pipe with running water."

EVERY HOUSE HAS BEEN DESTROYED

"Honestly, we could not believe it," he went on. "Every house has been destroyed and there are piles of garbage and furniture on the sidewalks."

Under the Pol Pot administration, the officials said, foreign journalists and other visitors were permitted to walk down one main thoroughfare that had been cleared of debris. Seen from the street, buildings seemed to be empty but in relatively good condition.

In fact, the relief officials said, every home had been ransacked. "It was not looting," one official declared, "because the soldiers did not take anything for themselves." But, he said, all signs of modern civilization—typewriters, radios, television sets, phonographs, books—were destroyed. In the shuttered hospitals of the capital, all the medical equipment, textbooks and reference journals were found, broken and scattered, on the floor.

A Roman Catholic cathedral in the center of Phnom Penh had been razed, with not a sign of its existence remaining, the officials said. Similarly, the city's central market had been destroyed.

All the automobiles in the city, the officials said, were driven by soldiers to an empty field and abandoned, left to rust as further symbols of modern decadence.

OUTBREAKS OF PLAGUE REPORTED

The increase in rats and other vermin has caused outbreaks of plague and other diseases, the relief officials said. The treatment of the sick is complicated, they said, by a lack of medical equipment, since the former Government was scrupulously methodical in its destruction of hospitals.

For example, in a hospital at Kompong Speu, about 30 miles west of Phnom Penh, the relief team found 30 patients who had developed hepatitis in recent weeks because of a lack of sterilizers for surgical instruments. The hospital had 500 patients when the group visited it last month, with one Vietnamese doctor who shuttled between it and other facilities.

The relief officials reported that there were believed to be 10,000 orphans in Cambodia, none of whom had been provided with the most basic immunizations.

NEW EQUIPMENT URGENTLY NEEDED

Some medical supplies were provided earlier this year by Vietnam, the officials said, and an emergency shipment of \$10,000 worth of drugs and syringes was sent in this week.

Still urgently needed, they said, are new surgical and medical supplies, such as X-ray machines and sterilizers, for the ransacked hospitals, most of which were in towns and therefore were shut down.

Complicating the medical supply efforts is the food crisis, the relief officials said. They

were permitted to visit some outlying towns. One of them, Kompong Speu, had been completely destroyed, they said. Everywhere they saw hundreds of children with the blank looks and distended bellies of the starving.

The officials said that the fragile government of Mr. Heng Samrin had set the daily intake of rice per person at 130 grams, roughly 4.5 ounces. That is less than one-third the average quota for other Southeast Asian nations, they said.

The officials said that Cambodia's fall harvest was expected to yield almost nothing, since many of the rice fields had been devastated in guerrilla warfare between Vietnamese troops backing the Heng Samrin regime and the surviving Pol Pot forces. In addition, the growing famine has forced many peasants to eat rice seedlings to stay alive, the officials said.

EASTERN AREA CALLED A 'DESERT'

Yet another factor in the famine, the officials said, is the apparent absence of any significant population in the fertile rice-growing areas east of the Mekong River, the area between Phnom Penh and the Vietnamese border. "My first impression after passing the border is that at present no more than 5 percent of the fields are cultivated," one relief official explained. "The eastern half of the country is a desert—no boats, no one on the roads," he said.

The people who had lived in that area, the official said, were viewed with special suspicion by troops of the Pol Pot regime because of its proximity to Vietnam, and thus they were forced to move out.

One relief official recalled his sharing some canned litchi nuts with a group of Cambodian officials last month in the Government's guest house in Phnom Penh. He was astonished when the Cambodians told him it was the first fruit they had tasted in two years.

COUNTRY KNOWN AS "LAND OF FRUIT"

"You have to understand," the official explained, "Cambodia has always been known as the land of the fruit."

The first-hand evidence of torture was found at a former French high school in Phnom Penh that had been converted to a political prison, the officials said. They recalled having seen a prison file on a Cambodian doctor who was tortured to death there. "The file indicated that he was tortured at least 20 times," one official said with an expression of horror, "and there were 5,000 files in the prison."

"You just cannot find anybody alive in Cambodia who has not lost somebody in his family," the official added.

He told of one couple who were overheard speaking to each other in French shortly after the Pol Pot Government came to power. "They were accused of being intellectuals and arrested," the official said. "She was killed the next morning by sticks, but he escaped."

[From the New York Times, Aug. 9, 1979]
EXODUS OF SKILLED ETHNIC CHINESE WORSENS HANOI'S FLIGHT

(By Semour M. Hersh)

WASHINGTON, August 8.—A crew of skilled Soviet longshoremen are now hard at work in Vietnam's busy harbor at Halphong, unraveling a huge tie-up caused by a lack of skilled workers.

There are precious few factories in underindustrialized Vietnam, but some of them had to be closed down recently because of a lack of skilled workers.

The missing workers were ethnic Chinese, and Vietnam's leaders acknowledged in interviews in Hanoi last week that their nation is facing a major "brain drain" in part because of the exodus of Chinese residents over the last year.

PROBLEMS ARE SEVERE

The drain, however, is only one of Vietnam's current difficulties. Other critical problems include the following:

The economy is stagnant, with little manufacturing and little foreign-trade revenue.

Inflation, difficult for an outsider to assess, has created 100 percent price increases over the last 18 months for some basic consumer goods.

Millions of tons of food have had to be imported to meet minimum food needs with much of that now being diverted to aid famine-stricken Cambodia.

Most Western nations, shocked by the recent flood of "boat people," have cut off aid programs in retaliation.

War with China and the ousted Pol Pot Government in Cambodia have thrown all of Vietnam's planning programs and quotas into disarray.

The one million residents of Hanoi, having gone through 30 years of war, still suffer from antiquated transportation facilities. The only automobiles in use are those owned by the Government and by diplomats.

Housing is still dilapidated and shockingly inadequate. One diplomat said he counted 80 residents living in the house next to his embassy.

IMPACT OF EXODUS

Vietnamese officials have found it impossible to calculate fully the extent of the nation's loss stemming from the exodus of ethnic Chinese in the last year. The Chinese population, which once totaled 1.2 million, traditionally has been concentrated in government offices, hospitals, schools and research institutes, Vietnamese officials said. They noted that 3,000 of the 13,000 Chinese living in Hanoi at the beginning of last year worked in central Government offices. Many of those have left, causing serious setbacks in the day-to-day operations of the bureaucracy.

One senior Vietnamese official acknowledged that because of the outflow of Chinese medical doctors, "Now you can find parts of Vietnam where there are none." He added: "We don't like to let the skilled people go away."

The loss has been felt not only in the upper reaches of Government and in medical clinics. More than 15 percent of Vietnam's coal miners were Chinese, and mining operations were said to have been hampered by the exodus of key workers.

Given all these problems, Hanoi's leaders remain firmly entrenched in power and seem serene and optimistic about the future.

THE PEOPLE SEEM HAPPY

During a weeklong visit to Hanoi, a correspondent could only describe the attitude of the people as happy. There were far more individual styles of dress, and boy-and-girl relationships were much more in evidence than during a visit to Hanoi in 1972, at the height of the Vietnam War.

Western values, manifested by blue jeans, T-shirts and rock music, have begun to take hold, albeit tenuously. One young Vietnamese interpreter, a dedicated Communist assigned to the Foreign Office, conceded that he had a hankering for Rod Stewart recordings.

In many interviews, Western and nonaligned diplomats in Hanoi confirmed that, despite the continuing hardships, individual loyalty to the Government was the cornerstone of Vietnam's viability.

Asked about the Government's seemingly strong support at home, Nguyen Co Thach, Vietnam's Acting Foreign Minister, raised the issue of foreign criticism over the refugee exodus.

"You see," Mr. Thach said in an interview, "there are some people from the West who say there is a lack of human rights and that lack is why people want to go from Vietnam.

So I must tell you that if there are no human rights, Vietnam could not stand these 30 years through these unthinkable difficulties, these unthinkable tests, if we do not have the support of the people."

"There is no gap in Vietnam between the life of the people and the life of the officials," Mr. Thach added. "I share in the poverty of my people. That's the way we can overcome all the difficulties—even 50 million tons of bombs on our heads."

The Vietnamese certitude and self-assuredness is a source of constant annoyance to western diplomats, who repeatedly used the term "arrogant" to describe some Government views.

For example, Australia, New Zealand, Britain and the European Common Market recently cut back food aid and other programs in an attempt to influence Vietnam's refugee policies.

EMPTY BARRELS ARE VERY NOISY

Mr. Thach, however, when asked about those cutbacks, attributed them to those nations' support for China. "Their aid is very small, so it's not too bad," he said.

"You see," he added with a laugh, empty barrels are always very noisy."

If Vietnam's attitude toward the West sometimes seems high-handed, a correspondent encountered a touch of the same imperiousness toward the Soviet Union and its huge aid programs. While grateful for the Soviet aid, Vietnamese officials made it pointedly clear that the aid would never turn Vietnam into a Soviet satellite, as some American analysts seem to fear.

A senior American official who deals with Southeast Asian affairs, interviewed in Washington, expressed the view that the Soviet Union for political reasons stemming from a reluctance to anger the United States, had not sought bases or received bases in Vietnam. "They're laying low until after the SALT treaty passes," he said.

Mr. Thach and other Vietnamese officials said, however, that they would not let the Soviet Union or any other country maintain a base on their soil.

The Vietnamese officials also said that the Soviet Union had not interfered or applied pressure to induce Vietnam not to seek normalization with the United States. If such pressure was brought, they said, it would be dismissed out of hand.

A nonaligned ambassador in Hanoi said that the leadership of Vietnam had been impressed by the many social programs undertaken by the United States during the years of America's support for the South Vietnamese Government, and was anticipating large-scale aid to provide some needed development programs in the North.

Even more important, the ambassador said, choosing his words carefully, is "that with the United States, they don't have to cringe to accept aid; with the Soviets, they do."

Surprisingly, the long years of war have left Hanoi free of signs of damage, but even a casual traveler can see the cost in terms of social progress. The roads are few, narrow and hopelessly jammed. Hanoi is still a city of bicycles and freshly slaughtered pigs being slowly brought to market could be seen on the backs of the cycles.●

MARY JANE JOHNSON TRIBUTE

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, for many years people from throughout the United States have looked to the city of Berkeley, Calif., for innovative leadership and ideas in the field of education.

Its programs of school desegregation, compensatory education, and special education for minority and underachieving youths have been instrumental in providing the entire country with important guidelines to what is possible in elementary and secondary education programs. Berkeley is proud of its leadership role, and through its successes and failures have come a recognition of its distinguished position in American education.

One citizen of Berkeley, perhaps more than any other, has been both a symbol and an instrument in Berkeley education achievement. That person, Ms. Mary Jane Johnson, has recently retired from the board of education, after having served two terms as its president, and two as its vice president.

Mary Jane Johnson was active in education in Berkeley long before she served in her official capacities. She was a community leader who pioneered the desegregation program, and who fought for its retention and success. Throughout her career, her performances have been marked by an extraordinary combination of keen intelligence, inexhaustible energy, and a magnificent humility.

Those of us who have worked closely with her admire her without measure; we plan soon to pause, as a community, and communicate to her our sincere thanks and appreciation for her many years of service. Because that service has been a service to her State and her Nation, I felt it appropriate to enter these comments of commendation into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. ●

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, on August 18, I had the honor of addressing the summer graduating class of Southwest Texas State University in San Marcos, Tex. Over 900 students sacrificed what could have been carefree summer vacations to complete their school work and become graduates of the same excellent institution as President Lyndon B. Johnson.

This graduating class helped celebrate the 75th anniversary of Southwest Texas State. During that time, the school has produced many national leaders, including President Johnson. I thought it would be appropriate to consider the concept of leadership in my remarks, to question why Americans seem not to want to be led, while sometimes craving for more benefits and stronger leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit these statements for the RECORD, along with a resolution of congratulations from the leaders of San Marcos to these future leaders of tomorrow.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN J. J. PICKLE

To these critics who say that America has gone to heck in a handbasket, I say we have not—at least not yet. We are becoming a "softer Nation," and as such more independ-

ent. You have the same opportunities as graduates before you.

This morning, one thing we can all nod in agreement with—you deserve a healthy pat on the back for your achievements. Gaining a college education is one of the strongest vehicles you can have for entering the society. You are better equipped to enjoy our freedoms and economic system, while contributing something in return.

Every commencement speaker probably reminds his or her audience they are entering the most critical stage in our history. But like a successful play with different scenes and turns, opening in many cities, there are many stages. And the next few years will prove as critical. Perhaps in a different way, than any other time.

You are entering a job market, or the graduate school routine. At a time when people are questioning the strength of our institutions and the people who are supposed to lead.

A national publication recently addresses the problem quite well, in almost an agonizing fashion. We are experiencing a lack of leadership. Commentators and politics complain that President Carter is a nice guy, but he just cannot lead the country. Some of the same people who rejected the decisive leadership of a Lyndon B. Johnson today almost yearn for such a distinctive figure.

But the malaise in our country goes beyond the person who sits in the Oval Office, or who bangs the legislative gavel, or who directs a corporation. Americans have questioned the need for strong leadership and the willingness to be followers. As TIME puts it, "Americans in the '70s have developed almost a psychological aversion to leading and to being led, even while they complain that no one seems in charge anymore."

This curious contradiction arises during the time when the 1960's impetus to expand, to improve and make a better society has been substituted with the so-called "medecade" of the 70s where we've lowered our expectations. The striving of the 60s, to go out and save the world, has been replaced by the self-improvement movements and fads of the 70s.

People don't seem to have time or the desire to follow a leader, because past leaders have not delivered on pledges, have not addressed the real issues, or have not avoided being convicted. We also worry about our own personal, economic concerns. Alexis de Tocqueville predicted in 1835, that the American Dream always ran the risk of degenerating into anxiety-ridden materialism... that Americans would be perennially unsatisfied, always wanting more, turning the land of plenty into the land of excess. Was Mr. de Tocqueville right? Are we becoming that materialistic?

This struggle for abundance is quite understandable. Traditional economics and personal finances don't seem to work anymore. As graduates, expecting to enter the housing market, you'll be shocked. Your college diploma salary will have trouble financing the average cost of a home, which is over \$70,000. The Washington Post recently wrote that a house cannot be found for much under \$100,000 in the nation's capital. In Washington, real estate wheeling, dealing and talking takes up almost as much time as running the government—and we are not far behind here in Texas—and elsewhere.

Instead of hopes for the future, young people are feverishly attaining goods, which may be cheaper today than they will be tomorrow. All the while, people run the risk of overextending themselves. Contrary to our country's early days of abundance, when we could always keep going West and conquer virgin areas, we have settled the frontiers. Our resources are finite. Americans are fighting for their turf instead of finding visionary leadership.

Because of past excesses, we have seen new government regulation, which, unchecked, could invade personal freedom. We have made progress in correcting those excesses, but we have paid a price. With less economic independence, it is every person or business for himself. Which has led to the politicization of business. Many corporations now resemble quasi-governmental enterprises. Leadership initiatives are easily stymied by courtroom challenges. Individuals feel they have little role to play in the continuing tug-of-war between big business and big government.

The emerging distinctions which mark our institutions are cloudy. Where do you fit in? This dilemma is sure to touch your lives. Are we willing to be lead?

Kedley Donovan, President Carter's Senior Advisor and new Economic consultant, put it succinctly, "One secret of America's strength is that two strains—rebelliousness and willingness to accept orders—run strongly through our national life."

The Imperial Presidency is gone. And has been for the past ten years. Americans elect—and then devour a President. Apparently, we concluded that the Presidency is not infallible and that we don't have to do what the President says. We want to protect our own interests and privileges more than we are willing to balance national interests. We want more income, less taxes, less regulation and more retirement than ever before.

This does not make us "bad people"—but rather that we have been accustomed to lead the good life and leave the accounting to others. We do not want to be controlled or regulated—or led—or, are we? Do you want strong leadership? Are you willing to accept it? I think we are. I think Americans, in this time of excesses and problem of energy shortages, are willing to do whatever is necessary—and follow a leader—if they believe it is necessary. Rebelliousness on our part today is not against a man or a single institution. It is an attitude that the individual should be let alone. That cannot be done—quickly, at least.

We should try to take a lot of government out of our individual and business life, but we must accept the fact that, in doing so, we must largely give up federal assistance. We can't have it both ways. We, the older generation, are trying to turn the corner now. As young leaders coming onto the scene, how do you vote?

Out of our materialistic desires and our lack of desire to be led, there is room to turn the tide. This country still possesses personal freedom and traditions to insure great personal opportunities. Your right to seize the opportunity is one of our strengths. We can and we must participate in the continuing evolution of excellence that marks our country's history and can characterize our future.

The most famous graduate of this University, who learned many principles of life in "Old Main" was President Lyndon B. Johnson. President Johnson excelled in his personal life and made an almost unmeasurable leadership contribution. He recognized that change is healthy, that constant improvements and reassessments constitute progress. Speaking to the 1965 commencement class at Howard University in Washington, the President said... "Our earth is the home of revolution. In every corner of every continent, men charged with hope contend with ancient ways in the pursuit of justice. They reach for the newest of weapons to realize the oldest of dreams, that each may walk in freedom and pride, stretching his talents, enjoying the fruits of the earth."

Despite new problems and current crisis, the words of Lyndon Johnson apply today as they did 14 years ago. In ten years from now, your generation will have its name,

just as the 60s was known as the activist generation and the 70s marked the "me-generation." You have the unique chance to seize the opportunity, to improve the human condition, promote freedom and liberty and to contribute to the strength of our country.

RESOLUTION FOR SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Whereas, Southwest Texas State University commemorates 75 years of service as a state-supported institution of higher education during the 1978-1979 school year; and

Whereas, The official university slogan, "the progressive university with a proud past," also serves as the 75th anniversary celebration theme, one which encourages the university community and residents of the San Marcos area to reflect on the rich history and tradition that have helped to make Southwest Texas one of the state's truly outstanding colleges; and

Whereas, Chartered in 1899 by the State Legislature as a two-year normal school Southwest Texas State Normal School opened its doors to 303 students who were taught by 17 instructors; and

Whereas, After 75 years and three name changes, Southwest Texas State University had an enrollment of more than 15,000 students and a faculty of more than 600 members; and

Whereas, With its original red-steepled building, Old Main, still in full academic use, the school blends its progressive educational programs with cultural enrichment and recreational opportunities that provide students with a well-rounded atmosphere for learning and maturing; and

Whereas, Known throughout the state for its teacher education program, Southwest Texas gained national attention when one of its most famous graduates, Lyndon B. Johnson, became president of the United States; and

Whereas, All university divisions have contributed to the anniversary observance, which culminates with the summer academic commencement; and

Whereas, Since its opening in 1903, Southwest Texas State University has grown into a first-class regional, state, and national institution of higher learning, and students, alumni, and all the people of Texas can be proud of its progress and its dedication to excellence; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Commissioners Court of Hays County, the City Council of the city of San Marcos, and the Board of Directors of the San Marcos Chamber of Commerce that these bodies commemorate the 75th anniversary of Southwest Texas State University and offer best wishes for continued growth and academic excellence; and, be it further

Resolved, That official copies of this resolution be prepared for Southwest Texas State University and for its president, Dr. Lee H. Smith, as an expression of highest regard from the citizens of the community.●

TRIBUTE TO THURMAN MUNSON

HON. RALPH S. REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, many people of our Nation were saddened August 2, by the tragic airplane crash which took the life of one of baseball's greatest catchers, the New York Yankee's Thurman Munson.

Thurman was a resident of the Stark County community in Ohio, and one of its best-known citizens. He was a devoted family man who also loved the city in

which he learned to play baseball. He was a sports hero who won respect in the Horatio Alger manner of hard work and personal sacrifice.

Thurman was a rugged individualist, admired for the way he played the game. His teammates showed their respect for his abilities by recognizing him as the team leader and field general. Only the great Lou Gehrig before him had held that position.

He was an All-American while a student at Kent State University, the American League's Rookie of the Year in 1970, the league's Most Valuable Player in 1976 and an All-Star Team choice seven times.

Thurman Munson was admired for his brusque frankness and complete honesty, his extraordinary athletic talents and competitive spirit, and his unstinting loyalty to his team and his friends.

A teammate and friend, Lou Piniella, said of the Yankee captain: "He exemplified a leader, he played hard, he played tough, he played hurt."

He had a burning desire to excel and he did.

As the baseball season draws to its close, sports fans throughout the Nation are missing the exceptional play of one of the great baseball players of our time. Those who live in and near the community he loved so much miss his achievements even more.●

STATUS OF NATO AWACS PROGRAM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues correspondence I have had with the Department of State concerning the status of the NATO AWACS program.

Early in August, it was reported that the Federal Republic of Germany, which, along with the United States, is the major participant in this project, might block funds allocated to it, because of the alleged slowness with which the United States had purchased certain West German communications and transportation equipment.

An August 21, 1979, letter from Mrs. Lucy Wilson Benson, Under Secretary of State for Security Assistance, Science and Technology, should help to clarify the situation regarding West German participation in this important program of NATO standardization and improvement.

The correspondence follows:

AUGUST 7, 1979.

HON. LUCY WILSON BENSON,
Under Secretary of State for Security Assistance, Science and Technology, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. BENSON: On August 3, 1979, The Washington Post reported that a leading member of the West German parliament had threatened to block West Germany's participation in the procurement of the AWACS aircraft for NATO because of what he considered a failure on the part of the United States to purchase in a timely fashion certain West German equipment.

In addition to a status report on the NATO

AWACS deal and delineation of current bottlenecks, I would like answers to the following questions: To what extent has the United States lived up to any arms sales agreements made in conjunction with the NATO AWACS project; Have we, in fact, been slow in our procurement from West Germany; What concerns has the West Germany government raised on this subject; What is the exact nature and extent of the "compensatory deals" we have made with West Germany in connection with its participation in the NATO AWACS project; Would a determination by the West German government that the United States had not fulfilled commitments associated with the project be appropriate grounds for reconsideration, or even cancellation, of the West German role in that project; What do we plan to do in the near future to meet West German doubts on this count; and What similar arrangements have been made for U.S. purchases of military equipment from the other European participants in the NATO AWACS project and what is their status?

I appreciate the information you have provided me in the past on this NATO AWACS project and look forward to your response to these questions.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

LEE H. HAMILTON,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe, and the Middle East.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 3, 1979]
BONN POLITICIAN CRITICIZES U.S. SLOWNESS
IN NATO ARMS DEAL
(By Michael Getler)

BONN, August 2—A leading defense specialist in West Germany's opposition party has threatened to block Bonn's participation in the \$1.8 billion NATO project to buy U.S.-built early-warning radar planes unless the United States speeds up its promised compensatory purchases of German products.

The threat came in a letter from Christian Democrat Carl Damm to Bonn Defense Minister Hans Apel. Damm called on Apel to warn U.S. Secretary of Defense Harold Brown of the seriousness of the situation, and to urge that the United States "fulfill its responsibilities."

Damm is an influential member of the defense committee of parliament, and it is generally felt here that he has enough support to carry out his threat.

The letter reflects growing impatience in some quarters over getting the United States to live up to its commitment to a "two-way street" in international military hardware purchases. This frustration arises from a perception that the U.S. military, Congress or industrial lobbies can slow or derail foreign purchases to which the U.S. administration has agreed.

"As a parliament, we have to deal with the United States of America as a whole," said Damm in an interview, and not with the U.S. Army, trucking lobbies or the Congress.

After years of controversy and debate, NATO last year agreed to buy 18 of the big Boeing radar planes—known as AWACS, for airborne warning and control system—with West Germany picking up 30 percent of the cost, the United States paying 42 percent, and the other NATO nations sharing the remainder. In return for its major support, however, Bonn was promised a number of compensatory deals, including the U.S. military purchase of some 9,000 German vehicles worth \$111 million and a German telephone system to replace the antiquated U.S. military network, for about \$105 million.

Damm complained that rather than some 1,500 vehicles a year, the United States thus far has purchased only 282 vehicles and has not let the contract for the phone system.

In Damm's view, that is not nearly enough to give parliamentary committees here con-

confidence that the United States will live up to its pledge, given its historical lack of interest in foreign purchases.

"I'm in favor of AWACS and don't want to kill it," Damm said. "What I'm trying to do is send a warning signal to the U.S. government—three or four months before the defense committee here meets—that if nothing happens before then, it is my feeling that we will not release the next \$55 million in our 1980 budget for AWACS."

Another cause of German frustration, Damm said, is that purchase of the French-German Roland air defense missile is still stalled in congressional disagreement and the U.S. Army, rather than buying 10-ton trucks already in service with the German army, is going out for bids on another, similar vehicle.

Andreas von Buelow, the number-two man in Bonn's Defense Ministry, said in a radio interview, "If we should come to the conclusion that the American attitude is developing along the lines suspected by Damm, we would consider this a basis for destroying the contract." He added, "But for the time being this is not so."

Damm acknowledged that he has no hard evidence that the United States will eventually fulfill these projects. U.S. officials in Europe admit the truck program is going more slowly than it should, but they also say there is no intention to back out.

UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE,
FOR SECURITY ASSISTANCE,
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1979.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe and the
Middle East, House of Representatives.

DEAR LEE: Thank you for your letter of August 7, 1979, concerning a report in *The Washington Post* of August 3, 1979, dealing with the procurement of AWACS and compensating United States purchases.

The US offered each government participating in the NATO AWACS program a Memorandum of Understanding that would permit its industries to compete on an equitable basis for US defense procurements until its share of AWACS acquisition costs (minus any economic benefits it received from AWACS acquisition expenditures) were offset. The MOU offered no guarantees, expressed or implied, to NATO governments. Only the FRG requested such an MOU, and it was signed on November 14, 1978.

The US government did not agree to procurements in Germany as compensation for its participation in the NATO AWACS program. On the other hand it seems clear that Carl Damm and a number of members of the Bundestag view the European Telephone System and administrative vehicle procurements as "compensation" for German participation in the NATO AWACS program.

To clarify this apparent discrepancy, we have reviewed the record and believe it demonstrates clearly that the United States proceeded with procurement of a European Telephone System (ETS) upgrade and with purchase of administrative use vehicles because, after long consideration, both were considered on their own merits to be cost-effective. In fact DOD evaluation of German administrative use vehicles began before initiation of discussions with our Allies concerning NATO AWACS.

However, the Bundestag Defense Committee linked both procurements to the NATO AWACS program by formally noting that its agreement to AWACS was based on the assumption that the US would go ahead with those procurements as well as concluding a license agreement for the 120 mm tank gun. The Defense Committee further requested the Ministry of Defense to submit relevant contracts at the beginning of deliberations on its 1980 budget request. It is in this context that some German officials have recently

expressed displeasure with the pace of activity in the telephone system and administrative vehicle programs.

Progress on the telephone system has been on schedule. However, in a closed mark-up, the Defense Subcommittee of the HAC apparently cut ETS FY 80 from \$17.5 million to \$9 million. DOD hopes that the Congress will restore this reduction. Still, in the worst case, the program should be approved and started in October, but with fewer switches. Regarding administrative vehicles, the Air Force buy should be completed on schedule in FY 83 (3,032 vehicles valued at about \$45 million). The Army program has not been as successful as originally anticipated, inasmuch as its FY 80-85 program is not firm at this time, but we expect that it will reach levels which, when coupled with the Air Force program, will total \$100 million which was anticipated by both the FMOD and DOD for the Administrative Use Vehicles (AUV) buy.

I might add that the 120 mm tank gun program is proceeding on schedule and that both our governments are satisfied with its progress.

On balance, we believe that German Defense Minister Apel and his colleagues in the German government are convinced of the firmness of our commitment to arms cooperation and to improving NATO standardization and interoperability in order to increase the effectiveness of the Allies' military forces.

I believe that the above answers all the questions raised in your letter. I would be pleased to discuss this matter further with you if you believe that might be useful.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

LUCY WILSON BENSON.●

STUMP CALLS COLORADO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATE- MENT DISCRIMINATORY

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, on August 3, 1979, in the *Federal Register*, the National Park Service released a sham called the final Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Colorado River management plan for the Grand Canyon. The final EIS calls for the ban of motorized trips down the Colorado River in the Grand Canyon within 5 years. This action will at the same time restrict the number of people wishing to take a trip through the Grand Canyon in the summer by a third.

The entire public participation and comment process has been a sham. Letters and cards written to the National Park Service opposing the removal of motors on the river were not included in the public response by the Park Service. Last August, during the public comment process, the Director of the National Park Service and the Secretary of Interior publicly announced in a newspaper interview that the National Park Service "will be cutting down on the number of popular motorized rafts allowed down the River." The comment was made before the plan had been completed and the public participation had concluded.

In March of last year, I called a meeting with National Park Service officials

concerning the lack of any evidence that motorized rafts were harming the canyon, the Colorado River, or animal and plantlife in the canyon. In that meeting, Park Service officials admitted (and many times since) that the motors did not harm anything but "their own aesthetic values." A letter was sent to the Secretary of Interior by the Arizona delegation requesting empirical evidence of harm and answers to nine questions concerning the EIS. The Secretary responded to the requested information after 7 weeks; however, the information could not be sent to the public for inclusion in the *RECORD*, because it was received 1 day before the end of the public comment period.

Subsequently, on May 1, 1978, I asked the Secretary for a time line as to when the Environmental Impact Statement would be published. I did not receive a reply from the Secretary until October 23, 1978, almost 6 months later, and then with no specific details as to when the EIS would be announced. As you know, people make plans months, even years in advance to go on these river trips, and suspension of the motors would be disastrous to thousands making plans.

On January 31, 1979, the Park Service announced in a briefing that publication of the final EIS would be tentatively set for April 1979. This was later confirmed by letter from the Park Service. April, May, June came and went. Public assurances were given that July 1, 1979, deadline would be met or the present system would be continued into the 1980 season.

On August 3, 1979, the final EIS was published.

Aside from the public participation sham under which the EIS was supposedly written, I have several major objections to this EIS.

Mr. Bill Whalen, Director of the National Park Service, on October 25, 1977, said at Estes Park, Colo., "we must work to remove all barriers that keep people out of the parks, for parks must not continue to be exclusive." I agree with Director Whalen that we must open up our national parks to the public and quit being exclusive. But the Colorado River-Grand Canyon EIS does just the opposite.

My chief objection is that the EIS would ban forever the use of motors on the river, and thus preclude the public of the option of going on the river through the canyon on a motorized craft. Approximately 80 percent of the public usage on the river is on motorized craft. The average motorized trip takes 7 days to complete, while most oar trips average 12 to 16 days. The average person with a 2-week vacation will be precluded from taking the trip, because of time constraints and the higher cost of the longer oar trips. As these trips are already expensive, increase in cost for the longer trips would place them financially out of reach of many people.

This discrimination would be further extended by safety factors in which the young and the very old are excluded. A 35-foot, 3-ton motorized raft is safer than a 16- to 20-foot, 400-pound boat

going down the Colorado River in "the greatest white water in North America."

One further point—it looks as though, at first appearances, the Park Service has expanded the season and enlarged the user days. Just the opposite is true. Traveling the Colorado River in early spring or late fall when temperatures are around freezing during the day and below freezing at night is not feasible, and thus the park goes unused. The Park Service takes away the summer user day and puts it in the winter when no one wants to use it. Usage during prime time on the river will, in fact, decrease.

As I have said numerous times before, the Park Service should keep the use of motors, as there is no evidence anywhere that suggests harm to the canyon, the waters, plant, or wildlife. The perceived esthetic views of the Park Service should not be the dictates by which the American people can see their parks, especially the grandest of them all, the Grand Canyon.

I will be introducing legislation Friday to statutorily mandate the continued option for the American public of continued motorized trips on the Colorado River in the Grand Canyon.

Any Member wishing to join me in this legislation, please contact my office.●

THE LIFE AND DEATH OF ELLIOTT PODOLL

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, Elliott Podoll was my friend. He was an outstanding physician, specializing in pediatrics. He practiced in Louisville until 1971 when he joined the faculty of the University of Miami Medical School.

Elliott fought a valiant battle against cancer. He lost the battle on July 1 of this year.

But, before he died, he recorded his thoughts, impressions—and, yes, his fears—on videotape so that future generations of doctors might learn how better to treat those who fall victim to the relentless scourge of cancer.

The following article about Elliott first appeared in the Miami Herald and was reprinted in the Louisville, Ky., Courier-Journal on August 5, 1979.

It is poignant. It is heart-rending. But, it is the stuff of life. And, life was what Elliott Podoll was all about.

In commending this article to my colleagues attention, I also commend it to oncologists and all physicians who deal with cancer patients.

As Elliott said:

I don't want to be derogatory to the medical profession . . . but they need to soften their approach, establish a way of communication, build up a relationship with their patients . . .

Young doctors can be taught respect of the human body, respect of the human mind ahead of medicines (and) respect of mechanical gadgets.

All of us who knew Elliott Podoll will miss him as a person, as a physician. But,

he leaves with us a rich legacy which could—and I hope will—lead medicine to a new and more compassionate method of treating those who have contacted the most dread of diseases.

The article follows:

THE LIFE AND DEATH OF ELLIOTT PODOLL— A PERSONAL ACCOUNT OF DYING

(By Beth Dunlop)

Thousands of Louisville children learned to say "Dr. Podoll" about the same time they learned to say "Mommy" and "Daddy."

Dr. Elliott Podoll, 59, a pediatrician who practiced in Louisville for nearly 25 years, died July 1 in Key Biscayne, Fla., of lymphoma, a cancer that kills about 18,000 Americans a year. He had moved to Miami in 1971 and became associate professor of family medicine and pediatrics at the University of Miami.

Podoll was more than a doctor, as his six-page curriculum vitae shows. He was active in a variety of community projects both in Louisville and in Miami. He was also internationally known.

As a captain in the Army Medical Corps, he was assistant chief of medicine at the 49th General Hospital in Tokyo from 1945 to 1947. In 1976 he was director of the Summit School for Disturbed Adolescents in Jerusalem. He lectured at medical meetings in Venice, London and Jerusalem and was a consultant on family and community medicine in Bogota and Cartagena.

He was a 1939 graduate of the University of Louisville School of Medicine. His interests included hypnosis, psychiatry, psychotherapy, sex education, unwed mothers, mental health, drug addiction and adolescent diabetes. He had been president of the Louisville Children's Hospital staff and the Louisville Pediatric Society and was medical director at the Kentucky School for the Blind for 22 years.

Two and a half years ago, Podoll learned he had cancer. He fought the good fight and during his illness tried to persuade his colleagues to be less clinical, to treat people as people and not just patients. Podoll also found some humor in the process of dying.

He put his thoughts on videotape for the University of Miami Medical School, to be used as a teaching tool. The tapes are not universally popular with physicians. But Podoll's son, Dr. Ronald Podoll of Louisville, said, "The medical community knew him well. Some of his views were different but he was well respected."

The younger Podoll has 13 partners in the practice of emergency medicine at Suburban and Sts. Mary & Elizabeth Hospital. He said his father's example "is hard to live up to." Before his father's death, he visited him in Florida every other week for two months.

The following story originally appeared in The Miami Herald on July 8, a week after Podoll's death.

Elliott Podoll didn't want to be immortalized with bronze plaques on walls in hospitals. His legacy to life is captured on thin strips of mylar videotape.

In a 30-month struggle with cancer, Podoll—pediatrician, teacher, psychiatry student, counselor, husband, father—made videotapes analyzing the debilitation of his body, sharing his most personal thoughts, invading his own privacy to leave behind a teaching tool for generations of future doctors, looking at cancer as both a physician and a human being. He fought a weary battle, persuading his own colleagues to be less clinical and more empathetic as they tried to fend off the fast-multiplying cancer cells.

He was 57 when cancer struck.

It started simply, ironically. The doctor did a self-diagnosis. He thought he had a hernia. He went to a colleague for an operation.

When the anesthesia wore away, the col-

league was there with abrupt and bad news. Podoll had a hernia, yes, but he also had cancer. The doctor told him matter-of-factly, succinctly.

That was 2½ years ago. He had two prolonged chemotherapy treatments, two bouts of radiation therapy. As the cancer spread finally and voraciously, he refused a third treatment of chemotherapy.

Throughout the videotapes—filmed for the University of Miami Medical School where Podoll taught in the department of family medicine—the doctor tells a story of anger and humanity suspended in time.

The first begins in January 1977. It captures Podoll three months into chemotherapy, both bitter and hopeful. Bitter about how medicine is practiced—"We're doing things the wrong way around: we find the disease, treat the disease, treat the person." Hopeful because the process was just beginning—"My personal belief is that illness can be controlled by the individual. If I had a poor attitude, I would start dying today. I'm feeling mentally and emotionally stronger than I ever was before."

The videotapes are informal interviews conducted by Thomas Crowder, a minister who teaches at the medical school. They are for use in classes on treating the terminally ill patient and for seminars for doctors and nurses throughout the community. Podoll made numerous other teaching tapes—most of them dealing with pediatrics, his specialty.

Podoll's first cancer film opens with a description of his self-diagnosis and the discovery of the lymphoma. He talks about his early dealings with his doctors.

His treatment was flatly outlined for him. "The oncologist said, 'You're going to get chemotherapy. We're going to give you the latest things. They're only five months old.' That's it. It wasn't reassuring."

"They separated my body from me as an individual. I felt schizoid. Your body is taken away from you. It belongs to the National Cancer Institute. It's like you're being invaded with a process."

"They gave me three drugs. The oncologist said they're going to make you sick as the devil. Then he took out three large syringes—which really frightened me. I'm a human being as well as a physician."

He wanted to read about the chemicals. He was told that anything in print would be out of date. He wanted to know everything he could about his body, his mind, his emotions.

"The oncologist said there's a 75 to 80 percent chance that I will get a remission. They talk about the quantity of life but not the quality of life. There's a feeling of split—the chemotherapy is working on this invader to my body."

The first night he had weird dreams—that he was choking to death, that he was sking down an endless white mountain never reaching the bottom.

The next day, he went to work. "My immediate thought was, gosh, if 57 is my magic number, then that's it. If I'm going to live, then I want to be effective. I have a place in the world and I want to continue it."

The predominant emotion wasn't fear. "Gee, I'm lucky. Other people don't know they're going to be run over by an auto or murdered in this terrible world we live in. I'm lucky. I have a time span."

He threw himself into that time span—playing tennis, working, becoming a better teacher, a more empathetic doctor.

Once, he had lunch with a friend, who asked him why he was doing so much for other people and less for himself. It depressed him because "my self was out of my hands. It was in the hands of three large syringes—prednisone and these exotic antibiotics they're giving me."

Two months passed. Podoll did a short interview for a Miami television program. He talked more about his feelings, about his own

treatment. His bitterness was more institutionalized, his optimism stronger.

"There was no informed consent," he said. "Just you have this, and this is what we're going to do."

He would have preferred a choice—even though the choice was chemotherapy or nothing.

"The key, the awful key, to medicine is two things: giving the patients the utmost education about the disease, plus giving them options about therapy. This puts the patients in the position where they are part of the treatment."

The camera panned from the interview set to Podoll swimming, to him and his wife, Rosalie, walking at the edge of the ocean. He talked about the new medical possibility of a cure for lymphoma. "I'm looking forward to that. I'm looking forward to a cure."

July 1977. He is making the second teaching film for the department of family medicine—a program for physicians who will work in pediatrics or general medicine. Later, Podoll confided that his teaching tapes were not universally popular with the doctors who saw them. They are too radical, too tough on doctors.

Yet cancer is tough. Cancer reduces the strongest, most analytical, most detached, to sheer humanity. It melds together the victims—who, in search of survival, surrender their bodies to the best of scientific knowledge. Cancer can even separate doctors from their colleagues.

By this time, Podoll has finished his initial, six-month chemotherapy. He has "an empty, hollow feeling." He hated the chemotherapy, hated his loss of control. But it was "sort of a protection—I still had a feeling I was getting treatment."

The distance of six months let him describe his feelings: "I was angry, depressed. Suddenly this magical figure that I thought was healthy, suddenly it went to pieces. My destiny was in those syringes in my veins."

It hurt. His veins ached. He lost hair. He was nauseated. His vision blurred. His skin had a "peculiar odor." His mouth had "a peculiar taste."

"Many times I thought I'd rather leave my life in God's hands. I persisted because I knew this was the only treatment."

But there was a distinct lack of psychological support from the professionals. "People with malignancies look for some hope, with some chance. They're looking for another human being saying, 'Hold on, old fella, we're going to give you some help.' The professionals thought they had to be objective. But objective is knowing there's a human being with feelings. You can't just treat a human being with medication."

"I was not able to communicate. I'd say, 'I'm hurting.' They'd say, 'We expect you to.'"

In 1978 there was a remission. Then the lymphoma recurred. It invaded his lungs, his respiratory tract, his throat. At the end, Podoll sat in a Mount Sinai hospital room, an oxygen tube his last lifeline.

It is June 18, 1979. He is filming the third—and final—teaching videotape.

This one is unedited. It begins with Podoll primping, worrying whether the oxygen tube will look bad.

He is dying. "The issue is," he is saying, "how long you want to stretch out the period when you're dying. The mind is well. Your body is being eaten by termites. You wonder if it would be better if you were in a coma."

The termites are very real to him—and very painful. They are his imagery for the cancer cells. He is using a positive-image method to fight off the pain.

"I'm alert, aware of the outside world. There is a detachment I have. I have a feeling of a hollow body with many termites inside. But they haven't gotten to my brain. Mentally, I'm trying to stamp out the termites. I have a feeling mentally I'm making progress."

He doesn't mind dying. "I'm prepared for death. I'm also prepared to fight death with a positive approach."

The decisions are easy at this point. No more chemotherapy. He has persuaded his doctors not to give him the cardiopulmonary resuscitation should his heart stop. He doesn't want to die with someone thumping on his chest.

"All I want is peace. That may be heroic. But I'm a person, and my body belongs to me. I fight for my ability to make decisions, to be part of my own therapy."

Too often, he says, patients aren't. "I call them victims of the PDR—the Physicians Desk Reference. The patient is always a page in the PDR. The physician can always find something in that book to control the patient."

Podoll chose to take Brompton's Cocktail—a mixture of cocaine, morphine and alcohol—a painkiller mixture often used with terminal cancer patients. The alternative would have left him simply coping with the pain of the now-enveloping cancer.

June 25—eight days after the final videotape and six days before his death—Podoll recorded his thoughts about dying, his feelings of the Brompton's mixture: "With the Brompton's mixture, medical science has found a way to dissect your head from your body. I'm very alert. I feel able to do anything. (But) physically, I walk from here to the john and I'm worn out."

He talked about the humor in dying—a virtually untouched topic, one that most shy away from—and about how people react to the dying patient, a dying friend. It is a blunt, loose, honest tape.

"Once everyone knows the diagnosis and the prognosis, their treatment of you changes. They don't come in to see you. They become uncomfortable. They become solicitous."

A dying patient, he said, loses his privacy. The hospital starts to own the temporal body.

"And yet I have the feeling that if I took off my pants and streaked down the hall, I'm sure the nurse would be severely criticized because she's allowing her patient to expose himself. I'd love to do that. I'd love to run up and down the hall naked, be a streaker. The only reason not to do this is that you lose your creditability."

His friends, he said, didn't know what to expect. They would "come into the room expecting me to look much worse than I do. They say, 'You look good.' There's humor in this, in how people expect someone who's dying to look. They expect you to be in agony. They expect you to be in a position where they can look at you and say 'God, he looks horrible. When you come up quote, unquote, looking good, that upsets them.'"

He told his friends and his physicians that he found humor in the fact that he could no longer sleep in a bed, that he had to get in a bathtub and run warm water to sleep or lie on the floor or in a hammock on the balcony of his Key Biscayne apartment. "You can say it was sad. I say it was humorous. I was preparing for death. As if someone was saying you can't live your life in a 12-hour day, so we have to make you uncomfortable at night. Although I suffered, I enjoyed thinking of ingenious ways to sleep."

June 28. He sat in a lounge chair—the only comfortable position for him—and talked about his message.

"I don't want to be derogatory to the medical profession," he said. "They do as well as they can. But they need to soften their approach, establish a way of communicating, build up a relationship with their patients. I often felt things were out of my control."

Control was very important to him. Keeping that control, that sense of dignity, of humanity, that sense of being a person—

being respected and cared about—would stay with him until the last moments of life.

"Young doctors can be taught respect of the human body, respect of the human mind ahead of medicines, respect of mechanical gadgets."

And then he talked of why he—a person who so safeguarded his privacy, who strove to control even his ultimate decisions—decided to share his emotions, his private thoughts.

"When you die, you leave part of yourself in a way in the feelings you express. I guess that's your big privilege. That's why I made the tapes. That's my way of leaving a piece behind—not just a plaque on a hospital wall. This is my philosophy. And it's a philosophy of life, as well as a philosophy of death."

July 1. Elliott Podoll died in his sleep at 10:30 a.m. His widow, Rosalie, said death came peacefully. He did not suffer excruciating pain. ●

ANOTHER UNKEPT CARTER PROMISE, OH-HUM

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, instead of using space by giving a long preface to the article I will insert, let me simply state that Don Lambro, United Press International reporter, has examined the Jimmy Carter promise of cutting back on the bureaucracy and has found—how best to put this?—certain discrepancies between the Carter promises and the Carter performance.

So what else is new?

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD, "Carter Has Not Fulfilled Pledge To Cut Bureaucracy" as published in Human Events, August 17, 1979:

CARTER HAS NOT FULFILLED PLEDGE TO CUT BUREAUCRACY

(By Donald Lambro)

Despite President Carter's campaign pledge to "cut the bureaucracy down to size" and throw out wasteful programs, few government agencies have actually been abolished.

One of Carter's major campaign promises in 1976 was to consolidate the bureaucracy's 2000-plus federal agencies and programs down to about 200 tightly organized units of government.

While much of this reduction, Carter said, would be achieved through general reorganization, he also vowed that through zero-based budgeting—under which each program must justify its existence—"unnecessary or obsolescent programs" would be abolished.

"The challenge before the nation is to cut the bureaucracy down to size," he said in Columbus, Ohio, on Sept. 9, 1976. If elected, he promised he would "shut down outdated agencies and programs once and for all."

How has the President succeeded two and a half years later?

Despite ambitious plans to reduce the size and cost of the bureaucracy, only a very tiny number of actual agencies have been actually abolished at a very small saving. On the contrary, by virtually every other measurable criteria the government has grown by leaps and bounds.

By this fall yearly spending will have increased by \$70 billion since President Ford left office—up to \$532 billion. Since January 1977 the total civilian payroll has risen by over 34,000 workers to more than 2.8 mil-

lion, excluding 2 million military men and women.

But this is only part of the story. Other growth areas are hidden. The budget does not include about \$9 billion in off-budget agencies. Also excluded from employee rolls are about one million workers in quasi-government agencies and four million contractors, researchers, consultants and local and state employees whose salaries are paid by the government.

As for Carter's campaign pledge to shrink government down to 200 consolidated units, White House officials would rather forget that he made it.

"I don't know where that figure actually came from," reorganization chief Harrison Wellford said in an interview. "Frankly, I wish it had never been used." A White House inventory—the first ever undertaken—found there were 1,846 departments, agencies, boards, commissions, administrations and advisory committees, which alone numbered over 1,000. (Excluded from this count are hundreds of interagency committees spread throughout the government which the White House says would be impossible to tabulate.)

From this master list, the Administration says it has trimmed a total of 760 units of government and added another 348, for a net reduction of 412 committees and agencies.

The cuts, however, are not as substantive as they may appear. This is because 677 of them are carved from the plethora of informal advisory committees which meet only occasionally, rarely involve any permanent staff, and represent little if any cost to a budget that spends \$1.5 billion a day.

Yet even with the reduction of 677 through terminations and mergers, the cost of advisory committees is still up—from \$64.9 million last year to an estimated \$74.1 million this year. This is because both Congress and the White House continue to create new ones each year. In 1978, 204 new panels were added.

Excluding, then, these 677, that leaves 83 actual Cabinet or non-Cabinet agencies which the White House says it has abolished.

Closer examination, however, reveals that most of the 83 were merged into other, larger programs—with their missions and payroll still intact, and often enlarged.

In fact, only about a dozen functioning governmental units or agencies have actually been terminated in the last two years as a result of Carter's efforts, most of them being tiny advisory offices or councils, some with little or no staffing. And in most instances the employees of these agencies remain, taking other government jobs.

For example, one of the agencies the White House "abolished" was the White House Office of Telecommunications Policy (OTP), which was created by President Nixon to research and coordinate communications policies and technology.

In truth, the OTP was transferred to the Commerce Department and merged with its research arm, the Office of Telecommunications. The merged agency, which includes some related programs from HEW, was then renamed the National Telecommunications and Information Administration.

Did the merger result in a net savings? Before consolidation, the two agencies cost less than \$10 million a year. Their cost for this fiscal year is nearly \$12 million.

"It certainly cannot be considered a termination," a Commerce official said. "The program was simply lifted out of the White House and moved over here." Thus, while the White House unit was eliminated on paper, its costs, employees and functions continue to exist.

Similarly, while the Domestic Council, created under President Nixon, is considered abolished by the White House, its functions

and job slots remain alive and well in Carter's now-named Domestic Policy Staff.

Other White House offices abolished by Carter, like the Energy Resources Council, the Federal Property Council and the Economic Opportunity Council were nothing but "shadow agencies," according to one White House official who said "they were pretty much moribund by the time we got to them."

More important, several independent agencies listed on the Administration's abolished list were killed because Congress chose not to extend their authority despite support for them by the Administration.

One was the Renegotiation Board, which died March 31 despite Carter's support, after Congress failed to reauthorize it. The President's fiscal 1980 budget asked for \$7.3 million for the agency, an increase of \$1 million over the previous year.

What happened to the board's 180 employees? Some sought early retirement or got jobs elsewhere, but many went to work for the White House Council on Wage and Price Stability, among other federal agencies.

Other agencies like the Commission on Federal Paperwork and the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration appear on the White House kill list. But both went out of business because Congress enacted "sunset" expiration deadlines for them, not because the White House sought their demise.

This was also the case with the Indian Claims Commission which went out of business last September, not because the Administration sought its termination, but because Congress in 1976 set a deadline for it to cease operations.

The National Center for Productivity and Quality of Working Life, for which Carter provided \$3 million in his fiscal 1979 budget, closed its doors last September 30—again, because Congress had placed a termination date in its authorization law.

Yet the Center hasn't totally disappeared. Two employees continue part of its work at the Commerce Department's National Technical Information Service. And last October Carter created a "National Productivity Board."

More important, however, is the fact that many others the White House places in its "loss" column were just renamed and moved into larger agencies.

The National Fire Prevention and Control Administration was moved from Commerce, renamed the U.S. Fire Administration, and placed in a new agency called the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

FEMA will in fact be the repository for many small agencies, including the Federal Disaster Assistance Administration, the Federal Insurance Administration, the Federal Preparedness Agency and the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency.

The Agriculture Department's 1,000-Employee Economic Research Service, which does marketing reports for big agricultural industries, was merged with the Statistical Reporting Service and renamed the Economic Research and Statistics Service. A spokeswoman at ERS said that no one lost their job as a result of the merger.

Likewise, many of the old energy programs, like the Energy Research and Development Administration and the Federal Power Commission, now called the Federal Energy Regulation Commission, were moved lock, stock and barrel into the new Department of Energy.

Similar transfers of agencies occurred when the Civil Service Commission was abolished and renamed the Office of Personnel Management. The new agency inherited at least seven sub-agencies from the old Commission.

"I don't see too much evidence of programs being knocked out," said Senate Appropriations Committee staffer Tom Van Der Voort.

"Instead of getting rid of old programs, they are starting new ones."

One of the new programs is the Department of Housing and Urban Development's \$5 million "Livable Cities Program" for grants to local governments to support architectural and art programs. The city of Lewiston, Maine, for example, is seeking a grant under this program to finance its annual winter carnival.

In the past two years, at least 68 separate grant programs have been abolished, but in those two years Congress and the Administration put an additional 62 in their place.

Essentially, Carter is applying the same approach to organization that he did as governor of Georgia when he consolidated 300 state offices, boards and commissions into 22 super agencies. This effort, however, resulted in the state payroll going up from 34,322 employees to 42,400 and the state budget rising by 58.5 per cent.

The White House is sensitive about keeping its list of 760 abolished agencies and committees intact, believing it represents the truest picture of what the Administration's reorganization efforts have accomplished.

When asked to provide a distilled list of those agencies that were actually terminated—deleting the advisory committees and any agencies whose functions have been transferred elsewhere—a reorganization task force official said that such a list would be "impossible to compile."

White House reorganization officials speak bluntly about the obstacles they have had to combat in their two-year bureaucracy-cutting exercise.

"The reality is that there is no office so humble or useless that it doesn't have some passionate defender," Wellford said in an interview. "You don't have anyone lobbying for the elimination of unnecessary agencies. You never feel any pressure on that. But there is always someone pushing for one of these limp-along, useless groups."

"The zeal for pruning the bureaucracy in general never matches the resistance against cutting the specific," he continued. "That's just the way it is. This is a bad season for reformers. Interest groups are flourishing. It's very difficult to marshal grass-roots support and opinion on Congress. Look at them: Common Cause, Ralph Nader's Citizens Lobby, the Fortune 500. There's an extraordinary imbalance here. They are all protecting some program or privilege."

That is why, Wellford said, the Administration's focus moved from program termination, which Carter emphasized in the campaign, to one of program consolidation.

"The focus has widened," he said. "The emphasis is on improving efficiency—on consolidation. Having been in office for over two years, we feel this is the emphasis that is the wisest and best approach."

Why the change? "Obviously we are influenced by what the market will bear on the Hill," he said.

Wellford fervently believes there are still many more "programs and agencies we could get rid of," but he also is acutely aware that "the amount of political capital required to eliminate a government agency that has a Congressional subcommittee chairman as its protector, is very, very large."

By that he means that any fight to abolish some obscure program or agency inevitably leads to opposition in Congress, sometimes making permanent enemies of lawmakers whose votes the Administration needs for major legislative battles.

Carter, he explained, is better off conserving his "political capital" for major congressional battles, rather than waste it by alienating lawmakers in an attempt to erase some obscure \$25-million agency.

"It doesn't make sense to alienate them," he added. "Carter came here with high ideals

and came up against a wall of congressional resistance."

Has the President fulfilled his campaign promise to cut back the bureaucracy?

"Within the realm of the political climate and the political realities, I think he has," Wellford said. While conceding that overall "growth is up," the pace of that growth has been slowed.

Nonetheless, like its predecessors, the Administration's chief hurdle to cutting unnecessary programs and agencies remains the same: Congress.

As he did last year, Carter proposed that 80 existing programs or agencies—totaling \$4.5 billion—simply be deleted from the fiscal 1980 budget. They run the gamut from \$3.6 million in Beekeeper indemnities (payments for dead bees) to \$1 billion in unnecessary or low priority public works projects.

White House sources say the list was itself pruned from an original proposal more than twice as long, but was whittled down, according to one White House official, "because it just would have created more enemies on the Hill than we can afford."

The consensus of opinion among congressional Appropriations Committee aides is that relatively few items on the list will be cut in this year's budget process. ●

HANDGUN VIOLENCE CLAIMS 696 LIVES IN JULY

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the unnecessary misuse of handguns resulted in the death of 696 lives during the month of July—the largest number during any month yet this year. The continuing increase in the number of people who needlessly perish each month is a mandate to take strong measures to curb the misuse of these weapons. For the first 7 months of this year, a total of 4,512 media-reported handgun related deaths have been compiled by Handgun Control, Inc.

Legislation has been introduced in the House that will effectively combat this dangerous problem. I urge my colleagues to seriously consider such measures in a concerted effort to save lives, and protect innocent citizens from handgun misuse.

The Handgun Control, Inc., list follows:

ROLL OF HANDGUN DEAD

ALABAMA (14)

Walter Beasley, Salem; Ramsey Randolph, Mobile; Johnny Blackburn, Birmingham; Austen Couch Sr., Huntsville; Bonnie Couch, Huntsville; Alice Howard, Mobile; John Nadeau, Huntsville; Larry Parsons, Birmingham; Cline Phillips, Anniston; Clement Stewart, Mobile; Coines Walker, Tusculumbia; John Whisenant, Ider; Meredith Whisenant, Ider; Sharon Williams, Tuscaloosa.

ARIZONA (7)

Stanley Edberg, Phoenix; Albert Hert, Phoenix; Jennifer Hopkins, Phoenix; Will Peel, Wenden; Sherri Perez, Eloy; Joseph Tomberello, Phoenix; Debbie Vaughn, Phoenix.

ARKANSAS (4)

Carl Adams, Corning; Donald Frederick, Harrison; Leon King, Pine Bluff; Mildred Rogers, Arkadelphia.

CXXV—1474—Part 18

CALIFORNIA (119)

Jamie Aponte, San Bernardino; Ali Badja, Los Angeles; John Barnes, Hollywood; Barbara Bennett, Lenwood; Ted Berman, Soledad; Ronald Bowles, San Diego; Joseph Cabrera, Riverside, Edward Calleros, San Bernardino; Jo Ella Champion, Torrance; Barbara Chase, Azusa; Alfred Clark, Los Angeles; Bruce Coleman, Compton; Larry Columbe, Modesto; Lynn Congoan, Azusa; Brad Conner, Sunnyvale; George Crocker, Marin Co.; Jesus Cruz, Moorpark; Roland De Armond, Los Angeles; Antonio Del Rio, Stockton; Felipe Espino, Watsonville.

Ada Ezes, Yucca Valley; Clarence Ezes, Yucca Valley; Evelyn Fischer, Vallejo; Policapio Flores, Oxnard; Juan Gaitan, Oxnard; Theresa Glass, Monterey; Ernesto Gomez, San Fernando; Michael Gonzales, Fresno; Ramon Gonzales, Modesto; James Graft, Lancaster; Vertis Hallman, San Diego; Helen Henry, San Diego; Segisfredo Herrera, Long Beach; George Hill, Torrance; Willie Hoefke, San Pedro; Robert Hope, San Rafael; Stephen Hopkins, Modesto; Ada Ives, Joshua Tree; Clarence Ives, Joshua Tree; Olin Jenkins, Riverside.

Kieron Kittle, Claremont; Douglas Krump, Central Valley; Carol Kumagal, Apple Valley; Rubin Levrette, San Bernardino; David Lewis, Oroville; Cornelio Llamas-Montes, Fallbrook; Michael Lynn, Fresno; Velma Lyons, Oakland; Manuel Magallanez, Bell Gardens; Juan Martinez, Torrance; Martha Maza, Lennox; Howard McDaniel, Pacifica; Michael Mejia, La Puente; Terrance Meyer, Lincoln; Eddy Montgomery, Hawthorne; Darlene Morford, Palo Alto; James Jorford, Palo Alto; Ronald Morrison, Inglewood; Roy Moulton, Wrightwood; David Myers, Woodland Hills.

Karl Neuenschwander, Buena Park; Phillip Niles, Los Angeles; Alfonso Olivares, Santa Ana; Carl Olson, San Jose; Brian O'Neil, Huntington Beach; Robert Opel, San Francisco; Adolfo Partida, Los Angeles; Javier Pedrosa, El Rio; Antonio Perez, Dixon; Thomas Phillips, San Diego; Janette Pinenal, San Francisco; Suwanna Quadro, Sunnyvale; Louis Ramirez, Torrance; Robert Reynoso, San Fernando; Adam Romero, San Bernardino; Reginald Scoby, Compton; Serena Savino, Indio; Perry Shuck, Roseville; Matilda Simental, Corona; David Simmons, Auburn; Jim YI Simmons, Suisun City.

Otis Simmons, Suisun City; Rubin Solis, La Puente; Denim Suenram, Lake Sun; Ross Swift, Hollywood; John Treadway, Sunnyvale; Robert Vargo, Argus-Courier; Juan Vega, Santa Paula; Guido Viera, Anaheim; Virgil Vizina, San Diego; Anthony Volz, Indio; Heinrich Vorum, Daly City; Ronald Waddel, Hawthorne; Harold Ward, Riverside; Ronald Warner, Oxnard; Robert Weisswasser, Los Angeles; Lynn Whinnery, Fremont; Darryl William, Los Angeles; Billy Williams, Stockton; Joyce Williams, Petaluma; Raymond Wong, San Francisco; Joseph Yarbrough, Whitethorn; Clarence Young, Los Angeles.

Unidentified female, Sanger; unidentified female, Laguna Hills; unidentified male, San Francisco, 7-1; unidentified male, 23, San Bernardino, 7-8; unidentified male, 30, San Bernardino, 7-8; unidentified male, Los Angeles, 7-11; unidentified male, Madera, 7-16; unidentified male, Los Angeles, 7-17; unidentified female, Lenwood; unidentified male, Linda Vista, 7-20; unidentified male, Perris, 7-25; unidentified male, San Bernardino, 7-25; unidentified male, Simi Valley, 7-26; unidentified male, Los Angeles, 7-27; unidentified male, San Bernardino, 7-27; unidentified male, Lytle Creek, 7-27.

COLORADO (14)

James Cotter, Denver; Raymond Cuevas, Vail; Phyllis Elcess; Alvin Ephriam, Denver; Reginald Henry, Boulder; Steven Lambert, Denver; John Lilly, Jefferson Co.; Thomas

MacDonald, Loveland; Kenneth Maughan, Westminster; Stella Patrick, Denver; Oscar Pugh, Pueblo; Oval Silvrants, Denver; Steven Tackett, Lakewood; Mary Westbrook, Denver.

CONNECTICUT (5)

Mattie Hooten, Stamford; Paul Izzo, West Haven; Alonzo Reed, Hartford; Melvin Rulnick, New Britain; Janice Walker, New Britain.

DELAWARE (1)

Anna Watson, Wilmington.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (2)

Alexander Lecount and Loring Topp.

FLORIDA (22)

Solomon Anderson, Key West; Steve Aycock, West Dade; Dorothy Bell, Jacksonville; Willie Clark, Chiefland; Elva Dotson, Pensacola; James Filion Jr., Miami; Fannie Hand, Bainbridge; Freda Kelly, Pensacola; Daniel Laverne, Boynton Beach; Charles McField, Opa-Locka; Robert Nichols, Fort Lauderdale.

Beverly Novak, Miami; Ignacilio Nunez, Hillsborough Co.; Buelah Player, Jacksonville; Paul Salamida, Miami; Edward Singleton, Deerfield Beach; Iris Woolcock, Venice; Thomas Young, Sarasota; unidentified male, Broward; unidentified male, Orlando; unidentified male, Apopka; unidentified male, Miami.

GEORGIA (29)

Gen. Grant Banks, Atlanta; Franklin Batts, Rome; Clarence Beard, Augusta; Dorothy Cooper, Ashburn; Grover Cooper Jr., Ashburn; Willie Cooper, Atlanta; Richard Ewins, Atlanta; Fulton Faniel, Atlanta; Porche Franklin, Atlanta; Madison Gordon, Ludowici; Charles Green, Savannah; Barbara Harris, Perry; Robert Harris, Perry; Charles Landers, Atlanta; Benjamin Langford, Atlanta.

Barbara Lanier, Atlanta; Chancey Lawson, Colquitt County; Elaine Lowery, Villa Rica; Willie Millsap, Atlanta; Julio Rozcorocco, Atlanta; Johnny Ruff, Atlanta; David Sinkfeld, Villa Rica; H. W. Smith, Decatur; Barry Spakowsky, Smyrna; Jobe Thomas, Atlanta; Alan Williams, Stephens County; Unidentified female, Macon; Unidentified male, Atlanta; Unidentified male, Doraville.

HAWAII (1)

Raymond Wolcott, Honolulu.

IDAHO (3)

Gail Bock, Naples; Deborah Rayfield, Lewiston; and Cecil Snapp, Weiser.

ILLINOIS (28)

Freddy Bell, Chicago; Leona Brantley, Chicago; Cheryl Dawkins, Chicago; John Dawkins, Chicago; Cleophus Fisher, Chicago; Boguslaw Grabski, Chicago; Jesus Gutierrez, Chicago; Melvin Horton, Arlington Heights; Alexander Jackson, Chicago; Van Jackson, Chicago; William Jenkins, Peoria; Kit Johnson, Chicago; Donald Lawson, Chicago.

Ronald Lee, Chicago; Michael Matusiak, Chicago; Patrick McAndrew, Chicago; Sylvester Norris, Chicago; Frank Parrilli, Evanston; Herve Ricourt, Chicago; Antonio Rodriguez, Chicago; Angel Roman, Chicago; Esther Sepmeyer, Edwardsville; Emily Thomas, Bolingbrook; Jonathan Thompson, Chicago; Donald Trier, Skokie; Oscar Williams, Chicago; Kathy Young, Chicago; Unidentified female, Harvey.

INDIANA (14)

Ned Brooks, Gary; Robert Brown, Gary; Warren Buel, Michigan City; Luther Collins, Indianapolis; Mae Collins, Indianapolis; Donald Cross, Anderson; Arnell Glass, Jr., Gary; Denise Glass, Gary; Kathy Jones, Indianapolis; Larry Marshall, Indianapolis; James Pounds, Indianapolis; Brett Rodgers, Starke County; Frederick Walker, Gary; George Williams, Indianapolis.

IOWA (4)

Brent Gullion, Des Moines; Robert Joslyn, Cedar Rapids; Tony Millard, Ottumwa; Jeffery Reisinger, Des Moines.

KANSAS (9)

Grant Avery, Peabody; Frank Foley, Lansing; William George, Wichita; Carol Meeker, Kansas City; Tito Mejia, Kansas City; Martha Schultze, Olathe; Amelia Skala, Belleville; Baron Slutter, Pittsburgh; Dorothy Tate, Leavenworth.

KENTUCKY (13)

Wesley Adams, Winchester; Gilbert Allen, Crab Orchard; Jesse Bowling, Confluence; Chester Grimes, Frankfort; Roger Hymer, Stamping Ground; Marsha Ingram, Flemingsburg; Robert Ingram, Flemingsburg; Robert Ingram, 9, Flemingsburg; Sam Jones, Carter County; Billy Martin, Lexington; Herbert Taylor, Jamestown; Neal Turner, Harlan; Marshall Witherspoon, Paducah.

LOUISIANA (24)

Jimmie Allen, Mansfield; John Bonnell, New Orleans; Darrell Brown, Monroe; Baldomero Cuarisha, New Orleans; Walter Dacks, Covington; Ronald Dean, Shreveport; Leonard Doucet, Jennings; Clinton Fuller, New Orleans; Edwin Goodwin, New Orleans; Anthony Holmes, New Orleans; Leon Jones, Port Barre; Vanessa Latson, Shreveport; Jessie Lewis, Shreveport.

Edith Marshall, New Orleans; Emile Maurice, New Orleans; Sandra Miro, New Orleans; James Pinkney, New Orleans; Dorothy Poland, Shreveport; Rosita Savole, New Orleans; Lucita Ward, New Orleans; Thomas Watson, New Orleans; Leslie Webb Jr., Denham Springs; Charles Winn, West Monroe; unidentified male, Lake Charles.

MARYLAND (20)

R. D. Clark, Odenton; Bernard Clemons, Baltimore; Arthur Contee, Baltimore; Robert Dixon Sr., Baltimore; Horace Forney, Baltimore; John Frick, Baltimore; Melvin Glass, Elkton; Harold Jenkins, Baltimore; Henry Jones, Bowie; James Joshua, Baltimore; William Lawrence, Baltimore; Eric Rada, Ridgely; Leo Shapiro, Baltimore; Rully Sims, Baltimore; Harry Spalding, Hillcrest Heights; James Vass, Baltimore; Steven Witherspoon, Baltimore; unidentified male, New Carrollton; unidentified male, Baltimore.

MASSACHUSETTS (5)

Sonny Alicea, Dorchester; Anthony Corlito, Boston; Roy Coull, Gloucester; Joseph Damello, Boston; Faical Mouhaldy, Boston.

MICHIGAN (18)

Diane Benward, Bay City; Elethea Benware, Bay City; Jason Benware, Bay City; Jeffrey Benware, Bay City; Thomas Benware, Bay City; Weldon Benware, Bay City; Verdia Billings, Pontiac; Theresa Coryell, Durand; Lenel Flemming Jr., Flint; Larry Jones, Flint; Robert Ledford, Flint; Pauline Murry, Flint; Theresa Onvell, Durand; Randy Pittitti, Durand; Arthur Quentmeyer, Harrison; unidentified female, Detroit; unidentified male, Detroit; unidentified male, Detroit.

MINNESOTA (3)

Alonzo Bridges, Minneapolis; Victor Mercado, St. Paul; and Heidi White, Beardley.

MISSISSIPPI (4)

David Bailey, Ackerman; Michael Mayer, Biloxi; Teresa Mayer, Biloxi; Alvin Seely, Biloxi.

MISSOURI (15)

Carl Adams, Corning; Jerry Bernat, Houston; Donald Brinkley, St. Louis; Osborne Campbell, Kansas City; Sheldon Collins, Springfield; Reubin Cruise, Kansas City; Kathryn Farnsworth, Kansas; Walter Hagan, St. Louis; Michael Johnson, St. Louis; Thomas Miller, Linn Creek; Charles Polatty, Springfield; Clarence Sampson, St. Louis;

Ralph Sharick, Geene County; Ralph Smith, St. Louis; James Ward, Kansas City.

MONTANA (1)

Caroline Wylie, Columbia Falls.

NEBRASKA (4)

Leroy Dorman, Lincoln; James Goslee, Council Bluffs; Judy Ott, York; Sylvester Windholz, Omaha.

NEW HAMPSHIRE (2)

Joseph Demet, Hanover and Alaric Gustavson, Jefferson County.

NEW JERSEY (4)

Vincent Ferguson, New Brunswick; Cynthia Gold, Newark; Eileen Gold, Newark; Donald Leotta, Bellmawr.

NEW MEXICO (5)

Don Doucette, Albuquerque; Juan Garcia, Albuquerque; Chester Jones, Clovis; Epitacio Lucero, Albuquerque; Marybelle McCoy, Flora Vista.

NEW YORK (25)

Robert Borwn, Harlem; Scott Cantrell, South Salem; Michael Christmas, Roosevelt; Jocelyn Fermin, New York; Jose Fermin, New York; Nancy Gage, Queens; Robert Gage, Queens; Damon Gustavson, Long Island; Deborah Gustavson, Long Island; Lascelle Hines, Bronx; George Holloway, Brooklyn; Warren Lewis, Buffalo.

Eliezer Lopez, Brooklyn; Earl Martin, New York; Mario Pinagas, Queens; Maurice Reid, Brooklyn; Victor Roudakoff, Rockland County; Fernando Santiago, Brooklyn; David Southard; Sally Stroup, Mattydale; Oscar Sussman, New York; Gerald Tillem, Staten Island; Robert Weisswasser, New York; Unidentified person, Salina; Unidentified male, New York.

NORTH CAROLINA (18)

Bobby Atkinson, Raleigh; Luther Davis, Greensboro; George Decher, Fayetteville; Arthur Hayes, Apex; Carolyn Hicks, Winston-Salem; Donald Howard, Kannapolis; Juanita Lamance, Sanford; Bert Lindsey, Jr., Bessemer City.

Robert McCauley, Mebane; Theodore McCray, Dunn; Charles McDonald, Dunn; Bradley Miles, Greensboro; Floyd Nichols, Durham; Pansy Nichols, Durham; April Radford, Mars Hill; Jane Richard, Reidsville; Charles Simpson, Atlantic Beach; Nathan Smith, Kenansville.

OHIO (36)

Frank Bly, Akron; Alfred Braxton, Cleveland; Walter Carter, Cincinnati; Stanley Cetner, Cleveland; Charles Clark, Cleveland; Antonio Conte, Brook Park; Alfred Davis, Columbus; James Davis, Cincinnati; Frank Dillard, Cincinnati; Duane Dixon, Cleveland; Lessie Ellison, Springfield Township; Violet Ellison, Springfield Township.

Richard Flowers, Lorain; John Frye, Rutland; Carl Greer, Columbus; William Guido, Brook Park; Sophie Hartman, Columbus; Clifford Hartwig, Norwalk; Darnell Jeffries, Columbus; James Kennedy, Columbus; James Lewis Jr., Canton; Thomas Liddy, Eastlake; Robert Maidlow, Toledo; Frank Morse, Columbus.

Leonard Ramseur, Cleveland; Jan Reiser, Cleveland; Ralph Schrader, Mimishillen Township; Charles Sedar, Cleveland; Mark Sipcich, Brilliant; Kenneth Smith-Burnett, Columbus; Timothy Talley, Aberdeen; Kenneth Tomaszewski, Lorain; Ronnie Wall, Cleveland; Joseph Wente, Cleveland; Deanna Wolgamott, Tuscarawas Township; Unidentified male, Springdale.

OKLAHOMA (11)

Elmo Gandy, Anadarko; Opal Gandy, Anadarko; Henderson Harris Jr., Oklahoma City; Jerry Husted, Oklahoma City; Dolly Joice, Wagoner; James Leach, Oklahoma City; John Malone, Muskogee; Sandra Malone, Tulsa; Kathryn Stelle, Broken Arrow;

Steven Wisdom, Oklahoma City; Ray York, Oklahoma City.

OREGON (11)

John Arias, Beaverton; Jasper Belle, Portland; Alan Blattman, Portland; Jerald Campion, Portland; Lawrence Ebbs, Dayton; Kym Fearrien, Redmond; Orville, Hakanson, Grants Pass; Donald Ryks, Eugene; Arthur Schroeder, Medford; George Sweitzer, Brookings; John Talbott, Bend.

PENNSYLVANIA (18)

Joel Bockol, Philadelphia; Michael Branch, Philadelphia; Theodore Cintron, Philadelphia; Juan Colon, Philadelphia; Robert Hartz, Philadelphia; Ollie Helem, Overbrook; Johnny Jennings, Philadelphia; Kinford Krauss Sr., Spinnerstory; Mrs. L. Krauss, Spinnerstory; James Lewis, Germantown; Janice Lewis, Germantown; John Pizzo, Philadelphia; Wiley Rogers, Philadelphia; Robert Sheppard, Germantown; Tom Singleton, Philadelphia; David Stanley, Philadelphia; Deborah Watkins, Philadelphia; Hilda Young, Philadelphia.

RHODE ISLAND (1)

John Simpson Jr., Providence.

SOUTH CAROLINA (9)

Ronnie Allen, Sr., Mount Pleasant; Elijah Belin, Sr., Florence; Belin, 1st name not given, Florence; Archie Craft, Columbia; John Gainey, Charleston; Sandra Gainey, Charleston; R. A. Mobley, Florence; Jerry Sieben, Summerville; George Skipper, Myrtle Beach.

SOUTH DAKOTA (1)

Brian Bundy, Rapid City.

TENNESSEE (36)

Phillip Adams, Nashville; Bob Beecham, Nashville; Peggy Beecham, Nashville; Joseph Berry, Nashville; Dana Boone, Memphis; Novella Bowling, Johnson City; Charley Boxley, Memphis; Norvin Brown, Memphis; Leonard Broyles, Memphis; Vance Crawford, Jr., Memphis; James Delones, Huntsville; Janet Durham, Whitehaven; Timothy Durham, Whitehaven; Monroe Frank, Memphis; Florine Gaines, Knoxville; Rachel Gibson, Cedar Grove; Norvell Hightower, Memphis.

Jerry Hord, Kingsport; Larry Jamerson, Athens; Lula Jones, Columbia; Fred Keyes, Jr., Rutherford County; Michael Knalls, Nashville; Robert Lynn, Winchester; Charles Maynard, Sevierville; Patricia Moss, Memphis; Andrew Owens, Memphis; John Purdy, Nashville; Tammy Ragsdale, Knoxville; Elizabeth Richardson, Johnson City; Robert Steele, Columbia; Walter Stewart, Gleason; Lon Tucker, Franklin County; Barbara Utt, Sullivan County; Ella Watson, Gallatin; Terry Watson, Nashville; Joe Wolfe, Rogersville.

TEXAS (102)

Corey Aiello, Richmond; Louise Allen, Houston; Lupe Araiza, Houston; Ed Attaway, Odessa; Pedro Avila, Santa Maria; Jimmy Bacon, San Antonio; Ernest Barrera, Houston; Felix Bermea, Midland; Lester Bernat, Houston; Lela Bradic, Plainview; Robert Brem, Odessa; Edward Burchell, Denton.

Clyde Burns Jr., Abilene; John Butler, Fort Worth; Kathy Carroll, Del Rio; Lonnie Carter, Dallas; Fred Casares, Dallas; Daniel Constanancio, Lubbock; Richard Corona, Houston; Landa Davis, Dallas; James Egger, Houston; Rosendo Elizando, Houston; J. P. England, Midland; Freddy Fletcher, Texas City.

Lindy Fonsera, Houston; Robert Ford, Harris County; L. B. Gamble, Mexia; Margaret Gamble, Mexia; Jesse Gaona, Galveston; Santiago Garcia, Houston; Ubaldo Garcia, Brownsville; Alfredo Garza, San Antonio; Leroy Gloger, Houston; Buck Gordon, Arlington; Allan Graham, San Antonio; Jacquelin Hancock, Woodway.

Martha Hart, San Antonio; Margaret

Hawkins, Hurst; Robert Haynie, Fort Worth; June Hefner, Everman; Robert Hefner, Everman; Maurice Herrera, Fort Worth; Rodolfo Hinojosa, Brownsville; Gerald Hunt, Houston; Adolphus Irabor, Houston; Anthony Jackson, Houston; George Jasso, San Antonio; Jack Kennedy, Dallas; Rebecca Kennedy, Houston; Randall Kingston, Beville.

Jose Lara, Houston; Raymond Lawrence, Lone Star; Robert Leigh, Pecos; Aaron Lewis, Houston; Carl Livingston, Houston; Eddie Martin Jr., Houston; Marion McGee, Beaumont; Marcus McGuinn, Fort Worth; Richard Meadows, San Antonio; Terry Milton, Waco; Manuel Montoya, Giddings; Tommy Morlock, Fort Worth; Joaquin Nevarez, San Antonio.

Merle Newbauer, Wills Point; Norma Newbauer, Wills Point; Larry Padgett, Amarillo; Sandra Palmer, Fort Worth; Humberto Pecina, Houston; Marion Peppers, Dallas; Virginia Philen, Athens; Joel Pomeroy, Dallas; Margaret Pomeroy, Dallas; John Pool, Dallas; Pedro Portillo, Hart; Juanita Powell, Rosharon; Hans-Gerd Promper, Houston.

Enrique Ramirez, San Antonio; Jose Reyes, Baytown; Richard Reynolds, Crosby; Pablo Rios, Jr., Houston; Alejandro Rivera, Galveston; Obie Robinson, Marion County; David Rocha, San Antonio; Olivia Rodriguez, Lubbock; Melvin Roland, Fort Worth; Melvin Savoy, Beaumont; Ernest Simone, Houston; Mary Sproles, Fort Worth; Kevin Swain, Arlington.

Joyce Sybert, Haltom City; Felix Trinidad, Houston; Tran Minh Tung, Houston; Maria Vasquez, San Antonio; Rosendo Villarreal, Houston; Diana Wanstrath, Houston; John Wanstrath, Houston; Kevin Wanstrath, Houston; Elton Williams, Dallas; unidentified male, Houston; unidentified male, Houston; unidentified male, El Paso.

UTAH (2)

Donald Mitchell, Salt Lake City and Louise Valdez, Kearns.

VERMONT (1)

Howard Gould, Montpelier.

VIRGINIA (14)

Howard Allen, Portsmouth; Leroy Booker, Richmond; Shirley Booker, Richmond; Robert Deutsch, Evergreen; Bruce Draper, Evergreen; Rena Franklin, South Boston; Eileen Fulcher, Roanoke; Robert Keating, McLean; Michael Mayo, Richmond; Lucille Net, Annandale; Todd Net, Annandale; Stephen Pli-green, Evergreen; Eunice Sowers, Floyd Joyce Terry, Danville.

WASHINGTON (8)

Michael Braun, Tacoma; Ronald Estabrook, Seattle; Seigfried Harmon, Lakewood; Florence Mansfield, Ronald Nowicki, Tacoma; Ricky Wheeler, Tacoma; Patricia Wilcox, Prosser; Robert Wilson, Sumner.

WISCONSIN (6)

Marjorie Brunn, Fox Lake; Oliver Brunn, Fox Lake; John Denn, Ellsworth; Esteban Ledesman, Milwaukee; John Maertz, Menomonee Falls; Jose Renovato, Milwaukee.

WYOMING (3)

Susan Bradley, Point of Rocks; Martha Hopkins, Cheyenne; and Robert Middaugh, Douglas.

HOMER E. CAPEHART OF INDIANA

HON. DAN QUAYLE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

• Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, one of Indiana's distinguished and outspoken political leaders, former Senator Homer

E. Capehart, passed away on Labor Day. Homer Capehart, a successful businessman, served the people of Indiana with distinction and fairness for three terms in the U.S. Senate from 1944 through 1962.

While I did not have the opportunity of working with Senator Capehart, or knowing him well, he did leave a legacy of accomplishment in the private and public sectors.

During his years in the Senate he left his imprint on business and housing legislation, and he was a staunch advocate of a strong defense and forceful foreign policy. As we view with alarm the growing presence of Soviet military forces in Cuba in 1979, we recall that it was Senator Capehart of Indiana who urged the blockading of Cuba and the forcing out of Soviet missiles and bases 90 miles from our shores in 1962.

Homer Capehart was the son of a tenant farmer whose love for his State and Nation enabled him to succeed as a salesman, advertising agency head, to manufacturing executive and to a lengthy and successful tenure in the U.S. Senate. In 1962 he returned to Indiana and remained active in the Republican Party.

Mr. Speaker, we extend our heartfelt sympathy to the Capehart family—his wife, Irma; his son Earl; and daughter, Patricia Pearson; and his 12 grandchildren. We pray that God will comfort them in their sorrow.●

TWO QUESTIONS ON SALT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

• Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a compelling short article on SALT by Arthur B. Krim appeared in the New York Times for August 21. Mr. Krim, a distinguished lawyer and motion picture executive, is a member of the President's General Advisory Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament. The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 21, 1979]

2 QUESTIONS ON SALT

(By Arthur B. Krim)

To those millions of Americans to whom evaluation of the strategic-arms treaty has become lost in technicalities and conflicting generalities, I suggest that you ask your Senators two basic questions. You will be amazed by the extent to which the answers will cut through to the bottom line, not only for yourself, but also for your Senators as they approach their own moment of truth in making one of the most crucial decisions in our country's life.

1: Which of your objections to the terms of SALT II would be satisfied or alleviated by a repudiation of the treaty?

The fact is that the principal arguments against the treaty would actually in most instances be exacerbated if the treaty were not to be ratified.

As an example, take the argument that the treaty allows the Soviet Union the unfair advantage of the 308 heavy missiles now in place. If there were no treaty, this limit would be lifted; even more, the Soviet Union could then arm each of these missiles with

up to 30 warheads, instead of the limit of 10 provided by the treaty, an overall potential increase of 6,000 warheads or more, which would otherwise be prohibited under SALT II.

Or take the argument that the Soviet Backfire bomber is not counted within the treaty ceiling. If there were no treaty, the Soviet Union could increase the range of the Backfire and its production rate without limits. Instead, in assurances that are integral to the treaty, the Soviet Union has specifically agreed to restrict the capacity of the Backfire to less than intercontinental range and to limit its production to no more than 30 a year.

Or, take the argument that compliance with the terms of the treaty is not adequately verifiable. If there were no treaty, we would be required to rely entirely on our ability to penetrate what is happening in a closed society in order to know what missiles the Russians were testing or deploying. Instead, under the treaty the Soviet Union is required to take affirmative steps to aid us in monitoring these same developments.

Or, take the argument that our Minutemen missiles will be vulnerable in the early 1980's. No one can argue that this is in any way due to, or caused by, the terms of SALT II. However, any steps to counteract this vulnerability are made much simpler by knowledge under SALT II that the threat to be counteracted comes from a limited and known number of Soviet missiles.

You may be surprised to find that your Senator, if he is opposed to the treaty, may not be able to point to a single substantive objection that would be remedied to any extent by a defeat of ratification.

2. What do you propose be done to enhance our security that cannot be done under SALT II?

The fact is that whatever is being credibly proposed to improve our security or the security of our allies involves questions for broad national debate that are not inhibited by SALT II. Should we deploy the MX missile and, if so, how? Should we enlarge our nuclear forces in the European theater?

You may again be surprised to find that our choices on these and the other important issues of security remain the same, SALT II or not. The difference is that under SALT II we can make these choices with greater certainty of the extent of the strategic forces deployed against us.

The argument that SALT II should not be ratified unless and until these choices are made, even though they are unrelated to any SALT II restrictions, in effect says that one-third instead of a majority of our Senators should control our defense decisions.

These two questions recognize that your Senator's decision cannot turn on what an ideal treaty might be but on whether we are better off under the terms of this treaty or by opting for the foreseeable future to go our own way without restraints on either side. If you insist on satisfactory answers, the bottom line becomes clear.●

REDTAPE SYNDROME

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

• Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, one of the major concerns voiced to me during the district work period was the excess amount of Government regulation and high taxes. The following poem, written by my friend Bobbie Broumley, clearly expresses the concern and feelings of

many. I am sure you will find the "Red-tape Syndrome" of interest.

"REDTAPE SYNDROME"

A Crisis of Confidence the President said. But he didn't hit the nail on the head. The folks are just tired of all being bled, And the nation is sorta "seeing all red . . ." The President can see folks begin to relax. When they get out of our pockets and off of our backs . . .

We've so much red tape and such regulations, Enough to choke the entire world of nations; Now, add to all that the rate of inflation; And how Proposition 13 created sensation. . . .

If Washington wants the folks to relax They can get out of our pockets and off of our backs. . . .

Long years ago when folks were discreet, It often was mentioned those who work shall eat;

But with such give-aways and our own tax receipt,

Our Zero Bank Account's complete . . . The Natives are restless but we could learn to relax.

If they'd get out of our pockets and off of our backs. . . .

Every expert has an instant solution, For energy, inflation and horrendous pollution,

It seems there may be an expert's collusion, That could bring about a New Tax Revolution. . . .

I believe, Mr. President the people would relax.

If Washington got out of our pockets and off of our backs. . . .

—Bobbie Russell Broumley, July 25, 1979. ●

FORT SAM HOUSTON, TEXAS ARMY HEALTH SERVICES

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the most prestigious and historical defense installation of our country is Fort Sam Houston. Images and memories of great soldiers who served at Fort Sam are evoked: General John J. "Blackjack" Pershing, Foulois, Eisenhower—just to mention a few.

Here now at this memorable and much desired as a duty post is headquarters for the U.S. Army Health Services Command.

Despite great odds, such as perennial budgetary shortfalls, much needed modern physical facilities (I am continuing my 18-year-old fight to obtain the long overdue modern new hospital building for the Brooke General Hospital), the administrators and personnel have done and are continuing to do an outstanding job.

During the Vietnam war I saw miraculous and heroic performances by Army orthopedic surgeons, who seemed guided by Divine Providence, repair and restore fragmented bodies and spirits.

I wish to share with my colleagues a very fine article about the command which appeared in the San Antonio Light on Sunday, August 5.

[From the San Antonio Light, Aug. 5, 1979]

CARE OF MILLIONS ROUTINE AT HSC

(By Donna Jones)

(It is hard to imagine an organization seeing 48,000 patients, dispensing 81,000

prescriptions or conducting 40,000 dental checkups—all in a single day.

(But that's part of the routine for the Army's Health Services Command, which is headquartered at Fort Sam Houston.)

(Light medical writer Donna Jones examines the worldwide operations of the health service and what it means to San Antonio.)

The U.S. Army Health Services Command at Fort Sam Houston is housed in an innocuous building that belies its power.

Operating with an annual budget that tops \$1 billion, the Army's physician-administrators at Fort Sam direct health services that cover 3 million beneficiaries and more than 3 million square miles.

Six years ago, when the Army was searching for a home for this impressive command, Fort Sam Houston was vying with posts in Washington, D.C., and Denver.

HSC chief of staff Col. R. E. Neimes speculates that San Antonio may have been chosen because since 1946, the city has been home to the Academy of Health Sciences, a clearinghouse for all Army medical personnel. Approximately 40,000 enlisted men and officers pass through the academy, the world's largest military training activity, annually, Neimes said.

And, he added, San Antonio is "a nice place to be."

Besides the Academy of Health Sciences, where students can earn college credits toward associate, bachelor and master degrees, Fort Sam is home to Brooke Army Medical Center and a Regional Dental Activity.

With 10,000 staff members, the HSC employs approximately 76 percent of the military personnel at Fort Sam Houston.

The command also employs 500 civilians from the San Antonio area.

Having a major command at Fort Sam Houston has obvious economic benefits for San Antonio merchants who serve the military population, Neimes said.

But, perhaps more importantly, the HSC enhances San Antonio's scientific community, he added.

The command often hosts scientific meetings, and the military's medical experts take time to share their knowledge with civilian researchers and physicians, he explained.

As a community service, the HSC operates one of the nation's five programs called Military Assistance to Safety and Traffic. This service makes available to civilian authorities military personnel and helicopters to quickly transport traffic accident victims and other medical emergency patients to local hospitals.

But, San Antonio is only a fraction of the HSC's service area. The command provides health care, throughout the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Johnston Islands, Guam, the Pacific Islands and to other government departments, agencies and organizations.

In October, the command will assume responsibility for the Panama Canal health system.

On an average day, HSC facilities see 48,000 clinic patients, fill 81,000 prescriptions and perform 40,000 dental procedures and 25,000 veterinary procedures.

They also offer education programs and conduct research.

The far-reaching HSC, predictably, is not without problems, most of which imitate those faced by medicine in the private sector.

Manpower and escalating costs are two major problems, Neimes said.

"That's not to say that giving us money will solve all the problems," he added.

The military admittedly has problems in attracting and keeping competent physicians, Neimes said.

Relatively low salaries deter some physicians from going the military route.

An emergency room physician in the private sector might earn \$75,000 annually,

while the top salary for an Army physician in the same specialty is \$48,000, Neimes said.

But, Neimes said, "What attracts a physician is job satisfaction."

And, the Army is striving to increase job satisfaction while making only "modest improvements" in salaries.

Part of what makes a job satisfying is working in a modern facility with modern equipment, Neimes said.

Plans for modernization at Fort Sam will add health and dental clinics and expand Brooke Army Medical Center during the next seven years. The improvements are expected to run up a bill approaching \$160 million.

By training physicians' assistants at the academy, administrators seek to assure that physicians will devote their time to the challenging aspects of medicine while assistants take histories and do routine tests.

HSC stays in contact with congressmen and local leaders and keeps them up-to-date on the Army's medical needs and assets, Neimes said.

The Army is improving its health services not only because it wants to attract more physicians, but also because "It's an asset to the nation," Neimes concluded.

THE "MYTHS" OF VIETNAM

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I wish to place into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Columbus Ledger-Enquirer on August 19, 1979, entitled "The 'Myths' of Vietnam." The author, Mr. Millard Grimes, draws some profoundly accurate conclusions regarding our Government's involvement in, and withdrawal from, South Vietnam.

This excellent analysis of the Vietnam situation sets the record straight, and I commend this superb commentary to my colleagues:

THE "MYTHS" OF VIETNAM

(By Millard Grimes)

As the 1970s draw toward an end, several myths from the 1960s have become virtually accepted as truth and dogma, and they are dangerous myths that should not pass into the history books unchallenged.

First, there is the broadly-accepted myth that the U.S. leaders who made the decisions that led to this nation's mission in Vietnam were wrong in both vision and morality.

Secondly, there is the corresponding myth that the protesters, demonstrators and other vociferous critics of U.S. policy in Vietnam were right.

And thirdly there is the oft-repeated claim that the United States "lost" its first war in Vietnam.

The decision by the Kennedy and Johnson administrations to send U.S. military advisors and aid, and then troops and massive air support, to South Vietnam was based on a belief that it was in the best interests of the people of South Vietnam and of the United States for that country to maintain a non-communist, pro-western government, and that military aggression by North Vietnam should be discouraged and turned back.

Further, the policy-makers believed that if North Vietnam's aggression was successful in South Vietnam that it could lead to further aggression in Southeast Asia.

Today, some 16 years after the decisive moves toward implementing the U.S. policy, we know that the leaders at that time were right in their main conclusions:

South Vietnam was threatened by a Communist takeover from North Vietnam. The people of South Vietnam—and of Cambodia and other neighboring nations—were unquestionably better off under non-communist, pro-western regimes; and the best interests of the United States were better served by such regimes.

The leaders were also correct about the much-maligned "domino theory," as North Vietnam now controls not only South Vietnam, but also Cambodia and Laos, and poses a threat to Thailand, Malaysia and other Southeast Asian countries.

On one other important point the U.S. leaders were right and their critics wrong. The war in South Vietnam was not a "civil war." North Vietnam's armies completed the conquest and North Vietnam's government controls South Vietnam today, even to the point of changing the name of its capital city from Saigon to Ho Chi Minh City.

Whatever else might be said of the outcome, it is difficult to argue that the South Vietnamese or the Cambodians are better off than they were under the regimes which the U.S. attempted to bolster and sustain during the 1960s.

And it is on that point that the protesters, demonstrators and critics of U.S. policy in Vietnam stand clearly branded as having been wrong.

They contended that it did not matter what kind of regime governed South Vietnam. Let them ask the "boat people" if it matters.

And then there is the oft-heard lamentation that the U.S. "lost" the Vietnam War.

The clear and indisputable record shows that the U.S. withdrew its troops from Vietnam—mainly because of domestic pressure from the demonstrators and the anti-Vietnam movement—in 1973, leaving the South Vietnamese government in control of most of the land area below the North-South border.

It was nearly two years after U.S. troops left Vietnam that North Vietnam launched an all-out military offensive—in violation of the treaty signed in 1973, which it had violated in lesser ways throughout the previous two years—and this offensive succeeded in routing the South Vietnam army.

The U.S. mission succeeded up to the point when its troops withdrew. The war was lost two years later, in 1975, when the U.S. government declined to again become involved militarily.

South Asia is a place of tragedy today, but it is a tragedy that U.S. policies of the 1960s sought to prevent, and which failed in large measure because of opposition from Americans who were wrong both factually and morally.

The U.S. mission in Vietnam was noble, and its warriors were brave and deserving of honor.

The "losers" were the people of Vietnam, both north and south, and the people of Cambodia, and eventually perhaps the people of Thailand, Malaysia and Burma. ●

NATIONAL CENTER FOR LAW AND THE HANDICAPPED

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, a recent article by Bill Steif, a reporter for the Scripps-Howard News Service, attracted my attention and I wanted to share it with my colleagues. The column addresses the very important and vital work of the National Center for Law and the Handicapped which is housed at

the University of Notre Dame Law School in South Bend, Ind. The center was conceived in 1972 and has received the endorsement of the American Bar Association and the President's Committee on Mental Retardation. As I know my colleagues are aware, few if any other federally funded projects have ever produced or fostered the development of young men and women directly in the field of handicapped law nor are there any other national resources providing help to the legal community, social workers, and parents of retarded and physically handicapped youngsters as is NCLH.

Clearly, the contributions of this organization extend far beyond the boundaries of my own congressional district and in that regard I believe Bill Steif's article focuses important and most needed attention on the center and its struggle for survival:

U.S. AND YOU

(By William Steif)

Three lawyers talk around a table in a small room. They're successful, urbane, middle-class professionals.

They are also loving fathers. Each has a retarded child.

Lawrence A. Kane Jr., of Cincinnati has six children. The last is retarded, a boy now 12. Kane says his son is "almost a rare person."

He's had an impact on the rest of the family. Another son is "establishing a group home for juvenile delinquents." A daughter has graduated from George Peabody College in order to teach "special education," the dreadful American euphemism for teaching disabled children how to cope with their problems.

Dennis E. Haggerty of Philadelphia says, "My boy is 20. He has an IQ of 25, a vocabulary of about 20 words. He has given us purpose; my two elder daughters are in a special education. My 17-year-old daughter understands that not all citizens have 20-20 eyes," this is, they're not all "normal."

David M. Barrett's son was his first-born. The boy is "profoundly retarded, but this has been an enriching experience."

Kane says: "I think many people still have latent fears of disability. . . . But my perception of this new generation, people from 18 to 40, is that it is very humane, sensitive, even compassionate."

Retardation is only one of many handicaps, mental and physical, Americans suffer. There are about 30 million handicapped Americans, a third of them severely handicapped. About 6 million of the handicapped are 3 to 21.

All these children have rights to public education, appropriate to them, under federal law. But often those rights are infringed upon or ignored because parents don't know what's coming to their children, or sometimes because school authorities flout those rights.

Kane, Haggerty and Barrett want to ensure those rights.

They are, respectively, president, vice president and a director of the National Center for Law and the Handicapped, founded in 1972 at South Bend, Ind., and jointly sponsored by the American Bar Association, the Notre Dame law school and the Council for the Retarded of St. Joseph County, Ind.

"The law (for handicapped children) is on the books," says Haggerty. "Now it's a matter of implementing and supporting it."

That's what the center does. It has taken part in more than 100 court cases. It gets over 3,000 inquiries a year. Kane says: "The most important thing is for our consumers—parents of children—to know they can call (219-

288-4751) or write us, and we can direct them to help in their communities."

The center has three fulltime lawyers and eight legal interns, Notre Dame law school students. It publishes a magazine, *Amicus*, that contains reports about law and the handicapped. It disseminates legal briefs and advice.

The center has published a valuable tool if you're the parent of a handicapped child. It is a 20-page booklet, "Parent's Guide to Ensuring the Educational Rights of Children." It's a straight-from-the-shoulder discussion of rights and remedies to which your child is entitled. It tells you what your schools are obligated to do and how to get them to fulfill their responsibilities. The booklet is available for \$3 from the center, 211 West Washington St., Suite 1900, South Bend, Ind. 46601.

Right now the center's having a tough time financially. It's been funded yearly by the Health, Education and Welfare Department's Rehabilitation Services Administration. It asked for \$288,000 in the coming fiscal year, starting Oct. 1. HEW's new Secretary, Patricia Roberts Harris, has given no indication on funding. Without it, says Barrett, "Our momentum will be dissipated. All we want is equal treatment of American citizens."

You can write Mrs. Harris, c/o HEW, 330 Independence Ave., SW., Washington, D.C. 20201, to urge her to continue the center's funding. An equally important person to write is Rep. John Brademas, Ind., the House Democratic whip, who represents South Bend—and was instrumental in starting the center. His address is Room 1236, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Another publication just off the presses can help you if you're seeking aid for children. It's entitled, "National Directory of Children and Youth Services '79," and it is a 540-page compilation of the name, address and phone number of every social service, health, mental health and youth service agency in the nation, broken down by states, counties, cities and towns.

Juvenile courts are included. Officials in charge are named. There's never been anything like this; it took a veteran newsmen, Bill Howard, to organize and do the job. The directory is aimed at professionals, but you don't have to be a pro if you want to spend \$39—reasonable, considering the work entailed—for this. Copies are available c/o CPR Directory Services Co., 1301 20th St., NW., Washington, D.C. 20036. ●

ENERGY LEGISLATION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, September 5, 1979, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ENERGY LEGISLATION

She stopped me on the main street of a small Indiana town and asked her question almost belligerently. I could not have missed her deep frustration over high fuel prices and the uncertainty and confusion of a hundred gloomy news reports. "What," she wanted to know, "have you and the Congress done about the energy crisis?" It is a fair question, one in fact that comes to me virtually every day from Ninth District residents. The short answer is, "Quite a lot, but certainly not enough." Let me explain.

Much has been accomplished in our effort to achieve our energy goals of increased conservation, greater domestic production, and rapid development of alternative sources.

There are many examples of progress. The number of car pools has risen sharply, the automobile industry is turning out more fuel-efficient vehicles, and the push to weatherize homes has been so strong that there has been a shortage of insulation. More natural gas is available, new exploration for oil has increased to record-breaking levels, and the utilities have helped to reduce oil imports by switching from oil back to coal. Finally, energy research is picking up, with solar power coming along faster than anticipated. The ultimate result of these and other trends is important: while the nation's economy grew by 3.9% last year, the demand for energy grew at about half that pace.

Some of the trends I have just mentioned are due to the operation of the free market, and others have been encouraged by legislation. The effect of legislation should not be underestimated. In the past three Congresses more than 100 bills relating to energy have been enacted. Congress has increased assistance to mass transit systems, set a fuel-saving and life-saving 55 mile-per-hour speed limit, required all cars made in 1985 and subsequent years to get 27.5 miles per gallon, mandated standards for greater efficiency in home appliances, demanded that federal agencies work up energy conservation programs and assisted the states in doing the same, decontrolled the price of oil and natural gas, accelerated the development of a variety of alternative sources of energy, created a national strategic petroleum reserve, fostered the exploration of oil shale deposits, raised oil production on federal lands, provided for the careful exploitation of offshore reserves, and brought Alaskan oil into production. The private sector has played a major role in most, if not all, of these initiatives.

This is by no means a complete list, but it should be sufficient to show that neither Congress nor the private sector has been "sitting on its hands" with respect to the energy problem. The initiatives have been taken with my full support. Everyone would agree, however, that much more needs to be done. The following are some initiatives that I am continuing to push:

Gasohol: I support a bill to provide loan guarantees for the construction of facilities to produce alcohol, with priority given to farmers. The bill would also expand research grants and provide tax incentives for the marketing of gasohol.

Synthetic fuel: I support a bill that within ten years could replace two million barrels of oil per day with synthetic fuel. The bill would offer financial incentives for the production of "synfuel" through any acceptable technology, whether coal gasification or liquefaction, extraction of oil from shale or tar sands, or conversion of garbage or crops into alcohol.

Wind energy: I support a bill to step up the development of wind energy. If the bill is passed and wind energy proves to be commercial, it could replace 1.5 million barrels of oil per day by the end of the century. Wind energy looks especially promising in rural areas.

Solar energy: I support a bill to create a solar energy development bank to make long-term, low-interest loans through private lending institutions. Homeowners and businesses would use the loans for the purchase of solar energy equipment. It has been estimated that solar energy could meet 20 percent of our needs by the year 2000.

Conservation: I support a bill to encourage additional energy conservation in residences, transportation, industry, and commerce. Under the bill, the government would seek private capital through the sale of bonds or notes and then use the capital to subsidize low-interest energy conservation loans of all sizes. Private lending institutions would make the loans.

Energy procedures: I support a package of

bills to improve the way the government handles energy matters. One item in the package, a "fast track" bill, would expedite federal decisionmaking on a limited number of key energy projects each year without exempting the projects from current laws. A second item in the package would establish a permanent Energy Committee in the House to speed up action on energy legislation.

No single step can solve the energy problem, but these pending bills would help us reduce our dependence on imported oil, meet our energy needs through conservation, and develop a large number of alternative sources of energy. I will work hard to ensure the passage of as many of the bills as possible. ●

KISSINGER LOOKS AT FUTURE OF NATO

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● **Mr. BROOMFIELD.** Mr. Speaker, since its creation in 1949, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has been of enormous value to both the United States and the European community. That the West has remained free and protected is in no small part attributable to the alliance. Most importantly, NATO has denied the Soviet Union the opportunity to dominate Western Europe and has provided the West with a sense of security and confidence. However, if the military imbalance in Europe is exacerbated, the next several decades will be most challenging to us all.

While attending the recent Brussels conference on the future of NATO as part of a study mission to Europe led by CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, my distinguished colleague and chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I had the pleasure of meeting with Dr. Henry Kissinger, the keynote speaker. I believe that his opening statement at the conference, which examines the alliance's future strategic and conventional concerns, merits the attention of all my colleagues:

NATO—THE NEXT 30 YEARS

(By Henry A. Kissinger)

It is a somewhat strange phenomenon for me to talk to a NATO conference in Brussels in the presence of so many old friends that will consider my words an unnecessary interruption in the thoughts they are getting ready to launch at the conference sessions. When I see my old colleague Ambassador de Staercke sitting here it is almost like the old days—he functions as my conscience as he always has.

I think I speak for all of you if I thank the Foreign Minister for the extraordinary arrangements that have been made to make us all so comfortable.

I thought at the beginning of the conference the most useful thing I could do is to outline the concerns that I have about the future of NATO, the problems that in my estimation require supervision, if we are to retain our vitality and if we are to remain relevant to the challenges before us. Since the early 1960s every new American administration that has come into office promises a new look at Europe, a reappraisal and a reassessment. Each of these efforts has found us more or less confirming what already existed and what had been created in the late 40s and early 50s, with just enough Alliance adaptation to please the endlessly restless

Americans who can never restrain themselves from new attempts at architecture.

Without going into which of these proposals were right or if any of these specific proposals were necessary, I think the fact that in the late 1970s we are operating an Alliance machinery and a force structure under a concept more or less unchanged from the 1950s should indicate that we have been depleting capital. Living off capital may be a pleasant prospect for a substantial period of time, but inevitably a point will be reached where reality dominates. And my proposition to this group is that NATO is reaching a point where the strategic assumptions on which it has been operating, the force structures that it has been generating, and the joint policies it has been developing, will be inadequate for the 80s.

I have said in the United States that if present trends continue, the 80s will be a period of massive crisis for all of us. We have reached this point not through the mistakes of any single administration. Just as the commitment to NATO is a bipartisan American effort, the dilemmas that I would like to put before this group—admittedly in a perhaps exaggerated form—have been growing up over an extended period, partly as the result of American perceptions, partly as a result of European perceptions.

Nor is this to deny that NATO, by all of the standards of traditional alliances, has been an enormous success; to maintain an alliance in peacetime without conflict for a generation is extremely rare in history. And it is inherent in a process in which an alliance has been successful, in which deterrence has operated, that no one will be able to prove why it has operated. Was it because we conducted the correct policy? Was it because the Soviet Union never had any intention to attack us in the first place? Was it because of the policies of strength of some countries or the policies of accommodations of other countries? So, what I say should not be taken as a criticism either of any particular American administration (even granting that there was one period of eight years in the past in which no mistakes were made) nor of any specific policies of European nations but rather as an assessment of where we are today.

Let me first turn to the strategic situation. The dominant fact of the current military situation is that the NATO countries are falling behind in every significant military category with the possible exception of naval forces where the gap in our favor is closing. Never in history has it happened that a nation achieved superiority in all significant weapons' categories without seeking to translate it at some point into some foreign policy benefit. It is, therefore, almost irrelevant to debate whether there exists a Soviet master plan for world domination or whether there is some magic date at which Soviet armies will head in some direction or another. I am willing to grant that there is no particular master plan nor that there is any specific deadline; I do not even consider that the present Soviet leaders are super-adventurous. That is fundamentally irrelevant.

In a world of upheaval and rapid changes, enough opportunities will arise in which the relative capacity and the relative willingness of the two sides to understand their interests and to defend their interests will be the key element. I do not believe the Soviet Union planned Angola or created the conditions for intervention in Ethiopia or necessarily had a deadline for the revolution in Afghanistan. But, all of these events happened to the detriment of general relationships. I would consider it a rash western policy that did not take into account that in the decade ahead we will face simultaneously an unfavorable balance of power, a world in turmoil, a potential economic crisis and a massive energy problem. To conduct business as usual is to entrust one's destiny

to the will of others and to the self restraint of those whose ideology espouses the crucial role of the objective balance of forces.

This is my fundamental theme. And I would now like to discuss this in relation to specific issues.

First, at the risk of repeating myself, let me state once again what I take to be the fundamental change in the strategic situation as far as the United States is concerned and then examine the implications for NATO. When NATO was created, the United States possessed an overwhelming strategic nuclear superiority. That is to say, for a long period of time we were likely to prevail in a nuclear war, certainly if we struck first and for a decade perhaps even if we struck second; we were in a position to wipe out the Soviet strategic forces and to reduce the counterblow to us to an acceptable level. And that situation must have looked more ominous to the Soviet Union even than it looked favorable to us.

If we think back to the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 which all the policymakers of the time were viewing with a consciousness of an approaching Armageddon, one is almost seized with nostalgia for the ease of their decisions. At that time the Soviet Union had about seventy long-range missiles that took ten hours to fuel, which was a longer period of time than it would take our airplanes to get to the Soviet Union from forward bases.

Today, or even in the Middle East crisis of 1973, when we had a superiority of about eight to one in missile warheads, if one compares this with the current and foreseeable situation, we are approaching a point where it is difficult to assign a clear military objective to American strategic forces in a strategic nuclear exchange. In the 1950s and for much of the 1960s NATO was protected by a preponderance in American strategic striking power which was capable of disarming the Soviet Union, and by a vast American superiority in theater nuclear forces, although, as I will discuss, we never had a comprehensive theory for using theater nuclear forces. Since all intelligence services congenitally overestimate the rationality of the decision-making process which they are analyzing, it is probable that the Soviet Union made more sense out of our nuclear deployment in Europe than we were able to make ourselves. In any event, it was numerically superior. And it was in that strategic framework that the allied ground forces on the continent were deployed.

No one disputes any longer that in the 1980s and perhaps even today, but surely in the 1980s—the United States will no longer be in a strategic position to reduce a Soviet counterblow against the United States to tolerable levels. Indeed, one can argue that the United States will not be in a position in which attacking the Soviet strategic forces makes any military sense, because it may represent a marginal expenditure of our own strategic striking force without helping greatly in ensuring the safety of our forces.

Since the middle 1960s the growth of the Soviet strategic force has been massive. It grew from 220 intercontinental ballistic missiles in 1965 to 1600 around 1972-1973. The Soviet submarine-launched missiles grew from negligible numbers to over 900 in the 1970s. And the amazing phenomenon about which historians will ponder is that all of this has happened without the United States attempting to make a significant effort to rectify that state of affairs. One reason was that it was not easy to rectify. But another reason was the growth of a school of thought to which I, myself, contributed, and many around this conference table also contributed, which considered that strategic stability was a military asset and in which the amazing theory developed, i.e., historically amazing, that vulnerability contributed to peace and invulnerability contributed to the risks of war.

Such a theory could develop and be widely accepted only in a country that had never addressed the problem of the balance of power as a historical phenomenon. And, if I may say so, only in a continent that was looking for any excuse to avoid the analogies of the perils it was facing and that was looking for an easy way out. When the administration with which I was connected sought to implement an antiballistic missile program inherited from our predecessors, it became the subject of the most violent attacks from the theory that it was destabilizing, provocative, and an obstacle to arms control; initially the ABM could be sold only by being applied as a protection against the Chinese and not against the Soviet threat. In any case, the ABM was systematically reduced by the Congress in every succeeding session to a point where we wound up with a curious coalition of the Pentagon and the arms controllers, both finally opposed to it: the Pentagon because it no longer made any military sense to put resources into a program that was being systematically deprived of military utility and the arms control community because they saw in the strategic vulnerability of the United States a positive asset. It cannot have occurred often in history that it was considered an advantageous military doctrine to make your own country deliberately vulnerable.

I repeat, I contributed myself to some of the theories and thus I am not casting blame here on any particular group (because everyone here who knows me knows that the acceptance of blame is not the attribute for which I will go down in history). But I would like to stress it as a fundamental fact.

Now we have reached that situation so devoutly worked for by the arms control community: we are indeed vulnerable. Moreover our weapons had been deliberately designed, starting in the 60s, so as to not threaten the weapons of the other side. Under the doctrine of assured destruction, nuclear war became not a military problem but one of engineering. It depended on the theoretical calculations of the amount of economic and industrial damage that one needed to inflict on the other side; it was therefore essentially independent of the forces the other side was creating. It was a general theory that suffered two drawbacks.

One was that the Soviets did not believe it, and the other is that we have not yet bred a race of supermen that can implement it. While we were building assured destruction capabilities, the Soviet Union was building forces for traditional military missions capable of destroying the military forces of the United States. So that in the 1980s we will be in a position where (1) many of our own strategic forces, including all of our land based ICBMs, will be vulnerable and (2) such an insignificant percentage of Soviet strategic forces will be vulnerable as not to represent a meaningful strategic attack option for the United States. Whether that means that the Soviet Union intends to attack the United States or not is certainly not my point. I am making two points. First, that the change in the strategic situation that is produced by our limited vulnerability is more fundamental for the United States than even the total vulnerability would be for the Soviet Union because our strategic doctrine has relied extraordinarily, perhaps exclusively on our superior strategic power. The Soviet Union has never relied on its superior strategic power. It has always depended more on its local and regional superiority. Therefore, even an equivalence in destructive power, even assured destruction for both sides is a revolution in NATO doctrine as we have known it. It is a fact that must be faced.

I have recently urged that the United States build a counterforce capability of its own for two reasons. One, the answer of our NATO friends to the situation that I have

described has invariably been to demand additional reassurances of an undiminished American military commitment. And I have sat around the NATO Council table in Brussels and elsewhere and have uttered the magic words which had a profoundly reassuring effect, and which permitted the Ministers to return home with a rationale for not increasing defense expenditures. And my successors have uttered the same reassurances and yet if my analysis is correct these words cannot be true, and if my analysis is correct we must face the fact that it is absurd to base the strategy of the West on the credibility of the threat of mutual suicide.

One cannot ask a nation to design forces that have no military significance, whose primary purpose is the extermination of civilians and to expect that these factors will not affect a nation's resoluteness in crisis. We live in the paradoxical world that it is precisely the liberal, humane, progressive community that is advocating the most bloodthirsty strategies and insisting that there is nothing to worry about as long as the capacity exists to kill one hundred million people. It is this approach that argues that we should not be concerned about the vulnerability of our missile forces when, after all, we can always launch them on warning of an attack. Any military man at this conference will tell you that launching strategic forces on warning can be accomplished only by delegating the authority to the proverbially "insane Colonel" about whom so many movies have been made. Nobody who knows anything about how our Government operates will believe that it is possible for our President to get the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Director of the CIA to a conference called in the fifteen minutes that may be available to make a decision, much less issue an order that then travels down the line of command in the fifteen minutes.

So the only way you can accomplish that situation is by delegating the authority down to some field commander who must be given the discretion that when he thinks a nuclear war has started, he can retaliate. Is that the world we want to live in? Is that where assured destruction will finally take us? And therefore I would say, which I might not say in office, the European allies should not keep asking us to multiply strategic assurances that we cannot possibly mean or if we do mean, we should not want to execute because if we execute, we risk the destruction of civilization. Our strategic dilemma isn't solved with reassurances. There is no point in complaining about declining American will or criticizing this or that American administration for we are facing an objective crisis and it must be remedied.

The second part of this problem is the imbalance that has grown up in theater nuclear forces. In the fifties and sixties we put several thousand nuclear weapons into Europe. To be sure we had no very precise idea of what to do with them but I am sure the Soviet intelligence figured out some purpose for these forces. And in any event it was a matter for disquiet. Now one reason we did not have a rational analysis for the use of these forces was for the very reason that led to the strategic theory of assured destruction. Let us face it: the intellectually predominant position in the United States was that we had to retain full control of the conduct of nuclear war and we therefore had a vested interest in avoiding any firebreak between tactical nuclear weapon and strategic nuclear weapon. The very reasoning that operated against getting a rational purpose to strategic forces also operated against giving a military role to tactical nuclear forces and this was compounded by the fact that—to be tactless—the secret dream of every European was, of course, to avoid a nuclear war but, secondly, if there had to be a nuclear war, to have it conducted over their

heads by the strategic forces of the United States and the Soviet Union. But be that as it may, the fact is that the strategic imbalance that I have predicted for the 80s will also be accompanied by a theater imbalance in the 80s. How is it possible to survive with these imbalances in the face of the already demonstrated inferiority in conventional forces?

If there is no theater nuclear establishment on the continent of Europe we are writing the script for selective blackmail in which our allies will be threatened, and we will be forced into a decision where we can respond only with a strategy that has no military purpose, but only a population destruction purpose.

I ask any of you around this conference table if you were Secretary of State or Security Adviser what would you recommend to the President of the United States to do in such circumstances. How would he improve his relative military position? Of course he could threaten a full-scale strategic response, but is it a realistic course? It is senseless to say that dilemma shows that Americans are weak and irresolute. This is not the problem of any particular administration, but it is a problem of a doctrine that has developed. Therefore, I believe that it is urgently necessary either that the Soviets be deprived of their counterforce capability in strategic forces or that a U.S. counterforce capability in strategic forces will be rapidly built; it is also necessary that either the Soviet nuclear threat in theater nuclear forces against Europe be eliminated (which I do not see is possible) or an immediate effort be made to build up theater nuclear forces. Just as I believe it is necessary that we develop a military purpose for our strategic forces and move away from the senseless and demoralizing strategy of massive civilian extermination for our strategic forces, so it is imperative that we finally try to develop some credible military purposes for the tactical and theater nuclear forces, for the theater nuclear forces that we are building.

And third, it is time that we decide what role exactly we want for our ground forces on the continent. These forces were deployed in the 1950s when American strategic superiority was so great that we could defend Europe by the threat of general nuclear war. And they were deployed in Europe as I have often said as a means of ensuring the automaticity of our response if our forces were in Europe as hostage and everybody had a vested interest not to make the forces too large; so we wound up with a paradox that they were much too large for what was needed in the 80s. I tried for the years that I was in office to get some assessment of just what was meant by the ninety-day stockpile that we were supposed to have, and what the minimum critical categories were. I know that my friend whom I admire enormously, General Haig, has done enormous work in improving the situation; nevertheless I would be amazed if even he would believe that we can now say that our ground forces by themselves can offer a sustained defense without massive, rapid improvements.

If the Chairman will permit, I will move to a few political considerations.

Everything that I have said about the military situation would be difficult enough to remedy, but the situation is compounded by theories to which, again, I myself have no doubt contributed. In 1968, at Reykjavik, NATO developed the theory, which I believe is totally wrong, that the Alliance is as much an instrument of detente as it is of defense. I think that that is simply not correct. NATO is not equipped to be an instrument of detente; for example, every time we attempted to designate the General Secretary of NATO as one of the negotiating partners with the Warsaw Pact it was rejected. But this is a

minor problem and detente is important. It is important because as the United States learned during Vietnam in a democracy you cannot sustain the risk of war unless your public is convinced that you are committed to peace. Detente is important because we cannot hold the Alliance together unless our Allies are convinced that we are not seeking confrontation for its own sake. Detente is important because I cannot accept the proposition that it is the democracies that must concede the peace issue to their opponents and detente is important so that if a confrontation proves unavoidable we will have elaborated the reasons in a manner that permits us to sustain a confrontation.

So I have always been restless with those who define the issue as "detente" or "no detente". All Western governments must demonstrate and must conduct a serious effort to relax tensions and to negotiate outstanding differences. But there is something deeper involved in the West. There is in the West a tendency to treat detente quite theatrically; that is to say, not as a balancing of national interests and negotiations on the basis of strategic realities but rather as an exercise in strenuous goodwill in which one removes by understanding the suspiciousness of a nation that otherwise would have no motive to attack. This tendency to treat detente as an exercise in psychotherapy, or as an attempt in good personal relations, or as an effort in which individual leaders try to gain domestic support by proving that they have a special way in Moscow—this is disastrous for the West. And it is the corollary to the assured destruction theory in the sense that it always provides an alibi for not doing what must be done.

Against all evidence we were told that ABM would ruin the chances of arms control. The fact was that Kosygin in 1967 told President Johnson that the idea of not engaging in defense was one of the most ridiculous propositions that he had ever heard. By 1970, when we had an ABM program, however inadequate, it was the only subject the Soviet Union was willing to discuss with us in SALT. When we gave up the B-1 we asked the Soviets to make a reciprocal gesture. We have yet to see it. When we gave up the neutron weapon, we were told that this position was correlation to the deployment of our SS-20. (If so it was an inverse correlation to the SS-20.) And now we are told that of course we are all for theater nuclear forces. But first let us have another effort at negotiation. I saw a report about a distinguished American Senator returning from Moscow the other day who said: "It is virtually certain that cruise missiles will be deployed and that NATO will undertake a build-up of its own unless negotiations to a new Treaty are begun soon." If this is our position, all the Soviets have to do is to begin a negotiation to keep us from doing what they are already doing, negotiation or no negotiation.

Such a version of detente leads to unilateral disarmament for the West. I favor negotiation on theater nuclear forces, but the talks will accelerate the more rapidly as we build such theater nuclear forces. Then we can consider some numerical balance or some deployment pattern, but we cannot defer the strategic decisions we must make for the sake of initiating a negotiation. We must have a detente, but the detente must be on a broad front in the sense that all of the NATO nations must pursue comparable policies. The illusion that some countries can achieve a preferential position with the USSR is theoretically correct, but it is the best means of dividing the Alliance. The illusion that some subjects can be separated for individual treatment of detente, while conflict goes on in all other areas, that turns detente into a safety valve for aggression.

My fundamental point is that we need a credible strategy; we need an agreed strategy, and we need to build urgently the required

forces. We cannot wait two or three more years. We cannot conduct a foreign policy, even though each of our political systems encourage a policy in which we ease the domestic positions of the individual countries, by pretending that single forays to Moscow can solve our problems.

Unfortunately, the time frame of the evolution of programs that I have described is longer than the electoral period of most of our leaders. Therefore our leaders in all of our countries have an enormous temptation to celebrate the very successes that lead to a differential detente either as to subject or as to region. How is it possible that the states that have 70% of the world's gross national product will not conduct a common energy policy. This is not just because it has become a shibboleth that we must not have a confrontation.

When have nations been confronted by a massive decline of their economies without being willing to confront those who are contributing significantly to the decline. And after all it takes two to make a confrontation.

How is it possible that in the Middle East, two totally conflicting theories on how to proceed are being carried out simultaneously? How can it be that both Egypt and the PLO must simultaneously be encouraged, sometimes I confess, by our own government? But fundamentally the Europeans are playing one card and we playing another, so that both the radical and the moderate elements are being strengthened simultaneously. One of us has got to be wrong and it is just an evasion to pretend that we work one side of the street and the Europeans work another side of the street because what is really involved is an attempt to gain special advantages in a situation in which the market conditions do not permit special advantages but where once it is accepted that oil is a political weapon, the moderates have no excuse for not using it as a political weapon.

I'm not trying to suggest what the correct answer is, but I am saying that the nations represented around this table ought to ask themselves whether the two years of special advantages that either of them might gain is worth the ten years' disaster that could easily befall them.

I know we have many alibis. We have the alibi that none of the things I said are inevitable because there is China. And we have the alibi that after all the Soviets have never stayed anywhere and they're in deep trouble themselves. And we have the alibi that we can make such great progress in the Third World that all of this is irrelevant. In my view the Chinese have survived for 3,000 years by being the most unsentimental practitioners of the balance of power, the most sophisticated and the ones free of illusion. China will be an alibi for us only if we do what is necessary. China will not be on the barricades that we refuse to man as the victim of the forces which we have unleashed; so certainly we can have cooperation with China only if we create a balance of power.

Now the theory that the Soviets can never stay where they have been is amazingly widely held and supported by exactly one example, Egypt. I don't count Somalia-Ethiopia because I consider Somalia as a voluntary Soviet switch from one country to a larger country. And in Egypt the fact of the matter is that the balance of power was in favor of those that we supported and those who learned in three wars, of which two approached a U.S.-Soviet confrontation, that they could not achieve their aims by Soviet military arms. And only after that demonstration was there an Egyptian switch so we are right back to our original problem.

And the final nostalgia—that for the noble savage—the Third World. That we're going to sweep them over to our side; I have to confess I cannot give this an operational

definition, or even what it actually means. As for the Third World nations, now meeting in Cuba, when I was in office I never read their resolutions, I regret to tell you which is just as well because I might have said something rather nasty. But I would think it is statistically impossible that over the period that these Third World nations have been meeting, the United States has never once done anything right despite the statistical improbability of that fact. Even by accident we're bound to do something right. I defy anybody to read through these documents to find one phrase on even the most minor thing that the United States has ever done. What are the prospects of progress in a world in which the Cubans can host the non-aligned conference.

It seems to me a nostalgia, not a policy; to appeal to radical elements in the Third World to change their operational politics; they can not because of the radical elements required for its bargaining position, a position between us and the Soviets and because its ideology is hostile to us and therefore, paradoxically, the more we approach them the more they are likely to pull away from us.

I'm not saying we should not deal with the radical elements of the Third World or that we should not do the best we can in the Third World. All I'm saying is the Third World is not our ally, it is not our escape route, we may not lose there but we are not likely to win there by repeating their slogans. Now what am I saying? This is not intended to be a depressing account of difficulties. It is not to say that we have no favorable prospects. It is simply to point out that problems neglected are crises invited.

In the thirtieth year of NATO we have come far and have achieved our principal purpose. If we do not address ourselves immediately to at least some of the problems I have mentioned we will face the potentialities of debacles. And the weird aspect of it is that there is absolutely no necessity for it. The weird aspect is that the nations assembled in this room have three times the gross national product of the Soviet Union and four times the population. The Soviet Union has leadership problems, social problems, minority problems, all they have in their favor is the ability to accumulate military powers and perhaps that only for a transitory period.

So if one looks ahead for ten years and if we do what is necessary, all the odds are in our favor. The challenges I have put before this group do not indicate that we are bound to be in difficulties but only that we can defeat ourselves and by contrast, one can say we have an extraordinary opportunity to rally our people, to define new positive programs even for negotiations with the East if we do what is necessary. Or to put it another way, our adversaries are really not in control of their own future. Their system and their conditions in many ways make them victims of their past. We around this table are in the extraordinary position that we can decide a positive future for ourselves if we are willing to make the effort.

We are in the position to say that the kind of world in which we want to live is largely up to us.

Thank you very much. ●

UNITED STATES AID TO THE PHILIPPINES

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, as we discuss the foreign assistance appropri-

ations bill this afternoon, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the amount of money being requested by the Marcos regime to permit the United States to continue using its Philippine military bases—\$500 million.

I would like to share with my colleagues a statement signed by many well known Americans opposed to this commitment of U.S. tax dollars.

UNITED STATES AID TO THE PHILIPPINES

SHOULD WE PAY \$500 MILLION FOR USELESS MILITARY BASES IN THE PHILIPPINES?

In early January, the U.S. and Philippine Governments concluded negotiations on U.S. military bases in the Philippines. President Carter pledged to the repressive Marcos regime his "best efforts" to secure congressional approval of \$500 million in security assistance over the next five years. Yearly operating expenses total \$200 million more. All this for bases experts dismiss as nonessential.

ARE PHILIPPINE BASES VITAL TO OUR NATIONAL SECURITY?

The Carter administration consistently opposes human rights inspired cuts in aid to the Marcos regime claiming that: "Continued security assistance to the Philippines is a critical factor in assuring continued U.S. access to the important facilities at Clark Air Base and the Naval base at Subic Bay." Experts, however, dispute the alleged importance of the bases:

"U.S. bases in the Philippines are not essential to the national defense of the United States." Rear Admiral Gene R. LaRocque, U.S. Navy (Ret.)

"The bases are at best of limited utility . . . the effort and cost associated with maintaining the bases are not necessarily commensurate with their potential military benefits." Francis T. Underhill, former political counselor U.S. Embassy, Philippines; ex-Ambassador to Malaysia.

"Southeast Asia is not in fact of much importance to American security and nothing vital to the United States is dependent on the outcome of political struggles within any country there. Nor is any major American interest served by maintaining bases in or defense pacts with any of them." George McT. Kahin, Professor of International Studies, Cornell University.

THE DOMESTIC CONSEQUENCES: SOCIAL PROGRAM CUTBACKS

At a time of high unemployment and proposals of drastic cutbacks in social programs, lavishing huge sums of money on a dictator for military bases of doubtful utility is tragically immoral and the height of fiscal irresponsibility. Could we not better spend \$500 million for basic human needs—like jobs, housing, education, health care, and care for the elderly and disabled?

. . . . AND RUNAWAY SHOPS

The American taxpayer should not subsidize a dictatorship that exacerbates the runaway shops problems by luring foreign corporations with strike bans and union-busting (resulting in a \$1.50 per day minimum wage), and special tax breaks detrimental to the average Filipino.

MUST WE ESCALATE AID TO A DICTATOR?

International organizations, including Amnesty International, have extensively documented torture and repression in the Philippines. Even the State Department concurs. Marcos' atrocious human rights record has so moved the Congress that for the past two years it has voted to reduce military aid to the Philippines. In the face of such Congressional disapproval, Pres. Carter has over-stated our interests in the Philippines—justifying increased support to an old customer.

MARCOS' OPPOSITION DEMANDS DISMANTLING OF THE BASES

With unprecedented unanimity, a broad coalition of the democratic opposition in the Philippines recently demanded the dismantling of the bases (see accompanying statement). But we have unwisely chosen to align ourselves once again with a shaky, unpopular regime. Can we not learn from our past mistakes and at this time heed the aspirations of the nationalist opposition for genuine sovereignty?

THE BASES: SPRINGBOARDS FOR INTERVENTION

Perhaps worst of all, the bases could serve to entangle us in future interventionist wars. They have been proposed for use in Korea, the Middle East and Africa. Our close ties to Marcos could also involve our 13,000 troops stationed there in his territorial disputes with neighboring countries, or directly involve us in defense of his regime from the widespread rural and urban unrest that has developed in response to his failure to effectively address the social and economic ills of his country.

AN APPEAL TO PRESIDENT CARTER AND THE U.S. CONGRESS

To reduce wasteful military spending and release funds that could meet human needs; to abide by our concern for human rights; to avoid another senseless interventionist war; and out of respect for genuine Philippine sovereignty: We urge the Congress and President Carter to immediately begin the removal of U.S. military bases from the Philippines, and to refrain from appropriating any of our tax monies to the Marcos dictatorship.

SIGNATORIES FOR STATEMENT "NO TAX DOLLARS"

- Eqbal Ahmad, Institute for Policy Studies.*
- Hugh Aitken, Wm. Paterson College.*
- Dr. William G. Alberts, Minister, The Community Church of Boston.*
- Harald Bakken, University of Lowell.*
- Marjorie Bakken, Wheelock College.*
- Richard Barnet, Institute for Policy Studies.*
- Helen M. Bearsley, Women Int'l. League for Peace & Freedom.*
- Norma Becker, Chairwoman, War Resisters League.
- Piers Beirne, Asst. Professor of Sociology, University of Connecticut.
- Jacqueline de Sleyes Bernard.
- Daniel Berrigan, Jesuit Order.*
- Philip Berrigan, Jonah House.*
- Betsy Beyler.
- James Bethune.
- Karl Bissinger, War Resisters League.
- Ann Blyberg, U.S. Coalition for Development Action.*
- Louise Bruyn, Mobilization for Survival.*
- Kenneth Neill Cameron.
- Charles Cell, University of Wisconsin.*
- Prof. Norman Chance, Dept. of Anthropology, University of Conn.
- Frank Shaffer Corona, D.C. Board of Education.*
- David Cortwright.
- Margery W. Davies.
- Chandler Davis, University of Toronto.
- Shelton H. Davis, Director, Anthropology Resource Center.
- Richard L. Deats, Fellowship of Reconciliation.*
- Ralph Digia, War Resisters League.
- Peter Dreier, Asst. Professor of Sociology, Tufts University.
- Joanna Fabris, West Main Books.
- Fr. Carl Feil, U.S. Catholic Mission Council.*
- Prof. Phillip S. Foner, Lincoln University, Pa.*
- Ann Froines, University of Massachusetts.*
- Joseph Carl Gerson, New England American Friends Service Committee.*
- Harvey Goldberg, Dept. of History, University of Wisconsin.*

*For identification only.

David Goldway, Science and Society.
Paul R. Gregory, United Church Board for World Ministries.*

Dr. George Gregoriou, Dept. of Political Science, William College, N.J.*

Rev. Hope Douglas Harle, Baltimore Clergy and Laity Concerned.

Burton Hatlen, Dept. of English, University of Maine.*

W. James Halfaker, Wash.-N. Idaho Conference, United Church of Christ.*

Travis Hedrick, Middletown College.*

Rev. Eugene A. Hessel, Minister, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.*

Saddie Hughley, V.P., WILPF, Durham-Chapel Hill.

Rita J. Immerman, Asst. Professor, Wm. Paterson College.*

Robert Jay, Brown University.*

George Mct. Kahin, Aaron L. Binencorb Professor of International Studies, Cornell University.

Rev. A. D. Kirkpatrick, Black Theology Project of America.

Prof. Len Krimerman, Federation for Economic Democracy—Conn. Chapter.*

Stanley Kyriatides, Professor of Political Science, Wm. Paterson College.

Frances Moore Lappe, Institute for Food and Development Policy.*

Prof. Bruce D. Larkin, University of California, Santa Cruz.*

Jane Leiper, Associate Director, Washington Office, National Council of Churches.*

Ed Luidens, Director, East Asia & Pacific Ocean, Division of Overseas Ministry, National Council of Churches.*

S. E. Lurla.

Florence H. Luscomb.

Arthur MacEwan, Dept. of Economics, University of Massachusetts.*

Dr. Evelyn Mattern, Director, Peace & Justice Center, Catholic Diocese Raleigh, North Carolina.*

Fr. Jerome McKenna, Director, Social Concerns Office, Passionist Fathers Church Coalition for Human Rights in the Philippines.

David McRenolds, War Resisters League.

Belinda Adriano McAnn, Natl. Board, Women's International League for Peace & Freedom.*

Rev. Joyce L. Manson, Human Rights for Asia.*

Rev. Thomas J. Marti, Coordinator, Justice & Peace Office, Maryknoll Fathers.*

Michael Moffit, Institute for Policy Studies.*

Eugene Moore, Unity on the Left, Middletown, Ct.

Phillip Morrison, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.*

Rev. H. C. Mulholland, Pastor, Mother of Mercy Church, NC.

Sis. Annette Mulry, Office of Social Concern, Maryknoll Sisters.*

Steve Nelson.

Kenneth J. Neubeck, Asso. Professor of Sociology, University of Connecticut.

Jean H. Nicholson.

Weldon Nisly, Coordinator, Discipleship Workshops.*

Lila Garner Noble, San Jose State University.

Richard Ohrmann, Wesleyan University.

Susan Gushee O'Malley, City University of New York.

Norman G. Owen, Dept. of History, University of Michigan.

Joseph V. Owens, Unity on the Left.

Sidney Peck, Clark University.

Penelope M. Poor, United Methodist Clergy.*

Joan Press, WILPF.*

Rev. Tom Peyton, MM, N.F.P.C. Justice and Peace Office, Chicago.

Jovelino Ramos, Brazilian Committee for Human Rights.

Bill Ramsey, American Friends Service Committee, SE.*

Earl Ravenal, Institute for Policy Studies.*

Howard A. Reed, Prof. of History, University of Connecticut.

Edwin O. Reischauer, Harvard University.

Terence Ripmaster, Asso. Professor, Wm. Paterson College, NJ.

Jack L. Roach, University of Connecticut.

Bruce D. Rubenstein.

John Russell, Local 525 Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union, NC.*

Dr. Stuart A. Schlegel, Chairman, Anthropology, University of California, Santa Cruz.

D. Boone Schirmer, National Coordinator, Friends of the Filipino People.

Harry M. Scoble, Human Rights Internet.*

Stephen R. Shalom, Wm. Paterson College.

Prof. Carole Sheffield, Wm. Paterson College.

Josephine Simon.

Mitch Snyder, Community for Creative Non-Violence.*

Mark Solomon, Professor of History, Simmons College, Boston.

Prof. Robert B. Stauffer, University of Hawaii.

Burton Stern, Dept. of History, University of Hawaii.

Dirk J. Struik, MIT Emeritus Professor.

Paul M. Sweezy, Editor, Monthly Review.*

May Alice Theller, National Lawyers Guild.*

Leonard Vogt, Wm. Paterson College.

Jean Linde Wagner, WILPF, North Carolina.*

George Wald, Nobel Laureate, Physiology, Medicine, 1967.

Peter Weiss, Center for Constitutional Rights.*

Donald Wesling, University of California, San Diego.

Rev. Chester L. Wickwire, Chaplain, Johns Hopkins University.

Rev. Paul Wilson, Intl. Human Rights Program, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ); Chairman, Church Coalition For Human Rights in the Philippines.

Laurie S. Wiseberg, Human Rights Internet.*

Prof. Howard Zinn, Boston University. ●

MCPL NUCLEAR ALERT SERIES: V

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, despite all the negotiations and all the debate, the dangers of nuclear proliferation are growing, not lessening.

As one of the Members of Congress for Peace Through Law, and as one who visited Pakistan last month to witness the latest country to be discovered to be nearing atomic capability, I question whether any of our present initiatives for peace—ranging from SALT to bilateral negotiations or talks with other countries—will lead us away from the nuclear threat we now face.

The Pakistanis say they fear India's nuclear power. India, in turn, fears that of China. China fears the Soviets. And the Soviets, of course, fear us.

Obviously the danger of Pakistan developing a bomb reaches far beyond South Asia. Obviously, also, we cannot be part of the solution if we do not recognize that we are part of the problem.

I submit that our present policies—those which we have been following for the past 35 years—will never succeed in reducing the threat of nuclear prolif-

eration. Neither will bilateral efforts made on a country-by-country basis. Rather, we must recognize that we, as the perpetrators of nuclear power, have little credibility as peace-seekers when we exclude ourselves from the limitations we seek to impose on others. If we are sincere about reducing the dangers, we end up, finally, with only one serious option: That is to renounce the use of nuclear weapons. And clearly, it is the superpowers who must lead the way: only then will the Pakistanis, the Israelis, the South Africans, or the numerous other potential atomic powers, ever be convinced by the legitimacy, equity and security of our arguments.

During the recent recess, Don Oberdorfer of the Washington Post wrote an excellent article which traces the legal and political loopholes which allowed Pakistan to acquire the components and technology necessary to make a bomb; it discusses Pakistan's fears and decision to go ahead with production; and it discusses the lack of power, and the resultant feeling of frustration, of the "nuclear club," including the United States, Britain, France and China, to stop Pakistan's "march toward the bomb."

The article, from the August 27 edition of the Washington Post, is an excellent summary of events outrunning diplomacy. I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD:

PAKISTAN: THE QUEST FOR ATOMIC BOMB
PROBLEM DISCUSSED BY WEST, MOSCOW, PEKING
(By Don Oberdorfer)

Behind an eight-foot-high stone wall near the sleepy town of Kahuta, 25 miles from Pakistan's capital of Islamabad, a clock is ticking for mankind.

Within three to five years by official United States estimate, and sooner in the reckoning of some, the heavily guarded industrial plant under construction there will produce enough highly enriched uranium for Pakistan to explode an atomic bomb.

A mushroom cloud rising from a test site in that undeveloped and unstable nation would have powerful repercussions on the world of the 1980s. It would be nearly certain to bring about a nuclear arms race between Pakistan and neighboring India and would pose a constant threat that, for the first time since Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945, nuclear weapons actually would be exploded to kill.

A Pakistani nuclear bomb also would be a grave setback to the international effort to stop or slow down the spread of atomic weapons. In the view of several experts, it would be an important milestone on the way to a world of "the nuclear armed crowd," where a long list of nations and possibly even subnational terrorist groups could threaten their enemies and everyone else with nuclear weapons.

In view of the momentous consequences, it is not surprising that the United States and several other governments recently have placed Pakistan high on their agenda of problems. President Carter and Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev inconclusively discussed Pakistan's nuclear activity at last June's summit meeting, and Carter has initiated secret correspondence on the question with the leaders of Britain, France, West Germany and Japan, among others. Washington also has taken up the matter at high levels with Peking.

In April, the United States announced the termination of economic and military aid to Pakistan because of its nuclear weap-

*For identification only.

ons program, as required by a U.S. antiproliferation law, and the United States, as well as other nations, has expressed concern in private diplomatic talks with Pakistani leaders. So far the action and talk have been to no avail.

Pakistan continues to deny publicly that it is seeking atomic bomb capability. Privately the Pakistani diplomatic response reportedly ranges from flat denial to "none of your business" to tacit acknowledgment of the uranium enrichment program, together with statements that its importance is exaggerated.

Inside the U.S. government, a task force of diplomatic, energy, intelligence and military officials was quietly formed the third week in June to devise a clearer strategy for dealing with the issue. Headed by Ambassador Gerard C. Smith, the top U.S. antiproliferation official, the "Gerry Smith South Asian study group" is expected to produce a set of policy alternatives for high-level consideration next month.

Few promising avenues have been discovered, to date. The more officials have learned about the physical and political aspects of the problem, the greater is their pessimism about halting Pakistan's march toward the bomb. Among the underlying reasons for the outlook, often summed up as "grim," are:

First, it is the judgment of U.S. technical experts that Pakistan has gone too far to be headed off by the denial of sensitive technology or key parts essential to the uranium enrichment plant it is constructing. Through a combination of clever tactics and good fortune, Pakistan is believed to have stolen the technology and deviously purchased the crucial components for its plant before the sluggish watchmen of the international nuclear establishment woke up to what was happening.

Officials of the British-Dutch-German uranium enrichment plant at Almelo, Holland, should have been alerted to Pakistan's potential, if not its intent, when a Pakistani physicist employed there in 1974 was caught reading secret documents he had not been authorized to see.

Abdul Qadar Khan, the scientist involved, left Holland without fuss in 1975 with lists of subcontractors and probably blueprints for the plant, according to intelligence reports. Khan reportedly is the director of Pakistan's Kahuta project, based on the Almelo model.

Pakistan's elaborate international purchasing efforts, which began in 1977, were detected long before anybody acted to cut them off. The British government expressed concern to Washington about the suspicious purchases in March 1978, but it took London seven months after that to impose effective export control on key items, and it took Washington a full year. In the meantime important equipment was exported to Pakistan by firms in Britain, the United States and western Europe.

Second, it is increasingly clear to American officials that Pakistan's military leadership has made a firm national decision to proceed with "the nuclear option," as it is politely called. The program is reported to have the solid backing of Pakistani ruler Mohammed Zia al Haq, who inherited it from the man he overthrew and later hanged, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, the father of the Pakistani bomb.

The Pakistani high command is believed to support the program both as a matter of prestige and as a deterrent against India, which exploded a nuclear device in 1974. The more it is obvious that Pakistan is going ahead, the more pressure is on Indian leaders to respond with an active weapons program of their own. The prospect of this, in turn, spurs new fears and new determination in Pakistan.

Third, the Pakistani nuclear problem, seen in its full dimensions, is at the heart of

overlapping circles of complexity involving nearly every alignment on the world scene.

It is a North-South issue because the United States, Europe and the developed world are seeking to turn around a developing country that recently joined the Conference of Non-Aligned States. Pakistani officials already have charged that the refusal of the United States and other donor nations to grant debt payment relief at a Paris meeting two months ago was nuclear pressure. The U.S. aid cutoff and talk of future economic pressures are seen in the same light by Islamabad.

Pakistan is an East-West problem because of its strategic location and increasing conflict with the Soviet Union. Moscow recently delivered several stiff warnings to Islamabad regarding alleged help to rebel forces fighting the ruling regime in Afghanistan, Moscow's ally and Pakistan's neighbor.

The problem even has an East-West dimension, because the People's Republic of China is Pakistan's closest ally, while India is aligned more closely to Moscow.

China has supplied much military equipment but no known nuclear technology or help to Pakistan. Chinese leaders are reported to be privately cool to a Pakistani nuclear capability although much less resistant than Moscow, a strong foe of proliferation everywhere.

And it is a Mideast problem because of rumors that Libya and perhaps other Islamic nations support Pakistan's "Islamic bomb" capability, a concept coined by Bhutto, and fears that weapons material might be shared with Islamic nations for use against Israel. The Jewish state, which is believed to have its own nuclear weapons stockpile, is particularly vulnerable to atomic threats because of its size. Israeli operatives are believed to have been involved in the sabotage last April of a nuclear reactor being built in France for delivery to Iraq.

Both India and Israel have the military ability to take out the Kahuta plant through bombing or commando action. American officials said such action by either of those states seems unlikely at present, though it cannot be ruled out. U.S. officials tacitly acknowledge that American covert action to disable the plant was among the many ideas talked about early in the options-gathering process, but they said it was dismissed without serious consideration.

The Pakistani nuclear weapons problem is a classic case in the chain reaction that threatens to spread possession of the bomb throughout much of the world. The first U.S. atomic explosions (1945) led to acquisition of atomic weapons by its adversary, the Soviet Union (1949), which spurred on that nation's adversary, China (1964), whose weapons program stimulated its adversary, India, to explode an atomic device in 1974. Pakistan is reacting in large part to its adversary, India.

This chain of fear and tension is another complicating factor in nuclear weapons diplomacy. Pakistan insists that any self-imposed restrictions also apply to India, which insists that they also apply to China, which refuses to restrict itself because of its nuclear weapons disparity with the Soviets. And the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, which are far ahead of everyone else, continue adding to their already vast weapon stockpiles.

As early as 1965, in the wake of the Chinese weapons test the year before, Pakistan's Bhutto made it clear that if India developed atomic weapons, so would Pakistan. Later Bhutto declared that his country would match India "even if we have to eat grass."

Bhutto began late in 1973, before India's test but after certain knowledge of India's program, to negotiate with France for a nuclear fuel "reprocessing" plant capable of producing weapons-grade plutonium. The

contract was signed in March 1976, to the alarm of the United States and other countries concerned about nuclear proliferation. Bhutto insisted in public that the plant was for peaceful use only, but virtually admitted the opposite in his final testament, smuggled from his prison cell last year.

Some of the circumstances of the French arrangement have given rise to speculation of a Libyan connection in Pakistan's nuclear program. Pakistani officials recently confirmed that Libya's Muammar Qaddafi had offered to finance the French reprocessing plant in return for access to the plutonium it produced. The officials said Pakistan rejected the offer and that Libya, in turn, canceled a plan to finance a Pakistani-French submarine production arrangement. The implication is that the submarine production was another part of the proposed deal.

Pakistan's links with Libya were cemented by a 10-year agreement of cooperation signed in 1974, and they have continued to be close. Pakistan supplies military advisers and training personnel to Libya, as well as to several other Arab countries. American officials said that, despite rumors and allegations to the contrary, they have no evidence of a Libyan-Pakistani deal involving Islamabad's current nuclear effort. But they concede they cannot be certain there is no such arrangement.

Pakistan's effort to obtain weapons-grade plutonium via the French plant generated a major diplomatic counterdrive by the United States in both the Ford and Carter administrations. A gradual turnabout in French policy brought about cancellation of the deal in August 1978, after most of the designs but very little sensitive equipment had been supplied.

Publicly, U.S. officials concerned with proliferation breathed a sigh of relief at the termination of the French arrangement last August. The decision was made in mid-September to restore Pakistan to eligibility for new U.S. economic and arms aid, which had been quietly suspended a year earlier because of antiproliferation laws and policies. A few American officials, however, were aware even as aid was restored that Pakistan still was seeking nuclear weapons capability through another, more secret route.

While openly negotiating to buy a plutonium plant from France in 1973-76, Pakistan also was working secretly to obtain a plant to make highly enriched uranium, an alternative weapons material, as early as 1975, American officials now believe. Washington sources suggest that the A. Q. Khan, the Pakistani physicist who was trained in Europe and worked at the Almelo gas centrifuge enrichment plant, persuaded Bhutto that this was a viable alternative that should be pursued. Funds for his purpose are believed to have been diverted from the French-related project.

By early 1977, before Bhutto's fall from power that July, orders from Pakistan are reported to have been placed with European firms for component parts of a centrifuge enrichment plant. Pakistan was shrewdly exploiting a loophole in the antiproliferation arrangements of "suppliers club" industrial nations, which banned the export of major weapons material facilities but did not address the purchase of components piece by piece.

Late in March 1978, a British embassy official in Washington called at the State Department to discuss U.S. plans to give greater attention to the enriched uranium route to nuclear weapons. The British official, according to informed sources, passed on "some disturbing information" that Pakistan had placed a suspicious order with a British firm for inverters, sophisticated voltage control mechanisms that could be used either for conventional industry or a nuclear enrichment plant.

"We didn't even know what an inverter was," said a State Department official later.

But a series of diplomatic and intelligence exchanges in the summer and fall of last year heightened the knowledge and interest in several capitals.

In July last year a British parliamentarian, Frank Allaun of the Labor Party, tabled a question in the House of Commons suggesting that equipment being exported would contribute to a Pakistani nuclear weapons program Allaun said later he acted, on a tip from "a friend who had a friend."

The British government responded to Allaun's question by saying the equipment was not subject to existing controls. Before London slapped on tighter controls last October, Emerson Electric Industrial Controls (a subsidiary of the U.S. firm Emerson Electric) had shipped 31 complete inverter systems capable of regulating a large number of centrifuge machines, which are the essential part of an uranium enrichment plant of this type. Emerson was working on 100 more inverters for Pakistan when the export controls were tightened to stop the shipments.

An elaborate purchasing system operated by a Pakistani ordnance official from an embassy office near Bonn placed large orders for industrial components in Switzerland, West Germany and other European countries as well as Britain. The number two man in the Pakistani embassy in Bonn, Abdul Waheed, is the first cousin of Pakistani President Zia. A career diplomat, Waheed denied any involvement in a nuclear purchase program and said reports of a weapons program are "nonsense and false."

Pakistan ordered from a California firm, which U.S. officials will not identify, about a half-dozen inverters evidently intended for the uranium enrichment plant. These were shipped from the United States last fall, after Washington had heard about Pakistan's efforts but before export controls were tightened this March 23, specifically to list inverters and other key components. State Department officials said there was no indication that other essential components for the Pakistani plant originated in the United States.

The decision to restore Pakistan to eligibility for U.S. aid last September, amid growing indications of a drive to obtain a secret uranium enrichment plant, was a ticklish one. Some officials suggest that U.S. intelligence was still uncertain at the time that Pakistan was going for a nuclear weapons capability via a new route (Members of Congress have been told by the Central Intelligence Agency that a "preponderance of evidence" to support this conclusion was available early last fall). Others involved in the decision said the U.S. sought to "plant some carrots" by promising new economic and military programs to create bargaining leverage with Pakistan.

By last January, the evidence of Pakistan's program was unmistakable and the United States began diplomatic talks with Islamabad on the subject. After Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher failed in a special mission March 1-2 to persuade Zia to call off his effort, the United States ordered a new cutoff of economic and military aid under the anti-proliferation law. This was made public April 6, after inquiries from the press.

Pakistan's repeated public denials of a nuclear weapons program are given no credence by American officials. Photographs of the heavily guarded and elaborate Kahuta plant as construction proceeds make it clear that its purpose is uranium enrichment, according to U.S. intelligence. And Pakistan has no civilian requirement for large amounts of enriched uranium.

The official U.S. estimate is that three to five years of construction and operation will be needed for the plant to turn out enough highly enriched uranium to make a bomb.

This assumes, as officials do, that the Pakistanis will be able to procure enough natural uranium, from one source or another, as raw material. Some officials have said a bomb might be ready as soon as two years hence; others believe that unforeseeable construction and operating problems might consume much more time and might even prove insurmountable.

Pakistan's uranium enrichment effort has cost somewhat less than \$100 million in the past four years, according to a U.S. estimate. The final cost is likely to be several hundred million dollars, a serious economic drain but well within the ability of a nation with a military budget of about \$1 billion annually. One major worry is that to capitalize on its investment, Pakistan might some day export highly enriched uranium.

Pakistan also is believed to be continuing work on the French plant, without French help. This would take six to 10 years, according to informed estimates, to produce bomb material. And Pakistan also is believed to have a pilot "hot cell" reprocessing capability at its Institute of Nuclear Science and Technology at Islamabad, where a small amount of bomb material could be produced relatively quickly if the right ingredients were available.

How much time is available is a crucial question for American officials. They do not believe rumors, evidently originating in India, that a Pakistani explosion could take place this fall, but they have been surprised before and are wary of being surprised again.

It is highly uncertain how the time will be used, whether it is three to five years or a shorter period. The U.S. task force in search of a policy has yet to find an acceptable answer to Pakistan's nuclear quest.

Also contributing to this article were Bonn Correspondent Michael Getler and staff researcher Maralee Schwartz. ●

COSTS OF PROTECTIONISM

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, a new consumer group, Consumers for World Trade, recently sponsored a study of the impact on consumers of protectionism in international trade. The study, "Costs of Protectionism," was prepared by David Hartman of the department of economics at Harvard University. It is a tough analysis of the results of protectionist measures throughout our economy. We are all aware of the impact of imports upon jobs, but we rarely see any effort to determine the costs involved in saving jobs by Government intervention to reduce competition.

As we look forward to implementation of the recently approved Trade Agreements Act of 1979, I believe this study can be instructive for all those interested in our trade policies. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

COSTS OF PROTECTIONISM

What is "Protectionism"? Government has many ways of interfering with trade in order to "protect" domestic industries from import competition. The best known types of protection are:

Tariffs and other fees, which add directly to the costs of imported goods.

Quotas, which put absolute limits on the physical quantity of certain goods that may be imported. Quotas often add indirectly to the cost of imports by creating an artificial scarcity, and by creating an equally artificial (but profitable) market for the sale of quotas by one foreign producer to another. As we learned under the old U.S. Sugar Act, quotas also invite governmental corruption.

"Voluntary" quotas, under which foreign governments agree to impose limits on what their own producers may export to the United States, currently apply to textiles, apparel, television sets, and footwear, among other products. These agreements, which are not really voluntary, are known as voluntary export restraints, and as Orderly Marketing Agreements (OMAs).

"Buy American" state and federal regulations, which exclude or limit foreign bids on government procurement, or impose a price differential favoring domestic producers, add significantly to the costs born by American taxpayers. These practices apply to all U.S. government purchases, including the Defense Department, Corps of Engineers, Amtrak and Conrail, and the General Services Administration (the largest nonmilitary procurement agency in the United States) and to many state and local purchases.

What does Protectionism cost?

Whatever form it takes, protectionism is a subsidy to a particular industry paid for by the consumer in higher prices.

During the past eight years, the U.S. Government has provided some form of protection from import competition to more than 70 domestic industries, from ball-bearings to horseshoes, from radial tires and nuts and bolts to instant potatoes.

The American consumer pays the cost of all these subsidies, in inflated prices.

It is impossible to calculate exactly the total out-of-pocket cost, to consumers, of protectionist subsidies. Too many products are involved. Too many variables affect prices—including the fact that, when protection forces import prices up, the prices for similar domestic goods usually increase too.

Nevertheless, responsible government and private organizations have conducted careful studies (and have come up with remarkably similar conclusions) on both the benefits of import competition, and the costs to consumers of restricting imports.

Here are some of the findings:

Consumer imports, on the average, are cheaper than comparable domestic goods.

In a four-city survey of retail prices (excluding food and automobiles), William R. Cline of The Brookings Institution of Washington, D.C., found (on weighted average basis) that imported goods cost 10.8% less than comparable domestic goods in the same categories. This means, according to Dr. Cline's analysis, an annual saving to American consumers of about \$2 billion, thanks to the availability of lower-priced imports. There are further, incalculable consumer savings simply because import competition helps keep the prices of domestic goods down.

But if American consumers are saving \$2 billion a year because of the imports that are available, how much are they losing because of protectionist measures which discourage, limit, or force up the costs of imports—and therefore make it easier for domestic producers to raise their prices?

Estimates vary, because the problem is so complex. Responsible estimates range from 8 percent to 12 percent of our total imports, or about \$15 billion a year.

Following are some of the specific industry-by-industry costs which contribute to this enormous inflationary burden on the consumer.

The U.S. public is paying over \$3 billion a year to protect textiles and apparel.

Textiles and apparel are the most heavily protected U.S. industries. The Council on

Wage and Price Stability (COWPS), which is the Government's inflation-monitoring agency, has studied the costs of this protection and finds that the 29.3 percent average tariff on apparel imports is costing American consumers \$2.7 billion a year.

These inflated consumer costs break down this way:

\$261 million goes to the government in customs duties;

\$2.2 billion goes to U.S. apparel manufacturers who, because of tariff protection, can charge that much more for their own products;

Another \$207 million is lost to the U.S. economy as a whole because tariff protection encourages domestic manufacturers to go on making uncompetitive products inefficiently, and because U.S. consumers (forced to pay higher prices for both domestic and imported apparel) end up buying fewer garments. This is what economists call a "deadweight loss" to the economy—lost production and lost consumption.

In addition to tariffs, textile and apparel imports are also subject to quotas which set rigid limits on the quantity of goods which 18 foreign countries are permitted to sell to the United States. According to COWPS, these quotas cost the American consumer \$369.4 million a year, including \$67.5 million in deadweight loss.

COWPS calculates that it is costing the American public \$81,000 per year for each textile job protected by these tariffs and quotas. This cost is unreasonable since the U.S. textile industry has been expanding employment since 1975. In fact, the United States has for a number of years exported more textiles than it imports. It is true, however, that jobs are declining in certain sectors of the domestic apparel industry notably low-cost apparel, employing low-skill, low-wage labor.

Steel protection is costing consumers over \$62,000 a year for each protected job.

The American steel industry has won several forms of government protection from foreign competition, including an orderly marketing agreement (OMA) for specialty steel from Japan, quotas on specialty steel from other countries, and the "trigger-price" mechanism (TPM) introduced last year. The full impact of the TPM is still uncertain but it has unquestionably led to higher steel prices for American consumers. Partly because of the continuing U.S. economic boom, steel imports did not begin to decline until November 1978, when imports began to fall sharply. Trigger prices (based on Japanese production costs, which are considered the world's most efficient) have served as a "floor," insuring against any lowering of steel prices, domestic or foreign. In fact, domestic steel producers raised their prices 9.5% during 1978.

Some private economists estimate that, because of the TPM alone, products containing steel (domestic or imported) will ultimately cost American consumers an additional \$6-8 billion this year.

A recent study published by The Brookings Institution estimates that all other forms of steel protection (OMAs and quotas) are costing the American consumer \$1.25 billion annually in inflated prices. If the intent is to protect jobs in the American steel industry, this means the American public is paying \$62,700 a year for each protected steel job!

Sugar protection could cost \$1.4 billion this year, and much more in the future.

Legislation before Congress in 1979 would artificially raise the wholesale price of sugar to 15.8¢ per pound, compared to the current world price of 9.46¢ landed in New York! The inflated cost to American consumers would be \$1.4 billion annually, or 68% protection over current world price. Moreover, the bill

would build in an annual increase in beet and cane sugar prices of 7 percent, costing consumers an additional \$300 million every year.

And, if domestic corn sweeteners (25 percent of the domestic market) follow this legislated inflation, the costs to consumers next year could be boosted by an extra \$330 million annually.

High beef costs are also, in part, the result of import protection.

Beef is protected by both quotas and orderly marketing agreements (OMAs) which limit imports to less than 6 pounds per capita (7 percent of total U.S. consumption). Because our imports of beef are used primarily for hamburger and relatively low-cost manufactured meat products, low-income consumers are hardest hit. The President's Council on Wage and Price Stability estimates that, in 1976, beef quotas cost American consumers between \$350 million and \$1 billion in inflated prices. The dead-weight loss to the economy was estimated at \$22 million to \$46 million.

In 1978, as domestic beef prices soared, President Carter temporarily relaxed beef-import restrictions slightly, but the increased imports (amounting to about one extra pound per person) are a drop in the bucket compared to the 16 pound-per capita decline in U.S. beef production since 1976. Strong opposition from the domestic cattle industry has prevented any further relaxation of import quotas, while beef prices continue to escalate.

Protecting U.S. TV-makers costs consumers \$221 million a year.

Imports of color television sets from Japan have been limited by an Orderly Marketing Agreement since 1977. When South Korea and Taiwan moved into the gap with highly competitive products, OMAs were negotiated with them as well. Now that all three countries are covered by OMAs, total imports are expected to shrink to originally targeted levels. Earlier estimates by the Council on Wage and Price Stability probably still apply: protection of the domestic TV industry is costing the public \$221 million a year.

Although some U.S. TV-makers are having trouble competing with foreign producers, the U.S. electronics industry continues to lead the world in high-technology products, and is a major exporter of electronic components, semiconductors, scientific measuring devices, computers and office machines. These are high-skill, high-wage, high-profit industries which need no protection.

Footwear protection costs \$114,000 a year for each job protected.

Since the beginning of 1978, footwear imports are being protected through OMAs with two major exporting countries, Taiwan, and South Korea. Although no estimates are available on total consumer costs of this protection, the President's Council on Wage and Price Stability estimates that the consumer pays about \$114,000 a year for each job protected in the U.S. footwear industry.

The OMAs have clearly resulted in higher retail prices for the consumer. The restrictions are aimed specifically at reducing imports in the low-price range. As a result, the unit value of imported footwear rose 17 percent in the year ending June 1978. At the same time, U.S. footwear manufacturers—taking advantage of reduced overseas competition—raised the unit of their nonrubber footwear products 14 percent in the third quarter of 1978, compared with a year earlier. (Prices were fairly stable in 1976-77.)

Costs of protection: more inflation, a less competitive U.S. economy.

Just these selected examples add up to \$6 billion in inflated consumer prices paid to "protect" these few industries.

At least another \$9 billion in consumer price inflation can be attributed to the literally hundreds of other forms of import pro-

tection that are already in force—not to mention new protectionist proposals now being pushed in Congress. Congress is now considering a new trade package which includes new forms of protection for a number of U.S. industries. If enacted, the bill will for example extend quotas on imported cheese to cover fully 85 percent of all U.S. cheese imports, and will probably freeze imports at present levels.

More protection can only mean more inflation. If inflation is now our No. 1 national concern, it makes no sense to go on protecting uncompetitive industries at rising consumer costs.

Besides, by restricting foreign competition we are undermining the market incentive for our least efficient industries (or our least competitive companies) to invest, modernize, improve worker skills (and earnings)—and to become competitive again in international trade.

The jobs we are protecting (at enormous cost per job) are usually low-skill, low-wage jobs in industries that failed to keep up with changes in technology or market demand. Keeping these companies afloat by protecting them from competition is a disservice to American workers. It makes the U.S. economy weaker and less competitive. It lowers American living standards in relation to the rest of the industrialized world.

Part of the answer is to plow more industrial profits into better technology, more efficient plant, higher productivity, improved U.S. competitiveness in world trade. At the same time, we should expand government "adjustment assistance" to industries and workers adversely affected by foreign competition—including retraining workers for better jobs in growth industries.

Protection against import competition is not an effective remedy. Our most efficient and competitive industries are exporting profitably, all over the world, and are more than holding their own in the domestic market. To expand U.S. exports, we have to keep our own markets open to imports—or risk protectionist retaliation from our trading partners.

The challenge to America is not to protect our weaknesses, by perpetuating our yesterday's industries, but to build up our strengths, by shifting capital and labor into tomorrow's industries. That's what our European and Japanese competitors are doing in many industrial areas where the United States was once supreme.

The historical American response is to welcome international competition head-on. ●

MICHAEL BLANKFORT

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on November 18, 1979, the distinguished novelist and screenwriter, Michael Blankfort, will receive the Shlomo Bardin Award of the Brandeis-Bardin Institute.

Born in New York City, Michael Blankfort migrated to Los Angeles in 1937 and since that time has achieved considerable success in his work. His impressive career spans more than 40 years. His novels include "Behold the Fire," "Goodby, I Guess," "I Didn't Know I Would Live So Long" and "Take the A Train." In 1952 his novel, "The Juggler" was awarded the Samuel Daroff Prize for the best novel on a Jewish subject and later won acclaim

as a major film. In 1965 he won the Gold Medal of the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco for the best novel of the year by a Californian. Recently the Hebrew University of Jerusalem honored Michael Blankfort with its S. Y. Agnon Award for literature. His screenplay credits include "Halls of Montezuma," "My Six Convicts," and "The Caine Mutiny," to mention only a few.

For the last 27 years the focal point of Michael Blankfort's life has been his close association with and deep commitment to the concepts and ideals of the Brandeis Institute. Much of his work has been influenced by the root ideas of the institute. Founded in 1941 by the late Dr. Schlomo Bardin at the urging of the late Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis, the institute conducts programs for college age youth, adults, and children in the ethics and culture of the Jewish tradition—its participants are Jews and non-Jews alike.

Michael Blankfort's first meeting with Shlomo Bardin lasted only half an hour but altered the course of the rest of his life. His play about Maimonides, written for Brandeis-Bardin, has been performed hundreds of times at the institute. Calling himself a "student of students," Michael Blankfort, for many years, attended almost every introductory institute where he shared with people coming there for the first time his thoughts and experiences as a Jew. His lectures were largely autobiographical, using his life as an example of the evolution of the American Jewish experience. He spent several summers at the institute teaching and lecturing in writing and literature. It was at Brandeis that he wrote his book, "The Strong Hand," a tale of spiritual crisis. His wife, Dorothy and daughters, Susan and Ellen, share his dedication to the work of the institute.

Michael Blankfort is a unique example of a complete individual. He enlightens as he himself learns, he enriches and endows others with his special enthusiasm and, above all, he always strives to achieve himself that which he encourages others to seek—the highest standards in human values and behavior.

I ask the Members to join me on this occasion in congratulating Michael Blankfort on his achievements and to wish him well for the future. ●

KATHY L. WEINER

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, as dean of the Florida delegation in Congress it is my sad responsibility to report to you that our good colleague WILLIAM LEHMAN lost his beloved daughter Kathy last Wednesday after a long and painful bout with cancer. All of us have the Lehman and Weiner families in our prayers and hope that their knowledge of the fine deeds of this young lady may give them some comfort in their grief.

I include two news accounts of this sad event:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 31, 1979]
KATHY L. WEINER, DAUGHTER OF FLORIDA CONGRESSMAN

Kathy L. Weiner, 34, a former high school English teacher in Miami, and the daughter of Rep. William Lehman, (D-Fla.) and his wife, Joan, died of cancer Wednesday at her home in Coral Gables, Fla.

Mrs. Weiner was born in Sao Paulo, Brazil, where her father was an instructor in aircraft maintenance for the Brazilian Air Force while serving in the Army Air Corps.

She attended the University of Wisconsin and earned a bachelor's degree in English from the University of Miami.

Mrs. Weiner frequently stayed with her parents here during the last three years while undergoing treatment at the National Institutes of Health and George Washington University Hospital.

Besides her parents, survivors include her husband, Donald, and two sons, Sean and Matthew, all of the home in Coral Gables and two brothers William Lehman Jr. and Tom Lehman, both of Miami.

[From the Miami Herald, Aug. 31, 1979]

KATHRYN LEHMAN WEINER, 34, TEACHER, DAUGHTER OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM LEHMAN

Kathryn Lehman Weiner, 34, daughter of U.S. Rep. William Lehman, died of a brain tumor late Wednesday night at her home.

Mrs. Weiner was born in Sao Paulo, Brazil, where her father was serving as a civilian with the old U.S. Army Air Forces serving in Brazil.

Six months later, the family returned to Miami, where she graduated from Edison High School. She attended the University of Wisconsin and graduated from the University of Miami.

After graduation, she taught English briefly at Coral Gables Senior High School and later became a part-time teacher there, until she became ill.

When Carver and Coral Gables elementary schools were ordered integrated in the early 1970s, she became a part of a group of parents who worked to make the plan succeed.

Whispering Pines Principal Phyllis Tannen, former principal at Carver, said, "She was part of a group of parents that tried to establish a climate of acceptance among the parents—to make them feel comfortable—and to ease the transition.

"She was a unique person with a unique group who met with parents at their homes to make things work for all the children.

"She was terrific," Miss Tannen said.

Mrs. Weiner had worked for the Democratic Party as a precinct leader in the Coral Gables area. ●

A TRIBUTE TO SAMUEL I. NEWHOUSE

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, August 29, 1979, Samuel I. Newhouse, publisher, died at the age of 84. Today, I ask my colleagues to join in this salute to Mr. Newhouse, a modern Horatio Alger in the truest and finest sense of the word.

Mr. Newhouse, at the time of his death, had interests in the Jersey Journal of

Jersey City, the Newark Star-Ledger, as well as newspapers in New Orleans, Portland, Oregon, Birmingham, St. Louis, Cleveland, and Springfield, Mass. Recently he purchased Parade magazine and eight papers from the Booth chain in Michigan.

This remarkable American began his career in Bayonne, N.J., where he worked as an office boy to help support his family. He began working for a lawyer at a salary of \$2 per week. By studying at night, he qualified for law school by passing the State regent's examination for those courses which he missed by never attending high school.

At the age of 16, Mr. Newhouse began his newspaper career at the faltering Bayonne Times daily newspaper. He developed such effective merchandising and sales campaigns to revive the paper financially that within 1 year, the Times was operating in the black.

After passing the bar at age 21 and practicing law for a short period, he devoted all his energy to newspaper publications, eventually becoming one of the leaders in his field.

Much of the profits derived from his publishing empire went to philanthropic causes. Through his generosity, the Mitzi Newhouse Theater at Lincoln Center was built. He also gave substantial sums to the S. I. Newhouse School of Publications at Syracuse University.

Thousands of journalists across the Nation developed and honed their skills with Mr. Newhouse as their publisher. His hard work and confidence in the American system resulted in the development of a communications conglomerate which included 31 newspapers, 7 magazines, 6 television stations, 20 cable television stations, and 5 radio stations. Administratively, S. I. Newhouse always had his finger on the pulse of his organization "to maintain control without dictating policy, to oversee without overwhelming."

Although Mr. Newhouse took care not to overwhelm his colleagues, his achievements were nothing less than astonishing by any standard. To his wife, Mitzi Newhouse, and his sons, Samuel I., Jr., and Donald, we extend our deepest sympathies. We know they will be consoled and gratified by the great accomplishments of this outstanding American. His exemplary life, love for his fellow man and high professionalism greatly merit the respect and admiration of the Members of the U.S. Congress. ●

A SYMBOL OF CHAOS: THE GAS PUMP

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the rush to blame the OPEC countries for our energy woes is incorrect. Nations which import virtually 100 percent of their oil are surviving nicely, such as Japan and West Germany. The OPEC nations, most of whom depend upon earning dollars with which to purchase

imports are also feeling the effects of inflation and the weakening of the dollar on the international scene. Thus, to a great degree they need increased oil revenues. The answer to the energy problem is not conservation of decreasing amounts of fuel, but increased production. We should be working to get inflation under control and decontrol of the energy industry in general. Once both steps are achieved, the energy problem will solve itself. Prof. Hans Sennholz, who heads the economics department of Grove City College in Pennsylvania recently wrote a very perceptive article on this problem. It appeared in the *Freeman* for August 1979 and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

A SYMBOL OF CHAOS: THE GAS PUMP
(By Hans F. Sennholz)

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 1970s to call attention to the industry and bring us the energy crises.

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 crisis 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 inten-

sive 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, yea, 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 repeal 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 socialistic 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 produc-

tion. 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. ●

THE ENERGY FOLLIES OF 1979

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it seems like there is no end to the incredible tales of incompetence that spew forth from the Carter White House. The month of August supposed to be a time when nothing happens in Washington, yet this administration managed two major energy bloopers with most of its first and second string incompetents out of town. It goes to show that Mr. Carter has all but cornered the market on some of America's finest examples of the Peter Principle in operation.

The two examples of how Mr. Carter and company are assuring our energy dependence range from Iran to just across our southern border. In both situations the United States managed to squander valuable bargaining chips at the negotiating table, and in one case, throw away valuable energy resources as well. The facts are still surfacing in both cases, but there is enough information at hand to begin to shape the parameters of August's antics.

MEXICO DOWN THE DRAIN

In 1972 the Petroleos Mexicanos (PEMEX) brought in two gushers in central Mexico. Additional offshore finds in the Bay of Campeche ushered in a new energy age for Mexico. In the last 7 years the proven reserves for oil and gas found within the borders of our southern neighbor have skyrocketed from 5.4 billion barrels to 40.2 billion. Some estimates put possible reserves at close to 100 billion barrels placing Mexico second only to Saudi Arabia in world oil resources.

By 1976 Mexico had decided to rely on an oil-based domestic development plan and to sell the excess gas associated with the oil fields to the United States. On August 3, 1977, six U.S. gas pipeline companies, Tenneco, Texas Eastern Transmission, El Paso, Southern Natural Gas, Florida Gas Transmission, and Transcontinental Gas Pipeline, agreed with PEMEX officials to a letter of intent on a project to have Mexico build an 847-mile, 48-inch pipeline from Cactus to Reynosa, which is about 100 miles from McAllen, Tex.; 800 million cubic

feet of gas a day would be shipped, increasing to 2 billion cubic feet per day after additional facilities were constructed.

One would think that such an agreement would have met with rejoicing among energy officials in Washington, D.C. However, this was not the case. It seems that the price to be paid for Mexican gas (\$2.60/1,000 cubic ft.) was 44 cents higher than that being paid for imported Canadian gas. Government officials proclaimed the private arrangement inflationary and forced the letter of intent to lapse in December 1977.

At this point our crack negotiators from the Departments of State and Energy took over the helm. Their first offer was \$2.30/1,000 cubic ft. The Mexicans withdrew from active negotiations. It was not until Mr. Carter's embarrassing trip to Mexico in 1979 did talks resume to any extent. At that time the Mexican price had risen to \$3.40 (or \$1.24 more than was being paid for Canadian gas). The U.S. counter offered with a \$3.00/1,000 cubic feet position that has just been rejected.

The missed opportunity of cheap (in retrospect) Mexican gas being ready for U.S. consumers is compounded by the indications that other factors have entered the negotiations, including possible policy concessions on the illegal immigrant problem. Only a government so blind and so prejudiced against market solutions could have grabbed defeat from the jaws of victory under these circumstances. The failure of the Mexican venture is eclipsed in its idiocy only by the bizarre turn of events with Iranian heating oil.

IRAN FIRST, AMERICA LAST

After months of pleading with the American people to conserve energy use Mr. Carter put everything in perspective early one morning on the Mississippi River. We were going to ship 1.5 million gallons of No. 2 heating oil to Iran, at a subsidized price because, in Mr. Carter's words:

Most of their families were very poor, like I was when I was growing up.

It seems that the President has more compassion for the Iranians than the Ayatollah Khomeini whose firing squads and raids on the Kurds have become daily events in that nation. Who cares that the Ayatollah kicked the United States out of the country, that he shut-down our monitoring sites, that he imprisoned American workers. Who cares that New England and other regions of the United States may face severe fuel oil shortages this winter. Obviously Mr. Carter's nostalgic view of revolutionary Iran takes precedence over the realities of the situation.

The United States still has not come to grips with the situation in Iran. We still do not have any set policy as to whether it is in our interest to bolster the Ayatollah, or to let his bloodstained regime fall in the hopes that something better would emerge from the chaos that inevitably would ensue. Certainly Mr. Carter is not ready to take a firm stand on Iran, especially now that his alter ego, Andrew Young, is no longer in the foreign

policy driver's seat. Yet what is Carter up to? Is he rewarding the Ayatollah for not killing more people than he has as a token of restraint in the name of human rights? Is Carter secretly against the Kurds and want to give up our oil resources as a pat on the back for suppressing a rebellion?

If it were only this simple. As of this writing there are no explicit quid pro quo arrangements with Iran on future oil shipments. Even if there were there are no guarantees that the present government could deliver. If Iran cannot keep its refineries in operation what is there to prevent its pipelines, pumping stations, or fuel docks from falling into similar states of disrepair? With no set policy regarding future relations with the Ayatollah how can any gesture be defined, especially one using our oil from our refineries?

The emotional outburst by Mr. Carter at 5 a.m. on the Mississippi might make good press, but Iran itself says it does not need the oil. In fact, it plans to resell the oil at a handsome profit. In a nation that is energy starved with an administration that screams oil company profits are obscene, what is so humanitarian about shipping off our oil so that Iranians can make obscene profits? This is carrying foreign aid a bit far.

The energy fiascos of August provide a new set of examples of why this Nation is facing such an energy crisis. It is no wonder that the President's ratings have declined far below those of Mr. Nixon.

America deserves better than what it is getting. Jimmy has to reach deeper and deeper into his bag of Rafshoon tricks in order to just keep his head above the rising tide of outrage over how he has driven this Nation into the ground. It is obvious that we did not need a Cabinet reshuffle in July, we needed a new dealer.●

TRIBUTE TO LEONA BEVIS, ACSW

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1979

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in tribute to an outstanding woman and citizen. Leona Bevis, since 1972 the executive director of the Federation for Community Planning in Cleveland, is a person who has devoted her entire professional career to helping those less fortunate than she. After graduating from the University of Cincinnati and obtaining a masters degree in social work from Western Reserve University, Leona spent 20 fruitful years serving with the Welfare Federation in Cleveland. She was appointed associate director of the Federation in 1959. From 1971-72 Leona also served as associate executive director of the United Torch Services of Greater Cleveland.

Miss Bevis also gives a great deal of her free time in service to the community. She is a member of the board of trustees of Blue Cross of Northeast Ohio; chairman of the State Social Services Advisory

Committee, a member of the Legal Aid Committee of the Bar Association of Greater Cleveland; and a member of the Visiting Committee School of Applied Social Sciences of Case Western Reserve University.

Leona's service has repeatedly been awarded by public and private agencies in the public welfare field. It is a great privilege for me to have this committed, self-sacrificing woman as a friend. She truly deserves the commendation of all the citizens of Cleveland as well as the Members of this House.●

WHAT'S RIGHT ABOUT SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with our colleagues an article that appeared in the Washington Post on August 9, 1979. The article, by Robert M. Ball, Commissioner of Social Security from 1962 to 1973, defends the much-maligned social security program, asserting that, on the whole, the program is one of which the United States can be proud.

WHAT'S RIGHT ABOUT SOCIAL SECURITY?

(By Robert M. Ball)

In recent years, various provisions of the Social Security program have come under attack—but little has been said about its overall effectiveness. What's right about Social Security?

In 1935, when the Social Security Act was passed, less than 15 percent of the jobs in the United States were covered by any sort of retirement system, and only a tiny proportion of those over 65 were drawing retirement benefits. Many people ended their lives in a now almost forgotten institution, the "county poor house." This year nearly 95 percent of the people reaching age 65 will be eligible for Social Security payments and most of those who are not will be eligible for retirement pay from some other government system, such as railroad retirement, federal civil service, or a state or local plan. Perhaps a third of those getting Social Security payments will also be eligible for a private pension supplementing their Social Security, although even for this fortunate one-third, Social Security is usually the larger payment and is inflation-proof and tax free.

According to a study by the Congressional Budget Office, without Social Security 60 percent of the families headed by people 65 and over would be below the government's rock-bottom definition of poverty. In fact, nearly half would have incomes less than 50 percent of the poverty level. Social Security lifts all but about one-fifth of elderly families above poverty, and when other government programs are taken into account, the proportion of elderly families who remain poor is reduced to about 14 percent. This is very substantial progress. As recently as 20 years ago, nearly 40 percent of those over 65 were below a comparable government definition of poverty.

But Social Security is much more than a program designed to reduce poverty. It is the base on which just about everyone now builds retirement income. The worker who has earned average wages throughout his life (this year \$11,500) will receive about \$400 a

month in a Social Security benefit if he retired this year at 65. When a spouse's benefit is included, the amount is \$600 a month. For such a couple, the amount paid is 82 percent of recent earnings. For the worker who has been earning the federal minimum wage, the proportion of recent earnings replaced by Social Security benefits is higher—78 percent for a couple. For the worker earning at the maximum amount, the proportion is less—47 percent for a couple.

Not only are these benefits tax free and inflation-proof once they are awarded, but prior to retirement the protection is automatically kept up to date with rising wages. Thus when a worker now in his early 40s retires at 65 after regularly earning the average wage, his benefit (assuming a continuing increase in wages comparable to the past) will be about \$15,000 a year. The \$15,000 reflects not only increases in prices but also the increase in the level of living arising from productivity increases. Because of the automatic provisions now in the law, if wages rise less than they have in the past, Social Security benefits will be lower, and if they rise more, benefits will be higher.

And Social Security is not just a retirement system. It is also life insurance, paying monthly benefits to widows, widowers and orphans to partly make up for income that is lost when a wage earner in the family dies. And it is disability insurance, providing protection for workers and their families against the loss of income due to long-continued total disabilities. It is well known that just about all older people get Social Security benefits but not so well known that every month the Social Security system pays monthly benefits to 5 million children. For many young families the life insurance and disability insurance protection—frequently with a face value of from \$150,000 to \$200,000—is the most important "asset" they have. And the survivors' and disability insurance, too, is automatically kept up to date with increases in the level of living before benefits are paid, and again the benefits are tax free and inflation-proof.

For the cash benefits I have described—and not taking into account the Medicare protection against the cost of hospital care—the worker today pays 5.08 percent of earnings up to maximum earnings of \$22,900 a year. This amount is matched by the employer. According to the latest estimates of the Board of Trustees of the Social Security trust funds, the benefits and administrative costs of the system can be met for the rest of this century by a contribution rate of 5.5 percent of earnings. (The maximum on the earnings counted rises to \$29,700 in 1981 and then rises automatically in proportion to the general increase in the wage level.)

In the next century, according to the trustees, if the proportion of retirees to earners increases as much as they expect, the contribution rate would have to be higher. Some 50 years from now the rate might need to be as high as 8 percent for an entirely self-financed system. Even this 8 percent rate in the distant future, however, would not seem to justify the kind of concern about Social Security financing now being expressed in various magazine and newspaper articles. For example, German workers and their employers each pay 8 percent currently for old-age, survivors' and disability insurance even though the cost of about one-fifth of the German system is borne by other revenue sources.

Certainly there are changes to be made in our Social Security system. I, among others, have proposed certain improvements in benefit protection and changes in the method of financing, but the point to be stressed is that the system works just as it is, and it works well. There is no crisis. Thirty-five million beneficiaries—one in seven Americans—get a check every month, on time, and

in the right amount, and those who are working today can count on getting their Social Security benefits when they in turn become eligible. ●

COUGHLIN CONSTITUENTS CITE GOVERNMENT, OIL COMPANIES IN GASOLINE CRUNCH

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the intense national concern over this summer's gasoline problems is reflected in my annual mail poll in which 17,609 individual responses from constituents in Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District were received before the July 31, 1979, deadline. This is an increase of 35 percent over last year's responses.

I am sure it comes as no surprise that the Federal Government and the oil companies are blamed for our gasoline woes. Forty-three percent of those answering cite the most significant cause of the shortage as "Government regulation and mismanagement," followed by 35 percent who perceive the situation as "A rip-off by the oil companies." Of the three specified choices listed, only 10 percent attribute the shortage to "lack of investment incentive to produce."

A space was provided for those who believe there is another reason that is the most significant cause. Of the 12 percent writing in their reasons, most were split between blaming the oil-producing countries and consumer waste, particularly in the United States.

Almost half of the questions pertained to our energy dilemma in the questionnaire poll mailed to every household and boxholder in my congressional district. In addition to sharing the results with colleagues, I also will mail them to constituents and to the White House.

A plurality of constituents—48 percent—oppose President Carter's proposal to decontrol domestic oil prices and impose a windfall profits tax. Forty percent favor the plan and 12 percent are undecided.

Of the 48 percent opposing the Carter proposal, 43 percent want to maintain controls. Thirty-one percent favor decontrol without a windfall profits tax. Of the three specified choices, 14 percent want to impose an excise tax on imported oil.

In the space provided for other recommendations, most of the 12 percent who wrote in their choices favor nationalization of the domestic oil industry.

A majority of constituents—52 percent—say they are cutting their driving "somewhat" in response to a question in which it was noted that gasoline prices are rising to \$1 or more a gallon. One-third of those answering aver that they have reduced their driving "substantially." Ten percent say their driving will be affected "not at all."

Of the 5 percent specifying other reasons, most cite their businesses or occupations as reasons for not reducing their

driving or the fact they already have cut personal motoring.

Fifty-eight percent of those responding to a question on U.S. nuclear generation want our present policy continued, but safety standards tightened. Almost one in four—24 percent—favor an immediate moratorium on building new nuclear plants. Thirteen percent opt for accelerating construction and cutting licensing time.

Five percent list other courses with many of them calling for a combination of accelerating construction and tightening safety standards. Much of the comment favors development of solar energy.

Three out of four answering want more coal used to power utilities and industrial plants even if air pollution standards must be lowered. Seventeen percent are opposed while 8 percent are undecided.

In a question on inflation, which pointed out that the rate has been running at double-digit figures in the first half of 1979, 48 percent of those answering say "no" to mandatory wage and price controls as a workable method of controlling inflation.

Forty-one percent—a steady percentage from last year's poll—respond "yes" to the question. In 1978, 42 percent of those responding favored mandatory controls in the fight against inflation. Eleven percent are undecided in this year's poll.

Across-the-board cuts in all expenditures are the most favored single step advocated to help stem inflation by reducing Federal spending. The 53 percent favoring this approach contrast to 17 percent who prefer reduced spending for domestic programs. Thirteen percent support decreased defense spending.

Of the 17 percent who wrote in other choices, the single program most cited for spending cutbacks is foreign aid. Many also want spending reduced for welfare programs and bureaucratic operations.

A majority of those answering support registration and a standby draft to be used in time of crisis. These 68 percent are opposed by 26 percent who do not want the system. Six percent register undecided.

Of the 26 percent who are opposed, 62 percent of these approve an alternative—a peacetime universal service proposal giving 18-year-olds a choice of active service, reserve military training or civilian service in the Peace or Job Corps. Thirty-two percent do not favor this alternative. Six percent are undecided.

A disparity of views is evidenced by a question on which type of health program—considering the cost—is preferred. Thirty-seven percent want national health insurance limited to catastrophic coverage while 27 percent favor comprehensive national health insurance. One-third oppose any new national health insurance.

Of the 3 percent listing other options, most believe that the Government should regulate medical and hospital costs.

A majority of constituents responding consider limits on Federal funding of abortions—based on language enacted in the last Congress—to be "about right." Contrasted to this 53 percent are

35 percent who consider the law "too strict." Twelve percent believe the legislation is "too lenient."

Those answering a question on whether the Egypt-Israel peace settlement is worth the cost to the United States in providing more aid to the countries were divided. Forty-six percent respond "no" and 42 percent answer "yes." Twelve percent indicate they are undecided.

An even greater range of opinion was recorded on a question which asked whether the U.S. Senate should ratify the strategic arms limitation treaty (SALT II). Thirty-nine percent favor ratification, 33 percent oppose it, and 28 percent are undecided.

Results were compiled by my staff and no computer was used. To insure the greatest accuracy, answers were compiled by ZIP code. Final results compared with preliminary results; they did not vary by more than 2 percentage points either way.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

1. Energy costs and shortages are continuing problems.

A. What do you believe is the most significant cause for the gasoline shortage? (one only)

[In percent]	
Government regulation and mismanagement	43
Lack of investment incentive to produce	10
A rip-off by the oil companies	35
Other (specify)	12

B. Do you approve of President Carter's proposal to decontrol domestic oil prices and impose a windfall profits tax?

[In percent]	
Yes	40
No	48
Undecided	12

C. If your answer was "no," what would you recommend? (one only)

[In percent]	
Decontrol but no windfall profits tax	31
Maintain controls	43
Impose an excise tax on imported oil	14
Other (specify)	12

D. With gasoline prices rising to \$1 or more a gallon, will you reduce your driving?

[In percent]	
Substantially	33
Somewhat	52
Not at all	10
Other (specify)	5

E. What course should the U.S. take on nuclear power generation? (one only)

[In percent]	
Declare an immediate moratorium on building new plants	24
Continue present policy, but tighten safety standards	58
Accelerate new construction and cut licensing time	13
Other (specify)	5

F. Do you favor using more coal to power utilities and industrial plants even if air pollution standards must be lowered?

[In percent]	
Yes	75
No	17
Undecided	8

2. Inflation in the first half of 1979 has been running at a double-digit rate.

A. Do you believe mandatory wage and

price controls are a workable method of controlling inflation?

[In percent]	
Yes	41
No	48
Undecided	11

B. What single step do you advocate to help stem inflation by cutting Federal spending? (one only)

[In percent]	
Across-the-board cut in all expenditures	53
Reduce spending for domestic programs	17
Decrease defense spending	13
Other (specify)	17

3. The question of providing military manpower in an emergency has arisen as a result of deficiencies in the all-volunteer services.

A. Do you favor registration and a standby draft to be used in time of crisis?

[In percent]	
Yes	68
No	26
Undecided	6

B. If your answer was "no," would you approve—as an alternative—a peacetime universal service proposal giving 18-year-olds a choice of active service, reserve military training or civilian service in the Peace or Job Corps?

[In percent]	
Yes	62
No	32
Undecided	6

4. Considering the cost, which would you prefer? (one only)

[In percent]	
National health insurance limited to catastrophic coverage	37
Comprehensive national health insurance	27
No new national health insurance	33
Other (specify)	3

5. Current law limits Federal funding of abortions to those necessary to preserve the life of the mother, in cases of rape or incest, and where severe and long-lasting physical health damage to the mother would result, as determined by two physicians. Is this limitation of funding abortions:

[In percent]	
Too strict	35
Too lenient	12
About right	53

6. Do you believe the Egypt-Israel peace settlement is worth the cost to the U.S. in providing more aid to the two countries?

[In percent]	
Yes	42
No	46
Undecided	12

7. Should the U.S. Senate ratify the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II)?

[In percent]	
Yes	39
No	33
Undecided	28

Party preference of those responding:

[In percent]	
Republican	62
Democrat	22
Non-partisan	16
Other	

Ages of those responding:

[In percent]	
18 to 21	1
21 to 35	21
35 to 50	25
50 to 65	32
65 and over	21

SHATTER THE SILENCE, VIGIL 1979

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, over the past 4 years I have been involved in numerous efforts to facilitate the emigration of Soviet refuseniks who have been denied exit visas because of their political and religious beliefs. The recent release and subsequent emigration of Alexander Ginzburg, Valentin Moroz, Georgi Vins, Mark Dymshits, and Eduard Kuznetsov, and the pardons of Anatoly Altman, Hillel Butman, Leib Khnokh, Boris Penson, and Vulf Zalmanson are testimony to the effectiveness of public officials' and private citizens' declarations against Soviet repression of the rights of refuseniks as guaranteed by the Helsinki agreements.

But for every Soviet Jew who is given an exit visa, hundreds remain behind against their will. Dissidents like Anatoly Shcharansky, Ida Nudel, and Yosip Mendeleovich are still incarcerated, despite repeated requests to Soviet authorities that they be released.

I would like to bring to your attention the cases of two refuseniks, Vladimir Slepak and Isaac Zlotver, who have been separated from their families by the prejudicial and arbitrary decision of the Soviet Government. Vladimir Slepak first applied for an exit visa in April 1970 and was refused permission to emigrate in June 1970.

After his application to emigrate, Vladimir was harassed and threatened and finally imprisoned. In June 1976, he became a Helsinki monitor, and his activism as a proponent of the rights of his people resulted in a sentence of 5 years in exile in the summer of 1978.

Vladimir Slepak now lives in exile in a remote area of Siberia with his wife. His two sons and their families were granted visas and now live in Israel. As an outspoken critic of Soviet discrimination against refuseniks, Slepak has sacrificed his health and well-being to champion the cause of religious and human rights in his country. We must, as legislators, continue to work for his release and the freedom for which he has struggled.

Isaac Zlotver is not a dissident. He is a man alone, with no living relatives left in the Soviet Union. Isaac first applied to emigrate in 1974 and permission to leave the country has been repeatedly refused, allegedly because of his army service 13 years ago.

Isaac's wife, Dina, died of cancer in 1977, and his daughter Lubo emigrated to Israel in 1971. Isaac himself has been seriously ill. It was Dina's last wish that her husband be reunited with his family. Perhaps, with our help, Isaac Zlotver may one day see his grandchildren in Israel.

I would urge my colleagues to join in this vigil for freedom and speak out against the continued violation of the 1975 Helsinki agreements by the Soviet Union. As a signatory of the United

Nations Declaration of Human Rights, the Soviet Union made a commitment that cannot be denied. For the sake of people like Isaac Zlotver and Vladimir Slepak, we must not allow that commitment to be so easily forgotten and shatter the silence that surrounds their oppression. ●

ENERGY: THE NEED TO ACT

HON. DAVID F. EMERY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. EMERY. Mr. Speaker, adopting a coherent, long-term energy policy for our Nation is the most urgent task facing this Congress. Continued indecision on energy will only lead to more inflation, greater personal hardship, higher oil imports, and diminished national security.

In a recent speech to the Brunswick, Maine, Chamber of Commerce, my distinguished colleague, Senator BILL COHEN, outlined several actions that are urgently required if we are to solve our worsening energy problem.

I hope that each of my colleagues will have an opportunity to review Senator COHEN's comments on energy, which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

SPEECH BY SENATOR WILLIAM S. COHEN
AUGUST 17, 1979.

An ominous cloud of frustration, anger, and, to some degree, hopelessness hovers over America. Our nation, accustomed to national prosperity and pre-eminence in world affairs, is now confronted with an uncertain economic future and a growing threat to our way of life.

As the turbulent decade of the Seventies draws to a close, we are a divided people, unsure about our goals, and increasingly distrustful of government leadership and institutions. Indecision on energy and other pressing national concerns has turned us into a nation of disbelievers and cynics. Somehow we feel better if we can assign blame for our problems, exonerating ourselves in the process.

To a great extent, the American mood is understandable. Our prolonged debate on energy has seemingly been marked by endless controversy, criticism, and outright confusion. Diverse interests, all pulling in opposite directions, have frustrated every attempt to adopt a coherent, long-term energy policy for our nation.

We cannot afford to be paralyzed by that frustration. The bleak history of energy mismanagement in this nation since the first shock waves of the 1973 oil crisis cannot be allowed to interfere with our decision-making and problem-solving processes today. We must move forward on energy, and we must do so immediately.

As we debate the energy challenge facing America, there are at least two questions that must be answered. Is there really an energy crisis and, if so, how do we respond to it?

I have no doubt that the crisis is real. Fifteen years ago, we imported almost no oil at all. Today, we import one-half of the oil we use—more than eight million barrels a day—at a cost of over \$1 billion a week. Equally alarming is the fact that our dependence is concentrated in a handful of producing countries, many of which are openly hostile to U.S. interests and objec-

tives. Our traditional allies in Western Europe and Japan are even worse off than we are.

Two factors make this dependence especially serious for us and for our allies in Western Europe and Japan. First, whether we like it or not, oil is indispensable to the functioning of our economies. Developing substitutes will take years. Secondly, world consumption of oil is increasing at a rate which suggests that we will need the equivalent of a new Saudi Arabia every three years just to keep up with projected demand. Attaining that objective is not a possibility a prudent man would bet heavily on.

We should not be lulled into complacency by the disappearance of gas lines, or the return of tourists to Maine, or assurances of adequate heating oil supplies for the coming winter. We remain, as the President has noted, dangerously dependent on the thin line of oil tankers stretching halfway around the world. Crisis is as near as the next political revolt in the Middle East.

Our choice is a simple one. We can make the maximum effort to reduce oil consumption and shift to alternatives, or we can simply wring our hands in exasperation, do nothing, and insure that we will face an even greater crisis down the road. In the end, this choice will not be made by the President and the Congress, but by people around the country such as you.

Few nations are blessed with the energy resources we enjoy. No nation on earth possesses the technological expertise we have developed. Putting these considerable assets to work is the challenge confronting America.

It will not be an easy task. Decades of cheap, abundant energy have left us ill-prepared to deal with the energy turbulence of the 1970's. What is required are fundamental changes in the way we use and think about energy.

As we contemplate the shift from an oil-driven economy, we can perhaps take some solace from the fact that major course corrections in energy supplies have been navigated in the past. Energy from wood burning was replaced by energy from coal. Coal was eventually replaced in large part by oil. We have now come full cycle, and are actively seeking to enhance the role of wood and coal as replacement fuels for oil.

Our current situation bears truth to H. G. Wells' observation that "human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe."

How can we reverse the deteriorating energy situation we have been facing since early in this decade? What steps are necessary to restore rationality to the energy debate and set the nation on an orderly course leading to energy security at a reasonable cost? In my view, several actions are urgently required.

First, we must end the frantic and futile search for scapegoats. Each of us must be mature enough to accept part of the blame, and concerned enough to shoulder part of the solution. Blaming OPEC, the oil industry, the President, the Congress, the environmental movement, or the Department of Energy may make us feel better, but it only distracts us from the more immediate task at hand.

We must accept the uncomfortable fact that there is no cheap, quick fix. It will take years to bring our energy budget back into balance, and the job will be enormously expensive. It is imperative that we rid ourselves of the misguided notion that energy prices will ever again return to pre-OPEC levels.

Second, we must begin to view conservation as an absolute necessity, not a passing fad. It is the single most important step we can take to reduce oil imports, lower energy costs, preserve jobs, and lessen the environmental, health, and safety problems associated with energy use.

While it is true that Americans have become increasingly energy conscious as a result of rising prices and supply shortages, we have not begun to approach our potential in this critical area. We must build a vocal, national constituency for energy conservation. To do this, we must greatly expand existing incentives for individuals and businesses, and remove regulatory roadblocks that discourage conservation.

Use of energy is involved in almost every human decision. Whenever we turn on a light, heat an unused room, or live in an unnecessarily large house, we are making an energy decision. Whenever we join a car pool, buy an automobile, or choose a manufacturing process, it has energy consequences.

A policy that legislates energy conservation while maintaining powerful incentives to consume excessive amounts of oil and gas is self-defeating. By transmitting the wrong signals, our overly regulated energy markets encourage too much energy use, and too little conservation.

Third, we must forge a constructive relationship between the energy industry and the government. We need to recognize that the economic, environmental, social, and foreign policy implications of oil transactions make it necessary for government to remain an active partner with private industry in energy decisions.

Government efforts should supplement, not supplant those of private industry. The system that built this nation and made it great should be allowed to make America's energy choices for the future. We need to spur competition and innovation, not install an army of bureaucrats in the Department of Energy.

If we have learned anything over the past six years, it is that we must rely more heavily on our free enterprise system, and not less.

Four, we need to vastly overhaul our existing mechanisms for assessing the economic, environmental, and social impacts of major public and private energy projects. The way the administrative procedure works now, we waste too much time, spend too much money on litigation, and end up with too few decisions.

I respect the right of every citizen to participate in good faith in the process for judging major energy projects. But efforts to use the process simply to obstruct or endlessly delay a final decision are unacceptable.

In his most recent energy address, the President called for the creation of an energy mobilization board to coordinate and expedite decisions on major energy projects. That an energy mobilization board has become necessary is an admission by government that its own regulations and policies have only frustrated attempts to address the energy problem.

Five, we should seek to develop a long-term hemispheric energy policy through improved relations with Mexico and Canada. This Common Market approach on energy can be expanded to include joint efforts aimed at resolving other pressing, unresolved problems facing the North American community of nations.

We should also use our membership in international lending institutions such as the World Bank and the International Development Association to aggressively promote development of energy supplies in non-OPEC nations. Such an effort will not only diversify world oil sources, but enhance orderly economic development in less fortunate nations.

Six, any comprehensive set of recommendations for addressing our nation's energy problems must include policies and programs designed to stimulate the development of alternatives to oil and gas. But let's make sure we understand the consequences of our actions.

The President has suggested that we pour \$88 billion into a crash program to develop

synthetic fuels. How much research and development of automobile efficiency and mass transit could we buy with that kind of money? How many solar collectors could we build for that sum? How many homes could we properly insulate for a similar investment?

These are the kinds of questions we should be asking. When we make our choices, we should be guided by common sense, not by a utopian vision of energy abundance unsupported by solid scientific evidence.

Seven, we must continue to address the legitimate public concerns over nuclear power—specifically, the management and disposal of nuclear wastes, the safety of reactor operations, health and environmental risks, and proliferation of nuclear weapons through the use of reactor by-products. No thoughtful person can reflect on the Three Mile Island accident without wanting to re-examine the future role of nuclear power.

In my judgment, we should not view nuclear fission energy as the long-term answer to America's energy problems, but as a necessary and important transitional resource that will buy our nation time until alternative sources are fully developed.

Eight, Congress must recognize that state and local governments can and must play an expanded role in alleviating our nation's energy problems. We should immediately approve a broad range of economic incentives that will assist state and local governments in their efforts to conserve energy or promote greater use of renewable resources that would include small hydroelectric projects.

Nine, we need to gradually free domestic oil prices from federal regulations, subject to the following conditions:

Presentation of credible evidence that decontrol will stimulate significant additional production;

Demonstration that decontrol will not significantly worsen our nation's already serious inflationary problems;

Enactment of a workable windfall profits tax that will recapture, for the public benefit, a percentage of the vast new revenues that will result from decontrol;

Presentation of conclusive evidence that world prices reflect true U.S. marginal replacement costs;

Assurances that additional profits resulting from decontrol will be reinvested in exploration, development, and production of new energy supplies;

Approval of a broad range of economic assistance programs that will help consumers adjust to higher prices and convert to alternative sources of energy; and

Demonstration by the oil industry that it is willing to cooperate fully with government in such areas as verifying petroleum inventories and true production costs.

Ten, we should strictly adhere to the ceiling on oil imports agreed to at the recent Tokyo energy summit. We should turn to a stand-by gas rationing plan only as a last resort. Such a plan should have as few exceptions as possible.

For the years immediately ahead, we must recognize that our choices are limited. Rapid and effective implementation of an energy conservation policy seems to be the only real prescription for at least partial relief of our national energy headache. Energy conservation alone cannot close the energy gap. It will, however, reduce the magnitude of the problem by bringing supply and demand into closer correspondence while allowing us to stretch our nonrenewable fossil fuel resources.

The critical consideration is that we seek solutions that are politically acceptable, while at the same time making significant contributions to resolving our energy problems. As Robert Stobaugh and Daniel Yergin wrote in a recent edition of "Foreign Affairs," such a solution is better than one that might theoretically solve our problems

altogether, but which has no chance of being adopted.

"It is time," Stobaugh and Yergin wrote, "for the United States to come to terms with the realities of the energy problem, not with romanticism, but in a pragmatic and reasonable way—and not out of altruism, but for the most pressing reasons of self-interest."

We are past the point where we can afford to discuss the energy issue from a detached or ideal perspective. The reality is that our own supply of conventional fuels has peaked, while our demand has not. Our sources of oil in the international market are charging what the market will bear—a price considerably higher than we expected to pay at this point in our Nation's history.

The crisis in energy has only magnified the crisis in leadership that has paralyzed our nation in recent years. We are paying an extremely high price for that indecision, and will pay an even greater price if action is not taken immediately.

Clearly, the time is at hand to enact a comprehensive energy policy for the United States that looks beyond the next election and into the next generation. This task will require an immense amount of leadership, will, imagination, sacrifice, and courage. It will also require that we lay aside the philosophical and regional differences which have, to date, resulted in energy deadlock.

Checking inflation and solving the energy problem are not conflicting goals, but opposite sides of the same coin. Our citizens want decisive and effective action on energy, and they want it now.

As former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger said in a 1975 speech on energy, "History has given us a great opportunity disguised as a crisis."

Our challenge is to seize the opportunity while it is still available, and mold a comprehensive, farsighted energy policy for the United States. With your continued support and assistance, we can and will get the job done. ●

THE DECREASING DOLLAR

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, when the Treasury engineered devaluations of the dollar in terms of gold—8 percent and 10 percent respectively—it was big news.

Since those days, the dollar has been devalued an incredible 87 percent, but there are no more headlines.

We hear about the rising price of gold, but that puts the monetary cart before the horse. Gold is not increasing in value, the dollar is decreasing, as the Federal Government prints more and more paper money, and balloons the supply of credit.

Now we get rumors that the U.S. Treasury plans to increase drastically its sale of gold, to try to lower the price. The planners are shamed by this barometer of their mistreatment of the people's money. And some are even suggesting that artificially and temporarily lowering the gold price would slow inflation, which makes as much sense as putting a piece of ice on a fever thermometer.

If Treasury is determined to get rid of our gold, let us, at least, sell it to Americans in the form of medallions, and not in 100 ounce bars to Arabs and

international bankers. The average American deserves a chance to protect his savings from Government devaluation, just as much as the plutocrat or the sheik. ●

ROCK ISLAND RAILROAD DISPUTE

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my grave concern with regard to the immediate harmful impact of the Rock Island railroad labor dispute. The seriousness of this problem is clearly understood by my fellow Representatives from the hard hit areas in the Midwest, but because this problem also threatens to have a negative effect on the entire Nation's economy, I would like to share my views with my colleagues in Congress.

The Rock Island railroad is a vital link in the transportation network of Midwest grain. A record grain harvest is predicted this year, but if already full grain elevators are not emptied soon to make room for the new harvest, Midwest farmers will lose millions of dollars. That is why, each day that the Rock Island does not operate at full capacity means substantial losses to the Nation's rural economy.

In addition, a significant and growing part of the grain harvested in Iowa and the Midwest is exported, and the continued disruption of grain transportation will affect our Nation's economy through the potential loss of overseas markets with a resulting negative impact on our country's balance of payments. This would be a serious loss as grain exports for 1979 are projected to exceed \$30 billion in foreign trade earnings, which are critically needed to offset our growing oil import bill. Agricultural exports have been one of the few bright spots in the U.S. trade picture, and it would be pure folly not to do everything possible to see that their flow is uninterrupted.

The Rock Island line also transports a significant amount of low sulfur coal from the western coal region to midwestern power installations. Curtailment of these coal supplies will have an adverse effect on energy production as the fall harvest and winter heating seasons approach.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that our national rail transportation is far from optimum in its current state. This fact makes it all the more imperative that the service that does exist is not impaired further.

Obviously, the current Rock Island labor dispute, if allowed to continue, would seriously deprive Iowa and the other Midwest States of essential transportation service, and would have a negative impact on the entire Nation's economy. Therefore, I have asked Mr. Robert O. Harris, Chairman of the National Mediation Board, to review the Rock Island situation and to recommend the

establishment of an emergency board with a 60-day cooling-off period, so that critical transportation services can be restored pending review of the Rock Island dispute.

I have also strongly urged President Carter to take immediate steps to prepare for the establishment of an emergency board, and to take whatever other action is necessary to end this potential crisis. I encourage all of my colleagues to join me and the rest of us from the Midwest, in calling for an early resolution to this dispute.●

EFFECT OF SALT AGREEMENT

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House will not have an opportunity to participate directly in the consideration of the strategic arms limitation treaty. We must, however, consider carefully the effect any such SALT agreement would have on American security. We must look carefully at our defense posture and determine whether, with or without SALT, our security position is adequately protected. It is a determination that cannot be made in isolation from Soviet actions.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent editorial in the Los Angeles Times which clearly describes the importance of preventing a serious shift in the military power balance toward the Soviet Union.

The article, "The Shadow of Soviet Might," follows:

THE SHADOW OF SOVIET MIGHT

Although the fate of the strategic arms limitation treaty will not be decided for some weeks yet, it appears probable that the agreement will be ratified by the Senate—but only after adequate assurances by President Carter that he will carry through with increases in the defense budget.

We sympathize with those who are disappointed that an arms control treaty should become a mile stone toward higher rather than lower military spending. To the American mind, it is obvious that both the United States and the Soviet Union would benefit if the military balance could be stabilized at a lower, less expensive level and that money put to more productive use.

Carter has made plain his own hope that the next stage of SALT negotiations will open the way to actual reductions in the strategic nuclear forces on both sides. Soviet leader Leonid I. Brezhnev has, at times, suggested that he shares this aspiration.

Unfortunately, there is no reason to believe that the Russians have any intention of reducing the most threatening portions of their strategic forces in order to satisfy American desires for a strategic balance.

In these circumstances, this country has no prudent choice but to take those steps that will prevent the power balance from sliding dangerously in favor of the Soviet Union. And that, regrettably, means that modestly higher spending is necessary, SALT II notwithstanding.

Those who believe that the United States should unilaterally cut defense spending, on the theory that the Soviet Union would follow suit, should understand that this country has, in effect, already tried that gambit. And it didn't work.

At the time of the Cuban missile crisis, the United States enjoyed overwhelming nuclear superiority. Under pressure of Vietnam war costs, the strategic budget and other non-Vietnam defense expenditures declined markedly in inflation-adjusted dollars.

When the Soviet Union was thereupon seen to be pursuing a massive missile-building program, Washington took the hopeful view that, once the Russians caught up, they would stop and settle for approximate strategic equality.

But they didn't. The Soviet Union continued to outspend the United States across the whole spectrum of military power, from conventional forces to military research and development.

As a result, the Soviets have long since surpassed the United States in most numerical measures of military power and are moving as rapidly as possible to close the qualitative gap.

Carter, since taking office, has made two unilateral gestures. He halted the B-1 bomber and indefinitely postponed deployment of the neutron warhead with U.S. forces in Europe. The Soviet response has been to move toward a new, B-1-type bomber and to deploy more short- and medium-range missiles targeted on Western Europe.

The reality is that this country's land-based Minuteman missile force will become vulnerable to a Soviet saturation attack by 1982, the aging B-52 fleet will lose its ability to penetrate Soviet air defenses by 1985 and missile-firing U.S. submarines are expected to become vulnerable in 1990 and beyond.

Nothing in the SALT II treaty will change this disturbing prospect.

Thus U.S. defense plans call for prolonging the survivability of the American nuclear deterrent—and therefore enhancing its credibility in a crisis—by putting some land-based ICBMs on wheels, mounting cruise missiles on bombers and building submarine-fired missiles with a longer range.

Even with these programs cranked into the military budget, U.S. defense spending will still be far less than the Soviet outlay. And in the framework of U.S. spending priorities, the strategic weapons budget will still be less, in inflation-adjusted dollars, than it was in the 1960s.

The fact remains, of course, that both the United States and Russians should be spending less for arms. But support of the second half of that proposition is notably lacking in the Soviet Union.

Soviet power and influence in the world have grown markedly in the last few years. This has not happened because the Russian version of communism is attractive to anybody, nor is it a tribute to the brilliance of Soviet diplomacy. It has happened because of the shadow cast by growing Soviet military power.

The day may come when economic strains will force the Soviet leadership to reconsider its spending priorities—especially if it becomes convinced that the United States will match whatever level of competition is necessary.

But as long as the military balance is shifting in their direction, and paying political dividends in the process, the Soviets will not willingly cash in what they see as a winning hand in order to satisfy the American longing to beat swords into plowshares.●

TAMA COUNTY FAIR CELEBRATED

HON. S. WILLIAM GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 9, the Third Avenue Mer-

chants Association (TAMA) will sponsor the fourth annual TAMA County Fair along Manhattan's Third Avenue from 14th to 34th Streets to showcase the unique and diverse attractions of this historic and colorful avenue.

Hundreds of thousands of visitors from the tri-State area are expected to attend this "urban county fair" and acquaint or reacquaint themselves with one of New York's most vital commercial and residential communities.

The Third Avenue Merchants Association, an organization of small businessmen and women on Manhattan's East Side, has contributed greatly to the financial well-being and to the overall neighborly ambience of New York City with its many community projects.

As a Member of Congress from the 18th Congressional District, which encompasses "TAMA County," I commend the members of the Third Avenue Merchants Association not only for their sponsorship of this community event—the TAMA County Fair—but for their tireless efforts to promote a spirit of camaraderie on Third Avenue throughout the year.

I wish the association the greatest of all successes at the fourth annual TAMA County Fair on September 9.●

WILL DOPE BE RUN BY DOPES?

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, as a leading opponent of S. 210, the bill to create Federal Department of Education, I read with great interest school teacher Charles M. Frye's impressive essay in the September 3 issue of Newsweek magazine.

Those of us in the House who do not want a new department have been making two major arguments against it: that an Education Department would inevitably lead to further Federal control over our schools, and that it makes no sense in terms of management policy. To these, Mr. Frye adds a third, equally valid proposition:

On the evidence, it would almost certainly tend to institutionalize the erosion of standards and calcify the inanities of the last ten to twenty years.

Mr. Frye's thesis reinforces my belief that the House acted unwisely when it rejected my amendment to name the proposed agency the "Department of Public Education" (DOPE).

I urge my colleagues, before they vote on the conference report on S. 210, to reflect on Mr. Frye's essay, which appears below:

WHO RUNS THE SCHOOLS?

(By Charles M. Frye)

The quality of public-school education in the United States has been declining for the last decade and a half. This almost universal decline has been marked by plummeting Scholastic Aptitude Test scores, functionally illiterate high-school graduates and the general alienation of many students. It has been paralleled by an explosive growth in the non-teaching school bureaucracy, over-all cost

increases vastly exceeding inflation, declining enrollment and a radical redefinition of school objectives. Educators flail their arms and point their fingers in self-defense at the home, the television sets and the shattered marriages. Or they cite the "expanded opportunities for the disadvantaged" and the development of "life-coping skills." They sound like a car dealer receiving a car for its tenth recall.

If a business or government agency had been experiencing a fifteen-year decline, somebody surely would have subjected the management to intense scrutiny at least. But various studies of the school problem have very carefully avoided dealing with the paramount question: Who runs the schools?

Credentials: The school Establishment consists of four major interlocking groups: the many and various graduate schools of education which train and certify teachers, administrators and the other bureaucrats; the Federal education complex; the various state departments of education, and the local school-administration corps.

The personnel of these groups are largely interchangeable and indistinguishable because they have all—from the professors of education, the HEW functionaries, the superintendents and principals to the most humble child-care directors—taken lots and lots of graduate courses while accumulating lots and lots of credentials in education. The capabilities of the people who take and teach these courses, and the almost total lack of content therein, create finally a remarkably homogeneous population.

Many, but certainly by no means all, of the graduate schools of education require the submission of a Graduate Record Examination. It can be safely assumed, given the education Establishment's commitment to seniority, that its more influential members began their graduate work some years ago, and hence data circa 1963-64 are most relevant indeed.

During that period, 77,000 candidates took the GRE. Of the 4,365 who were applying to graduate schools of education, 81 percent were below average in the verbal section (why Johnny can't read) and 84 percent below average in the quantitative. Only home-economics and physical-education candidates did worse. (Interestingly enough, of the nineteen principals under whom I have worked, at least six had a physical-education background.) Fewer than 100 compiled scores that would be considered distinguished. Bluntly, this is the number of academically highly qualified candidates available to all the "selective" graduate schools of education in the country.

By 1977, the entire graduate-school situation had changed—the number of GRE's administered each year had increased by approximately 120 percent, while the number of graduate-school-of-education candidates increased by about 300 percent. Only two-thirds of the education scores were below average during this period (an improvement!), exceeding only home economics, physical education and speech. If NASA had been staffed as selectively as the education Establishment, it would have been lucky to hit Tallahassee.

During the last ten to fifteen years, this Establishment has managed to keep its graduate schools employed and growing despite a steady drop in the school population and an embarrassing surplus of teachers and administrators. The schools of education of the California State University system, for example, have accomplished this by offering 28 different master's degrees, among them some virtually indistinguishable specialties, such as "communication handicapped," "learning handicapped," "physically handicapped" and "severely handicapped"; or, "special education" and "special-education supervision."

The California state department of education now requires a special-education credential or M.A. for the teaching of "gifted" children. Considering the dismal performance of GRE candidates for education, it is obvious that these requirements will effectively exclude most intellectually able adults from the "gifted" programs.

There is currently a concerted drive by the graduate schools of education to treat "black English" as a second language. This, of course, will require special educational programs and credentials, and the infusion of Federal "English as a Second Language" funds to support programs in the schools. (Had English as a Second Language existed when I was in high school, it would have meant extensive curricula in Italian, Bohemian, Slovakian, Moravian, Polish, Estonian, Lithuanian and Latvia—the mother tongue of the valedictorian of my class.)

Objective tests: The explosive growth in the education Establishment has been, and is being, drawn from among the weakest of our college graduates. It is, therefore, entirely consistent that they should attack or drop IQ testing, ability grouping and objective tests for teachers and administrators, while using their energies to develop myriad elective subjects and remedial programs. This type of growth has cost us all—in more ways than one.

The establishment of a Federal department of education would be a veritable bonanza for the Establishment, a potentially limitless source of jobs, funds and authority. On the evidence, it would almost certainly tend to institutionalize the erosion of standards and calcify the inanities of the last ten to twenty years.

The ultimate irony is that the fundamental responsibility for this state of affairs lies precisely with those institutions now most vociferously bemoaning the education product of schools; that is, with the colleges and universities that have permitted their graduate schools of education to grant valid master's degrees and doctorates in education in ever-increasing numbers to people they would not have deigned to consider for admission to any of their academic or professional schools. Clearly, the various components of this Establishment should be dismantled with all deliberate speed. But, in the meantime, it wouldn't hurt if school boards required the submission of employees' GRE scores, the better thereby to understand "who runs the schools" and how they have come to be conducted as they are. ●

CONGRATULATIONS TO NEW CITIZENS

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it is with particular pleasure that I congratulate 24 residents of Maryland's Second Congressional District who have chosen to become American citizens, with all of the responsibilities that freedom and citizenship entail. I hope you will join me in welcoming these new Americans and extending to them our wishes for a happy and prosperous life in the land we love.

They are:

Mr. Dilip Dunjbehari Derooka, Mr. David Pottash, Mr. Kyung Sun Noh, Mrs. Hiew Joyce Noh, Miss Yuet Nror Lew, Mr. Jose Luis Pino Y Torres, Mr. Sergio A. Acle, Mr.

Chiau-Wen Hsiao, Mrs. Dana Hsu Hsiao, Mr. Charles Lin, Miss Mei Mei Lin, Mrs. Eun Jum Jo.

Mrs. Helena Moran, Mr. Franklin W. Knight, Mrs. Jeong S. Lee, Mr. Sung Lee, Mrs. Deepa Sharma, Mr. Giovanni G. Di Fatta, Mr. Nirmal Kumar in behalf of Vaswati Sinha, Mrs. Maria Beleeos, Mrs. Purita Te de Guzman, Mrs. Mary T. Homan, Miss Maria Patricia Albornoz, Mrs. Kallias G. Amin. ●

RETIREMENT OF CHIEF JUSTICE SUSIE SHARP OF THE NORTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of personal regret that I note the recent retirement of Chief Justice Susie Marshall Sharp of the Supreme Court of North Carolina.

Chief Justice Sharp, better known to her many friends, colleagues, and associates as "Miss Susie," compiled an outstanding record of public service and distinction during her long career. She was born in Rocky Mount, which is within my congressional district, and graduated from the North Carolina College for Women, now the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. She received her law degree from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Her career in the law included 20 years in private practice, 10 of which she also served as city attorney for her hometown of Reidsville. She spent 13 years as special judge of the superior court of North Carolina before being appointed associate justice of the North Carolina Supreme Court in 1962 by Gov. Terry Sanford.

In 1974, Miss Susie was elected chief justice. A footnote to history will be that she was the first woman popularly elected in her own right to the position of chief justice of a State supreme court. More than that, to her fellow citizens of North Carolina, she was the right person for the job.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for the other Members of the North Carolina delegation to Congress in wishing for Miss Susie a long and happy and successful retirement. Her presence in the legal affairs of our State—particularly at the appellate level—will be missed. But I know she will use her extra time to continue her service on behalf of her fellowman.

I commend to my colleagues' attention the following August 16 editorial from the Raleigh News and Observer which pays just tribute to Miss Susie's public service:

[From the Raleigh (N.C.) News and Observer, Aug. 16, 1979]

SUSIE M. SHARP: JURIST

"I broke the ice. I hope I made it a little easier for women who want to be lawyers and judges. But no one else can have the fun, the pleasure and the shock of being first."

Susie Marshall Sharp once used those words to explain how she felt about being the first woman Superior Court judge in North Caro-

lina, the third woman in the country to sit on a state appellate court, the first woman to become chief justice of a state Supreme Court.

Her explanation typified the lucidity of thought and expression that marked her 30 years on the bench. Chief Justice Sharp refused to deny the thrill of being a pioneer for members of her sex. She could not fail to be conscious of the great responsibility she carried for all women in those 17 years at the Supreme Court.

But Susie Sharp earned esteem for more than breaking new ground in the judicial system for women. When she retired officially Aug. 1, the chief justice retained the respect and devotion of North Carolinians because she had done a good job as judge.

From the time Gov. W. Kerr Scott named her a special Superior Court judge in 1949 until she stepped down this month, she carried out her duties with diligence and dignity. Her competence never emerged more clearly than in the four and a half years she presided as chief justice.

Court historians will note her insistence on high judicial standards. Six district court judges were censured and one removed during her term as chief justice. She counseled and corrected in private others she felt were inviting disrespect for the courts. She remains convinced today that too many judges in the state don't come up to standard.

The chief justice's strong belief in the separation of powers and her emphasis on the duty of judges to interpret and not make laws built her conservative reputation. But she also spoke out and worked for reforms in the treatment of alcoholics and juvenile offenders, reform of the prisons and the justice-of-the-peace system and for assurance of quality legal representation for indigent defendants. The state listened and responded when she spoke from the heart. ●

STATE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS
ON VIEWS OF A PALESTINIAN
MAYOR

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, in the July 9, 1979, issue of Newsweek, Muhammad Milhem, the mayor of Halhul, a town of 13,000 Palestinians in the Israeli occupied West Bank, stated his reservations about the Camp David peace process and the Israeli-Egyptian peace treaty and why he feels the Palestinians are entitled to self-government and national independence.

I wrote the Department of State asking for their comments on Mayor Milhem's article and a specific critique of Mayor Milhem's reasons for rejecting the Camp David formula.

I would commend to my colleagues and all interested observers of the important Middle East peace process both Mayor Milhem's article and the Department of State's reply to it which follow:

A PALESTINIAN VIEW

If there is a single people in the Middle East more anxious than any other to seek peace, it is the Palestinian people. We have suffered enormously during the last 60 years—30 years of British occupation, followed by 30 years of fragmentation, exile and Israeli occupation.

I am the mayor of Halhul, a Palestinian

town, which has itself seen the mass arrests, deportation, torture, house demolition, land expropriation and harassment of people at checkpoints and on the streets of their towns and villages that have characterized twelve years of Israeli military rule.

We who have suffered this also deserve peace, but instead, the Camp David accords have borne us bitter fruit. Two of our Halhul youngsters were shot dead by Israeli soldiers, and a sixteen-day curfew was imposed on our town while the Egyptian-Israeli treaty was being signed in Washington. During the curfew there were scores of arbitrary arrests. Farmers could not spray their vineyards, so that 30 per cent of this year's grapes were spoiled. Israeli soldiers smashed the windows of at least twenty homes to punish families where a child had strayed outside during the curfew. The authorities did not allow relief supplies to come, and prevented other West Bank mayors from publicly expressing concern for our plight. For us, these were the fruits of the "peace" treaty. We ask: what lies ahead?

RIGHTS

More than half a century ago, the international community, through the League of Nations, determined that the Palestinian people were entitled to self-government and national independence. Today, we are offered "autonomy" for one-third of our people in one-fifth of our country. We know of no convincing justification for this severe diminishment of our national rights. We owe it to ourselves, the peoples of our region and the cause of lasting peace to strive for an equitable peace that can be willingly embraced, rather than for an oppressive settlement that must be grudgingly endured, divorced from our aspirations for nationhood. We are alarmed and angered by the present mutation of our hope for a comprehensive regional peace into a partial, bilateral settlement.

In recent years, an international consensus has taken shape regarding the nature of a just and lasting Middle East peace. This consensus, to which all but a few states subscribe, and which we Palestinians find to be an acceptable basis for a just and lasting peace, calls for a comprehensive settlement that includes the realization of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination, including their right to political independence in a national state on their native soil.

A settlement that is not comprehensive and omits Palestinian self-determination will produce a temporary truce, not a state of peace. The Camp David "Framework for Peace in the Middle East" and subsequent negotiations and agreements have given lip service to the "urgent necessity" for a just, comprehensive and lasting peace, but they have been unfaithful to this commitment by promoting formulas that blatantly ignore and circumvent the basic and essential prerequisites of such a peace.

The Palestinians and all the peoples of our region have a right to a genuine peace. Equally, we share the obligation and responsibility to resist and reject tranquilizing substitutes. We believe that Israel sought and obtained at Camp David a formula that can only lead to the dead end of a separate treaty with Egypt.

Camp David provoked Palestinian rejection for several reasons:

1. It spoke of "the inhabitants of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip" instead of the Palestinian people, thus ignoring the majority of our people who have suffered the most, and asking us, the minority, to represent the whole. While we live under occupation, we at least live in our homeland. Our brothers and sisters are the victims of forced exile. We cannot forget them or act without them.

2. Camp David accepted the principles that the other peoples concerned are free to desig-

nate their spokesmen and representatives, but denied this right to the Palestinians. The Palestine Liberation Organization is accepted by the Palestinian people and by the overwhelming majority of the nations of the world as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. Camp David requires the Palestinians to seek a substitute leadership as a condition of participation.

3. The agreements envision only "autonomy" for the inhabitants of one-fifth of Palestine. Autonomy is less than independence, and an autonomous region is a part of a larger state. The agreements, therefore, rule out the possibility of independence. We see no reason why we should negotiate a settlement that prohibits the option of independence for the Palestinian people. We have no interest in legitimizing Israeli occupation by consenting to a thinly camouflaged version of it.

4. Jerusalem, the heart of Palestinian history and heritage, was not mentioned. Jerusalem is also the geographic link between the northern and southern halves of the West Bank. We are neither willing nor able to envision the future without it.

5. The agreements did not require an internationally supervised cessation to Israeli settlement in the West Bank and Gaza, thus betraying a lack of good faith and a cruel disregard for the future of our people. A halt to the settlement is a sine qua non of the conference-building process that is alleged to be the principal achievement and merit of the ongoing diplomacy.

6. The agreements represent a regression from earlier international commitments to the Palestinian refugees. They make no mention of their internationally recognized right to choose repatriation or compensation. Before Camp David, there were agreed-upon solutions needing implementation. Now there is simply a "problem" that will someday be considered, without principles agreed upon in advance upon which negotiations can be based.

The Palestinian people are aware of the complexity of the issues. They certainly do not expect that the accumulated injustices will vanish overnight, and they do not daydream of easy and sudden freedom. But they are equally aware of the sterility of negotiating a settlement that in advance rules out the essence of their national identity, rights and aspirations.

The Palestinian people would be prepared to discuss how and when they are to achieve independence in their homeland. But they are not prepared, and no one has the right to expect them to be prepared, to discuss the modalities of denying them their freedom.

MOHAMMED MILHEM.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

July 10, 1979.

HON. CYRUS R. VANCE,
Secretary of State, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Attached is an editorial from the July 9, 1979 issue of Newsweek written by Mohammed Milhem, the Mayor of the town of Halhul on the Occupied West Bank.

I would appreciate a detailed commentary by the State Department on the statements made by Mayor Milhem about the Camp David process in general and the specific reasons for rejecting the Camp David process, which he cites. Naturally, citation of actions taken, rather than rhetoric, provide a better basis for countering the Mayor's critique.

I appreciate your consideration of this matter,

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe and
the Middle East.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
August 27, 1979.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe and the
Middle East, Committee on Foreign Af-
fairs, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response
to your letter of July 10 concerning the News-
week article by Mayor Milhem.

Mayor Milhem has articulated in a co-
herent and effective way the case of the
Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza
who distrust or find inadequate the negotiat-
ing process envisaged in the Camp David
accords. It is not an unfamiliar position, nor
is it one to which we are unsympathetic.
It reflects, however, what in our opinion has
been an unfortunate reluctance among
Arabs and Palestinians to take advantage of
an opportunity to end thirty years of hos-
tility and to lay the foundation for peace and
prosperity in the Middle East. While not
achieving everything the Palestinian people
want at a single stroke, the Camp David
Agreements set in motion a political process
that can significantly advance legitimate
Palestinian objectives.

The following comments are keyed to the
numbered points in Mayor Milhem's article:

1. The United States has consistently
taken the position that resolution not just
of the issue of the West Bank and Gaza,
but of "the Palestinian problem in all its
aspects" is central to achieving peace in the
Middle East. This is called for in The Frame-
work for Peace agreed to by President Sadat
and Prime Minister Begin at Camp David
last year, and reaffirmed in the Peace Treaty
signed on March 26, 1979. The first stage of
these negotiations began on May 25, 1979,
with the objective of bringing into being a
self-governing authority for the West Bank
and Gaza. There are provisions for Palesti-
nians not now in the West Bank and Gaza
to have their representatives, as mutually
agreed, join the negotiations on establish-
ing the Self-Governing Authority. Through-
out the transitional period in all the
negotiations, responsive Palestinians in this
area and outside almost certainly will re-
fect each other's views and concerns.

2. The United States would very much
like to have Palestinian participation in the
current negotiations. The foundation of
these negotiations, as of all diplomatic ef-
forts for peace since 1967, has been United
Nations Security Council Resolution 242.
Until the PLO explicitly accepts 242 and Is-
rael's right to exist behind secure and re-
cognized borders, it is hard to see how the
PLO as an organization could be accepted
into the negotiation process. On the other
hand, the Camp David agreements do not
prevent the involvement of PLO sympa-
thizers and supporters from among the
Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza.

3. The Peace Framework provides that
within three years of inaugurating an
elected self-governing authority in the West
Bank and Gaza, "negotiations will take
place to determine the final status of the
West Bank and Gaza and its relationship
with its neighbors." Palestinians will par-
ticipate in these negotiations, and they will
have a clear voice in determining their own
future. While it is too soon to predict what
that final status might be, no possible out-
come is precluded. In the meantime, the
self-governing authority is to replace the
Israeli military government and its civilian
administration which will be withdrawn, and
a withdrawal of Israeli military forces is
to take place. For the first time in history,
a Palestinian self-governing body is to be
established. We believe this will be a major
step toward fulfilling the legitimate rights
of the Palestinian people.

4. It is generally agreed that Jerusalem
is the most difficult problem in the entire
range of Arab/Israeli issues. The United

States believes that determination of the
ultimate status of Jerusalem must be sought
in the context of a just and lasting settle-
ment of the conflict as a whole and must
be based upon agreement among the parties
concerned. The Camp David Agreements have
established a framework for an eventual com-
prehensive settlement. The United States is
committed to help the parties make progress
toward that goal. We believe that a
process has been set in motion offering hope
for the permanent solution to the problem
of the status of Jerusalem that people of all
faiths and of all nations have so long sought.

5. The United States Government has re-
peatedly deplored new Israeli settlements in
the West Bank and Gaza. Our belief is that
the settlements are contrary to international
law and an obstacle to peace. The question
of the Israeli settlements in the West Bank
and Gaza, and their relationship with the
Self-Governing Authority (SGA) during the
transitional period will have to be dealt with
in the course of negotiations on the powers
and responsibilities of the GSA. The question
of the settlements and their status after the
transitional period would be a matter for dis-
cussion during the negotiations regarding the
final status of the West Bank and Gaza pro-
vided for in the Camp David Agreements.

6. At Camp David, Egypt and Israel com-
mitted themselves to work with other inter-
ested parties to establish agreed procedures
for a prompt, just and permanent resolution
of the refugee problem. The Agreement also
provides for the creation of a mechanism
which could permit the early readmission of
persons displaced from the West Bank and
Gaza in 1967. These people would be able to
reestablish themselves in their homes and
pursue their livelihoods for themselves and
their families in dignity and justice.

Sincerely,
NELSON C. LEDSKY,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congres-
sional Relations.●

WORKPLACE FATALITIES

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, in order
to demonstrate the need for effective
safety regulations, I would like to pro-
vide for my colleagues the following ex-
amples of tragedies in the workplace:

On November 3, 1978, an explosion and
fire occurred at a chemical plant in Hous-
ton, Texas, killing one employee. The
company involved was given two citations
for violation of the OSH Act with a pro-
posed penalty of \$4,280.

On July 24, 1978, two employees of an
offshore drilling company were killed when
an explosion occurred at the drill site—
120 miles southeast of Cameron, Louisiana.
OSHA was refused entry to investigate the
fatalities. A warrant was obtained by
OSHA and served; entry was again refused.

On October 2, 1978, two employees were
killed when a steel beam crashed during
construction of an overpass on an expres-
sionway in Miami, Florida. The company in-
volved was issued a citation by OSHA for
violations of standards regarding construc-
tion. A penalty of \$640 was paid by the
company.

Tragedies such as the above continue
to occur on a widespread basis, thus
pointing out the need for extensive and
comprehensive safety measures.●

THE GOOD NEWS ABOUT ENERGY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I
would like to insert my Washington Re-
port from August 8, 1979, into the CON-
GRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE GOOD NEWS ABOUT ENERGY

Not all the news about energy these days
is bad. Despite lines at service stations and
rumors of shortages in home heating oil
this winter, progress against the energy
problem is being made on several fronts.

Our effort to conserve energy is beginning
to make headway. Industrial use of energy
has dropped 6 percent since 1973 in spite of
a 12 percent rise in industrial output. Energy
efficiency in homes is up 5 percent to 10 per-
cent over the 1973 level, a gain due pri-
marily to the fact that half of all home-
owners have added insulation since that
year. The energy efficiency of home appli-
ances has increased 5 percent over the 1973
level, and the annual growth in the home
use of electricity has been halved. The aver-
age rate of fuel consumption for a new car
will be 20 miles per gallon in 1980, compared
to 14.4 in 1974. The federal government cut
its energy use by about 6.8 percent between
1975 and 1978.

These statistics reflect a very encouraging
trend in the economy: the rate of economic
growth is outpacing the rate of increase in
energy consumption. The economy expanded
at an annual rate of 3.9 percent last year,
yet Americans consumed only 1.9 percent
more energy in 1978 than they did the year
before. Energy consumption is now growing
less than half as fast as the economy. In
addition, from 1975 to 1977 energy consump-
tion grew only two-thirds as fast as the
economy. The amount of energy needed for
each dollar of the gross national product is
going steadily down.

We are making slow but constant prog-
ress against the energy problem by exploit-
ing alternative sources of energy. Gasohol, a
mixture of gasoline and alcohol, was an
experimental fuel only a few years ago, but
its use in 1979 could approach 75-100 mil-
lion gallons by the end of the year. There
was practically no solar energy industry
prior to 1974, but sales in that industry
reached \$225 million in 1977 and there are
now more than 40,000 solar heating and
cooling installations in place. President
Carter has stated that we could get 20 per-
cent of our energy from solar sources by
the end of the century. Production of energy
from municipal waste has risen dramati-
cally in the past decade, with more than 25
special conversion plants completed or under
construction across the nation. Recent action
in Congress provides strong evidence that
other alternative sources of energy are also
being taken seriously. Just a few weeks ago,
the House of Representatives overwhelm-
ingly approved a comprehensive program to
create synthetic fuels from coal and other
materials.

Over and above these novel developments,
research is moving ahead in the promising
technologies of nuclear fusion, hydrogen pro-
duction, small-scale hydropower, wind power,
ocean thermal energy conversion, and geo-
thermal steam. Behind the research is a nine-
fold increase in federal funding since 1970.

We have a mixed record on domestic pro-
duction of energy from traditional sources,
but here too, there is reason for cautious
optimism. Coal production is going up again,
from 552 million tons in 1971 to an estimated
715 million this year, and as much as 100,000
barrels of oil could be saved every day by

consumers who switch from oil to coal. Natural gas production has fallen from a high of 22.6 trillion cubic feet in 1973 to 19.7 trillion last year, but new legislation enacted by Congress and the exploitation of reserves in Alaska could reverse the decline. Oil production was 8.7 million barrels a day in 1978, down from a peak of 9.6 million eight years before, but increased production in Alaska, accelerated leasing of offshore tracts, and President Carter's gradual decontrol of domestic oil prices could halt the downward drift.

One of the most disturbing aspects of the energy problem is our dependence on foreign oil. Although we have pulled out of a steep increase in imports that began over ten years ago, we are still importing about 8 million barrels of oil a day on the average, only 9 percent below the record we set in 1977. The overall level of imports is not the only cause for concern. A sizeable portion of our imports comes from nations in the volatile Middle East, and oil produced in that region cannot be regarded as secure even when it is readily available.

Conservation, alternative sources, and domestic production all tend to diminish our dependence on oil from abroad, but a more direct solution is being tried. Acting in concert with the leaders of the other industrialized nations, President Carter has agreed to hold our oil imports to 8.5 million barrels a day. His decision ensures that we will not become more dependent on foreign oil than we already are. The recent discovery of huge oil reserves in Mexico (estimated to contain as much as 100 billion barrels) and our rising imports from that country (they will grow fourfold from 1977 to 1980) mean that the foreign oil we must have will be more secure. We now buy about 80 percent of all Mexican oil exports, a total of 550,000 barrels each day.

Solving the energy problem will be one of our greatest challenges in the 1980s. However, we should realize that we have the will and the means to meet the challenge head-on. The progress we have made so far is significant, but it is only a small part of what we can and must do in the years to come. ●

FORCE TO SOLVE ENERGY VULNERABILITY?

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, every once in awhile I receive a letter which stands out both in style and in substance. On July 25, I received one such notable letter from Scott McKell of Lansing, Mich. Last night as I watched the thoughtful NBC white paper "No More Viet Nams, But" I was reminded of Mr. McKell's letter in which he cautions against the temptation to use military force as a means of solving our energy vulnerability. I insert his letter at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

LANSING, MICH.,
July 21, 1979.

Representative Bob Carr,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CARR: The news-media tells me that some people in government are seriously in favor of attempting to enforce the flow of oil from the Middle East, if it is determined to be feasible. I believe that attitude demonstrates an essential misunderstanding of the energy

crisis; and I disagree with the idea of coercing foreign nations to meet domestic needs.

The issue of what constitutes "excessive" U.S. influence in other parts of the world is of great interest to me. U.S. governmental and business groups—ostensibly in my behalf, as citizen, consumer and stockholder—have taken varying degrees of control of governmental and economic policy decisions in many areas of the world, through covert and overt military actions, bribery, manipulation of public opinion—what have you. Official and unofficial documentation of this steadily builds up with little effective refutation.

Please allow me to express to you that these actions are not representative of my desires or best interests. I do not choose this manner of assuring that I and my kin have a comfortable standard of living. My opinion is that while we Americans may choose in our wisdom to maintain a standard of living that is excessively consumptive and wasteful of finite natural resources, to use force—military or economic—to coerce other nations to invest their resources or self-determination to our prosperity is simply immoral. I could no sooner support that than I could condone the robbery or extortion of a neighbor.

The lesson to be learned from our vulnerability to OPEC is not that OPEC is our enemy, but that our addiction to high energy usage is not without its own consequences; and so our solution to the energy crisis must focus on reconsidering our habitual energy consumption in light of the real cost of energy. All energy is going to remain almost prohibitively expensive until the day that solar power is well established. Shifting emphasis to coal is only a stop-gap measure, and nuclear energy is no longer even economically attractive.

I question what we will do when the resources actually run out—the oil and nickel and other minerals we depend on—and I wonder if the currently undeveloped nations will not eventually have the power to force us to stop exporting their varied resources. I would rather we work toward adapting to these inevitable changes than assume a posture of having the power to forever shape the world as is most convenient or profitable to us.

It would appear that the orientation of our society is such that we automatically reach for our guns or money to solve our problems. I believe that we must reach for wide alternatives now, including the morality to allow all the earth's people the whole power to govern their own lives, and a willingness to peacefully relinquish some of our material and psychological comforts to the end of allowing decent levels of security in all the world.

I thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

SCOTT MCKELL. ●

NO GROWTH PEOPLE ATTACK MAGNETIC FUSION

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, over the last several years of our deliberations in the Congress on the question of the breeder reactor, one aspect of the no-growth opposition to technology has become apparent to me. The environmental zealots who are really interested in slowing industrial progress and its

associated benefits only demonstrate concerns about energy options when it becomes clear that an option such as breeder technology is about to be demonstrated in a way that will convince people it is, in fact, sound.

The magnetic fusion option in the long run promises the most benign nuclear approach to generating electricity while at the same time we tap a virtually inexhaustible resource. I have warned the fusion community over the past 2 years that, once magnetic fusion energy reaches the threshold of becoming a reality for generating electrical power, the no-growth zealots will attack it.

I refer my colleagues to the recent Wall Street Journal on the progress of magnetic fusion for the first tangible evidence that this attack has begun. The no-growth faction through the Union of Concerned Scientists has raised questions about the initial use of tritium as a fuel in fusion reactors. It is clear that their strategy is to stretch out the demonstration for this relatively benign nuclear option by calling for an emphasis on advanced fuels which do not involve tritium handling. Although tritium has a much shorter half life than the isotopes of concern in nuclear fission, the environmental zealots have shown their hand by raising concerns about its use.

I hope the Congress and the citizenry have better sense than to allow these people to play on unreasoned fear about this attractive energy option and thus slow its critical progress.

The article outlines the promising evidence of recent progress in the magnetic fusion program and surfaces environmental concerns in the concluding paragraphs.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 28, 1979]

GETTING IT TOGETHER—PROSPECTS FOR ENERGY FROM NUCLEAR FUSION ARE IMPROVING AGAIN

(By Arlen J. Large)

PRINCETON, N.J.—For 28 years scientists have been struggling to re-create on earth the same source of sustained energy that powers the sun. After an initial glow of optimism, researchers on nuclear fusion went through a gloomy period of disappointment and frustration as experiments kept failing. Now, however, their mood is upbeat again.

So optimistic are fusion workers about recent scientific progress that they're getting impatient with the government's stately timetable stretching out research for another 40 years. Not until the year 2020, according to Energy Department plans, will fusion's tremendous heat be making electricity on a commercial basis.

One who would like to go faster is Melvin Gottlieb, director of the Princeton University Plasma Physics Laboratory here. "This is comparable to the effort to produce a bomb in the war," he says, "except that we aren't going at it on the same urgent basis." The pace "absolutely" could be speeded up, he says.

In fusion work, "plasma" is hydrogen gas so hot that its individual nuclei fuse together to produce helium and release energy. What's eye-catching for the layman is that the hydrogen can be obtained from a limitless supply of sea water, though the fuel source actually is more complicated than that. Fusion of the nuclei of hydrogen, the lightest natural element, releases more energy than the splitting (or fusion) of uranium, the heaviest, which has been pro-

ducing commercial electricity for years amid growing controversy.

FEW ENEMIES

Fusion fans say their method doesn't have fission's safety problems. While there are doubters among environmentalists, fusion probably won't attract many committed enemies until actual electricity producing reactors are closer to reality. What's generally undisputed at this point is that fusion is ready to make the leap from the scientific laboratory to the engineering drawing boards.

"This is the year in which we can finally say that man can make and control a plasma of burning fusion fuel on earth with reasonably sized and reasonably simple equipment," says Edwin Kintner, director of the Energy Department's office of fusion energy. "This is a thought which is shared worldwide by people working in the fusion field."

And world-wide the field is, reflecting the willingness of rich governments to spend money on what they see as a promising future source of energy. Outside the U.S., aggressive research programs are moving ahead in Western Europe, Japan and the Soviet Union. Indeed, the annual U.S. fusion-research budget of \$510 million accounts for just one-third of the world-wide effort.

GOVERNMENT MONEY

Because most of the work has no military application, there is a free and easy exchange of research data. Japan this year is putting up \$12.5 million for fusion work in California.

In this country and abroad, fusion research depends almost entirely on government bankrolls. Energy Department officials estimate that the U.S. government will have spent \$18 billion on this technology by the time it's ready to produce commercial electricity in the next century. But in the coming decades fusion will have to compete hard for research dollars with other potential sources of energy for central electricity-generating stations; fission-breeder reactors, electrified coal gas, solar-power satellites.

So far the expensive machines needed for fusion research have been built at government laboratories or at university campuses like Princeton. John Deutch, research director at the Energy Department in Washington, would like to see contracts awarded to private companies to build and operate future fusion-research machines. The companies wouldn't, however, be required to put up their own money, and the government has no plan to try to recapture its fusion-development costs from electric utilities that eventually may use the technology. Early-stage development of these new energy sources, says Mr. Deutch, "is a national responsibility."

HOW THEY WORK

Researchers think a fusion reactor could make commercial electricity along these lines:

A hollow metal doughnut is filled with a special mixture of hydrogen gas and heated to more than 100 million degrees Celsius, four times hotter than the center of the sun. Magnets surrounding the doughnut keep the electrified plasma from burning the walls. Nuclei of the hydrogen atoms fuse together to make new helium atoms, while releasing a shower of the atomic particles called neutrons. The neutrons, carrying 80% of the energy of the fusion reactions, bank into an outside blanket of lithium metal, making it hot. The heat is turned into steam, which drives the generator that turns on your light bulb.

That's one of many different conceptions, none of which has actually been tried. Princeton scientists using test doughnut devices called tokamaks have been fusing hydrogen and making neutrons at temperatures of up to 75 million degrees, but they're putting more start-up energy into the machines than comes back out.

Under construction here is the biggest tokamak yet, scheduled for completion in 1982. The scientists here are increasingly confident that by 1984 the machine will pass the break-even point, producing more energy than goes in, and by a significant amount.

The tokamak doughnuts, invented in the Soviet Union, have seemed to solve the problem of keeping the hot hydrogen plasma inside a stable magnetic "bottle," safely away from the metal walls. A famous experiment here last summer, though put down by Science magazine as a "media event" because of excited reports of a "break-through," nevertheless was important because it showed that plasma in the doughnut wouldn't break up at high temperatures.

While tokamak technology is the furthest advanced, the Energy Department continues to put chips on other potential fusion methods. Its long-term plan for picking the winning techniques for commercial development looks for all the world like the elimination brackets of a basketball tournament.

An alternative to the doughnut is a cylinder in which hydrogen plasma also is confined magnetically. To keep the plasma from seeping out the ends of the cylinder, magnetic fields or other devices serve as "mirrors" at each end. One such machine is being tested at the government-financed Lawrence Livermore Laboratory in California.

The first elimination is scheduled to come in 1984, when the Energy Department chooses between tokamaks and mirrors. The winning concept will be incorporated into a new machine called an engineering test facility scheduled to start operating in 1992. Princeton's Mr. Gottlieb and others rooting for a faster pace think work could start right away on certain parts of this machine that will be needed either for tokamaks or mirrors, no matter how the decision goes.

In 1997, according to the current schedule, officials will decide the fate of an entirely different way of fusing hydrogen to make energy. Work is under way at Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory and elsewhere on zapping a hydrogen-filled pellet with high-energy beams, either of laser light or atomic particles. The temperature in the pellet gets so high that fusion occurs, releasing the tell-tale shower of neutrons. To produce commercial electricity, a way must be found to shoot new pellets continuously into a chamber to be zapped by the high-energy beams.

Some researchers complain that work on this technique is hampered because some of it is classified as secret. The exact design of the pellet is related to what makes a hydrogen bomb go off.

The Energy Department's Mr. Deutch says pellet fusion "isn't in the same state of maturity" as plasmas confined in tokamaks or mirrors, which are being engineered specifically for commercial electrical production someday. Whatever technique looks most promising in 1997, however, will become the basis for a \$1 billion engineering prototype reactor that will start operating in 2004.

The government's final effort, a scaled-up "demonstration" reactor using the winning technology, is scheduled for operation in 2015. Thereafter, private utilities would be expected to start building their own fusion plants, using all the scientific and engineering data the government has developed.

This is too long a wait for fusion's go-faster faction. Democratic Rep. Mike McCormack of Washington, a leading fusion fan in Congress, wants to have "the first commercial demonstration fusion plant on line by the year 2000." Energy research boss Deutch tries to placate such proponents by saying the timetable for those distant

years is "flexible" and could be stepped up if future Congresses and future energy bureaucrats choose.

Fusion also has, however, a go-slower faction that wants to make sure that technical and environmental problems are solved before the government commits itself to a final design. The problems most often mentioned deal with the hydrogen fuel of a tokamak or mirror reactor.

The reaction that can occur at the most easily reached temperature requires two special forms of hydrogen: isotopes called deuterium and tritium. Deuterium can be obtained from sea water. Tritium doesn't occur in nature, but it can be produced artificially from lithium when those neutrons hit the metal during a fusion reaction. So most of the contemplated machines will breed their own tritium.

Tritium, however, is radioactive and will require special handling techniques and disposal methods. This disturbs the go-slow faction.

For example, the Union of Concerned Scientists, which wants no more of the current fission reactors built until disposal sites for the nuclear waste are found, thinks the government should investigate fusion technologies other than the deuterium-tritium approach. Steven Nadis, a research analyst for the union in Cambridge, Mass., says that at higher temperatures than those currently planned some particles will fuse to produce direct electric current without any neutron bombardment or radioactivity. However, he concedes that use of these so-called "advanced" fuels at higher temperatures "admittedly will be more difficult to achieve." ●

JOURNALISM AT ITS FINEST

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, if you were to ask me what I believe to be the most important virtues in a newspaper I would give two answers: The courage to print the truth even though it may make the newspaper unpopular; and the honesty to take a second look at what you have printed and, if necessary, revise your original opinion in the light of later evidence. Good newspapers all have the first virtue of courage; truly great newspapers have both virtues.

With this in mind I want to insert "Anti-Nukes 'Use' Media" and "You Were Used in ICC Fight," both published in the Peoria Journal Star, August 15, 1979:

ANTI-NUKES "USE" MEDIA

Last Sunday Steve Strahler reported his findings in talking with the neighbors of several new nuclear power plants around this state, and the results were rather surprising in the wake of all the noise made over "The China Syndrome" and Three Mile Island and all.

Folks had various normal neighborhood complaints such as one might have over a coal-fired plant or any major industrial installation. "It adds traffic" or it "uses up good farm land"—but it was a rare neighbor who expressed any concern about the circumstance that these plants were nuclear much less any fear of nuclear "threat."

There was very little paranoia among the "real people" around these places, including the one Commonwealth is building in the La Salle area and the one Illinois Power is building in the Clinton area.

The anti-nuclear organizations, meanwhile, make noises out of all proportion to their role and representation.

The neighbors may not be concerned but Illinois Power is having its problems with the "professional" anti-nuclear movement, and to some extent the media—including us—has been "used" by the anti-nuclear zealots in their effort to stop, delay, hamstring or mess up that operation any way they can.

The "Prairie Alliance" for example is admittedly against nuclear power. It appears to us that in that pursuit, as seems to be fashionable these days, folks tend to abandon the old concept of "conscience" as a sense of honor—a guide to personal conduct—and now seek "honor" and "morality" by selecting a "cause," setting personal conduct free to bang away any old way at the supposed evil.

The Prairie Alliance has waged a propaganda campaign against the Clinton plant, using any device available, including the Illinois Commerce Commission rate-making process. This obviously seems to be merely a device for doing any injury they can to the builder of a nuclear plant—and not a sincere concern about costs or rates, as such. It also seems that in this pursuit they do not really care if their charges and claims and figures and quotes are accurate and reliable or not—just so it inflicts a wound.

But even with zealots there are tricks you don't expect—such as releasing documents identified as "evidence" presented or to be presented to the Commerce Commission in these formal hearings . . . never presented in fact.

Never subjected to standard of evidence, to examination, cross-examination and testing for validity.

That is hoodwinking the media. That is assuming a false identity with a formal process for other purposes altogether—in order to piggy-back on the ICC's serious business and mis-use it as a mere propaganda prop; to mislead and "use" the media as to what you are really doing; and to steal "authority" for your claims that they do not possess.

That is part and parcel of a series of press conferences or releases designed to exploit the ICC hearings for propaganda, but not designed as bona fide procedures or evidence in the actual proceedings, in fact. (Also, probably not qualified to meet responsible standards for evidential matters which such bodies require in order to get responsible and reliable results.)

And by and large, much of the media fell for these devices, and we, next door, fell for some of the news "reports" arising from these mixed proceedings.

One result is the letter elsewhere on this page taking violent issue with one of our editorials on that subject. While the letter says things we would not interpret quite the same, its facts are facts and its criticism is valid.

Commonwealth Edison is the most experienced builder of more nuclear plants of any institution in the world and their cost "over-runs" at La Salle, which is a comparable project, are almost identical to those being experienced by Illinois Power at Clinton—in IP's first experience building a nuclear plant. That's a fact.

Much broader comparison in the nuclear field also demonstrates that in this period of inflation together with changes and improvements in nuclear plant technology, the Clinton development is well within the standard range of everybody's experience.

Please read their letter. It's only fair—and they've been subjected to enough unfairness in recent weeks.—C. L. DANCEY.

YOU WERE "USED" IN ICC FIGHT

Dear sir: Your editorial entitled "No Way To Run A Nuclear Plant," published July 23

in the Journal Star is inaccurate, misleading and unfair.

It is inaccurate because Illinois Power is not constructing the same nuclear plant at Clinton that Commonwealth Edison is building "85 miles northeast of Peoria." Commonwealth Edison is building four larger units of different design while Illinois Power is building one unit. Even though Commonwealth Edison is benefiting from the economies of scale resulting from large orders for materials and equipment on that project, it is still experiencing cost increases of about 100 percent. More important, however, is that Commonwealth Edison is experiencing a cost increase of approximately 200 percent (as we are at Clinton) at the two-unit LaSalle County Station which is much more similar to Clinton.

The editorial is misleading because of the inferences and implied conclusions. For example, the statement: "The Illinois Commerce Commission detected a slight flaw in the costs of one of the new nuclear plants in the state," is incorrect. A member of the ICC Staff has alleged such "flaws," but was unable to prove his contentions when cross-examined in the pending IP rate case before the ICC. Nevertheless, the editorial proceeds to accept these "contentions" by making unsubstantiated references to "shoddy management," "loose management," "poor management," and "questionable management practices."

Although the editorial gives much attention to the "contentions" of the ICC staff member, it totally neglects the positive, favorable findings of this staff member. He testified that he authored a study of performance of electric generating units in Illinois which concluded in part, "In terms of power plant productivity, one Illinois investor-owned utility, Illinois Power Company, is among the best in the nation, and in terms of productivity from large coal units, it ranks in the top five nationally." It is disturbing that the editorial would exhibit such obvious selective bias as to emphasize negative contentions and omit positive findings.

Your readers may be aware of similar allegations made in a "white paper" by the Prairie Alliance. I would hope that the frequent references in the editorial to a "report" do not refer to this document, which is even more distorted, biased, and without foundation. The Prairie Alliance is simply working to fulfill the goal printed on its masthead, "Stop the Clinton Nuclear Power plant."

More importantly, this editorial is unfair to your readers and to the Illinois Power Company and its employees because it gives credence to unsubstantiated allegations and contentions and makes it difficult to differentiate between fact and opinion. It is then a small step to real or implied personal attack. Our management and board of directors should not be smeared by innuendo and implications. As serious as these abuses are, however, they are overshadowed by the consequences of the Journal Star being "used" by those whose purposes are to thwart and obstruct legally authorized power plant programs. Although they profess concern for the cost of energy, they work to delay projects, which will further increase their cost and the cost of alternate generative capacity required while they are delayed. The Journal Star is playing into their hands when you imply concurrence with their position (and therefore, their objective).

The editorial closes with the "hope that the Illinois Commerce Commission will stand fast on this recommendation." This statement could be interpreted as an expression of editorial policy of the paper. We "hope" that this is not the case and that you will re-evaluate the facts, the conclusions, and your editorial position. This could be very important to the people of downstate Illi-

nois.—L. J. Koch, Vice President, Illinois Power Company.●

THE REGULATING STANDARDIZED TESTS: A RUSH TO JUDGMENT?

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, during the August recess, the Washington Post published an editorial which I feel every Member should read and consider. Proposed legislation to regulate standardized admissions tests is under consideration by the Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education Subcommittee. The Post writes that—

At first glance, it's a terribly appealing idea.

However, the editorial continues with a well reasoned and balanced analysis of the dangers of hasty Federal action in this area. Similar legislation was recently enacted in New York State and is scheduled for implementation in January 1980. It would certainly be prudent to evaluate the results in New York before embarking on a grand scheme for the Nation.

We are not in a "testing emergency." There is no crisis. Therefore, we do have time for a careful analysis of the pros and cons on this issue. We must not be stampeded by rhetoric but rather persuaded by the honest deliberation of the committee process before considering action on this issue.

I recommend to each of my colleagues the following Washington Post editorial of August 27, 1979:

SCORING THE ADMISSIONS TESTS

At first glance, it's a terribly appealing idea. A House subcommittee is now briskly proceeding with a bill giving students a legal right to see their college entrance examinations, with the questions and the corrected answers. For good measure, the bill would also establish broad federal supervision over all admissions testing. On a second and closer look, this legislation becomes less appealing.

Some of the support for it comes from people who simply think that students ought to be able to review their exams and see where they fell short. But some comes from people who want to change the nature of the tests, and the whole admissions process, on grounds that these are tilted against the poor and the minorities. Rep. Ted Weiss (D-N.Y.), the author of the principal bill under consideration, says that he doesn't want to regulate the tests. But his bill clearly lays the foundation for a regulatory system.

Young Americans take these tests by the millions every year for admission to college or professional school. The most widely used, the College Board's Scholastic Aptitude Test, is given more than 20 times a year throughout the country and abroad. Each new edition picks up a good many questions from the previous one, to ensure that the scores on a test given on one date will be comparable to those of another.

But Mr. Weiss' bill would require the College Board, after each test is scored, to give the student both the questions and the answers. Since the questions would immediately be passed around to other students, they could hardly be used again. The cost of the tests would go up, and the reliability of the

scores would probably go down. If you think that competitive admissions tests are wrong in principle, fine. Certainly test scores aren't the only criterion for admissions. But to diminish their usefulness would force colleges to depend on the other and more subjective measures—not necessarily an advantage to the youngster who doesn't fit the usual pattern.

Mr. Weiss wants the scores reported to Congress by students' family income, race, sex and ethnic origin. What, precisely, do you suppose he has in mind? It's obvious that the children of educated middle-class parents tend to make higher scores than the children of poor and uneducated parents. But the increasing use of these tests has demonstrably been accompanied, even at the most rigorously selective colleges, by increased enrollments of children from disadvantaged families.

But not everybody likes the idea of an independent testing board run by the colleges that use it. The National Education Association, the country's largest teachers' organization, warmly supports the Weiss bill. Under it, the oversight of testing would reside in the new Department of Education, if Congress is unwise enough to create one. The strongest political influence within that new department would be the NEA. That's another reason for concluding that the Weiss bill has dangerous implications that go far beyond its author's stated intentions. ●

BRYCE N. HARLOW

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I share with my colleagues the contents of an editorial which appeared in the *Baltimore Sun* on Monday, August 13, 1979. The author is Stephen Hess, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and a former White House staff member in the Nixon administration.

The subject of the editorial is one of the most worthwhile persons I have ever known. Bryce N. Harlow served as chief clerk of the House Armed Services Committee under chairmen of both parties. He left Capitol Hill to become one of the most valuable staff members in the Eisenhower administration.

I first met Bryce Harlow shortly after the beginning of my congressional service in 1953. He was extremely patient in enduring the foibles of all Members of Congress, particularly the members of that rowdy Republican freshman class in the 83d Congress. Our friendship has always been one of my prized possessions. After becoming minority leader of the House of Representatives, I frequently called Bryce and asked to meet him for breakfast to talk over matters which I found particularly puzzling. His broad knowledge of the Government and the people involved therein, his insight into the workings of the business community, and his good commonsense helped me over many rough spots.

Perhaps the greatest and most unselfish contribution made to our Government by Bryce Harlow came about as a result of a dinner at a private home in Washington in the spring of 1973. Robert

Haldeman and John Ehrlichman had resigned from the White House staff, and the course of the Nixon administration was indeterminate, to say the least. President Nixon obviously needed persons around him whom he could trust, and also who could be trusted by the people of the country and the Republican Party. The depth of the difficulties of the Nixon administration had not yet been plumbed, and it was felt by most of the Republican leadership, both in and out of Government, that the Nixon administration could and should survive.

This nice private dinner party turned into a real donnybrook with the result that at the end of the evening those of us present had drafted Bryce Harlow and Melvin Laird to go on to the White House staff to try to set a course which would preserve the effectiveness of the Presidency. Bryce Harlow served from July 1, 1973, to April of 1974. He and Mel Laird worked hard and effectively, and if it had been possible to save the Nixon Presidency, these two extremely capable men would have done so.

Only after the disclosures from the Nixon tapes did it become apparent to all of us that even Harlow and Laird could not restore the place of the Nixon Presidency in the eyes of the American people, which was a necessary prerequisite to the continuation of an effective executive department under that President.

It is my belief that of all the accomplishments of Bryce Harlow, his finest hour was this unselfish attempt to keep the country from suffering the wrenching pangs of Watergate. As it turns out, nobody could have succeeded in this endeavor, but nobody could possibly have tried harder than did Bryce Harlow. The editorial follows:

EISENHOWER ON HOLD—THE POWER BROKER
(By Stephen Hess)

WASHINGTON.—The time is November, 1968. The place is New York city, the Hotel Pierre, transition headquarters of President-elect Richard Nixon. Bryce N. Harlow has been called in to help plan the Republican administration that will take office in January. Mr. Harlow tells the story:

"I'm there in this room, phones ringing, jumping off the walls. Suddenly over runs a little twinkle-eyed secretary. She says, 'Mr. Harlow, President Johnson's calling.' I cut off who I was talking to and I said, 'Yes, Mr. President . . . yuppi yup, yuppy yup, yes sir . . .' And over runs the little twinkle-eyed secretary. I put my hand over the receiver. 'Yes, what do you want?' 'President Eisenhower is calling.' 'Tell him I'm talking to the President and I'll call him right back, or if he prefers, we'll put him on 'hold.' Believe me, we put President Eisenhower on hold. Now I've got the President [on the line], got the former President waiting. In runs Larry Higby, and he says, 'Mr. Harlow, Mr. Harlow,' very imperiously. 'The President-elect wants you in his office immediately.'"

Who is this Harlow whose counsel was once demanded simultaneously by a former president, a present president, and a future president?

Bryce Harlow has retired in the past year from business and public life, and it seems like an appropriate time to recall a remarkable person. But my purpose is not merely to pay tribute. There is instruction here on how government ought to operate. For Mr. Harlow's career is a reminder that government can only function well if the relations

between those who have been given power are based on integrity and trust. No agenda of procedural reforms can ever be a substitute for what Mr. Harlow brought to public service.

Quickly the outlines of a life: Bryce Harlow was born in Oklahoma City, August 11, 1916, received his B.A. and M.A. at Oklahoma University, and came to Washington as the secretary to his district's congressman. During World War II he was a Pentagon liaison officer to Congress; after the war he was chief clerk of the Armed Services Committee in the House of Representatives.

He made one effort to return to Oklahoma, but was lured back to Washington in 1953 when Mr. Eisenhower became president. He served in the White House during Ike's two terms, as a presidential speechwriter, and eventually as head of the congressional relations staff, a job he also held at the beginning of the Nixon administration. President Ford made him a member of his informal "kitchen cabinet." Between periods of White House service, Mr. Harlow directed the governmental relations office of Procter & Gamble.

There is no law that bears his name, no grand design for restructuring social services or national defense that history will credit to him. Yet he was the "insider's insider" in Washington, who by virtue of his personality, knowledge, skill and tireless effort formed a bridge between executive and legislature.

What were the traits that made Mr. Harlow the quintessential broker of power?

First, he was an incredibly skillful negotiator. As go-between, he had an uncanny knack for discerning what was most crucial to each "player." He knew on what point a legislator could afford to give in, and where the legislator would have to stand firm. He understood that the trick was to insure, if possible, that everyone would be able to claim some victory.

Second, he was always a giver of credit. It was Robert Taft, I think, who once said that it's remarkable how much can be accomplished if you let the other fellow take the credit. In a city of great egos, Mr. Harlow's effectiveness was partly based on an unassuming nature. To those who aspire to see themselves on the network news, Mr. Harlow never posed a threat.

Third, he was imminently practical. There was a sign in his office at the Eisenhower White House: "Have you come with the solution, or are you part of the problem?" Mr. Harlow had firm views on public issues. But, basically, he was a solver of problems. Washington's job, I'm sure he felt, was to defend the nation and improve the lot of the citizenry rather than to turn legislation into moral imperatives.

Yet others have been skilled in negotiations, practical persons of modest mien. Ultimately, what made him the greatest power broker of his era—at least in the Republican party—was that he was worthy of trust. He reported each side accurately to the other. He did not promise what he could not deliver. He delivered what he promised. He made no cutting comments in drawing rooms or gossip columns. No opponent's motives were ever called into question. Surely there are lessons here for those who are now asking why government doesn't work. ●

CONGRESSMAN GREEN CITES PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR GUN CONTROL

HON. S. WILLIAM GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, last year at this time I shared with our colleagues

the results of a public opinion poll showing widespread support for Federal gun control legislation. This year during our recent August district work period, the results of a new ABC News-Harris survey were released and they show that most Americans continue to support handgun control by a wide margin. As one who feels strongly about this issue and as a cosponsor of legislation to impose mandatory minimum sentences for felonies committed with a handgun and to require registration of all firearms, I would like to draw attention to the results of this latest poll.

By a 78 to 20 percent majority, Americans favor "a Federal law requiring that all handguns people own be registered by Federal authorities." The massive majority backing of gun control continues at the same high level it has maintained over the past several years, despite the fact that effective gun control legislation has been thwarted in Congress.

In fact, Americans would like to go further than simply registering handguns. By 72 to 26 percent, a solid majority favors "Federal laws which control the sale of guns, such as making all persons register all gun purchases, no matter where the purchases are made." This level of backing for comprehensive gun control legislation has remained about the same throughout the 1970's. But according to the ABC News-Harris survey of 1,496 adults nationwide, it is higher than the 66 to 28 percent who felt the same way about registration of gun purchases in 1967.

In addition, this sample was asked:

If a candidate for Congress in your district took a stand opposed to Federal registration of handguns, would you vote against that candidate mainly because of his stand on gun control, or not? (Base: Favor Federal law requiring registration of handguns.)

[In percent]			
	Vote against	Not vote against	Not sure
June 1979.....	29	63	8
July 1978.....	33	57	10

If a candidate for Congress in your district took a stand in favor of Federal registration of handguns, would you vote against that candidate mainly because of his stand on gun control, or not? (Base: Oppose Federal law requiring registration of handguns.)

[In percent]			
	Vote against	Not vote against	Not sure
June 1979.....	37	54	9
July 1978.....	45	50	5

Thus, as pollster Louis Harris concluded:

If Congress were to pass legislation controlling handguns, and those who voted for it were willing to make their vote a major issue in their campaigns, it is likely that the issue would help rather than hinder such candidates.

The need for such legislation is great

and congressional action is long overdue. I am hopeful that the Members of the House will respond to the sentiments of the people, as reflected in this poll, and will give serious attention to substantive gun control legislation in this Congress.●

TRIBUTE TO EDGAR HARDEN

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, Edgar Harden, retiring president of Michigan State University, served his university community with uncommon distinction for 2 years. Called unexpectedly to lead the university, he responded with energy and commitment and led Michigan State University out of a period of lethargy into an era bright with promise. In an editorial comment telecast over WJIM-TV, Lansing, Mich., on July 25, Walter Adams, a past president of Michigan State University, singled out for praise the accomplishment of Edgar Harden, citing particularly his leadership capacity. I would like to share with my colleagues Professor Adams' remarks:

SALUTE TO A LEADER

(Guest editorial by Dr. Walter Adams, telecast over WJIM-TV, Lansing, Mich., July 25, 1979 (6 p.m. and 11 p.m. news))

I'm Walter Adams, and this is a guest editorial.

Ours is a time remarkably devoid of leadership—a period in which plastic personalities with pedestrian minds and opaque hearts are in charge of giant organizations—in government and politics, in industry and in education. Ours is the age of the bureaucrat—the administrator rather than the leader, the paper shuffler rather than the innovator, the manager rather than the thinker and doer.

A notable exception is Dr. Edgar L. Harden, MSU's 15th President, whose stellar performance these last two years will leave an indelible mark on Michigan's largest university.

His obvious achievements are familiar enough: He restored morale and enthusiasm to a megaversity seemingly adrift in uncertainty, lethargy, and purposelessness. . . . He was magically successful in stimulating the financial generosity of the legislature. . . . He brought the triple crown to East Lansing—in football, basketball, and baseball—a feat unprecedented in MSU athletics.

More important, however, he displayed a talent for tapping the better instincts and nobler ideals of people—a talent for making them transcend narrow self-interest and jurisdictional jealousies—to work for a common goal. He articulated a vision of MSU's purpose and mission, and inspired divergent groups to help him move that vision closer to realization. Approachable and accessible—with perennial bonhomie—he was open to the ideas of friends and critics alike, but never sought the shelter of committees to avoid decisions or to shrink from action. Big Ed was a leader because—no matter where the battle raged—he stood tall in the front ranks of his battalions, and never can it be said of him that "palsied hands were fumbling with the reins of empire."

At least, that's the way I see it.●

HUBBARD STREET FIRE FUND

HON. MARTY RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, there are some people back in my town of Chicago that deserve to be congratulated on a job well done. The story of what they have accomplished deserves to be studied as an example of what can happen when you combine compassion and generous hearts with specific goals and a practical approach to providing assistance to those in need.

"Kup's Column" speaks for itself. I know my colleagues join with me in commending all those involved with the Firemen's Fund.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Sun Times, July 30, 1979]

KUP'S COLUMN

This is the story of a tragedy that cast a pall of gloom over Our Town 18 years ago. It's a story with a happy ending, if there can be any happiness in a fire that took the lives of nine Chicago firemen. That was the Hubbard St. fire on Jan. 28, 1961, in which the nine deaths were the most in modern Fire Department history. No sooner had the news of the devastating fire reached the public than Bill Veck was on the phone to this reporter with a suggestion that "something must be done for the families of those firemen."

Let me refresh your memories by recalling the names of the firemen who died that night. Requiescat in pace Hillard F. Augustine, Robert E. Burns, William F. Hillstad, George E. Kuhn, Charles F. Rauch, George R. Rees, Lt. Louis Repkin, Stanley M. Sliwinski and Cyril Zuccarello. . . . Veck's phone call started a chain reaction. The next day, the Firemen's Fund was established by this column. And in no time, we had offers to assist from Fire Comr. Bob Quinn, Pat Hoy, Joe Meegan, Arthur Morse and, of course, Veck. They, along with this reporter, constituted the committee to administer the fund. Death has taken its toll here, too, and Quinn, Hoy and Morse have gone to their reward.

Chicagoans, stricken by the enormity of the firemen's death toll, responded with contributions that totaled \$90,000. The committee asked the First National Bank to handle the money, and the bank replied that it not only would head our request "pro bono publico" ("for the good of the public," which means no charge), but also would assign a top executive, George B. Rogers, as its representative on the committee. He, too, has since passed on. . . . Many suggestions on how to disburse the money were studied. One was to divide the funds equally among the nine widows. Another was to allocate the money according to need. Still another was to apportion the money according to the number of survivors.

The final decision was the best one—to use the funds solely for the education of the children of the dead firemen. This, the committee decided, would be the most pressing demand on the families down through the years. Other funds, like insurance and Fire Department provisions, would take care of the families' immediate financial problems. Education is costly and a long process.

Thirteen children were the beneficiaries of the fund. The Augustines had three—Gary, Gail and Sandra. The Burns family had three—Robert, Debra, and Dawn. The Hillstads also had three—William, Daniel and Ralph. The Zuccarellos had two—Cath

and Paul. There was one Reese child, Carol Ann, and one Repkin, Allan. There were other children of the dead firemen, but they either were beyond school age or had no need for financial help.

This is where Meegan, executive secretary of the Back of the Yards Council, became the stalwart of the fund. He and one of his staff assistants, Helen Dinucce, had the experience of dealing with bereaved families. They spent untold hours visiting the widows and their children to guide and encourage them in their educational pursuits. Thanks to Joe and Helen, all 13 children now have completed whatever educational desires they had, all paid for by the fund. In some instances, this meant from grammar school (public and parochial) through college, and in a few cases, even beyond to graduate school.

The cost of educating one family's children came to \$19,571. Another family spent only \$848. The total amount expended by the Firemen's Fund for education came to \$68,255. The original amount raised, as we pointed out, was \$90,000. But thanks to the adroit investing of the money by the First National, now represented by John Kloss, the fund still has an estimated \$100,000 in the bank. That posed a problem for the surviving members of the original committee, now down to three—Meegan, Veeck and myself.

The decision was that it was time for the three of us to step aside. Our original purpose practically is finished. Only three of the children still are drawing on the fund for the completion of their college educations. The others have had their schooling fully paid for. The original intent of the Firemen's Fund now will be continued, but under the guidance of Fire Comr. Richard Albrecht. Therefore, we are turning over \$100,000 to him, to be used for the education of the children of firemen killed in the line of duty. And in respect to the late Comr. Quinn, who helped make Chicago's Fire Department one of the best in the nation, the fund will bear his name.

To the young people whose education was made possible, we ask only that they make the most of their schooling and to remember how the big heart of Chicago responded to their tragedy. And to the committee, especially Meegan and Dinucce, who devoted so many hours in the intervening 18 years to make sure the job would get done, we express gratitude for an effort beyond the call of duty. It was, as the First National said, "pro bono publico." ●

ANOTHER ATOMIC ACCIDENT

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, as a participant in the public information project on the little-known history of atomic accidents, I am today introducing the following excerpt from Leo Goodman's catalog of mishaps involving nuclear materials:

[Excerpt]

EXPLOSION, CHALK RIVER, CANADA, DECEMBER 13, 1950

(Source: TID-8206 ("A Compendium of Information for Use in Controlling Radiation Emergencies"), February 1960.)

At Chalk River, Canada, on December 13, 1950, there was an explosion involving a relatively small amount of material, killing one man and injuring and contaminating five others. Only through good luck, 45,000

pounds of the same material in a room adjacent to the room in which the explosion occurred did not detonate. This accident is not widely known because there was much stricter security at the time the incident occurred. It is possible now to relate more about this accident and a few significant lessons that were learned from it. In fact, it may interest some of you to know that this accident helped initiate action on the part of the National Committee on Radiation Protection to produce Handbook 56, "Safe Handling of Cadavers Containing Radioactive Isotopes."

Many lessons were learned from this accident, and it should be of interest to quote the following from AEC 43/345, dated February 9, 1951:

"The relative urgency of different kinds of medical treatment became immediately complicated by radiation, since, in cases where shock would normally have been given priority, the doctors hesitated to make hypodermic injections through contaminated skin. The decontamination of wounds was complicated by the lack of a probe sufficiently directional to tell from what part of the wound the radiation was coming. The volume of contaminated materials became a sizeable problem. As a result of the explosion, four truckloads of materials required decontamination, while two more truckloads had to be scrapped. For two days after the accident, most of the medical facilities were tied up as a result of contamination. After preliminary treatment at the plant hospital at Chalk River, a new kind of decision had to be made concerning the extent to which the patient should be decontaminated before transfer to the townsite hospital could be allowed.

"Identification of the personnel was difficult because badges had been blown off or destroyed. One of the casualties had about 200 mr per hour over the face and chest, and this further inhibited work. Unprecedented problems arose in connection with transferring the contaminated body to an undertaker.

"The medical group at Chalk River had been planning for some time to rebuild the medical set-up at the plant, and, until this accident, their thinking had been almost entirely concerned with facilitating routine decontamination. The accident exposed shortcomings in the present set-up, and the experience of handling the contaminated and wounded patients dictated revision of their plans for rebuilding." ●

GEORGE BUSH PROPOSES A STRONG COURSE

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker one of our former colleagues, George Bush of Texas, yesterday outlined at the National Press Club the serious dangers facing our Nation and offered his prescription for the course the national Government must follow to avoid a confluence of unhappy events which could transform the world. He urged a strongly integrated approach to shaping national policies with full recognition that every major policy decision affects a wide range of Government responsibilities. Ambassador Bush called for policy unity, coordination and continuity in dealing with the threats and problems we face

in economics, in national security, in energy. Certainly an integrated approach has been terribly lacking in the present administration which gives the impression its decisions are made in a vacuum.

Mr. Bush is a serious and attractive candidate for our highest office and his views comprise a significant contribution to the dialog the people deserve to hear as we approach another Presidential election. To further that dialog, I request unanimous consent to print George Bush's remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF GEORGE BUSH

Understandably, much of the public attention so far has been devoted to the personalities and the early polls. I'm as interested in them as the next fellow, and lately, I've been enjoying them more than I used to. But I would urge that the campaign soon move into a new phase—a more serious consideration of the issues at stake as we head into the 1980s.

Personally, I think those issues are terribly serious—deadly serious, in fact—and it is that vein that I would like to address you today.

We must soon face up to the fact that the United States in the 1980s will enter the most dangerous decade in the past 40 years. On three fronts—the economy, energy, and international affairs—dark clouds are now pushing over the horizon and promise to join together during the early years of the decade. This confluence of events—this "gathering storm" as Churchill might have called it—may be less visible than the threat hanging over the democracies in the late 1930s, but it is no less ominous and certainly it demands no less of a struggle.

To a striking degree, the issues that confront us are also inextricably bound together. Progress in one area requires progress in another, just as a setback on one front will ripple through other areas. Our economic progress, for example, will be closely tied to our ability to sustain the value of the dollar abroad and to ensure a steady flow of energy. By the same token, our ability to obtain crude oil from the Persian Gulf will hinge upon our willingness to bolster our defenses and strengthen our alliances. Yet it is equally true that our success in foreign policy will rest upon the vitality of our domestic economy and those of our allies.

So, the issues are closely tied together.

The engineering approach that we have applied to public policy in recent years, trying to separate out each issue and treat it in isolation, is totally inadequate for the 80s; what we need, and need desperately, is a strategy that deals with our domestic and international problems within an integrated, coherent and predictable framework.

Personally, I remain an optimist, guided by a powerful belief that, having come this far, this country will never surrender to the forces of adversity. We haven't been a nation of quitters, and we aren't going to start being one now. This past month, a number of distinguished men and women were kind enough to meet with me in Maine to talk about the 1980s. While many of them thought the immediate outlook was bleak, I was encouraged that all of them agreed with me that we could ultimately prevail. Indeed, there is good reason to believe that the late 1980s could usher in a new era of prosperity and hope for America.

But the point I must emphasize is this: The dangers that lie just ahead are real and they are serious. To minimize them, to ensure that they do not extend any further, to realize the bright promise of the future, it is crucial that we adopt an integrated strategy

for the 1980s, and begin immediately to make the hard decisions that strategy demands. To err may be human; but to delay, to duck and dodge as we have—all of that would leave an inexcusable legacy for the next generation.

Let me be more specific about the nature of our challenges. Our economy today is in the worst mess since the Great Depression. Beyond Washington, where people aren't insulated from the ups and downs of the economic cycle, they are reeling from 13 percent inflation and many are now fearful of losing their jobs.

And the trends are nearly all pointing in the wrong direction. The growth in the productivity of our work force has fallen from the 3 percent range in the 1950s to 2 percent in the 60s, to minus 2.4 percent in the second quarter of 1979, annualized.

Our savings rate is the lowest of the major Democracies—consumer debt is now six times what it was only 20 years ago—the proportion of U.S. patents awarded to U.S. firms has dwindled—and our producers have dropped behind our international competitors in one field after another—cars, steel, television sets, and on and on.

Here in Washington, the Federal government—the driving force behind so much of our economic life today—has abandoned all sense of self-discipline. We have piled up nearly three times as much debt in the past 15 years as we did during the first 188 years of our history combined, and the money supply has been expanding at rates more than double those of earlier years.

The fact that we're not in more trouble than we are is only a testament to the remarkable underlying strength of the American economy.

But the central problem now is that the steady, deteriorating trends in our economy almost surely guarantee a rough passage ahead. Among economists, there is now widespread agreement that the current recession could be shallow. But a shallow recession also means that inflation is likely to continue at runaway rates, so over the next few years, our economy may either begin a rollercoaster ride—with recession soon followed by inflation, followed by another recession, and so on—or we may have a short period of peace before the economy plunges into a severe, painful decline that may slow the inflation rate but also cause enormous social suffering. In either case, the first half of the 80s could be very difficult economically.

In the energy field, despite our best efforts on energy conservation, the downward trends may be even more perilous. By most reasonable estimates, in order to achieve even modest economic growth over the coming decade, we must expand our available supplies by some 20 percent—or the equivalent in oil of about 7 to 9 million barrels a day. But no one yet has figured out where we are going to find all that additional energy.

Under new quotas, for example, we can obtain precious little new oil from abroad. At home, most oil producers believe—and honestly so—that we will be doing well to hold production at present levels over the next decade—and that's with immediate decontrol. Similarly, authorities believe that we will be fortunate during the 80s to hold production levels steady in natural gas—and once again, that's with much greater decontrol.

So what's left to fill the gap? As attractive as they are, exotic fuels are years away from major development—and solar power is unlikely to make a major contribution to new supplies in the near term. Inevitably, then, one is driven to three major alternatives: nuclear power, coal, and greater conservation.

But I needn't tell you, as veterans of the Washington scene, how stubborn the resistance is in each of those areas. One of the greatest political challenges of the 80s, I believe, is to overcome that resistance, for

unless we do, we will condemn ourselves to a long era of sluggish growth and social tension.

All that I have said so far about controlling inflation and bridging the energy gap is subject, of course, to the question of whether we can also navigate through the troubled waters abroad. As one surveys the unraveling of international order—the overthrow of regimes in countries like Iran, Afghanistan, and Nicaragua, the civil strife spreading from one continent to the next, the growing impunity with which nations like Vietnam and Ethiopia now attack their neighbors—even an incurable optimist must recognize that the 80s could bring convulsive changes in sensitive regions of the world.

Unfortunately, this threat of regional instability is greatly heightened—and this is a point I would underscore—by the shocking vulnerability of America's strategic forces. A day of reckoning—a day brought on by the massive increase in Soviet armaments and a persistent disregard for the state of our own force structures—is swiftly closing in upon us. In nearly all quarters, it is now agreed that in the early 1980s, the United States will enter a period of maximum and unprecedented vulnerability to a Soviet first strike. This "open window", as it is called, could last from the early 80s until the middle of the decade, and even then, we won't be able to shut it unless we move aggressively and immediately to bolster our forces.

The nightmare that troubles me about the 1980s is not that of a nuclear exchange with the Soviets. They continue to shrink from that possibility. No, what concerns me far more is that all of the troubles I have outlined to you—in the economic, energy and foreign fields—will come rushing together in a great thunderclap that will transform the world.

It is not inconceivable, for example, that sometime in the 80s, the U.S. could be in a precarious economic state, heavily dependent on foreign oil, and then a crisis could erupt in one of the important nations of the Middle East. At that point, assuming present trends go unchecked, the Soviets who will have an energy shortfall in the 80s, could move in quickly and present us with an impossible choice—either we yield a critical source of oil to their control, or we risk nuclear catastrophe.

In short, the Persian Gulf could become the scene of a second Cuban missile crisis—only this time, we might be the first to blink. I am not predicting such a crisis; I only point it out to illustrate how far we have drifted into dangerous waters over the past 15 years.

What is to be done? Our most pressing requirement is to stop kidding ourselves that by continuing on our present course—a temporary patch here, a bit more rhetoric there—we can somehow muddle through. The British once believed that, and they lost both an empire and their own prosperity before they pulled themselves together. Now we, too, must seize the opportunity for a change of direction.

At the same time, however, let us beware of politicians who promise quick, easy answers. President Carter captured the White House in 1976 by making more than 600 promises to the electorate. Now he claims that he can't fulfill them because people's confidence has failed; the truth is that the country has lost confidence because he has failed.

That same temptation to overpromise exists in this election campaign. From all sides, candidates are under pressure to promise they will significantly increase spending on defense, increase spending on energy, make deep cuts in taxes, and still balance the budget—and all in a flash. Over time, through discipline and steady policies, those goals can be achieved, but any candidate who promises instant relief is a fraud—and I don't mind saying so.

I propose to all Republican candidates today that in this campaign, we add a new commandment to our party's creed. The 11th commandment, as all of you know, says this: Speak no evil of a fellow Republican. Now let us adopt a 12th commandment for 1980: No phony promises to the American people. Not one.

The voters of this country don't want any more of the old baloney; they want a new vision—a new candor—and that is what we must deliver.

I have spoken to you about the critical problems that lie ahead. Let me now outline in greater detail some of the solutions that I favor.

The first goal of a new administration should be perfectly obvious: to put a firm leash on inflation. I am frankly dismayed that there is so little serious discussion in Washington today about slashing inflation to one percent or less—a goal that I think achievable. It would almost appear to be a conspiracy of silence between some of the politicians on the Hill and the White House, and for very clear reasons.

On the Hill, they know that Washington created this inflation and that every year the IRS reaps windfall profits as middle-income taxpayers are pushed into higher and higher tax brackets.

In the meantime, the President and his staff have little inclination to address the issue because they've run out of ideas. They have no policy to fight inflation—none whatsoever. Yet, the economy is visibly deteriorating. Three years ago, candidate Carter added together the nation's inflation rate and its unemployment rate and called it the "economic misery index." The misery index, he charged, was scandalously high, so Ford had to go. Today, that same misery index is more than a third higher than when Jimmy Carter was elected—indeed, it's at the highest rate since 1935—and yet the White House, incredibly enough, doesn't even have a fig leaf for a policy.

My plan to break the back of inflation involves some very simple elements:

In my first 100 days in office, I will submit a plan for a balanced budget into the Congress and will campaign hard for its acceptance. As a former member of the House Ways and Means Committee, I believe I can work with the Congress toward that end, but if not, I will not hesitate to take the veto club out of the closet again.

The Budget must not only be balanced, it must be balanced through limitations on the growth of federal spending that do not allow increased taxation.

Only through tight fiscal policy will it be possible for the Federal Reserve Board to pursue more moderate monetary policies.

At the same time, we must accelerate efforts to cut back the jungle of conflicting and redundant regulations, laws, and judicial procedures that are smothering economic growth—and giving few social benefits in return.

All of these steps may sound fundamental, and they are. But our problem is not that we have tried the fundamentals and they have failed; our problem is that for too long we have failed to try them.

As a second major goal of my Administration, I will seek to lighten the tax burden now crushing so many American families and discouraging productive investment in our economy.

One of the worst sins of the Carter Administration is that it has permitted federal taxes to rise from 18 percent to 21 percent of the GNP. After reviewing the most recent budget estimates of the Administration and taking into account the need for increased defense spending, I have concluded that we can—and should—cut taxes immediately, effective this January 1980, by \$20 billion.

Such a tax cut should be divided into two parts:

Roughly one half should be directed to individual taxpayers, encouraging greater

personal savings, encouraging greater energy efficiency, and providing tax incentives for home purchases through IRA type accounts. I would also cut payroll taxes in a way that would not jeopardize the integrity of the Social Security trust fund.

The other half of the tax cuts should be used to increase productivity and investments in the business sector. This would include more rapid depreciation, investment tax credits, tax incentives to hire and train young workers and to create jobs—especially in areas of high unemployment. So that investments can be planned ahead, I also propose a 1 percent per year cut in the corporate tax rate for each of the next five years.

All of these tax changes are aimed specifically at increasing the productive wealth of our nation—a step I believe is vital in overcoming inflation and in returning us to a stable, productive economy.

In the energy field, I believe it is urgent that we adopt a two-track system to attack both our near-term and long-term problems simultaneously. On one track, in order to fill the energy gap of the 1980s, we should immediately decontrol the price of oil; we should remove controls on natural gas in ways that are real, not phony, utilizing our awesome ability in science and technology to guarantee safety; we should expand nuclear power; we should also significantly step up our production and use of coal, even though that may mean temporary relaxation of some environmental standards; and we should find new methods of conservation.

On the second track, we must bring on line as quickly as possible, both synthetic fuels from our domestic resource base and the next generation of renewable fuel sources for the longer term. While I welcome the Administration's new found interest in synthetic fuels, I believe this program to spend \$88 billion in tax money on 50 different plants—long before all of the technological problems have been addressed, much less solved—is needlessly wasteful and injects the government far more deeply into the energy field than is either desirable or necessary. We have a shortage of energy, but we already have a surplus of government.

As President, I would move immediately in cooperation with private industry, to build a limited number of synthetic fuel plants to perfect the technology. Then I would leave it to the private sector to choose which of those technologies make the most sense for full scale development. If the economics require government assistance to compete with fossil fuels, we can turn to guaranteed markets, loans, or price supports, so that we can move ahead as rapidly as possible.

For the longer term, let us also recognize that the development of energy sources such as solar, hydrogen, and nuclear fusion, require the best scientific minds in the free world—not the best bureaucrats in Washington, Paris or anywhere else. As President, I would bring together the best minds and talents that the free world can offer—from both consuming and producing nations—to work together so that we can realize the dream of renewable energy resources by the end of this century.

And let's tell our friends plainly: Join with us in projects to overcome our energy shortages; join with us in programs to expand our economics; and as we do that, let us join in expanding and invigorating our alliances.

This last point brings me to another fundamental position: To promote regional stability and counter the Soviets, we must build a new alliance system that girdles the globe, an alliance system that unites the seafaring nations of the world who share our values and interests. These alliances would not be just military in nature; they would also address our economic and energy interests, so that each nation shall have the strength of ten.

Such alliances, I should add, will not diminish in the slightest the need for us to repair our own defenses. In recent weeks, it has been suggested that the Senate might buy off on the SALT Treaty if the Administration promises to increase defense spending by 3-5 percent a year in real terms. I cannot accept that point of view. The SALT Treaty is seriously defective and should be corrected before it leaves Capitol Hill. As the debate proceeds, I think it will become clearer than ever that after correcting the Treaty, the Congress also ought to move ahead with several new weapons systems that have been cancelled or delayed by the Carter Administration—including a new manned bomber, the cruise missile, the MX, and a greatly strengthened Navy. Progress on those fronts will not immediately close the "open window" of the early 80s, but it will send a signal to Moscow that we are serious about our security and that in turn may promote world stability.

Ladies and Gentlemen: By now, my deep-seated concerns about the 1980s should be clear. Over the past 20 years, through indulgence, through neglect, through shortsightedness, this nation has drifted into fearful straits. The problems are not all of Jimmy Carter's making, but he has made them so much worse that there is no longer reason to ask whether he should stay or leave.

The critical question now before us is whether we as a people have the wisdom and the fortitude to face up to the challenges of the 80s and overcome them.

Forty years ago, peering into the gathering darkness, Winston Churchill wrote that he had watched his nation "descending incontinently, recklessly, the stairway at the beginning, but the carpet soon ends—a little further, there are only flagstones, and a little further still, these break beneath your feet."

Only by heroic efforts were the allies rescued before they reached the end of the path. Now, as we enter the 1980s, we must summon that same spirit of self-discipline, of unflinching determination, and of common purpose. The 1980s will be a dangerous decade for America; but it can also be a decade of decision—a decade when we finally put our nation on a new course and go forward together again, united, strong and confident. That will be my great resolve as your President.

Thank you very much. ●

SELLING APARTHEID

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are concerned about U.S. policy in Africa—including many of us who are Members of Congress for Peace Through Law—have spent a great deal of time this past year studying the complicated issues involving Zimbabwe-Rhodesia. After considerable negotiation, we were able to reach a compromise on the issue of lifting sanctions, delaying consideration pending the all-parties conference soon to convene under Britain's leadership. We may soon see a second election, this time internationally supervised, and we anticipate that we will be faced with a crucial decision in review of the sanction question later this fall. Similar crucial decisions relating to Zimbabwe-Rhodesia's neighbor—South Africa—will face us in the months ahead.

Many of us at MCPL believe that Congress should increase its policymaking review with regard to South Africa. We are anxious to help in this endeavor. We believe that apartheid is immoral as well as an open invitation to increased Communist influence in Africa. We think the United States must act decisively to encourage and assist the ending of the apartheid system in South Africa through whatever means may be available to us.

There are many areas of United States-South African policy in which Congress has a major role. We should inquire, for instance, whether the U.N.-imposed arms embargo against South Africa is effective—or whether South Africa's massive military establishment has been developed with the covert aid of elements in the United States; we should determine whether U.S. companies are truly in compliance with the embargo, or if they have violated it with or without the knowledge of our Government officials; we must consider whether "civilian"—nonmilitary—trade with South Africa tacitly endorses the principle of apartheid or, in the alternative, represents the best means we have of ending apartheid; we should consider and determine whether U.S. corporate investment in South Africa strengthens our bargaining power or weakens it; whether new U.S. corporate investment is helpful or harmful; whether economic equality pressures by U.S. corporations can help to reform not only the economic structure, but also the political structure; whether strict penalties for noncompliance with employment opportunity codes by U.S. corporations can be imposed, and if so, whether compliance with such codes is or can be effectively monitored by private groups such as the Sullivan organization or the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

In conjunction with all of these questions, an excellent article by Mr. Aryeh Neier appeared in the August 11-18 edition of the Nation magazine, which I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Neier addresses the question of "the death of apartheid" as argued by South African Minister Piet Koornhof, known in the West as one of the more "forward-looking" of the South African government officials. While Mr. Neier points out some steps Mr. Koornhof has taken to moderate apartheid, he concludes that the replacement policy of "denationalization" is indeed as unfair, and as sinister as was, or is, apartheid, and that its replacement, while representing a short-term public relations gain, will in fact be as harmful and exclusive of the majority black population as is the present policy.

The article follows:

SELLING APARTHEID

(By Aryeh Neier)

JOHANNESBURG.—"I and my Government," Dr. Piet Koornhof, South Africa's Minister of Cooperation and Development, told the National Press Club in Washington a few weeks ago, "are seeking to create a happy and meaningful life, therefore a new blueprint, for all in South Africa. We are en-

tering a period of complete reformation. We are presently in a new era. We have reached a turning point in our history. Apartheid, as you came to know it in the United States, is dying and dead. We are in a period of reform."

Exciting news. Koornhof, who even professed his Government's belief in full citizenship for people of all races, was greeted by a standing ovation, and with cheers in many American newspaper editorials. The Washington Post called South Africa "the most lively and ambitious social laboratory in the world" (June 17). Back home, Prime Minister P.W. Botha endorsed Koornhof's statement and shielded his itinerant Minister from the backlash of Andries Treurnicht, leader of the *verkrampste*—or rigid (more literally, constipated)—wing of the ruling National Party. The dispute among the Nationalists gave heightened significance to Koornhof's statement, for the Prime Minister appeared to ally himself with the *verligte*—or enlightened—faction's expressed intention to mitigate the humiliation of 80 percent of South Africa's people that has been Government policy since the National Party came to power in 1948. All in all, it was a great publicity coup for South Africa. As *To the Point*, a journal noted for its support of Government policy, exulted, Koornhof had "take[n] American news media by storm on his Washington visit."

After traveling around South Africa during the three weeks subsequent to Koornhof's National Press Club speech, I found his report of the death of apartheid not merely exaggerated but ludicrous. Nonwhites must still use separate toilets, ride on separate buses, purchase tickets for trains at separate counters and ride in separate rail cars. They must continue to live in separate townships—almost always miserable slums lacking electricity and indoor plumbing, far removed from the gleaming white cities and suburbs to which they commute daily at great expense to serve those whom they are expected to address as "master" or *baas*. Despite a housing surplus in areas reserved for whites, any nonwhites who attempt to move into them in order to escape from quarters where they are required to live three or four to a cubicle are vigorously prosecuted under the Group Areas Act. A black child is still required to attend a separate school, where the expenditure per child is only one-tenth of the amount allocated to educate a white child. Every day, a thousand or so nonwhites are prosecuted for violations of the pass laws in "trials" that lack any semblance of due process and that rarely last as long as two minutes. These help to preserve South Africa's distinction of having by far the largest portion of its population in prison of any country in the world. Although Dr. Koornhof said in his Washington speech that he beted the pass laws and was in the process of doing away with them, penalties for violations are going up. Most important of all, no non-white may vote in any election for officials of South Africa. Disenfranchised, nonwhites are politically powerless against the intricate web of laws, regulations, proclamations and bureaucratic decisions that oppress them.

There is another sense, however, in which Koornhof's speech to the National Press Club was not so much a lie as a deceptive half-truth. Apartheid, as Americans know it, no longer adequately describes South Africa's approach to race relations. But what is replacing it? Something more sinister: denationalization of all South Africa's blacks. In place of their South African nationality, they are becoming nationals of new mini-states that the South African Government is busy creating. As Koornhof acknowledged a few weeks after his Washington speech, when he repeated his remarks about "full citizenship" before a black group in Johannesburg he had in mind a "plural setting," pressed by a member of his audience, he said,

"I don't believe it can be achieved in a unitary setup. As a student of political and constitutional development, I say again it cannot be achieved in a unitary setup. I say again."

The policy of creating mini-states—known as "homelands"—granting them independence and, thereby, denationalizing black South Africans, has been developing for a long time, though the grand design is only now becoming clear. Seeds of the policy of denationalization were planted when South Africa adopted the Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act of 1959 and the Bantu Homelands Citizenship Act of 1970. These laws require that blacks ("Bantus") must become citizens of the autonomous homelands to which the South African Government says they are attached by birth, residence or linguistic, ethnic or cultural affiliation. Two homelands have been granted independence by South Africa, Transkei in 1976 and Bophuthatswana in 1977, though their sovereignty is recognized only by South Africa. Ciskei, Lebowa, Venda, Gazankulu, Qwaqwa and KwaZulu are now considered self-governing and South Africa plans to grant them independence in due course. In all, 13 percent of the land of South Africa, most of it the poorest soil, has been set aside for the creation of these mini-states.

The use of linguistic, ethnic and cultural affiliation to determine citizenship in the homelands is the key to the policy. A black born in Soweto—the giant black township that serves Johannesburg—whose parents were born in Soweto, whose grandparents were born in Johannesburg before the blacks were all forced out, who has never visited Transkei, may be designated a citizen of Transkei if the South African Government determines that he has cultural affiliations with that independent homeland's Xhosa- or Sotho-speaking people. South Africa does not expect him to settle in Transkei. The homelands could not sustain the 70 percent of the South African population who are to comprise their nationals, and the South African economy needs them. No one expects the black living in Soweto to establish ties to the political processes of Transkei. For him, citizenship in a homeland is a legal fiction that leaves him worse off than he was under apartheid as we used to know it.

John Dugard, a South African legal authority and widely respected human rights activist, summarized the effects of his legal fiction in his presidential address to the 50th Anniversary Conference of the South African Institute of Race Relations in Johannesburg in July. "At present," said Dugard, "all South Africans, irrespective of their race, are South African nationals. Only whites, however, are full citizens as they alone have political rights within the central political process. According to Government policy, all homelands will ultimately become independent and there will no longer be any black nationals in South Africa with claims to political rights. This will allow the South African Government to argue that there are no black South Africans." Blacks who were born in the 87 percent of the land that is to remain as South Africa and whose families have lived there for generations are to be regarded by the law as temporary sojourners, aliens in the land of their birth and the land of their ancestors. Pass-law prosecutions would be transformed into passport-law prosecutions.

An important advantage of denationalization from the South African Government's standpoint is that it will allow it to identify its treatment of blacks with the treatment Western countries accord foreign nationals. Blacks designated as citizens of independent homelands could be stripped of any legal right to reside in South Africa by the stroke of a pen and, thereby, their status would be comparable to that of the Mexican, Caribbean and Oriental illegal aliens in the United

States. Alternatively, South Africa can grant them permits like those given to "guest workers" in Europe. Blacks have been treated this way all along under apartheid, but by denationalizing them, South Africa will try to cover over the practice Koornhof says is dying or dead with a veneer of Western legality.

How far can South Africa delude its own people and the rest of the world into believing that denationalization is less repressive than apartheid? Piet Koornhof, who has taken on the task, is an adroit publicist who chose his title as Minister of Cooperation and Development because it sounded better than the previous names for the same post: Minister of Bantu Areas Development and Minister of Plural Relations. Koornhof won over much of the English-language press by calling off the bulldozers that were set to level Crossroads, a squatters' camp outside Cape Town where 20,000 blacks live. The planned destruction of its 3,000 corrugated tin shanties put up by people with no place else to live was becoming an international symbol of the Government's heartlessness. Elsewhere, in places to which the world is not paying attention, Koornhof's department regularly razes squatter residences. If Koornhof has his way, what the South Africans call "petty apartheid" will diminish and signs will come down like those that now provide separate entrances to liquor stores for whites, or blankets, and for nonwhites, or nieblankes. Koornhof has played an important part in South Africa's sports diplomacy that is to be capped on October 20 by a world heavyweight championship boxing match in Pretoria between a black American and a white South African before a desegregated audience.

These moves by Koornhof are far from universally acceptable within the National Party. The idea of blacks and whites sitting next to one another in a sports stadium is still anathema to the *verkrampes*. If Andries Treurnicht has his way, a "homeland" would even be created for "colored" South Africans—racially mixed people whose ethnic and linguistic ties are as strong to Afrikaners as to any black tribe. Koornhof's wing of the National Party, on the other hand, has suggested that colored and Indian South Africans would be accommodated in a "new political dispensation" giving them some right to participate in South African Government—though certainly not proportionate to their numbers—once all the blacks become nationals of homelands and no longer have to be taken into account.

Though the differences between Koornhof and Treurnicht are real, they do not run very deep. As Koornhof put it on his return to Johannesburg after his Washington speech: "Dr. Treurnicht and I understand each other very well. There were one or two things reported in a certain way and he reacted to that." *The Financial Mail*, the best journal that still survives censorship in South Africa, said of the Koornhof-Treurnicht argument that "the difference between fiendish *verkrampes* and lily-white *verligtes* is small indeed. Apart from the ambitions of the individuals, the difference between the two camps is mainly one of strategy about how apartheid is to be made to work, not whether it should be made to work." Koornhof, the better publicist, believes that the way to make it work is to tell the world that it is dying or dead.

Criticism of the denationalization policy by South African blacks and white opponents of apartheid is muted by Government persecution of those who decry its policies. Even so, virtually all black leaders outside the homelands who have not been forcibly silenced have denounced the policy. It is also criticized by white liberals, though many only find fault with details such as the amount of land allocated for homelands and the failure to allow urban blacks any opportunity to participate in self-government. They speak of "racial accommodation"

rather than of racial equality and use terms like "consociationalism" and "confederalism" to describe schemes of government in which representatives of all races, elected racially, would share in government while whites would retain the power to veto decisions that might threaten their hegemony. Advocates of majority rule in a single state are a small minority even among those who may fairly be described as South Africa's white liberals.

As for international acceptance, the refusal to recognize Transkei and Bophuthatswana and condemnation of their creation by the United Nations have been setbacks for denationalization. Yet National Party strategists are far from giving up hope. Koornhof's public relations triumph encourages them, as does pressure in England and the United States for the lifting of sanctions against Zimbabwe Rhodesia. The West may well accept a black majority parliament that pretends to govern while 300,000 whites continue to control all the machinery of power. Surely then, the reasoning goes, the West will accept South Africa's plan to establish superficial legal equality—blacks and whites each exercising full citizenship in their own lands—while safeguarding the interests of fifteen times as many whites in a territory of infinitely greater economic significance.

Germany denationalized its Jews in 1941 but, having passed the point of caring about international opinion, did not bother with subterfuges. White South Africans care deeply about what Americans and West Europeans think of their racial policies and, therefore, are applying a gloss of legality. Their economy, their security and their national sense of pride are at stake in their struggle for the affections of the West. If they fail to deceive the West and incur its condemnation, they will not be able to sustain the denationalization plan. Perhaps, then, apartheid would really die.●

BOISE LEADS THE FIELD IN GEOTHERMAL

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1979

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, today I am submitting a copy of an article from the

September 4 New York Times concerning geothermal energy development, utilization, and potential in Boise, Idaho.

The article illustrates the leadership and farsightedness that caused Boise to look into this very viable alternative energy source long before it was fashionable or necessary to do so.

In following Boise's lead in recognizing the potential of geothermal energy, I recently introduced H.R. 4471 with my colleague Congressman HANSEN as a counterpart to Senator McCLURE's S. 1330.

Although others have followed that lead, and I commend their efforts, H.R. 4471 is the first legislation of its kind. It is a complete approach to the development and extraction of geothermal energy, a package which opens incentives to development of geothermal steam and requires the Federal Government to act promptly in granting licenses and permits to turn that incentive into badly needed energy. It further rewards that initiative with tax credits for such investments.

The United States is sitting on a veritable cache of geothermal steam that can be extracted to operate turbines and produce power. There is no question that it will not be the panacea to our energy problems, yet the contribution it can make is very significant. It is but one of the many means by which we can encourage our great country to again become energy independent. To date, development of this vital energy contributor has faced shuns from the Federal Government, disincentives to the development of its technology, and highly restrictive Federal leasing policies.

H.R. 4471 recognizes a commitment to follow in the footsteps of Boise to see this potential energy source become a reality. I commend this article to my colleagues' interest:

BOISE LOOKING TO ITS HOT SPRINGS AS A HEAT SOURCE FOR DOWNTOWN

BOISE, IDAHO, September 3.—The Glens of Boise pay only \$10 a month to heat their two-

story, Tudor-style home with natural steam and hot water.

Marla Glenn said that she has lived in geothermally heated homes for 42 years. The Glens have no need for a hot water heater, and several neighbors use the naturally warm water to heat large swimming pools for \$75 a year.

Now, with a new \$5 million Federal grant, city officials want to heat the whole downtown area the way the Glens heat their home: by tapping the heat produced by hot springs that run under the town. The city plans to take a heating system started in 1892 and pipe natural hot water to buildings in that area. It needs \$10 million to complete the project.

BIG FUEL SAVING EXPECTED

When the job is done, Phil Hanson, the manager of the Boise Geothermal Project estimates, the saving in fuel may be the equivalent of 25,000 barrels of oil a day.

He said that an average family saved from one-half to two-thirds of its heating bill by using natural steam and hot water, and that as many as 2,000 additional houses could be heated by the natural energy source from

Robert Chappell of the Department of Energy's Idaho Falls office that the agency's four planned wells.

\$4.9 million contract with Boise was the largest of 22 projects in Western states designed to gather scientific data on the potential for geothermal energy. Such energy is widely used to heat homes in Iceland.

Some state office buildings here are already partly heated by a geothermal well. Along Warm Springs Street and nearby streets in this city of 100,000 more than 200 houses have been heated by hot water for decades. A recently constructed city building and a proposed county building are designed for conversion to hot water heat.

John Griffith, a research engineer, said that the techniques used by Boise Geothermal "may well set the trend for future geothermal progress in the United States."

At present, geothermal heat used in Boise generally radiates directly from water pipes in the rooms being heated. Mr. Hanson said that the method was inefficient but that there was now a newer technology involving central systems with heat exchangers.

Several major office buildings are considering switching to geothermal heating, he said, but no contracts have been signed yet.●

SENATE—Friday, September 7, 1979

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 21, 1979)

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. HOWELL HEFLIN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend L. R. Eison, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and most merciful Father; from whom cometh every good and perfect gift; we give Thee praise and hearty thanks for all Thy mercies; for Thy goodness that hath created us; Thy bounty that hath sustained us; Thy fatherly discipline that hath corrected us; Thy patience that hath borne with us; and Thy love that hath redeemed us. Grant unto us, with Thy gifts a heart to love Thee; and enable us to show our thankfulness for all Thy benefits; by

giving up ourselves to Thy service; and delighting in all things to do Thy blessed will; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. MAGNUSON).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., September 7, 1979.
To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable HOWELL HEFLIN, a

Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HEFLIN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the majority leader is recognized.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the

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