

atives to postpone for one day the final vote on any bill or resolution which was amended in the Committee of the Whole.

H. Res. 435. September 27, 1979. Rules. Amends the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that a portion of the time provided for general debate on any bill or resolution when the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole shall be reserved and made available exclusively for a final period of general debate on the bill or resolution in its final form.

H. Res. 436. September 27, 1979. Rules. Amends the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that at least 500 copies of any proposed floor amendment be made available in the Hall of the House of Representatives for the use of other Members prior to the offering of such amendment.

H. Res. 437. September 27, 1979. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 1885.

H. Res. 438. September 27, 1979. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 3580.

H. Res. 439. September 27, 1979. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.J. Res. 341.

H. Res. 440. September 27, 1979. Waives certain points of order in the consideration of the conference report on H.J. Res. 404.

H. Res. 441. October 9, 1979. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.J. 412.

H. Res. 442. October 9, 1979. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.J. 413.

H. Res. 443. October 9, 1979. Post Office and Civil Service. Proclaims the week of October 14 through October 20, 1979, as "National Mobile Home/Manufactured Housing Week."

H. Res. 444. October 11, 1979. Waives certain points of order against the consideration of the conference report on H.J. 412.

H. Res. 445. October 12, 1979. Rules. Establishes in the House of Representatives an Ad Hoc Committee on Water Resources.

H. Res. 446. October 16, 1979. Rules. Amends the Rules of the House of Representatives to restrict provisions of and amendments to appropriation bills.

H. Res. 447. October 16, 1979. House Administration. Limits the use of the section of the Congressional Record entitled "Extensions of Remarks" by Members of the House of Representatives.

H. Res. 448. October 16, 1979. Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Directs the Department of the Interior to rename the Big Stone National Wildlife Refuge, Minnesota, to be known as the Lem Kaercher National Wildlife Refuge.

H. Res. 449. October 16, 1979. Foreign Affairs. Expresses the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the failure of Chile to extradite certain individuals to the United States.

Urges the President to take certain actions with respect to Chile.

H. Res. 450. October 17, 1979. House Administration. Authorizes the printing as a House document of an anthology of Captive Nations Week proclamations, addresses, and other relevant material.

H. Res. 451. October 17, 1979. Foreign Affairs. Condemns the use of poison gas in Laos.

H. Res. 452. October 18, 1979. House Administration. Authorizes expenditures for the further expenses of investigations and studies conducted by the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

H. Res. 453. October 18, 1979. Appropriations. Disapproves the deferral of budget authority for fiscal year 1980 for prompting and developing fishery products (Deferral Numbered D 80-7).

H. Res. 454. October 18, 1979. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 2727.

H. Res. 455. October 18, 1979. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 3948.

H. Res. 456. October 18, 1979. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 2313.

H. Res. 457. October 18, 1979. Waives certain points of order in the consideration of the conference report on S. 1030.

H. Res. 458. October 18, 1979. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 2335.

H. Res. 459. October 18, 1979. House Administration. Prohibits the use of official funds for expenses of foreign travel by a specified Member of the House of Representatives.

H. Res. 460. October 18, 1979. House Administration. Authorizes funds for the further expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted by the House Committee on Small Business.

H. Res. 461. October 19, 1979. Standards of Official Conduct. Amends the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit foreign travel by Members convicted of a felony.

H. Res. 462. October 22, 1979. Authorizes the printing as a House of Representatives document of the transcript of the proceedings of the Workshop on Congressional Oversight.

H. Res. 463. October 23, 1979. Elects a named Member to the House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H-BUMS BY HARRY

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1979

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, Harry Dumford, who writes for the Lexington Advertiser-News, of Lexington, Mo., recently wrote an article about Americans' attitudes regarding the Iranian crisis. I wish to show it to the other Members of the body, as it reflects the thinking of many in western Missouri.

The article follows:

H-BUMS BY HARRY

It seems to me that not since December 7, 1941 have the American people been so united as they have been in the past week. The dastardly attempt to blackmail our country through the actions of a mob in Tehran, Iran has been the moral equivalent of another Pearl Harbor. It is my opinion that the United States should enunciate a clear set of principles to meet the situation.

While it is obvious that at the present moment there is little we can do to free the 60 Americans held in the embassy except play a waiting game in the hopes that they will soon be freed, nevertheless, we should be prepared eventually to announce to the world a course of action which will serve notice that we no longer will be patsys to the whims of the rest of the world.

A principle to which we already appear to be committed is that we will not bow to blackmail. The kidnapping of our embassy personnel—and that is what it amounts to—is a threat to the future safety of all diplo-

matic personnel. If it succeeds we can expect to be faced with the same situation again and again. We simply cannot afford to allow a foreign mob to dictate United States policy in any respect.

We may be forced to bide our time until our people are safely released and returned home, but it seems to me that we are dealing with fanatical, irrational people and we may have to bite our tongues for a period of weeks or months until the situation is resolved. In my opinion, we should then announce certain principles in our further dealings with Iran or any other country which acts in like manner.

We will not continue to feed the faces that curse America. We will not send our grain to those who vilify our country and shout for the death of our president. We will embargo every shipment of foodstuffs to them and will continue such embargo until they respond in friendly ways to our past generosity.

Further, we will not furnish technology of any kind to such a country; we will not allow oil drilling or refining equipment to be sent from Houston; we will not allow airplane parts to be airlifted to them when their planes sit on the tarmac and cannot take off without spare parts; we will furnish no computers, no telephone equipment, no training, nothing to aid them in any manner until they have made amends to our country in word and deed. We should make this clear and stick to it.

We should not only break off all diplomatic contacts, but we should act as if their country does not even exist. They will, of course, cut off our oil supply, but we should make it clear that somehow or other we'll get by without it.

There has been nothing that has riled Americans more in the past week than the

sight of foreigners, here in the U.S. by the grace of our generosity, acting like they own this country and can dictate our course of action. We should certainly establish the principle that this is our country and anyone who is visiting here is doing so because we have allowed them to come, not because of any inherent right for them to be here. Ninety days should be sufficient to deport those Iranians now here and if it takes new legislation from the Congress to get this accomplished, so be it.

Pearl Harbor pulled the United States together in a bond of unity which lasted until after the victory was won. Current events have again united us against the enemies of our country in Iran. We should establish principles for dealing with such situations, and then we should follow the advice of Thomas Jefferson to stand like a rock. ●

AFGHAN APPEAL TO UNITED NATIONS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, many Members have become experts in recent weeks on Islam as a result of the tragic developments in Iran, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia.

However, a positive development involving Islamic leaders must be noted in Afghanistan where inspiration for resistance against the Soviet-imposed gov-

ernment has been provided by religious leaders in that country.

I submit for the RECORD a memorandum from the Afghan National Liberation Front to the United Nations. This organization is a member of the United Islamic Forces for the Liberation of Afghanistan.

The memo follows:

THE APPEAL OF THE AFGHAN PEOPLE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

The Soviet Union's struggle for world domination is contrary to the present international order and the right of other nations to national sovereignty. This allegation, which has been upheld also by Mr. Dung, Prime Minister of China, is not groundless. The invasion of several Asiatic and European countries by the Soviet Union during the last sixty years is still fresh in our memories. The recent Soviet aggression in Afghanistan is more evidence of the Soviet Union's imperialistic efforts.

The Soviet Union is, indeed, an aggressor in Afghanistan in the eyes of international law. President Leonid I. Brezhnev himself arranged the bloody coup of April 27th, 1978, through intrigue and the cooperation of Soviet agents in the Afghan army. A few months before the coup, he requested President Daoud, during their meeting in the Kremlin, to assign key positions in the government to communist party (Khalq) members.

This distressed Daoud very much. He pounded on Brezhnev's desk and said, "I will not allow any foreign power to interfere in the internal affairs of my country." Brezhnev considered this an insult and looked for revenge. Through the coup, he tried to reach both his objectives: to annihilate Daoud for his "recklessness" and to establish Soviet domination in Afghanistan. According to Brezhnev's instructions, Soviet advisors and pilots in the service of Afghanistan's government participated openly in the coup against the Afghan Army. Besides, hundreds of people in Afghanistan are convinced that Soviet planes coming from the bases near the Afghan border have bombarded the barracks of the Presidential Guard and several military centers outside of the capital. Consequently, President Daoud, a non-communist friend of the Soviet Union, seventeen members of his family and 12,000 men from the Afghan Army were massacred mercilessly. Taraki's Marxist government was brought to power against the will of 16 million Muslim Afghans.

President Brezhnev continued to violate boldly the spirit and the letter of international law by further actions. He precipitately recognized the government of Taraki, while of 28 provinces of Afghanistan, 27 had not been under its effective control. He also pledged in the treaty, which he signed in December 1978 with Taraki, to assist the illegal communist government in Kabul against the people of Afghanistan. The Soviet President publicly denied the participation of the Soviet advisors and air force in the coup. He stated repeatedly that this country does not interfere in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. He also tried to convince world opinion that the coup was in reality a revolutionary move of the Afghan people, who favor "Socialistic Reform." Soon after the coup, events revealed the falsity of President Brezhnev's statements.

The Afghan nation, which has never yielded to foreign domination, revolted against the Soviet puppet government of Taraki. Consequently, President Brezhnev has been forced to increase the number of so-called Soviet advisors and pilots from 1,500 to 4,000 and later to 8,000, and has instructed them to suppress the Afghan nation's uprisings with drastic action as quickly

as possible. In fact, Soviet forces tried to enforce his instructions with no discernment or feeling of pity, as usual.

Adolph Dubs, the U.S. Ambassador, was killed together with his kidnapers. Over 3,000 political prisoners have been executed without any trial. 60,000 to 80,000 people have been imprisoned and tortured mercilessly.¹ The Soviet Air Force, covered with the red flag of Taraki's government, has dropped napalm bombs on the cities and villages and has burned to death many thousands of innocent children, women and men. According to some sources, 250,000 people have been massacred by the Soviets. In excess of 200,000 people have lost their homes to napalm bombs and have taken refuge in Pakistan and Iran. They live presently on the border areas of these two neighboring countries without adequate food and shelter. Any international inquiry board would most likely find higher figures and more cruelties than those mentioned.

In addition, President Brezhnev has requested the Prime Minister of India, during his visit to Moscow, to compel Pakistan's government to take radical action against the Afghan guerrilla fighters and refugees.

To President Brezhnev's great surprise, the Soviets have failed to break down the resistance of the Afghans by these unparalleled massacres and atrocities. On the contrary, the more the Soviets kill the Afghans, the stronger becomes their will to defend their freedom and independence. To date, they have delivered 24 provinces from the communist yoke and have established an effective national control in 75 percent of Afghanistan's territory. The cities in the hands of the communists are encircled by national revolutionary forces. Even inside the capital, the increasing hostility and disorder among the people has forced the leaders of the so-called Khalq (People's) party to take refuge in the barracks of the Soviet forces outside of Kabul and to send their families to Moscow.

Under these conditions, no one can deny that recognition of the communist government in Kabul by the Member States and its admission to the United Nations is a flagrant insult to justice, to the spirit and the letter of the Charter, and to the principles of international law.

The member states cannot pass over this manifest violation of the Afghans' rights to national sovereignty without jeopardizing international order and their own freedom and independence. They may hide the present situation in Afghanistan by using any imaginable excuse, and shun their moral and legal obligations. But they cannot prevent the Soviet Union from seeing the reality. The Soviet Union knows that the other member states are perfectly aware of its aggression in Afghanistan, and that their silence is essentially due to their weakness and fear. This will naturally encourage the Soviet Union to take more important steps toward world domination.

Undoubtedly, Afghanistan is not a final objective in the Soviet scheme. In subjugating Afghanistan, the Soviet Union is trying to pave its way to the domination of South Asia, the Indian Ocean, the Middle East, and subsequently Africa and Europe. Many eminent statesmen and scholars have expressed their worry in this respect. Today, the general public shares their views.

Therefore, it is vital for member states, especially small nations, to bring the United Nations back to life by honoring their obligations. They should use the power granted to them by the Charter and stand collectively, with courage, against the Soviet Union's continual acts of sabotage and aggression in any form and in any part of the world. This is the only way to protect the small nations'

¹ See the report of Amnesty International published in September, 1979 in London.

independence, human rights, peace and order. Otherwise, the free world will soon collapse under the increasing pressure of the Soviet Union's uncontested power.

As for us, we will never give in to the Communist doctrine which denies God, preaches hatred, creates divisions inside the nations and considers religion, justice, international law and order as creations of crafty men designed to exploit the lower classes. We will defend our religion, dignity, freedom and independence at the cost of any amount of blood and tears.

However, we believe in your wisdom and sense of justice, and still place our hope in your organization. Therefore, we urge you to take immediate action in order to make possible the exercise of our right to self-determination. The exercise of this right through popular consultation (referendum) must take place under the auspices of the United Nations, without the interference and pressure of the Soviet Union. We pray that God may give the United Nations the courage to prevent the Soviet dictators from gradually exterminating the non-communist population on earth. ●

CHRYSLER

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Chrysler issue is pressing, but Congress must weigh it objectively. England's experience was that financial aid led to a governmental socialistic industry.

You will appreciate the statement of the editorial from the Dallas Morning News.

Here is the Dallas Morning News editorial:

COUNTING THE COST

The headline in the Friday paper said, "Trouble clouds air for Chrysler in Senate panel." It is just possible that the reason can be found in the senators' reading of stories like the one appearing in the previous day's news.

The Associated Press reported, in Thursday's issue of The News:

"Britain lurched toward a new industrial crisis Wednesday when militant union workers at the state-run British Leyland auto company called for a 1-day general strike . . .

"The Leyland militants, angry about the firing of a communist union official for urging workers to take over the ailing company's plants, called on Britain's 12 million unionized workers to join Leyland workers in a 'day of action and demonstration' Monday."

There is usually strong political pressure on politicians, even conservatives, to throw public money with both hands at any program that claims to save jobs. This is particularly the case when a recession looms and weaker companies begin to wobble.

It is very easy to put numbers on the damage that will be done if government stands by and lets an "ailing company" fall. Never mind that the free enterprise system is supposed to weed out those competitors who fail to win the consumers' approval and purchases. When governments hear about the number of jobs in danger, they weigh that cost of inaction against the much-less quantifiable cost of bailing out the company. And so, in they go.

The British government has been doing this for years, British Leyland being one of

the rescued. The record there provides a most startling picture of the cost of the rush to bail out uncompetitive firms with government money and direction.

Has government intervention made British industry more productive, more efficient in producing what customers want?

Well, let's see. The AP story reports that the Leyland director incurred the wrath of the union militants because he fired the entire night shift at one plant for sleeping on the job. And his survival plan for the company, which has the unions in turmoil, calls for laying off 25,000 employees, for closing or cutting back a third of the firm's plants. So the protection of jobs, including those slept on, would seem to be temporary at best.

Government intervention may seem to save jobs in the short run. But when such rescues become standard operating procedure, they create in the long run an unholy mess. ●

ILLINOIS ENERGY TOUR PROVES USEFUL

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, during the period October 2-4, I toured energy-related facilities in and around the 15th District. In view of the importance of energy today, and particularly because of my membership on the Commerce Committee's Energy and Power Subcommittee, I felt it important to obtain firsthand knowledge of energy from the Illinois perspective.

During my tour, I found much to be optimistic about. People are apprehensive about U.S. energy policy but they are doing the best they can under the circumstances. I am grateful to the Illinoisans who took the time and made the effort to help me gain a better insight into the energy situation as it exists in Illinois. I would like to share with my colleagues the below listing of energy facilities I visited during my October Illinois energy tour.

The listing follows:

LISTING OF ENERGY FACILITIES IN ILLINOIS AMOCO RESEARCH CENTER, NAPERVILLE

On our tour of this major facility, we learned of the extensive research Amoco is undertaking to best utilize crude oil and other fossil fuels. Keith McHenry, Bob Arganbright, and Chuck Mason hosted our tour of this facility.

FERMI NATIONAL ACCELERATOR LAB, BATAVIA

During this tour, we learned about Fermilab's energy conservation programs in terms of solar development, conservation measures in buildings, and the Lab's transportation planning and use of gasohol for its vehicles. We also toured the central helium liquifier building and the cancer therapy facility. This tour was hosted by Leon Lederman, John McCook, Hank Hinterberger, John Colson, Bill Fowler, and Miguel Awaschalom.

ARGONNE NATIONAL LAB, LEMONT

Our tour of this major facility included a briefing and a first-hand look at the National Battery Test Laboratory. NBTL is the major Federal facility which tests and evaluates electric storage batteries developed under the Electric and Hybrid Vehicle Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1976. I was particularly interested in this facility as I have introduced legislation, H.R. 3718, that would encourage the production and

sale of electric vehicles. Argonne is working closely with a major battery manufacturer, Gould, of Rolling Meadows. Argonne also has a nuclear waste management project which I hope to be able to visit in the future. Mike Yao, Duane Barney, and Dick Adams assisted with the Argonne tour.

MOBIL REFINERY, JOLIET

The briefing given at this refinery was most useful in describing refinery operations and the efforts petroleum companies are exerting to conserve energy in their production of petroleum products. This facility is the second newest refinery in the United States. Ray Kruep, Bill Abbey, and Russ Snowe gave the briefing at the refinery and John Philbin assisted through Mobil's Washington office.

LA SALLE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, MARSEILLES

This station is under construction by Commonwealth Edison. I was able to have a complete tour of these facilities, and was impressed with the emphasis on the safety standards being incorporated into this plant. Leo Burke hosted this tour.

ADM GASOHOL PLANT, DECATUR

This plant is the largest of its kind in the United States engaged in the production of alcohol used for gasohol. I was pleased to note that DOE Secretary Duncan toured the ADM plant earlier this month. Briefings on ADM's operations were provided by Dick Burket, James Randall, and Duane Andreas.

ELM MINE, MIDLAND COAL CO., DIVISION OF ASARCO, TRIVOLI

Illinois is the nation's third-largest producer of coal, and so I thought it important to tour a mine. The Elm Mine is a surface mine typical of Illinois. Bob Kropp and Bob Izerd hosted this tour.

SOLAR HOME, LACON

The Dave Wier family home is an A-frame which has eight roof panels and three 400-gallon water storage tanks. Solar heat provided the primary heating source during last year's severe winter.

SOLAR GRAIN DRYER, STREATOR

Under the guidance of an agricultural professor at the University of Illinois, the Dale Sass family has constructed a building with fiberglass on the south wall and a roof with fiberglass panels to absorb solar heat. The heat is circulated throughout the structure with fans and dries the grain.

CENTRAL ILLINOIS ENERGY CONFERENCE, PEORIA

I addressed the Central Illinois Energy Conference which included as participants representatives of industry, commercial interests, educational institutions, and government.

CATERPILLAR TRACTOR CO., AURORA

I conducted my energy tour by touring the Caterpillar plant in Aurora. I gained firsthand knowledge of the various efforts Cat is using to conserve energy as well as Cat's anti-pollution efforts. Bob Dryden and Dan McAvoy hosted this tour. ●

STATEMENT AS TO VOTE

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1979

● Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 16, 1979, I was unable to be present on the floor of the House of Representatives for rollcall vote No. 672 and No. 673. On No. 672, in which the House agreed to the conference report on H.R. 4391, making appropriations for military construction for the Department

of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, I would have voted "yea."

On No. 673, in which the House passed H.R. 2335, to provide for a research, development, and evaluation program to determine the feasibility of collecting in space solar energy to be transmitted to Earth and to generate electricity for domestic purposes, I would have voted "nay." ●

IRANIAN SITUATION III; THE NEED FOR INTERNAL SECURITY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the current crisis in Iran has impacted on about every aspect of American life. Our energy resources have been partially crippled, our diplomatic respect has been shattered, our military capability has been questioned, and our Nation as a whole stands awestruck by the ongoing shockwaves that are emanating from the Middle East. Unfortunately I must report that the Iranian situation has also called into question the adequacy of America's ability to remain internally secure. While the tension in the Moslem world has been building, there has been a parallel evolution of Iranian-led violence within the United States. This trend has already shown the gaping holes in our security. Thankfully, no one has been injured or killed by this new wave of terrorism, but enough is going on to underscore the need for quick action by this Nation before tragedy strikes.

Some of the incidents of the new Iranian terrorism range to the bizarre, like the arrest of four Iranians who planned to kidnap Minnesota Governor Al Quie. However, other situations have more serious and deadly overtones. In one case, an airliner flying out of Chicago has a bomb explode in its cargo hold. The plane landed safely but, had the bomb been larger, many deaths would have occurred. Last week eight Iranians were arrested at Baltimore-Washington Airport in Maryland. Under surveillance for over a week the group was intercepted as one of them was about to board a TWA flight to New York. The police found three disassembled Winchester 30.06 rifles, matching scopes, 15 boxes of ammunition, and a map of Washington, D.C., with certain embassies marked, according to court documents.

There are currently 40,000 legal Iranians studying in the United States, another 25,000 to 250,000 are estimated to be in the United States illegally or on expired visas. Many of these students are organized, according to a recent Newsweek article. The article went on to say:

There is no doubt that Iranian student protests in the U.S. are well orchestrated, and perhaps centrally directed. Two major groups, the Iranian Students Association and the Organization of Iranian Muslim Students, have dozens of U.S. chapters. Both organized frequent marches and demonstra-

tions in New York, Washington, and other cities. If this were the extent of Iranian activity in America there would be no need for concern. However, Newsweek adds an ominous note, "some European counterintelligence specialists believe that as many as 5,000 of the 60,000 Iranian students abroad belong to Marxist or Trotskyite groups and that 500 or so are active members of terrorist cells."

Given that there are no solid numbers of how many Iranian students are really residing outside of Iran, all of these numbers are only estimates. Numbers problems are not the only thing hampering adequate monitoring of Iranian activities. The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) had not checked on the status of student visas until April 1979. On that date the agency announced it was planning monthly, random checks on 1 percent of all foreign students in the United States. This effort quickly bogged down, and as of September no deportation proceedings had even been begun as a result of the spot checks.

Monitoring visas does not root out the possible terrorists nor does it provide information on arms caches or terrorist projects in the works. Unfortunately any monitoring of foreign students to prevent terrorism is hampered by provisions in the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, which defines aliens admitted for permanent residence as "United States persons" and confers privileges and immunities pertaining to American citizens. In addition, U.S. authorities, until recently, have treated Iranian students in this country with special leniency because of the unsettled conditions in their homeland.

The result of these actions, or nonactions, is that very little can be done under present law to counter violent acts before they happen. Up until now, U.S. officials have been lucky enough to stop any violence or, in the case of the plane bombing, have the terrorists botch the planting of the bomb. This may not always be the case. As the United States prepares to host the 1980 Olympics, and as tensions increase between the United States and Iran, we should think twice about our internal security capabilities. When the Congress considers the FBI charter and possible Intelligence Agency legislation, it should keep in mind that hindering the intelligence community in the name of reform may lead to the taking of innocent lives in the name of the Ayatollah.●

THE 61ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE
DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE
OF LATVIA

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on November 18, Latvians throughout the world commemorated the 61st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Latvia. It is important that Americans take time to memorialize the plight of the Baltic people who have been

overcome by the ruthless tyranny of the Soviet Union.

Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia exemplify the true meaning of human rights. In fact, no part of the world represents a more serious denial of human rights, including the right of self-determination, than the imprisoning of the Baltic people.

Soviet repression has been consistent and harsh. Human rights have been violated in numerous ways and these violations are continuing. This ongoing repression makes it incumbent upon us to uphold our heritage of a free and open society and we must champion the cause of self-determination for the Baltic people. The United States must continue to support the aspirations for freedom, independence, and national self-determination of all peoples. We cannot accept foreign domination by any nation over another nation. To this end we remain committed and we must not waiver from our responsibility.●

USE WINDFALL FUNDS FOR ALTERNATE FUELS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a very interesting and timely editorial which appeared in the November 18 edition of the Pointer-Economist Publications, serving southwest Cook County, on the subject of the vote in the House and Senate on the question of winter heating oil costs. While many Members have already made up their minds on the issue, I commend this editorial to the few that are rethinking their position.

The editorial follows:

USE WINDFALL FUNDS FOR ALTERNATE FUELS

While it may be good politics, and it sounds fair to suggest that excess oil profits be used to help the poor meet the rising costs of heating oil this winter, it is not a proper use of these funds and it will not do a thing to help solve our energy problem.

We think the House and Senate acted with undue haste and let sentiment rather than reason rule their heads in passing similar bills appropriating up to \$1.35 billion for this purpose.

It is not that we want any family to have to choose between eating and heating, or that we have a lack of concern for poverty stricken families. No, we simply believe that welfare programs are adequate to take care of anyone and everyone in need, and if their appropriations prove inadequate then let Congress boost them.

Such need can best be determined and be met by welfare agencies at the local level.

Bear in mind that the poor are largely renters who already receive rent subsidies and share public housing—that fuel bills are, for the most part, the landlord's problem. Also, there is the possibility that a bonus fuel check may wind up in the hands of aggressive bill collectors or be squandered for purposes other than fuel.

And, can there be any doubt that this stop-gap fuel aid will become a permanent, open-ended extension of the federal welfare program that now numbers 182 programs ac-

counting for transfer payments of some \$250 billion annually?

In other words, this is a good way to send another government check to some 25 million persons—the total of those enrolled on welfare, food stamps or supplementary social security—and cement their voting loyalty to the administration.●

THE INVENTION THAT REMADE THE
WORLD

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it has often been said the four major inventions that changed the world during our century are the radio, the automobile, the telephone, and the airplane. To this list I would add one more: the traction machine. It can be said, quite literally, that the bulldozer and the tractor, and the other machines that belong to the traction family, have helped to remake the world. Wherever human beings seek to use the Earth for the purpose of mankind, the traction machine is essential.

The world capital of this important business is Peoria, Ill., home of the Caterpillar Tractor Co. For many years Peoria has come to symbolize middle America. Will it play in Peoria? is a question that suggests we all look to this city as the essential embodiment of our national outlook. This is true because Peoria reflects the primary American virtues including the can-do quality best symbolized by our national talent for building and harnessing nature to serve the needs of all. Small wonder that the Caterpillar Co., which is at the forefront of construction and agriculture all over the world, should be located in this truly American city.

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD "A Moment of Machinery Revolution: The Invention of the Bulldozer in 1904" from the Washington Post, November 26, 1979:

A MOMENT OF MACHINERY REVOLUTION: THE
INVENTION OF THE BULLDOZER IN 1904

(By Larry Kramer)

On Thanksgiving Day, 1904, grain harvester manufacturer Benjamin Holt tested a new earth moving machine on a farm near Stockton, Calif.

By the time he finished his experiment, more than just earth moved.

The invention of the diesel-powered traction machines that could move over land too soft to support horse-drawn or wheeled tractors caused a revolution not only in the farming business but in the construction and military businesses as well: Holt's track-drive principle was applied later to everything from bulldozers to the World War I military tank.

In celebration of the 75th anniversary of that tractor, the Smithsonian Institution's Museum of History and Technology put on display last week a 1929 Caterpillar tractor called the "Cat 10."

It was a merger of the Holt Manufacturing Co. and the Best Tractor Co. in 1925 that created the Caterpillar Tractor Co., which is today the largest crawler-tractor manufacturing firm in the country.

The "Cat 10" on display is a gift from George E. Logue of Trout Run, Pa., a businessman who has collected over 50 antique pieces of Caterpillar equipment since he first developed a passion for them living on a farm at age five.

"It's a totally American invention," Logue says of the Caterpillar tractor. "What would transportation be without the bulldozer? What would our roads, shipyards, airports, anything be like? It all has to start with the bulldozer."

The "Model A" of the tractor business, the "Cat 10" was the smallest ever built by Caterpillar. Nearly 5,000 were produced between 1928 and 1931, selling for about \$1,100.

But that tractor represents only one of the many manifestations of Holt's dream machine.

There are millions of tractors on farms across the nation today. The track-type tractor has more than doubled farm output per man-hour since they were first put into mass use 50 years ago.

Militarily, they were first used by the Allies in 1916. In fact, the word "tank" originated because of the way in which the new weapons were shipped overseas during that first World War.

The armor-plated machines with tractor treads were considered a secret weapon. So when they were shipped they were identified only as water tanks for British troops in Egypt.

Today, tractor customers expect their vehicle to live a functioning life of about 20,000 hours: roughly the equivalent of one million miles of automobile travel, the Smithsonian claims.

Not to mention what the tractor has done for George Logue. In an interview with the local newspaper in Williamsport, Pa., he said it has "had a profound effect. My life has never been the same."

Which, by the way, is easy to believe. His fascination for the Caterpillar tractor led Logue to quit what he called a "respectable, good engineering job" in 1957 to work with bulldozers full time. Despite the objections of his father, Logue began digging wells and basements with his own Caterpillar.

Today, Logue heads a \$5.25 million construction business with 125 employees. "It's kind of fun to be able to make a living at what you like to do," he says. ●

RUBEN ORGANISTA, GOOD CITIZEN

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, General Telephone Co. of California's Good Government Club has chosen Mr. Ruben Organista as its Good Citizen of the Year. The Good Government Club does not take the award lightly nor do its recipients earn it easily. Out of the company's 25,000 employees, only 16 were considered this year.

Ruben Organista, a 14-year employee of General Telephone, believes in good government and believes in being part of it. He has been recognized for entering the city of Carpinteria's political arena in 1978, without any organized financial support and running on his own merits to improve local government; he was elected to city council. Prior to this election, Mr. Organista spent 2 years on the Carpinteria Planning Commission. He

CXXV—2121—Part 26

will be honored at several events, because of the Good Citizen award.

Ruben's demonstrated leadership qualities deserve to be recognized, and I ask the Members of the House to join with me, his wife Sharon, and their two children, in extending congratulations to Ruben Organista. ●

POPULATION STABILIZATION

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, Congressman OTTINGER addressed the New York Chapter of Zero Population Growth, pointing out the need for a national policy of population stabilization. His remarks are worthy of our perusal and concern.

The address follows:

H.R. 5062: A CHALLENGE TO LEADERSHIP ON POPULATION STABILIZATION

The 1980 national elections are exactly a year from today. But the Presidential campaigns are already well underway. In both parties, men are vying for the nomination.

For all the candidates' talk of SALT II, energy, and inflation, they give one main reason for their quests. It's the need for "leadership." More accurately, it is the absence of leadership in the federal government which preoccupies both the candidates and the makers of the candidates.

Americans seem to be searching for the meaning of leadership as much as a good leader. But we're better at knowing what it isn't than what it is. It's not fist pounding. It's not a louder voice; nor a sterner expression.

A Washington Post editor recently offered a positive definition which I like. Leadership, said William Greider, is "the ability to see the future and to make it convincing."

I would put it in terms of the work to be done. Leadership is the ability to:

Grasp a problem fundamental to the nation's well-being.

Put forward clear goals for its solution, and Take visible, consistent steps to realize those goals.

That kind of government leadership in the face of problems aggravated by great changes in our country's population does not exist and that is why H.R. 5062, the population stabilization bill, is so needed. Ignored and overlooked for decades, changes in the growth, the distribution, and the age-structure of the population have wrought havoc with the United States' environmental, economic, and social well-being.

Between the 1930's and the 1950's, we doubled our average family size and produced an enormous Baby Boom. And then we proceeded to ignore the tremendous impact of their numbers.

The Baby Boom added to a rate of population growth which often has outstripped our ability to protect the environment from its collective impact. For example, had there been no population growth between 1946 and 1968, poisonous lead emissions from cars would have been 50 percent less.

The need to house and educate the Baby Boom—plus the desire to give them a better life—propelled a nationwide drive to the suburbs. With this movement came the loss of agricultural lands, a dependence on gasoline-fueled transportation, and pollution—all of which the Council on Environmental Quality has tagged the "costs of sprawl."

The Baby Boom created a generational

bulge which we ignored even as it crowded schools and later flooded the job market. In only ten years, between 1950 and 1960, school enrollments leaped almost 50 percent, from 22 million to 33 million. Two decades later when those students graduated to job hunting, it was possible for President Gerald Ford to report that employment had never been higher and for candidate Jimmy Carter to respond, neither had unemployment.

Last year, the House Select Committee on Population looked back on what has happened in federal policy since those years when we ignored the impact of the Baby Boom's numbers. You know what they found? We continue to ignore demographic change. Population changes still affect our lives and the government's work. But we have no policy to respond to those changes, and we don't even have the capacity to make decisions about what we should do.

In other words, we lack the needed leadership, as I have defined it, to:

Give political definition to population changes and the problems they create,

Set goals for federal response to them, and Take concerted, visible action on them.

Yet, the need for leadership in the decades ahead will be greater than ever. People are having small families today, but the population still grows by about two million more each year. In the 1980s, reports U.S. News and World Report, "Growth in the number of Americans will speed up. Population will expand by about 21 million * * * or 3 million more than in the 1970s."

Adding to it will be mounting pressures for international migration. Global population growth and global poverty already are driving millions of people to leave their homelands, seeking entry into industrialized countries like the United States—both legally and illegally. There are 300 million unemployed and underemployed in the world today. During the next 20 years, 800 million more adults will seek jobs.

Meanwhile, people in the United States are on the move, too * * * motoring beyond the metropolitan suburban rings to the next stretch of the countryside. Rural communities which lost population for years are now growing again. Between 1970 and 1976, more people moved into rural counties than metropolitan ones—2.3 million more. And it's all built, says USDA demographer Calvin Beale, on the gas-powered automobile in its last years of economic viability.

The Baby Boom hasn't gone away. It is simply growing older. Our older population already is growing faster than the populations of Korea, India, and other less developed countries. Today, about one out of every 11 Americans is 65 or older. Early in the next century, when the Baby Boom generation reaches retirement age, one out of five may be. Straining schools, housing markets, and job markets will give way to new strains on our health care and social security systems.

H.R. 5062 establishes a mechanism to watch for and deal with these changes in the nation's population growth, distribution, and age structure:

H.R. 5062 recognizes the tremendous impact these population changes will have on health, education, the economy, and the environment as well as the federal programs in these areas.

H.R. 5062 recognizes the need for the federal government to plan continually for these changes with stabilization—an end to growth and a balance between generations—as our national goal.

H.R. 5062 recognizes that visibility is needed at the top of federal decision-making with a White House Office of Population Policy pointing to population changes and the goal of stabilization when federal decisions about health care, education, the economy, and the environment are weighed.

I believe enactment of H.R. 5062 could make a big difference in federal policy-mak-

ing if it were enacted. I'll give you some examples.

European countries already have experienced slower population growth, for which they did not prepare themselves. Their response: to encourage families, through tax-breaks and other incentives, to have more children. In the United States, with a White House office focusing policy-makers on our goal of stabilization, the issue would be how to allow people to have the smaller families they want while benefitting from the economic advantages of slower growth, which *Business Week* magazine highlighted in its 50th anniversary issue this fall.

Today, we are making major decisions about the future of health care, education, and employment programs supported by the government. In an increasingly older population, will we continue to subsidize institutionalized health care, schooling only for the young, and job-retraining primarily for teenagers? With a commitment to planning for stabilization and a balance between generations, a White House office would focus policy-makers' attention on the need for programs which maximize the health and productive occupation of all generations; older as well as younger.

This year, at the initiative of Congress, a high level Select Commission is re-examining our nation's immigration policies. For two hundred years, the federal government has written and rewritten the laws limiting the numbers of immigrants the United States admits without considering the total population it serves. With a stabilization policy, a White House office would call attention to the need for this Commission and Congress to determine future limits on immigration with goals for population size as well as the economic and social well-being of the country.

Reacting to the gaslines of the summer, federal officials have pushed energy development strategies which would commit the Southwest to population growth its resources—particularly waters supplies—cannot withstand. With a White House office, the growth issue would have to be raised and addressed in terms of the future of the region and the implications for the nation's goal of stabilization.

The United States has experienced leadership, William Greider wrote, at times of greatest national controversy, not the least. H.R. 5062 could generate its own share of controversy in Congress. Broad, national goals such as stabilization are not popular in the halls of Congress today, but without them, government and governing are nothing more than politics. New White House offices are not popular either in a time of disenchantment with bureaucracy. But without a top level focus on the impact of population changes across the board of federal policy, we'll continue to watch federal programs be upset by twists in demographic trends.

Leadership in the Executive Branch is what H.R. 5062 is all about. But neither leadership nor its absence are the preserve of that branch of government. For the House of Representatives, which dismissed the needed work of the Select Committee on Population in favor of returning those responsibilities to overburdened standing committees, it will take real leadership to act on H.R. 5062.

Leadership is also not the preserve of the government. It must come from the private sector, too. Activists such as ZPG supporters have shown it in their advocacy for H.R. 5062. But just as H.R. 5062 looks to government institutions, not just individuals, for leadership, so the population and environmental movement must look to the adequacy of its institutions to lead in the development of a national effort to plan for population stabilization.

There is more you can do. Last summer, in an article on population policy, Sierra Club activist Les Corsa called for new leadership. He proposed a private consortium of environ-

mental groups which would invest in a professional staff capable of analyzing both the impact of federal policies on population growth and the ways the government in its on-going programs can plan for changes in the population.

I am challenging the Congress and the Executive Branch to demonstrate leadership by acting on H.R. 5062. I also challenge concerned citizens—like each of you—to support the creation of institutions which would add to the leadership for population planning in the private sector. ●

THE DECLINE OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, following are two articles which appeared in the November 11, 1979, *Washington Post*, by George F. Will and Joseph Kraft.

I recommend them to my colleagues' attention as representative of the views of the citizens of this Nation who are getting tired of an administration that makes excuses for itself instead of demands on itself, especially in view of the immense demands it makes on its people. Americans are forced to stand by helplessly and swallow the abuse and insults which are hurled at them. It is no wonder the frustration is beginning to show. We have asked this country to swallow too many Government mistakes. The articles follow:

TIME FOR A SHOW OF POWER

(By Joseph Kraft)

Events in Tehran decree the opening of a full-scale inquest into American policy toward Iran. Not only because American citizens have to be protected. More important, the whole Mideast—and in the matter of oil, the whole world—needs to be insulated against the fanaticism of the Ayatollah Khomeini.

The starting point of the inquest is acceptance of a hard fact that does not go down well with moralists in the country at large and the administration in particular—namely, that the downfall of the shah was a calamity for American national interests.

Like him or not, the shah made available to the world a regular flow of oil in large amounts and without political conditions. His imperial pretensions, and the forces he maintained, imposed order on the Iranian plateau and the submerged nationalities that populate its borderlands.

The ayatollah, in contrast, instituted what amounts to a cultural revolution. He is preparing an Islamic constitution that vests absolute authority in the Moslem clergy, or mullahs. He pushes Iran's brand of Islam—the Shi'ite version—into neighboring countries where the more orthodox, Sunni brand of the creed holds sway. He ties the sale and production of oil to narrow political considerations.

Since theocracy doesn't work, practical power gravitates elsewhere. In Tehran, militant students and revolutionary guards rule the streets. The minorities of the provinces—including the oil fields in the south—are restive or in revolt. Every country adjoining Iran sees in the ayatollah a threat to stability, which is not high in the region anyway.

Washington has tried appeasement of the

ayatollah with disastrous results. Not only has American sovereignty been trampled in the embassy, but this country has been increasingly regarded by Iran's neighbors as a poor credit risk, a pitiful helpless giant.

In trying to right the balance, Washington first needs to reduce its vulnerability to the blackmail tactics of the Iranian militants. That means closing down the embassy in Tehran and shutting down the embassy here—at least until a firm understanding on ground rules can be reached.

In the bargain, as an indication that it means business, the United States ought to enforce seriously the laws governing Iranian students in this country. If the laws are inadequate, then new statutes can be written.

A next necessary step is to blunt the Iranian oil weapon. The United States can easily push the few American companies that do business with Iran to other sources. Whatever is lost on that account, and it will not be more than 500,000 barrels daily, can be offset from allied countries—notably the Japanese, French and Germans—that buy Iranian oil. In that way this country would show Iran and the world something they both need to know—that Tehran cannot organize an oil embargo against the United States.

The next step is the truly important step. It involves finding occasion for an unmistakable, and preferably surprising, assertion of American power on behalf of the regimes that feel menaced by the ayatollah. That might take the form of supporting Iraq in its efforts to stir up provincial resistance inside Iran. It might mean giving military assistance to Turkey.

But the most likely candidates for American help are the oil-rich monarchies of the Persian Gulf. The regimes in Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, the Arab Emirates and Oman feel their security in danger. They would like to develop a joint policy for the Persian Gulf, and they met to consider measures to that effect in Saudi Arabia on Oct. 16.

The United States could support them *en bloc*. More dramatically and more effectively, it could give assistance to a particular country in a particular place—say, Oman, at the choke point of the Gulf, the Straits of Hormuz.

To find and exploit such opportunities, there is required a crucial internal change in Washington. The United States needs a capacity to do something besides sending Marines and bombing. It has to rebuild a capacity self-destructed only a few years ago—a capacity for covert intervention.

As that requirement suggests, the rebuilding of American policy toward Iran is going to be a long, slow, uphill task. It will probably be years before this country is ready to play a political role in Iran.

But in the meantime there is one thing ordinary Americans can do. There is nothing in the Constitution that obliges this country to be run by a president whose instinctive reaction to a challenge is a declaration of national impotence.

A NATION AFRAID

(By George F. Will)

It is difficult, and not at all desirable, to be coolly clinical about photographs of American citizens bound and blindfolded and spat upon by rabble, but the freezing truth is that Americans had better get used to such photographs, if they are not already. Enduring the contempt of the contemptible is just one severity that life has in store for a declining nation.

A nation that, in gestures aimed at the Middle East, sends an aircraft carrier steaming in circles in the South China Sea, and sends ostentatiously unarmed airplanes to Saudi Arabia (where many are then grounded for days because of bungled planning and support)—such a nation had better get used

to enemies who think it is impotent. Well, not altogether impotent: it can unleash Ramsey Clark.

A nation that loses a war it could have won by confidently employing its conventional military assets had better get used to humiliation. A nation that has no serious response when three ambassadors are murdered (in Cyprus, Sudan and Afghanistan) had better get used to spittle on its cheeks.

A nation that, in February, orders the Marines guarding its embassy in Iran to surrender without a fight to a mob should not be surprised when, in November, another mob arrives to play with the embassy as with a toy.

A nation that uses an ally such as Taiwan as a pawn for utterly unnecessary appeasement had better get used to having fewer and fewer allies of any size, and to the worldwide conviction that it is a nation with no serious convictions. A nation that collaborates in throwing to the wolves an ally like the shah should not expect respect from the wolves.

Respect? For a nation too feckless even to confine Iranians' diplomats to their Washington compound when they are collaborating with the rabble of Tehran? Respect? For a nation so inanely tolerant it does not promptly ship home to Khomeini the thousands of Iranian "students" who are here illegally, and who adore Khomeini—from a safe distance, of course—from the comfort of what Khomeini calls "Satan America"?

You know Khomeini: he's the fellow Andrew Young said might be a saint. You remember Young: he's the fellow who symbolized the Carter administration's plan to get America loved in the Third World by appeasing terrorists in Rhodesia and subverting the shah.

You remember the shah, an ally for 37 years. During the 1973 war he was the only ruler in the region who banned Soviet overflights. He urged an end to the oil embargo and rushed fuel to U.S. ships. He rushed arms to South Vietnam (you remember South Vietnam: an ally deceased) before the ban on such aid went into effect under the Paris accords. (You remember the Paris accords: they brought peace to Indochina.) The shah helped the United States in many ways, but such is our trembling fear of Khomeini, that the shah had to become a cancer patient before we would let him past the Statue of Liberty.

A nation afraid of Khomeini should not bluster at the Soviet Union. A nation that blusters about Soviet activities in Cuba being "unacceptable," and then says, well, er, come to think about it, we just remembered that these activities are, well, for want of a better word, acceptable—and, no don't worry, we won't reject SALT II; we were very decent, you must admit, canceling the B1 and neutron weapons, no reciprocity asked; and, oh, yes; are you quite sure 25 million metric tons of grain will be sufficient?—a nation that behaves this way had better get used to the cackle of derisive laughter.

Speaking of grain, and of photographs that take some getting used to, and of the price of losing wars, consider Cambodia. If the people who used to rant about "American genocide" are really interested (and they really aren't) they should note this: real genocide looks like what is happening in Cambodia now. The starving of millions, the obstruction of relief: this is Hanoi's work and could be stopped by Moscow. But we flood the Soviet Union with grain while the Soviet Union collaborates in keeping to a trickle the relief for the people it is helping to exterminate.

Will we make continued grain shipments to the Soviet Union contingent on Soviet cooperation about Cambodia? No.

President Carter says Cambodia is "a moral issue." Yes. But I, for one, am past trying to understand what he means by that, and

past hoping he will understand that, between nations, such issues also are problems of power. ●

LADIES AUXILIARY OF ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS IN CLINTON, MASS., LAUNCHES GRASSROOTS EFFORT ON BEHALF OF PEACE AND JUSTICE FOR IRELAND

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the 130-member ad hoc congressional Committee for Irish Affairs I am pleased to inform my colleagues of a major grassroots effort being undertaken by the Clinton, Mass., division, Ladies Auxiliary, Ancient Order of Hibernians—America's oldest and largest Irish American organization.

Beginning in July, the auxiliary under the inspired and tireless leadership of Mary J. Richards began a national petition drive to bring attention to human rights violations in Northern Ireland. As of early October, more than 4,200 Irish Americans from the States of Massachusetts, New York, and Illinois had signed their name to the following petition which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

A PETITION

We, the undersigned, citizens of the State of Massachusetts and members and friends of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and Auxiliary, are deeply concerned by the ongoing violations of human rights by the British Government in Ireland and by the lack of action on the part of our President, our Senators and our Representatives in Washington.

We urge you to make a concerted effort to inform yourself of the true situation in Ireland. We respectfully demand that the issue of human rights in Ireland be made a priority in all statements and decisions on foreign policy matters.

There are more than 46 million Americans of Irish descent in the United States and we are ready to utilize our voices and our votes by petitioning you to secure human rights and peace in Ireland.

We urge all Congressmen to join the Ad Hoc Committee on Irish Affairs and work toward this goal.

In September of 1977 largely due to the efforts of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and the Irish National Caucus, the ad hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs was formed. In that time, we have raised the Irish issue from obscurity to one of national and international visibility. The support we have received from the Irish American Community has been invaluable to our work.

The petition focuses on the largely overlooked problem of human rights violations in Ireland. The fact is—Amnesty International in 1978 cited Great Britain for human rights violations practiced by their security forces in the North of Ireland. Later when the British Government appointed a special commission to verify the Amnesty findings—this same commission did just that—confirm the findings that prisoners and suspects were customarily mis-

treated. Earlier in 1976 and 1977 the British Government was tried, found guilty and pleaded guilty to human rights violations charges filed against them by the Irish Government before the European Commission and Court of Human Rights. The human rights record in Northern and Southern Ireland is not good. The United States now considers respect for human rights to be the very soul of our foreign policy. It is therefore imperative for us to speak out against these violations and urge their cessation.

We are in fact making progress in terms of recognizing the human rights problems. The annual human rights report to be filed by the State Department early next year will have references to the human rights problems in Ireland. More directly, thanks to the efforts of the ad hoc committee as well as the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the State Department has instituted an indefinite ban on the sale, export, or licensure of any U.S. weapons to the Royal Ulster Constabulary because of its conflict with our law and its provisions barring sale of U.S. weapons to nations or organizations with proven record of human rights violation.

I hope that my colleagues will pay close attention to the message contained in the petition. It is a message which seeks a consistent application of U.S. foreign policy. Above all it is a message which all should respond to—it seeks peace and justice for the beleaguered people of the six counties of Northern Ireland.

At this point in the RECORD I also insert two newspaper articles discussing the work of the auxiliary and Mary Richards:

HIBERNIANS INITIATE HUMAN RIGHTS DRIVE FOR NORTHERN IRELAND

CLINTON.—Mary J. Richards of 189 Prescott St., with help from other Irish-Americans, has initiated a national drive to bring attention to human rights violations in Northern Ireland.

The drive is being coordinated through the state divisions of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and the auxiliaries. Mrs. Richards and Miss Hester are local auxiliary members.

"What we need is an Irish lobby too big to be ignored," Mrs. Richards said. She said persons wanting to help should contact her or Joseph M. Duffy and James P. Morrison of the men's division.

PRISON CONDITIONS

Dr. Desmond Fitzgerald of Sterling, a native of Ireland, spoke at the "Leprechan Convention" here last St. Patrick's Day and noted one Irish archbishop toured the infamous Long Kesh prison in Northern Ireland and said it was similar to the concentration camps operated by the Nazis during World War II.

Eva B. Hester, local auxiliary member, told the irate Hibernians the Clinton people should initiate this drive because it was here President Jimmy Carter said he would seek peace between Egypt and Israel.

Miss Hester added when the peace talks become a reality the national media referred to President Carter's remarks in Clinton as "another shot heard around the world."

VOCAL ROLE

Miss Hester said "Here is our opportunity for us, as members of an ancient and honorable Irish organization to play a vocal role in this great expectation. Surely all Hibernians and their friends will win in this quest for human right and peace."

Mrs. Richards said, "There are 46 million Americans of Irish descent in this country and it is time to raise our voices and our votes in support of a lasting peace in Ireland," Mrs. Richards said.

She made her appeal for state help at the Hibernian State Convention in June at the Raddison Berncroft Hotel and Country Club in Danvers. Other Clinton Hibernians there were Virginia Sesia O'Toole, local auxiliary president and recently elected county vice president, Kathleen Chiavaras, local auxiliary vice president and newly named county historian, and Esther Kilcoyne, local auxiliary treasurer.

PETITIONS

Mrs. Richards, program chairman, for the local auxiliary said yesterday petitions seeking an end to human rights violations and peace in that country will be distributed in town. They are now available at Ryan's General Store, the Old Timer Restaurant and Sesia Motors. More locations are expected shortly.

Mrs. Richards introduced a petition on the convention floor that she discussed at the local division meeting in May. "The petition will be a national effort to bring attention to the violations of human rights in Northern Ireland which are happening on a daily basis," she said.

She distributed 1,000 petitions to be signed by all convention delegates and auxiliary members.

NORTH IRELAND VIOLATIONS HIT IN LOCAL DRIVE

A group of Clinton women have initiated a drive which would bring national attention to violations of human rights in Northern Ireland.

Mary J. Richards of 189 Prescott St. introduced a petition on the floor of the Hibernian State Convention in Danvers recently. The petition had been initiated by her at the Clinton meeting this spring.

Mrs. Richards was accompanied at the convention by Virginia Sesia O'Toole, Clinton auxiliary president and recently-elected county vice president; Kathleen Chiavaras, vice president of the Clinton auxiliary and newly-named county historian Esther Kilcoyne, auxiliary treasurer.

The petition will be a National effort to bring attention to the violations of human rights in Northern Ireland which are happening on a daily basis.

Richards told the convention delegates: "There are 46 million Americans of Irish descent in this country and it is time to raise our voices and our votes in support of a lasting peace in Ireland." She distributed more than 1000 petitions to be signed by all the delegates and their member Auxiliaries.

Richards said the signed petitions will be forwarded to the U.S. Congressional Committee on Irish Affairs which is to begin talks in Washington in September to investigate the charges of violations of human rights in Ireland. Copies will also be mailed to Senators of each state and to President Carter who made statements prior to his election in support of a peace effort in Ireland.

Eva Hester, local member of the A.O.H. Auxiliary and a past county president, introduced the petition at the gala banquet which was attended by the entire state delegation and their guests. Officers from the national headquarters were in attendance including Thomas McNabb, national president and Sarah Murphy, national vice-president of the Auxiliary. Also Representatives of the Irish National Caucus, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. Thomas W. McGee, Congressman Nicholas Mavroules and James M. Shannon.

Hester in her presentation stated, "It is most appropriate that the Clinton delegation

should introduce the petition for peace, since two years ago when President Carter visited Clinton, one of the questions asked of him was regarding the possibility of Peace talks between Israel and Egypt. Hester said when the peace talks became a reality the national media referred to President Carter's remarks in Clinton as "another shot heard round the world".

"Ladies and gentlemen", Hester continued, "here is our opportunity, for us, as members of an ancient and honorable Irish organization to play a vocal role in this great expectation. Surely all Hibernians and their friends will join in this quest for human rights and peace." Concluding her remarks, Hester said, "We would like to introduce this petition in memory of a great Hibernian, known to many of you here, John P. McGrail of Clinton and Berlin who passed away in Clinton this morning. He was a great Irish scholar, teacher and a friend of Ireland, an inspiration to many of us in Clinton, we present this petition in his name."

Richards said the petition signing is well under way in Clinton and will be circulated nationally for added effectiveness. Richards said, "What we need is an Irish lobby too big to be ignored."

Anyone wishing to help may contact Mary Richards or other members of the Hibernian Divisions. Joseph M. Duffy and James P. Morrison are representing the local men's Division. Petition may be signed at: The Old Timer Restaurant, Ryan's General Store, the Senior Citizens Center and Sesia Motor Sales and the Clinton Daily ITEM.●

TRIBUTE TO JANA E HAMBY AND OAKDALE HIGH SCHOOL

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an admirable and commendable effort originated by Miss Janae Hamby, president of the student body at Oakdale High School (Calif.), and carried to successful completion by Janae's fellow students. Miss Hamby is to be commended for her leadership just as the students are to be congratulated for their responsibility, cooperation, and determination.

Following the President's announcement of a ban on the importation of Iranian oil, and recognizing that cooperation among Americans would be necessary to offset the resulting shortfall, Janae circulated a petition among her fellow students. Those who signed pledged to refrain from unnecessarily burning gasoline by curtailing pleasure driving during free time before and after school classes, and to exercise planning in the use of their automobiles. Some 400 students signed the resolution, indicating their commitment to the goal of citizen response.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that America can face and resolve most any eventuality if we stand united, and particularly if we gain the understanding and cooperation of our youth. The students at Oakdale High School have proven clearly what can be achieved if we take the time to communicate the Nation's needs to our younger citizens. I support Janae Hamby and her school-

mates completely, and I strongly urge all Americans to emulate their outstanding example. Not only will we be conserving a vital and scarce resource—we will also be making it known that we will not capitulate to fanatical unstable regimes in the name of oil.

At this time I ask that my colleagues join with me in paying tribute to Janae Hamby and the students of Oakdale High School, and in working fervently to stimulate other citizens to follow that lead.●

ABUSE IN THE HEW OFFICE IN KANSAS CITY

HON. ADAM BENJAMIN, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. BENJAMIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an article from the Chicago Tribune regarding reported abuse in the management of the Health, Education, and Welfare office in Kansas City.

Once again, the growing lack of confidence in our Government by our constituents has been nurtured by another exposure of irresponsible management. If we are to restore confidence in our Federal Government, we must respond to these alerts of abuse by bringing them to the attention of the appropriate congressional committees and agencies for review and necessary action.

I have forwarded copies of the article and have requested Health, Education, and Welfare, the General Accounting Office, the House Subcommittee for Intergovernmental Relations and Human Resources and the Senate Subcommittee on Civil Service and General Services to investigate the extent of abuse in the Kansas City regional office as well as the existence or prevalency of mismanagement in other Health, Education, and Welfare offices.

I urge my colleagues to join with me to pursue a course of action that demonstrates our commitment to seek out and eliminate abuse. I believe a concerted effort to arrest these wastes will lend credibility to our reputation as a Congress that is aggressive in monitoring sound management of Government and its services to its citizenry.

Although I realize that news media reports can be questioned on points of accuracy, I will continue to communicate any reports of fiscal irresponsibility in our Government to the appropriate investigative committees and agencies for review and confirmation or denial of charges of mismanagement.

In conclusion, let us respond to the citizens of our country with authoritative action that profiles our determination to put the tax dollar to use, not abuse.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Nov. 22, 1979]

REPORTER LOGS WASTE OF TIME AT HEW OFFICE

KANSAS CITY, MO. [AP].—A reporter who spent three months working in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's

regional office says she often read books or newspapers because employees had nothing to do.

Esther Bauer, in a copyrighted series in the Kansas City Times, reports she and other secretaries spent hours reading books and newspapers for lack of anything to do. At other times, they were swamped not only with a sea of bureaucratic paperwork, but also personal and business correspondence for their superiors.

There were training sessions lasting from three hours to entire days on how to fill out government forms. They included an eight-hour training session on how to fill out forms for training sessions.

The director for the four-state HEW office, Thomas J. Higgins, has refused comment on the articles, which were published Monday and Tuesday. The final article was planned for Wednesday.

Steve Glorioso, an HEW spokesman, said Higgins would comment on the series at a press conference Monday. Glorioso said the articles were filled with "distortions and innuendos," and accused the Times of "unethical conduct" in placing Bauer in the job.

In a typical work day, Bauer said, she typed an envelope, photocopied a report, mailed some letters, typed a travel voucher, and spent a few minutes typing a revised job description. Nearly half the work day was spent reading newspapers or books to kill time.

The Kansas City office has 6,000 employees. Nationally HEW has a \$200 billion annual budget—a tab of nearly \$1,000 for every American.

At no time was the politics of the bureaucratic system more evident, Bauer said, than with the July 19 firing of HEW Secretary Joseph A. Califano Jr.

"I was able to observe firsthand how political upheaval in Washington sends after-shocks out to the provinces," Bauer wrote.

Middle-level bureaucrats were fearful that their heads would also roll and July 19 ended with practically no work done in the Kansas City office, she said.

Only half of the 25 employees in the regional administrator's office showed up for work, some arriving just in time for an early lunch, she said. The paper flood was reduced temporarily to a trickle.

Bauer took a series of Civil Service tests to get her job in the HEW office. She said, in the months that followed, her role included:

Typing letters and running photocopies, on a government machine, for the private business of an HEW executive.

Typing a reply from an HEW career bureaucrat to a Terre Haute, Ind., mail order record club that had sent a dun for an overdue payment.

Typing a letter from Glorioso to a bank president, plugging for a job for Glorioso's brother.

Typing a two-sentence memo four times—using fresh sets of carbon each time—because a public affairs assistant was not quite satisfied with the "esthetic" merits of the memo.

She outlined a typical work day:

8 a.m., Aug. 7—Came to work in the Federal Building, read newspaper and book for two hours.

10 a.m.—Typed envelope address.

10:12 a.m.—Photocopied report.

10:26 a.m.—Mailed two letters.

10:48 a.m.—Placed phone call to Vermont for boss.

11:22 a.m.—Typed revised job description.

11:30 a.m.—Went to lunch.

Noon—Returned from lunch. Transferred phone call, then read because of nothing to do.

2:15 p.m.—Typed travel voucher.

2:25 p.m.—Passed out mail to four bureaucrats.

2:50 p.m. Passed out more mail to four

bureaucrats, then read because had nothing to do.

4:30 p.m.—Went home.

Her job paid \$32.16 a day.●

CONGRESSMAN RUDD ADDRESSES WORLD ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE MEETING

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a belief that is held by many Americans is that a major foreign policy goal of the United States should be to unite in freedom with all other non-Communist nations in order to improve the quality of life for all people of the world and to overcome Communist aggression.

One of the most dedicated advocates of this freedom philosophy in the Congress is our distinguished colleague from Arizona, ELDON RUDD, who spent many years on diplomatic assignment for our country in Latin America prior to his election to the House of Representatives.

I have had the privilege of reading the remarks which Congressman RUDD delivered on invitation as the keynote speaker before the executive committee of the World Anti-Communist League, which met in Asunción, Paraguay, on November 16.

It is a most thoughtful speech, which touches on many important points that I believe the leadership of our Nation would benefit from heeding.

I would like to insert the remarks of Congressman RUDD at this point in the RECORD.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN ELDON RUDD AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE WORLD ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE—ASUNCIÓN, PARAGUAY, NOVEMBER, 1979

[By special invitation to deliver the keynote address]

We are gathered here to bear witness to the eternal truth that man's thirst for freedom is unquenchable.

It was Thomas Jefferson, American, patriot, writer of the United States' Constitution, shaper of the new republic and third President of the United States who said, "Let us swear upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Ten months ago we gathered on Taiwan in Free China to mark the 25th anniversary of a remarkable demonstration of the power of freedom.

It was our hope that we might attract the world's attention—bring the mind and memory of man to focus on a great victory for freedom.

The occasion was the 25th anniversary of that moment when more than 14,000 Communist soldiers of the North Korean and Communist Chinese armies who had been taken prisoner in that war with the South—prisoners who when released by their South Korean captors refused to go home.

In every war there are some stragglers who defect to the enemy, but I cannot recall another time in all history when so great a number chose not to go home—turned their backs and their minds and their hearts away from their native land, from their families, their friends, their sweethearts, to remain in the land of their captors.

Perhaps it might be said that since this was almost a civil war between two branches of the same family, the decision of these 14,000 North Korean troops to remain in South Korea was significant.

My friends, in a reach of history where the victories for freedom have been scant, that decision by the North Korean prisoners was and is of transcendental world importance.

At a time in history when the Communist tyranny was being extended all across the face of the earth these 14,000 North Koreans who had known Communism—who had lived under Communism—who had fought in defense of Communism—freely and spontaneously rejected Communism.

These men were soldiers drawn from every strata of North Korea's society. They were not philosophers or political scientists. They were men whose thirst for freedom forced them to turn away from their homeland, and the death dealing tyranny of Communism. There can be no compromise with Communism. To do so means slavery and death—they chose freedom.

They may never have heard of Thomas Jefferson. But by that action they identified in motive and belief with him who said, "Let us swear upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

When we met in Taiwan we were suffering in the aftermath of President Carter's announcement of his decision to unilaterally abrogate the mutual defense treaty between Taiwan and the United States.

I told you then I believed the Presidents' action was the result of a tragic error in judgment. I said that I had joined with Republican Senator Barry Goldwater in a lawsuit to challenge the American President's authority to unilaterally abrogate that defense treaty.

We have cause for great encouragement in the fact that the judge of the trial court in stern and uncompromising language declared President Carter exceeded his authority in that action.

This action has earned the gratitude of every disciple of freedom throughout the world.

It has been reported to me that up to this moment our brothers in freedom in Taiwan have continued to prosper. Mainland China has made no concentrated effort to destroy them or to absorb them.

The significance of the ruling of the court lies in its support of the U.S. Constitution—its denial of unlimited arbitrary power to any transient occupant of the White House.

It is conceded that in the present climate the U.S. Senate may give its consent to the abrogation of that treaty. But, unless the court's decision is reversed, we have accomplished our primary objective. The rule of law has triumphed once more over the rule of men.

The memory of the Korean war brings tears of shame to many Americans and particularly, to your servant who served as a Marine Corps fighter pilot in World War II. Korea was the first no-win war America ever fought.

It was the first example of politicians overpowering the wisdom and judgment of our military leaders.

It was the first step—the beginning step of a possible retreat.

Timid men, perhaps traitors, persuaded the President of the United States to fire General Douglas MacArthur because he refused to wage a no-win war.

Fearful of the threat of total Communist Russia involvement, fearful of the presence of the hordes of Communist Chinese soldiers, we denied our military leaders the victory they might easily have won.

My friends, at the end of World War II almost fifty percent of the people then living

on planet earth enjoyed some aspects of political and individual freedom.

Today that percentage has dwindled to about seventeen percent.

It is not necessary for me to itemize freedom's losses for you because you understand the enormity of the peril which threatens you and me, and the free men everywhere today.

But for those who might be listening—for those who are unaware, I am compelled to make that count.

Moving from the triumph of that accommodating ceasefire in Korea—and I would remind you we are still living under that unreliable ceasefire—there has been no permanent settlement of the Korean question. International Communism has spread into most of Southeast Asia, all of Vietnam.

In the troubled country of Cambodia the slaughter continues. There, the contest is not between freedom and slavery, but rather between two different brands of Communism.

In Sub-Saharan Africa the Communists hold dominion in Angola and Mozambique and threaten Rhodesia. They dominate the entrance of the Red Sea in Ethiopia and South Yemen. There disciples control Afghanistan. They threaten the entrance to the Persian Gulf.

And in the Western Hemisphere, operating from their forward base in Cuba, they have produced and supplied the revolt in Nicaragua. They are the source and inspiration for the troubles in El Salvador and in Costa Rica.

The Dictator of Panama is Castro's friend and ally.

In the troubled Middle East recent events in Iran threaten to destroy our efforts to establish peace.

The attacks by the Iranian mob on the American Embassy, the attempts to blackmail the U.S. government, have a significance beyond the present moment.

This incident clearly demonstrates the weakness of the West. Pinned down by our dependency on the Middle East for oil, it appears we were forced to temporize.

The murdering terrorists of the PLO have persuaded some Americans to overlook their cruelties and their inhumanities and to regard them as the legitimate spokesmen for the Palestinian people.

When terror, directed against innocent civilians, can successfully bring its perpetrators to the international bargaining table, morality and decency disappear from the arena of international relations.

Have we failed? Of course not!

Can it be that the doctrine of Communist slavery holds more appeal for mankind and more hope for tomorrow than does the promise of individual, physical, political and economic freedom?

Of course not.

Stalin preached the nothingness of the individual.

We recognize that every human being is precious, intended by his Creator to be free.

What then has happened to erode the purpose and the will and the commitment of the Western World to freedom's cause?

Some will say it is our comfortable affluence which has turned us soft. Others will say that in the changing world with the emergence of the have-not nations freedom and capitalism can no longer satisfy the aspirations of these populations.

Where has Communism done better?

Mother Russia cannot feed her own people without drawing on the productive capacity of the American farmers.

Russia's Communist leaders squander their substance on the weapons of war, secure in the knowledge that humanitarian Uncle Sam will not permit their people to starve.

My friends, there has in this century developed a new and dangerous dominant philosophy. It is secular humanism.

All of man's noble impulses rest on religious foundations. We care about the poor and

the sick and the prisoners because our Lord taught us to accept responsibility for the welfare of our brothers.

Secular humanism, separated from its religious foundation, is like a bouquet of cut flowers—beautiful and appealing, sweet smelling—but doomed to wither and die and putrify.

This philosophy is the handmaiden of appeasement.

The secular humanists argue that concern and charity are an essential part of our public policy in order to quiet and contain the restless.

You and I know that concern and charity and compassion are the essentials of the teachings of our Lord.

Secular humanism rests on expediency.

The free man's proper concern for his neighbor rests on the commandments of God.

There is a character in a great American novel who, when confronted with vexing problems, put off facing reality saying, "I will think about that tomorrow."

My friends, for the past twenty-five years leaders of the free world, for the most part, have refused to face reality. We have closed our eyes hoping the evil would go away. Shrinking from the brutal, wasteful, miserable bloodshed of war, we have compromised with the beauty of truth.

Let us then, on this occasion, put aside wishful thinking and self deception.

Let us look at the world around us and face reality.

The struggle which threatens to engulf our world is a battle for the minds of men. It is not commercial or territorial. It does not center on a disagreement over political theory. It rests squarely on two contending constructions of the nature of man himself.

Is man to be regimented, exploited, doctored, fed, and worked then discarded?

Is our transient existence on this earth all there is to life?

You and I say no; but our voices have been faint and some leaders, hoping to postpone the final showdown, have retreated.

This contest may someday degenerate into an armed conflict with the missiles of the West destroying the East and the missiles of the East destroying the West. But it need not be.

For we know the appeal of freedom will overpower those who would resort to slavery.

We know that in every human heart there lives an insatiable thirst for the blessing of freedom.

We anti-Communists know that over the long reach of history, through wars and famine and pestilence men in every nation and in every land have raised their hands to grasp the torch of freedom.

We also know that weakness breeds aggression. We know that superior strength—military strength, economic strength and, above all, spiritual strength is the only certain way to contain the ambitious adventurer, aggressor nations who would destroy freedom.

Their hope is that because we long for peace, because we are peaceful by nature, because we understand the horror and futility of war, they can by threatening war impose their will on the other nations of the world.

Their economic system based on compulsion is bankrupt. The great reversal of Red China is ample evidence of this.

They rule by fear and force. And, tragically, some prominent voices in the free world echo the Communist propaganda line.

Some leaders in areas of American foreign affairs would have us believe the Russians, fearful of American superior might, were driven to increase their armaments—to build their ICBMs—to enlarge their armies—driven by fear of what the West might do to them.

The disciples of parity are now having a very difficult time explaining why the Rus-

sians have gone from deficiency to parity to superiority.

Then there are those who believe in convergence theory, who insist that all the competition between the masters of the Kremlin and the free world will gradually disappear and modify if we provide the resources to bring the Communist world into a position of economic parity with the free world.

This argument might be more believable if the tyrant masters of Russia were not devoting such a disproportionate share of their social resources to achieving military superiority.

It is not given to us to know the future. But to look at the future without reading the past is childish nonsense. And the lessons to be learned from the events of the 1950's and the 1960's and the 1970's are clear.

The Communists do not share our commitment to peace. They will lie, cheat, steal and murder to gain their objective.

They can be restrained only if the free world remains strong and committed and willing to use the same measure of force our enemies have employed against us.

We must build the defenses of the free world. We must modernize the Western arsenal of defensive weapons. We must use our economic power to discourage Communist Russian expansion.

But above all we must recapture that courage—that spirit—that will which is the property of all free men.

For if we do not unite in freedom, we will be divided by slavery.

Let us then put aside timidity and uncertainty and fear.

Let us proclaim to all men everywhere that only by uniting in freedom can we improve the quality of life for all sorts and conditions of men, and overcome Communist aggression.

Let us now, with one mind and one voice and one purpose, in concert with those who have gone before and those who will come after, swear upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man. There can be no compromise with international Communism. You see, freedom is not negotiable. ●

INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT 877 PASSES RESOLUTION

HON. RICHARD NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a resolution recently passed by Independent School District 877, Buffalo, Minn., in opposition to proposed cuts in school lunch reimbursement for paid lunches. I believe the board has done an excellent job of expressing these very legitimate concerns.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the President has recommended that Congress reduce the federal reimbursement level for lunches served to paying children under Section 4 of the National School Lunch Act and;

Whereas, such a cut would make it necessary for most local school districts to make an additional charge of 10¢ per pupil (above inflationary cost of 5-10¢ already budgeted for the 1979-80 school year) and;

Whereas, surveys show that any increase will result in significant decreases in the number of children participating in the school lunch program and;

Whereas, all children are required to attend school and need a nutritionally adequate school lunch to function effectively and;

Whereas, a decrease in participation would also adversely affect long-term health; the fact that per unit cost will increase because of less volume; lessening of some community programs; the loss of employment in the community and;

Whereas, the General Accounting Office has no conclusive evidence to support the proposed cuts in the school lunch program; and be it

Resolved, that the School Board of Buffalo, Minnesota, hereby oppose all proposals to reduce the federal school lunch reimbursement for the middle-income paying child; and be it further

Resolved, that the Congress of the United States ensures the continuation of all funding under the National School Lunch Act of 1946 by resisting any future cuts.●

THE EFFECT OF THE RECENT VISIT OF POPE JOHN PAUL II ON THE UNITED STATES

HON. WILLIAM CARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent visit of His Holiness, Pope John Paul II, was an experience to be pondered by our entire Nation. Too often, events pass us by in their spectacle and splendor without our recalling the true meaning of the actions and words of the moment. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an address given by Mr. Harry B. Farrell of Hampton Bays, N.Y.

Mr. Farrell, now in his midseventies, spoke before the Holy Name Society of St. Rosalie's Church, of which he is a member. He has captured the stirring nature of the Pope's visit, and provides a moving reflection on the meaning of the visit and its effect on our entire Country.

A retired member of the faculty of St. Mary's College in California, Mr. Farrell spoke eloquently and with deep conviction. I commend to my colleagues his words about the Pope and about the important choices to be made in America—choices for a proud and moral citizenry.

The address follows:

REFLECTIONS ON POPE JOHN PAUL II AND HIS VISIT TO AMERICA

Reverend Fathers Gill, Giuntini, and Fox, Brother Edward, Mr. President, and fellow members of the Holy Name Society of St. Rosalie's:

I am honored by your request to recall some of the highlights of the visit of Pope John Paul II.

We all witnessed a spectacle the like of which has never been seen in our country and one which may never be duplicated in our life-time.

Of all the characteristics that stood out, perhaps it was the Pope's luminous face, so gentle, so expressive, so much a compendium of a life of trouble, hard work, scholarship, and inner sanctity. His face alone was a benediction to behold. Its mobility reflected the universality of his reflexes to each occasion. As he held up infants to cuddle and caress, one was forced to remark on the double innocence we beheld. When he fell over our

skyscrapers, he stood the skyscrapers straight up again and almost impishly looked out at the audience and seemed to be saying: "You think I don't know about your long and short vowels; I'll show you," and he repeated skyscrapers, to the wild cheering and applause of the audience. That same face reflected moments of deep prayer as he leaned against his crucifixion staff. His radiant and happy face recalls Dante's definition of pleasant laughter: "It is a sudden light which flashes from the delight of the soul."

In today's plastic and phoney world, we have the thing called "images". You can go to school and pick a veneer of the kind you want. You can run the whole gamut up to the assumed urbanity of pagan humanism. No charm school could ever do anything for this complete man. He is a truly charismatic character—the one giant bestriding the earth and renovating its spirit. I am sure he will circumnavigate this planet many times before his heavenly flight and spread the good news of the Gospel.

What he had to say was a continuation of the eternal verities which because of their nature cannot change. No economic betterment will ever ensue by the denial of morality. The topics, often stated in sledge-hammer blows of seeming redundancy, are the absolutes of decent human living. The man who once said "there are no absolutes" forgets that he just stated an absolute. The "seeming redundancy" was intentional on the part of the Pope, because he knows that the stubborn will of man is hard to move, and that repetition is the soul of learning.

His homilies are the latest editions of papal pronouncements that in all ages have given light to the world as, for instance, the stirring encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, called "Rerum Novarum," issued at a time when the industrial revolution was peaking and the Pope reminded the world industrialists flatly that no man should be a chattel of any other man. Now our present Pope reminds us of the dignity of every human being, born and unborn. Dignity is in the soul of man, not in the outward show of furs, diamonds, image dressing, and hair-dos, nor in that way of talking which has been characterized as "the constipated nasal tone which some people pick up by too long a residence in Newport."

Whether mankind realizes it or not, we are by nature adoring creatures. The object of our adoration may be some sleazy filth-monger, some worn-out beauty in the penthouse, some great American, who, after he dies, was found never to have paid an income tax, or some politician full of charisma but degenerate beyond recall. Salvian, a priest of Marseilles, in the 4th century, speaking of the downfall of nations, wrote: "Long before the nation was beaten physically, it had lost itself morally and though some wished to survive, the WILL to do so was no longer there."

John Paul II, in speaking of God and Jesus, focused our adoration where it belongs and made it clear that Jesus is not a distant myth, but is living right next to each of us every day of our lives—that the Incarnation is the central fact of all human history. The French writer, Montaigne, in an apostrophe to human stupidity, wrote: "O senseless man who cannot possibly make a worm, and yet makes gods by the dozens!" Our yearning for God is as St. Augustine wrote: "Our hearts are ill at ease until they rest in Thee." And Lammartine's gentle reminder "that man is a fallen god who remembers heaven."

So there we were in the blinding rain-storm at Shea Stadium, when along came his Holiness and at the very moment of his entrance, the heavens opened and the most brilliant sun ever

beamed over the stadium to the thunderous roar of the crowd. On another day, if you were driving by the stadium, and heard such cheers, you would believe it if someone told you that, with 12 men on each base, Joe Met had hit a 37-run super grand slammer. A man near me, astounded by the spectacle, hit himself on the head and yelled: "My God, it's been raining like Niagara all morning and he comes and just turns it off. Look at that blazing sun!"

As I sat watching the Pope, I realized I was looking at the 264th successor to St. Peter, the present link in an unbroken line of the dynasty that has never ceased to uphold the rights of man. Here was the man now running the worldwide mission, the stupendous operation of the Vatican in its never-ending crusade for the peoples of the Earth.

In Rome they have a saying, *Festina Lente*, meaning "make haste slowly." Now we have seen the Pope doing just that on his visit. Others were concerned with the timetable. He didn't bother with it. If there was a child to hug, a hand to clasp or a broken body to touch, this astounding man took all the time needed, not in an elitist condescension, but rather in the profound humility of the servant of the servants of Christ. And in other matters he will take his time, for Rome deals in centuries while we may be preoccupied with days and weeks. And he will continue to see things in the stretches of eternity. He reinforced the sanctity and special honor of the priesthood, bringing back to me the memory of having read the panegyric of the priesthood by the famous French Dominican Pere Lacordaire in the cathedral of Notre Dame. Here is a portion of it:

"To live in the midst of the world without wishing its pleasures; to be a member of each family, yet belonging to none; to share all sufferings, to penetrate all secrets; to heal all wounds; to go from men to God and offer Him their prayers; to return from God to men to bring pardon and hope; to have a heart of fire for charity and a heart of steel for chastity; to teach and to pardon, console and bless always! Oh, the sublimity of such a life! And it is yours, O Priest of God."—Pere Lacordaire.

The pall that is hanging over the Church by reason of a present day malaise was temporarily lifted by Pope John Paul II's visit. If he had the time, I am sure he would have analyzed and soothed the minds that are forever questioning, the souls that are hungering for the truth. Chesterton spoke of "the ill-tempered Christian turning into the ill-tempered agnostic, tired of a story which he has never really heard." And sadly we have a lot of such people today, who have neither the time nor the mentality to fathom these matters that needlessly torment them. That is why Louis Pasteur in such a moment cried out: "O God, give me the simple faith of a Brittany fisherwoman." Let us not get caught up in what Erasmus called the "rabies theologorum", theological hate. Let us not torture ourselves by going beyond the tangents of the human mind. Even if some doubts persist, remember the consoling words of the great Cardinal Newman: "A thousands doubts never made one denial."

A Protestant English novelist wrote after World War I: "Nobody knows where the next Pope is coming from, but he always comes." Well, we know this Pope came from Poland, that stalwart land which gave so much

through all the centuries to the enrichment of our glorious faith. What radiance came to the face of his Holiness as he beheld the native costumes, heard the songs and saw the shining faces of the Polish-American children.

It was a pagan Roman mother who once said: "My children are my jewels." Today life has become a burden and the planners, the birth controllers, in their hatred of children or of themselves, and in their stupid theses on lack of land and food, have taken upon themselves the decision that belongs to God alone, and yet do you know it is a federal felony to disrupt the nest of the bald eagle? Dally we hear of police and firemen who risk their lives to save a kitten caught between walls, or a dog on an ice floe in a stormy lake, or saving valuable race horses from a burning stable. But we forget that nightly in our cities, trucks filled with disposal cans containing little heads and hearts and limbs swimming in their own blood, are racing to the disposal dump. To such depths has the human race fallen that one wonders how long God will allow this rotating earth to continue its course. Why should it be so hard to know that life begins at conception? In that fusion of the cells is contained every element of life in the new baby who will become a handsome boy of twelve, a sweet girl of sixteen, or a 295 lb. line-backer who thrills us every autumn weekend. In that one speck of conception is contained the body's thousands of miles of arteries, veins and ducts, the billions of nerve endings, the bones and sinews, and the heart that may pulse four to five billion times before we die. Such is the unfathomable mystery of creation!

The article "abortion" in the 1950 edition of the Columbia Encyclopedia ends with the sentence: "However, (except in previously mentioned cases) to produce or to attempt to produce abortion in a pregnant woman is a legal offense in all states of the United States."

Up to January 22, 1973, forty-six of the 50 states still had their original abortion laws on the Statutes. Four had already "liberalized" their abortion laws. On the above-mentioned date, in one fell swoop, the so-called Supreme Court cancelled the law in the remaining 46 states, by a vote of seven to two.

Moreover, in an astounding statement the majority opinion read in part: "The unborn have never been recognized in the law as persons in the whole sense." At this juncture, we can only cry out with Shakespeare: "Oh judgment, thou hast fled to brutish hearts and men have lost their reason!" So this new massacre of the Holy Innocents continues. If they could talk they might answer in the words of a World War I memento in the beautiful Cathedral of Amiens, France. The two pathetic lines run: "How went the day, well or ill? I died, I never knew."

The Pope in his blazing enthusiasm for life made it clear that life is encompassed from conception to the grave. His theme of love and justice was reiterated so that all could understand that without love there is no living.

And so, Your Holiness, we bid another fond farewell, benumbed as we are with your leaving. Somehow we thought you would stay longer and like little children we were sorrowed at your parting. But there are other sheep in the fold who are waiting to see you and we are sure your itineraries are in the making. In one short year, you have renewed great portions of this planet earth in the knowledge of God's love. You have already taken your place among the giants of Christendom who have been sent by God in troubled times to keep the warp and woof of the Church fabric intact and all the lustrous glow of Western civilization. But the supreme lesson you have taught us is that, in all the strainings of human knowledge, through all

the vicissitudes of centuries, the human heart is the common denominator of the human race. And so with our hearts still welling with love speaking to your heart over continents and oceans we once more bid you: Arrivederci Papa! ●

VIEWS OF THE OHIO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION ON TRUCKING DEREGULATION

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, over the past few months a number of newspaper editorials and other materials have been placed in the RECORD by some Members of the House and Senate on the issue of trucking deregulation. These materials, by and large, extol the virtues of deregulation.

As is true of most of the controversies which come before the House, there are two sides to the issue. It is in this light that I submit these remarks.

At a time when Members of Congress are being lobbied extensively on both sides of the issue, it is important that we are fully aware of the arguments for and against deregulation of the motor carrier industry. And, while it is no doubt important that we keep abreast of the editorials being published in newspapers throughout the country, I think it is even more important that we listen to the professionals, the people who really understand how the trucking industry works.

Therefore, today I am submitting for printing in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence between the State of Ohio and the U.S. Department of Transportation on the administration's deregulation proposal, H.R. 4586. The letter from the Ohio Public Utilities Commission, the agency charged with the responsibility of regulating the motor carrier industry in the State of Ohio, tells a different story than most of the newspaper editorials which have been printed in the RECORD. This is a report from the people who are knowledgeable in this particular field. This is a report from the agency that has widespread experience with the trucking industry—an agency that is confronted with the day-to-day problems in regulating the trucking industry—an agency that speaks from experience and knowledge—an agency that understands the pitfalls and ramifications of total deregulation.

The commission indicates that it is opposed to the administration's bill as currently structured, and advocates a much more cautious approach in altering the regulatory system for motor carriers.

I commend these letters to my colleagues' attention, since it is so important that Congress not take any drastic actions which could result in irreparable harm to our transportation system—a system which works well and in our Nation's best interest.

Mr. Speaker I submit herewith a copy of this correspondence.

OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1979.

HON. JAMES A. RHODES,
Governor of Ohio,
State House, Columbus, Ohio

DEAR GOVERNOR RHODES: On June 20, it was a pleasure for me to send you a copy of the Administration's Truck Competition and Safety Act of 1979 together with material analyzing this proposed legislation.

As a follow-up to this correspondence, I would like to bring to your attention a copy of the testimony presented to the Senate Commerce Committee by Mr. Charles Schultze, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. This testimony focuses on the four major concerns that have been expressed by opponents of regulatory reform of the trucking industry.

I hope that you will study the Schultze testimony and carefully review our position regarding service to small communities.

I would appreciate receiving your comments on this bill. Please contact David Joyner of my staff (202) 426-1524 if you have any questions about this proposal.

Sincerely,

TERRENCE L. BRACY,
Assistant Secretary for
Governmental and Public Affairs.
Enclosure.

STATE OF OHIO,
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION,
Columbus, Ohio, October 11, 1979.

The Hon. TERRENCE L. BRACY,
Assistant Secretary for Governmental and
Public Affairs, Office of the Secretary of
Transportation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRACY: We have your letter of July 18 relative to the Administration's Truck Competition and Safety Act, addressed to Governor Rhodes. The Governor's office has asked this agency to respond. Following are an analysis and comments from this department.

This Commission has attempted to keep abreast of the federal de-regulation battle that has been waged in the past several years. We are basing the following comments on Ohio's 56 year experience with regulated intrastate transportation and Ohio's long-standing cooperative effort with the ICC on both economic and safety matters, and most recently with the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety of the Department of Transportation on safety matters.

Mr. Schultze's testimony makes reference to propaganda by the proponents of the status quo, particularly in four areas: (1) service to the small community; (2) chaos because of change; (3) trend to monopoly; and (4) regulatory reform will not enlarge amount of traffic. We agree that these issues have been simplified and distorted. The very phrasing of the issues is designed to initiate an emotional response.

Our observations of the studies, statistics, and statements in support of freer entry and reduced rate regulation indicate that this material is equally simplified and prejudicial to a logical analysis of the issues. Statements claiming billions of dollars in savings, to the shipping public and an opening of the industry to small operators and minorities, have no basis in fact.

First of all, we would like to address the four points discussed in the testimony.

We would agree that the small community issue has been overplayed. American ingenuity will develop a system to service the small community with or without regulation.

But the "whys" behind the various conclusions are more important than the conclusions.

Page 2 of the attachment refers to a conclusion that small carriers serve small communities profitably because of efficiency of controllable costs. What is not mentioned is

that the R. L. Banks study only considered direct service. All carriers, large or small can show more cost efficient operations on single line traffic. Joint or interline traffic is cost expensive.

If a point in southeast Ohio (an area off the major traffic routes) needs intermittent service to points west of the Mississippi, no small carrier can provide reliable service with or without regulation, by itself. Conversely, if large interstate carriers lose revenues from on-line profitable traffic, both interline business and direct service will dry up completely. Then if the long-haul carrier serves a rural community because of a quasi monopoly for on-line freight, and the free entry provisions reduce the tonnage, the long-haul carrier will discontinue service completely leaving large gaps in service. Not only will there be a reduction in service—but very likely no service at all, on long-haul, intermittent, less-truck-load traffic.

It may be true that some traffic will move cheaper and more efficiently if anyone has a chance to compete for it. But the bulk of the traffic will not be the subject of cheaper, more efficient operations.

Page 4 points up Friendlander's conclusion of "no consistent finding" of subsidized rates for rural areas. Which means there are some, and there are not some, areas where which are subsidized. The pricing and costing processes in the motor carrier industry are not sophisticated enough to draw any precise conclusions. Few people in the motor carrier industry could isolate pick up, platform (if any), line haul, and delivery costs for a move or a small geographic area's moves. Computations are done on system-wide, or company-wide, or industry-wide formulas. There are average pick up, dock, line haul and delivery costs—not Cleveland or Circleville, Ohio costs, or cookie and ping pong ball costs.

On page 5, the trading value of operating rights is a poor measuring stick for profitability. Most often trading value of operating rights is an off the wall process. Where any science at all is involved, the prior or existing rights of the acquiring carrier is of utmost importance. Thus, where an interstate carrier has rights between the east coast metro area and Nebraska, it is obvious that acquiring Ohio, Indiana, or Illinois authority could be profitable. It is equally obvious that such a carrier wouldn't pay a dime for to and from Alabama rights.

Carriers who acquire other carriers, or portions of other carrier's rights, usually do so because: (1) the geographical pattern of traffic fits their own; and/or (2) the commodity traffic is compatible with their present operations.

Again, the sophistication to isolate traffic patterns of the small community and their profitability is not present. All of the great disasters in motor carrier acquisition over the past 20 years occurred because of failure to observe the above simply stated maxims: (1) end to end or hole filling geographical acquisition; or (2) same commodity traffic acquisition.

Page 6, The applications for small communities before the ICC, are all part of the first proposition suggested above. A carrier was seeking to fill in holes in his existing geographical authority. I am familiar with two of the examples used, and those applications were for that express purpose.

Pages 6 through 12. Active case law enforcement is not necessary to impose an obligation to serve upon a carrier or groups of carriers. A complaint that a carrier or group of carriers is not serving a community, or a shipper, can have startling effects upon those carriers. There is no need for a "failure to serve" citation where the threat of formal procedures brings compliance. The force behind the law has been adequate since the beginning of motor carrier regulation.

Every driver, dock foreman, dispatcher, vice president of sales or marketing, traffic

employee, and motor carrier executive can recite for you chapter and verse the consequences of complaints for failure to serve. It is true there are abuses. The stock industry reply to the shippers of "no trailers available," does make it difficult for some shippers on particular instances. But by and large the traffic will seek its own level, i.e., it will gravitate to a carrier who can supply the service.

Secondly, a carrier risks financial loss in failure to maintain service on his existing rights. In a transfer proceedings the application must meet the ICC dormancy test. A carrier can't (sell) transfer dormant rights. And in the event new industry comes into an area, a carrier is going to be hard pressed to oppose new applicants when he cannot show activity of existing rights to that area.

THE TRENDS TO OR AWAY FROM PRIVATE CARRIAGE

There are far more factors which put a shipper into private carriage than the failure of or overpricing of common carrier service. Any number of studies indicate that control is the most often cited reason, and costs (often miscalculated) the second most prevalent reason for using private carriage as opposed to common or contract carriage. As long as the majority of the common and contract carrier industry is subject to uniform labor contracts, much of the cost element in motor transport is constant nationwide. The problems of control or non-control are also constant for the common or contract carrier since the labor contracts follow a general pattern.

It then makes little difference if the industry has freer entry and less or no rate control, as to whether a shipper chooses private or common and contract carriage.

We would agree that after a shake out period, small community service will continue, but we hesitate to predict it will improve. Areas which do not generate sufficient less-truck-load traffic, will see the redevelopment of small feeder lines. But there is no guarantee that either the service will improve or the price will be as competitive as routes between major metropolitan areas.

The history of the general commodity less-truck-load carriers since the 1950's has been to expand routes into a large network of service by application, or most often by acquisition or merger. Acquisition was most often of the small feeder lines, thus eliminating interline traffic in favor of single line longhaul service. Anyone at all familiar with the trucking industry knows that was progress. Interline costs and delays in service time were eliminated. To revert to and create a new fragmented, interline pattern would set the industry back 20 years. No new long haul less-truck-load giants are going to appear to challenge today's leaders, with or without regulation. Capital investment, creating a market need for the service, and the complexity of creating an immediate system are far too great a risk for private capital.

It seems to us that along with the myths listed in this testimony should be added myths number 5 and number 6. The cost of entry—either purchasing or applying for a certificate—is the least of restrictions on entry. If there is a market for the service the cost of entry is nearly inconsequential. What will create the chaos referred to in myth number 2, is for existing small entrepreneurs to believe that they can jump into large long haul operations, just by buying a fleet of trucks, when deregulation arrives. Diluting the traffic of carriers supplying needed transportation service, will cause rates to rise. The second step is that the dilution will not be argument. Minor adjustments in the common the block and that operation will fall. The small operator relying upon the representation that deregulation is going to benefit him, will go broke based on that representation.

Myth number 6, is the absolute certainty of the authors of this legislation that deregulation will work. What happens if it does not?

How long will it take government to gear up to reestablish controls necessary to protect and preserve the vital industry which has functioned reasonably well under regulation?

It seems to us, that this is the crux of the argument. Minor adjustments in the common law created at the Commission are always necessary. That approach is much safer than a massive overhaul of the statutory framework within which the Commission functions.

In all discussions we have seen on the small community problem, we have seen a statement similar to that on page 9 of the testimony; "Far from reducing service to small communities, I expect that our proposed bill will improve service to such communities." Someone should ask the small communities if they want to gamble with that expectation. The fact is that the small town is now receiving adequate service within the regulatory framework. It will not be Washington, D.C. or the Department of Transportation that will suffer if those expectations do not materialize.

Emphatically, this department opposes the "de-regulation" bill as structured.

Freer entry is not only not a panacea for whatever problems the industry may have, it will create immense hardship for the stability of the industry. Entry needs to be difficult and restrictive so that the quasi-monopoly of the present structure can continue to protect the network of transportation necessary to insure transportation service to all segments in the nation's economy.

Rate structure and regulation needs to be simplified, but the structure needs to be retained to guarantee reasonable and non-discriminatory rates to all shippers regardless of size or geographical location.

Very truly yours,

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES

COMMISSION OF OHIO,

Transportation Department,

M. E. ROTHHAAR, Director. ●

JIM FABERT RECEIVES COMMISSIONER'S CITATION

HON. DON BAILEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to bring to your attention a resident of the 21st district, Jim Fabert, a 1979 recipient of the Commissioner's Citation for his outstanding service to the Social Security Administration in the public information field.

Commissioner Stanford Ross hand selects the citation recipients from a host of recommended candidates from across the country. I wholeheartedly agree with the Commissioner's choice in Mr. Fabert.

The Commissioner's Citation is the highest internal award within the Social Security Administration recognizing service aimed to improve and make it's operation more efficient. Mr. Fabert has given 15 years of dedicated service to the Administration and has been a part of the Altoona, Sharon, and Greensburg offices. His outstanding perseverance in implementing direct deposit procedures and initiating superior service, procedures, and liaison with all service banks is commendable. His inherent and distinctive professional abilities have been responsible for much of the progress reported in the respective offices.

I admire his leadership qualities and managerial skills and am very proud to bring him to your attention. The Social Security Administration is very fortunate to have a man of his character within its ranks.●

IRANIAN STUDENT SITUATION ANALYZED

HON. GERALD B. H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, among the many issues that have arisen during the Iranian crisis are questions regarding Iranian students in the United States. Following is an analysis compiled by Cheryl Fish and Walter Olson of the ACU Education and Research Institute which offers insight into the various aspects of the alien student situation. I commend this study to the attention of my colleagues:

IRANIAN STUDENTS: WHO ARE THEY?

The seizure of the American embassy in Iran—supported by demonstrating Iranians in various American cities—has focused public attention on the status of Iranian students in this country. From recent investigation of these students, a number of little-known facts have emerged to view. Among them:

According to official estimates, there are more Iranian students in the United States than in Iran—at least half again as many, and possibly a good deal more. Though the exact number in the U.S. is not known, it is estimated that there are at least 50,000 to 60,000 Iranian students in this country, and the actual number could be much higher.

A large percentage of these students are not in school, and are therefore in violation of the terms of their visas, while others are known to have violated their visa status in other ways. Depending on which set of official figures is consulted, the number of Iranian students illegally in the United States could range from 10,000 to 50,000. Some unofficial estimates go much higher.

Until recently U.S. immigration had exerted little or no control over the conduct of these students in America. Although many of the Iranian students have been engaged in highly organized political demonstrations, and some in overt violence, the Carter Administration for several months imposed a "freeze" on the deportation of Iranians from this country. Only when the recent controversy erupted was this policy reversed.

HOW MANY?

No one, including the Federal Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), has an exact idea of how many Iranians are in this country on student visas. The range of estimates extends from 50,000 (*Washington Post*)¹ to 290,000 (*Time*)². Whatever figure is accepted, there are far more Iranians here on student visas than there are students in Iran. According to C. F. Gernie of the Iranian Embassy in Washington, there are only 30,000 to 35,000 students in Iranian post-secondary institutions.

One estimate has it that Iranians constitute 23 percent, or almost one-fourth, of all foreign students in the United States at present. That total is estimated at approxi-

mately 236,000, which is double the number ten years ago. In addition, the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) says that at least 42,300 foreign students admitted to this country on visas (no breakdown as to nationality) are no longer at the institution where they were supposed to be registered and taking full credit loads of courses.³ As the *Post* observes, "no one knows how many former students continue to live here, illegally."⁴

Guesses as to the number of Iranian illegals in the United States vary widely, from 25,000 (*U.S. News and World Report*) to 250,000 (*Time*). The INS estimate suggests about one-sixth of the foreign students in the United States have violated or overstayed their visas, and the proportion of illegal Iranians could well be higher. *U.S. News*, for instance, suggests that roughly half the Iranians here are illegals. But even if the Iranian percentage is the same as that for other nationalities in general, this would mean at least 10,000 Iranian students here who are not in fact students.⁵

The largest category of illegals consists of those who stay on after graduation. Others drop out of their American college, and some never bother to enroll at all.

There is also confusion as to the number of "legals." INS said in April that there were 50,000 Iranians studying here on valid visas.⁶ In January, *U.S. News* put the number at 23,000 and *Newsweek* at 40,000.⁷

Many students returned to Iran after the fall of the Shah. The Iranian Embassy here estimates that about 11,000 returned; the leftist Confederation of Iranian Students put the number below 10,000.⁸ Some later returned to this country from Iran when they became disillusioned with the strict Islamic rule prevailing there.

Considerable numbers of the students in the United States are organized, and many are committed to Marxist revolutionary doctrine. As *Newsweek* puts it, "there is no doubt that Iranian student protests in the U.S. are well orchestrated—and perhaps centrally directed. Two major groups, the Iranian Students Association and the Organization of Iranian Muslim Students, have dozens of U.S. chapters. Both organize frequent marches and demonstrations in New York, Washington, and other cities . . ."

Newsweek adds that "some European counterintelligence specialists believe that as many as 5,000 of the 60,000 Iranian students abroad belong to Marxist or Trotskyite groups, and that 500 or so are active members of terrorist cells. But both FBI and Justice Department officials say they have no evidence of any connection between Iranian radicals in the U.S. and terrorist organizations abroad."⁹

NO U.S. SURVEILLANCE

That the U.S. authorities have "no evidence" linking Iranian students here to Marxist elements overseas is less reassuring than it sounds, since until recently there was absolutely no official monitoring of these students. The INS made no effort at all to check on the status of the students until April 1 of this year. On that date the agency announced that it was planning monthly random checks on one percent of all foreign students in the U.S., to determine if they were really in school. The effort quickly became bogged down, however, and at least as of September no deportation proceedings had even been begun as a result of the spot checks.

This lack of monitoring of foreign students stems in large measure from provisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, which defines aliens admitted for permanent residence as "United States persons," and confers on them privileges and immunities pertaining to American citizens.

This means, in essence, that such immigrants are not subject to surveillance by the

authorities unless and until they are suspected of committing a major crime. The practical effect is to permit them to move about the United States more or less at will, without official cognizance of their actions. A typical example is a case reported by the *Washington Post*, concerning an Iranian student who (a) is a Marxist, (b) is in violation of the terms of his visa, and (c) has travelled freely all over the country participating in demonstrations.¹⁰

In addition, U.S. authorities, until the recent reversal, have treated Iranian students in this country with special leniency because of unsettled conditions in their homeland. Under this policy, deportation of Iranians—except those convicted of serious crimes, but including many involved in violent demonstrations—had been postponed. The policy, known as "extended voluntary deportation," allowed illegal Iranians to put off their departure until June 1, 1980.¹¹

The department gave Iranian political instability as its reason for the action. It feared, it said, that those sent back to Iran would face reprisals from the Khomeini government, even though most of the potential deportees had supported the Shah's overthrow.

The policy was especially ironic in the light of the tough Administration language in January, when Iranians rioted at the Beverly Hills home of Princess Chams, sister of the Shah, protesting a visit by the Shah's 90-year-old mother. An estimated 500 took part in the protest, throwing rocks and bottles as well as overturning cars and setting brush fires in the area. The demonstration was finally broken up by tear gas, and 45 persons were admitted to nearby hospitals with injuries.¹²

The Beverly Hills fracas provoked widespread outrage among California residents, and in fact throughout the nation. Phillip Smith, assistant director of INS in Los Angeles, observed that "everyone seems shocked that foreigners can come over here and be allowed to demonstrate in that manner."¹³

"We're not going to put up with this conduct," Attorney General Griffin Bell said after the incident. He added that he was speaking for President Carter as well. "All participants in such violence," he vowed, "will be deported from this country to the extent the law permits or requires."¹⁴

That vow was not kept. No one was deported. Nor have any Iranians been deported on account of violent demonstrations in downtown Chicago, where three policemen were injured by rioters;¹⁵ Houston, where 95 rioters were arrested; or San Francisco, where 2,000 protesters blocked traffic and smashed the windshield of a passing taxicab.¹⁶

THE DEPORTATION GLACIER

Even without the freeze U.S. immigration law makes it extremely difficult to deport any alien. Backed by government-paid or "public interest" lawyers, the alien can drag out the appeals process for months or years, whether or not he has a valid visa.

After the Chicago melee in May of this year, Immigration and Naturalization spokesman Vern Jervic said that "Chances are they're not going to be deported, at least as far as that demonstration goes. If people choose to fight, they can tie the government up for a long time."¹⁷ These Houston arrestees have appealed their case to the Supreme Court.

Any alien with a valid visa can be deported only if he commits a felony or violates the terms of the visa. Both provisions are virtually meaningless. There is no effective way to compel attendance at college classes, the major requirement for student visas; the federal government is not about to call a roll of foreign students every time a class meets at an American college.

Footnotes at end of article.

As for felonies, American courts virtually refuse to hand down felony convictions for violent demonstrations—the major form of Iranian lawlessness in this country so far. One hundred eighty-two Iranians arrested after the Chicago riot, in which three policemen were injured, were set free without bail after they gave their names—and no other information—to the authorities.¹⁸

The difficulty of obtaining convictions is so great that many authorities do not go to the trouble of making arrests in the first place. Of the hundreds of students and others who rioted in Beverly Hills, injuring 25 police officers and causing hundreds of thousands of dollars of property damage, only seven were arrested. Of the seven, five were immediately released on bail.

One effective roadblock to deportations is the request for political asylum. When four of the students in the Beverly Hills riot were charged with arson, for example, they promptly asked the U.S. government for political asylum. Such a request entitles them automatically to a formal hearing, stalling deportation for months, and appeals and legal red tape can drag out the process for years.

Potential deportees are free to use this technique regardless of whether or not their political views differ from those of the Iranian regime to which they would be returning. The government decides whether or not each claim is justified, but since it is forbidden to gather data on the political sympathies of the students, the applicant himself may be the only source of evidence.

WHY AN AMERICAN EDUCATION?

Education is one of this country's most exportable products, and a sizable amount of OPEC oil money is recycled to this country in the form of tuition. Daryoosh Tirnia, second secretary of the Iranian Embassy, says that more than a third of the Iranian students are enrolled in engineering and other technical programs.¹⁹ Economics and business are also popular.

Iranian scholarships pay for one-quarter of the students here, Tirnia says. "The rest," he says, "are wealthy." With domestic enrollments dropping, the tuition paid by Iranians and other foreign students often comes as a boon to American colleges.

During the Shah's reign such institutions as Princeton and Georgetown University obtained funds from Iran to expand Middle Eastern study programs. Professor John Marks, chairman of Princeton's department of Near Eastern Studies, says his department is one of the best of its kind, with over 600 students.²⁰

Some smaller schools, badly in need of funds, employ recruiters who offer slide shows and brochures to foreign students to get them over to the faltering schools. One such recruiting firm, International Education Services, Inc., takes in 15% of the tuition paid by each recruit.²¹

The trouble is that it is not difficult for recruiters to obtain I-20 (student immigration) forms pre-signed by college admissions officers. Once a student has his hands on such a form the State Department will routinely grant him a visa.

"Everybody in the field knows there are people who take presigned I-20's in their pockets and sprinkle them abroad," says Mary Chance of the National Association For Foreign Student Affairs.²² An informed high Justice Department official confirms that I-20 forms are often sold and otherwise abused.

Once the alien reaches the country, there is no way to ensure that he will actually enroll in the college, and no way for the INS to keep track of him if he does not. INS does not have centralized or computerized files, and what files it does have, according to informed sources, are not in order. The Los Angeles INS center keeps student files stacked in boxes. The agency is apparently

unable to keep track even of those legal aliens who register voluntarily with it each January, sources say. When it comes to illegals, INS has virtually no information base, no enforcement power, and no prospect of getting more. If the United States ever seriously attempts to deport illegal Iranian students here, it will have to pay the price of years of neglect.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ *Washington Post*, Nov. 11, 1979.
- ² *Time*, Nov. 19, 1979.
- ³ *Los Angeles Times*, April 12, 1979.
- ⁴ *Washington Post*, April 24, 1979.
- ⁵ *U.S. News and World Report*, Jan. 29, 1979.
- ⁶ *Los Angeles Times*, April 12, 1979.
- ⁷ *Newsweek*, Jan. 15, 1979.
- ⁸ *Los Angeles Times*, May 20, 1979.
- ⁹ *Newsweek*, Jan. 15, 1979.
- ¹⁰ *Washington Post*, Nov. 15, 1979.
- ¹¹ *Washington Post*, Nov. 11, 1979.
- ¹² *Los Angeles Times*, Jan. 3, 1978.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁴ *Los Angeles Times*, Jan. 5, 1979.
- ¹⁵ *New York Times*, May 19, 1978.
- ¹⁶ *New York Times*, Dec. 29, 1978.
- ¹⁷ *New York Times*, May 19, 1978.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁹ *Los Angeles Times*, Jan. 6, 1979.
- ²⁰ *Los Angeles Times*, April 15, 1979.
- ²¹ *Newsweek*, Jan. 29, 1979.
- ²² *Ibid.* ●

NIKONOV FAMILY ALLOWED TO EMIGRATE FROM MOSCOW

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, I was overjoyed to learn recently that the Boris Nikonov family has been allowed to emigrate from Moscow. The Nikonovs have friends who, until recently, lived in Aurora, a city in my district. Several Aurora-area residents wrote to me expressing their concern that the Nikonov family had not been allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union. I expressed my concern in this case in an April 5 letter to Soviet Secretary Brezhnev. Shortly after I sent the letter, the Nikonovs were asked to reapply for visas. They reapplied and were finally granted permission to emigrate.

Mr. Speaker, the apparent successful conclusion of the Nikonov case has been most gratifying to me. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point the text of the letter expressing my appreciation to Secretary Brezhnev.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., November 26, 1979.

His Excellency LEONID I. BREZHNEV,
First Secretary of the Central Committee
of the CPSU, Chairman of the Presidium
of the Supreme Soviet, Moscow, U.S.S.R.

DEAR SECRETARY BREZHNEV: I have recently learned that the Boris Nikonov family has emigrated from Moscow. There are indications that my April 5 letter to you on behalf of the Nikonovs may have been useful with respect to the Nikonovs' request for visas. As I mentioned in my April 5 letter to you, the Nikonovs have close friends who lived in Aurora, a city in my district, until recently.

I was most happy to learn of the Nikonovs' emigration, and I very much appreciate your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

TOM CORCORAN,
Representative in Congress. ●

LEGISLATION TO FIGHT DRUG TRAFFICKING

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, drug abuse in our Nation has reached epidemic proportions. It has been estimated that there are: 1.7 million persons who have used heroin, with 453,000 daily users; 13 million persons who have used stimulants such as amphetamines; 6.9 million persons who have used PCP at least once; 10 million who have used cocaine; and, 43 million who have tried marijuana at least once.

Illegal drug trafficking—which feeds this national cancer—involves the use of billions of dollars in cash transactions. Therefore, law enforcement authorities must have an effective means which would insure that they have the authority to police the movement of drug-related currency into and out of this country.

On a recent factfinding mission to major drug trafficking regions, I learned of several gaps in the law which hinder our law enforcement officials in their efforts to curtail the ever-burgeoning multibillion-dollar drug trafficking industry. After my return from this mission and a series of intensive meetings with administration officials, I introduced three bills, all of which would amend the Currency and Foreign Transactions Reporting Act (popularly called the Bank Secrecy Act), which would fill those gaps.

H.R. 4071 would give informants a portion of the recovered currency, thereby giving a further incentive to those who know of cash smuggling to report this to U.S. Government officials. These rewards could be extremely helpful for obtaining information from informants who could easily be subjected to physical retribution because of the extraordinarily violent nature of the drug trade.

H.R. 4072 would make it illegal to "attempt" to leave the United States with large amounts of currency without filing those reports which are already required under the Bank Secrecy Act. While present law makes it illegal to leave the country with more than \$5,000 without having filed the report, the courts have held that a person cannot be arrested for violating this law until he has actually left the country. At that time, the violator is outside the jurisdiction of the United States and cannot be successfully prosecuted, which is an obvious "Catch-22" situation.

My third bill, H.R. 4073, would allow customs officials to search for unreported amounts of cash—in their presently authorized search for contraband—where reasonable cause exists to believe that this currency is leaving the country as a result of illegal activities.

I have worked closely with the administration on the above three bills, and have recently received the written support and endorsement of the Departments of Justice and Treasury, the Customs Service, the Drug Enforcement Ad-

ministration, and the Office of Management and Budget. Treasury has written me that they "strongly urge enactment" of my bills. The Drug Enforcement Administration wrote me on November 5, 1979, detailing the tremendous need for this legislation and specifying how the bills would "greatly improve" the efforts of law enforcement officials in curtailing drug trafficking. I want to share the contents of that letter with all of my colleagues, and insert the text in the RECORD at this point:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C.

HON. JOHN J. LAFALCE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LAFALCE: I have been monitoring closely the three legislative initiatives you introduced upon your return from Colombia this past May. I refer to H.R. 4071, 4072, and 4073 which still remain pending in the House of Representative.

As you know, the enactment of these three laws would greatly improve the effectiveness of our law enforcement efforts to curtail the illegal movement of U.S. currency out of the U.S.A. Most of this illegally obtained money is realized as a result of narcotics trafficking. With the enactment of H.R. 4071 there is no doubt would be the added incentive for law-abiding citizens to come forward with information relating to currency violations. The impact would greatly improve the effectiveness of the U.S. Customs Service in its enforcement responsibilities.

Present law makes it illegal to leave the country with more than \$5,000 without filing a declaration. However, the courts have held that a person cannot be arrested for this violation unless he has actually left the country, thus escaping U.S. jurisdiction. The enactment of H.R. 4072 would remove this loophole by providing that attempting to leave the country is also a violation.

This will improve our effectiveness in stemming the flow of illegally obtained currency from leaving the country. H.R. 4073 would give to our brother law enforcement officers of the Customs Service the authority to search for undeclared monetary instruments where reasonable cause exists to believe that these monetary instruments are leaving the country as a result of illegal activities. With today's sophisticated drug trafficking organizations, much of the profits leave the United States for source countries to purchase additional drugs and other smuggling resources.

I understand that the above three legislative initiatives are before the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and there is a possibility of hearings regarding these measures. As Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, I would welcome the opportunity to participate in these hearings and discuss further with the Subcommittee the importance of this corrective legislation as it relates to effective drug law enforcement.

On behalf of the Drug Enforcement Administration's Special Agents, I thank you for your efforts.

Sincerely,

PETER B. BENSINGER,
Administrator.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Treasury Department for its recommendations for certain technical changes in H.R. 4071.

Because the administration has announced its support for all three of my bills, with certain technical changes in one of them, I have today introduced one omnibus bill to amend the Bank Secrecy Act, which includes all the provisions of the three bills referred to above and introduced last May, with the technical

changes suggested by Treasury. I hope all my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring that very important bill.

Attached is a copy of the omnibus bill:

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 231(a) of the Currency and Foreign Transactions Reporting Act (31 U.S.C. 1101(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) PERSONS REQUIRED TO FILE.—Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, whoever, whether as principal, agent, or bailee, or by an agent or bailee, knowingly—

"(1) transports or causes to be transported, or attempts to transport or have transported, monetary instruments—

"(A) from any place in the United States to or through any place outside the United States, or

"(B) to any place within the United States from or through any place outside the United States, or

"(2) receives monetary instruments at the termination of their transportation to the United States from or through any place outside the United States.

in an amount exceeding \$5,000 on any one occasion shall file a report or reports in accordance with subsection (b) of this section."

Section 235 of the Currency and Foreign Transactions Reporting Act (31 U.S.C. 1105) is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c) and by adding a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) any customs officer may stop, search and examine without a search warrant, any vehicle, vessel, aircraft or other conveyance, envelope or other container, or person entering or departing from the United States on which or whom he shall have reasonable cause to suspect there are monetary instruments in the process of being transported for which a report is required under section 231 of this Act."

That the Currency and Foreign Transactions Reporting Act is amended by adding a new section 236 to read:

"SEC. 236. AWARD OF COMPENSATION TO INFORMANTS.—

"(a) The Secretary is authorized to pay a reward to any individual who provides original information which leads to a recovery of a criminal fine civil penalty, or forfeiture, which exceeds \$50,000, for any violation of this Act or any regulation issued hereunder.

"(b) The amount of the reward, if any, is to be designated by the Secretary, but shall not exceed 25 percent of the net amount of the fine, penalty, or forfeiture collected or \$250,000, whichever is lesser, in a case in which the person was an informant.

"(c) Any officer or employee of the United States or of any State or local government who furnishes information or renders service in the performance of official duties is not eligible for payment under this section.

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section."●

VOTE ON SOLAR POWER SATELLITE
R. & D.

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 16, I was unable to be present in the House for the final vote on H.R. 2335, the solar satellite research and development bill. I was speaking at a

meeting of the U.S. Conference of Mayors in Baltimore on the subject of transportation.

Had I been present for the vote on H.R. 2335, I would have voted against the bill. At best, the bill is unnecessary since solar power satellite research is already underway. More likely, it will push our country into developing a highly technical system which has not yet been found safe, economical, or wise. Since the Department of Energy and NASA will soon complete a 3-year study on the solar power satellite, I believe it was premature for the House to authorize an additional \$25 million in fiscal year 1980 to establish a research, development, and evaluation program in the Energy Department.

I will oppose the conference report to H.R. 2335 when it is presented for House approval and I will continue to oppose efforts to speed up development of a solar power satellite until I am satisfied that such a satellite would be environmentally and economically sound.●

A VETERANS LEADER

HON. DAN MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to my colleague, RAY ROBERTS of Texas, the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The Congress and the veterans of this country will miss his leadership when he retires at the end of the 96th Congress.

A wise man once said that the true cost of war does not start until the last shot is fired. Since first coming to Congress and joining the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs in 1962, the gentleman from Texas has seen the budget for veterans' benefits and services rise from \$5 billion to over \$21 billion. A vast portion of that startling increase has been forced upon us by inflation, which is a challenge we all must face, not only in the area of veterans affairs, but throughout Government. But while RAY ROBERTS is the first on our committee to scrutinize the cost of veterans programs and services, especially in these days of high Government spending and escalating inflation, he is unyielding in his determination to maintain our commitment to our Nation's veterans in full.

The number of veterans in the United States today has grown to a record level. The Congress and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, especially in recent years, have been challenged to meet the needs and fulfill the expectations of almost five generations of veterans, from the Spanish American War to the Vietnam conflict—now over 30 million strong.

As committee chairman for the past 5 years, ROBERTS has led the fight to maintain an equitable distribution of benefits and services among all those who have served in defense of our country. Accordingly, he has safeguarded the traditional

rights of older veterans while, at the same time, encouraging legislation to meet the needs of those just returning to civilian life from military service. He has gone before the House innumerable times to defend the rights of veterans whenever programs and services administered by the Veterans Administration have been threatened. For example, with reports coming in from around the country of deteriorating conditions in the VA hospital system resulting from medical staff cuts imposed by the administration, ROBERTS has gone to the floor of the House 2 years in a row to request the additional funds to get those people back on the job. It is a tribute to his position and leadership in this body that on both occasions the Members of the House unanimously approved the Roberts amendments of 1978 and 1979.

Maintaining the integrity of VA programs, and achieving an equitable balance of benefits and services for all veterans, has not been an easy job. Neither has it been inexpensive. However, RAY ROBERTS, an avowed fiscal conservative, has taken a stand on principle. He has said that in meeting this obligation, those of us in Government not only provide comfort, support and readjustment assistance to those who have already served, but we offer a solid commitment to all those who may have to serve, and even fight, for our country in the future. In other words, by maintaining our traditions and meeting our present commitments now, we safeguard the strength of America for our children and their children. This principle holds true for what we do here for veterans; and it holds true for everything we do in Congress.

Today, in part because of RAY ROBERTS' leadership and dedication, our country has the most generous, and the most beneficial assistance program for those who have served in its defense of any nation on Earth. That is the way it should be. And I would like to thank RAY ROBERTS for helping to make it, and helping to keep it so. ●

TAXES AND THE BLUE COLLAR INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR

HON. RICHARD T. SCHULZE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures, of which I am a member, met on Friday, October 19, to begin markup of H.R. 5460, the Independent Contractor Tax Act.

Since the subcommittee is expected to resume consideration of this proposal later today, I believe it is important to note one of the developments that occurred during that initial markup session. At that time, the distinguished ranking minority Member, Congressman JOHN DUNCAN of Tennessee, offered an amendment to give statutory recognition

(safe harbor) to those independent contractors who are frequently identified as blue-collar workers. This amendment was based on a concept developed within the bill, H.R. 5266.

Although the Duncan amendment was defeated on a 5-to-4 vote, it would seem that the logic of this proposal must prevail in the full Ways and Means Committee. All the confusion and conflict over place of business and control of hours could be eliminated with this simple amendment based on common law.

In addition, I must report that the National Construction Industry Council has adopted a resolution in support of H.R. 5266 at their November 20 meeting here in Washington. The NCIC is composed of 26 trade associations.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I include in the RECORD a copy of this resolution and a list of those associations:

NATIONAL CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

American Concrete Paving Association.
American Concrete Pipe Association.
American Consulting Engineers Council.
American Institute of Steel Construction.
American Rental Association.
American Road & Transportation Builders Association.
American Society of Civil Engineers.
American Subcontractors Association.
Associated Builders and Contractors.
Associated Equipment Distributors.
Associated General Contractors of America.
Associated Landscape Contractors of America.
Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute.
Mechanical Contractors Association of America.
Metal Building Dealers Association.
National Asphalt Pavement Association.
National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors.
National Association of Surety Bond Producers.
National Constructors Association.
National Crushed Stone Association.
National Electrical Contractors Association.
National Society of Professional Engineers.
National Utility Contractors Association.
Portland Cement Association.
Prestressed Concrete Institute.
Sheet Metal & Air Conditioning Contractors National Association.

POLICY STATEMENT FOR NATIONAL CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY COUNCIL

Whereas, Congressman Dan Rostenkowski has introduced H.R. 5460, and

Whereas, this bill contains a provision to apply a 10 percent withholding tax on all independent contractors, and

Whereas, this tax would result in withholding 10 percent tax of the operating revenues of independent contractors, ultimately driving many out of business unless prices are increased, resulting in a marked effect on the cost of construction, and

Whereas, a withholding tax on the independent contractors would destroy a basic institution of our society in that entrepreneurs must organize, manage and assume the risks of a business or enterprise, and

Whereas, the NCIC in principle does not believe that the industry should serve as tax collectors for an independent unit of our nation's workforce, and

Whereas, the Construction Industry is composed of transitory units, the new payroll

and personnel expenses associated with the administration of a withholding tax would be enormous for the payor, further increasing the costs of construction, and

Whereas, H.R. 5460 does not give specific statutory recognition (safe harbor) to the common law test as it affects blue collar independent contractors, and

Whereas, a four year study to improve the tax compliance of independent contractors in lieu of a burdensome 10 percent withholding tax involving both payors and payees is in keeping with NCIC policy, and

Whereas, H.R. 5460 surely leads to adverse economic impact on consumers, independent contractors, and the Construction Industry further exacerbating the inflationary cycle contrary to the top priority of our Government, and predictably leads to serious and complicated problems concerned with labor relations, THEREFORE

Be it resolved, that the National Construction Industry Council is appreciative of the efforts of Representative Richard A. Gephardt and Senator Robert Dole in resolving this vital issue and calls upon them to continue working on our behalf, and endorses the concept that any measure that becomes law must protect the needs of the construction industry that are addressed in H.R. 5266, introduced by Representative Phillip Crane. ●

HENRY ARNOLD DENNIS

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to memorialize and pay tribute to the late Henry Arnold Dennis of Henderson, N.C., who passed away on November 17. Henry Dennis was editor of the Henderson Daily Dispatch for more than 50 years. He was also a very close and valued friend of mine. More than that, he was a dedicated servant of God and his fellow man.

In calling the passing of Henry Dennis to the attention of my colleagues, and his friends and all others who may read the RECORD, I want to make available several obituaries and editorials from North Carolina newspapers. These articles reflect great credit upon him and his full life of service to his family, his church, his community and State, in a variety of ways.

Seldom do I make such insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but Henry Dennis was such an unusual and outstanding man for so long a period of time, that I think mention of him in this way is most deserved. I regret that I do not have access to all the fine statements and editorials written about him but the enclosed will suffice to give his life the credit it deserves.

Simply stated, he fought a good fight. He kept the faith and "he finished his course" at the age of 88 with flying colors.

Late in August of this year, I visited him in his newspaper office where he was still typing away—on an editorial, I suspect, because he wrote them until just before his death. I had a very limited time with him because of a heavy schedule. I spent about 15 minutes with

him. His last remarks to me as I left were: "Congressman, we just don't have enough time for me to get off my chest all the things I want to say—especially about what's going on in Washington and throughout the world. Next time you come, try to stay longer." I responded by saying, "I sure will." However, I had conversed with Mr. Dennis many times. I knew what he wanted to say. I always got his message. He was always clear and unambiguous as to where he stood, whether or not one always agreed with him. Usually I did, but once he said to me: "I'm doing a lot of talking, but you have to do the voting."

In Henry Dennis' passing, I have lost a good friend and valuable critic. The city of Henderson, Vance County, and North Carolina have lost a valuable citizen, but the memory of him and his life will have a long and lasting effect upon all who lived within the range of his voice, his vision, and his influence. That memory will be cherished and held near and dear to the hearts of many of our people.

The articles follow:

[From the Henderson (N.C.) Daily Dispatch, Nov. 19, 1979]

EDITOR HENRY A. DENNIS DIES; RITES SET TUESDAY

The editor of the Henderson Daily Dispatch for more than half a century, Henry Arnold Dennis, 87, died at his residence at midnight Saturday night following an illness of some ten days. He had been a patient at Maria Parham hospital in Henderson for more than a week.

He had been active in operation of the newspaper until the time of his illness.

Funeral services will be conducted at three o'clock Tuesday afternoon at the First United Methodist Church in Henderson and burial will be in Elmwood cemetery here. Officiating will be the First Methodist minister, the Rev. Sam D. McMillan, Jr.; Dr. Marlon D. Lark, pastor of the First Baptist Church; and the Rev. Robert E. Bergland, minister at City Road United Methodist Church.

The deceased is survived by two daughters, Mrs. Doris D. Tharrington, of Henderson, and Mrs. Ruth D. Cassell, of Greenville, S.C.; one son, William B. Dennis, of Henderson; and one brother, Robert K. Dennis, of Rocky Mount. Also surviving are eight grandchildren and two great grandchildren. His wife was the late Mrs. Essie Daniel Dennis, who died on November 15, 1972.

A native of Concord, Mr. Dennis was born on December 7, 1891, and was the son of the late Haywood and Ida Dennis. He was a graduate of Trinity College, now Duke University, in Durham, receiving the A.B. degree there in 1913 and was a member and past president of the Duke Alumni Half-Century club.

Before coming to Henderson, he served on the news staffs of the Greenville Daily Reflector, the Raleigh News and Observer and the Rocky Mount Evening Telegram.

Mr. Dennis joined the Henderson Daily Dispatch on January 5, 1915, as news editor and had been active in operation of the paper for nearly 65 years. He became president and editor in 1922.

He served as president of the North Carolina Press Association in 1957-58 and also was on the board of directors of the association for several years. He had been a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors

for more than twenty years and had been a member of several committees of the Associated Press news organization.

The deceased was a member of the First United Methodist Church in Henderson, served on the board of stewards and was a life member of the church administrative board. Since 1915, he had been teacher of the Men's Bible Class at City Road, except for an interim of eleven years as superintendent of the Sunday School at the First Methodist.

He was a life member of the Salvation Army Advisory Board in Henderson and had been active on that board since the 1920s. He was a director on the board of Home Savings and Loan Association and had been a director of Peoples Bank and Trust Company in Henderson until reaching the age of retirement.

A trustee of H. Lisle Perry Memorial Library for many years, he also had been a trustee of Maria Parham Hospital for some ten years and formerly served on the Henderson City School Board and Vance County Board of Education, with two years as chairman of the latter. For several years he was secretary of the Vance County Democratic Executive Committee.

Mr. Dennis served as a director of the State-owned North Carolina Railroad Company under successive appointments by Governors Hoey, Broughton and Cherry and was president of the railroad company in 1945-46.

Named to serve as active pallbearers are George W. Harrison, Junius W. Rogers, George Rooker, Jimmy Adams, M. L. Finch, Jr., J. W. Jenkins, Jr., James H. Hight and Paul Nowell. Honorary pallbearers will be members of the Henderson Daily Dispatch staff, the North Carolina Press Association, Men's Bible Class of City Road church and board of stewards of the First Methodist church.

The family will be at the home of Mrs. Tharrington on Young avenue, and the body will remain at Flowers Funeral Home. Memorial gifts may be made to the Salvation Army in Henderson.

[From the Henderson (N.C.) Daily Dispatch, Nov. 19, 1979]

A DAY OF SADNESS AND THANKSGIVING

Today is a day of sadness but also a day of Thanksgiving.

We are saddened by the death of our editor, Henry Arnold Dennis, 87, who had been editor and president of the Henderson Daily Dispatch for more than half a century.

He joined the news staff of the Henderson Daily Dispatch in 1915 and had been president and editor since 1922, remaining active in operation of the paper daily until his sudden illness less than two weeks ago.

We give thanks that we had him with us for such a long and fruitful period. We give thanks that he remained active and in generally good health until the end.

We are thankful for his love, devotion and generosity to his family. We appreciate his strength and his concern for his newspaper. And we are thankful for his Christian outlook and proud of his steadfast loyalty to his church, his community and his country.

Now that the time has come, we rejoice that he can be reunited with his beloved wife and companion of more than 50 years, Essie Daniel Dennis, who preceded him in death in 1972.

For nearly six decades, Henry Arnold Dennis and Melvin Lewis Finch were the Henderson Daily Dispatch. Their association and friendship, until the death of Mr. Finch in 1973, made this newspaper what it is.

Editor Dennis was a native of Concord and an alumnus of Trinity College, now Duke University, in Durham. He was a newsman with the Greenville Daily Reflector, Raleigh

News and Observer and Rocky Mount Evening Telegram before coming to Henderson in 1915.

He had been a president of the North Carolina Press Association and one of the association's strongest supporters through the years. For more than twenty years he was a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

His devotion to his church was unwavering. He was a member of the First United Methodist Church in Henderson and a life member of that church's administrative board. He had been teacher of the Men's Bible Class at City Road United Methodist Church for more than sixty years, since 1915.

The editor was a life member of the Salvation Army Advisory Board in Henderson, a trustee for many years of H. Leslie Perry Memorial Library and a Maria Parham Hospital trustee. In years past, he had served on the Henderson City School Board and also the Vance County Board of Education, with two years as chairman of the latter. He had been active in the Vance County Democratic party and was a savings and loan association board member and a former bank director. In 1945-46 he was president of the State-owned North Carolina Railroad Company and was a director on that board for three terms.

Henry Dennis was sensitive to needs of his community, warmly interested in people and always alert to events as they occurred.

We shall miss him. His death leaves a void which cannot be filled on this newspaper. But we shall endeavor to live up to his expectations. We shall seek to build on the foundation which he fashioned.

[From the Raleigh News and Observer, Nov. 19, 1979]

HENRY A. DENNIS, EDITOR, DIES

HENDERSON.—Henry Arnold Dennis, editor of the Henderson Daily Dispatch for more than a half-century, died at his home at midnight Saturday after a 10-day illness.

A funeral service will be held at 3 p.m. Tuesday at the First United Methodist Church in Henderson, with burial at Elmwood Cemetery.

Dennis, 87, joined the Dispatch in 1915 and had been president and editor since 1922.

He also worked on the staffs of several other North Carolina newspapers, including The News and Observer.

Dennis was president of the North Carolina Press Association in 1957-58 and was on its board of directors for several years.

In 1968, the Vance County commissioners voted to name a county office building in his honor, saying "he has at all times accurately and fairly reported the news and has been a healthy influence with his timely editorials on important issues."

Dennis was president of the state-owned North Carolina Railroad Co. in 1945-46, and was on its board of directors under three governors.

He was a life member of the Salvation Army Advisory Board, former president of the Henderson Chamber of Commerce, former chairman of the Vance County school board and, in 1936, an unsuccessful candidate for the state Senate.

A graduate of Trinity College, now Duke University, Dennis was a member and past president of the Duke Half-Century Club.

He is survived by two daughters, Mrs. Doris Tharrington of Henderson and Mrs. Ruth Cassell of Greenville, S.C.; a son, William B. Dennis of Henderson; and a brother, Robert K. Dennis of Rocky Mount.

[From the Raleigh News and Observer, Nov. 20, 1979]

HENRY ARNOLD DENNIS, EDITOR

Henry Arnold Dennis was not merely the president and editor of the Henderson Daily

Dispatch for 57 years. Long before he died Saturday—less than a month prior to his 88th birthday anniversary—Dennis had become an institution in Henderson and Vance County.

The Henderson editor was known in his town and among his newspaper colleagues in North Carolina as conservative and fair. In addition to writing editorials and performing other duties at the paper, he filled responsible civil, church, state and professional positions. He served as president of the North Carolina Press Association in 1957-58.

His was a long, productive and conscientious life.

[From the Durham Morning Herald, Nov. 21, 1979]

HENRY DENNIS—HENDERSON EDITOR BELIEVED IN SERVICE

"You ever know anyone who wrote editorials that didn't make some folks mad?" Henry Dennis once asked. "If you don't find that someone disagrees with you you're not writing much."

Some folks probably disagreed with Mr. Dennis' editorials, but it is doubtful that many got mad with him. Not people who knew him, at least.

For more than 60 years, until his death last weekend, Mr. Dennis wrote for the Henderson Daily Dispatch, of which he was president and editor since 1922. He preached what one of his colleagues once called a type of progressive conservatism. His editorials were based on morality and his morality was based in the Bible. He kept a copy of the New Testament on his desk.

As a young man Henry Dennis thought he might want to be a preacher. He had been raised in an orphanage in Goldsboro and attended a private school in Concord, where he was born, and he got a scholarship to Trinity College in Durham.

Back in Goldsboro he had helped put out a twice-weekly newspaper at the orphanage. He supplemented his college scholarship by working part-time at the Durham Morning Herald, and he changed his mind about his career.

"When I was walking on campus after graduation," he said, "I ran into Bishop John C. Kilgo, the president of Trinity College. He said, 'I hear you're going into the newspaper business.' I said, 'Well, yes, I guess I am.' He said, 'If the Lord wants you to do it, I guess you'd better do it.'"

Mr. Dennis started at the Greenville Daily Reflector and later worked at the Rocky Mount Evening Telegram and the Raleigh News and Observer before going to Henderson in 1917. Five years later he and some other employees bought the Henderson paper and lived sparsely, putting most of their money back into the company, until they had the Dispatch on independent footing. There were times when they sold subscriptions for a bag of sweet potatoes or some other farm produce. Mr. Dennis did just about all of the newsroom work.

Even in his later years Mr. Dennis the publisher would put other business aside to write local news. Not long ago a young editor on a paper in eastern North Carolina called the Dispatch to share a news story of mutual interest. The editor had arranged to have his secretary dictate it by telephone. But Mr. Dennis himself answered the phone in the Dispatch newsroom. He thanked the editor for the call and said he'd take the story. The editor dictated it himself. "I felt that if he was willing to take the dictation, the least I could do was deal with him myself," he said later.

For all his humility, Mr. Dennis was a man of accomplishment, and not just in journalism. He had been a bank director, a lifetime

member of the Salvation Army advisory board, a director of the North Carolina Railroad Co., chairman of the Vance County Board of Education, a member of the Henderson City Board of Education, for decades the teacher of a men's Bible class at City Road Methodist Church, for 11 years superintendent of the First Methodist Sunday School and a life member of the First Methodist Administrative Board. He held several offices in newspaper organizations, including president of the North Carolina Press Association.

His philosophy as he once explained it was simple. "Try to treat everybody fairly and give as much needed service as you can." ●

HYATTSVILLE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

HON. GLADYS NOON SPELLMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mrs. SPELLMAN. Mr. Speaker, American novelist William Faulkner, in his 1950 speech accepting the Nobel Prize, expressed his belief that mankind would not merely endure but prevail. I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to draw my colleagues attention to an institution in my district that has both endured and prevailed for close to three centuries now.

I refer to the Hyattsville Presbyterian Church, which recently marked its 275th anniversary with a ceremony I was most honored to attend. I would like to take a few minutes to enlighten my colleagues on this venerable religious institution, which has been serving the spiritual needs of residents of my area for so long.

Although its roots can be traced back even further, the Hyattsville Presbyterian Church officially recognizes as its moment of birth a day in 1704 when Col. Ninian Beall donated a half acre of land near the Patuxent River for the erection of "a House for the service of Almighty God."

Over the years, the church at times prospered and at other times suffered. It survived shifting times and attitudes and realignments in denominational affiliations. Membership dwindled at one point to only four individuals, but then rebounded. The church eventually moved from its original location in Upper Marlboro, Md., to Bladensburg and from there to Hyattsville, where for the last two decades it has been located at 3120 Nicholson Street.

Pastor Rev. John V. Carlson attributes the church's longevity to a variety of factors, including the dedication, love and sacrifice of its members and, most of all, to the grace of God.

Mr. Speaker, I most certainly would agree with Reverend Carlson's comments. But I think for any religious institution to have survived so long, to have endured and prevailed as Hyattsville Presbyterian has endured and prevailed, it must also have been doing an exceptional job of serving the community around it.

I am reminded of a remark attributed to Franklin Roosevelt in the dark days of

the Depression. Our 32d President pointed out that the objectives of the church and State in our society are basically the same, to provide "a more abundant life" for each and every American.

Mr. Speaker, few churches in this country have done a better job of providing "a more abundant life" for their members than has Hyattsville Presbyterian. Its presence in my district has truly been a blessing for which all the area's residents can be grateful.

I know my colleagues will want to join me in congratulating this remarkable institution on the occasion of its 275th anniversary. I know, too, they will want to wish the church and its members well in the future. For 275 years, the Hyattsville Presbyterian Church has set an example that many may try—but few can hope—to match. ●

DI BUON SERVIZIO

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, this Friday evening, November 30, it will be my great pleasure to attend the Enrico Fermi Scholarship Fund's Di Buon Servizio Committee Annual Dinner in New Rochelle, N.Y.

Three illustrious members of the Yonkers community will be feted at that time: Judge Anthony Cerrato, Angelo Grippo, and Fanny Piemontese.

I am pleased to share with my colleagues at this time a bit of background information on the three honorees.

If there is an award that Fanny Piemontese has not received, it is only a matter of time before it will be bestowed upon her. This phenomenal woman's achievements have been recognized by such organizations as the American Committee on Italian Migration, the Soroptimists, and the American Cancer Society. Her dedication to such causes is tireless and she has brought her talents to such places as the Italian language and culture classes, the Scarsdale Women's Club and St. John's Riverside Hospital. She spearheaded an effort which I joined to have issued an Enrico Fermi stamp, and while we failed in this country, she succeeded in Italy.

One can always count on Fanny for assistance—her boundless energy is available for countless worthy causes. I am delighted to call her my friend and know that her work will continue for many years to come.

One of the most extraordinary residents of the city of Yonkers is the next honoree—Angelo Grippo, also a good friend of more than 15 years. Known throughout Westchester County as the Yonkers Democratic City Leader, Angelo has worked long and hard on behalf of all of "his" candidates. He is constantly seeking out fresh, new talent and does an incredible job of talking qualified peo-

ple into running for office. His No. 1 asset is his terrific sense of humor which manages to transcend all political boundaries and partisan causes. He delights in "roasting" those in the public eye and has that rare ability to be able to laugh at himself.

Aside from his visible work on behalf of the Democratic Party, Angelo works diligently with a number of humanitarian organizations ranging from the Park Hill Boys' Club to "Operation Santa Claus" to ways to help the handicapped—especially the visually impaired. No matter how busy he is, Angelo is there to give of his time and resources. I don't think many realize the number of times Angelo digs deep to help those in need—both known and unknown to him—never asking or willing to receive anything in return. Those who are able to call Angelo their friend have something very special, indeed.

The third honoree is Judge Anthony Cerrato, founder of the law firm of Cerrato & Naylor and also a good friend. Judge Cerrato was first elected to Westchester County family court judge in 1969 and became a county court judge 2 years later. Since 1972, he has served as a New York State Supreme Court justice.

Judge Cerrato has devoted a lifetime of service to the community of which he should be most proud. He is an exemplary public servant who gives so much of himself to humanitarian causes and is one of the best loved and respected of Westchester's residents. We are, indeed, fortunate to have him as a leader in our judicial system.

In addition to the warm thanks of their colleagues and friends, these three honorees will receive scrolls issued by Pope John Paul II, a Presidential citation, and gifts from the committee.●

RAY ROBERTS

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to pay tribute to a fine gentleman, a brilliant and indefatigable advocate of veterans' rights, and a Congressman who has done an extraordinary job of representing his constituency for 20 years—the Honorable RAY ROBERTS of Texas.

It was with regret last week that I learned of Representative ROBERTS' intention to retire at the conclusion of the 96th Congress. The people of the Fourth Congressional District of Texas will not find it easy to replace a man of RAY ROBERTS' consummate legislative skills.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of working with and observing RAY ROBERTS' ability in two different capacities. On several occasions as Chief Counsel of the Commerce Department's Economic Development Administration, I had the opportunity to testify before his

Subcommittee on Water Resources. Invariably, I found RAY ROBERTS to be well prepared and cooperative.

And as a colleague of his on the Public Works and Transportation Committee, I am personally indebted to Mr. ROBERTS for his work on behalf of a flood control project for the people of Lock Haven, Pa. Representative ROBERTS deserves much credit for assiduously guiding the Lock Haven flood control legislation through the Water Resources Subcommittee and later the full Public Works Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that I will only have the privilege of working side by side with Representative RAY ROBERTS for one congressional term. RAY ROBERTS is a legislator in the finest sense of the term. His presence will be sorely missed in the 97th Congress.●

HON. BILLIE S. FARNUM

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the people of Michigan have recently lost a good friend and a devoted public servant in the death of former Congressman Billie S. Farnum. Throughout his life in government, he made great contributions in a quiet, competent way to the well-being of the people.

When I was informed of his passing by our mutual friend, Oakland County Circuit Court Judge William Beer, I was deeply shocked for while Billie and I belonged to different political parties, I always considered him to be a good and respected friend.

Billie started his 40-year career through his work with the United Auto Workers leading organization drives at General Motors plants. From the union halls of Michigan, his energy and activities took him into a variety of State and Federal positions, where, during the 82d Congress, we served together in the House of Representatives.

Other positions that Billie held during his long public service were as the assistant, then deputy secretary of State; Michigan's last elected auditor general; and the deputy chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

In 1975 Billie was elected to the position of secretary of the Michigan State Senate, a position he held until his death.

As the senate secretary, he instituted a major reform of the senate's accounting system and kept close watch of its spending. Through these efforts, it is estimated that the taxpayers were saved more than \$1 million.

He also made changes in the senate's recordkeeping system which made it easier for the press and the public to tell how each individual State senator spent the taxpayers' money.

Billie's career is highlighted with many impressive accomplishments, but these do not describe the man himself. To all

who knew him, Billie was recognized as a patient, hard-working friend. He was truly a public servant in the finest tradition of the term, and he will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, in this time of sorrow, I wish to join all the friends of the late Honorable Billie S. Farnum in extending heartfelt condolences to his wife, Mildred, and their three sons, Norman, Roland, and Eugene.●

ENERGY QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. DONALD JOSEPH ALBOSTA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Speaker, last August I sent to each of my constituents in the 10th Congressional District of Michigan a newsletter which contained an energy questionnaire. This newsletter contained pro and con arguments on four major and several minor questions dealing with this Nation's approach to our energy problems.

I am pleased to advise my colleagues that many of my constituents took a few minutes to read the arguments and then registered their opinions. My staff has completed the tabulation of these questionnaire responses, and I would like to share the results with you.

I am grateful to all of those people who have participated in this survey. I appreciate their active participation in public policy formulation through this questionnaire. Below I have listed the questions and the responses by percentages of the total number of responses made to the question. The answers do not add to 100 percent in each case, since not everyone answered every question.

The questionnaire follows:

ALBOSTA'S ENERGY QUESTIONNAIRE

- Should the use of coal be greatly increased?
Yes, 92 percent.
No, 7 percent.
Undecided, 1 percent.
- Should clean air standards be relaxed to permit the burning of coal?
Yes, 67 percent.
No, 28 percent.
Undecided, 5 percent.
- Should coal be liquefied?
Yes, 65 percent.
No, 18 percent.
Undecided, 17 percent.
- Should oil prices be decontrolled?
Yes, 39 percent.
No, 51 percent.
Undecided, 10 percent.
- Should oil companies be made to pay an excess profits tax?
Yes, 79 percent.
No, 16 percent.
Undecided, 4 percent.
- Do you believe the oil companies are withholding oil?
Yes, 74 percent.
No, 22 percent.
Undecided, 4 percent.
- Should we use more nuclear power?
Yes, 49 percent.
No, 42 percent.
Undecided, 9 percent.

8. Do you believe nuclear power can be generated safely?

Yes, 59 percent.

No, 36 percent.

Undecided, 5 percent.

9. Should we shift from development of nuclear power to other alternative energy sources?

Yes, 59 percent.

No, 32 percent.

Undecided, 9 percent.

10. Should gasohol be developed?

Yes, 84 percent.

No, 7 percent.

Undecided, 9 percent.

11. Do you believe American agriculture can produce enough additional foodstuffs to produce gasohol?

Yes, 84 percent.

No, 10 percent.

Undecided, 12 percent.

12. What types of Energy Sources would you like to see the Federal Government develop?

(Rate in order of priority, 1 highest).

Coal, 27 percent.

Gasohol, 8 percent.

Nuclear, 10 percent.

Solar, 29 percent.

Other, 4 percent.

Undecided, 22 percent.●

A PROCLAMATION AGAINST IRANIAN MILITANTS

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, with the November 4 invasion of the U.S. Embassy in Tehran by Iranian militants, public opinion in this country was immediately galvanized, and it is no exaggeration to say the current crisis in Iran and all that it portends are being felt wholeheartedly by the American people.

Because we are not accustomed to wanton acts of terrorism directed against innocent American citizens abroad, we were shocked when diplomats assigned to the Embassy in Iran were taken hostage. And many of us still have trouble accepting the fact that the Iranian Government has condoned that action, breaking all diplomatic conventions that govern international relations between countries.

But in spite of our fears and concerns and frustrations, we have withheld violent reaction and tried to maintain calm in the middle of an unprecedented crisis. Americans are responding to the Iranian situation responsibly, and I would like to commend the country as a whole for that.

One of the cities in my district in Texas, the city of Nacogdoches, has appealed to its citizens to protest Iranian action against the United States by flying the American flag until the hostages are set free. Since the American flag is symbolic of all that we as a nation hold sacred, I can think of no better way to mark our vigil for the 49 Americans still held captive.

I respectfully submit for my colleagues' attention the text of the proclamation

CXXV—2122—Part 26

signed by Mr. A. L. Mangham, Jr., mayor of the city of Nacogdoches.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, on November 4, 1979 irresponsible and fanatic citizens of Iran perpetrated upon American citizens in the diplomatic service of the United States, the take over of the American Embassy in Iran, and the holding of such American citizens as hostages against their will since that date in violation of international laws; and,

Whereas, the Government of Iran has condoned such illegal and dastardly acts and has by its failure to take steps to correct such action become an active participant in this cowardly and hideous crime against American citizens.

Now, therefore, I, A. L. Mangham, Jr., Mayor of the City of Nacogdoches, by this proclamation, encourage all the citizens of Nacogdoches and Nacogdoches County to fly the American Flag as a visible means of protesting this unlawful act of the Iranian citizens and their government in holding the American citizens in the diplomatic corp of the United States in violation of international law, and further that such flags be flown until all such American citizens are set free without harm.●

WHY IS THE U.S.A. SO UNPOPULAR?

HON. GERALD B. H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the American people are frustrated and angry over the events in Iran and in other Moslem countries. The new violent outbreak of anti-Americanism has hurt and confused Americans. "Why is the U.S.A. so unpopular?" they ask.

Mr. Speaker, the best expression of these feelings I have seen is contained in an editorial in the Washington County (N.Y.) Post, America's oldest weekly newspaper, on November 8, 1979. The Washington County Post, first published in 1788, is edited and published by Mr. Nicholas J. Mahoney. I offer the following editorial for the consideration of my colleagues:

WHY IS THE U.S.A. SO UNPOPULAR?

A United States citizen is entitled to wonder why this country is so unpopular throughout the world. After the billions of dollars taxpayers have spent to bolster the rest of the world starting with the Marshall Plan in the Truman Administration, one wonders why some of the same countries which have been saved from financial ruin, where famines have been prevented, signs appear which demand "Yankee Go Home."

American citizens give liberally to charitable institutions ranging from the likes of Red Cross to CARE and Catholic Relief Services which feed and clothe the people of distressed countries. Ever since the presidency of John F. Kennedy, members of the Peace Corps have been serving throughout the world to aid in education, agriculture, health, and in a variety of other ways to bring the so-called Third World into the 20th Century.

We know that Mexicans by the hundreds of thousands are constantly poised on the border, ready to sneak their way into the United States. We know that dissident Russians are eager to live here. Immigrants from Jamaica, the Philippines, Cambodia, Viet-

nam, Thailand, East Germany, Cubans, want to spend the rest of their lives in the United States of America.

The world generally knows that America maintains border guards to keep illegal aliens out of the country. It also knows that the communists build walls to keep their subjects from leaving. Those who attempt to escape are shot.

Newspapers recently reported that in the Soviet, the decision has been made to remove all the children from Moscow during the 1980 Olympics. The Soviets are fearful that their children will become contaminated by western democracy.

A great many South American countries are suspicious of us despite the generosity of citizens of the United States in going to their aid during disasters. We are looked upon as imperialists although no effort has been made to annex any South American territory and we are in the process of giving to Panama the canal which the United States created and has maintained since the days of Teddy Roosevelt.

Our country defrays the bulk of the costs of the United Nations, maintains an army and pays most of the expenses of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for the protection of Europe against the threat of the Soviets. America maintains an army in South Korea for the protection of that country. We fought a bitter war there to prevent it from being swallowed by communism. We stand as protectors of Japan and Southeast Asia generally.

The latest country to vent its spleen on us is Iran where about 70 Americans were taken hostage in our own embassy to be held until the former Shah of Iran, undergoing medical treatment in New York City after having escaped from the country he once ruled, is returned for trial. Iranian students captured the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor and dangled propaganda from the crown. Their action prevented thousands of Americans from visiting their own historic landmark. What happens to such students? Do they get deported?

Other Arab countries are hostile to the United States.

The United States guarantees the protection of the Panama Canal and maintains a base at Guantanamo, Cuba, to thwart any invasion of South America.

Even western European countries who do not spend as much money to protect themselves as we do to protect them, are critical of us. Among other things, they consider us to be wastrels.

It is obvious that throughout the world, we will win no popularity contests.

The average American wonders why.

Is it because those who represent us in foreign countries are arrogant? Is it because our propaganda is second rate?

How is it possible for a people who have done so much good for so many, whose country has sacrificed so many lives for the protection of others, who have risen in affirmative response to almost every disaster in the world, who seek no additional territory, who maintain the flaming torch of liberty, who grant sanctuary to thousands of persecuted people, to be so unpopular?●

RUSSELL SAVILLE

HON. RALPH S. REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, with the death of Russell Saville,

the House of Representatives gallery lost one of its more familiar faces and one of the House's most ardent supporters. Russell had served on various staffs since 1945, when he came to the Capitol as an administrative assistant to Congressman Thomas Morgan. He has served the people of the 16th Ohio District since 1966 as a member of my staff and that of the late Frank T. Bow.

A unique characteristic of Russell was his unflinching devotion to the House of Representatives and particularly to the Capitol building. Most people will remember Russell Saville as the man who almost daily walked the halls of the Capitol with numerous constituents of all ages in tow. Oftentimes he would begin one of his famous tours with six or eight people but, by the time he finished, the group would have doubled in size. Visitors in the Capitol would overhear some of his commentary and tag along for the rest of the tour. Attracting people to him was one of his more charming assets.

Russell managed to breathe life into the marble walls, the bronze statues and the paintings on the walls. He knew all there was to know about this building and the men and women who served here in Congress. The names and faces, the stories and tales of all who have made their mark here were an important part of each of his tours.

Russell loved the Capitol. He could think of nothing better than to spend the day sharing his enthusiasm for it with others. Once when asked if he ever tired of giving the same tour over and over, he responded that tours fed his appetite for the Capitol just as food satisfied his hunger.

"No matter how much I eat in one day," he said, "I'm ready to eat again the next day. I never grow tired of eating, and I never grow tired of the Capitol."

He considered each tour a unique opportunity to impart some of his knowledge and interest in Government on others and help them to appreciate more fully what this country really was.

One measure of Russell's life can be taken from the thousands of Ohio's 16th Congressional District residents who walked with him through the chambers and corridors of the Capitol. Their eyes provided the measurement of the man.

In bidding him farewell, their shining eyes clearly reflected the respect, the admiration, the appreciation and the affection they had for this man who had given them a greater understanding and love of their country and his.

In losing Russell Saville, we have lost a good friend; one with a big heart and a love for this Nation and its people so great that it could fill a room. Fortunately, his love and enthusiasm were contagious. And all of us who worked with him, who knew him or who merely saw him each day as he passed by have been affected.

I can't think of a better legacy to leave behind than devotion to one's Government and a love of its people. ●

THE IRRIGATION WATER CONSERVATION ACT OF 1979

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Irrigation Water Conservation Act of 1979.

It is estimated that, in the United States today, approximately 40 million acres are under irrigation. Without water delivery capability, our great agriculture regions could not realize the significant production of food and fiber for our citizens and export sales to other nations. Irrigation is a crucial part of the production of many crops such as corn, cotton, fruits, vegetables, and nuts.

However, it is becoming increasingly evident that our once-plentiful supply of irrigation water is becoming rapidly more scarce. Increased demand for available supplies by residential users is diverting water away from farmers. During the last two decades, water withdrawals have been increasing at a rate of 3.5 percent a year, thus indicating a need for all users to assure that water is consumed in the most beneficial manner.

Recent estimates show agriculture uses about 80 to 85 percent of the water consumed in the United States. Unfortunately, irrigation methods are not always the most efficient means of distributing agricultural water. Simple surface irrigation has an application efficiency of anywhere from 30 to 70 percent, and a great deal of water is lost through seepage in unlined canals and leaky pipes. In some parts of the country, the cost of water is the only irrigation expenditure, so the farmer has no incentive to increase the efficiency of his system.

For these reasons, I am introducing legislation which will provide incentives for farmers to change their methods of irrigating and thereby reduce water consumption. The Irrigation Water Conservation Act of 1979 would provide an additional 10-percent tax credit to the current investment tax credit for the purchase of certain irrigation works. The grower who purchases this equipment would also have the opportunity to depreciate it over 3 years, and thus have the additional incentive of rapid amortization. The bill defines the following water conservation property as eligible for the credit and 3-year depreciation: (a) drip irrigation equipment; (b) recovery systems; (c) sprinkler irrigation equipment; (d) canal or ditch lining material; and (e) pipeline equipment.

These incentives are necessary because farming costs are high and as a result farmers have been reluctant to purchase new and improved systems. The amount of capital to convert to a drip system is significant, running as high as \$500 per acre. Various components of the system which include emitters are \$3.15 each; plastic pipe at \$7.65 per 100 feet; pumps, filters, and pressure equalizers all substantially increase the cost. If an aver-

age U.S. farm, which is 412 acres, was to convert entirely to a drip system, it would cost the farmer over \$200,000.

Today's family farmer simply cannot afford to borrow that much money, nor has the available capital to invest. This predicament will not improve because equipment prices will only continue to escalate. The drip irrigation equipment is made primarily from plastic. With the unsettled nature of the world petroleum production there is no question that the price for oil will continually increase and consequently plastic products will continue to be more expensive. According to the Department of Energy, imported crude oil has increased \$4 per barrel over the first 7 months of this year and it is expected to escalate even further in the future. Thus, farmers who might otherwise plan on installing a new system are persuaded to repair existing equipment, rather than upgrade for next season, in view of projected costs.

Inflation continues to eat away at the buying power of the farm dollar. Just as equipment costs soar, growers are looking elsewhere to finance their operations and, as a result, farm debt in 1980 is expected to reach \$159 billion—an all-time high. In view of this, most farmers must contend with more immediate and pressing commitments.

A farmer can realize other positive results when a more modern irrigation method is online. Weed growth is often substantially reduced since the uncultured portions of a field's surface never become wet. In the case of drip irrigation, wet and dry soil fluctuations are minimal since the soil stays well aerated, thus increasing the possibility of enhanced yields. Additionally, a grower has the opportunity to apply fertilizers directly to his plants by means of the plastic delivery system. This type of fertilization is more direct, lessens the chance of over-application, and reduces energy costs. Besides saving a great quantity of water, other agricultural-related benefits occur when a more modern irrigation system is implemented.

These innovative systems would be an asset during drought conditions. For example, during the 1976-77 California drought, groundwater tables were substantially reduced to augment depleted surface water supplies. In the San Joaquin Valley, the number of wells nearly doubled as a result of the drought. If advanced irrigation equipment were online, it is reasonable to conclude that groundwater overdraft would not have been so significant.

Two crops which illustrate the amount of water that can be saved by utilizing refined irrigation systems are tomatoes and grapes. According to Dr. Elias Ferreres at the University of California at Davis, a grower who utilizes a drip system on his tomato crops will save over 50,000 gallons of water per acre per year. This means that on an average American tomato farm of 25 acres, 1.25 million gallons of water (3.8 acre feet) will be saved. On one average grape farm of 50 acres, 5 million gallons of water (15.3 acre feet) are conserved.

If we are to make water conservation a national priority—as the administration suggests—emphasis must be placed on rural America to conserve its irrigation water. American agriculture uses approximately 80 percent of our Nation's consumed water. Clearly, the time has come to bring about real and lasting conservation. President Carter, in May of 1977, labeled water conservation as the "cornerstone" of his revised Federal Water Policy. In order to achieve conservation on the farm, members of the agricultural community must be given appropriate incentives.

Although the bill specifically provides benefits for the American farmer, others will realize positive results. Since the installation of irrigation conservation devices would save a tremendous amount of water, it is reasonable to assume the quantities not used could be beneficial for groundwater recharge, municipal and industrial use, and many other uses.

The Irrigation Water Conservation Act provides incentives for farmers to save water by updating their existing systems. It will encourage the use of modern equipment and methods, and will allow substantial saving of water on the farm. The tax credit and depreciation incentive give the grower the opportunity to make the extensive capital investments when he otherwise would not.

Not only would water be conserved, water would be applied directly to the plants, thereby enhancing aeration and reducing weed growth. In addition, farmers would have the potential for lowering energy bills. According to the Government Accounting Office, irrigation accounts for 20 percent of a farmer's energy bill. Since irrigation pumps in many cases would be pumping less water and at a lower pressure, a strong possibility exists for energy savings.

Water is the lifeblood of American agriculture. All too often of late, this most vital resource has been overdrawn, misused, and taken for granted. The Irrigation Water Conservation Act demonstrates an effort by the Congress to focus attention on this problem and provides means to overcome it.●

COMPARING RISKS IN THE 1980'S

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues are aware that, since coming to Congress early this year, one of my primary concerns has been to encourage in Congress an understanding of how important it is that we as a society begin bringing comparisons of risks in areas like energy, environment and technology out into the open. If we do that, we will enable the American people to better understand that almost every major political choice we make in Congress involves a sensible balancing of

risks—the true risks of alternative energy sources, for example.

I believe that much of the impetus for public understanding of comparative risks can and should come from Congress and, toward that end, I have tried to formulate legislative approaches. I have recently introduced a bill, H.R. 4939, which would assist the American people in analyzing technological activities. Essentially, the bill would direct the President's Office of Science and Technology Policy to lead Government agencies in exploring the ways that comparative risk can become an active field of investigation and public education.

H.R. 4939 is an updated version of a bill I introduced shortly after the start of the 96th Congress. The updated bill was introduced on July 24. It is presently pending in the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology.

I think the time has never been riper for bringing comparative risk into public view in Congress and elsewhere. In fact, I was delighted to see that the Washington Post devoted its lead editorial yesterday to this very subject. Entitled, "Everyday Risks," the editorial put its finger on the heart of what comparative risk is all about.

I believe it would be of interest to my colleagues to read this excellent editorial.

The editorial follows:

EVERYDAY RISKS

A quarter of a million Canadians were evacuated from their homes two weeks ago because of a train derailment that released deadly chlorine and phosgene gases. The story made front-page news for one day and was quickly forgotten—which illustrates the strange and often perplexing ways in which society responds to the myriad risks of industrialized living. One can only imagine how bleak the future of nuclear power would be if 250,000 people had had to be evacuated from the vicinity of a nuclear reactor.

What accounts for the phenomenon that produces yawns over chemical accidents and instant headlines about even the hint of a nuclear danger? It is not just a reaction to the ghostly qualities of radioactivity, though that is a part of it. Radioactivity can kill you without your ever having seen, smelled, heard or felt it. But there are also many chemicals—carbon monoxide, for example—that are colorless, odorless, tasteless and deadly. Nor is the difference simply that nuclear energy is relatively new and unfamiliar. Commercial nuclear power has been around for two decades now, and that is substantially longer than, for instance, people have recognized the relationship between chemicals and cancer.

Society, in other words, reacts differently to risks that a mathematician would say were equally grave. Coal, for example, is almost certainly more dangerous than nuclear power if the combined risks of mining accidents, black lung, air pollution, acid rain and carbon-dioxide buildup are considered. But Jane Fonda, et al., have yet to hold an anti-coal rally. We live happily with one technology, the automobile, that causes 50,000 deaths a year—an astronomical figure. And of course there is smoking. The death rate of smokers is double that of non-smokers, regardless of age. And smoking also increases the danger from a variety of other sources: asbestos workers who smoke, for example, get lung cancer at nearly 100 times the rate of their non-smoking coworkers.

People are naturally more willing to accept the risks of a voluntary activity—especially one from which they receive a direct and obvious benefit—than the risks of an involuntary one. But a larger part of the explanation lies in a general public confusion. Recently it has begun to seem as though just about everything is dangerous to your health—nuclear power, chemical wastes, pesticides (which DuPont now advertises as "crop protection chemicals"), occupational hazards, antibiotics in animal feed, air pollution and on and on. Just about everything seems to cause cancer—what you do, what you eat (or don't eat), where you live. In the face of such a systems overload, it is difficult to be very rational.

Are the risks of ordinary living really increasing, or are they merely being advertised better? The answers aren't clear. We are running out of empty space where wastes can be dumped and forgotten. We are also able to measure tiny amounts of chemicals and traces of pollution that would have been undetectable only a few years ago. We have a slightly better understanding of which substances are likely to be carcinogenic, and a much improved appreciation of how closely various parts of the environment interact. In short, we are much more aware of risks that have been around for some time. But it may also be true that, because of more people, more industrial activity and declining natural resources, new dangers are now being generated faster than ever before.

A central theme of the 1980s will be coping with the discrepancy between the technical capacity to generate, detect and measure risks, and our much more rudimentary social abilities to control, accommodate and manage them.●

THE NURSE SHORTAGE

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, congressional moves to cut back Federal funds for nurses' education are usually accompanied by arguments about a surplus of nurses.

Well, there is no surplus of nurses, as many of us can attest. I have personal knowledge of the shortage of nurses in my area, and the Baltimore Sun said on November 18 that "the quality of patient care is seriously threatened" in Maryland by the shortage.

For the attention of the House, I respectfully submit the editorial:

THE NURSE SHORTAGE

Maryland and other states face shortages of hospital nurses so severe that the quality of patient care is seriously threatened. City Hospitals has 80 vacancies, University Hospital has 75 vacancies and Sinal Hospital has 43. The situation, unfortunately, may get worse before it gets better.

Hospital nurses traditionally have been overworked and they often have been underpaid and undervalued as well. That situation was tolerable in a time when patient care was simpler and less demanding and when nurses themselves viewed their work as intrinsically subordinate or even menial. But as nursing becomes a highly sophisticated profession often requiring advanced degrees and medical skills of a high order, its prac-

tioners are much less willing to accept low pay, poor working conditions and menial status.

As a result, many nurses are leaving hospitals for non-institutional nursing or even for different occupations. That, in turn, throws a heavier work-load on the nurses who remain, and a vicious circle is created. Another problem is the difficulty many aspiring nurses have in financing their initial training and later their advanced training—a problem exacerbated by declining federal support.

In the sellers' market nurses now enjoy, pressure is growing on the hospitals for major changes in the way they treat their nursing staffs. Perhaps the most important demand by nurses, and one that may often be justified, is for higher status, including a role in hospital policy-making. Also needed is an expansion of hospital programs for providing advanced training at low cost to their nurses.

Help is needed from government, as well. For instance, the Maryland Health Services Cost Review Commission needs to give more consideration than it has to the sometimes legitimate demands by nurses for higher salaries, and the president and Congress need to re-examine the thinking that led them in recent years to cut back funds for nurses' training. While all of the demands nurses are making nowadays obviously are not going to be met, many of them at least deserve to be taken far more seriously than they have in the past—especially when the alternative could be a serious breakdown in patient care in the nation's hospitals. ●

AGRICULTURE: IT'S AMERICA'S HEARTBEAT

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's No. 1 industry. Our Nation's No. 1 employer. Our Nation's most productive sector of the economy.

Each of these statements describes the bedrock of the U.S. economy—agriculture. And each is being presented nationwide in an exciting new communications program coordinated by the Agriculture Council of America (ACA).

The theme of the program is: "Agriculture: It's Your Heartbeat, America."

I would like to draw my colleagues' attention especially to an outstanding article featured in October editions of the Farm Press Publications (Southeast Farm Press, Southwest Farm Press, Delta Farm Press and California/Arizona Farm Press). It explores through several personal interviews how people in communities all across America are joining together to tell the story of agriculture to the urban public in a unified program being nationally coordinated by ACA.

I think it is important to point out that the basic approach is coordination—not competition—among the many diverse interests in agriculture. This effort includes individual farmers, ranchers, agribusiness employees, and local farm businessmen, the farm and commodity organizations, and national agribusiness firms. They are taking a positive step

together and are achieving tangible results.

The publisher, William S. McNamee of the Farm Press Publications is to be commended for this excellent job in examining grassroots interest and participation in the program. And, certainly the participants in this program are to be praised for their effective efforts in expressing the message—"Agriculture: It's Your Heartbeat, America."

ACA: CAN IT BECOME VOICE FOR AMERICAN AGRICULTURE?

Jack Baldwin is an International Harvester dealer in Greensboro, N.C.

Don Snider is a John Deere dealer in Phoenix, Ariz.

Will Stokes is a Massey-Ferguson dealer in Murray, Ky.

Aside from being farm implement dealers, they all have something else in common. Each is a member of the Agriculture Council of America and they think other dealers as well as all of agribusiness should get behind the ACA to help create a single voice for agriculture.

AGRICULTURE'S VOICE

"I think it's one of the few farm organizations really trying to get the message across to the American public about the true facts of agriculture," Baldwin said.

"ACA is letting them know that the farmer just doesn't put seed into the ground and sit back waiting for dollar bills to sprout."

The ACA message is: "Agriculture—It's Your Heartbeat, America!" And Baldwin thinks it's time this story is told.

FOOD PRICES

"Everytime prices go up in the supermarket, urban people blame the farmer," said the North Carolina dealer. "ACA is telling the true farm story and I think all of agribusiness ought to support the ACA and get this story told."

The ACA is a non-partisan organization of farmers and farm-related businesses created to advance the economic and social interests of the U.S. by increasing the awareness of agriculture's contribution to the community, state, national and international levels through programs of research, education and communication.

That's the way ACA states its purpose.

John Barringer, immediate past chairman of the ACA board, is a Memphis cotton merchant who helped pioneer the organization.

HOW IT STARTED

"Seven or eight years ago, a group of people who understood that agriculture didn't have a real voice came up with the idea of one organization which didn't have anything else to sell but agriculture," he said. "We found out that just about everybody in agriculture had a communication problem."

Barringer said ACA does not involve itself with politics or lobbying.

The current "Heartbeat" campaign is the center of the ACA communications program. It is especially designed for implementation by businesses at the community level.

BASIC APPROACH

The basic approach is to provide members with a comprehensive communications program that can be put to practical and effective use. Packaged in an attractive kit are a wide range of useful materials such as fact cards, posters, bumper stickers, speeches and much more.

The centerpiece of the effort is a special survey called the "Economic EKG for Agriculture USA." Farmers and people involved in farm-related businesses nationwide are being encouraged to express their personal

views on the major issues facing agriculture in the 1980s.

MEMBERS VARIED

Members include not only farmers and implement dealers but local cooperatives, production credit associations, federal land bank associations, commercial banks, farm supply dealers, agricultural media and others.

How does USDA view the ACA?

"They love us," said Barringer. "We give them the exposure they can't get any other way. We have what we call Farm Lines where people are encouraged to call in and ask questions of USDA officials and others. For instance, Secretary Bergland can sit in his office in Washington and take calls and questions from a meeting of 400 farmers anywhere in the country."

And many of these programs are aired over radio which can increase that audience to millions.

DEALER REACTION

Don Snider, the Deere dealer at Arizona Machinery Company in Phoenix, looks at it this way:

"ACA's activity is one of education and one of the best things they have going is the farmer hot line. They have a positive approach where some organizations do not," he said.

"They don't talk boycotts and tractor-cades and that sort of thing which can leave a bad taste in the public's mouth."

"They have a good information program such as films and slide programs. Their whole approach is putting agriculture's viewpoint in front of the public. We support it one hundred percent."

WORK TO DO

Massey-Ferguson's dealer in Murray, Ky., feels that ACA still has a long way to go. "I think they're doing a good job but I'd like to see them put it all together and see more farmers, themselves, get involved," Will Stokes said.

"I'm a fairly new member but I don't see the interest in the organization that there should be. It's going to take more publicity and education. But at least they're making a good effort and I think ACA deserves full support from everybody."

OTHERS INVOLVED

Not all of the agribusiness members are equipment dealers. Harry Dendy is president of the Federal Land Bank Association that serves six counties in central Mississippi.

"The pocket-size fact card included in the Heartbeat Campaign informational folder has sparked a lot of interest for us," he said.

In addition to making them available at the association office, Dendy has been passing out the cards to real estate groups he speaks to.

PRICES COMPARED

"The price comparisons showing what would have happened to certain food prices if they had increased as fast as other necessities over the past 20 years hit the inflation issue right on the nail," he said. "Although people generally recognize food is a good buy, they've never seen the facts spelled out in black and white."

Dendy said that the whole program shows his borrowers that the association has taken responsibility to promote the industry it serves.

"This is very important. Everyone we do business with wants to see the urban public better informed about agriculture. And our association is proud to say we participate in a nationwide program committed to that goal."

GROUP COORDINATION

Jerry Paul Combs, International Harvester dealer in Kennett, Mo., feels that ACA is the

only organization working toward trying to coordinate all other groups into one common purpose—to tell the story of agriculture.

"The National Cotton Council, American Agriculture Movement, American Soybean Association, American Farm Bureau and other organizations are all very fine groups," he said, "but they are working their own programs. ACA can give some correlation to these separate programs."

Combs said that the farm story has got to be told in Washington and to the general public.

SPECIAL PROJECT

That's one thing a project called "Washington On The Line" is trying to do. This ACA program can be conducted with audiences of any size meeting anywhere in the country.

Recently, the annual meeting of the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans participated in the program and asked questions via a special telephone conference call hookup by Sen. Thad Cochran (R., Miss.); Rep. David Bowen (D., Miss.) and Sandy Belden, deputy governor of the Farm Credit Administration.

LIVE SESSION

For nearly an hour, some 500 people conducted a live question and answer dialog on such questions as "What direction is Congress taking regarding the credit needs of farmers?"

"What steps can Congress take to limit the foreign ownership of American farmland?"

And "What's being done to solve the problem by young people getting into farming?"

Not all agribusiness people are one hundred percent sold on ACA. Harold Young is a Ford Tractor dealer in Virginia and he thinks they are doing a fair job "as long as they don't let the chemical companies take it over like they do so many other groups."

But Young still feels that all farmers and all agribusiness should be involved. "I don't want to capitalize on it or benefit from it in a personal way," he said. "We need support from everybody."

ANOTHER REACTION

But his Allis-Chalmers counterpart in Harrisonburg, Va., Harry Rawley, feels ASA is doing a pretty good job of promoting agriculture's position with the consumer.

"It's a matter of education and someone needs to do the job," said the A-C dealer. "We need ACA which encompasses all facets of agriculture speaking with one voice rather than so many groups going their different ways."

BRIDGING THE GAP

Fred Jones, Ford Tractor dealer in Spartanburg, S.C., says he thinks ACA is bridging this gap between the farmer and the consumer.

"From all appearances, it is a good vocal group for agriculture—speaking in one voice. The main purpose is to get the word of agriculture across to urban people and they are doing that."

The John Deere Company heavily supports ACA and encourages its dealers to do likewise. One such dealer-member is Bud Harrington of South Kern Machinery Company in Bakersfield, Calif.

"ACA is primarily a sounding board for agriculture and it's certainly needed," he said.

Harrington agrees that Deere heavily supports ACA from its headquarters and "dealers in turn support it and help get the word out," he said.

FARMERS CONSUMERS

At least one Massey-Ferguson dealer thinks the word should be put out that farmers are the biggest consumers of all and he believes ACA can help do this job.

He's Robert Taylor, manager of Fontenot Motors in Welsh, La. "When farmers start buying \$70,000 and \$80,000 tractors and combines, this makes them pretty big consumers," he said. "But when urban people go to the supermarket, they think that high grocery bill is the farmer's fault."

"Not at all," said Taylor. "When my wife and I went to the store the other night and came out with \$60 worth of groceries, I'll guarantee you no more than \$30 worth was edible. So farmers, as consumers themselves, are not trying to gouge the public. They're just trying to make a living like everyone else."

ASSOCIATION MEMBERS

Taylor said that he belongs to the Jeff Davis Implement Association in Jeff Davis Parish and that this organization is a member of ACA as an association. "I think all dealers are behind it one hundred percent," he said. "We believe in the fundamentals for which it stands."

Taylor said that he passes out ACA literature to customers and others and feels ACA can get the job done if everybody gets behind it.

BIG JOB AHEAD

Don Hargrave was recently elected president of the National Farm and Power Equipment Dealers Association and he feels ACA has really got a big job cut out for them.

He's a White Farm Equipment dealer and his dealership has been an ACA member for quite a while. "It's a real big job to try and update the American housewife's thinking about farmers and agricultural businesses," he said. "But I don't know of any other way to do it."

Hargrave said that in order to keep it free from personal gain, he feels such a coalition of agribusiness and farmers is a must to help get the word across to consumers.

"I think we've all got to support ACA in a big way to get this important job done," he said.

HARD TO PINPOINT

A J. I. Case dealer in Fredericksburg, Va., says it's hard to pinpoint just how good a job ACA is doing but he admits he hasn't done all he can to support the organization's goal.

"It's a very important message that needs to be put across to people," said W. F. McCarty of White Oak Equipment Company. "I haven't done all that I can personally to promote the ACA but I am encouraged by the enthusiasm shown by those people behind it."

McCarty said that people still don't realize what a good buy that food is today, even at the higher prices. "But they shouldn't blame the farmer," he said, "and that's the message we've got to get across to the public."

And, he said, it's a real tough job. But he doesn't know any other way to do it.

Why should others join ACA? Kent Johnson is an Allis-Chalmers dealer in Edinburg, Texas, and he signed up only a week ago.

"If we don't get some sort of unified effort on the part of agriculture, we're in trouble," he said. "In many organizations, the farm-related business is left out in the cold and although I can't say yet if ACA is the way to go, I do believe it could be the best organization farmers and agribusiness may have in getting our story across."

Johnson said that agriculture has to develop a positive attitude and work together for its goals.

CURRENT THRUST

The big feature in ACA's thrust right now is its so-called "EKG Survey," designed to get fresh, grassroots thinking on the major issues facing agriculture. Nationwide results will be tabulated by ACA from its current survey of individual farmers and farm-related businesses and presented to top leaders in Washington early next year.

It should be interesting what these grassroots people have to say and how much attention Washington pays to their comments when formulating farm programs in 1980 and beyond. ●

SEND IRANIAN STUDENTS HOME

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by Dave Farnham of the Lamar Democrat of Lamar, Mo., is a well-thought-out editorial relating to Iranian students—in our country. I take this means to share it with the other Members of this body.

The article follows:

SEND IRAN STUDENTS "HOME"

It's not the Democrat's policy to comment editorially on state, national or international issues unless they directly affect this community.

Just as the goal of this newspaper is to have 100 percent local news content in every edition, the aim remains the same when it comes to editorials. A small daily newspaper's editorials should be as-nearly 100 percent local as possible.

There are occasions, however, when issues with international complications arise which the editors of this space feel so strongly about that they forgo the prementioned editorial objectives and comment strongly upon that issue.

This is one of those occasions.

The issue is Iran. More particularly, the issue is Iran and the policies and attitudes towards the United States which have developed since the overthrow of the Shah's government and the ascension to the throne of the wild, religiously fanatical Ayatollah Khomeini.

The latest evidence that the "government of Iran" has done a complete about-face and lent its support to anti-American fervor in that country is the hostage incident which recently entered its second week.

More than 60 Americans are being held against their will in the U.S. Embassy in Tehran. Why? Because the new leaders of Iran were not satisfied by the killings of those supporters of the Shah who were not able to escape before the Ayatollah claimed guidance of the country.

They want the blood of the Shah himself and because the United States, long an ally of the deposed leader, have accepted him in this country for medical treatment, suddenly the mindless zealots who act with the Ayatollah's support have found a fulcrum for blackmail—the lives of innocent Americans.

This scandalous episode has also resurfaced the question of President Carter's leadership abilities. What has been done to safeguard the lives of the U.S. citizens involved. Not much.

He finally took a step forward Monday by announcing that we would no longer accept oil imported from Iran. But, it was just a little baby step. The Iranians had already threatened to deny the U.S. the 700,000 barrels it receives daily from that country. He simply got the jump on them.

What we have here is a stalemate—only the Iranians hold the trump card—oil.

It's damaging to the confidence of the people of this country to think that a band of bloodthirsty hoodlums backed by the leader of a country which was once a strong supporter can bend us over their knee and give

us a good, publically-embarrassing and deflating spanking—a spanking that's taking place with weapons we probably supplied in the first place. What is the answer? The first one is to the students' demands for the return of the Shah: "Absolutely not."

It would be another signal of weakness on the part of the United States—a signal that would strengthen the Communist nations' hold on the countries they already control and indicate to countries which have formally stood with us that we can't be counted on in a crisis or to stand behind those who have befriended us.

Advocation of force under the present circumstances would be foolhardy. It would almost certainly result in deaths and could possibly lead to another skirmish tainted with the ramifications of another Vietnam.

Economic and educational sanctions may be the best solution. We don't pretend to know all of what Iran depends on us for, but certainly we still export materials and equipment there.

That may be a good place to start but the education arsenal may be an even more startling and painful blow to strike against this still largely underdeveloped country.

What is it exactly we are suggesting? It's simple.

There are thousands of Iranian students in American colleges and universities today. Many are keeping native Americans off the enrollment lists in medical and other professional schools.

We suggest they be tossed out of the schools they are in now—no questions asked or answered—and sent back where they came from.

The educational cooperation between the United States and Iran was a direct outgrowth of the cooperation fostered between our government leaders and the Shah. The Shah is no longer the leader of Iran and that country has turned against us.

Let the United States end its role as the world's "fairy-godmother." People are taking advantage of our good nature. It's every man or country for himself these days and the sooner our leaders recognize this the better off we'll be.

By the way, it might also be a good idea if every other Iranian-born person without U.S. citizenship is sent back on the same boat with the students. Let 'em know we mean business.

Then Iran and the rest of these formerly pip-squeak nations will get the message and start treating us with the respect we deserve. ●

OCTOBER PAY JITTERS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation designed to banish forever the October pay jitters.

This is the problem that has cropped up periodically in the past—and looks like it might recur regularly in the future—as continuing resolutions designed to keep the Government functioning in a new fiscal year get snagged on a dispute between the House and Senate.

This last October 12 more than a half million civilian employees of the Federal Government received only half their expected paychecks. If we had not resolved the problem by October 15, more than 2 million men and women in the military would have received nothing.

Our military and civilian people who staff the Federal Government have a right to complain if they do not get paid on time. They should not be expected to go through the October jitters every year.

Missed paydays are not unknown in our world, of course. Ebenezer Scrooge did not consider his payroll to be a top priority. In Iran, even before the revolution, it was quite common for companies to hand out the monthly pay envelopes a day, few days, or even a week or more late. Nineteenth century sweatshops would often miss paydays. And failing businesses may run out of money, go belly-up and be unable to meet the payroll. But the Federal Government does not—or should not—fall into any of those categories.

The bill I am introducing today is short and to the point. It simply states that if an appropriations bill or continuing resolution has not been passed, then funds will automatically be made available to pay the wages of Government employees. It does not apply to Government programs or nonpayroll expenditures.

Section 1 states that funds are made available to pay salaries at the same level as the last day of the expiring fiscal year. This would not provide pay for promotions or the annual comparability pay increase. However, any such pay raises would be made retroactively once congressional action on a regular appropriations bill or continuing resolution is completed.

Subsection (b) of section 1 says the authority granted in the bill continues until an appropriations bill or continuing resolution is passed that denies funds for such salaries.

Section 2 is language standard to continuing resolutions. It exempts the administration from having to comply with the law on submitting apportionments. The law states that such apportionments must be submitted 40 days before the start of the fiscal year. In the case of legislation of this type, the provisions only take effect on the first day of a fiscal year. It would, therefore, be physically impossible to comply with the 40-day rule.

Section 3 states that the authority of this act can be applied to fulfill obligations made before the start of the new fiscal year to pay a salary in the new fiscal year.

Section 4 states that payments made under this act will be charged against whatever appropriation, fund or authorization is finally enacted into law. In other words, this act does not make any funds available on top of the regular appropriations or continuing resolution process.

Section 5 defines the term "salary" that is used in the other sections. It includes civilian salaries and military pay and allowances. It includes pensions and retired and retainer pay. And it includes such fringe benefits as the Federal Government's contributions toward pensions and medical, dental, and life insurance.

I want to emphasize that the bill applies only to these payroll expenditures.

It would not replace the continuing resolution process because it would not apply to Government procurement or other Federal programs. The legislation is designed solely to address the problem of the October pay jitters.

Members may logically be concerned about social security. These payments are made from a fund and are not, therefore, affected by either the passage or defeat of my proposed legislation.

This year the continuing resolution was held up over a dispute involving congressional pay and abortion. Some may look at this legislation as somehow a statement on congressional pay or abortion. On the contrary, this bill is designed simply to protect Federal employees from facing a payless pay period. No one knows what issue may be attached to a continuing resolution next year or a decade from now. It may be something we have not even thought of today.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is relatively simple and straightforward. I hope it can be acted on speedily in the new year so that the October jitters can be laid to rest before next October.

The bill follows:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) for any day during a fiscal year on which funds are not available to pay the salary of any official or employee of the United States (or any former official or employee of the United States) for which funds were available on the last day of the fiscal year preceding such fiscal year, there are appropriated such sums as may be necessary to maintain such salary at the level of such salary on the last day of the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year during which funds are not available for such purpose.

(b) Funds appropriated by this Act shall not be available for any day during a fiscal year which occurs after the date of the enactment during such fiscal year of an Act or joint resolution which includes appropriations generally for the department or agency which has the responsibility for paying such salary and which makes no appropriation for such salary.

Sec. 2. Appropriations and funds made available under this Act may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 3679(d)(2) of the Revised Statutes of the United States (31 U.S.C. 665 (d)(2)), but nothing in this Act shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

Sec. 3. Appropriations and funds made available under this Act shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred to pay the salary of any official or employee of the United States, or any former official or employee of the United States, during the period for which funds for such salary are made available under this Act.

Sec. 4. Any expenditure made under the appropriation contained in this Act shall be charged to the appropriation, fund, or authorization which includes funds for such expenditure whenever a bill or joint resolution in which such appropriation, fund, or authorization is provided for is enacted into law.

Sec. 5. For purposes of this Act, the term "salary" includes any benefits paid to or for an official or employee of the United States, or a former official or employee of the United States, because of such employment of the

official or employee (including medical and dental benefits, life and health insurance premiums, and pension contributions), any pay and allowances of members of the armed forces, any retired and retainer pay, and any pensions. ●

MORE EQUITY FINANCING NEEDED

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post recently ran a story pointing out that no longer do corporations raise needed money by selling a piece of the action. Instead, business corporations are mainly selling long-term bonds, or borrowing from banks. This heavy debt loading, as opposed to equity financing, is a serious, and troublesome, development.

The article states that many, cash-rich firms are not hurting at this time. But many firms are having to reduce dividends greatly to service long-term debt payment. Some firms, on the margin of profitability or losing money, like Chrysler, find the long-term debt to be the straw to break the camel's back.

A final point is the new firm, or the moderate-sized firm, cannot borrow adequate funds at a reasonable cost, and cannot issue bonds. They need equity capital desperately.

I have introduced legislation that will correct this problem. It would give an incentive to those who own stock in a corporation that raises money by the equity route. My bill would defer taxation on \$1,500 of dividends reinvested in new-issue stock of the corporation. The bill contains several provisions to prevent abuse, and the first-year calendar loss is estimated to be around \$240 million by the Joint Committee on Taxation staff.

Right now, over 60 House Members cosponsor my bill. Chairman AL ULLMAN's tax restructuring bill contains a section embodying my bill.

I would like to insert in the RECORD the full article on corporation financing problems:

FIRMS HUNT FUNDS OFF WALL STREET

(By James L. Rowe, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—Ten or 15 years ago, Suzanne and Gerald Ives—a prosperous, professional Washington couple—used to invest in stocks. But no more. Today nearly all their investment money is tied up in real estate.

Chuck Rich just made his first investment. The 27-year-old film critic and writer for WTOP-Radio bought government securities. They are not alone.

Millions of Americans who 10 or 20 years ago would have purchased common stocks as their primary investments today instead are buying houses, condominiums, government securities, certificates of deposit, gold, or commodity futures.

Eight years of high inflation and high interest rates have driven stock prices down from their overvalued highs of the late 1960s and kept them relatively low. As a result, many individual Americans have found stocks an unattractive way of holding their wealth. Only Americans over 65 years of age are increasing their stock purchases.

Similarly pension funds, which were big buyers of stock in the late 1960s and early 1970s, are devoting ever-smaller portions of their incomes to equity purchases.

Just as individuals and institutions are finding stock purchases less desirable, companies have discovered that selling new stocks is a costly, unpalatable way to raise new funds. "We'd sure like to sell more stock. But as long as our stock is selling at 60 percent of book value (the worth of the company assets), we can't justify it," said William Lowe, vice president for finance at Inland Steel Co. in Chicago.

Instead Inland raises the long-term funds it needs by going into debt or keeping profits rather than paying them out as dividends to shareholders.

Other big companies are doing what Inland is doing. Rather than selling new shares of their stock—which represent a part ownership in the company—they are selling bonds, paying out a smaller percentage of their profits to shareholders or hitting the banks for long-term loans.

Unlike a common stock, where dividend payouts are dependent upon the performance of the company, bonds are long-term debt securities that guarantee the owner a fixed payment every year.

Since 1970, the amount of corporate bonds outstanding has increased by more than \$230 billion, while new stock issues have totalled less than \$80 billion.

Over the same period, companies have reduced their dividend payout rates from about 60 percent of after-tax earnings to 40 percent, according to Johann Gouws, a general partner of the investment banking firm Salomon Brothers.

Banks used to make mostly short-term loans to businesses to finance inventories and the like until revenues were realized. Today a significant portion of our loan portfolio is in long-term loans with seven-year or eight-year time horizons, according to George R. Baker, who heads general banking services for Continental Illinois National Bank.

In 1971, when stock prices were high, companies raised more than 20 percent of their long-term funds by selling new stock to the public. Last year new stock sales accounted for about 4 percent of the net new funds raised by American corporations. A new Conference Board study reports that many major corporations are planning to increase their use of bonds in the next 12 months to come up with outside funds they need for investment purposes.

If it wasn't for utilities, the amount of new stock sold by American companies would be even smaller, according to Jeffrey Schaefer, director of research for the Securities Industry Association.

Much of the new stock sold by utilities is sold by the giant American Telephone and Telegraph Corp., which will raise about \$1 billion this year through a dividend reinvestment plan. About a quarter of AT&T's 3 million shareholders automatically buy new company stock with their dividend payments.

In 1969 the outstanding value of corporate stock was equivalent to 110 percent of the total gross national product, according to Charles Boothe of the Bank of New York. Last year it was down to 45 percent.

New stock sales never have been the primary means by which big companies have generated new capital. But in recent years those sales almost have become an unimportant source of funds to most large companies.

Small companies that might be the International Business Machines of the future, however, often have no alternative but to sell stock if they are to expand. Their profits aren't big enough to provide much in the

way of retaining earnings, banks aren't willing to take the risk and they can't sell bonds. So these companies have to sell a part of themselves to the public. But in this depressed market they cannot, according to one major investment banker.

In 1969, there were 698 companies with a net worth of less than \$5 million each able to sell shares to the public, raising \$1.4 billion in the process. Last year only 21 such companies were able to sell stock, and they generated but \$129 million in capital.

The stock markets—be they formal trading floors such as the New York Stock Exchange or the loosely knit group of dealers called the over-the-counter market—exist in part to facilitate the raising of new capital.

"As a capital-raising mechanism, it just hasn't been working all that well the last few years," said Leslie J. Silverstone, head of Dean Witter Reynolds' Washington office.

The increasing reliance of American companies on debt capital rather than equity capital could become a cause for concern if it continues. "You need an equity base to support debt," said Robert Salomon Jr., general partner of Salomon Brothers. When a company hits a slow period, it can reduce or eliminate its dividends (one of the reasons stocks are more risky), but it must continue to pay interest on bonds or bank debt.

"At some point, the system buckles under the debt," Salomon maintained.

For example, Chrysler Corp. has eliminated the dividends it pays, but still must shell out a hefty amount of income to pay its bankers and its bondholders.

Unless stock prices rise, however, the stock market is unlikely to become a vehicle for new sales of equity by companies. Instead the stock market will remain a financial horse race where individuals or institutions can place bets on the relative performance of an individual stock, but their activity will do little to entice companies to raise new capital.

Indeed stock investors seem to be running faster to nowhere.

Although nearly 6 million fewer individuals own stock today than in 1970 and institutions are pushing less and less of their income into stocks, trading volume is rising.

In 1970 an average of 11.6 million shares of stock changed hands each day on the New York exchange. Last year trading volume averaged 28.6 million shares a day. In the same period, the Dow Jones Industrial average has sunk about 20 percent—at a time when inflation has pushed up prices more than 60 percent.

Is it any wonder that households keep only 12.3 percent of their assets in stocks today compared with 22.7 percent in 1970 and 28.3 percent in 1968?

"You've just got to write off the stock market," argues the manager of a small investment fund.

Not everyone agrees.

Donald Regan, chairman of Merrill Lynch and Co., the nation's largest financial services company, said the nation's equity markets are poised for a substantial recovery. When that happens, companies will find it economical again to sell stocks to raise capital.

"I see in American corporations the greatest undervalued set of assets in existence in the world," Regan said. "Everything else relative to the asset value of American corporations is overvalued: paintings, gold, diamonds, land, timber, etc."

That fact has not gone unnoticed by the companies themselves.

"Companies are finding it cheaper to buy one another than to invest in new facilities themselves," said Boothe of the Bank of New York. If a company is selling for only 60 percent of book value, another company can purchase its stocks at a substantial premium

over current trading price and still come away with a bargain.

"Why buy a new 747 for \$25 million if you can buy an airline and get its fleet for the equivalent of \$20 million a plane?" asked one banker.

Similarly some companies are buying back their own shares. "Not only does it boost our price and earnings per share by reducing the number of shares outstanding, it also reduces the amount of dividends we have to pay out," said the chief financial officer of a company that is buying its own shares.

Some companies even have liquidated themselves: sold off their assets and distributed the proceeds to shareholders.

What has happened? Ten years ago, common stocks were the darling of both individual investors and institutional investors. In 1952 only one American in 16 owned stock. In 1970 it was one in four.

Analysts cite a combination of stocks being overpriced in the late 1960s, the heavy round of inflation and high interest rates that have shadowed the economy since 1970, and tax laws that discourage investors from buying stocks and companies from trying to sell them.

"When you add everything up, it's no mystery why the stock market is performing so poorly," said James Balog, senior vice president of Drexel Burnham Lambert Inc.

Analysts list a host of factors that have hurt the equity markets, among them:

Tax laws that encourage investment in houses—where mortgage interest is deductible—and in tangible assets such as stamps, coins, paintings and the like. "Mortgages are now the largest component of the capital markets," noted Robert Salomon.

The same tax laws that allow companies to deduct interest payments as a cost of doing business but permit them to pay dividends only out of after-tax profits. Furthermore the dividends are taxed again when received by shareholders.

The discouraging impact on investors of the increasing retention of profits by corporations. Unable to sell new stock, companies devote a smaller share of profits to dividends. Because investors have not realized much increase in the price of their stocks, they cannot be comforted by rising dividend payouts. In the last 10 years, dividends have about doubled, while retained earnings nearly have tripled. "It's a self fulfilling prophecy of discouraging people from buying stocks," says Salomon.

High interest rates, which make investing in nearly riskless assets such as Treasury bills and very safe assets such as corporate bonds or high-yielding bank certificates nearly as profitable—and in some periods more profitable—than buying stocks.

Inflation that eats away at the value of corporate earnings and makes the replacement cost of current corporate assets (which the tax laws value at original cost) rise sharply every year.

The growth of pension funds and Social Security which discourages individuals from saving at all.

But probably the most important reason investors—first individuals, then institutions—became wary of stocks was the sharp decline in stock prices that began to occur around 1970.

Investors were lured to the market by the sharp growth in stock prices that began in the 1950s and 1960s and was accompanied by strong economic growth and low inflation.

Common stocks began to seem riskless. And most American investors, be they individuals or institutions, are adverse to risk.

"It's the simple rule of supply and demand," said Drexel Burnham's Balog. "There was a tremendous influx of cash into the equities markets in the late 1960s. The whole

pricing mechanism got out of whack. Stocks were severely overpriced."

As happens with most overpriced items, the stock bubble burst.

"Lo and behold, just when inflation became rampant, stock prices were killing you," Balog said.

Individuals began to get out of stocks. Institutions were slower to do so—today nearly one-third of the stock outstanding on the New York exchange is owned by institutions and 30 percent of the trades are with institutions—but they slowly are moving into other investments as well.

Real estate became the next game. Americans always have preferred to live in their own homes. And just about the time the stock market began to sag the early members of the postwar baby boom began to search for houses.

Housing prices began to climb, and homeowners, aided by government agencies, found that for small down payments they could buy houses, save on their taxes and watch the value of their real estate climb.

According to Federal Reserve Board figures, households had 17.7 percent of their assets in houses worth \$569.7 billion in 1970. Their stock holdings were larger: \$729 billion.

Today households own residential real estate worth \$1.5 trillion—22.8 percent of total assets—while their stocks are worth only \$790 billion.

They also are showing interest in other things such as gold, and in newly formed investment devices such as stock options and financial futures that permit investors to put up small amounts of cash with, the hope of large financial gains.

But the nation's love affair with tangible assets will come to an end just as its love affair with the stock market did a decade ago, many analysts believe.

"It's fine to own a home that keeps increasing in value," said Washington broker Julia Walsh. "But what good is that if you cannot sell it. And we're beginning to see signs of that in Washington right now."

"The young people who have never invested in stocks will begin to realize that they might not be able to sell a stock for quite what they want, but they will always be able to sell it. That's the great virtue of the stock market. It brings together thousands of buyers and sellers," Walsh said.

Indeed liquidity is one of the primary functions of the stock market, according to New York Stock Exchange chief economist William Freund. It is a forum where investors always can exchange their financial assets for cash.

"All we need to change attitudes toward stocks is for enough people to realize that owning things is not always what it is cracked up to be," Gouws of Salomon Brothers said. "For example, antique car sales in a West Coast auction last spring fetched prices far beyond what was anticipated. A 1935 Mercedes which was expected to sell for \$200,000 went for \$400,000. When a similar auction was held here last month, people had high expectations. But only about eight of the 40 cars were sold."

"In our business, people are highly skilled at looking in the rear-view mirror. They haven't noticed that somehow the Standard & Poor's index (of 500 stocks) has sneaked in with a 16 percent return recently," Gouws said.

Drexel Burnham's Balog is not so sure that stocks will rebound. "Unless there is a cut in interest rates or an increase in the reward for investment, Americans are not likely to return to the equities markets," he said. "When inflation is as high as it is, are stocks really a bargain?"

Merrill Lynch's Regan noted that there will

be a big tax debate in Washington in the coming years that will determine whether the laws will continue to penalize savings and investment.

"Half the interest in buying things like paintings and stamp collections is a desire to save in a way that the government won't get you," said Salomon Brothers' Salomon. "If you buy a stock, or put your money in a savings account, they want your Social Security number."

Analysts point out that prices have soared in France, where last year investors were given a tax break for buying French stocks.

Analysts here point out that the reduction in the capital gains tax passed by Congress last year seems to have had some impact on stocks here.

Schaefer, of the Securities Industry Association, pointed out that there was a surge in public stock offerings by small companies in late 1978 and early 1979. During the first half of 1978, only one small company sold stock to the public. In the last half of that year, 20 did. During the first half of 1979, another 16 companies made public offerings. ●

FIRST WORLD AEROSPACE EDUCATION CONGRESS

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the First World Aerospace Education Congress was held in Cairo, Egypt, on October 21, 1979.

We were ably represented by our distinguished colleague from California, Congressman DON CLAUSEN. This was indeed a major historic event and is deserving of recognition by the people of the United States and other countries of the world. Representatives of 14 nations attended this important conference and discussed means of promoting aerospace-aviation education.

I can think of no better spokesman for our body than DON CLAUSEN. His long-time national leadership in the field of aviation and aerospace education is well known to us all—culminating in his having been the recipient of the Nation's highest award in aerospace education—the Frank Brewer Trophy.

The most significant aspect of the Congress was that it provided a forum for nations, which have sometimes been at odds with each other politically, to work together in harmony toward the achievement of a common goal. In this way, the Congress and future Aerospace Education Congresses contribute to international understanding and world peace.

The Congress was opened on October 21 by the World Aerospace Education Organization's President, Kamal Naguib. Dr. Mahmoud Amin Abd El-Hafez, Egypt's Minister of Tourism and Civil Aviation, then read a message from the Congress sponsor, President Anwar Sadat. DON CLAUSEN, as senior American Representative, responded with a personal message to the Congress from President Carter. Our colleague from California presented the keynote ad-

dress—"Aviation Education, a Global Challenge."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert President Sadat's message and President Carter's response in the RECORD at this point:

MESSAGE OF DR. MAHMOUD AMIN ABDEL HAFEZ, MINISTER OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION, ADDRESSED ON BEHALF OF PRESIDENT ANWAR EL SADAT, TO THE FIRST WORLD CONGRESS ON AEROSPACE EDUCATION

The President of the World Aerospace Education Organization, Ladies and Gentlemen, members of the Congress.

It is my privilege to be honoured by President Anwar El Sadat, to inaugurate on his behalf this First World Congress on Aerospace Education, and to convey to you his personal greetings, and best wishes for your Congress to achieve the noble objectives for which it is convened.

Most of you have come from far away to exchange views and experiences, needed to realize the goals of the World Aerospace Education Organization, to promote the methods and practices used in this domain and to help create international standards related to aerospace education.

You have come from far away to foster the interest of the World Youth in the aerospace age, to increase the masses' understanding of aerospace importance for life today and tomorrow, and to help developing countries by conveying to them the experience of developed countries on how to promote aerospace education.

Our generation has lived with the technological advancements in aerospace sciences achieved during the sixties and seventies of this Century. The younger generations will be really affected by those advancements. They will actually live the Aerospace Age. It is the duty of leaders and educators to prepare their minds to cope with the changes which will accompany this new Age.

We know that developed countries have given the subject the attention it deserves. It is now the time of our countries to join the game.

We cannot forget that our country had carried the flambeau of civilization, seven thousand years ago, and we cannot also forget that Egypt was the first to enlighten the way for wisdom and knowledge for the rest of the World, and that its scientists have imagined flying and soaring in the air, thousands of years ago.

Today, our President with his faith in God, and his unparalleled courage, has overcome the obstacles which were draining our resources. He gave his directives to modernize civil aviation services, and he is assigning the human and material resources needed for the education of our youth in aerospace aspects.

We are extending our hands to the World, we are strengthening our ties with international organizations and we believe deeply in World Cooperation.

Our mind is open to exchange knowledge with you in a civilized framework. Our heart is open to welcome you, the leaders of aerospace industry and aerospace education.

I wish you again success in building a new beacon for science, culture and civilization.

I hope, that when you go back to your homes, you will feel satisfied with what you have achieved in the Congress, and that you will keep the best memories about this Country which was privileged to be your host, and which was proud when you selected Cairo to be the site of the World Aerospace Education Organization.

Best regards to all of you, from my heart, and from the hearts of all Egyptians. May

God be with you in your sincere efforts to pave a better future for the human race.

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF PRESIDENT JIMMY CARTER, PRESENTED BY REP. DON H. CLAUSEN AT THE FIRST WORLD CONGRESS ON AEROSPACE EDUCATION IN CAIRO, EGYPT, ON OCTOBER 21, 1979

On behalf of the American people I extend warmest greetings to those attending this first Congress of the World Aerospace Education Organization. We in the United States have long been interested in the concepts of aeronautic and aerospace technology and in their application to the field of education. The transfer of knowledge gained in space and aviation to other fields and the spreading of this knowledge as widely as possible continue to be among our primary objectives.

The National Congress of Aerospace Educators has long been involved with these issues. It has always welcomed observers from other nations at its annual sessions. This first Congress of the World Organization represents a formalization and broadening of that international interest in the field of aeronautics and aerospace education.

Within the U.S. Government we have a specific mandate from the Congress to insure the widest possible dissemination of information gained in the fields of aeronautics and space technology. We also share a keen interest in increasing the participation of young people everywhere in addressing the problems and challenges of space and aeronautics. The world organization promises to make a major contribution toward achieving both of these goals.

Given Egypt's historic and modern leadership role in education, your meeting in Cairo seems especially appropriate. You have my best wishes for a most successful Congress.

I would like to briefly mention a few of the 120 distinguished participants representing 14 nations at the Congress:

Dr. Assad Koteit, president of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

Gen. Jacques Mitterrand, president director general, Aérospatiale.

Mohamad Fathy Taha, president of the World Meteorological Organization.

Knut Hammerskjold, director of the International Air Transport Association.

Dr. Farouk El-Baz, research director, Center for Earth and Planetary Studies, Smithsonian Institution.

John Steiner, vice president-corporate product development, the Boeing Co.

Secor Brown, professor MIT and past president of the CAB.

Dr. Mervin K. Strickler Jr., vice president of WAE0 and former Chief, Aviation Education Programs Division, FAA.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus the attention of my colleagues on the historic and genuinely constructive purposes of this great World Aerospace Congress. This, the first Congress of its kind, can provide both the developing and the developed nations with a new forum for the exchange of ideas and information.

To give my colleagues a better idea as to the importance of the World Aerospace Education Organization, let me briefly state its objectives. These are:

First. To group at the international level, organizations, firms and individuals interested in aerospace education to provide an international forum for exchange of experience;

Second. To promote the methods and practices used in aerospace education and to contribute to the creating of international standards related to aerospace education;

Third. To identify the main trends in aerospace education in the developing countries making use of the experience of developed countries; and

Fourth. To increase the understanding of people everywhere of aerospace importance for life today and tomorrow.

By bringing the representatives of many nations together to work toward the achievement of these objectives, something even more important can be accomplished: A major step can be taken toward the achievement of world peace with freedom.

The achievement of these vital objectives could make the World Aerospace Education Organization a major force for the improvement of international relations throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD at this point the full text of DON CLAUSEN's keynote address wherein he outlines his innovative concept of an "Airborne Freedom Offensive."

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN DON H. CLAUSEN TO THE FIRST WORLD AEROSPACE EDUCATION CONGRESS, CAIRO, EGYPT, OCTOBER 21, 1979

I firmly believe it is providential that we come together for this First World Aerospace Education Congress in Cairo, Egypt.

I further believe it is most fitting and proper to launch this great Aerospace-Aviation Education Initiative in the land of one of the greatest peacemakers of our time—the brilliant and courageous President of Egypt—Anwar Sadat.

In my view history will record President Sadat as the "Statesman of the Century"—recognizing him for his bold and courageous peace initiative here in the Middle East.

To our Egyptian friends we, respectfully, say Shukran Gazlin (thank you) for the steadfast support you have given this outstanding "Citizen of the World." All Americans stand steadfast in support of his timely and productive effort that led to the negotiated Camp David agreement signing ceremony, which I attended on the White House lawn, between President Sadat, our own President Carter and Prime Minister Begin of Israel.

My colleagues in the U.S. Congress share a common conviction—this mutual commitment to stability and peace in the Middle East could prove to be the turning point in world history. A "momentum for peace" was set in motion that day.

Today, as I stand before you, I see another historic event taking place—the launching of the First World Aerospace Education Congress that has the potential of accelerating that "momentum for peace."

As I look around me, it is a pleasure to recognize both old friends and see new faces: WAE0's President, Kamal Naguib, who has done so much to make this great Congress possible.

Semret Medhane, Secretary General of the African Airlines Association who has contributed so much to building commercial aviation on this continent.

My old friend, Dr. Mervin Strickler, Former Chief, Aviation Education Programs Division, Federal Aviation Administration.

Mary Jo Oliver, Acting Chief, Aviation Education Programs, Federal Aviation Administration.

Curtis Graves, Chief, Community Services and Educational Programs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Jack Sorenson, Deputy Chief of Staff for Aerospace Education, Civil Air Patrol.

Dr. Shannon W. Lucid, recent graduate of NASA's Astronaut Training Program.

The signs of our times, as we view the world situation, strongly suggest the time has come for increased cooperation among the Free Nations of the world—a movement where the developed and developing countries start coordinating and integrating transportation systems in order to accelerate the building of better public, private and volunteer sector institutions in these countries.

We need to share and convey the full potential of benefits and blessings that can accrue to the people of the developing countries if they associate with this free institution building effort.

In particular, I want to transmit this message to the young people of the world.

Open your minds, open your hearts and open your eyes to the unlimited potential available to all of you that choose to participate in this "Airborne Freedom Offensive."

We can forgive the child for being afraid of the dark but the great tragedy of our lifetime is when grown men and women refuse to see the light.

Our challenge is to broaden the perspective of the people in the developing countries of Africa, Latin America and Asia by acquainting them with the great value of building public, private and volunteer sector organizations and institutions designed to maximize the participation of people in the process.

Functioning democracy is a continuing experiment in the governmental process which places the strongest emphasis on Government Of, By and For the People. A properly structured public sector makes this possible.

The Free Enterprise System is the "engine of productivity" from which fund sources are derived to support the public and volunteer sector institution building effort.

The dreams and aspirations of millions of Americans, and other people in the developed countries have been realized through the evolutionary free institution building effort.

There are advocates in the world of a closed-controlled society.

We want to be associated with the free and open society concept where basic human needs are addressed and the dignity of the individual is recognized and meaningful.

The airplane is one of the greatest tools for meeting human needs. When used as the basis of a rapidly developing communications and transportation network, the aircraft can significantly contribute to the meeting of basic human needs such as food, shelter, and clothing. Clearly by helping nations meet their basic needs, the airplane can help provide the political, social and economic stability so vital to achieving peace in the world.

The most successful efforts are those which involve the people themselves. The aircraft is an invaluable tool to accelerate the community and institution building concept to help the people help themselves.

As we review the great technological and engineering achievements in the aviation and space programs over the past decades, we must applaud the great talents among the people responsible for these accomplishments. Also, we must recognize the tremendous contributions made to our communications and transportation systems throughout the world. The potential to benefit mankind is seemingly unlimited. Conversely, the potential to destroy mankind still remains as the most frightening thought of our time.

It is to this end that I should like to address a few remarks.

Many of us in America with extensive aviation backgrounds have seen the general aviation fleet grow from a few small 40-horsepower Piper Cubs to our present-day equipment where business now recognizes the company aircraft as an indispensable tool in the promotion and expansion of its enterprises. The flexibility and general utility of scheduled and nonscheduled aircraft have increased trade areas to be served and permit highly competent executives to expand their talents and opportunities to regions heretofore considered to be inaccessible.

In our recent past, there has been a pre-dominance of concentration on programs to increase the speed of aircraft and space vehicles. In the 60's, I stressed my concern to the American aeronautical community that we were concentrating on programs to increase the speed of aircraft and space vehicles but were making an inadequate commitment to STOL/slow flight aircraft. I am firmly convinced that not enough attention has been given to how slow we can fly an aircraft, even though great progress has been made.

Rapid transportation in rural areas and locations with limited access have caused spectacular growth in general aviation in almost every country in the world. Most nations have remote areas that cannot be efficiently reached by any other means than through small, slow-flight aircraft. As I am sure Monsieur Miterand knows, there are alpine areas in France which rely heavily on general aviation for transportation. And this is particularly true of my area of the United States.

As a matter of fact, the use of aviation by emerging nations is of particular interest to me because the geography of the part of the United States I represent in Congress has many similarities to that of emerging nations. The people of my Congressional District are widely dispersed through large rural areas. Quick transportation of goods, services, and people from one end of my Congressional District to the other takes place by air. We are using aviation extensively just as the emerging nations are using aviation extensively. It appears that industrial and rural nations alike need general aviation.

I would also like to see the revival of an Arab Aerospace Education Seminar similar to the one held 6 years ago initiated by Kamal Naguib and adopted by the President of the Civil Aviation Council for the Arab States. At that time, Mr. Mohammed El Hakin, the most knowledgeable man in the Arab world in the aviation field, was President of the Council. It is clearly conceivable that a similar educational effort can have application to all of the countries of the continent of Africa. In addition, I have participated in events to similarly advance this concept in the Americas.

We all need aircraft that will permit access to remote sections of the world. Developed nations can share knowledge and know-how with the developing nations through the expanded use of aircraft.

Developing nations can profit greatly from the use of the Economic Growth Center concept. By geographically concentrating business activities, more land will be preserved for agriculture. The key to success of these centers in sparsely populated areas is transportation, particularly through the use of aircraft. I'm convinced that many developing nations will advance their social and economic well being through the early establishment of a coordinated and integrated air transportation system.

With the overwhelming needs of the world and the staggering costs involved, it demands our consideration of the most effective and efficient means available, with primary emphasis on promoting self-sufficiency in the environment people live. The lack of adequate roads and tax sources or funds to build them, points to the need for expanded use of aircraft. But, financial restrictions also limit the size and quality of airports—pointing again clearly to the dramatic need for slow-flight aircraft.

The importance of aviation to our area of the United States has made us see the importance of fostering aviation education. Just as aviation is vital to our area, so is aerospace education vital to the future of aviation. The growth of aviation demands a continuing supply of qualified men and women to work in its ranks.

There are, however, additional benefits to be realized from a dynamic aerospace education program beyond having capable aircrews and ground support staffs.

Aerospace education has proven its ability to provide previously disinterested and unsuccessful students with that vital spark we call motivation which makes them productive members of our society. I have seen, at first hand, this fantastic transformation change a backward and indifferent youth into a dedicated and enthusiastic graduate and member of the aviation family.

Why? Because aviation gave that student the added spark of excitement, motivation, and interest that was so badly lacking in his life. Suddenly, otherwise dull subjects such as mathematics and science, physics and geography took on a new and exciting meaning.

Based on many years of personal experience with aerospace education, I am firmly convinced that it is not only an effective and viable "anti-drop-out-tool," but also a highly motivating force that will provide the kind of a challenge that many young people so desperately need early in life.

I predict that aerospace education is going to be ever more widely taught in the world's school systems. Where yesterday's schools taught Latin or Greek, today, driver education is prevalent in many areas. Tomorrow, aeronautical training will come to the fore and may even become essential in some areas. There is little doubt about the need for aviation and aerospace education in today's schools, if only to instill in the student an understanding of the problems and potentials of aviation in this expanding new aerospace age.

Now how do we go about introducing today's student to aerospace education?

One way is by placing a flight simulator in each elementary and secondary school in our respective countries. This is a fine way to introduce young people to the techniques of flight.

Much more can be done to foster aerospace education. The way to do this is through extensive and innovative use of "available resources."

Look around you. There are numerous sources of aerospace information in every nation. You can find them in the private sector and in the public sector. They exist in commercial airlines, in aircraft manufacturing firms and in small general aviation companies. You will find them in government agencies, both military and civilian. The sources and opportunities are virtually limitless.

As an example, I am proud to be the author of legislation enacted by our Congress which establishes a program to encourage the use of available resources in my own country. This plan requires the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to establish, "within available resources" a

civil aviation information distribution program. The legislation requires the program to be designed to provide state and local school administrators, college and university officials, and officers of civil and other interested organizations, upon request, with informational materials and expertise on various aspects of civil aviation.

Note that in drafting this program, we did not just provide for the establishment of a repository of information but rather an information distribution system. Information has no value unless it is placed in the hands of the people who can and will make good use of it.

Now what is the best method of establishing an effective aerospace information distribution system?

In my home state of California, we found that the task force approach was highly successful. Our task force, which I was honored to chair, assembled many of the finest minds in the state in every phase of aerospace education. And we did it without the expenditure of public funds.

Let me suggest the establishment of these aerospace education task forces by neighboring countries which are geographically contiguous to each other. By gathering the best people in the aerospace field from the nations of a common geographical area, which face common aerospace problems, much can be achieved in advancing aviation education.

The procedure used in California and the United States was successful because of years of free institutions building. While this approach was possible in our country, similar efforts in other nations will clearly have to be structured to fit your own situations.

We will share with you the information we have developed, and I hope this Congress can serve as a forum for a continuing dialogue in the years ahead.

In the United States, we have enjoyed the benefits of a positive and evolutionary process throughout the past 200 years.

We started with an Agriculture Revolution then came the Industrial Revolution. In more recent years, the Technology Revolution. And, now we're entering the Knowledge Revolution.

We're disseminating knowledge and information about our agricultural and industrial technologies through the expanded use of our communications and transportation technology. We are prepared to share this knowledge and know-how with the people of the developing countries.

All that is required is for those people to prepare themselves, educationally and institutionally, to take advantage of it.

There are three documents which amplify these concepts that I'd like to make available to you:

The Report of Governor Reagan's Task Force on Aerospace-Aviation Education which includes my speech given in New York City on the merits of aviation education in schools.

My speech "Slow Flight in a Peace Offensive."

My remarks on the "Growing Crisis of the Lack of Airports" which details the need for a national plan of integrated airport systems.

As we look to the future, "the Cooperative and the Corporation" concept of enterprise development can and will play a dynamic role in the free institution building process.

They provide the organizational structure for the human and financial resources needed to responsibly develop our natural resources for the benefit of mankind in our quest for economic and social progress and the improved standard of living we all seek.

This is in keeping with the Creator's master plan. As his children we have a special responsibility to utilize our advancing technology in communications and trans-

portation to carry forward his work. This World Aerospace Education Congress can become the instrument through which we carry out his plan. Our guiding principle for this effort must be the Golden Rule, "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you."

Clearly, we, the United States of America, do not have all the answers. We, too, have our share of problems to resolve. But, we have gained valuable experience from our continuing experiment with functioning democracy for the past 200 years.

By launching an "Airborne Freedom Offensive" through the implementation of Aerospace-Aviation Education programs in our respective countries, we can all become "soldiers of peace and stability" throughout the world.

This is not to suggest that we will ever let down our "Security Guard" for the protection and preservation of Free Systems but rather to indicate our desire to mobilize the non-military capabilities—economic trade, knowledge and information distribution, institution building and technology advancement—into a "Freedom Offensive."

What noble task could we undertake? Today, we have the awesome potential of destroying the world with our advanced weapons systems.

But, today, we also have the communications and transportation technology potential to build a better world.

It is my fervent hope and prayer that we capture this moment and all its meaning.

By dedicating ourselves to the cause of peace, with freedom and justice for all;

By dedicating our Aerospace Education efforts toward the countries of the world desirous of building freedom and free institutions for the progress of mankind; and

By proving conclusively that the airplane can be used more constructively as a "tool of peace" than destructively as a "tool of war."

My experiences and efforts have been shared and coordinated with many of America's outstanding aviation leaders and pioneers, many of whom are here today. I am but a "small cog in the wheel" of the extensive Aviation-Aerospace Enterprise.

We believe the lessons we've learned have potential application to the newly developing countries—much of which is already underway.

But this is just the beginning. We have only scratched the surface. The highest ideals and greatest aspirations of people will never be realized or supported unless they fully comprehend how aerospace-aviation equipment and technology can provide solutions to our most pressing domestic and international problems.

The threats and dangers of our nuclear age have brought us to a point in history where those people and nations who believe in retaining and advancing the cause of freedom and free institutions can no longer afford to "remain in ignorance" of the great problem-solving capabilities our aviation and aerospace technology can provide for us in the social, economic, political and security fields of endeavor.

The key to our survival and quality of the life we all seek requires a commitment to this effort.

Together, we can accelerate the Free Institution development process.

This is the challenge to the young people of the world.

This to me is what this First World Aerospace Congress is all about.

DON H. CLAUSEN

Congressman Don H. Clausen (R-Calif.) was awarded the Frank G. Brewer Trophy for his efforts in furthering aviation and space

education. The Brewer Trophy, sponsored by the American Society for Aerospace Education and administered by the National Aeronautic Association, is awarded annually for the most outstanding contribution to the development of aerospace education.

The Brewer Selection Committee met in Washington, D.C. on March 3 to review the nominations for the award. Congressman Clausen was cited for his "Outstanding leadership and performance in a number of activities in furthering aviation and space education, including Chairmanship of the California Task Force on Aerospace-Aviation Education. He also authored federal legislation establishing a civil aviation information distribution program designed to provide state and local school administrators and college university officials with informational materials and expertise on various aspects of civil aviation."

Congressman Clausen is the first elected public official ever to receive the Brewer Trophy. The Selection Committee members, distinguished aviation and aerospace education and government officials appointed by the President of the National Aeronautic Association, commended Clausen for his several decades of leadership in aviation education as a public official and aviation businessman. His efforts in making aviation education a part of the curriculum of local schools in California and his leadership in assuring nationwide adaptation of such programs was an important part of Clausen's selection. The Committee also cited his innovative Congressional leadership role in helping to create and assure passage of Public Law 94-353 and authorship of Section 21, Appendix B of the Aviation Development Act which stimulated a nation-wide aviation education and information distribution program.

Clausen was a U.S. Navy pilot during World War II. He is an instrument rated commercial pilot, has a flight instructor's rating, and was a CAA pilot examiner. Among the highlights of his leadership role in aviation education he was an early advocate of placing flight simulators in school classrooms, he has been a strong supporter of women's aviation organizations, established aviation education programs at several colleges and high schools, cosponsor of legislation recognizing the contribution of Women's Air Service Pilots (WASPs) in World War II, member of the Advisory Board of Embry Riddle Aeronautical University, served as President of the Congressional Flying Club, and coordinated aviation education programs through established educational facilities.●

THE IRANIAN SITUATION II; THE SOVIET STAKE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy in Tehran has touched the hearts of all people in our Nation. There is a growing awareness that our policies around the world have led to the present crisis and that our past lack of resolve has put innocent lives in jeopardy. We all know that the issues involved in the embassy takeover and the hostage situation have little or nothing to do with the fate of the Shah. The ayatollah is using the Shah as a vehicle to con-

solidate his precarious hold over the mobs in the streets and to divert attention from his own inability to govern a complex oil-based economy.

These facts, however, do not bring the hostages home safely nor do they solve the deep rift between this Nation and Iran. If the domestic violence in Iran or even the turbulence of the Shiite sect were the only issues involved even the blundering Carter White House might be able to meet the challenge thrown on our doorstep. However, other forces are at work in the Middle East.

The Soviet Union has been desperately trying to regain its ability to act in the region since Egypt wisely threw the Communists out. Recent activity by the Kremlin in the region points to a pattern far more ominous and far-reaching than Moslem violence. If the United States is going to assure its future use of Arab oil and prevent the Red Sea or the Indian Ocean from becoming a new holding tank for Soviet naval might, it must realize that other events are happening in the Middle East that may prove America's undoing in light of Iran.

The entire southern border of the U.S.S.R. has been a focal point of turbulence for some time. The first wave of diplomatic violence directed against the United States happened in Afghanistan, not Iran, in 1979. Ambassador Adolph Dubs was kidnapped—and then killed by terrorists. At that time, there were already growing signs of Soviet support for the Marxist dictatorship that had taken control of the nation. Throughout the year, the United States refused to aid the growing rebellion against the government or against the Soviet presence. The State Department, so quick to applaud the downfall of Somoza, was silent on any questions dealing with the future of freedom in Afghanistan. Today, with Iran and Pakistan, both neighbors of Afghanistan, seeing anti-American violence, the new events inside this pivotal country take an important meaning to the future of the United States in the region.

The Soviets have recently established military bases at Farah and at Shindand towns very close to the border with Iran. In addition to this military presence, the Soviets have spent \$6.7 million on supplying the new internal security police force for the Amin's government. Another \$500 million is being used by the Soviets to stimulate the Afghanistan economy. In other words, this strategically important country is taking on all the looks of a fledgling Soviet satellite complete with over 2,000 Soviet personnel advising, and, in some cases, actually holding office in Afghanistan's economic ministries.

Not content with only a northern presence near the Persian Gulf, the Soviets have been quietly airlifting two complete brigades, about 10,000 men, along with armored vehicles and artillery, to South Yemen. These forces bolster an already commanding presence in both South Yemen and Ethiopia.

If one were to look at a map of the Middle East one would see the Soviet presence in Afghanistan, in Ethiopia,

and in South Yemen, circles the Persian Gulf area. It also effectively closes the Gulf of Aden. At any time, the Soviets could move against any of the crucial oil lanes in the Middle East with overwhelming force. Although the Soviets may decide not to force such a confrontation at this time, the mere fact that they have the capacity provides important diplomatic leverage for them in this vital region. In light of American reversals in the area and the new wave of Moslem violence, the United States should keep these developments in mind as the stakes start rising.

I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an excellent article by Robert Moss, of the Daily Telegraph in London, that provides additional evidence regarding Soviet intentions in the region. Mr. Moss' article makes it very clear why the democracy of Bakhtiar and the moderate Moslem state of Bazargan have both failed in Iran and why no stable, pro-West government will rise there as long as America avoids facing up to all the realities of the situation.

WHO'S MEDDLING IN IRAN?

(By Robert Moss)

Throughout the upheavals in Iran the taboo subject has been the extent of covert Soviet involvement. Leonid Brezhnev, the Soviet party leader, showed his hand the weekend before Thanksgiving by issuing a public warning to the West—published as an interview on the front page of Pravda—not to intervene on the side of the shah. That was the closest the Russians had come in many years to openly declaring their interest in the destabilization of Iran.

Moscow's strategic interest is obvious. Iran is the only state around the Persian Gulf equipped to serve as a policeman of the region. Seventy percent of West Europe's oil passes through the Gulf, along with 90 percent of Japan's, almost all of South Africa's and most of Israel's. If Iran fell under the control of a pro-Soviet or fundamentalist, Qaddafi-style Muslim regime, the consequences for the West would be terrifying.

It is not just that Iranian oil production no longer would be automatically available to the West. The fragile regimes of the Arabian peninsula would be up for grabs.

South Yemen continues to be used as a Soviet base for destabilizing the entire Gulf region, as well as the Horn of Africa. The KGB rezidentura for the area is located at a Russian military complex in South Yemen. In the South Yemeni-owned island of Socotra, the Russians are believed to have positioned the ballistic missiles removed from Somalia after President Barre turned toward the West.

Imagine how the geopolitical scene would be altered if Iran were to swing toward the Soviet bloc. Squeezed as they are between Iran and South Yemen, the feudally governed, thinly populated states of the Arabian peninsula would fall like a row of ninepins.

The Soviets don't deserve all the credit for turmoil in Iran, or even to share it with the local Communist (Tudeh) party. The shah's own experiment in liberalization has helped to release many pent-up forces. The wave of riots and demonstrations since "Black Friday" and the declaration of martial law in Tehran last September have embraced forces as diverse as conservative shopkeepers, recreational mullahs who want to compel women to wear the veil and marry before puberty and trendy university students revolting against middle-class parents.

The shah confronted the classic dilemma

of the reformer in a backyard society accustomed to absolutism. How is it possible to make concessions without giving encouragement and impetus to a revolutionary movement that would sweep away the reforming regime itself?

But even though the shah's problems are mostly self-generated, they certainly have been aggravated by covert warfare waged against him by the Soviet Union and proxy regimes like Libya. The main reason why the evidence of Soviet involvement in Iran has not become generally known is that the shah himself has striven to keep it secret, fearing that the Russians would take even more aggressive measures if provoked. The shah told me when I met him a month ago that he is very conscious of sharing a 1,600-mile border with the Soviet Union. The Russians recently have reinforced their border military presence, which includes a division of Farsi-speaking troops recruited in the southern republics of the U.S.S.R.

I have been able to assemble, from both Iranian and non-Iranian sources, some striking new evidence of surreptitious Soviet involvement in this year's troubles. The Soviet intelligence services—the KGB and GRU—have long been engaged in an ambitious program of espionage and covert action in Iran. The success of the Soviet intelligence services in filling Iran with both professional officers and "illegals" (agents operating under deep cover, often posing as Iranian citizens) is impressive. About 100 Soviet citizens are accredited as diplomats with the Russian Embassy in Tehran and the Soviet consulates in Mashad, Isfahan and Tabriz. In addition, about 4,000 Soviet "technicians" are employed in the country, including about 1,000—some of them identified KGB and GRU officers—at the Aryamehr steel mill in Isfahan alone. There are also about 600 technicians from other East European countries.

The KGB also can make use of many "cover" organizations in Iran, including the Irano-Soviet Cultural Society; the Russian hospital in Tehran (providing cheap medical treatment for Iranian patients); the Soviet news agency, Novosti; the bureau of the state-controlled Soviet publications; the state-owned Soviet transport company, registered locally under the name of Iran Sutrans; the state-owned Soviet insurance company; and the official Soviet trade mission in Tehran.

The KGB and the GRU can draw on a large supply of Farsi speakers in the southern states of the U.S.S.R. There are many thousands of peasant families along the Iranian-Soviet border with relatives on both sides, and it is simple to infiltrate "illegal" agents. The Soviet border guards along this frontier, as along all the borders of the U.S.S.R., are responsible to the KGB.

But the biggest manpower reserve for KGB "illegals" in Iran has been provided by the Soviet success in establishing total control over Afghanistan, Iran's eastern neighbor, following the Soviet-supported coup against the regime of Mohammed Daoud on April 27 of this year. There are now about 500,000 Afghans living illegally in Iran, most of them employed as menial laborers, content to work for half the wages of Iranians employed on similar jobs. Their dialects and appearance are in most cases indistinguishable from those of Iranians from the eastern provinces of the country. Afghans were arrested in some of the major demonstrations in Tehran and Tabriz last September and October. This could be interpreted as circumstantial evidence of the involvement of the KGB-controlled Afghan secret service, the Esthabarat.

The KGB also works through members of the Armenian minority in Iran, applying blackmail pressures in the case of those who have relations inside the Soviet Union.

One of the questions often raised about this year's upheaval in Iran is the possible connection between the traditionalist Islamic revolt and the Marxist elements active in the country. An interesting clue is provided by an underground Tudeh party publication called *Navid*, which has been appearing weekly in the streets of Tehran. Unlike the bulletins of other left-wing groups—which are crudely printed and usually only semi-legible—this Communist organ is beautifully typed and printed by offset. Western analysts are convinced that it is printed on an offset press inside the Soviet Embassy in Tehran. The theory that *Navid* is the covert voice of the KGB rezidentura is made more plausible by the fact that it faithfully echoes every twist and turn of Moscow's policy line.

The phrase "Islamic Marxism" was not, as is commonly believed, an invention of the shah or some conservative publicist abroad. It was first used by a leftist terrorist organization, the People's Mujahedeen, which has links with Colonel Qaddafi's regime in Libya. The Russians make use of Libya and South Yemen as middlemen between themselves and extremist religious or terrorist groups inside Iran. Both the People's Mujahedeen and the more effective People's Fedayeen (founded in 1967 and responsible for the murder of the police chief in Mashhad in October) have been the beneficiaries of Libyan finance, weapons and trading facilities. They maintain close links with the extremist Palestinian organizations. Other countries where Iranian terrorists, receive training include Algeria, South Yemen, Lebanon (in the Palestinian camps before the civil war), Afghanistan and Cuba. Until the purge of Communists in Baghdad last summer, Iraq was the primary base for subversion and terrorism directed at Iran. The new line adopted by Iraq's President Bakr this year, however, has led to cooperation between the Iraqi secret service and the shah's secret police, SAVAK. The Iraqis banished Ayatollah Khomeini, the Shiite Muslim leader, for refusing to give up his campaign against the shah's regime and handed over captured Iranian terrorists—including one of the men responsible for the arson in the Abadan cinema last August—to SAVAK.

Afghanistan, under Soviet tutelage, has now become the primary center for anti-Iranian activities. The Afghan foreign minister, Hafizollah Amin, visited Cuba earlier this year where he talked to Iranian guerrillas receiving training there and promised substantial material aid from his country. There have been Western intelligence reports that Afghan agents infiltrated Iran through India and Pakistan, and later were active in sabotage in major Iranian cities. Two new Soviet-supervised training camps have recently been opened in Mazar Sharif in northern Afghanistan, one of them providing Marxist indoctrination courses, the other supplying guerrilla warfare training for recruits from Iran, the Arab countries and the northwest provinces of Pakistan.

It does not take much strategic imagination to appreciate implications for the West of a radical Muslim or pro-Soviet regime replacing the present setup in Iran. The militant hostility of the demonstrators in the streets of Tehran—both religious fanatics and leftists—toward Britain and the United States was symbolized by the partial gutting of the British Embassy and the assault on the American Embassy that was thwarted only by the intervention of hundreds of Iranian troops. The "Islamic republic" that Ayatollah Khomeini is demanding—and whose program for government remains largely a mystery, even to those who have discussed the matter with him in person—might prove to be only a transitional

phase before the imposition of a pro-Soviet regime on either the Qaddafi or the South Yemeni model.

Radical change in Iran probably would be followed before long by similar upheavals along the Arab side of the Gulf. In the absence of the shah's regime, what power could be relied on to intervene in the event of attempts at Marxist revolution in the smaller emirates or in Kuwait? How long would it be before the Saudis themselves would be threatened by a Marxist-inspired subversive campaign that could conceivably be supported—if the Russians were willing to accept the risk of confronting the United States in a direct way—by the intervention of Soviet proxy forces that are now based in South Yemen? These questions have urgency because of the rapid build-up of Soviet-bloc forces in South Yemen, where the control of the unconditionally pro-Moscow faction headed by Ab Fatah Ismail has been consolidated, despite continuing armed resistance inside this country since the overthrow and murder of President Robaya Ali last June. According to sources both Oman and North Yemen, there are now 6,000 to 7,000 Cuban troops in South Yemen a result of recent transfers from Ethiopia. Will the Cubans train and supervise the people's militia in South Yemen, the 2,000 East Germans stationed there, including officers of the East German state security police, train and command the local police and intelligence services. Several hundred Soviet Red Army officers supervise and train the armed forces. Behaving in classical fashion of an imperial power in stationing soldiers from one province in another far away, where they are less likely to be inhibited by local loyalties, the Russians have even arranged the transfer of an Ethiopian battalion to strengthen the defenses of Belhan province in South Yemen, where the coup last June resulted in the defection of the local army commander and other key military personnel by the border into North Yemen. Ironically, with Ethiopian troops with Arabia-speaking officers have taken up their new posts along South Yemen's border, South Yemeni forces are so committed to supporting the Ethiopian regime against the Eritrean rebels—in contradiction to the policies of most of the rest of the Arab world.

It seems to me that the survival of a strong Iran under a government that is willing to adopt a "forward strategy" in the Gulf region is required, must be the linchpin in any realization Western strategy for the containment of Soviet expansion in this crucial area. An oil tanker passes the straits of Hormuz every 10 to 15 minutes. The presence of the Iranian navy in the area and the greatly expanded role that Iranians adopted at the start of the year in controlling air and sea communications throughout the entire Persian Gulf appear to be almost irreplaceable guarantees of Western access to energy supplies.

The Russians have made little secret of their designs on Iran. They occupied parts of the country in the course of two world wars, they were most reluctant to be evicted from northern provinces in 1946, when they organized Communist takeovers in cities like Tabriz. Molotov declared in 1942 that all the territory to the south of Baku fell into Russia's nautical sphere of influence. The quest for warm-water ports to the south has been a traditional goal of Russian imperialism, unaltered under the czar or the Bolsheviks. If Russia ever were to be permitted to achieve control or Iran, the position of Western Europe and other countries, including Israel, would arguably become strategically untenable.

Iran without the Pahlavi regime probably would start out as a fanatical, Qaddafi-style

Muslim regime that would give way after civil war to Marxist elements. This is not a prospect that liberals in the West should welcome. Whatever the failings of the shah's regime, which has undoubtedly been oppressive and corrupt, the alternatives that Iran offers at present are horrendous to contemplate. ●

FAMILY FARM TASK FORCE ORGANIZED

HON. RICHARD NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to announce the formation of the Family Farm Task Force, numbering over 75 of my colleagues in the House and Senate. The Family Farm Task Force was created because of the alarming trends in American agriculture. Farm numbers have decreased from 5.9 million in 1945 to 2.7 million in 1978. During the same period, the number of farm laborers has decreased from 11 million to 4 million. Average farm size has risen from 197 acres in 1940 to 440 acres in 1974. Farm households now receive 60 percent of their income from off-farm sources because farm income alone is inadequate. Concurrent with this trend toward fewer and larger farms is the concentration of farm sales in the large-farm sector; The top 2 percent of the farms received almost 37 percent of total farm sales receipts in 1974, and the top 20 percent of U.S. farms accounted for almost 80 percent of farm sales in the same year.

These trends need to be reversed. American democracy must not become beholden to a few producers of food. A democracy in which there is a handful of dominant producers (whether they produce food, oil, or manufactured goods) degenerates into an oligopoly or monopoly disguised as a democracy, which makes a sham out of representing the interests of all the people. A system of small- and moderate-sized farms gathered around a rural town bolsters the rural economy and provides the tax base for proper health care, education, and general services in our rural areas. An agriculture such as the United States presently has is geared toward more and more production due to a brutal cost-price squeeze; this leads, all too often, to farming practices which mine the land rather than conserve and nurture it. Farmers need better prices for their products to combat this cost-price squeeze; the alternative is greater concentration of farm production and the loss of our soil, which is as important to us as the much more publicized drain on energy sources.

Our survival as a democratic society and as an agriculturally rich Nation depends upon the strengthening of the small- and moderate-sized family farm in America today. The Family Farm Task Force being formed today is a

group committed to helping the family farm, and therefore is committed to the sustenance of a strong America.●

TAX INCENTIVES FOR SMALL SAVERS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, like most of my colleagues, I am receiving a great deal of correspondence from my constituents in support of a tax incentive for small savers. I would like to take this time to make some brief comments on the issue.

I believe the message is clear. Our Nation's decreasing rate of disposable income savings is having a serious and adverse effect on our economy.

The American willingness to save has substantially decreased over the last 10 years. By the end of 1978, the rate of disposable income savings in the United States reached a 30-year low of less than 5 percent. This compares to a 18-percent savings rate in Germany, and a 25-percent rate in Japan. These high rates of savings in other countries are a direct result of special tax concessions or government bonuses paid to savers, which are not offered in the United States.

Without adequate savings, there cannot be sufficient investments in U.S. industry, small business, and home construction. The result is higher consumer prices and increased unemployment.

Unfortunately, our Nation's policies make it very difficult to attract consumer savings back into the banks. After taxes and adjustment for inflation, the consumer is actually getting a negative return on his or her savings account.

At a time when the inflation rate stands around 13 percent, Federal regulations limit the interest a saver can receive on his or her savings account to not more than 5½ percent.

In addition to losing about \$25 a year in purchasing power on a \$500 savings deposit, the money placed in the savings account is taxed twice during the process—once when you earn it, and again when it earns interest. What incentive is there to save?

Recognizing these facts, I have introduced two bills aimed at providing incentives for small savers. The first bill, H.R. 5071, would increase the amount of interest consumers can earn on their savings account.

The second bill, H.R. 4931, would exclude from taxes the first \$1,000 of interest earned on a passbook savings account.

The ultimate effect of both measures would be to reduce inflation. Since increased savings means increased capital investment, there would be a boost in productivity, and an overall economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have spoken on this important issue. I am confident that the Congress will respond in a prompt and responsible manner.

At this time, I would like to insert a recent Sylvia Porter column discussing this issue in more detail. The article appeared in the October 29, 1979, edition of the New York Daily News:

EXPECT A BIG PUSH TO MAKE SAVINGS TAX-EXEMPT

For the first time, you who have had no first-hand experience with the Great Depression of the 1930s, are a majority of our nation's voting population.

More than five out of 10 of you (56 percent) 18 years or older were born after 1935. For you, the economic catastrophes which directly affected us, your parents—the stock market crash, bank failures, skyrocketing joblessness—are tales out of a distant past.

You never will fully appreciate why we fought so hard for laws to protect our nation from ever again undergoing this traumatic event, why we so deeply approved of the so-called work ethic and why we tried so hard to build at last an emergency savings nest-egg.

Instead, your daily lives and habits have been shaped in an era of sharply rising taxes and prices—forces pushing you to spend rather than save. And as an average U.S. worker, you do pay 25 percent to 35 percent of your income in taxes to government. Social Security taxes rather than income taxes take the biggest bite out of your incomes, if yours is a family earning less than \$11,000 a year—or even if your family earns above this level.

With so large a percentage of your earnings going out in taxes and to pay for ever more expensive goods and services, your incentive to save is steadily shrinking. At latest report, you were saving only slightly more than 4 percent of your after-tax income, the lowest rate in decades, against a Japanese savings rate of 25 percent and a German rate of about 18 percent.

If the U.S. economy is to return to a healthy rate of growth and "real" wages and incomes are to resume rising, these trends toward undersaving and overspending must be reversed.

"If we don't increase our growth rate to the point where taxpayers see their standards of living improve, they'll start to turn on the less fortunate in our economy," predicts Michael Boskin, Stanford economics professor. Boskin, 33, is one of the young economists who believe the answers to our sluggish growth and persistent inflation lie in stimulating savings and investment, while reducing taxes and government spending.

The chronic inflations of recent decades can't be curbed by the old, depression-born remedies aimed at influencing people's demand for goods and services, the young economists insist.

These techniques are simply not geared to today's problems, even though many economists over 40—including some who hold influential government posts—still advocate them. The younger group argues that the key to higher productivity, improved "real" wages and long-term economic prosperity rests with the supply, not the demand, side of the economy.

The single, most important move the U.S. government could make now to spur savings and investment, spokesmen for the group told my associate, Brooke Shearer, would be to eliminate the taxes individuals must now pay on their savings accounts.

This alone would remove an enormous barrier to saving. The combination of interest rate ceilings, inflation and taxes means that most Americans who save actually lose money by saving, says Boskin. This is particularly pertinent to the elderly who have more savings in relation to the rest of the American population.

Eliminating taxes on savings accounts of

all sorts would hike the average saver's return by 40 percent and result in a \$30-\$40 billion rise in personal savings a year.

The larger supply of savings would drive down interest rates over a period and make long-term capital investment more appealing. A larger stock of capital—more tractors, say, per farmer—would in turn make workers more productive and help increase wages. After 10 years or so, tax revenues would rise along with higher wages.

The arguments of this younger school of "incentive" economists are getting an ever more serious and sympathetic hearing in Washington. The Joint Economic Committee of Congress issued a report recently supporting the general view that the economy faces major supply problems. More and more Senators and Representatives in Congress are backing measures to encourage savings and investments—including tax-free savings.

It may be a sleeper now. But it's increasingly realistic to expect a big drive for tax exemption on at least part of your savings—and it's not unrealistic to expect the drive to succeed.●

THE WORST IS YET TO COME

HON. GERALD B. H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, from the time of Lenin, Soviet leaders have been great admirers of the German strategist Karl von Clausewitz who reminded us that power is more than the capacity to destroy. It is also the capacity to influence. His maxim that "war is the continuation of politics by other means" underscores the fact that the exercise of political influence in peacetime is always one of the primary purposes governing force deployments.

Recently Soviet leaders have announced their belief that the world's "correlation of forces" has shifted strongly—and perhaps irreversibly—in favor of the "socialist camp." They point to the U.S. defeat in Vietnam, the lack of U.S. support for Angola, the U.S. acceptance of Soviet numerical superiority in SALT I, as well as the rapidly growing kaleidoscope of recent events: Soviet troops in Cuba; Soviet and Cuban support of Ethiopia against Somalia; the Communist coup in Afghanistan and South Yemen; Vietnam's invasion of Cambodia; the massive buildup of Soviet conventional and strategic arms given international acceptance through U.S. behavior and codified in SALT II; the Shah's overthrow in Iran; the dramatic seizure of the American Embassy and the holding of hostages in Iran; the burning of the U.S. Embassy in Pakistan; the increasing uncertainty of events in Saudi Arabia; the increasing destabilization of Rhodesia and South Africa; and the guerilla drive from the Western Sahara against the King's troops in Morocco aimed at dominating the narrow waters opposite Gibraltar. Geopolitically speaking, the land areas crucial to the control of the "chokepoints" of the world's waterways are moving outside Western influence. To an impartial observer, it is increasingly apparent that

the tide has begun to shift against the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that we are witnessing a dramatic decline in influence of Western nations worldwide. Fundamental changes are in the making, changes which if go unheeded could well bring about our demise.

Mr. Speaker, the collapse of Europe in 1945 as the power center of the world radically transformed America's position worldwide. Forced to fill the vacuum, the United States became the reluctant inheritor and leader of a world order dating back to the beginning of the modern state system. Overnight, the international system became the American system and our economy and institutional life became inextricably connected with events around the globe. For over 30 years, this system prospered and the only threat to its survival—Soviet military and political power exercised in peacetime—was successfully contained.

Today, with the increasing destabilization of Third World countries and the growing "Finlandization" of our NATO Allies and Japan, some observers have declared that "the American era is passed."

Whether this judgment is correct or not can be debated. What cannot be debated is the fact that all the aforementioned events are linked—either by design or otherwise—to the central core of Soviet grand strategy and the increasing vulnerability of the United States to its design. The present international system is based on an order and stability conducive to both American, and ultimately Western, values, and interests. To survive, the United States must preserve international stability by having a decisive influence on the general course of events worldwide.

The Soviet objective, however, is different. Not unlike Soviet naval strategy which aims at sea denial—as opposed to U.S. naval strategy which seeks control of the seas—Soviet grand strategy aims at destabilizing the present world order so as to deny U.S. access to strategic areas around the Eurasian-African Rimland. With such a strategy, the Soviet Union does not have to control vast territories with the often insurmountable problems that entails. Nor does it have to commit its own troops and equipment. Rather, through the use of proxy troops in conjunction with carefully planned covert activities, it needs only foment minority discontent and undermine the legitimacy of existing regimes. In short, it is through the exercise of power in peacetime that Soviet grand strategy seeks the destruction of the American system of international order as a prelude to the final emergence of a new world-order, Marxist inspired, and Soviet controlled.

Viewed in this light, the recent events in Iran—and elsewhere—can be viewed as a Soviet victory. Access denial can only have consequences of catastrophic proportions to America and her allies. For without access to the vast areas of the globe, the entire world we now know and depend upon could well become hostile and force the eventual destabilization of the United States itself.

Against this background, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to an article appearing in the Wall Street Journal November 26, 1979, entitled "The Worst Is Yet To Come" by Irving Kristol, professor of Social Thought at the New York University Graduate School of Business and a senior fellow of the American Enterprise Institute. Mr. Kristol analyzes the basic relationship foreign and military policies will have to the problems of our domestic economic policies during the coming decade and beyond. Quite rightly, he points out that our very ability to survive—not only in an economic sense, but more fundamentally, in a political and institutional sense—is contingent upon the success with which we confront the growing destabilization that is occurring around the globe. As he says, "the truly important problems of the American economy will result from things that happen elsewhere in the world, things that will profoundly affect us and to which we shall have to respond."

I enthusiastically commend the article to my colleagues as follows:

THE WORST IS YET TO COME

(By Irving Kristol)

The 1980s have already begun. They began with the takeover of the American embassy in Tehran earlier this month and with the subsequent confrontation between the United States and a virulently anti-Western Iranian regime. This episode is, as it were, the shocking prologue to an equally tense drama that stands poised to unfold in the decade ahead. It promises to be an absolutely ghastly period.

These past years have been dominated by problems of domestic economic policy—of maintaining economic growth in the face of inflation, stagflation, high rates of taxation, governmental overregulation of business, etc. Even OPEC has been regarded as primarily a phenomenon within the economists' universe of discourse, and the arguments have centered around the kind of economic policy that would be most appropriately responsive to the new level of energy costs.

On the whole, and from this same economic perspective, we have managed these problems rather badly. The cast of mind shaped in the 1960s—one which perceived the United States as an "affluent society" whose major challenges were achieving a better "quality of life" and a "fairer" (i.e., more equal) distribution of entitlements to wealth, income, and opportunity—was quite unfit to cope with the bleaker realities of the 1970s, and we were very slow getting on a new learning curve.

THE ROLE OF FOREIGN POLICY

More recently, however, there have been hopeful signs of progressive adaptation to these realities, an increasing recognition of the need for economic policy to spur economic growth instead of being indifferent or hostile to it. But one senses it no longer matters quite so much. For it seems clear that in the 1980s it will be foreign policy, not domestic economic policy, that will be decisive for economic growth, and for our destiny in general.

If the 1970s were dominated by considerations of domestic economic policy, the 1980s are going to be dominated by considerations of foreign and military policy. The two are not unrelated, of course—and, indeed, in the case of oil they are most intimately related. But a whole new set of priorities will have to be established, as we come to grips with the fact that the American

economy does not exist in isolation from world politics.

Take, for instance, the issue of inflation which President Carter now says is the most important economic problem facing the nation, a proposition that is heartily assented to by conservative economists and Republican politicians. They are almost surely wrong. Two years ago they would have been right, but not now. Today it is military rearmament that is the first priority, economic as well as political. And if there are going to have to be massive increases in military spending, then we shall have to put up with more inflation, for a longer time than any of us would like. Should the rate of inflation in the 1980s stabilize at, say 8 percent, that would represent a not inconsiderable achievement.

The truly important problems of the American economy in the years to come will result from what economists so chastely call "exogenous shocks"—i.e., things that happen elsewhere in the world, things that will profoundly affect us and to which we shall have to respond. None of these things is likely to be pleasant, for the world order—such as it is, which isn't saying much to begin with—is in the process of going through a whole series of convulsions.

The Middle East is the most obvious source of trouble. Even if the Arab-Israeli conflict were not a constant irritant, the chances for stability in that area seem slight. Intra-Muslim religious tensions are on the rise and anti-Western paranoia is endemic. Egypt under Sadat is indeed a remarkable exception, but one can properly doubt whether Egypt after Sadat will remain so. Iran will surely be hostile to American interests, whatever kind of regime is eventually established there. The days—at best, the years—of Saudi Arabia's anachronistic feudal oligarchy are numbered, to be succeeded by Lord only knows what. Iraq is likely to go to war against Iran, or against Syria, or against itself. Syria could easily go the way of Afghanistan and end up as a Russian puppet. Oil at \$50-\$75 a barrel is not too far down the road, and chaos in that region might well result in no oil being available at any price.

All this would seem to suggest the likelihood of some American military involvement in the Middle East to protect our interests, both economic and strategic. Unfortunately, we shall there encounter another presence: the Soviet Union.

The U.S.S.R. is today our superior in effective military power of a kind that is relevant to a situation such as the Middle East's—i.e., conventional military power. Even if we were now to undertake a serious and sustained effort to improve our military capabilities in this respect, it would probably take a good part of the decade to accomplish it. Moreover, a new Soviet leadership is on the verge of coming to office, and all the evidence points to its being very self-confident, highly nationalistic, and likely to be more boldly assertive than its predecessors. And, perhaps most important, the Soviets are going to be needing foreign sources of oil by 1981, and the Middle East is not only the logical place for them to turn to, it is the only place. So an era of confrontation with the Soviet Union seems to be in the cards.

And as the post-World War II international order falls apart—not only in the Middle East but probably in Latin America as well—all thinking about American foreign policy derived from that era assumes an air of irrelevance. SALT becomes irrelevant. The United Nations becomes irrelevant. Foreign aid becomes irrelevant. Sermons on human rights become irrelevant. NATO itself may soon become irrelevant, as our European allies decide that, in the face of American weakness, *sauf qui peut* is the sensible flag to fly. What will be relevant is an American

foreign policy in which power, and the readiness to use it boldly, will play a far more central role than has ever before been the case in our history.

Nor will the United States really have any alternative but to use such power to recreate a world order it can live with—a world in which there is relatively free trade and relatively free access to the world's resources. Though there is much we can, should, and in the end probably will do to set our own economic house in order—including the more abundant use of coal and nuclear power, despite any hazards they might create—it is an inescapable fact that the American economy is a vital organ of a larger world economy. The one cannot survive, and certainly cannot prosper, without the other. The wealth of nations today is indivisible. Our economic growth will henceforth be as dependent on our foreign policy as on our economic policy. And if we fail to establish the conditions for such growth, our democracy will itself unravel, as economic pressures give rise to political polarization, at home and abroad.

There is far too much easy and glib talk these days about the need for Americans to tighten their belts, accept a reduction in their living standards, even resign themselves to an economic philosophy of no-growth. It is dangerous and irresponsible talk. Yes, of course, the American democracy can cope with a temporary cessation of economic growth, as it has done in wartime. But only if it is perceived to be temporary. What few seem to realize is that a prospect of economic growth is a crucial precondition for the survival of any modern democracy, the American included.

For over two thousand years, the consensus among political philosophers was that democracy—the rule of the majority—was an inherently unstable and therefore undesirable form of government. The reason they came to this conclusion was not because they were snobs or disliked the common people, or because ordinary people then were inferior to the people of today. It was because they believed, on the basis of experience (in the ancient Greek city-states especially), that in a democracy the majority, being poor, would always use its power to expropriate the wealth of the more affluent minority, and that this would lead (as it always had) to economic chaos, followed by political chaos, followed by the restoration of order by a dictator.

What changed the attitude of political philosophers was the emergence of modern capitalism, with its promise of economic growth—of an economic system in which everyone could improve his condition without having to do so at someone else's expense. It is because this promise of economic growth has been kept that democratic politics has survived in the United States, in Western Europe, more recently in Japan. And it is only so long as economic growth remains a credible reality that democracy will remain an actuality. It is the expectation of tomorrow's bigger pie, from which everyone will receive a larger slice, that prevents people from fighting to the bitter end over the division of today's pie.

WHAT THE U.S. SHOULD DO

The 1980s will see a disintegrating international order in which economic growth is going to be extraordinarily difficult to achieve, and in which even economic stability will be hard to maintain. It will therefore have to be an overriding goal of American foreign policy to help shape this world so that the growth of the world economy can continue. This will require many sacrifices, but so long as the goal is visibly there, the sacrifices are tolerable. If the goal is not there, our situation will gradually

deteriorate until we end up divided among ourselves and destroying our institutions in a frenzy of recriminations.

For the very survival of this nation, our foreign policy is going to have to be oriented quite explicitly toward such a goal. Where will such a foreign policy come from? Who will articulate it? Who will be able to sustain it? Those are the questions that ought to be dominating the 1980 elections. But no one, so far as I can see, is asking them. ●

NRC AUTHORIZATION: LESSONS MUST BE LEARNED FROM THE PAST

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, this past year, we have learned some painful lessons about nuclear power. Today, the House will consider legislation to reauthorize the Nuclear Power Commission, the agency which is entrusted with the ultimate responsibility of protecting the public health, safety, and environment by regulating and supervising the nuclear power industry.

I consider nuclear power to be an important element of our Nation's energy supply in the future. However, as the incident earlier this year at the Three Mile Island nuclear plant has affirmed, extreme caution must be exercised in the building and operation of nuclear powerplants.

I was deeply concerned by problems in the construction of Marble Hill nuclear powerplant, 31 miles upstream from my home of Louisville, Ky. Deficient construction and poor management and supervision have caused tremendous anxiety, increased costs, and caused massive layoffs of workers.

We must learn from these mistakes. As the House considers this important authorizing legislation today, decisions must be made in light of our past experiences at Marble Hill and Three Mile Island—keeping in mind the suggestions offered in the Kemeny Commission report.

Further thoughts on this matter were inserted in the RECORD on page 33049. For more detailed information, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, a letter I wrote to Chairman Hendrie, of the NRC, regarding events at Marble Hill.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., September 28, 1979.
MR. JOSEPH M. HENDRIE,
Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HENDRIE: I would like to express my concern and deep disappointment regarding the management and NRC supervision of the construction of Marble Hill Nuclear Power Plant near Madisonville, Indiana, 31 miles upstream from my home of Louisville, Kentucky.

I have always stated that nuclear power will be an important element of our nation's energy supply in the future. However, as the

incident earlier this year at the Three Mile Island Nuclear Plant has affirmed, extreme care must be used in building and maintaining nuclear power plants. Our primary consideration must be the safety and welfare of the citizens of our nation.

In light of this, I find recent developments at the Marble Hill plant utterly indefensible and reprehensible. Not only is this going to further chip away support for this vital element of our energy mix, but the potential for disaster is beyond comprehension.

Public Service Indiana's (PSI) mismanagement of plant construction is appalling. PSI President, Mr. Hugh Barker, has admitted that contractors and supervisory staff are inexperienced and that a higher priority was placed on cutting costs and construction short-cuts than on following strict safety standards on the construction site. But, yet, the NRC which is entrusted with the ultimate responsibility of protecting the public health, safety and environment by regulating and supervising nuclear plant construction and management, failed to detect any problems until workers at the plant went to the press with stories of poor construction.

This lack of NRC supervision is an indefensible as PSI inexperience and mismanagement. And, I demand that before construction resumes at Marble Hill, the NRC take steps:

Insuring that only the best qualified contractors and construction workers be allowed on the site;

Requiring that qualified PSI and NRC supervisors be on site—not in Plainfield or Washington, D.C.;

Requiring monthly inspections by NRC technicians and top management; and

Insuring that the costs of these delays and foul-ups not be dumped on the consumer.

I will certainly be monitoring closely any future actions by the NRC at the Marble Hill plant.

Sincerely,

ROMANO L. MAZZOLI,
Member of Congress. ●

EASE THE UNNECESSARY TAX BURDEN PLACED UPON EMPLOYERS OF "SELF-EMPLOYED" CREWMEN

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that will greatly benefit fishing crews employers throughout the country. My bill will alleviate these employers' problem of paying unemployment benefits for what has been defined as "self-employed" workers.

These "self-employed" crewmen have been independently taking care of their financial problems and have the option of paying for their own unemployment benefits. The State of Alaska has passed legislation to provide these employers the option of paying unemployment compensation for their crews on a statewide basis. Thus, there is a need for some sort of Federal resolution of this imbalance.

My bill has the support of the major fishermen's groups in the State of Alaska such as the United Fishermen of Alaska and the Cordova District Fisheries Union.

It is my hope that this piece of legislation will help ease the unnecessary tax burden currently being placed upon these vessel owners and employers of "self-employed" crewmen. This matter has demanded serious consideration by this Congress and my bill will need its support. The situation of the employers of these crews should be one serious enough to warrant specific attention to my bill introduced on this day. ●

**GOLDSCHMIDT THREATS REQUIRE
NONPARTISAN INVESTIGATION
OF THEIR LEGALITY**

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues newspaper articles in which the U.S. Transportation Secretary, Neil E. Goldschmidt, is quoted as conditioning Philadelphia's chances of obtaining needed mass transit funds on the support of the city's mayor-elect for President Carter over Senator KENNEDY for the Democratic Presidential nomination.

The threat of awarding or withholding taxpayers' moneys for necessary transportation projects based on political considerations within the Democratic Party is a reprehensible and questionable tactic. Moreover, I believe there are serious questions, not just of the propriety of a Cabinet Secretary stooping to such political blackmail, but of the legality of the threats themselves.

The mayor-elect of Philadelphia is William J. Green, a former Congressman, who confirms the substance of the Goldschmidt threats in a followup article. That the threats were issued appears not to be in doubt. Vice President Mondale rode to Goldschmidt's rescue and the Transportation Secretary denies the threats.

This type of conduct comes from an administration that has continually chided the Congress—Democrats and Republicans alike—for their provincialism, for not putting the interests of the Nation first over the interests of their own constituents.

I find this monumental hypocrisy even more appalling coming from an administration that has ranted and prattled about the necessity of conserving oil and emphasizing mass transit. Never mind that the administration's Office of Management and Budget has objected to needed moneys for mass transit. Never mind that the administration has refused to set an example for the Nation by its own conduct in reducing unnecessary travel and depending on mass transit facilities. Now, the administration, through the new Transportation Secretary, wants to award mass transit funding on the basis of Democratic Party political considerations.

These funds, I hasten to remind Mr. Goldschmidt, are paid by the people of

the United States to be used prudently and wisely. By treating mass transit moneys as his own private kitty to be dispensed at his whim, the Secretary has exhibited an enormous contempt for the taxpayers and an exaggerated opinion of his power.

I submit that this is an issue that far transcends Mr. Goldschmidt's heavy-handed venture into Presidential politics. It is a cause for grave concern to Democratic and Republican Congressmen alike. Getting the most out of every taxpayer's dollar should be our first concern in any circumstances. It seems to me it is even more important in awarding moneys for mass transit.

Therefore, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two articles and an editorial from the Bulletin, Philadelphia, and an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer.

The articles follow:

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, Nov. 22, 1979]

U.S. MOVE ON GREEN IS DENIED

(By Ashley Halsey 3d)

Vice President Walter F. Mondale has denied that the flow of federal transit funds to Philadelphia will be jeopardized if Mayor-elect William J. Green endorses Sen. Edward M. Kennedy in next year's presidential race.

U.S. Transportation Secretary Neil E. Goldschmidt reportedly has warned that the Carter Administration is watching Green to see which candidate he supports.

Green said both Mondale and Goldschmidt called him yesterday to deny the report.

"I told them that, frankly, I did not feel this was the way to conduct business and they agreed," Green said in a meeting with reporters late yesterday.

"It is my understanding that this does not represent the President's policy vis-a-vis Philadelphia," he said.

Green said he has been invited to meet with Carter and Mondale in Washington next Thursday.

Goldschmidt made the remarks in Washington with a group of reporters on Monday.

Before mentioning Philadelphia, he said Chicago could not expect friendly treatment from the Transportation Department because Mayor Jane Byrne had endorsed Kennedy.

Asked how politics might influence funds for other cities, Goldschmidt noted Philadelphia had submitted an application for money to improve its "light rail" system.

He said the request for \$120 million to buy new trolleys could get preferred treatment over applications from cities seeking funds for heavy rail systems.

But Goldschmidt made it clear that the Green Administration, which begins with Green's inauguration on Jan. 7, must pass two tests.

It must show "it has the ability to program the money."

And, he made it clear, special consideration depends upon whether Green supports Carter or Kennedy.

Green yesterday said he is not ready to disclose his choice for president. He laughed when a reporter suggested the day he would have to make that endorsement is nearing.

"All I can tell you is, today is not the day and, when the day comes, I will be open, candid and frank," Green said. "Right now I'm not focusing on it. That's for another day."

Asked if he expected the President to press for his support at their meeting next week, Green said no agenda had been discussed.

"My goal is to establish a working rela-

tionship with Washington to help the people of Philadelphia," he said.

Green met for about 30 minutes with reporters in the City Hall press room yesterday. He was accompanied by several aides who were members of his campaign staff and who are now working on his transition team.

"I want to be open about the transition process and meet with you frequently," he said.

Though he had no appointments to announce, Green said one of his top priorities is to find a suitable finance director.

It has been forecast he will face a \$72-million gap between revenues and expenses when it comes time to prepare a budget for the fiscal year that begins July 1.

Green said he will attempt to eliminate waste and study the possibility of furloughing city workers before considering a tax increase. But he did not rule out the possibility taxes will be increased.

He said his transition staff will be contacting "a host of people" who will be considered for jobs or asked for advice.

Green met briefly with Managing Director Hillel S. Levinson yesterday and said he also hoped to meet with Mayor Rizzo.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, Nov. 21, 1979]

HEAT PUT ON MAYOR-ELECT

CABINET AIDE PRESSES GREEN TO BACK CARTER

(By Lawrence M. O'Rourke)

WASHINGTON.—Mayor-elect William J. Green was alerted yesterday that the Carter Administration is watching carefully to see if he supports the President for renomination or endorses Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.).

Philadelphia is in line for considerable help from Washington for the modernization of its "light rail" system, U.S. Transportation Secretary Neil E. Goldschmidt said.

The city's \$120-million application for new trolleys could get preferred treatment over bids by other cities to start heavy-rail systems, he said.

Goldschmidt, meeting with a group of reporters, made clear that the Green Administration must meet two tests.

It "must show it has the ability to program the money," Goldschmidt said.

And special consideration depends upon whether Green supports Carter or Kennedy, Goldschmidt made clear. Green was not immediately available for comment.

In town on Oct. 22 to boost Green's mayoral chances, Kennedy told 1,400 persons at a reception and dinner, "I'm here because I love my friend Billy Green."

Green in turn called the Massachusetts senator "the man who has picked up the (presidential) banner and rekindles it with hope," but Green has refused to say whom he will support for president in 1980.

Philadelphia has asked the Urban Mass Transit Administration for millions of dollars to improve the SEPTA system, including about \$120 million for new trolleys. Eighty-percent of the \$700 million needed for all the improvements will come from the Federal Government.

In Washington yesterday, Goldschmidt cited the example of Mayor Jane Byrne of Chicago as a big-city executive who cannot expect very many good things from Washington during his tenure at the Transportation Department.

Goldschmidt said he is a member of "the political arm" of Carter's cabinet and he elaborated on how that will affect his official decisions.

He said he learned from the late Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley that "your word is your bond."

"A lot of people in Chicago are willing to say that style is gone now," Goldschmidt

said. Ms. Byrne declared for Kennedy after she made public statements indicating support for Carter. The Carter campaign people have been attacking her ever since.

"Daley would say, 'If you do this, I'll do that,'" Goldschmidt said.

"But I wouldn't operate on that lady's word," Goldschmidt said of Ms. Byrne. "I don't know anybody in Federal Government who would. The people in Chicago will have to get used to that."

Goldschmidt said that Ms. Byrne has "used up a lot of capital for the community" by her political decision. Asked if he was referring directly to Ms. Byrne's support for Kennedy over Carter, Goldschmidt said, "Yes."

Goldschmidt, former mayor of Portland, Ore., who took office in September, was asked for an example of how he might deal with the Chicago mayor over a government decision.

"If a lot of pink slips were stacked up on my desk for phone calls," he said, "her's would not be the first I'd answer."

Goldschmidt said that his statements about Chicago and other cities that might look for friendly treatment from Washington were "not an effort to manipulate the resources of government to further President Carter's campaign."

"But my personal view is that as secretary, I must make judgments on the quality of the people I deal with," he said.

Goldschmidt said that he had discussed his viewpoint with White House staff members and other cabinet officers and found them receptive. He insisted that he had not been instructed by the White House to reward political friends and punish enemies.

He said he doesn't intend to "see the people of Chicago hurt" by his decisions. Asked if he could abide by that desire, yet still give Ms. Byrne less than expedient treatment, Goldschmidt said, "We'll see."

His mention of Philadelphia as a beneficiary of federal funds came as he ticked off several cities that could get substantial grants from the Carter Administration for their mass transit systems. He also named New York, Buffalo, Atlanta and San Francisco.

He said that only last week he pledged federal support to Los Angeles, where Mayor Tom Bradley has announced support for Carter.

Goldschmidt said, "Chicago politicians play by a unique set of rules and I'm capable of playing by them."

He said Chicagoans must recognize that Ms. Byrne is neither "a creature of national stature or great credibility."

Goldschmidt said his statements about politics and grants covered funds for highway construction, mass transit, aviation and railroads. He said that most of the money must be distributed by formulas set by Congress and that key members of Congress have a lot to say about where grants go. He said his control was greatest over "discretionary funds."

Goldschmidt said that Kennedy "has a long road ahead of him before he can take the nomination from the President. I'm astounded by how poorly prepared he is on the issues considering his long time in the Senate."

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Nov. 22, 1979]

GOLDSCHMIDT OFF BASE

Crude, brazen politics. That's what the new Secretary of Transportation, Neil Goldschmidt, is practicing when he suggests that he will withhold funds from a city because its mayor is supporting Sen. Edward Kennedy for the Democratic nomination rather than President Carter. Mr. Goldschmidt, the former mayor of Portland, Ore., indicated he would look for ways to withhold money

from Chicago because Mayor Jane Byrne, after implying she would back President Carter, days later switched her support to Sen. Kennedy. The unmistakable implication is that other mayors had better board the Carter renomination bandwagon if they want their cities to enjoy full benefit of the federal largesse.

This side of the political game is not new. Federal "discretionary" funds—those not awarded automatically on the basis of population and need formulas—have always been subject to political uses. It is known that local officials on good terms with an administration get more friendly treatment than those who are at odds. But seldom has a high government official threatened so openly that he might punish a president's political opponents by withholding federal money.

The practice itself—doling out funds on the basis of raw politics—is objectionable. Individual citizens of communities end up being cheated because their leaders' politics don't suit Washington. In a curious display of convoluted thinking, Mr. Goldschmidt said he did not intend to hurt the people of Chicago, only Mayor Byrne's administration. (A spokesman for Mr. Goldschmidt said later that there are other officials in a city through whom transit funds can be channeled.) However, if money actually is withheld from a community, the people inevitably are hurt.

This practice becomes even more objectionable when an official like Secretary Goldschmidt presents it publicly in a manner that would suggest it is merely business as usual, and ought to be. Saying he was from the "political arm" of the cabinet, Mr. Goldschmidt justified his heavy-handed pronouncement on grounds that he "wouldn't operate on that lady's word." What that indicates about the Carter Administration and its priorities will dismay and anger many citizens—and could work to the President's political disadvantage.

Secretary Goldschmidt's (or President Carter's) personal pique with Mayor Byrne is understandable, even acceptable in the world of real politics. His intention, if that's what it is, to translate his anger into a policy punishing Chicago and other cities, including Philadelphia, that need federal mass transit funds urgently, is not.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, Nov. 23, 1979]

IT'S NOT GOLDSCHMIDT'S MONEY!

What was behind President Carter's cabinet shuffle last summer is beginning to come into focus: some of the new secretaries have been brought into the game to pitch political hardball.

A case in point is Secretary of Transportation Neil Goldschmidt. His pitch to mayors in no uncertain terms the other day was: if you're not for Jimmy Carter's reelection, you're going to have trouble getting highway and public transit money out of his department.

This kind of maneuver seems to recur in the Carter Administration. Last month we commented on reports of federal largesse being spread around to "friendly" mayors and governors. We asked whose money they thought this was. We repeat the question.

We know there has always been some of this greasing of the political machine in an election campaign. But it appears to us that the Carter people are especially open and brazen about it. And as a practice it's deplorable anyway.

Mr. Goldschmidt's bald remark that the incoming administration of William J. Green in Philadelphia must meet the test of supporting Mr. Carter to get preferential treatment for federal transit money hits us on a raw nerve.

Mass transportation in the Philadelphia

area—in case Mr. Goldschmidt has been so busy with politics that he hasn't heard about it—is in bad shape.

Some of SEPTA's buses are so weak that passengers have to get off and walk up steep hills. Express service has been knocked off the Broad Street Subway because so few cars are in running condition. Fires break out in ancient equipment, shutting down service, sometimes for days.

And now comes Mr. Goldschmidt, from the self-styled "political arm" of the cabinet, to tell us that if Mayor-elect Bill Green doesn't throw his support to Mr. Carter we'll end up whistling for money to fix our region's decaying transit system.

We have two suggestions: first, Congress should immediately tighten controls on transportation funds so that the likes of Mr. Goldschmidt will have an absolute minimum of discretion on how they are spent. This is taxpayers' money, not Mr. Goldschmidt's.

Second, Mr. Goldschmidt observed that, "I have been given an opportunity to get a great education." He and Mr. Carter should be educated to the notion that voters, too, can play hardball. ●

HOW THE RICH FAMILY BROUGHT JOBS AND RICHES TO OUR COMMUNITY AND COUNTRY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the familiar words of Victor Hugo that "greater than the tread of mighty armies is an idea whose time has come" has many manifestations in the realms of political ideas, science, the arts and other fields.

And the power of ideas has been the genesis in making America's free enterprise system the greatest productive engine for social and economic change in the world. Epitomizing this phenomenon which has marked jobs-intensified industries, spurred by the likes of a Henry Ford, a Thomas Edison and the Wright Brothers, is the amazing growth of the frozen food business.

The largest, privately owned frozen food corporation in the world is headquartered in Buffalo. Its name is Rich Products, guided by the genius and founder and now chairman of the board, Robert E. Rich, Sr., and his son, Robert E. Rich, Jr., president, both of whom I am proud to call friends.

When the corporation was launched in 1944, it had a total work force of four people. The firm's first year's sales totaled \$28,000. At this time, as Rich Products observes its 35th anniversary, it has a work force of over 3,500 employees in 15 plants. In 1979, the corporation and its various subsidiaries in the United States and overseas will sell a record \$250 million in products.

Chronicling this extraordinary experience of an idea put into motion with hard work, talent and daring is a story entitled "The Riches of Rich Products" which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express' Sunday magazine.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share this inspiring story of "Enterprise" with my colleagues:

THE RICHES OF RICH PRODUCTS

(By Mike Billoni)

Robert Edward Rich, Sr. takes a long, slow draw on his cigar and lets the smoke ease out of his mouth in no particular direction.

"We have what I believe is the greatest innovation in the frozen foods industry," announces the founder, chief executive officer and chairman of the board of Buffalo's Rich Products Corp. and all its divisions worldwide. "It is freezing without freezing, and I think it is absolutely terrific."

"Freeze Flo"—Rich Products' newest and most stunning effort to date—is no small feat. Its development comes at a pivotal time in the company's history.

Rich Products is celebrating its 35th anniversary this week, and in a fitting gesture, the dynamic founder of the nation's largest privately owned frozen-food-packaging firm is bringing more than 200 of its executives, production managers and sales personnel from Europe, Australia and all over the U.S. and Canada to its Niagara St. headquarters for a week-long series of meetings beginning today.

"All of our people will shuffle off to Buffalo" for what will probably be the most important series of meetings in the history of the entire company, says Rich.

And what a company Rich Products is.

It is noted throughout the entire food industry as the originator of frozen non-dairy coffee creamer—Coffee Rich. It also has a work force of more than 3,500 in 15 production plants, with 400 employed in its non-dairy-product plant at 1145 Niagara St. at W. Ferry, on Buffalo's West Side.

This year, Rich Products and its various subsidiaries will sell a record \$250 million in goods. The figure ranks Rich's frozen-food sales as the fifth largest in the nation, fifth out of 1,530 frozen-food packers, surpassed only by Campbell Soup Co., which owns Swanson and Pepperidge Farms; Banquet Frozen Foods, owned by RCA; Morton Frozen Foods, owned by IT&T; and the Ore-Ida Co., owned by H. J. Heinz.

Rich Products was founded in 1944 with a total work force of four—Rich, Herbert R. Kusche, Joseph C. Robida and Jerrold W. Hannon. They became a corporation the following November when Rich's Whip Topping, the first of five major breakthroughs for the company, was invented.

Remembering those early days vividly, Rich smiles and lowers his voice: "During that first year, the company recorded sales of \$28,000. And the four of us used to do all of the work. But we loved it."

"It was a dream when we started," adds Kusche, who has remained an integral part of the corporation and is now executive vice president. "We all had a lot of big ideas and we were always talking about reaching a million dollars in sales."

"I learned a lot from Bob. I never saw a guy who fought so hard and wanted to succeed so much. He got guys like Joe (Robida) and I to join the team and we all became fighters. We fought pretty damn hard for what we got," adds the 58-year-old Syracuse University alumnus.

"I've said it before that I would give my right arm for Bob Rich," declares Robida, the vice president of non-dairy operations, who remembers the 16-hour days in those early years when everyone would help fill and package the Whip Topping.

Although he stepped down as president of the company last year, Bob Rich Sr., 66, still has an active role in its growth, which has been slow and well-planned over the years. He will join his son, Robert Edward Rich Jr., the energetic, 38-year-old president of the firm, to head this week's conclave.

Rich Sr. has made it a point to keep the company run as tightly and efficiently as a family. His son appears to be following in his footsteps.

The company's executive offices in Buffalo attest to that. They are next to the plant, in the former John H. Wells home, which was the western terminus of the famed old Wells Fargo freight line. When the old home was acquired by Rich Products, it housed seven families. It is now restored, with a plaque in the entrance foyer recalling its historical significance.

On the third floor is what is called "The Greenhouse." There, at 12:15 each working day, Trudy the hostess rings the lunch bell, and like clockwork, the heads of the various departments walk upstairs for a leisurely, home-cooked meal.

When business is discussed—between golf scores and other table talk—it resembles what David Fernow, director of public relations, calls the company's trademark—"a roll up your sleeves and let's get it done" attitude.

To say that Bob Rich Sr. and his son are "bullish on Buffalo" would not be using strong enough words. They have had numerous opportunities to sell or move their main headquarters elsewhere, but their response is always, "Absolutely not."

"Buffalo is my home," Rich Sr. emphasizes. "How could you walk down Main Street in, say, Dallas and know anyone if you had moved there with National Gypsum? Or if you were in Ft. Lauderdale, where Houdaille went? We'd be nothing in any of those cities. Everyone agrees Buffalo is on a comeback. There is a whole different feeling in the community now."

It was for those reasons that Rich Products broke ground a year ago for a \$3-million, four-story office building and research and development laboratory adjacent to the company's present office building and across the street from its plant and executive offices.

And it was Bob Rich Jr. who seven years ago paid \$1 million for the right to name the new football stadium in Orchard Park, although legal hassles with the Buffalo Bills have prevented the "Rich Stadium" name from achieving total acceptance.

Over the years, Bob Rich Sr. has mastered the art of mixing business with pleasure, and has become a pretty good story teller.

"I was educated on Main Street," he says with a sly grin and a puff on his cigar. "I was graduated from School 17 at Main and Delavan; Bennett High at Main and Mercer, and U.B. at Main and Bailey."

Sports has always been a big part of the Riches' lives. During his days at U.B., in the early 1930s, Bob Sr. played center on the football team and founded the Bulls' wrestling program—something he is very fond of mentioning. Later, he became one of the city's top squash and racquets players. Today, his game is golf.

"My dad brought us up in a world of athletics," says Bob Jr. "From the time we woke up in the morning, we would start pushup contests to see who could do the most. On of the legacies he passed along was a very competitive attitude, and that is very important in business."

Bob Jr. quarterbacked the football team and was a goalie on the hockey team at the Nicholas School. He went on to play hockey at Williams College, serve as back-up goalie for the Buffalo Bisons of the American Hockey League, and just missed making the 1964 U.S. Olympic hockey team.

Today, he is a director of the Buffalo Sabres, an active squash and tennis player and player-coach of Western New York's Region VI medal-winning team handball team in this year's Empire State Games.

"I always think of a line Seymour Knox Sr. once said: 'A day without working up a sweat is a day wasted'," relates the younger Rich.

Robert Rich Sr.'s story is hardly a rags-to-riches tale. His father, the late Paul J. Rich Sr., ran the largest milk business in Buffalo between 1901 and 1913 before selling out to

get into the ice cream business with his elder son, Paul Jr.

"Since my brother was in the ice cream business I wanted to start a business of my own, so I looked into purchasing the Wilbur Farms Dairy," Bob Sr. explains.

With \$5,000 from his father to get started, Bob Sr. assumed a \$6,500 mortgage and paid the remaining \$20,000 off on notes for the dairy. His original business in 1935 included four routes (three run by horses), a city distribution center and a country bottling plant.

Rich ran the dairy himself until World War II, when he was called to Washington to serve as a consultant to the dairy section of the War Food Administration.

From there he was sent to Detroit to become Michigan's milk-order administrator. It was a fateful move.

During his stay in the Motor City, Rich chanced upon some research into dairy substitutes being done at the George Washington Carver Laboratories, and he began thinking about a whipping-cream replacement made from soybean oil.

Returning to Buffalo and his dairy business, he pursued his idea for a substitute whipping cream, working with Buffalo's Spencer Kellogg & Sons' research and development team for a suitable soybean product.

"After many weeks of trial and error we came up with a concoction called Rich's Whip Topping and began selling this product, from our Wilbur Farms Dairy milk routes," Rich recalls. "We soon found out this method of distribution was very limited, so we made a stab at the New York City market. I got an appointment to demonstrate whip topping to the salesmen of New York's largest butter and cheese distributor, the Fred Pape Co."

He took a train to New York the day before the meeting.

"I packed my bowl and whipper and insulated my samples with dry ice, surrounded by newspaper. If done properly, the samples would not freeze. But when the meeting started, I found they were frozen solid."

"There I was with a frozen sample facing a hard-nosed sales manager and 50 impatient salesmen. I had never tried to freeze whip topping because I knew dairy cream would never whip if it had been frozen. I stalled a little, but in the end, I had no other choice but to try and whip the defrosting product—and it whipped to perfection. Three months later, we were freezing all of our product."

That was in 1945, and through the years that followed, Rich's dairy business grew tremendously. It acquired several other small Buffalo dairies and ultimately became Jones-Rich Dairy, one of the largest wholly-owned dairies in the nation.

When the company's major breakthrough—Coffee Rich—arrived in the 1960's, Rich Sr. sold the dairy business to the DairyLea cooperative.

"With Coffee Rich coming along and Rich's Whip Topping going so good, we were really competing against ourselves in the milk business," he explains. "So, in 1969, we decided to get out of the milk business and just concentrate on non-dairy, where we believe the future is."

"The future wasn't with a cow, but with an all-vegetable product."

Today, one-half million units of Coffee Rich are produced daily in one-half ounce cuplets and pint and quart containers in the company's Buffalo plant.

The company's first development outside of non-dairy products came in baked goods. Realizing that frozen dough and baked goods were rising stars on the horizon, Rich purchased Palmer Frozen Foods of Easton, Pa. in 1971. Its president, John E. Schaible III,

is now Rich's vice president of bakery operations.

Schalbe introduced a new marketing concept to supermarkets, mass-feeding institutions and retail bakeries in which Rich supplies the frozen dough, and its clients bake the products and package and sell them on their own. This "bake-off" idea has led to Rich Products' becoming the nation's leading supplier of frozen in-store dough products. More than 4,000 U.S. supermarkets now "bake off" Rich's dough.

Two additional bakery-products plants were purchased in 1974 in Winchester, Va., and Fresno, Calif. The three centers now produce a variety of pre-formed cookies, breads, rolls, doughnuts and specialty pastry doughs, in addition to "thaw 'n' serve" items.

In 1971, Rich had also purchased the L. K. Baker Co. of Columbus, O., which produces non-dairy powdered coffee creamers and dessert toppings, soup bases and gravy mixes.

Then, in 1976, Rich entered the frozen seafood business with the acquisition of the SeaPak Corp., headquartered in St. Simons Island, Ga.

"One of our main strategies in the frozen-food business has been to attack the dinner plate," explains Bob Jr. "We have the non-dairy business, portions of the dessert business, are now into the entrees with our seafood, and we've gotten into vegetables specialties. Where else can we attack to control more of the plate?"

Bob Jr. joined the company upon his graduation from Williams College in 1963.

"My father said he would give me a \$1-million budget to build a business in Ft. Erie, Ont. He told me I could run it, make all the decisions and he wouldn't bother me," he recalls.

"So, we built a Canadian plant in Ft. Erie and I started building a sales force. I ran into many problems, but realized I had the leading authority in the field right here. I was able to call on my father for help and as a result, we drew very close and have become very close friends."

With a little help from his dad, Bob Jr. made the Canadian business into a success.

"Along about 1967, I felt that if I was going to move back into this operation and play in what I considered the 'big ball game', I had to increase a lot of my skills. So I went to business school and earned a master's from the University of Rochester while I was continuing to work.

"From that point, I set up a marketing department and started putting together the best of our people and raiding the major companies for good, young people."

"When I became president last year, I said we would do one billion dollars in sales in 1986. The company is looking at a compound growth rate of 17 percent, and I feel we have the destiny to become one of the major factors in the food industry in the United States and in the world.

"There are no pressing reasons now to go public or sell out. We are profitable, well financed, but most of all we all enjoy it," Rich Jr. says.

"I've been talking a billion-dollar goal for the last five years and every one used to laugh about it. But nobody is laughing any more." ●

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this past Friday, the people of Michigan and the Nation lost one of our distinguished citizens and heroes with the death of former Senator Charles E. Potter.

Senator Potter's service to the country spanned more than a decade and a half as a war hero, a Government official, a Member of the House of Representatives, and a Member of the Senate.

During his service in the Congress, it was my privilege to meet and become good friends with this great man as we represented the people of Michigan together.

By the time Senator Potter came to the Congress, he was already recognized as a World War II hero. He enlisted as a private, later receiving a commission, and fought with the 28th Infantry Division in Europe. During his service in the army, Senator Potter was wounded 3 times and lost both legs from stepping on a German land mine. He received the Silver Star, the Bronze Star, the French Croix de Guerre, and three Purple Hearts.

After the war, Senator Potter briefly worked within the Federal Government, and then was elected to the House of Representatives to fill an unexpired term as a Representative from Michigan. In 1952, he was elected to fill the unexpired term of the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan. He continued in the Senate until 1958.

During his service in the Senate, he demonstrated the courage that distinguished him on the battlefield by often arguing with the late Senator Joseph McCarthy over the latter's tactics and over McCarthy's staff aides during the Army-McCarthy hearings.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Potter leaves behind a distinguished record of public service, and I am proud to have known him. I wish to extend my deepest sympathies to his wife, Betty, and their daughter, Mrs. Wendy Cundy, in this time of sorrow. ●

IN HONOR OF ED REA

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a retirement dinner that was put on last night by the Palos Verdes, Calif., PTA, in honor of one of my constituents, Mr. Ed Rea of Palos Verdes Estates.

Ed epitomizes a wonderful American success story. Born in Spokane, Wash., he was fortunate enough to move to California at the tender age of 3. After graduation from Glendale High School, Ed attended Stanford University, where he earned a degree in economics "With Great Distinction." His superior academic performance earned him a membership in the academic fraternity, Phi Beta Kappa.

Ed's first job, with Firestone Tire and Rubber, lasted a year and a half. Longing to be his own boss, Ed moved to El Segundo, Calif., and opened his first hardware store in 1941. The business thrived, and he expanded to six stores. Ed's hard work in the hardware business

gained him a reputation as an industry expert. For 11 years, he has served on the board of directors of Cotter & Co., America's largest hardware distributing business. A former president of the Pacific Hardware Association, Ed served for 9 years as a "member of the board of governors" of the National Retail Hardware Association, representing hardware dealers in California, Arizona, and Nevada. His responsibilities to that organization will grow heavier when he assumes the presidency of the NRHA, in July 1980.

One might believe that running a chain of six hardware stores and serving in three trade association groups would be enough to occupy any active person's time. But not Ed. Despite all these responsibilities, he has found time to participate actively in his community's civic and educational affairs. His achievements include serving as president of the El Segundo Kiwanis Club, president of the Hermosa Beach Chamber of Commerce, and of the Palos Verdes Peninsula Chamber of Commerce. He was a chairman of the South Bay Intercity Highway Committee, and the first president of the Peninsula Center Association. He was voted last year the Palos Verdes Peninsula Chamber of Commerce and Rotary Club "Citizen of the Year."

Ed has also done his part to insure that his community's schools served the taxpayers by providing our children the best possible education. In his 10 years on the Palos Verdes School Board, he served as its president three times, and was a recipient of the PTA Council Honorary Service Award in May 1971.

In addition to these notable accomplishments, and even more important, Ed and his beloved Helen have raised two outstanding children, Ed, Jr. and Nancy. They have both joined in the hardware business—a formidable family team effort.

However, Ed has decided to slow down his ferocious pace just a bit with his school board retirement. I proudly join with the Palos Verdes PTA, in honoring Ed. Yes; an invaluable asset to his community and State—and because of contributions to America's youth, Ed Rea is certainly an asset to our Nation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. ●

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ANDREW MAGUIRE ON PROPOSED ADMINISTRATIVE PRICE INCREASES

HON. ANDREW MAGUIRE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, On November 14, I was pleased to join with 30 of our colleagues, the Consumers for World Trade, the United Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, Common Cause, and EF Hutton sugar analyst Thomas Oxnard, Jr., in protesting the President's determination to administratively increase the level of price supports for sugar to 15.8 cents. This was a pricing scheme that was clearly rejected on Oc-

tober 23 when the House voted down the International Sugar Stabilization Act of 1979.

I would like to insert into the RECORD the letters we sent to President Carter, together with a letter to the President from Consumers for World Trade:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 14, 1979.

President JIMMY CARTER,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On October 23, 1979, the House voted 249-158 to reject the International Sugar Stabilization Act of 1979. This overwhelming vote by a bipartisan majority of the House clearly indicated that Congress was unwilling to see the current 17.7 percent food inflation rate pushed any higher. Congress was unwilling to add \$380 million to the \$2.6 billion already paid to our nation's 14,000 growers. Congress was unwilling to increase government's involvement in an industry which demonstrated classical free market model characteristics. These reasons, perhaps more than any others, motivated this decisive vote.

And there was agreement with this position from your own Administration. According to Alfred Kahn, "every one cent difference in the market price of sugar means \$250-300 million out of consumers' pockets directly, and approximately 0.30 percent * * * in the Consumer Price Index, and as much as \$150-250 million more indirectly." Mr. Kahn was painfully aware that implementation of these subsidies would make his job as Chief Inflation Fighter that much harder.

Given his advice and the substantial vote by the House against implementation, we were astonished to learn that you had agreed to use your administrative powers to establish the support price of 15.8 cents which Congress clearly rejected in voting down H.R. 2172. Administration moves to lift the price supports at this time are not only economically unsound but they are contemptuous of the American consumer and their Congressmen or Congresswomen who have reflected their will on a roll call vote in the House.

We urge you to reconsider your decision to raise the support price of sugar in keeping with the decision that we made in rejecting H.R. 2172.

Sincerely,

Herbert E. Harris, Glenn M. Anderson, Phillip M. Crane, David Stockman, James Scheuer, Don Edwards, Thomas J. Downey, Pete Stark, Richard L. Ottinger, Les Aspin, Marc L. Marks, Ben A. Gilman, Frank Guarini, Robert Roe, James J. Howard, Lester L. Wolf, Andrew Maguire, William H. Gray, Jim Lloyd, Daniel Crane, Robert Edgar, Charles F. Dougherty, Edward Derwinski, Gladys Spellman, S. William Green, Raymond Lederer, Jim Santini, Ted Weiss, Larry McDonald, Stan Lundine, Jack Kemp.

CONSUMERS FOR WORLD TRADE,
Washington D.C., November 13, 1979.

Re increasing the minimum price for sugar.
HON. JIMMY CARTER,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We have read with dismay recent press reports stating that your Administration is preparing to take actions which would, in effect, raise the floor price for sugar to 15.8 cents per pound—despite the overwhelming vote by the Congress October 23 to reject such an inflationary price increase in this essential food product.

Consumers for World Trade actively opposed H.R. 2172 when it was before the House (as indeed we opposed similar legislation to mandate sugar price increases in 1978). We were pleased to note that Members from both

parties joined in the massive 249-158 vote to reject that bill, which provided for a 15.8 cent minimum price and built-in future price increases which would cost American consumers billions of dollars in higher sugar prices.

As you know, your own Council on Wage and Price Stability estimates that every additional penny in the market price of sugar takes some \$250 to \$300 million directly out of consumers' pockets, plus an equivalent amount in added indirect costs. As usual, this extra burden hits hardest at those who can least afford it: low-income families, the elderly and others living on fixed incomes.

Consumers for World Trade was founded in 1978 by concerned consumers, economists, trade experts and others who were alarmed at increasing demands for protection from import competition. CWT speaks for the broad general interest of American consumers in lowering trade barriers to counter inflationary pressures.

CWT supports the proposed International Sugar Agreement as a means to assure adequate sugar supplies at stable prices. As for domestic price supports: we learned from the 1974-1975 experience that our domestic sugar support system does not protect the American consumer against world shortages and high prices. We found then that when world prices rise, the consumer pays the higher world price and domestic producers reap a windfall profit. When the world price drops, the American consumer is called upon to support domestic producers in the style to which they have become accustomed.

We see no reason why 220 million American consumers should be asked to subsidize indefinitely a relatively small number of uncompetitive sugar growers among our 17,000 domestic producers. In virtually all cases, marginal sugar growers could switch to more competitive products. The Department of Agriculture has the necessary lending authority to provide financial assistance to facilitate this adjustment.

At a time when inflation is a prime concern to every American, and when rising food prices have been leading the spiral, we find it hard to believe that your Administration would impose by administrative measures an inflationary step specifically rejected by the Congress.

We hope the press reports will prove to be mistaken, and that you will act to limit price increases in sugar and other essential foods.

Sincerely yours,

DOREEN L. BROWN,
President. ●

BIOMASS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORIZATION ACT

HON. FLOYD J. FITHIAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert, for the benefit of my colleagues, testimony I presented earlier this month before the House Science and Technology Committee on H.R. 5428, the Biomass Research and Development Authorization Act.

The testimony points to the need for an accelerated research and development effort, coupled with administrative changes within the Department of Energy if the vast potential of biomass energy is to be realized.

I hope that my colleagues will find my statement helpful in their own deliberations on the Federal Government's biomass programs.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE FLOYD J. FITHIAN

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you and the Members of the Subcommittee for the opportunity to testify before you here today on H.R. 5428, the Biomass Research and Development Authorization Act.

As the authors of the Harvard Business School's report, Energy Future, observed, an ideal solar collector has already been designed. Requiring virtually no maintenance it is economical and nonpolluting; it uses an established technology and it stores energy. It is called a plant.

When we talk of biomass conversion technology, we are really talking about ways of tapping the stored energy of plants. We can burn them directly for energy, we can let them decompose under controlled conditions to produce methane. We can heat them under pressure to produce oil and natural gas substitutes. Or we can ferment their sugars to produce a premium liquid fuel, alcohol.

While they have never been fully inventoried, biomass resources around the world are huge. One expert recently estimated that ten times as much energy as the world consumes every year is collected and stored by plants. But the real question is not of course, how much plant matter there is, but rather how much of it is economically available for energy without threatening its other important end uses, such as food, clothing and building material production, or damaging the long-term productivity of the soil.

Three important major categories of resources which meet these criteria are wood wastes, crop wastes, and municipal solid wastes.

The Department of Agriculture estimates that approximately 485 million dry tons of unused wood is left to rot in U.S. Forests every year. Based upon the assumption that half of this could be recovered and economically converted to energy in an environmentally sound way it could produce up to 4.1 quads of energy per year, about 5.2 percent of our annual energy consumption. I am providing the subcommittee with a copy of the USDA estimate for the record.

Purdue University, which has done a great deal of work in this area under the auspices of its Renewable Resources Laboratory, estimates the total annual U.S. crop residue production at about 400 million tons. These are residues, mind you, not food. Useable residues, i.e., those not required for soil enrichment and which can be economically collected, are estimated to range between 70 and 86 million tons per year. If three fourths of these useable residues were burned directly as a boiler fuel, they could produce between .6 and .9 quads per year. If the same residues were converted to alcohol, the contribution would be less, on the order of .19 quads per year. I am including with my written testimony a copy of the Purdue crop residue resource assessment I have cited.

Finally, municipal solid waste (MSW) could provide about 1.5 quads of energy per year, according to the Office of Technology Assessment's report, Materials and Energy from Municipal Waste. The report, which focused on a broad range of issues associated with resource recovery and recycling of MSW, estimated that another .3 quads of energy could be saved in the process as a result of recycling metals and glass contained in MSW.

OTA's report, like the others I have cited, makes realistic assumptions about the economic and environmental constraints on energy applications of biomass resources. I am aware that other more optimistic assessments are available, but I would like to keep our discussion of the topic as realistic as possible.

Even using these conservative figures, the total energy contribution biomass resources could make is staggering. The combined con-

tribution of the three resources I have mentioned here today is between 6.2 and 6.8 quads of energy every year. To put this into perspective for those among us who are not used to thinking in terms of quadrillion British thermal units, this amounts to roughly:

Eight percent of our total energy consumption last year;

One-third of our imported oil;

Half again as much energy as the President's original synfuels program;

More than twice as much energy as all the nuclear plants in the U.S. produced last year; or,

Nearly three times as much energy as was produced on Alaska's North Slope in 1978.

So, as you can see, biomass is not a minor source of energy, but rather a major energy resource which we can no longer afford to ignore.

OUR GOALS

In July, 1978, Agriculture Secretary Bergland outlined the first of the Administration's bioenergy goals in testimony before the Senate Agriculture Committee. Those goals included net energy self-sufficiency by 1990 in forestry production and processing under conditions that sustain productivity. A more ambitious goal—that of achieving 20% of the country's energy needs from solar and renewable resources (including biomass) by 2000—was declared by President Carter in his June 20, 1979 message on Solar Energy.

These are ambitious, but achievable, goals, goals which have broad support among our people. The question we must ask ourselves as legislators is whether present policies and institutional arrangements in the agencies over which we have jurisdiction will allow us to achieve these goals.

My own evaluation is that we will miss the mark by a wide margin unless we organize and energize these agencies to meet the challenge.

Despite the President's decision to establish ambitious goals for renewable energy resources, including biomass, the federal biomass program receives relatively low priority in both the Department of Energy and the Department of Agriculture. Only \$57.8 million—7.6 percent—of the \$4.4 billion the federal government will spend this fiscal year on energy supply is devoted to biomass programs jointly administered by USDA and DOE. Of that relatively small amount, far too much is being spent on exotic 21st Century concepts—such as kelp farming and energy plantations—rather than on short term technologies with more immediate applications. And neither agency has used existing legal authority fully to develop the great potential of biomass energy. There is, fortunately, a legislative solution to these problems. H.R. 5428 is a step in the right direction.

Within DOE, the Fuels from Biomass Program has been plagued by managerial and staffing problems since its inception, problems which are still adversely affecting the ability of program managers to perform their duties. The problems include:

(1) Rapid personnel turnover in key managerial positions. During one nine month period (May 1978, through January, 1979) the program had four permanent or acting branch administrators.

(2) Lack of a comprehensive plan. As a result, few meaningful evaluations of the program have been performed. The first Mission Analysis of the program was completed in FY 1979, a full four years after the program's inception.

(3) Serious and systematic staffing problems. While the Fuels From Biomass budget has more than doubled each year for the past five years—actually increasing nine-fold in four fiscal years—actual program staff levels oscillated between two and three full-time professional staff positions until the recent internal reorganization of solar programs

within DOE. Although Congress recommended a total of 25 full-time professional program staff for FY 1979, only three positions were actually filled last year.

(4) Excessive administrative demands on FFB staff.

(5) Abdication of monitoring responsibilities. The Fuels From Biomass Program has played almost no role in coordinating or monitoring 10 related programs within the Department (such as the Urban Waste Technology Program, and the Alcohol Fuels Utilization Program) nor the biomass activities of at least 10 other federal agencies.

While H.R. 5428 offers no solution to these administrative problems, this subcommittee can influence DOE's administrative procedures through congressional oversight procedures.

Because biomass energy development is intricately tied to agriculture and forestry policies, and because the food and fiber sectors of the economy affect the economics and availability of bioenergy, the Department of Energy and the Department of Agriculture have common areas of interest and responsibility. But despite overlapping jurisdictions and similar programs, virtually no substantive coordination or program planning has taken place between the Department of Energy and the Department of Agriculture.

There are indications that DOE/USDA coordination and cooperation may improve in the future, however, and recent interagency agreements set forth a more explicit biomass development role for both. USDA, for example, is expected to receive a portion of the DOE biomass budget (Fuels from Biomass Program via pass-through funding), for the purpose of administering some biomass development projects. H.R. 54428, my Biomass Research and Development Act, makes more extensive use of this action-forcing mechanism for USDA/DOE cooperation and coordination. Nevertheless the dissimilarities between the functions of these agencies can make effective coordination exceedingly difficult, a factor we must constantly bear in mind when we legislate in this area.

The need for cooperation between USDA in developing the potential of biomass energy is, in part, a reflection of the need for a systemic approach to biomass research and development. Most biomass conversion technologies are highly source-specific. In other words, the local conditions such as long-term availability of biomass and raw material transportation and storage costs, are just as important as the hardware involved. At some point in the development of biomass technologies, the emphasis must shift from solving strictly hardware problems to solving the practical problems facing people—mainly people in rural areas—who will run the hardware. Integrating proposed bioenergy systems is not an easy task when the two federal agencies with responsibility for biomass split precisely along these lines. Integrating bioenergy systems—putting all the pieces together—is so crucial to the success of biomass that Congress should specifically require it in authorizing legislation.

H.R. 5428 does just that.

In closing, I'd like to raise several questions I did not specifically touch on in my testimony for the consideration of the subcommittee.

First, the Department of Energy's solar programs including biomass are currently undergoing reorganization. As you know, the goal of the reorganization is to consolidate—and hopefully speed the development of—solar and other renewable technologies. It seems to me that the subcommittee has an opportunity to exercise effective oversight during the reorganization. When last I checked, there were eleven separate programs having some jurisdiction over bioenergy programs in the Department. It might be appropriate for the subcommittee to request

consolidation—or at least better coordination mechanisms—between these programs.

Second, the Subcommittee may wish to explore with appropriate DOE officials the reasons why the Fuels From Biomass Program has been unable to obtain the level of staffing recommended by the Congress in past fiscal years and why excessive administrative demands continue to be placed on staff assigned to the program.

Third, the subcommittee may wish to look into several state and regional initiatives on biomass which seem to be progressing smoothly. Some of them actually appear to be achieving more on their meager resources than the DOE/USDA program. The TVA effort on wood pyrolysis, the work of the Purdue Renewable Resources Laboratory, and the efforts of the Iowa Development Commission are efforts you may wish to explore. I suspect that you will find a close link between the success of these groups and their ability to cut through institutional barriers to integrate all aspects of biomass energy systems. ●

NICARAGUA—PART I

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, between the 16th and 18th of this month I and four other colleagues, ROBERT LAGOMARSINO, MATTHEW MCHUGH, DAVID OBEY, and GUS YATRON, under the able chairmanship of DANTE FASCELL, visited the capital city of Managua in Nicaragua, our deeply troubled Central American neighbor whose recent history of natural disaster and civil strife is well known to you.

The purposes of our mission were essentially two. To begin, we were to assess firsthand the trying economic, social, and political conditions in which the Nicaraguan people find themselves. Second, we were to reach an informed judgment as to what posture and action would best serve the interests of the United States in Nicaragua. I know that I speak for all members of the mission when I congratulate Chairman FASCELL for an exercise of leadership that helped us to accomplish our purpose.

Our schedule of discussions in Nicaragua can only be described as comprehensive. We were able to meet and talk frankly with many Nicaraguan political leaders and a broad spectrum of Nicaraguan citizens. In the course of 2 days we saw members of the collegial executive of the Government of National Reconstruction, the Minister of Education, the Minister of the Interior, the Minister of the Exterior, the new Government's team of economic planners, representatives of several political parties, members of the Sandinista National Liberation Front, the Archbishop of Managua, the owners and editorial staff of the independent newspaper La Presna, the editorial staff of the Government-owned media, and numerous businessmen from the private sector.

In addition to making these contacts, colleagues visited AID projects, attended a mass celebrated by the Archbishop, and benefited from a reception hosted by our Ambassador, Lawrence Pezzullo. The latter was attended by an impressive

cross section of the public and private leadership of the country. There was, of course, ample opportunity for continuous exchange with both the Ambassador himself and members of the Embassy staff. A final press conference was held just prior to our departure. A schedule of such range and depth cannot but contribute to the success of a congressional mission.

My personal impression is that we Members of Congress were treated with respect and candor by all the Nicaraguans whom we met. Questions asked by us were answered fully with few exceptions, and information not solicited by us was volunteered freely. Areas of disagreement or difference in emphasis were not glossed over, and areas of agreement, or similarity in emphasis, were placed in proper perspective.

The Nicaraguans in government, church, and private sector made their hopes and misgivings very clear to us, as we did ours to them. There was a notable and pleasing absence of rancor and verbal sparring. I think it no exaggeration to say that each group came away with a better understanding of the other's point of view.

As you know, President Carter has recently submitted to Congress a supplemental request for assistance to Central America and the Caribbean. New authorizations totaling \$80 million in economic support funding, \$75 million of which are intended for Nicaragua, form a major part of the President's overall plan. Of the \$75 million, \$70 million would comprise a loan on concessional terms to provide foreign exchange resources needed by Nicaragua for the maintenance of supplies of imports vital to reconstruction and development. Sixty percent of the imports, agricultural, industrial, medical, and transportation items, would be for the private sector. The remaining \$5 million would comprise grants to finance technical assistance to agriculture, activities of private and voluntary agencies, technical assistance in municipal development, a technical assistance fund for American experts, assistance for business education, and scholarships for poor children.

My experience in Nicaragua has convinced me that additional assistance of the kind requested by the President, assistance designed to help the Nicaraguan people and to stimulate the Nicaraguan private sector, would well serve the interests of the United States. Consequently, it is in the context of the supplemental request, especially the portion intended for Nicaragua, that I wish to address a series of statements to you.

I hope to lay out a detailed case to demonstrate that, all things considered, support for the President's plan would be preferable to opposition to it.●

OH CHRISTMAS TREE

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with an early sense of the holiday spirit which

I rise to commend to the attention of the Members of this body a recent position adopted by the Maryland Christmas Tree Association regarding the repeal of carryover basis. That association now urges the repeal of carryover basis. I urge my colleagues, particularly those from the State of Maryland, to bear in mind this new aspect of the issue.

As you know, the Senate has voted 81-4 to repeal the carryover basis provisions of the Tax Reform Act of 1976. This has been done in the context of the Senate's consideration of the proposed Windfall Profit Tax Act. This was done in spite of the risk of being chided for making that bill a Christmas tree, and I commend the Senate for its fine efforts.

I urge all my colleagues to look to those days not far down the road when the holiday season will be upon us, and to bear in mind the position of the Maryland Christmas Tree Association. Growers will face new burdens if carryover basis is not repealed. Do we really want to make it more difficult for persons in our society to celebrate these holidays as they see fit, or will we act responsibly to repeat carryover basis?

The MCTA position follows:

CARRYOVER BASIS RULE

Recently a number of laws have been passed by Congress which will benefit people in the tree growing and selling business. But, according to Forest Industries Committee offer Valuation and Taxation, the American Forest Institute and the National Christmas Tree Growers Association there is a bill now pending which looms as a major disincentive to growing trees. This law is scheduled to go into effect January 1, 1980 and will, in most cases, greatly increase the capital gains tax by an heir who sells inherited property. For a tree farmer this concerns either land or trees. According to the "Tree Farm News", published by the American Forest Institute, payment of a capital gains tax on inherited property is based on its increased value over the cost to the original owner, rather than on the increase in its market value from the time it passes to the heir. Given the long periods of time needed to plant, grow and harvest trees, this rule has major implications for the Christmas Tree Farmer who hopes to see his activities continued by succeeding generations in the family. Other implications and reasons for concern are: it will be extremely difficult to use this law—especially if you have timber—as conceivably you would have to reconstruct the cost of trees planted by one's great-grandfather! Obviously the rule will markedly reduce the return on a timber or tree investment.●

"JESS" CARLOS—COMMUNITY LEADER

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, we all know, or have known, genuine community leaders who have spent decades in service to their neighbors through good times and bad. Every time one of these rare individuals passes away, a very real sense of loss is felt by all whose lives were touched. Such is the

case in the recent death of Jesus M. "Jess" Carlos of Riverside, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, in tribute to the life of this selfless man, I wish to insert in the RECORD, at this time, an article from the Riverside paper which briefly describes the life of "Jess" Carlos.

The article follows:

"JESS" CARLOS, EASTSIDE COMMUNITY LEADER, DIES

Jesus M. "Jess" Carlos, longtime Eastside community leader and merchant, died yesterday morning of an apparent heart attack. He was 68.

A Riverside resident since 1948, Carlos was known both for his work in civic organizations and for his role as a spokesman and leader of the Eastside chicano community.

In ill health in recent years, he had attempted to pass on the unofficial leadership role to younger men, but was still regarded by city officials and others as a spokesman and elder statesman of the Eastside.

Riverside Mayor Ab Brown said, "I have known Jess for about 30 years, from when we were on the Community Settlement Association board. He was a good man to work with. He was a leader of the Eastside community, but he was really known and respected all over town."

A city-proclaimed "Jess Carlos Day" in 1973 brought him tributes and awards at a bilingual Mass and a dinner attended by 350 persons.

George Williams, then president of the Riverside NAACP, said of him, "We have a good community because he came to town."

Jesse Ybarra, director of the Community Settlement Association, said, "We needed a better park for our children and it was through Mr. Carlos that we were able to get a park, Bordwell Park."

"He had the political power behind him," Ybarra said in a later interview. "The Anglos looked toward him because he had the ability to rally the community."

During the Jess Carlos Day observance, Carlos said he became involved in community affairs because "there were so many needs in the community and in the church, recreation, housing and education. I was part of the Park and Recreation Commission, and, naturally, since I was from the Eastside area I knew the needs and I expressed them."

In education, he said he was able to convince school administrators to explain disciplinary procedures to parents.

"Whenever the kids got into trouble, the school would suspend them for two or three days, and the kids might be wandering around," he said. "I talked to the school officials and got them to let the parents know about the kids."

Although he was a leader in working for social change for minorities, he was not a militant.

"I think there's a right way and a wrong way," he said. "I don't say I wouldn't do it, marching in front of a building, but I think there's always a way to accomplish things without that."

His activities included membership on and presidency of the Community Settlement Association board of directors, a seven-year term on the Riverside Park and Recreation Commission, the board of directors of Opportunities Industrialization Center, the Mexican-American Political Association, the GI Forum, the University Area Kiwanis Club and Knights of Columbus.

He was named a Knight of St. Gregory by the pope in recognition of his service to the community and to Our Lady of Guadalupe Shrine Church. He was one of only two men in the Riverside area so honored.

Born in 1911 in the Mexican state of Zacatecas, Carlos was brought by his parents to the United States just after World War I.

He worked in an Azusa grocery store from

1928 until the Depression forced the store to close in 1933, and then worked as a laborer for the Colton Cement Co.

In 1948 he bought the old Farias Market at 14th and Howard streets and in 1961 opened the present Carlos Market across Howard Street from the former one. For a time he also operated a liquor store at 14th and Howard.

He is survived by his wife, the former Eladia Pimentel; sons Jess Jr. of Santa Clara and Louis of Riverside; daughters Mary Jo Carlos of Santa Clara and Lucia Sanchez, Anna Maria Orega and Martha Medura of Riverside; a sister, Alta G. Carlos of Riverside; brother, Leopoldo Carlos of Riverside and 14 grandchildren.

Rosary will be recited today at 7 p.m. at Our Lady of Guadalupe Shrine Church and requiem Mass will be tomorrow at 10 a.m. at the Church. Burial will be in Crestlawn Cemetery. Preston-Simons Mortuary is in charge of arrangements.●

THANKS, KHOMEINI

HON. GERALD B. H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to find a "silver lining" in the current, tragic and frustrating, events in Iran and in other countries of the Middle East. Nevertheless, one byproduct of this anti-American violence is a resurgence of patriotism throughout our Nation. For the first time in about 20 years, Americans of all walks of life are joining together in support of their country.

Mr. Speaker, this new spirit is best expressed in an editorial in the Glens Falls (New York) Post-Star on November 14, 1979. I offer this fine editorial below for the consideration of my colleagues:

THANKS, KHOMEINI, WE NEEDED THAT!

The college kids are marching in the streets again.

Picket signs are part of the picture on campuses across the nation. Dock workers are refusing to unload ships, airport workers are causing planes to be diverted by refusing to help them land and warning if they do land they will not take off again.

Flags are being burned, songs chanted, marches organized, the protestors have staged a comeback.

But this time the young, the old and those in-between are united, and they're mad.

Americans had sat around getting soft, picking away at each other, letting traditions slip away. Patriotism became a dirty word, the flag made into clothing and the armed forces and the intelligence community neglected.

Then a group of "students" in Iran invaded the United States Embassy in Tehran, took the staff hostage, tied them up, blindfolded them and marched a few around for the cameras.

Suddenly Americans got mad. Liberals, conservatives, the haves, the have-nots, came together against this common enemy.

It is not as dramatic as Pearl Harbor, and we pray it does not lead to anything like that mistake in judgment by the Japanese did, but the so-called "take-over" in Iran certainly woke Americans up.

It woke them up to the fact much of the world thought America had lost its will. The Americans will "view with alarm," or

"take a dim view" but they won't do anything.

Maybe the leadership won't do anything, maybe Washington views with alarm and won't send any more spare parts for air-planes for a while, but the people of this nation showed they are ready to stand up for their country.

Thanks, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, we needed that!●

RAY ROBERTS

HON. SAM B. HALL, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. HALL, of Texas. Mr. Speaker, after more than 40 years of devoted public service to the Nation and the State of Texas, our great friend and colleague, RAY ROBERTS, recently announced his intention to retire from the House of Representatives at the close of the 96th Congress.

We are going to miss RAY ROBERTS. I am especially saddened because his congressional district—the fourth—is adjacent to the first, which I have the honor of representing, and as such, RAY has given me good advice, cooperation, and help on problems of significant interest to the citizens of east Texas.

In addition, I serve under his chairmanship of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, and no one has done more to promote the legitimate interests of our veterans than RAY ROBERTS.

RAY ROBERTS is of the old school. His political mentor was none other than Sam Rayburn, and Mr. Sam taught RAY well. RAY fights for what is right and good about America. He was a genuine hero in World War II, and his wartime experiences further strengthened his resolve to help veterans and their survivors.

It was RAY ROBERTS who went to the floor again this year to maintain the integrity of the VA hospital system in the face of a determined effort which would have eliminated 5,000 medical care beds and 6,800 full-time medical staff. It was the distinguished gentleman from Texas who, in 1978, took the heat and joined the battle in Congress to fight those who would limit veterans preference in Federal employment. It was RAY ROBERTS who stopped the move to extend full veterans benefits to deserters and others who either refused to serve, or who served so poorly that they received dishonorable discharges. With these achievements, and many other noble works, he has maintained the veteran's right for an extensive program of benefits so justly earned in service to our Nation.

As fine as his record is in the continuing fight to sustain equitable benefits for veterans, RAY ROBERTS has a distinguished career as chairman of the House Public Works Subcommittee on Water Resources. In many parts of our country, water is as valuable as oil. Most of the water-poor areas of the Nation have benefited from his insight and leadership on this great committee of the Congress.

Even though we all will feel the loss of this outstanding man, we are fortunate that he will be just as active as ever in his legislative pursuits for the remainder of his term. I salute RAY ROBERTS, a great Texan, a great man, and a great friend.●

WHY INVEST ABROAD—ONE MULTINATIONAL'S RESPONSE

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, a prominent Minnesota-based company, the 3M Co., has just published a special report on global economic development.

More than half of 3M's current sales now come from outside of the United States. The company has been an aggressive exporter and a strong supporter of our country's free-trade policy.

A portion of the 3M report follows. It explains in relatively simple terms why investment abroad is necessary to do business in world markets and how investment abroad builds American jobs and American prosperity.

I commend this portion of the 3M report to my colleagues and respectfully suggest that those who have not seen the report may wish to order it from 3M's Washington office.

WHY INVEST ABROAD?

In 1950, 3M management made a decision that would affect greatly its future role as a provider of goods and services, and a generator of profits and employer of people.

The decision was that 3M, until then primarily attuned to U.S. markets, would invest in manufacturing operations in other countries. No longer would the Company regard its participation in world trade as an extension of domestic operations; the Company would regard the world as a large, and growing opportunity for its operations.

With the benefit of today's hindsight, it seems that the decision to "go global" was an easy one to make.

A federal judge in Boston had ruled against joint ventures abroad by U.S. companies that were competitors in the United States. The result was the dismantling of the Durex Corporation, in which 3M was a participant. As a consequence of this court decision, the Company was compelled to reassess its prospects for growth outside the United States.

At the time, post-World War II recovery was well under way and there were unmistakable signs that the booming early '50s were only a prelude to even greater economic growth.

Economists, business managers and others, who were estimating the potential for long-term growth looked at two criteria on which such forecasts traditionally have been based: 1) technological change; 2) population growth. In the early '50s, there was no lack of faith in continued technological change, and, in terms of long-term economic growth, the future population projections could not be ignored.

GROWTH OF NON-U.S. MARKETS

In 1950, 94 percent of the world's population lived outside of the United States versus six percent inside the United States. Clearly, as the world economy developed and its population increased, the prospect for the greatest long-term growth in markets was in countries other than the United States.

Following the court decision in Boston, 3M's management had been sending increasing numbers of sales representatives abroad to sell 3M products as personal income soared in the industrialized countries. However, many business executives both inside and outside 3M had reservations about investing substantial amounts of capital in operations outside the U.S.

With the Korean War being waged, senior business executives remembered all too well the losses in foreign investment which U.S. companies suffered as a result of the two World Wars. They recalled the explosive and destructive inflation of the '20s and the protectionist policies of the '30s—both of which resulted in heavy losses by U.S. business abroad and deterred new foreign trade and investment.

U.S. businessmen also had reservations about transferring their technology to foreign soil. Wouldn't that make their technology more accessible to foreign competitors who then would compete more effectively in U.S. markets?

3M's management—and probably those of many other companies—would have preferred to serve those growing postwar markets outside the United States with exports from their U.S. plants. They realized that setting up shop abroad was a difficult chore because of the cultural, linguistic and legal settings which were alien to U.S. business managers.

They were aware that foreign affiliates of U.S. companies, far from being masters of their own fate, operate under the laws, regulations and political whims of host governments. The assets of a U.S. manufacturing affiliate consist mainly of fixed plant and equipment and trained people who are citizens of the host country. Those assets usually are not portable.

OWNING VS. CONTROLLING

So, once an investment is made in another country, it is for the long haul, and under the control of the host government. The role of the U.S. parent is that of a major shareholder who "owns" the assets but does not "control" them.

The fact that companies do own assets and governments do control them contradicts a basic assumption made by economic nationalists who equate ownership with control.

For example, economic nationalists in Canada argue that ownership of most (perhaps 70 percent) of Canadian manufacturing companies by U.S. citizens means that Canada does not control its economic destiny.

The affiliates of U.S. companies, however, are subject to the laws and regulations of the federal and provincial governments of Canada, which control these companies' operations as well as their continued existence.

There are disciplines imposed upon these U.S. affiliates by customers in the marketplace, employees (almost completely Canadian), Canadian labor unions and other institutions, such as banks, which are largely Canadian owned.

Thus, taking into account the constraints on operations, his unfamiliarity with foreign markets, and potential risks, the U.S. businessman, given his druthers in the early '50s, would have preferred to export to foreign markets rather than establish manufacturing plants abroad.

But the U.S. businessman had to react to facts and push aside his misgivings about plunging into unfamiliar surroundings as he examined all of those growing markets in other countries. He came to realize—as 3M executives did—that the only way to participate in those markets was to get established on the inside.

BARRIERS TO WORLD TRADE

Tariff and non-tariff barriers effectively barred many exports from the U.S. For example, French tariffs on 3M pressure sensitive

tape, for which 3M built a manufacturing plant in France in 1952, were 20 percent. In addition, France, similar to other European countries, imposed an "uplift" (percentage surcharge on the duty) of 11.8 percent.

In 1953, when 3M built facilities to manufacture rubber-based adhesives in West Germany, the duty on such products was 25 percent, making exports from the U.S. uncompetitive with non-U.S. companies.

In Brazil and other Latin American countries, duties ranged—and still range—far above 50 percent.

Tariffs, however, are only one type of trade barrier which encourages U.S. foreign investment by manufacturing companies. Testifying to the House Ways and Means Committee on April 3, 1973, 3M made an extensive report on trade barriers and why it made decisions to invest abroad. Among the criteria leading to foreign investment decisions:

Service Requirements

Competitive marketing requires quick reaction to customer needs, which is difficult when the distances between supplier and customer are great. Customers of industrial products require strong technical support. This is most easily provided by local managers who also are able to modify products so they can be used in a particular environment.

Standards and Product Requirements

Examples

A. Customary electrical current in Europe is 220V-50 cycle compared to 110V-60 cycle in the U.S. 3M decided to make transformers for copiers for the European market at the West German plant because it would have been too costly to incorporate them in U.S. production.

B. Except for Latin America, most other foreign countries have a coated abrasives grading system which differs from the U.S. It is necessary to make these abrasives abroad for cost reasons.

Patents and Licensing

Example

If a company exports a patented product to France over a period of two years, it must register and produce that patented product there or else license someone to produce it. If this is not done, French law permits local companies to produce that product.

Freight

Example

In exporting "Scotch-Brite" brand scouring pads from the U.S. to France, 3M paid a freight rate based on cubage rather than weight. As a result, 84 percent of what 3M paid to transport this product was the cost of exporting air.

Differing Definitions for Applying Duties

Example

U.S. companies exporting to France are charged duty based upon C.I.F. (Cost/Insurance/Freight) rather than F.O.B. costs as in the U.S.

The result is that U.S. companies shipping goods into France pay duty on freight while French companies shipping goods into the U.S. do not pay such duty.

Altogether, according to the U.S. Dept of Commerce, more than 800 non-tariff barriers to trade have been identified.

Because of tariff and non-tariff barriers, the main reason why companies invest abroad is to gain access to markets.

MINIMAL IMPACT OF WAGES

Lower wages are a minor reason for U.S. direct foreign investment, as demonstrated by the following facts:

(1) In 1976, 81.5 percent of U.S. direct foreign investment is in industrialized countries where the wages are relatively high.

(2) Wages are only one ingredient in calculating business costs. What really matters to a business is per-unit costs—productivity.

Thus, in some cases, wages may be relatively high in the United States, but this is offset by higher productivity. For this reason, 3M finds U.S. labor competitive with foreign labor, as do U.S. manufacturing companies generally, although there are some exceptions in a few labor-intensive operations, such as hand-wiring of circuits.

(3) If lower wages abroad were a significant attraction for U.S. foreign investors, one would expect that the foreign affiliates of U.S. companies would account for substantial amounts of imports into the U.S. This is not true. Only about eight percent of the products made by U.S. affiliates abroad find their way into the U.S. market. Of this amount, three-quarters (six percent of the overall) are accounted for by a U.S.-Canada production sharing agreement involving motor vehicles. Thus, the bulk of U.S. imports originate with non-U.S. companies. Of those imports that are derived from the foreign affiliates of U.S. companies, a substantial amount are accomplished under U.S. Treasury regulations which permit U.S. companies to manufacture a portion of a product in the U.S., ship it abroad for further manufacture and then bring it back for domestic sale without duty being imposed on the value added abroad. The foreign entities involved in this activity mainly are Mexico, Taiwan, Hong Kong and South Korea and the products often are electronic. 3M does not participate in this kind of activity. In 1978, less than three percent of 3M products manufactured outside the U.S., including Canada, were imported into the U.S.

PUTTING UP A GOOD DEFENSE

In addition to all the above reasons for U.S. companies investing abroad, there also are "defensive" motivations for foreign investment.

Any successful business must compete in as many markets as possible. The alternative is that non-U.S. competitors will become so strong in unchallenged markets that they will be better able to capture an enlarged share of markets in the U.S. and elsewhere.

In addition, a part of each increment in foreign investment is intended not to develop innovations, products and markets, but to protect the value of existing invested capital. Without adequate continuing investment flows, the entire investment is jeopardized.

DYNAMICS OF GROWTH

It is true that business enterprises, if they are to survive and grow, must undergo a constant process of renewal, developing new products and producing older profitable products more efficiently than competitors who will be attracted to compete with a company's products which enjoy good profit margins.

U.S. businessmen also realize that, if they confine their operations to the U.S., their foreign competitors may have greater access to raw materials and, most important, to the technology which is developed outside the United States.

Additionally, businessmen realize the importance of a "growth" psychology within a business organization, if people are to be motivated to develop, make and sell products and if companies are to remain strong competitors. Companies which confine their horizons are doomed to eventual stagnation.

THE EFFECT OF 3M'S INVESTMENT ABROAD

In virtually every country where 3M does business, there has been a typical growth pattern. First, a sales representative appears on the scene with little more than a briefcase containing information and order blanks for a limited number of products. A sales office is set up and the country is served wholly by exports, primarily from the United States.

When the volume of business grows significantly, competitors are attracted to the scene if they are not already resident there. Particularly in larger countries, it may then

become necessary to manufacture in that market, not just because tariff and non-tariff barriers give resident competitors a comparative advantage over companies who export to that market, but because the requirements of customers in that particular marketplace cannot be serviced quickly or completely enough from afar.

As markets grow in the various countries, 3M investment increases for offices and warehouses and such functions as sales, marketing, research and product development. And growing right along with this investment are exports from the United States of finished and semi-finished goods to fill out the various product lines. This results in increased employment for 3M in the United States, providing many job opportunities at various skill levels in both plant and office. In none of the 3M companies outside the U.S. is a complete line of products manufactured. ●

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE ACT AMENDMENTS

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw attention to the conference report on the Domestic Volunteer Service Act Amendments of 1979 which will be voted on by the House of Representatives this week. At little cost to the Government, the volunteers within these programs provide legal assistance, companionship, and social services for the elderly; the volunteers help bring factories into small rural communities which provide jobs for the unemployed; and, volunteers provide technical assistance to farmers to increase their agricultural yield. ACTION volunteers are weatherizing public housing units which will save the Government up to 50 percent of the cost of heating these units this winter. These are just a few of the projects performed by ACTION volunteers. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the conference report on the Domestic Volunteer Service Act Amendments of 1979. I am pleased to submit to the RECORD the November 25, 1979 Washington Post article by Larry Kramer on the citywide conservation program in Fitchburg, Mass. which is being conducted with the assistance of ACTION volunteers:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 25, 1979]

FITCHBURG, MASS., IS ON OFFENSIVE IN ENERGY WAR

(By Larry Kramer)

FITCHBURG, MASS.—New England always has been a hotbed of patriotism, and earlier this month this sleepy, blue-collar town of 38,000 people fired the first volley in the battle of the people vs. the Ayatollah.

With the help of the federal Action program and the tireless efforts of an army of local volunteers, Fitchburg has launched the nation's first citywide energy conservation program and is well on its way to the goal of "weatherizing" every house in town.

All over this town, everyone from school children to little old ladies are replacing air filters, sealing vents, cleaning refrigerator coils, and taking dozens of basic energy-saving steps.

By the end of next month, an estimated half of Fitchburg's 14,000 dwelling units will likely be weatherized, saving about 2 million

gallons of home heating oil a year, according to a spokesman for Fitchburg Action to Conserve Energy (FACE), the umbrella group supervising this effort.

At that rate, Fitchburg residents' annual savings will reach \$1.9 million at an average weatherizing cost of only \$25 to \$50 a home.

Although the project of weatherizing an entire city originally was undertaken to hold down fuel oil bills, recent events have given it added urgency.

"The problem of energy conservation has taken a more serious tone than we expected," said Mayor David Gilmartin at a press conference on Nov. 13, the day President Carter ordered a halt to U.S. purchases of Iranian oil.

"We've seen our national government tell Iran to keep its oil," the mayor went on. "Now it's up to us in Fitchburg to do something about that, and back up our federal government."

So that day Fitchburg decided to do something. Action Agency Director Sam Brown led a delegation of Washington bureaucrats to Fitchburg to receive a progress report.

Action had greased the skids for the Fitchburg project last month by cutting reams of red tape and getting Energy Department and Department of Housing and Urban Development regulations waived in order to free federal funding for FACE.

It took only five days, for example, for Fitchburg to receive an innovative grant from HUD to help pay for the materials needed to weatherize homes occupied by low-income or moderate-income families. "That has to be a new world's record," said one Action aide.

The federal funding generally covers the cost of materials for weatherizing, while local volunteers frequently donate the necessary labor.

"The young people in town have been wonderful," said Ellen DiGeronimo, executive secretary of FACE and vice president of Worcester North Savings Bank in Fitchburg. She told of scores of school children doing the weatherizing for elderly and handicapped persons.

In addition, more than 300 volunteers from Fitchburg State College have joined with skilled retired citizens to offer a formidable work force for FACE.

The army is run out of several neighborhood storefront centers, where homeowners also learn to do their own weatherizing. Special storefront centers serve the Spanish-speaking community.

Action officials say Fitchburg seemed a likely target for this program because of its heavy reliance on oil, and electric rates that are the highest in New England and third highest in the nation mainly because the local power company does not generate any of its own power but purchases it wholesale from other power companies.

Fitchburg's involvement in the program has transcended the actual weatherizing efforts and influenced almost every civic activity in the city. "It's akin to an old-fashioned barn-raising," said city Planning Director Tom Cunningham, who also serves as FACE's project director. "Everybody helps out."

Two 14-year-old girls staged a 10-minute skit called "Facing the Energy Crisis" at B. F. Brown Jr. High School last week, encouraging children to explain to their parents the need to weatherize.

The skit included a teacher who walked across the auditorium stage throwing dollar bills away at a window left open and at a parent who put off caulking a windy door.

In another demonstration of community involvement, residents at the Sundial Apartments, a senior citizens' housing project in Fitchburg, gathered that same day for a weatherization training session, then returned to their apartments to get to work.

"For six years we've been telling people about the energy crisis in Washington. Final-

ly someone has listened," Brown said to an assembly at the junior high school after viewing those two events while on a tour of the city.

"We can talk all we want about consumption, but it takes you and your parents and your grandparents to do it," he continued. "We must start at home, and go one house at a time."

It takes this kind of extraordinary effort to make true conservation a reality, said local FACE staff coordinator Larry Casassa.

"Look, 75 percent of Fitchburg's housing stock was built before World War II, and they haven't been improved since that time," he said. "The steps toward saving energy are simple; the savings are great."

"In the long run, we know that the only way we can conserve energy will be to do it ourselves," said FACE's DiGeronimo. "We can't count on the government to do that for us." ●

REASONS FOR A NUCLEAR CONSTRUCTION MORATORIUM

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with our colleagues certain considerations concerning the vote on my amendment for a short-term moratorium on the issuance of permits for new nuclear construction.

First, I think we should be clear on the views of a majority of the members of the President's Commission on Three Mile Island. Eight of the 12 members of that commission, chaired by the president of Dartmouth College, Dr. John Kemeny, favored an across-the-board halt to the startup of nuclear construction. Dr. Kemeny himself joined five other commissioners in supporting the following proposal:

No new construction permits should be issued until the reports of this Commission, the NRC self-evaluation, and the congressional investigations are completed, and until the President and Congress have had an adequate opportunity to consider such recommendations, including restructuring the NRC.

The purpose of my own amendment is precisely to make these inquiries possible. On November 14, our colleague from Michigan (Mr. WOLPE) questioned Dr. Kemeny on this point during a hearing held by the Energy Research and Production Subcommittee of the House Science and Technology Committee. Mr. WOLPE asked:

In other words, you would be more in support of a congressionally based moratorium?

Dr. Kemeny replied:

Yes. That is what I said over and over again in the debate that I thought the action should be by the President or the Congress, and I voted for those (proposals for a moratorium) that were tied to the President and Congress and not to the one where it would be up to the NRC to decide when it was time to start licensing again.

Yet, when the Kemeny Commission issued its report, an absolute majority—seven commissioners—was unable to agree on the mechanism that would lift an across-the-board construction moratorium. Nevertheless, the Commission did recommend unanimously that, on a

case-by-case basis, no new operating licenses or construction permits should be granted until three things occur. First, the NRC or its successor should assess the need to introduce new safety improvements in reactors. Second, the NRC or its successor should review the competency of the prospective utility to manage the plant. Third, the NRC or its successor agency should approve State and local emergency evacuation plans. Commissioner Theodore Taylor, a nuclear physicist from Princeton University, testified before a congressional hearing on November 5:

I view this as a very strong moratorium which receive a unanimous and enthusiastic vote in the Commission.

Second, I believe it is important for every Member of this House to understand that the majority of the American people favor a moratorium on additional construction, according to a recent AP-NBC poll. This poll, conducted on October 15 and 16, was based on a sample of 1,600 adults nationwide. They were asked the following question—

Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: No more nuclear power plants should be built in this country until questions about safety are resolved, even though some say this will mean energy shortages within 10 years.

Fifty-seven percent of those polled replied yes; 36 percent replied no; 7 percent were not sure. We should remember that this question was asked before the publication of the finding of the Kemeny Commission on October 31, a report that issued a blistering, scalding indictment of the nuclear industry in America today.

Third, I think we should recognize that one consequence of failing to halt new nuclear construction is that we may allow plants to be built which will not be safe enough. One of the new plants may go haywire sometime in the future also. Remember that Three Mile Island 2 was the newest of the 72 plants already built and licensed to operate. In the event of another accident somewhere else, ratepayers will be forced to assume an enormous burden. If the plant is knocked out of commission for a long period, or is never able to reopen—which many experts believe may be the case at Three Mile Island—the ratepayers will have to pay for replacement power. The Kemeny Commission estimate that the cost of the Three Mile Island accident probably will be \$1 to \$2 billion. Most of the expense will be for buying replacement power—imported oil, for the most part—over the next few years. The moral to this story is clear: if more nuclear plants must be built, let us make very sure they are built right the first time. Taxpayers, as well as ratepayers, may have to pay for the costs of nuclear accidents like Three Mile Island. The owner of the damaged Three Mile Island reactor is, of course, the Metropolitan Edison utility, which is a subsidiary of General Public Utilities Corp. On November 8, GPU President Herman Dieckamp told the Senate nuclear regulation subcommittee that it is seeking Federal help in paying the cost of cleaning up the damaged reactor.

Cleanup is expected to cost a minimum of \$400 million and GPU is insured

for \$300 million in damage to its property. "Every little bit helps," Dieckamp said. Senator GARY HART, chairman of the subcommittee, tried again and again to get GPU to promise to run Three Mile Island if Metropolitan Edison should declare bankruptcy. The GPU response was conditional. In the words of the GPU treasurer John Graham, "it would be difficult to know all the ramifications of where Met Ed (bankruptcy) would go." If GPU fails to pick up the tab, however, the buck will pass to the NRC, observed Senator HART. NRC Chairman Joseph Hendrie admitted, "if there's an urgent need, why, we do what we have to." In this light, the National Taxpayers Union has endorsed my amendment. In a letter to me yesterday, the National Taxpayers Union declared:

We believe it is a step in the right direction toward Congressional reassessment of the economic and safety aspects of the nuclear power option.

I would like to note that in so doing, the National Taxpayers Union joins the other following groups in supporting my amendment: The League of Women Voters, the Union of Concerned Scientists, Congresswatch, Critical Mass, Sierra Club, Environmental Policy Center, the United Auto Workers, the United Mine Workers, and the International Association of Machinists.

The letter from the National Taxpayers Union follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
November 26, 1979.

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MARKEY: The National Taxpayers Union would like to commend you on your amendment to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Authorization Bill which would impose a six month moratorium on construction permits for nuclear power plants. We believe it is a step in the right direction toward Congressional reassessment of the economic and safety aspects of the nuclear power option. In light of the Three Mile Island accident it is imperative to end the "business as usual" attitude and take time to review the information that will be forthcoming from the various investigations that are currently underway.

Although the NRC has imposed a de facto moratorium it is our point of view that Congress, itself, must re-examine its policies in regard to nuclear power.

In particular, it is our belief that the Price-Anderson Act should be re-examined. Presently, it appears the taxpayer will shoulder the burden in case of an accident. For example, the owners of the Three Mile Island nuclear plant (General Public Utilities Corp.) have already stated their intention that they want federal funds to assist in the clean-up of their damaged reactor.

In a November 9 article in the Washington Post, GPU President Herman Dieckamp stated "Every little bit helps" regarding the anticipated \$400 million clean-up. GPU is insured for \$300 million.

In recent hearings, the Senate's nuclear regulation subcommittee has been unsuccessful in determining the limit of the federal role should GPU's subsidiary, Metropolitan Edison Corporation declare bankruptcy.

In closing, we support our initiative in taking this first step towards the reassessment of the federal government's role in the nuclear power industry.

Sincerely,

JILL GREENBAUM.

There are major policy—and philosophical—questions about nuclear power

that Congress has not addressed in years. And without some signal from the legislators, the nuclear regulators will go only so far in forcing expensive safety improvements. Congress has never expanded on the few words in the 1954 Atomic Energy Act that said there should be "adequate assurance of no undue risk" from nuclear power. I believe that with my amendment Congress has the opportunity to take an important first step in making certain that safety is the top priority in our Nation's program for the regulation of nuclear power.●

MAIN CATHOLIC PARTY IN ULSTER CRITICIZES BRITISH

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Social Democratic Labor Party (SDLP) of Northern Ireland has always impressed me with its opposition to senseless violence, and its vigorous struggle for the rights of the Catholic minority in Ulster, and for the ultimate goal of a free and united Ireland. Its candidates for public office have regularly been successful in Catholic areas in the north; most recently, Mr. John Hume, the SDLP's deputy leader, was elected to serve in the European Parliament at Strasbourg, and Mr. Gerry Fitt to Westminster.

The following account of the SDLP's 9th annual conference held early this month appeared in the Irish Advocate for November 10:

SDLP WANTS BRITISH PLEDGE TO UNIONISTS
ENDED

Calls for the British Government to remove its guarantee to the Unionist population that Northern Ireland would remain a part of the United Kingdom for so long as a majority there wished it, dominated the part of the United Kingdom for so long as a ninth annual conference of the SDLP held in Newcastle, Co Down, at the weekend.

Delegates overwhelmingly accepted a new policy paper based on this demand, together with calls on the British and Irish Governments to involve themselves in a process which would lead to an "agreed Ireland." The party rejected a suggestion that it should open contacts with the Provisional IRA, while leading figures made it clear that the party would participate in the constitutional conference planned by the Secretary of State, Mr. Atkins, for the end of this month.

The conference heard stronger than usual criticism of the Republic for what was described as a lack of political leadership and a lack of interest in the North. The Government should "shut up or put up," said one speaker.

The conference's basic theme was set by the deputy leader, Mr. John Hume, in proposing the acceptance of the new policy document which is entitled "Towards a New Ireland." He said the British guarantee to Unionists was an obstacle and a road block; there had never been genuine dialogue in the North, only verbal warfare. He appealed to Unionists to "stand on your own feet and use the strength of your own numbers." There was no instant solution, but they should begin a process that could lead to one.

Some speakers in this debate found fault with alleged lack of definition in the docu-

ment, the strongest attack coming from party founder-member Mr. Paddy O'Hanlon, of South Armagh, a frequent conference critic. He described the document as "an early letter to Santa Claus."

The liveliest session came with the debate on a lengthy emergency motion submitted by the party's Mid-Ulster branches, advocating, among other things, contacts with the leadership of all paramilitary organisations belonging to the Irish tradition.

Mr. Hume argued that the motion was ill-conceived and could do serious damage.

Leading party figures, speaking both publicly and in private at the conference, said the party would participate in the initiative announced recently by the Secretary of State, though they made it clear that they foresaw little chance of success for the move.

Since the SDLP conference was held, the party decided not to participate in the all-party conference called by the British because the reunification of Ireland had been specifically ruled off the agenda. Mr. Fitt disagreed and resigned from the party. These developments are described in the following article from the New York Times of November 23:

CATHOLIC PARTY IN ULSTER REBUFS LONDON ON TALKS

(By William Borders)

LONDON, November 22.—The British Government's latest political initiative for Northern Ireland suffered a severe setback today as the principal Roman Catholic party in the province rejected it.

The Social Democratic and Labor Party, which has the backing of most of the Catholic minority in the province, said there was no point in its attending an all-party conference that the Government wants to hold next month, since the matter of reunification, or any other change in the constitutional status of the province, has been specifically ruled off the agenda.

The head of the main Protestant party in the province, the Ulster Unionists, has also declined the invitation. Thus there are now serious doubts about the whole idea of the conference, which had been intended to find a way of granting the province a greater measure of home rule.

"If it transpires that nobody comes to the conference, then clearly we shall have to seek other ways forward," Humphrey Atkins, the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, said in Parliament.

But he reiterated the Government's determination to bring some kind of changes to Northern Ireland, even if its political leaders continue to resist.

Protesting the decision by the Social Democratic and Labor Party, its lone member in Parliament, Gerry Fitt, resigned in what he called "intense sadness" from the party.

"It is obvious that there is no meeting of minds between me and my colleagues," said Mr. Fitt.

The move by the party, which was formed 10 years ago as a voice for moderation and against violence, was the latest sign of a gradual drift it has taken in recent years toward the nationalist position, contributing to the deepening of the division of Northern Ireland between the one million Protestants and the 500,000 Catholics.

The reason that the party gave for not attending the conference is that London has insisted that the meeting will be concerned only with "a transfer of power within the United Kingdom," not even contemplating any change in the basic constitutional status of the province, such as independence or reunification with the Republic of Ireland.

"This is an absolutely inadequate basis" for talks on the future of the province, the party said.

Without Mr. Fitt, the party, which received 20 percent of the total popular vote in the province during the election last May, will

have no voice in Parliament. There is one other Catholic, Frank Maguire, among the 12 Ulster members of Parliament, but he is an independent.

The two parties that have accepted the invitation from London are the Democratic Unionist Party, a militant Protestant group led by the Rev. Ian Paisley, which received 10 percent of the vote in May, and the Alliance Party, a moderate group of both Catholics and Protestants, which got 12 percent of the vote, but elected no members of Parliament. ●

MCPL UPDATE ON RELIEF EFFORTS FOR CAMBODIA

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, the November edition of the food and population newsletter of the Members of Congress for Peace through Law contains an excellent article and map on the status of the international relief effort to alleviate the suffering of the Cambodian people. Since some Members may not have an opportunity to see this report, I ask that it be reprinted here. I would also like to pay tribute to MCPL, and its excellent chairman, Representative PAUL SIMON, of Illinois, for his outstanding efforts to make this organization a most useful and effective means of keeping its members abreast of international issues.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this update on Cambodian relief efforts be reprinted here:

UPDATE ON RELIEF EFFORTS FOR KAMPUCHEA

U.S. Government efforts to alleviate Kampuchea's (Cambodia's) monumental food crisis are slowly cranking into gear.

The food crisis, resulting from years of war, from the brutal policies of the Pol Pot government, from the devastation imposed by the invasion of the country by Vietnamese troops, and from the ongoing struggle for control of the countryside by the Pol Pot and the Heng Samrin forces, remains massive. Under Pol Pot more than one third of the 7 to 8 million population died or disappeared. With most of the crops destroyed and less than 10 percent of the fields under cultivation, 75 percent of those who survived now face starvation. Observers in Phnom Penh and on the Thai-Kampuchean border all agree that relief efforts will be needed on a large scale over at least the next year to avert widespread starvation. Even with these efforts, an entire generation of Khmer may perish.

Current estimates of the price tag for relief operations are now in the range of \$310 million. Of this sum, \$250 million would be spent within the country and the remaining \$60 million would be used to feed and clothe Kampuchean along the Thai-Kampuchean border. 34 countries and the European Economic Community have now pledged about \$210 million to the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, UNICEF and other international agencies which will administer the relief operations.

For its part, the United States aid package now totals about \$105 million in newly authorized and reprogrammed money approved by Congress. Included in this aid package is \$25 million under the Food for Peace Program, \$20 million in assistance to Kampuchean refugees in Thailand, \$30 million in special disaster assistance and an additional \$30 million from previously authorized disaster assistance. Additional

funds—already authorized by refugee legislation (HR 4955—P.L. 96-110) and contained in the Refugee and Migration Account in the continuing appropriations resolution (HJ Res. 440)—could probably be used to meet the critical situation in Kampuchea.

In recent months there have been numerous, and often conflicting reports, that the Heng Samrin government in Phnom Penh and its Vietnamese and Soviet allies have frustrated the efforts of UNICEF/ICRC and the voluntary agencies in providing emergency food and medical supplies to Kampuchea. At present, the Heng Samrin government seems to be encouraging sea and air relief efforts: the UNICEF/ICRC airlift from Bangkok, Thailand was originally limited to one plane per week, then was increased to a plane every day and, as of November 19, five plane loads of food and emergency supplies were being flown daily from Bangkok to Phnom Penh. Most of the food, however, is transported by sea to the port of Kompong Som in the southern part of the country (see the map). From this port city UNICEF/ICRC has recently been able to implement a new inland transportation system, organizing two convoys of twenty trucks each to move shipments of food and medicines to distribution points in the northeast and the northwest parts of the country. The recently announced opening of the Mekong river for additional shipments of emergency supplies directly to the capital city will soon provide a much-needed alternative to the overcrowded and congested docks at Kompong Som.

10,000 metric tons of food aid have been delivered to Kampuchea as of mid-November and an additional 12,600 metric tons are now enroute to Kampuchea. The World Food Program (WFP) of the United Nations is presently coordinating all the food aid efforts from international agencies and voluntary agencies, including Oxfam, Church World Services, Catholic Relief Service and many others. WFP observers expect that the combined air and sea shipments of UNICEF/ICRC will exceed 20,000 tons per month by the end of this month and that by January this level will rise to 34,500 tons per month, which will be just enough food to stabilize the starving population. Experts in nutrition and famine relief point out, however, that diet adequate to strengthen and rehabilitate the people of Kampuchea will eventually require as much as 60,000 to 75,000 tons of food per month.

Many Members of Congress, concerned that food aid has not been arriving fast enough in Kampuchea, have called for alternative methods of providing food aid to that country. On a recent trip to Kampuchea, Senators John C. Danforth (D-Mo), Max Baucus (D-Mon) and Jim Sasser (D-Tn) suggested a "land bridge" whereby columns of trucks would carry aid into Kampuchea from Thailand. This suggestion has, however, met with strong opposition from the Heng Samrin government which evidently regards this idea as a security threat and a backhanded way of aiding the Pol Pot forces.

On October 30, 68 Members of the House led by MCPL Chairman Rep. Paul Simon (D-Ill) and Rep. David Bonior (D-Mich) called on President Carter to undertake immediate consultations with the Soviet Union with the aim of starting a joint U.S.-Soviet airlift of emergency supplies into Kampuchea. Reps. Simon and Bonior, emphasizing joint cooperation whereby perhaps the Soviets would supply the planes and personnel with the U.S. supplying the food, medicine and trucks, continued their joint efforts by testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on November 14 about the need to enlist the support of the Soviet Union.

In addition, Members of Congress have met with high officials in the State Department and the White House to encourage creative and speedy initiatives to solve the food shortage. ●

DON KAVANAGH

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to congratulate Mr. Don Kavanagh of San Jose for achieving a significant professional milestone: this year marks Don's 50th year as a builder-developer in California. On December 8, the Consulting Civil Engineers of San Jose are hosting a reception for Don, his friends, and associates in honor of his many contributions to housing development in our State.

Don, who will be 73 years old in March, began his career as a builder in 1929. He was a builder before the Federal Housing Administration existed, and after FHA was created, he built under almost every program that was insured by the Federal Government.

From 1929 through the depression years, Don was a homebuilder in San Francisco, and during World War II, he was authorized by the Government to build housing needed for wartime production workers.

Don developed subdivisions and built homes in the bay area and northern California and in the San Joaquin Valley throughout the 1940's, 1950's and into the early 1960's. In the mid-1960's, Don went to Brazil for a few years to work on government housing, and then came to

Santa Clara County where he has been actively engaged in developing assisted housing.

During the past 10 years, Don's specialty has been Government assisted housing, and he is as active today as ever before. He currently has a half dozen assisted housing projects under construction, and a half dozen more in the works for future years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Don Kavanagh for completing 50 successful and productive years as a builder and developer, and in sending him best wishes as he embarks upon his second half century in the building business.●

IRENE KETCHUM

HON. ADAM BENJAMIN, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. BENJAMIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of the finest and most outstanding women with whom I have ever had the pleasure of working.

Irene Ketchum, of Highland, Ind., is retiring from her position as clerk-treasurer for the town of Highland, after 24 years of faithful service. Irene's years of elected public service reflect the esteem and respect held for her by the northwest Indiana community. More

than that, it also attests to the strong belief of everyone in her abilities, dedication, and total commitment to the welfare of her fellow citizens.

It has been my honor and privilege to have worked with Irene since being a member of the Gary City government in 1964. For 15 years I have admired the professionalism, thoughtfulness, and compassion that Irene has infused into her responsibility as the unofficial mayor of Highland.

It is seldom that one finds a town "Father" as gentle, humane, and talented as Irene. Her overwhelming command of her duties, her reputation as one of the great town officials of the United States, and her extremely judicious nature led many to believe that her job was lifetime, and that she was only subject to removal, should she not behave well. The truth of the matter is that Irene did have to stand for election every 4 years, and campaigned in a delightful and devoted manner.

Irene is formally retiring from her public service office, but I cannot believe that Irene will ever stop working to make Highland and northwest Indiana a better place in which to live.

I am hopeful that other Members of Congress have had the opportunity and good fortune to work with local officials as sincere as Irene Ketchum. Fellow public officials like Irene Ketchum make all of our jobs much easier by allowing us to truly share in the representation and advocacy of the needs and interests of our people.●

SENATE—Wednesday, November 28, 1979*(Legislative day of Thursday, November 15, 1979)*

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. CARL LEVIN, a Senator from the State of Michigan.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, known of old: In this moment dedicated to the unseen and the eternal may we see above the turbulence, the cruelty, the inhumanity of man to man, the coming kingdom which destroys all evil, establishes the reign of righteousness, and sets men free. Grant us Thy light in dark places and Thy strength for our weakness. Make plain that it is only when the soul is redeemed, the heart cleansed, the mind made new, the will captive to Christ, that Thy kingdom comes. Send us into this new day armed with the power of Thy spirit, to right the wrong, to overcome evil, to endure hardship and in all things to serve Thee bravely, faithfully, joyfully until in the peace of evening we are sheltered in Thy fold.

In His name who went about doing good we pray. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. MAGNUSON).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D.C., November 28, 1979.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CARL LEVIN, a Senator from the State of Michigan, to perform the duties of the Chair.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,

President pro tempore.

Mr. LEVIN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the majority leader is now recognized for not to exceed 5 minutes.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business of not to exceed 10 minutes, and that Senators may speak therein up to 5 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.