EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HOSPITAL COST Containment and the Elderly

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago several organizations representing this country's senior citizens held a local rally in which I and other Members of Congress participated to protest the continued rise in the cost of hospital care, and to express their firm support for passage of H.R. 2826, the Hospital Cost Containment Act of 1979. While the opponents of this legislation would have us believe that rising hospital costs are not keenly felt by the American people, our believe that rising hospital costs are not and to express their firm support for

The public, which finally pays, is not stingy about paying necessary medical costs. In Framingham, Mass., last week a special town meeting voted overwhelmingly for a small increase in local property taxes to enable a retiried resident to receive a heart transplant operation without which he will die.

But the public should demand that restraint be imposed on the rapid escalation of hospital costs, as proposed in the pending administration bill.

Under the bill, mandatory government controls would be imposed only if hospital costs nationwide grow more than 11.6 percent this year.

In that event, mandatory limits would be set on revenues in future years, with allowance for increases in wages, food and other supplies that are beyond the hospitals' control. If a hospital receives revenues in excess of the limit, it would be subject to a penalty of 150 percent of the excess.

Beyond its immediate objective, passage of the pending proposal, which is before Congress can seriously consider establishment of an inclusive national health plan. In its consideration of the bill, the House faces this challenge from President Carter: "This is a most important anti-inflation and budget-saving bill the Congress will face this session. Every member should work with the anti-inflation and wasteful federal spending will be judged—correctly—in large part by his or her vote on this issue."
TRIBUTE TO MAMIE EISENHOWER

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1979

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, Madam Eisenhower, the widow of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and one of the Nation's most admired women, died of cardiac arrest on November 1. It is indeed a special privilege to join with my colleagues to honor our former First Lady, Mrs. Eisenhower, who served her country with such grace, courage, and dignity. I am sure I will echo the many fine things that have already been said.

Mrs. Eisenhower still led an active life well into her eighties. In fact, her appearance over the years remained the same as it did when she first entered the national scene as the wife of the man who became the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe during World War II; bangs, carefully matched coat and hat, and the cheerful smile that were her trademarks.

As the General's partner, she came to be known for her personable nature, vigor, and determination. She labored arduously in the background, supportive of her husband's career. She often quipped that "This is my life," a fact that could not be easily overlooked. She pictured herself in the role of public emissary to her husband.

Throughout her marriage, Mamie got used to having no permanent address, and moved with her husband from one Army post to another. In fact, Time reported in its January 19 issue back in 1953 that "Mamie learned to clean, decorate and move out." These quarters were widely scattered parts of the globe, including Paris, the Panama Canal Zone, and the Philippines.

With great competency, Mrs. Eisenhower ran the many households into which her husband's political and military career placed her. Although she resided in over 28 homes throughout these years, she labored arduously to make each and every one a true home—where her heart was—for her husband and family. In fact, the Eisenhowers did not purchase their first home until 1950 in Gettysburg, Pa.

General Eisenhower credited his wife's role in his own success. He was once quoted as saying that—

"If I had not listened to Mamie on two or three occasions, I might not have had the opportunities to serve in a country that I have had the fortune to have.

Mrs. Eisenhower once stated that—

She knew almost from the date that I married Dwight that he was destined to become a great man. He was always dedicated, serious, and purposeful about his job. Nothing came before his duty. I was forced to maintain my own schedule to stay on his good side. I could. Being his wife meant that I must leave him free from personal worries to concentrate his energy as he saw fit.

Mamie endured long, difficult, and lonely years during World War II while the general was winning the war over the seas. At home in Washington, she contributed to victory by using her extensive volunteer services at the Soldier's, Sailors, and Marines Club.

Although the First Lady considered herself "nonpolitical," she personally assisted her husband's political campaigns during his four-year Presidential campaign tour and thus her warm smile became a familiar figure to the Nation.

In her official capacity as First Lady, she brought home to the President many years of experience as hostess for other leading European political figures while her husband was stationed abroad.

As a charming hostess, Mrs. Eisenhower was famous for having an amazing memory for names and faces. When necessary, she could shake more than 1,500 guests' hands without seeming fatigued. She felt that she had an obligation to greet as many citizens who wanted to see the President's wife as she was able. Mamie managed to have something to say to each guest at the White House that made them feel welcome. By the end of her husband's first term of office, Mrs. Eisenhower had rightfully earned the title of "Top Hostess in Washington." During her White House years, Mamie, in no second, fulfilled only to her husband's fame. Her down-to-earth attitude led the press and general public to fondly refer to her as simply "Mamie." Since 1960, many first ladies have occupied the dwelling at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and all have tried to emulate Mamie's personal style that endeared her to most Americans.

In her last interview with Barbara Walters, when asked how she would like to be remembered, she responded as "just a good friend." In my judgment, Mrs. Eisenhower was truly a good friend to the American people. She will be remembered as a special part of our history during an era when our country was at its best, and through a period of our heritage to which all Americans can be proud.

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE MARIE A. FITZGERALD OF PASSAIC, N.J., DISTINGUISHED MEMBER OF THE PATERNOS DIOCESAN COUNCIL OF CATHOLIC WOMEN

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, November 10 residents of my congressional district in Passaic County, New Jersey will join with His Excellency, the Most Reverend Frank J. Rodimer, D.D., Bishop of Paterson, N.J., for the Congregational Salute to the Honorable Marie A. Fitzgerald of the Paterson Diocesan Council of Catholic Women.

In seeking ways to express the esteem of her associates for her many accomplishments—the richness of her wisdom, warmth of her friendship, and sincerity of purpose in everything she set out to do, the Paterson Diocesan Council of Catholic Women has planned the following program in honor at the 35th annual convention to be held in my hometown of Wayne on Saturday, November 10.

THIRTY-FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE PATERNOS DIOCESAN COUNCIL OF CATHOLIC WOMEN

(UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF HIS EXCELLENCY THE MOST REVEREND FRANK J. RODIMER, D.D., BISHOP OF PATERNOS, N.J.)

PROGRAM

Convention Chairman, Mrs. Harold Van Winkle 9:00 a.m. Eucharistic Liturgy. Theme: "Mary, the Heart of the Family" prepared by Mrs. James Barrett, Church Community Chairman Immaculate Heart of Mary Church, Wayne, N.J.


Chairman—Mrs. Thomas Bay, Diocesan President

10:15 a.m. Formal Opening of Business Meeting—Mrs. Thomas Bay, Diocesan President.

Mr. Speaker, the 35th Annual Convention of the Paterson Diocesan Council of Catholic Women is designated as a tribute to "the greatest first lady to wins esteem" (Prov. 11-16)—Marie A. FitzGerald—and is dedicated to the theme, "Focus on Family.

Miss Fitzgerald is an outstanding individual who throughout her lifetime has earned the respect and esteem of all of us who have had the good fortune to know her.

In 1922 Marie commenced her career with the office of the Passaic County clerk. In 1936 she received her bachelor of arts degree in English, French, and psychology and returned to her career with the county of Passaic where she continued her public service endeavors until her retirement in 1971.

Miss Fitzgerald was actively involved in civic and community endeavors and particularly in Catholic action with her parish, St. Nicholas of Passaic. In 1945 she became the second president of the Passaic-Clifton district of the newly formed Paterson Diocesan Council of Catholic Women, one of the seven districts of the diocesan council, and in 1970 was elected president of the Diocesan Council of Catholic Women.
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Scripture Reading—Monsignor John Shanley
Entire Assembly
Salute to the Flag and National Anthem—
Entire Assembly.
11:15 a.m. Introduction of Theme: "Focus on Family—Mrs. Harold Van Winkle.
Speakers—Commission Chairmen
Mrs. John McManus, Organization Services.
Mrs. Joseph Levendusky, Family Affairs.
Mrs. James Barrett, Church Community.
Mrs. Anthony Radloe, Community Affairs.
Mr. Frank Bollerman, International Affairs.
Miss Marie A. FitzGerald, Legislative Information.
Mrs. John McManus, John Shanley.
Mrs. Thomas Bay.
Miss Marie A. FitzGerald, Legislative Information.
Mrs. John McManus, John Shanley.
Mrs. Thomas Bay.
Review of Exhibits—Mrs. Andrew Metzger.
Coordinator of Events—Mrs. Peter Sagin.
1:00 p.m. Luncheon—Mrs. Sal Donatello, Chairman.
Introductions—Mrs. Thomas Bay.
Tribute and Presentation to Miss Marie A. FitzGerald by Mrs. Thomas Bay, Bishop Rod­
Shanley, Mrs. Thomas McManus.
Mr. John McManus, John Shanley.
Installation of Officers—Monsignor John J. Shanley.
Address—The Most Reverend Frank J.
Rodlmer, D.D., Bishop of Paterson.
Remarks—Monsignor John J. Shanley.
Closing—Mrs. Thomas Bay.
Executive Board of the Paterson Diocesan
Council of Catholic Women.
Monsignor John J. Shanley, Moderator.
Miss Marie A. FitzGerald, Moderator.
Chairman, PAPA.
President, Mrs. Thomas Bay.
Vice President, Mrs. Norman Sergeant.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Paul Chorney.
Treasurer, Mrs. Elinor Dutcher.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. George Murphy.
Closing Remarks—Mrs. Thomas Bay.
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Extensions of Remarks
Mrs. Maria Haas, Mrs. James Sebald, Mrs.
Kermit Sidie, Mrs. Michael Celermirino, Miss
Marie FitzGerald, Mrs. Harold Van Winkle, Mrs.
Casimir Piekoszka.

TRIBUTE TO MARIE FITZGERALD
"Wise is more precious than coral." (Prv. 3:15)
Generous Father, we thank You for Your gift of counsel, wisdom, thirty-fifth anni­
terous, although the ancient esteemed coral, holding it as mysteriously sacred, because of its unique beauty, were still they recog­
nized that wisdom was a more precious pos­
session.
During our thirty-five years, we have grown and branched in wisdom, through Your gift of grace. And who is wise among us? She who has been mentor, peacemaker, and tireless worker. Marie FitzGerald. Marie who has been "heart" of our Council family from its very beginning.
Lord, we thank You for Your lavish gifts to us—the gift of coral; thirty-five years of Council service; the gift of Marie, whose friendship and example of Christian living continues to inspire us; the gift of Mary, who is "heart" in every family. Father, we are grateful. Amen.
Mr. Speaker, it is most significant that this year's convention theme dedicated to
"Focus on Family" has been selected to commemorate a most distinguished char­
ter member whose faithful and active participation in the most noble endeavors of the diocesan council has been of in­estimable value to all of our people.
Pope John XXIII described the family as "the first and essential cell of human society." The family is indeed the basic fabric of our society—the foundation of a healthy and vibrant communion of people—who nurture, support and care for their own members, in many different cultures, providing irreplaceable strength and shelter for one another.
Family life provides a forum for the sharing of the unique gifts of family tradition among our people. And so it is with the membership of the Paterson
Diocesan Council of Catholic Women who have chosen Marie as this year's honoree to applaud her service, particu­larly through legislation, which has helped to chart the path that will lead our citizens toward the fullest develop­ment of their potential.
Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great privi­lege for me to echo the sentiments of the officers and members of the diocesan council with deepest of appreciation for the quality of her leadership and sin­cerity of purpose throughout her life­time in devoted and dedicated service to her fellowman.
We do indeed salute a grand lady—a distingushed citizen, a compassionate woman and benefactor to the public good, esteemed friend and great Amer­i­can—the Honorable Marie A. Fitz­Gerald.
CHAIRMAN'S RETIREMENT
HON. RONALD M. MOTTLE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1979
Mr. MOTTLE. Mr. Speaker, it was with the regret of learned of Chairman Ray
Roberts' decision to not seek reelection.
His leadership in both veterans' affairs and public works will be sorely missed by the Congress. Experience is always a good teacher; and when this is com­bined with the qualities of leadership possessed by Chairman Roberts, it is the people of this great Nation who reap the benefit.
Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs under the chair­manship of Ray Roberts since I came to the 94th Congress. He has always dis­played the unusual qualities that young­er members may so much as they go about the business of learning the legis­lative and oversight functions required of them. When I became the chairman of the Special Investigations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Veterans' Aff­airs, Chairman Roberts assured me of his complete support. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what he has given me.
Under Chairman Roberts' steward­ship, the veterans of this Nation have always been treated fairly. At the same time, he has never lost sight that these programs must be funded through tax revenue, and they have been contained within reasonable limits rather than be­coming unrestricted as some have ad­vocated. He has helped lead us through a most difficult period.
His retirement will mean a great loss to veterans and to the Congress as a whole. He has earned his retirement, if this is his choice. On this occasion, I want to convey to him my sincere thanks for his friendship and the limitless as­sistance he has provided to me personal­ly and to the entire Committee on Vet­erans' Affairs. He is a very effective lead­er and I look forward to working with him next year as a member of the Commit­tee on Veterans' Affairs.

URANIUM, COAL, OIL—WHICH?
HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1979
Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our Nation must press forward now with the development of an effective energy conservation program. The benefits of energy conservation are enormous—it is economic, nonpolluting and environmen­tally acceptable.
The advantages and benefits of energy conservation are made clear in an editor­ial which appeared in the Washing­ton Post. The editorial sheds much light on the benefits of holding down our energy consumption to wise levels. I urge my colleagues to read this editorial.
The editorial follows:
Uranium, Coal, Oil—Which?
The outlook for nuclear power is, post­Kemeny, somber at best. But burning coal and toxic gases can be stored away and, while technology can lower the risks to health, it cannot entirely eliminate them. Burning gas is less desirable for power use than firing utility boilers. As for oil, you have only to follow events in Iran to perceive that it became the least cost source of all energy.
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HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, although the United States is a land of great natural resources and inherent wealth, it is unfortunate to face the fact of life that many Americans are in legitimate need of financial assistance. The American people have extended their hands to those of our population truly in need, and have made a commitment to provide them with assistance to enable them to live with some semblance of dignity.

Despite the best of intentions, however, what began as a sincere effort to help the needy has grown into one of the worst Federal-State-local boondoggles ever imagined. The welfare system that we live with is a patchwork, piecemeal program without direction or design. Most taxpayers are highly critical of how the welfare program operates—and justifiably so. They are convinced that much of their hard-earned tax dollars are being wasted through mismanagement and fraud.

Today, the Congress has the opportunity to take a giant step toward cleaning up the welfare mess. By passing the Social Reform Amendments of 1979, it will enhance the cost-effectiveness of the U.S. taxpayer's dollar.

I believe that anyone who is capable of holding a job should not receive welfare benefits. I also believe that any benefits received should be based on the legitimate needs of the individual or family.
However, it is no secret that the welfare system is rampant with fraud and abuse. This legislation is designed to drastically curtail the instances of welfare cheating. For example, benefits will be based on actual, rather than projected, income. The income of the recipients will be required to be reported on a monthly basis. The income of all people residing in the household will be taken into account when computing benefits. By standardizing and coordinating certifying procedures, aid to families with dependent children and food stamps programs, the bill will streamline administration and reduce error and fraud. In addition, the Federal Government would provide financial incentives to the States to develop computerized information systems so that they can more effectively administer their programs.

Besides curbing abuses, this bill will remove many of the work disincentives that currently exist. For some people, it is often more beneficial to go on welfare rather than divide the work income. This legislation seeks to remedy that situation to ensure that anyone who is capable of handling a job does just that.

The welfare system should not be a subsidy for those who need it least. I am very pleased to see that this bill addresses this issue.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to look at the beating the American taxpayer is taking at the hands of those who create a welfare system that rewards the worst possible behavior.

Does anyone care what is really happening to our Nation?

At this time I would like to insert in the Record, "Soviet Military Spending Up," from the Washington Post, November 2, 1979:

**SOVIET MILITARY SPENDING UP**

The Soviet are spending about 60 percent more on military outlays this year than the United States. Our analysts told Congress yesterday.

They predicted Soviet military spending will go on increasing at least through 1985 despite the strain on the Russian economy.

A private analyst and two members of the Senate Armed Services Committee said they thought the CIA statistics were too low.

Sen. Robert C. Byrd, (D-W.Va.), chairman of a Senate Armed Services Subcommittee, said the panel was seeking to learn if the "massive surge of unprecedented military procurement" by the Soviets in the 1970s was likely to be matched in the 1980s.

Byrd said, "we must have facts to formulate the fiscal 1981 (defense) budget"—which, with increases promised by President Carter, will be costly.igraphic shoe-lace technique are shown to readers on the screen.

"In 1979, the Soviet total will be about $16 billion, about 60 percent higher than current outlays," one of the senators, Rep. Nathan S. Long, asked the CIA's Military Economics Analysis Center.

Total Soviet defense activities for the 1970s, he said, exceeded comparable U.S. outlays by almost 50 percent.

Estimating the Soviet defense activities "caught up with U.S. defense outlays in 1971 and have exceeded them by a widening margin in each succeeding year," Burton said.

Byrd scheduled another hearing for Thursday.

**COMMON CAUSE: PRACTICE WHAT YOU PREACH**

**HON. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.**

**OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Thursday, November 8, 1979**

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday's Washington Post contained a most interesting article about the self-styled citizens' lobbying group, Common Cause.

When President Carter and his traveling array of goodie-dispensers visit a local community, interest groups are started as a few dollars for each day of the week. The New York Times does not even bother to carry it.

This is an interesting article about the self-styled citizens' lobbying group, Common Cause. When President Carter and his traveling array of goodie-dispensers visit a local community, the credit has gone to Judy Goldberg, who started as a volunteer in Richmond six years ago and later became a full-time, paid executive director. Under Goldberg's leadership, the state group lobbied successfully at the Virginia General Assembly over the last four years for stiffer financial disclosure, lobbying and open meeting laws. But in order to move forward, to offer real competition to the group's national governing board earlier this year authorized a study of the state organization's expenditures. The committee quickly targeted state organizations, which had mushroomed in the mid-1970s and some of which had strong and independent programs for lobbying state legislatures.

The Virginia group is considered to have one of the strongest state programs. Much of the credit has gone to Judy Goldberg, who started as a volunteer in Richmond six years ago and later became a full-time, paid executive director. Under Goldberg's leadership, the state group lobbied successfully at the Virginia General Assembly over the last four years for stiffer financial disclosure, lobbying and open meeting laws. But in order to move forward, to offer real competition to the group's national governing board earlier this year authorized a study of the state organization's expenditures. The committee quickly targeted state organizations, which had mushroomed in the mid-1970s and some of which had strong and independent programs for lobbying state legislatures.

But Goldberg and activists from other states clashed several times with the organization's national staff over direction and legislative priorities.

Last summer Goldberg submitted a salary study that concluded that female state executive directors received an average of $1,600 a year less than their male counterparts, and that all state executive directors were paid considerably less than their national counterparts. Goldberg then resigned as a protest.

Goldberg, who usually is willing to talk freely to reporters on any pertinent subject, refuses to comment on the situation and evenbothers not to carry it, although other Common Cause members say she did.

Common Cause President David Cohen says state offices are to develop similar programs, which accounts for the disparities.

**COMMENTS: COOK COUNTY GAS STARVATION**

(For Glenn Frankel)

Closed-door meetings, courts of interest, sex discrimination in pay scales—those are the kind of practices Common Cause, which calls itself a citizens lobbying group, has long deplored and sought to purge from government.

But in the last few weeks, Common Cause has been the target of complaints that the group's national staff consistently seeks to develop computerized information systems so that they can more effectively administer their programs.
even though funding is channeled through national headquarters.

The salary disparities were one of the reasons cited by the study committee in its recent report advocating consolidation. It also cited a growing disinterest in state expenditure toward what it characterized as “an estimated $400,000 next year—and what it called “enormous strains between the staff and volunteers as well as between the state and national organizations.”

The report, mailed to state leaders Oct. 14, has been criticized by the Ohio State Capitol headlines: “New York Chairman Howard Hoffman says ‘has been on the verge of hysteria.’

Several sources say they are convinced the report’s adoption will mean quick elimination of Goldberg and others who have offended the national staff. They are particularly incensed by a charge that the committee drafted its final report in a closed-door session early last month in Cincinnati without notifying organization members. An Ohio Common Cause official contended that committee chairman Kathleen Sebelius told her she could not attend the meeting.

‘Would Common Cause tolerate a government agency’s going behind closed doors to prepare documents of such consequences?’ asked a memo circulated to state organizations by Common Cause of Virginia. ‘Does Common Cause view itself as a part of the open government extend to our organizations?’

Sebelius was en route to Washington from her Topeka, Kans., home yesterday and was not available for comment.

Arthur Cescelki, a Springfield resident, is himself the subject of another allegation—that his participation in drafting the proposals constitutes a conflict-of-interest because his wife Dorothy is a member of the national staff, which stands to benefit if the report is approved.

Not true, says Cescelki: ‘I’m very sensitive to conflict-of-interest issues and I don’t think this is one at all.’

Most of all, state leaders say they are concerned that the proposals will be assumed through this weekend by a governing board that rarely fails to approve proposals supported by the national staff.

For example, a Common Cause President Cohen denies the proposal is part of a power play or a purge of dissidents by the national staff. He contends several small state organizations favor the plan, which he says is necessary to maintain Common Cause’s stability.

Cohen contends Common Cause has just as big a role to play in the 1980s as it did in the Watergate era.

‘The question is still how to end the sour relationship between citizens and government, how to make sure government is accountable,’ he said. ‘For me, it’s an exciting time.’

VETERANS DAY

HON. RAY ROBERTS
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, at 11 a.m. on November 11, 1918, representatives of the Allied forces and the German Imperial Army sat down together in a railroad car on a siding outside of Paris and brought to an end 5 years of bloody warfare that had ravaged the continent of Europe and split the entire world. We have remembered that occasion ever since as a moment that signaled instant jubilation: a lightning flash rang, and men and women poured into the streets. They danced and they sang. They cheered that the “War to End All Wars” had finally ended. They cheered that the American boys, across the Atlantic Ocean, would soon be coming home.

We have kept November 11 as a special day ever since: First, as “Armistice Day” to recognize the courage of those who fought “The Great War” and as “Veterans Day” to honor the United States emerge as a world power for the first time. Later, November 11 became Veterans Day to honor all Americans who have been called to arms, so often in this century, that our country might always remain both strong and free.

Mr. Speaker, there are over 30 million veterans from five wars living in the United States today. Over the years our Congress has given special recognition to those who have served in defense of the most progressive nation on Earth. The impetus behind these ceremonial events has normally accompanied a great upsurge of gratitude following a period of prolonged war.

For example, on that first Armistice Day, and on V-E Day and V-J Day, all were heroes and deservedly so. Our Nation was unified in its support for those who had fought and especially for those who had paid a toll of their own because of their service in defense of our country. However, from an historical standpoint, as we as a Nation go farther down the road in peace and farther away from the immediate memory of war, the priorities which once seemed so absolute in the minds of many fade with the passage of time.

The plight of our Nation’s veterans is surpassed by new problems and complex exigencies of a more immediate nature. Indeed, we face many difficult problems in the United States today: Inflation, unemployment, energy, hunger, the enemy of our trade, our own personal enemies. To name the top three. We must meet these problems head on, and we will, but in doing so we must not forget our continuing obligation to our veterans.

There are almost 600,000 World War I veterans, average age 83, in the United States today. World War II and even Korean conflict veterans also are reaching the point in their lives where they will need that assistance, rightfully provided by our Government, more than ever before. This will mean that in future years we will have to maintain a program of special direction for their needs, and a medical care system second to none. Our youngest veterans, the 9 million who served during the Vietnam period, have even greater needs, and our nation must provide for them.

The vast majority returned from war proud of their service and eager to get on with the business of living. However, in many cases they also faced a life of real hardship. They came back from military service without the acclimation and the universal gratitude of the American people experienced by their fathers and their grandfathers. We salute them, and we are determined to care for their disabilities and provide the necessary readjustment assistance to bring them all home again at full potential. Doing so will be worth all the ticker tape parades in the world rolled into one.

This year the Congress has returned the observance of Veterans Day to its original date, November 11. No longer will this important occasion be shifted on the calendar and be considered a casual holiday to accommodate a 3-day weekend. Veterans Day should remain a traditional day of rest and thanksgiving for the dedication and special sacrifice of all Americans who have served their country in time of war.

This is as it should be. We mark this day, not only for this day, but for every day.

This Sunday at 11 a.m., precisely the time the guns fell silent throughout Europe 61 years ago, ceremonies will begin at Arlington National Cemetery to pay tribute to the veterans of this country. Let us join all Americans in the spirit of this occasion. Our veterans did our duty in all America go farther than America. Let them not abandon them now or in years to come.

DEPRECIATION AND CAPITAL FORMATION PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, the House Small Business Subcommittee on Access to Equity Capital and Business Opportunities which I chair, held hearings September 12 and 13, on the capital formation problems of small business.

One of the issues addressed was depreciation reform. Depreciation is generally defined as a capital recovery concept. This concept suggests that a business-man should be able to deduct the amount he invests in a capital asset over the useful life of the asset. It gives the business-man the capital necessary to replace the productive capacity of a plant or equipment, more efficient productive capacity.

The major bill before the Congress on depreciation reform is the Capital Cost Recovery Act of 1978, introduced by Representatives Jones and Conable as H.R. 4646. H.R. 4646 has acquired the nickname of the “10-5-3 proposal,” as it provides for a 10-year writeoff for commercial buildings, 5 years for equipment, and 3 years for automobiles and light trucks.

Consistently, throughout the summer and fall, national newspapers and business periodicals have portrayed the 10-5-3 bill as a consensus measure. On the other hand, it would appear that business is unhappy with the subject of depreciation reform.

Several small business groups, however, have problems in supporting this measure as presently drafted. It was brought before the Committee on Small Business, Die, & Precision Machinary Association and the National Small Business Association, that they fully support the need for depreciation reform and the abandonment of the useful life concept.
This is consistent with the original intent of H.R. 4646; but they are concerned with the impact of H.R. 4646. The National Tool, Die, and Precision Machining Association should be enacted in its present form.

In order to give a proper airing to the views of these groups, and because the members of this group are not American business community and to the Congress, I am submitting for insertion in the Record a statement presenting the views of the framers, the National Tool, Die, and Precision Machining Association.

The statement follows:

**STATEMENT OF NATIONAL TOOL, DIE & PRECISION MACHINING ASSOCIATION**

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: Good morning. My name is William E. Hardman. I am Executive Vice President of National Tool, Die and Precision Machining Association, an association of 3,000 small businesses who manufacture tooling, dies, precision machined parts, molds and special machines. With me is Mr. Herb Liebenson, Vice President, Government Affairs with the Business Council for National Affairs.

The Small Business Administration (SBA) represents over 50,000 small businesses in 1,000 of 1,200 SIC codes in the United States. Under SBA regulations, SBA writes for the矶ne national association for small businesses, with the exception of the special tax counsel for the National Small Business Association, Mark Weinberg, who will discuss technical aspects. Mr. Weinberg was formerly an attorney advisor with the Office of the Chief Counsel of the IRS and is now with the Washington Law Firm of Arex, Kent, Kintner, Ploitr and Kain.

I am grateful for the opportunity to share our thoughts on depreciation. This area is absolutely critical to the survival of small businesses in America. Basically what is needed is legislation that will do two things. First, it should encourage small businesses to increase capital investment and thus help close the gap between capital investment in the U.S. and foreign countries.

Second, since big business is steadily increasing its share of the Nation’s economic assets, small businesses should be encouraged to reverse the disturbing trend towards economic concentration by providing enough stimulus to small businesses to enable them to begin some small share of the American dream.

Nineteen years ago, small business manufacturers under $10 million in assets accounted for 20 percent of the total business assets. Today, 50 percent of the same period those U.S. corporations with over $1 billion in assets increased their assets from under 30 percent of total business assets to over 50 percent of total business assets. Moreover, total United States investment in R & D and capital investment is far below most competing industrialized countries. I’m also sure that small businessmen don’t invest as much on a percentage basis as does big business.

Many of our members got into the tool and die business after rising up through the ranks as apprentices. In earlier days, a young man who worked hard could save a little money and start his own business with a reasonable chance of success. Today, 5 percent of the purchases in the U.S. fail within the first five years.

We have some great toolmakers in this industry.

A top toolmaker can easily earn over

2. National Small Business Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NATO EXPERTS CONSIDER THE SURVIVAL OF THE WEST

(By Geoffrey Stewart-Smith)

The 25th Annual Assembly of the Atlantic Treaty Association was held in Washington DC from 9–13 October. Some 400 delegates from among the 15 NATO nations and I was present as a British delegate. Our hosts, the Atlantic Council, and the Council of the Atlantic Treaty were in conference admirably and the United States Government allowed the proceedings to be held in the State Department.

The main conference was "The Global Nature of the Threat against the West", but while the consensus agreed overwhelmingly that the main threat to the Alliance came from outside the NATO area, the same consensus rather lamely conceded thus our potential of power it was impossible to extend its boundaries beyond those agreed in 1949. It was felt—probably quite rightly—that the NATO nations would never agree amongst themselves politically about a joint NATO intervention outside their present treaty boundaries, and that any such intervention would have to be undertaken by one or more NATO nations acting together on their own initiative.

In his opening remarks the Chairman of the Atlantic Council of the United States, Mr. Kenneth Rush set the scene by stating if we believe that we must get into the habit of thinking more in global terms and that NATO, or some of its members acting together, should be ready and willing to take part in an appropriate and cautious expansion of Soviet power and influence. 

He went on to remind the audience that—"The threat we face in the Western world is by no means new. Past forces have besieged military establishments. It has equally important political, economic and psychological aspects with a military thrust. The Russians frequently refer to 'the correlation of forces' in the world, by which they mean the various political activities of power at the disposal of a modern industrial nation. This should remind us in the West that our approach to security must be total as well as global. We all agree that we need strength on land, on the sea and in the air. But we also need to tackle our political and economic problems in the same way."

Representing President Carter, the U.S. Vice President, Mr. Walter F. Mondale attended and gave the delegates a valuable insurance of interest of the United States. The history of our country has shown that consistently from the beginning and including today, the continuation of our Nation is a bipartisan American commitment that is permanent and lasting and complete in terms of total public support."

Dr. Zbigniew Brezinski, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, gave a forceful description of the reality of Soviet military might and chilled the audience with the revelation of the scale of the missile threat against Western Europe "At current Soviet deployment rates there is one new SS-20 warhead deployed roughly every second day."

Appreciating that the world is getting smaller, the national security of Western Europe, the Far East and the Middle East represent three interrelated strategic zones which are closely bound to the survival of the West as a whole and to global economic stability. This is an important strategic reality, and it is one that military, political and economic implications. The United States must work with the countries in all three zones to protect the independence of these regions ..."

POLITICAL INTELLIGENCE

NOVEMBER 9, 1979

A very competent maritime view was given by Vice-Admiral Sir David Loram, the British Deputy Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic, who stated that the United States is currently building nuclear submarines at the rate of one every seven weeks, and the numbers of their nuclear will double within a decade 

"We are beginning to see emerging from South Asia towards a deep-sea capability for sea control rather than sea denial. It has sophisticated logistic support and increasing access to overseas bases. It poses a substantial and credible open-ocean surface threat to the trade routes not only in the North Atlantic but also in the other oceans of the world.

"Just imagine what one or two of these big groups could do or threaten to do to our oil supplies if there were any at all, or to the Cape of Good Hope. Imagine what they could do to the supply of other vital raw materials. Imagine what they could do to our exports. Imagine what they could do to our military forces. Imagine what they could do to our own Navy and other minerals, if they were in the Pacific..."

"The materials I have mentioned are necessary for many uses so that they are particularly important to the United States, which is the power house of our time."

He went on to consider the growing naval deployment of the Soviet Backfire bomber which has been used by the Soviet navy air arm since 1975. "There are now some 40 of these highly sophisticated, swing-wing, Mach 2 aircraft with the navy and this number could be trebled by the mid-80s even if production is limited by treaty..."

"In sum the Soviets with an avowed policy of denouncing us for maintaining a maritime capability which will assist this achievement. They have gone to sea—they have become seafarers—they are challenging us for world-wide sea control. We, on the other hand remain in a straightjacket, focusing only on a small geographical area..."

"Apart from the trebled by the mid-80s, even if production is limited by treaty..."
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opined “I need hardly stress the danger to the West if Moscow perceives a weak, disunited, a public indifference, a paralysis of will.”

MODERNIZATION OF NF-P ESSENTIAL

The new Supreme Commander of NATO, General Bernard, has called for a modernization which naturally concentrated on the military aspects of the Alliance. Dr. Henry Kissinger’s remarks in Brussels in September, he continued “With the onset of strategic equivalence the West can no longer rely on American strategic nuclear superiority as the ultimate arbiter in every crisis which directly or potentially involves the Soviet Union.

“Today over 100 mobile SS 20 launchers with the multiple and highly accurate MIRVed missiles and reload capability and 90 Baccarat bombers are deployed against Allied Command Europe.

“Despite the many attempts being made to turn the West (this is the nuclear or force) modernisation, we must proceed with the vital Alliance decision to deploy long range missiles, systems, provided with the parallel arms control approval, if we are to demonstrate the cohesions and solidarity of the Alliance. For the three houses—four member nations will never permit propaganda and pressures from the East, not least among them the Soviet Union—will not be satisfied by taking whatever actions it deems necessary—to include the deployment of inappropriate interim weapons systems—to demonstrate that for which the Soviet Union itself is responsible. Surely the West must not put itself in the position of letting the Soviet Union make the important decisions to use to deter the growing threat posed by the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact.

“Nations, unpreparedness and inequivalence are provocative. Equivalence, force readiness and determination are protective.”

A QUESTION OF WILL

The paper presented by Lt. General Brent Scowcroft, former Assistant for National Security to the President contained some very valuable observations on Soviet military intentions.

“In the strategic field, the Soviets are well deployed into the deployment of third generation missiles with their strong inclination that, notwithstanding the SALT II treaty, they are preparing to begin testing at least four new or strengthened long range systems. Observation and qualitative improvements planned for the currently deployed missile forces are such that within two or three years the Soviet militaries, utilising only a small proportion of their own land-based missiles, will be able to pose a mortal threat to U.S. ICBMs.”

Turning to the risk of a surprise attack in Europe, he noted

“If the Soviets have developed their forces to the point where they could mount a success- ful surprise attack, from this (theater or nuclear) no detectable prior reinforcement from the western military districts of the USSR, a fundamental NATO concern which we would receive sufficient warning of a major attack to undertake our time-consuming but essential preparations for mobilisation and force deployment— is destroyed. The impact is obviously of catastrophic proportions.

“If I were to define simply a case of the Soviets having to estimate their options and what would risk its cities by responding strategically to an attack on Europe which appeared to be coming. Dr. Henry Kissinger’s comment, the consideration for the Soviets that we are no longer able to reverse the war outcome themselves is that the Soviet Union would not rely on a threat of theater nuclear weapons or the use of US strategic forces. This is a development of profound significance for the West.”

General Scowcroft then described the enormous additional resources allocated to the Strategic Defense Initiative. “The overall impact is likely to be that the Soviets will feel less deterred, more self-confident, and perhaps more secure.” We may already be witnessing such a change in the West.

“The strategic problem is structural, not systemic. The NATO problem is fundamentally one of will. If we do not succumb to the pressures which expect that our task may be without end, if we will work to¬gether to use our minds to take advantage of the many currents flowing in our rapidly changing world and turn them to our own purposes, surely we will prevail.”

RAPID REINFORCEMENT PROGRAMME

Hastily specific solutions were offered as to what should be done to rectify the military situation in Europe in a witty speech by Mr. Robert W. Komer, Advisor to the Secretary of Defense for NATO Affairs when he addressed the participants at the National War College.

“One of the most critical deficiencies in NATO’s vital Center Region is the relative thinness of our widely stretched ground forces—land, sea, and air—operational reserves to rescue the situation. Let me tell you what we Americans are finally doing about it.

“We are spending billions today on a massive Rapid Reinforcement Programme, designed to take more than double our land forces in Europe within less than two weeks, and triple our tactical air force. To give you some idea of magnitude, within two weeks we plan to deploy more US firepower than the entire German Army, European NATO’s strongest ground forces and all RAAF or Luftwaffe. This is not two weeks after the war starts but after the decision to reinforce is taken.

“This will give the NATO commanders vitally needed operational reserves to pre¬vent a breakthrough with forward or pitch it off if it occurs. Our technique is to pre¬position full sets of equipment in Europe, and fly over the troops by passenger airlift. If the order comes, it demands enough well-stocked Allied bases to receive them, several hundred aircraft to carry the equipment. Since our airlift aircraft can self-deploy, all they need is enough well-stocked Allied bases to receive then, negotiations to this end are under way.

“But timely provision of this massive rein¬forcement is critically dependent upon logistical requirements. First, you must provide storage sites and warehous¬es for our prepositioned equipment, collocated operating bases for our air squad¬rons, ammunition depots to store much more ammunition and the like. . . . Second, you simply cannot simultaneously deploy to Europe the equally massive logistic support forces needed to back them up. Hence we have turned to an innovative concept called Host Nation Support, whereby our European Allies will help provide us, out of the same mobilised civilisation and resources which you use, support for our own units, with the airlift and sealift, port and airfield reception and unloading, transport forward to the battle area, deployment of medical facili¬ties, fuel storage and tank trucks etc. vital to our ability to fight.

“In short, we propose a Transatlantic bargain to its European partners: We’ll deploy rapidly massive combat reinforce¬ment, extra sized RAPID REINFORCEMENT PROGRAMME and Host Nation Support to enable us to do so. If you can’t, we can’t.”

“Again we are spending several billions to develop and field long range mobile cruise and ballast warheads to maintain the continent of NATO’s deterrent effect. But it is up to Europe to agree to receive them and help support them for the common defense...

“The days of defense on the cheap for Europe are over, with nuclear parity at hand. But we need not disrupt our economies or neglect social needs either, if we rally as this Conference will and collaborate more effectively in the common defense.”

STATUTORY COMMITTEES NEEDED

The paper presented by the British Con¬gressman of Members Dr. Henry Kissinger and Mr. Britsels returned to the global theme of the conference, and he felt it “that it may be assumed that a Soviet invasion of Europe likely would be combined with a threat to seize the oil states of the Gulf and to intercept the Cape Route and vice versa.”

“The threat has changed in two important respects:

“It is global, not regional. No longer can it be contained within the geographic limits of the North Atlantic Treaty. It’s political, economic, indeed spiritual. The Alliance cannot any longer hope to defend its interests by a wholly or even partially military response.

“...He then went on to make some specific recommendations: Inevitably, they can perhaps be taken within the present structure of the Alliance. One possibility might be ‘standby’ forces to which, if the situation warrants, we could call up for help for refugees, e.g., the Vietnamese ‘boat peo¬ple’, and in the rescue of Allied citizens caught up in-wars situations outside the NATO Alliance...

“To ensure success for such limited ac¬tions, the West founds states nearly always is indispensable...

“Turning to Africa, Mr. Britsels pointed out the Soviet Union has established a mili¬tary presence in the Red Sea and the Horn of Africa. Together with its Cuban allies, it has extended Soviet influence to Angola and Mozambique. Meanwhile, through Africa—the ‘Arabia of minerals’—a large share of the Alliance’s sources of minerals could be at risk to political instability and possibly racial war, backed by Soviet influence.

“(a) The oil producing areas of the Middle East.

“(b) The South Atlantic.

“(c) Relations with South East Asia and Japan...

“(d) Latin America.

“The duties of each committee would be to monitor, study, and report on all aspects of the possible threat to Alliance interests in its area, political, military and economic; to advise on closer relationships, should these seem desirable, between members of the Alliance and specific countries outside NATO and with their defence establish¬ments, and, as appropriate, to recommend action.

“If Soviet strategy is now intercontinen¬tal, so must NATO strategy become global. To be effective our response must be global too.”

“The American people are very resilient and they have shaken off the post-Vietnam deceptions and regained their self-confidence. As manifest leaders of the Free World, they bear a terrible responsibility.

“The Secretary General of NATO, Dr. Jolms ended his speech with these remarks: “I look to the future, and foresee the efforts of all NATO nations in the future: “May I conclude by saying that the most immediate imperative is to move forward from any lessening of our resolve to look to...”
our own defense. This would be all the more paradoxical since the Western countries have at their disposal as incomparable human and material resources for self-defense and strength unsurpassed by any other country or group of countries. Future generations would have to judge whether, in the name of vigilance or moral courage, they failed to take up the challenge confronting their civilization and ideals."

AMBASSADOR MIKE MANSFIELD
REVIEWS AMERICA'S JAPANESE RELATIONS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1979

Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I urge each of my colleagues to read this address by Ambassador Mike Mansfield, chairman of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee. Mansfield presented this address to the Foreign and Domestic Issues Council in Tokyo on September 12, 1979.

When I first arrived in Japan in June of 1977, I felt strongly that the framework of close and friendly ties between our two countries was sound. I served for many years in the U.S. Congress, and on the basis of a long and enthusiastic interest in Asia, I had concluded that our two democracies had much in common and that a U.S.-Japan partnership was vital to our mutual well-being.

There were some problems in our relationship—for example, the concern here about the disruptive effects of the oil embargo by Japan was having record-breaking surpluses. There was a long list of problems and complaints relating to steel, magnesium, nickel, and other industrial products. Color television exports to the U.S. were arousing strong objections from industry and labor. Some TV trade issues were being tested in U.S. courts. There were also problems in our trade in special and carbon steel. The multilateral trade negotiations had been going on for some time, and there were intractable issues; for example, the question of how things can go wrong. We must be prepared to handle problems.

The mood in the U.S. Congress was that the U.S. had much in common and that those questions could be managed and resolved with good will and cooperation on both sides. That confidence was well placed. We have worked out good understandings on those and other issues, testify to the basic strength of our relationship.

The state of our economic relations in June of 1977, however, was not good. We were in serious difficulty. The U.S. was heading into a period of severe trade deficits, while Japan had much in common and that a U.S.-Japan partnership was vital to our mutual well-being.

In short, while there was no doubting our strong ties of friendship and our ability to talk to each other frankly, our ties were deeply troubled by major difficulties. The next two years, consequently, were among the most difficult period in our relationship since the end of World War II. "Taking the picture is markedly different, and the change has been for the better. Our two countries have developed a broader and more mature understanding of each other, and we are cooperating actively in a growing variety of areas. The breadth and depth of our relationship have grown stronger and more substantial, and there is a comprehensive, broad-based approach to our affairs."

Some of Japan's traditionally strong exports have declined or levelled off, at least in terms of volume, in the first three months of 1979, and this decline reflects the impact of the oil embargo on the Japanese economy. However, the U.S. has been able to absorb the decline in some areas, and we have maintained our economic ties.

The Carter-Ohira Communique agreed to between President Carter and Prime Minister Ohira on May 2, 1979, did not concern only bilateral issues. It mirrored the main concern of our two countries that our two countries have a growing mutual concern about world issues and that our bilateral relationship must be seen in the context of multilateral dimension. President Carter's state visit just before the Tokyo Summit demonstrated a new maturity and balance in our relations. In addition to the very good good discussions he held with the Prime Minister, and the important formal aspects of his stay, the President dramatically demonstrated that he had the opportunity to meet and talk directly with the Japanese people at the President's House in Tokyo. He demonstrated clearly its stature as a leading country in the free world.

One of the rewarding and satisfying aspects of our ties in the time I have been here has been the U.S.-Japan security relations, which we believe are a cornerstone of our relationship. In the last two years, a number of steps have been taken which enhance Japan. Japan is going ahead with force modernization plans, both for defense systems such as the F-15 fighter, the PAC anti-submarine warfare aircraft, and the ESC early warning ships which lend credibility to its defensive posture. Japan has contributed a substantial share to the cost of U.S. Defense Forces in Asia. These forces will continue to be vital to our mutual security purposes. Representatives of our two governments have developed guidelines for defense planning, which will add a new and important dimension to our cooperation in the security field. We are also engaged in intensive and high-level consultations on a broad range of security matters. In the recent successful meeting between JDA Director General Yamashita and Defense Secretary Brown in Tokyo, I was impressed with the breadth and depth of the discussion.

Perhaps the most impressive improvement has been in the area of our trade and economic relations. I think the extent of the change is not fully appreciated, so I would like to cite the recent record.

In the first half of 1979, U.S. exports to Japan were up 46 percent compared to a year ago. U.S. exports from Japan were also up, but only by 8 percent. When we look at the U.S. representatives said they were seeking a correction of the trade imbalance, but that restrictions on imports, this was precisely the trend they had predicted.

Japan's global current account surplus has disappeared and Japan had a deficit of $8 billion in the first seven months of 1979. In part, that is the result of sharply higher oil prices, but it also reflects import increases across the board. By 1978 the U.S. may well see more increases in Japanese exports, but there is no reason why the problem of burdensome Japanese surpluses should not be resolved.

Some of Japan's traditionally strong exports have declined or levelled off, at least in terms of volume, in the first three months of 1979, and this decline reflects the impact of the oil embargo on the Japanese economy. However, the U.S. has been able to absorb the decline in some areas, and we have maintained our economic ties.

In the U.S. for smaller, energy efficient cars. It is certain that Japanese auto exports will rise to some extent. This trade is beneficial to both countries, and we should expect increases in response to the demand for smaller, energy efficient cars in the U.S. If they are smooth and in accord with market developments. U.S. agriculture continues to be a bright spot in our world trade, and Japan is our best foreign market. In 1978 we shipped $4.4 billion in agricultural products to Japan, up by a half a billion dollars from the year before, and the total should be over $5 billion this year. We are also selling capital goods, up 29 percent in 1978, and consumer goods which were up 33 percent.

The major reasons for this improvement, but one of them is that we Americans are following your advice and working harder at selling in Japan. You sent a record-breaking trade development mission to the U.S. in the spring of 1979, and we reciprocated by sending a mission of over 100 members to Japan in October. This year we and the Japanese Government are cooperating in a project to use the Japanese exhibit ship, the Shin Sakura Maru, to bring U.S. consumer products to 13 port cities in Japan beginning in October for two months. One hundred forty eight U.S. firms will find local distributors for them to develop their sales in the future. U.S. products will be on display just shown, and I hope all of you will find time to visit the ship and see what we have to offer.

The successful completion of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations for world trade is a major achievement. Japan made a splendid contribution, agreeing to lower duties on industrial goods from applied rates by 28 percent and much more from statutory rates, while the U.S. cut will be 31 percent. As a result, Japan's average tariff on dutiable industrial goods will be 4.9 percent compared to 8.6 percent in the major industrial country. Japan also contributed greatly in the negotiation of new codes governing international trade, and I hope Japan will ratify them expeditiously.

The success of the MTN and continuing benefit of all is our best answer to nationalism. As trade expands and more and more business is conducted across national boundaries, the value of mutually agreeable behavior will become more important. The Lockheed scandal which shook Japan is an example of what can happen. We must be sure that international business is carried on in accordance with the highest ethical standards. We are not the only country, and we should dictate what is ethical behavior in international business. Therefore, I think that the proposal last month for a conference of leading industrial countries to consider an international convention on business conduct. This idea is not new; the need for multinational action is clear, and I think all industrial countries should act on this with- out delay.

We still have much to do. Our problems really have not all disappeared. I have heard of two examples. One is that Japan's surplus has not gone away for good, but is only hiding for awhile and will soon be back. This is a serious situation, but I believe we have all learned that a balanced course is a wiser course, and that all countries share the responsibility for avoiding excessive surpluses or deficits. The Carter-Ohira Communique of May 2 confirms that we must take a common approach which will contribute to a stable and solid economic pattern clearly in our interest to do so.

The success of the MTN also imposes obligations on us. We have to live up to our promise. The U.S. Congress has already passed our implementing legislation by an overwhelming vote. The Japanese Diet has also passed the necessary legislation in accordance with Japanese law. The MTN codes
and the agreement of June 2 between Ambas-
sadors of the United States and Japan is an in- 
ventive mechanism to promote cooperation be- 
 tween both countries to clear up some dif- 
ficult problems relating to import standards, 
sales of tobacco to the Japan tobacco con- 
rolled agency by government controlled agencies, especially NTT. We must 
approach these issues in a spirit of compre- 
hensive diplomacy to settle them in a manner consistent with the principles 
of reciprocity and open trade. The objective is 
to assure reciprocal benefits and expanded opportunities for business.

Japan also needs to develop a better image in the eyes of American partners, but this work is not easy. Much of the difficulty lies in 
our different approaches to trade expansion. We see our market as fully open to all, and 
only after imports in one category grow too 
fast or too large, do we seek to restrain them. 
When that happens Japanese exporters feel 
that they are blamed for being "too success- 
ful". When we try to sell to Japan the most 
severe problems arise before the entry of a 
new company or product. Sometimes the 
result is that a would-be American exporter 
fails before he even gets started. To him that 
seems unfair and he has never had much of 
a chance. We need to find a way to avoid 
giving such an impression to newcomers to 
Japan. 

Changing our attitudes and styles of be- 
havior is not easy. We Americans need to 
take a big step forward. 

We must give up the notion of initial resistance. We also need to 
invest our resources and energy for bene- 
ficial trade long time. Japanese need 
to recognize how damaging it can be to 
them when an American is given a bad 
impression at the start. American exporters 
know it of course, but they must develop 
competitive products and meet Japanese standards. They 
should be given to understand that they can 
exceed the Japanese market on the same basis as 
Japanese export to the U.S. 

Such problems can rise owing to the 
cultural and societal differences between us. 
Despite our friendship, partnership and 
interdependence, we are separated by cultural 
and societal gaps which have to be understood If they 
are to be bridged. To help that process along 
I would like to propose a program of work-
study grants to help Americans understand 
Japan better. Many Japanese learn English 
and spend many years in America really 
learning American ways firsthand and con- 
ducting business as Americans. They 

They need more. I would like to see U.S. businesses 
operating in Japan devote a portion of their 
resources to support several top or graduate 
students in Japanese studies each year 
who would come to Japan for a year or two 
of language study and academic preparation, 
followed perhaps by a three-year assign- 
ment in the Japanese offices of an American 
company. They would live and work in a 
broader sense in Japan for a longer period. Having learned something of 
Japanese language, culture, history and society 
firsthand, they may then be better equipped to explain how modern business and life in Japan 
really works. This would represent a long- 
term investment for the companies and for the organizations which would 
participate, but in time it would pay great dividends.

Another theme I wish to emphasize is the importance of increasing U.S. productivity. 
Productivity is a major determinant of how competitive we are in international markets 
and also of the general welfare of workers themselves. In the United States our record 
or recent growth in productivity has been 
only 0.3 percent annually since 1973, and in 
recent months has actually gone down. Japan's productivity has grown by an average 
of 7.7 percent every

In any case, a regime bent on irrational 
consequences, occasionally capable of 
awashing out gains in income and 
substantial gains in that income have 
resulted. This is an example Americans 
should study carefully. We have much 
to learn from that experience.
Earlier this week a number of Iranian students occupied the Statue of Liberty in New York City, chaining themselves inside the monument for several hours. Federal Park officials were forced to close the landmark and to evacuate more than 1,600 tourists from the island.

Mr. Speaker, under title VIII of the United States Code, the Attorney General of the United States is given the authority to deport those lawbreakers. Today, I have forwarded a telegram to Benjamin Civiletti, Attorney General of the United States, urging him to instruct agents of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to closely monitor the activities of these students—within the framework of U.S. law—to determine if they are fulfilling the terms of their visas. Those that represent a danger to public welfare and safety should have deportation proceedings initiated against them.

In addition, I have contacted President Carter and urged him to join in this effort to quell these protests and demonstrations. This crisis must be met both forcefully and diplomatically. The message must be clear: those who choose to act in violation of our laws will be held accountable.

The occupation of the U.S. embassy in Tehran and the taking of American citizens as hostages is not a permissible act of terrorism. Even more incredible is the fact that Ayatollah Khomenei has condoned this act of terrorism through his refusal to permit American envoys to enter the country to negotiate the safe release of those hostages.

This crisis must be met both forcefully and expeditiously by the President and the State Department to ensure the safe return of our citizens. The Immigration and Naturalization Service must make every effort to enforce all American immigration laws, as far as is consistent with the rights of Iranian students and temporary residents as a sign to the Iranian government that we will not stand idly by while this debacle in Tehran continues.

In the tradition of American goodwill toward the international community, our government has welcomed students from around the globe—including several thousand Iranian students—in order to permit them to pursue their higher education. This privilege does not grant these temporary visitors the right to disrupt American society through unruly protests and demonstrations.

Earlier this week, a number of Iranian students occupied the Statue of Liberty in New York City, chaining themselves inside the monument for several hours. Federal Park officials were forced to close the landmark and to evacuate more than 1,000 tourists from the island. This protest, and other similar actions throughout the United States have also held disruptive demonstrations of support for the despicable acts of their countrymen.

THE VIII, Subsection 1123, paragraph 27 of the U.S. Code states that aliens "shall be ineligible to receive visas and shall be excluded from admission into the United States if the consular officer or the Attorney General of the United States believe (they) seek to enter the United States solely, principally or incidentally to engage in activities which would be prejudicial to the public interest or endangers public welfare, safety, or security of the United States."

I interpret this statute to mean that the students who occupied the Statue of Liberty cannot enter and should be deported. In addition, Immigration and Naturalization Service officials must now make every effort to more closely monitor the activities of all Iranian activists residing in the United States to determine whether they are upholding the terms of their visas and the laws of the land.

This crisis must be met both forcefully and diplomatically. The message must be clear: those who choose to act in violation of our laws will be held accountable.
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Veterans of other wars and that we have been mean to Viet vets because the war was unpopular. These are the findings of a poll conducted by the New York Daily News.

Most Americans believe that we have not treated Viet vets as well as

AN ENERGY VIEWPOINT FROM BANKERS TRUST

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the movement of the recent synthetic fuels legislation through the Congress, of course, raises the question about the levels of Federal and private sector investment required to develop a synthetic fuels industry. At the same time, we must move forward in our domestic oil and gas supplies.
November 8, 1979

The Bankers Trust Co. of New York last month published an energy newsletter which is a valuable contribution to the public debate on the economics of energy supply. Its conclusions are that if we are to maintain today's level of oil and gas production in 1980, given the growth in coal and nuclear energy for electricity, it will require much greater capital investment than we see today. I suggest that the following two sections of the newsletter were particularly interesting to Members in shaping the congressional pieces of a major energy policy. The report certainly raises questions about current economic policy and underlines the challenges which must be met to ensure financing for adequate energy supply.

The newsletter follows:

**OIL AND GAS SHARE**

Based on these inflation rate estimates and on the constant dollar expenditures projected earlier, oil and gas capital requirements would remain enormous in 1979. Total business investment would increase from approximately $2 billion in 1979 to $5 billion by the 1990's. Meanwhile, total business investment would increase from approximately $2 billion in 1979 to $5 billion by the 1990's. As a result, the oil and gas industry's capital needs in 1979 would climb to 21 percent of the nation's total investment, up from only 7 percent of total investment last year.

It is obvious that the oil and gas industry is extremely unlikely to capture such a proportion of total business investment. If the industry actually managed to do this, all other business investment would be limited to about 1/4 percent of the 1980's total investment, given the growth in coal and nuclear energy for electricity. This is completely incompatible with our fundamental assumption of GNP growing at 3 percent; a 1/4 percent growth in business investment cannot be expected to propel GNP at 3 percent. Our energy needs and the major energy sector seriously out of balance.

The inescapable conclusion, as we see it, is that the United States must devote a larger share of its gross national product to fixed business investment, if it is to maintain its economic strength. This need not become an unbearable sacrifice as other industrialized nations can demonstrate. For example, in Germany the ratio of investment to GNP is 25 percent while in Japan it is 20 percent. If our present 10.2 percent share in the U.S. were increased by 1/2 percentage point, then severe limitation would be transferred to the investment sector in 1980. In this case the oil and gas industry's proportion would still be 18 percent, but the remaining capital supply would be sufficient to support the predicted 3 percent real growth rate in all other business investments.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

To avoid economic stagnation during the 1980's, maximum effort both to produce and conserve energy in the United States. Merely to stabilize U.S. oil imports will not suffice unless growth in available capacity over the next decade. Necessary expenditure for oil and gas will be increasing, but alternative industries for replacing capital stock to improve energy efficiency and utilize alternative energy sources will be necessarily higher. The Bankers Trust Co. suggests that the investment share of GNP will have to increase to meet the balanced needs of both the energy and other industries through the coming decade.

This means more savings will be required. The government could encourage savings with tax policies that recognize the need for more rapid depreciation rates for industrial try to cover soaring replacement costs. Moreover, tax policy should preserve the national reserves which are already in place, may have to be increased. Personal savings could be encouraged by the reduction of real savings and taxes on savings deposits. Similar taxation for dividend earnings would also be helpful. Most importantly, because inflation discourages both business and personal savings, a greater effort to curb inflation is mandatory. This is a time for an increased responsibility on the part of the Federal Government and prudent monetary growth on the part of the Federal Reserve. There are institutions which have not prevailed in the recent past. 

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

**TOSSING A DROWNING MAN AN ANCHOR**

HON. TOM CORCORAN
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, the House was pleased H.R. 4985, the Priority Energy Security Corporation. I have argued that this far. track legislation would establish an Energy Mobilization Board with broad powers at all levels of Government, Soon, however, the full House will take up consideration of yet a major agency, the Energy Security Corporation. I have argued that what we really need is not more bureaucracy, but a comprehensive review of existing statutes which are perceived by many to hinder the planning and implementation of energy projects. The House last week passed H.R. 4985, the Priority Energy Project Act. This bill is likely to work unless the oppressive regulatory regime already in being is reformed. This holds true for development of other domestic energy resources as well. Federal regulations governing the minerals industry are strictly procedural. The natural gas industry should be flexible . . . arbitrary where they should be equal, and legalistic where they should embody common sense. They are prime culprits in the energy crisis. The Energy Mobilization Board which can cut through the regulatory labyrinth to clear a path for priority energy projects is a critical tool and reform of a Board which was provided for in the bill approved by the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, but its powers are too severely circumscribed. Rather than merely managephant some of its critics claim, it is a toothless tiger in the regulatory jungle. The Board would have power only to accelerate the strictly procedural requirements of regulations, but it could do nothing about the substantive bias of the underlying laws and the prejudicial mind-set of their enforcers. What it would amount to, then, is the promise of a speedy trial for a man who's predestined to hang. This offers him scant solace.

A much preferred version of the bill is being sponsored by Rep. John Dingell and has been approved by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. It grants the Energy Mobilization Board authority to waive all other governmental and local laws, as well as to clear procedural roadblocks to priority energy projects.

Such sweeping powers are other necessary. It is that the major impediments lie in federal laws and in actions imposed on the states by these laws, and the Board is already empowered to waive these provisions. Beyond that, however, it is important to preserve states' rights in determining issues that necessarily vary
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from state to state, and it is particularly vital not to allow interference with the water laws in the West, which have evolved through long experience and practical testing.

If you have been provided to meet these requirements, it could lead to a regulatory climate in which industry and government could operate, not only the state, but the nation at large.
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States became the most powerful country on earth militarily, the wealthiest country on earth, the country with the ability to exterminate mankind with the atomic bomb but then went ahead and developed an escape route to the stars through the galaxy.

This is the country that started the phenomenon—which Europe is beginning to catch up with—of wealth at every class level except the class that doesn't work at all. This is our Bourbon period. It's been a time of tremendous upheaval, tremendous energy, tremendous growth. Yet people of influence in this country so often act as if it were the opposite.

Because of these achievements, it's hard for me to be terribly pessimistic about the rest of this century.

LONGVIEW OBJECTS—MASSIVE PAPERWORK

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, energy and inflation are the major domestic concerns before Congress. Down in Texas, we have worked to conserve oil and gas so we turned to coal. The Texas Utilities Co. was way ahead of the congressional mandate and has for years been developing and turning to lignite.

When Congress discussed Government strip mining legislation, we did not have a single complaint from Texas. Every community spoke well of the fine strip mining job of the Texas utilities.

Yet, Congress passed a law that is burdensome, top heavy, and places tremendous additional costs upon the consumer. I remember discussions about the need to have our energy come from these resources because we had heard of some problems in West Virginia; and the law for the entire Nation must cover the West Virginia situation. It reminds me of the principal of the school who had heard one pupil had misbehaved and to correct the situation, he lined up every youngster in the school and beat the daylights out of them.

An excellent editorial on this subject was written by the Longview Daily News in east Texas. You will be interested in reading the viewpoint on excessive paperwork by the Longview Daily News:

PERMIT APPLICATION COST HALF MILLION

Changes in Texas Railroad Commission rules governing surface mining operations will force lignite users into vastly heavier costs and more voluminous reporting systems, but that will be the price of keeping Uncle Sam in the Texas private business.

A recent application by Texas Utilities Company for a permit to mine lignite in Panola county weighed 474 pounds and was prepared at a cost of half a million dollars. But the heavy involvement in these complex processes is not all the state agency's fault. Compliance with federal guidelines also is a big factor, and the recent move came as

the commission sought to bring its system into compliance with the federal statutes.

The company met the legislation to begin with and then made a provision that if the various states wished to exercise authority for compliance in mining operation in their own boundaries they must submit a set of rules by which they propose to operate. This was done by Texas in 1972 and the rules have been tentatively approved. A hearing is due shortly by the federal Office of Surface Mining to determine the rules' adequacy. If they are found acceptable they will be adopted, perhaps in February.

But the pathway which the utility had to follow in securing a permit to operate was a bureaucratic nightmare. In 1976 the utility got a permit to do the surface mining in Panola county and the questionnaires and reports required for the permit weighted 77 pounds and cost $50,000 to prepare. The commission required 10 copies.

The most recent weighted 474 pounds, cost half a million dollars and there were 20 copies this time. These are the kinds of things about which business, large and small, has been concerned. There is no way that all this material can be assimilated by three members, and certainly requiring 20 copies of anything represents the waste of all of them. We might hope that at the compliance hearing on the matter, some of the 330-page volume of present requirements may be deleted as superfluous.

But if the federal government is involved, and it certainly is here, the chances are that if changes are made it will be to add pages, not to subtract anything. It has been years since Uncle Sam used a modus operandi like that.

THE "GARDEN OF EATING" PROGRAM

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. Speaker; in the past two sessions, the Congress has enacted pioneering legislation in the area of consumer nutrition, which was designed not only to protect but to enable and encourage the American consumer to understand and to act intelligently on those diet and nutrition matters that directly impinge on health. Nutrition has become a matter of public policy—and that is as it should be.

Of course, there is still a large job to be done—there are still critical needs that the Congress will be asked to help meet. In the session ahead we will be considering a number of these urgent matters. Nutrition is a matter of public health, and to understand the probable consequences of nutrition education and food selection and to understand the probable consequences of individual food choices.

The "Garden of Eating" materials are free, child centered, colorful and innovative. They permit the teacher to introduce young children to an exciting way of exploring food through stories, poetry, songs, educational games, creative art projects and other activities, in the classroom and in the home.

This past spring semester these resources were field tested in 161 classrooms across the country. The curriculum specialists and teachers who participated in the field test were particularly enthusiastic about the observed effects of the program. For instance, school food service personnel reported children making wiser food choices in the lunchroom, and parents commented on improved eating habits at home, such as increased breakfast and the unacceptability of junk foods for snacks.

Are not the very concerns that this Congress has been addressing itself to for some time now?

This is the first year of the program. In this year, the "Garden of Eating" materials are being provided, free to the schools by Weight Watchers area directors.

This program exemplifies the best aspects of American education and of socially responsible American business. What I feel is particularly commendable about the "Garden of Eating" is that it provides a clear guidepost to ways the private sector and public education can work cooperatively to strengthen the curriculum.

The strength of America is American education and the strength of American education are many. It is universal, it is free, and it is responsive to the aspirations and goals of the citizen whose children it enrolls.

This ability of the schools to respond to citizen concerns is extraordinary. When Sputnik went up, Americans demanded a new emphasis in the physics and science curriculum, and the schools responded, and have been responding to public concern on public issues ever since. Witness: The national consumer movement, and the introduction of consumer education as a major curriculum area in the Nation's schools; the energy crunch followed by incorporation of energy education in the classroom; public focus on the environment and on an economy of shortages and the enormous push for conservation education.

While nutrition education has long been a part of the school curriculum, particularly among the professional leadership, today's widespread public interest in all aspects of food and nutrition has given
the subject a new, highly emphasized position in the curriculum—at all grade levels from kindergarten through high school.

Accordingly, schools across the United States are now gearing up to meet the new mandate to strengthen their classroom nutrition education programs—and school administrators and curriculum specialists acknowledge they need help with this challenge—from all appropriate sources—from both the public and private sectors. Indeed, the degree of help that will be forthcoming from the public sector is defined and limited, and so support from the private sector, if appropriate and educationally sound is eagerly sought and willingly accepted.

Weight Watchers “Garden of Eatin” program gives me hope that other responsible American business will undertake appropriate support of the curriculum in similar fashion. Indeed, a number of companies and trade organizations already are doing so. Obviously, neither Weight Watchers nor any other corporation is in a position to take on the sole responsibility for providing nutrition education materials for all grade levels and all schools. They are not even in a position to do that for a single grade level. Nor, in my judgment, would it be appropriate for any company to take on a continuing burden of that dimension. But it seems to me that what the Weight Watchers nutrition education program does do is help us do a few other similar public service efforts—is to point the way in which corporations working cooperatively with educators can share in meeting our schools’ curriculum needs. These needs are large but so is business’ capacity. The challenge today is to motivate the private sector to take on responsibilities in this arena.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, November 9, 1979

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. BRADemas.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

Mr. BRADemas. I hereby designate the Honorable JOHNP. TEMPORE, pro tempore of the Senate, by Mr. CONABLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, as the new Commissioner Stanford Ross has examined the Journal of the Senate, by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 668. An act to permit the Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe of Indians to take fish on the Quinault Indian Indian Claim Commission under the act of August 13, 1946 (80 Stat. 1044).

ACTION URGED TO COUNTER IRA­

Mr. HubbARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HubbARD. Mr. Speaker, as the Avatollah Khomeini-incited revolutionaries continue to threaten and hold hostage 60 Americans in Tehran, at this point we do need to give President Carter what he asks of us regarding this tragic crisis—the continued support of the American people.

Yes, I admit I am humiliated and very angry about the events in Tehran. Iran is in obvious violation of the first principle of the United Nations Charter—that force or the threat of force should not be used to achieve national political objectives.

When will the world leaders of the United Nations take strong action against Iran’s current mob rule—a dangerous affront to the U.N. Charter? I have never been impressed by the ability of the United Nations to solve crises, but it would be refreshing to see the United Nations prove now they are capable of intervening to bring about a peaceful settlement of the conflict in Iran.

FURTHER DEMONSTRATIONS SEEN AS THREAT TO LIVES OF HOSTAGES IN TEHRAN

Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned at reports that District of Columbia officials may permit anti-American demonstrations today by Iranian students.

At a time when every American is deeply concerned about the lives of those U.S. Embassy employees being held hostage in Tehran, such a decision is not only ill-advised but dangerous.

While I am vitally concerned about preserving every citizen’s right to free speech, the potential for violence in such demonstrations could only further inflame the situation, hinder the President’s diplomatic efforts and endanger the lives of those American hostages.

I am much more concerned about preserving the rights—and the lives—of those Americans held hostage in Tehran than I am about the rights of those Iranian noncitizens who are, after all, guests in our country.

The President is to be commended for the restraint he has shown in dealing with this difficult situation. He clearly has placed the safety of the hostages ahead of all other considerations and I fully support the diplomatic initiatives he has undertaken to win their freedom.

There are indications that those efforts may now be making some progress and we all have a responsibility to make certain they are not upset.

ANOTHER PERSONNEL RESHUFLING AT SSA

Mr. CONABLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, Social Security Commissioner Stanford Ross recently announced his resignation, after barely a year on the job.

Serious questions can be raised about such short tenure in such an important post. But an overriding question, Mr. Speaker, is whether the Social Security Administration can stand another reorganization, which a new Commissioner understandably might wish to effect.

Over the past 5 years, this agency has been through three different reorganiza-
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