

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRESSMAN MURTHA  
SPEAKS ON DEFENSE POLICY

## HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following excerpts from a speech I prepared for a Memorial Day presentation in Somerset. These remarks outline many of my concerns about the present and future trends of American defense policy.

The excerpts follow:

Usual Greetings.

In the rush of national and world events, sometimes in Washington we lose track of what is important and essential. During many debates in Congress I remind my colleagues of one simple fact: the primary responsibility of the Federal Government is to insure America's defense, to make certain our military strength is sufficient.

Memorial Day has become a time for looking back at the brave men and women who have served our country, and looking ahead to America's role in the world. Our concern this year is heightened, because we realize that as we gather here today 53 Americans are still being held captive in Iran. In the rush and pressures of our daily lives, we sometimes lose track of the anguish being experienced by these American citizens. Memorial Day is a time to remember that kind of situation and contemplate what it means for America, and our role in the world.

Quite frankly, ladies and gentlemen, as I look at the state of America's defense on this Memorial Day, 1980, I am concerned. As many of you know, I have been active in the U.S. Marines since the time of the Korean War. I served in Vietnam. I now serve on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee in Congress which oversees virtually all the spending on defense in our country. And I am concerned about much of what I see.

Basically, I think that America has gone through several stages since the second World War. Certainly, we came out of that war the dominant country in the world with both psychological and actual military dominance. During the Cold War period—which was phase two—the world began to settle into the communist and free world ranks with the free world holding a cumulative though shrinking edge that was best dramatized when President Kennedy backed down the Russians during the Cuban Missile Crisis. But Phase Three started shortly after that crisis—the Russians began a massive build-up designed to escalate them to equality and beyond with the United States; meanwhile the United States became bogged down in Vietnam, eventually tearing the country apart and starting an anti-military feeling. Support for defense spending dropped dramatically, we ended the military draft, and Americans no longer wanted to take a forceful world role. With this U.S. attitude, the Soviets pulled up to us in defense capability. I now think we are on the edge of the next development—

Phase Four—and I want to talk about a few specific military problems to illustrate the situation as we begin this new period.

The first question involves the performance of the all-volunteer army. The United States has troop strength problems. The Army is about 50,000 short of its peacetime manpower strength. In worse shape are the back-up forces, reserve strength is only at about 75 percent of its peacetime strength.

Moreover, we have to look at the type of recruits we are getting. In many recruiting groups less than half of the volunteers have graduated from high school. One colonel reports that about 300 of his 2,500 soldiers go to class during the year because they can't read above a fifth grade level or can't speak English. And this at a time when our weapons are becoming increasingly sophisticated and technical.

A third manpower problem is that we would have trouble mobilizing quickly in case of war. In our present situation, it would take us over 100 days just to find out who we could draft, much less begin to train them.

That's a key reason why I recently voted for a return to registration, because it would cut 115 days from the time it would take our country to mobilize. And I will say very frankly to you that if the present trends continue in manpower as I have outlined here, we may have to return to an actual draft.

The second major problem we have is in the coordination of the free-world military alliance against the Soviets. The fact is that the Communists are better organized. Even though our NATO troops in Europe represent our front line combat defense units in case the Soviet Union started a march into Europe, we recently had to take equipment from U.S. troops and National Guard units just to supply these troops with basic weapons. Much of the present National Guard equipment is outdated.

One of the major tasks we face is rebuilding the free-world alliance so that we bring together the allies into a cohesive unit, and make the necessary military preparations to insure their readiness in case of conflict. And let me say quite frankly, one thing we must demand is more cooperation from our allies, more willingness to join us in the battle against Communism, more willingness to stand up with us in the world debate. I don't see that kind of cooperation.

The third major problem is in defense spending. The Soviet Union has simply outspent us for the last decade. The Soviets have been spending two and three times as much per year on defense as the United States, and they have been doing it for several years.

I serve on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. Last year we approved the largest defense spending bill in history; this year I predict we will approve an even larger one. This type of spending is essential. Let me make a few comparisons as to how the U.S. and the Soviet Union compare against one another after the tremendous spending of recent years by the Soviet Union.

COMPARISONS BETWEEN U.S. AND U.S.S.R. MILITARY  
STRENGTH

	U.S.	U.S.S.R.
Active armed services personnel.....	2,100,000	4,300,000
Military reserve strength.....	870,000	6,800,000
Nuclear warheads.....	9,500	4,000
Strategic missiles.....	1,700	2,415
Warplanes.....	5,800	8,100
Tanks.....	11,100	50,000
Submarines:		
Nuclear.....	70	85
Diesel.....	5	158
Aircraft carriers.....	13	3
Major surface warships.....	172	240
Military spending as a percent of gross national product.....	6	12

What those figures show, ladies and gentlemen, is that we will have to undertake a major commitment in this country to upgrade our military defenses. You know, I often say there's no first, second, and third in defense; there are no medals for coming in second, the only thing that counts is who's number one because that country can control world policy. For the past few years I have been saying the Soviet Union and United States are roughly equivalent in strength. Now, I am changing my position. I no longer believe the United States is even equal, and I think it will take 4 to 5 years of concentrated effort and spending to return our superiority.

And that superiority is essential. Our entire economy is now dependent on a thin line of oil tankers making their way from the Middle East. If we cannot defend that route and insure our tankers' safety, then we can be thrown into a massive depression at any time by the Soviets interrupting that oil flow. And meanwhile, the Soviet Union has invaded Afghanistan in a blatant power move. They are now poised on the edge of the Middle East countries. For our own safety and for the safety of the free world, we must make it clear to the Soviet Union that we will not tolerate their aggression, and that we will take whatever military steps are necessary to defend our interests and the cause of freedom. That is why we need military registration and may need the draft. That is why we must continue to spend as much as is necessary to insure our defense strength (Congress is committing the Nation to a five-year, \$1 trillion spending plan). That is why we must be firmer with our allies and demand their cooperation in battling communism. Through all this we can send a clear message to the Soviet Union, that message: we will never cease in our efforts to offset communism, we will never weaken in our resolve to spread freedom throughout the world, we will take whatever steps we must to preserve freedom and liberty.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, this report today has been pessimistic, it has pointed out serious problems, but in conclusion I want to tell you a little story. Last year as part of my concern about NATO, I took a short tour of military facilities in Europe. And while I was in Germany I was taken to the Berlin Wall, and I went up in the towers around that wall, and I looked out at the wall separating Communist Berlin from Free Berlin. And I saw the U.S. and communist soldiers watching each other through binoculars with the dogs patrolling on the

communist side of the barrier and the weapons at hand. And I was very moved by that experience, because I thought to myself: look at that wall—the communists have to erect that wall to keep their people in their country; if that wall didn't exist those individuals would leave communist East Germany in a minute. On this Memorial Day we remember the brave men and women who served and the thousands who also gave their lives so that barriers to freedom are never erected in the United States and so that the cause of freedom can spread.

We have a difficult task ahead of us. The Soviet Union has made tremendous gains. But I feel the spirit of the American people reawakening, I feel a rededication of the American spirit throughout the land, and I am confident that as we have done in the past, we will prevail and insure that America remains the greatest, freest, strongest country in the world.●

**COFFINS FROM AFGHANISTAN**

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is well known that censorship and deviation of information to the people in the Soviet Union is a standard procedure of the Communist regime in Moscow. However, a great deal of information concerning the Soviet cover-up of casualties in Afghanistan has been leaked to Western sources, as evidenced by a recent report in the May 1980 edition of ELTA, the information bulletin of the Lithuanian National Foundation, Inc., located in Washington, D.C. I insert the article at this point:

**COFFINS FROM AFGHANISTAN: FOOD SHORTAGES REPORTED IN BALTIC COUNTRIES**

The impact of Moscow's invasion of Afghanistan is already felt in the Baltic countries. There are many reports of food shortages since the Soviet aggression last December. Balts maintain that greater quantities of food products are now sent to the Soviet Union. Some of them speak their minds quite openly, as the woman quoted in Chicago's Lithuanian-language daily, Draugas, who said in a letter that, "our country is preparing for war, and so we are short of meat . . ."

Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia are forced to contribute more than goods to the Soviet war effort. Some 30,000 Lithuanian men are constantly serving in the Red Army. Obligatory military service is two years long. Young Lithuanians are not allowed to serve in the Red Army units that are stationed in Lithuania and are usually scattered so as to avoid a greater concentration. According to the Latvian exile press, a draftee cannot be stationed closer than 800 kilometers from his native land or residence. The reason for all these reasons is the deep-seated mistrust of the Balts by the Soviet government.

Are there any Lithuanian soldiers in Afghanistan? Many of them are stationed near the Chinese border, in Caucasus, or in Kazakhstan, from where the Red Army units were sent to Afghanistan. A large number of Lithuanian reservists have been called to active duty. Evening Outlook (Feb. 29, 1980), a newspaper published in California, has reported that 300 coffins with soldiers killed in Afghanistan were unloaded in the

Vilnius railway station. This report has not yet been verified.

The Latvian-language newspaper, Latvija (March 1, 1980), published in Germany, informs that coffins from Afghanistan containing Baltic casualties do regularly arrive at the customs office in Riga, Latvia. The coffins are then whisked away by security agents in closed cars. The guess is that the fallen soldiers are returned to their parents for burial. There are no obituaries in the Latvian press, but military funerals in Latvia's cemeteries have become more frequent.

The first list of eleven Estonian soldiers who have perished in Afghanistan has been published in the Estonian exile press.●

**WHY BALANCE THE BUDGET NOW**

**HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, with the conference report on the fiscal year 1981 budget pending before the House, I feel it is important for us to reflect on the necessity of crippling domestic programs as we head into an increasingly severe recession. The New York Times in its May 27 editorial places this budget balancing fever in perspective. I encourage my colleagues to read it:

**WHICH BUDGET WAR?**

There is something comic, or even pathetic, about the desperate drive in Congress to balance the Federal budget for the fiscal year that starts in October. Members of the budget committees in the House and Senate are running about frantically trying to win support from their colleagues for a compromise budget resolution that would supposedly bring about a budget balanced at \$613.3 billion. The trouble is that, even if it is achieved now, by the time October rolls around, it will be impossible to maintain a balanced budget. It will also be undesirable.

Congress, in other words, is still fighting the last fiscal war. So is the President. They have all pledged to give the nation a balanced budget and no one wants to be the first to call off the charade in an election year.

The drive for balance made some sense two months ago when the recession was playing hide and seek with economists, and prices and interest rates were rising shockingly fast. That's when the President launched the credit control program, tossed out his first 1981 budget, only seven weeks old and involving a deficit, and pledged instead to come up with a budget in balance for the year. Congress followed his lead. And suddenly the special interest lobbyists began to worry that maybe Congress was serious. For the first time in decades Washington seemed ready to kill, or at least cut, some of their favorite programs.

That was the mood, too, at last week's conference to iron out the differences between the House and Senate versions of the budget. The legislators acted as though nothing has been happening to the economy. They had promised to balance the budget next year and nothing was going to stop them from doing so, at least on paper, at least for the moment.

The budget is balanced on the assumption of a relatively mild recession. But much in the economy has changed. Every day, the

long-awaited recession is more evident. And it does not look mild; on the contrary, it may well be long and deep. And that means two good reasons for deliberately throwing the 1981 budget out of balance: to help the private economy recover and to cushion the effects on the victims of recession.

Meanwhile, Congressional conservatives have fought for—and won—a large boost in defense spending. Liberals have tried to protect the poor and the cities from further cuts—and lost. The House this week may even reject the budget because of objections to the cuts in domestic programs wrought in the compromise. This supposed compromise would take unduly from the sectors of society that have least to give. But it is hard to become aroused about a budget plan that is obsolete before it's even printed.

The drive to cut a few billion dollars here and there out of a \$600-billion budget has lost even its symbolic value. The election-year charade should end.●

**THANKS TO THE ILLINOIS COMBINED FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CHAIRMEN**

**HON. TOM CORCORAN**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois State chairmen for the Combined Federal Campaign worked very hard and did a superb job in the most recent Combined Federal Campaign. All too often, we are quick to criticize and slow to extend appreciation and thanks, which is why I take great pride and pleasure in recognizing 22 Federal employees in Illinois. These 22 individuals recently headed up Combined Federal Campaigns in my State, which resulted in our most successful fundraising drive yet. Federal military and civilian employees pledged more than \$3.4 million. These generous contributions will be donated to a wide range of health and social welfare agencies which participate in the National Health Agencies, the local United Ways, and the International Service Agencies.

Richard Lockhart, who serves as the coordinator for the 17 health agencies in Illinois further informs me that the health group will receive \$896,979. This money will be used primarily for patient services, research, and public and professional education.

All of these worthwhile results, however, are only possible with the extra hard work and effort by those who head up this fundraising campaign. Their work on the CFC is in addition to their regular duties in government. Therefore, I am very pleased to commend each of them at this time.

Ernest Bickhaus, Adams County CFC—Quincy Post Office.

Don Markwell, Aurora CFC—Federal Aviation Administration.

Arnold Dahlman, Carroll County CFC—Savanna Army Depot Activity.

John Comerer, Elgin CFC—Elgin Post Office.

Huber Goforth, Carbondale CFC—Carbondale Post Office.

Boyd Holmes, Jefferson County CFC—Social Security Administration.

Clark McKenna, Kankakee County CFC—U.S. Post Office.

Ms. Fran Ryan, Cook-DuPage Counties CFC—Department of Labor.

Bill Tipsword, Knox County CFC—Social Security Administration, Galesburg.

Stephen O. Young, McLean County CFC—Social Security Administration, Bloomington.

Henry Pauls, Macon County CFC—Decatur Post Office.

Charles Caton, Will County CFC—Joliet Post Office.

Captain Robert Beskind, Lake County CFC—Great Lakes Naval Reserve.

Fred Halbig, Sangamon County CFC—Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Springfield.

Gerald Hartwig, Peoria County CFC—Social Security Administration, Peoria.

John Fritsch, Vermilion County CFC—Danville Post Office.

B. J. Tolson, Williamson County CFC—Marion, U.S. Penitentiary.

Thomas Kelly, Winnebago County CFC—Rockford Post Office.

Colonel Dick Dorsey, Champaign County CFC—Chanute Air Force Base.

Peter Copeland, Rock Island County CFC—U.S. Army Armament Material Readiness Command.

Clarence Squellati, St. Louis CFC—USDA, Farmer's Home Administration.

Joseph Zanddecki, LaSalle CFC—U.S. Post Office, LaSalle. ●

### JACK KRAIZMAN NAMED "MAN OF THE YEAR"

#### HON. WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, 1980, Jack Kraizman will be named "Man of the Year" by Congregation B'nai David in Southfield, Mich. Jack is an extraordinary man, whom I have known for years, and he richly deserves the honor he will receive.

Jack has been extremely active in community, religious, and professional organizations. I have been most closely associated with him as a result of his work with the Jewish War Veterans, of which he is a past commander of the Michigan chapter. It was Jack who called my attention to the fact that decisions of the Board of Veterans Appeals may not be subject to review in court, and I have subsequently introduced legislation to remedy this inequity. Jack's interest in this issue reflects his overriding concern for justice and the welfare of all citizens.

Jack emigrated to the United States from Russia as a child, and attended elementary through law school in Michigan. His life has been a testament to the opportunities that America has traditionally made available to all people; his many successes have resulted from his dedication to making

the most of these opportunities and taking initiatives to help his country and fellow citizens at every turn. I feel very fortunate to have Jack Kraizman as one of my constituents.

I know that my colleagues will join me in congratulating Jack on the honor he is about to receive and warm wishes for success in his future endeavors. ●

### TROUBLE FOR AMERICA'S AUTOMAKERS

#### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I insert my Washington report for Wednesday, May 28, 1980, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### TROUBLE FOR AMERICA'S AUTOMAKERS

The Indiana Congressional Delegation recently met with representatives of the Hoosier State's automobile industry. Those representatives impressed upon us the seriousness of the economic slump which has struck their industry with devastating force. They point out that the slump may well inflict lasting damage on their companies.

The American automobile industry is plagued by several problems. In today's stagnant economy, sales are off about 43 percent from this time last year. The sharp decline in business has sent profits tumbling. The regulatory policies of the federal government bear some responsibility for the losses since regulations have added to the cost of cars and contributed to the shortage of gasoline. Potential purchasers of automobiles, hit hard by inflation and high interest rates, are simply postponing their decisions. The United Automobile Workers (UAW) is faced with growing numbers of pensioners as the people who joined the union during the years of expansion reach retirement age. With their profits dropping precipitously, the automakers are cutting their capital spending and introducing expensive rebate plans to stimulate sales. General Motors has reduced its dividends. It is questionable whether Ford, which has suffered setbacks in its North American operations, will be able to sustain its position as a worldwide competitor. Chrysler is scrambling just to keep its head above water.

Even these grim facts do not give the whole picture. At a time of sagging sales and profits, Detroit is struggling to adapt to a changing market. The industry is doing away with the big cars that were its mainstay during the past two decades, and it is tooling up to manufacture the small models demanded by law and consumer preference. The process of conversion is costly: production of the 1980-85 lines may require \$70 billion in capital outlays. A further complication is the increasing share of the market being taken by importers who have small cars to sell. Imports may soon account for 30 percent of all sales. The impact on autoworkers is yet another concern. Thirteen of 40 assembly plants have been shut down, about 300,000 people have lost their jobs, and many more fear that they will be next to join the ranks of the unemployed. To make things worse, some experts are asking whether the automobile has a future in a world of shrinking petroleum reserves.

Washington is alarmed by the deterioration of the American automobile industry. It recognizes that the industry needs some kind of help. Among the initiatives being weighed are the easing of fuel-efficiency regulations, the use of tax credits and generous depreciation allowances to assist the industry in paying its higher costs, the relaxation of antitrust laws to permit car companies to cooperate on safety and research projects, the imposition of barriers to imports, and legislation to require that a certain percentage of each imported car be made of American parts. Support in the form of small business loans is being considered for car dealers, 1,000 of whom have closed their doors since last summer. The list of possible remedies is so long that it has become necessary to identify priorities and pin down the best steps.

Imports are a special problem. Ford and the UAW want Congress to restrict Japanese imports which now account for 20 percent of all cars sold here. The restrictions would force the major Japanese automakers to build plants in the United States, thus driving Japanese car prices up. More and more, American automakers are competing directly with Japanese counterparts whose workers are very productive. In the body assembly shop of a plant in Japan, for example, an amazing 96 percent of all welds are made by robots, enabling the plant to manufacture 67 cars per man-year. The Japanese industry as a whole averages 45 cars per man-year. Our industry, in contrast, averages only 25. Labor costs are another factor favoring the Japanese. Wages at American plants may reach \$20 per hour in 1982, substantially above the expected wages in Japan.

It is clear that worldwide competition among automakers has generated intense protectionist feeling in Detroit. Although protection may boost profits and employment in the short term, it may mean higher prices to consumers and fewer total sales later on. Also, it raises the very real threat of retaliation: if Japan cannot export its cars to America, the Japanese may choose to cut back on their purchases of our food, thus harming the American farmer. Perhaps the best approach to the problem is one that proceeds in steps. First we seek voluntary controls on the part of the Japanese, then we price their cars here as our cars are priced in Japan, then we force them to assemble their cars here, and finally, if all else fails, we curb imports.

Despite the gloom, there are hopeful signs. The government and the automakers are beginning to put away their quarrels. They understand that the industry is so important to the nation's well-being that cooperation must replace confrontation. A basic question of the 1980s—a genuinely difficult one to answer—is the extent to which the government should become involved in the coming worldwide commercial struggle for a bigger share of the car market. Also, the introduction of small models should revive sales and recapture some of the market now going to imports. Finally, Japanese plants are already being established in this country.

A leaner and more competitive American automobile industry must, and in my view will, emerge from the current trouble. For the companies that adapt to changing demands, most experts see a bright future. ●

THE DARK SIDE OF THE TITO LEGACY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is not unusual for eulogies for the deceased to ring mellifluously if not always quite true. When Mao Tse-tung died a few years ago, some American papers were hard put to even call him a Communist, as if in fear of a libel suit. We see a somewhat similar situation in the case of Marshal Tito's death earlier this month. To provide a little balance to the generally highly favorable press comment, Cord Meyer's recent column on Tito is of interest. The cult of personality that the Yugoslav dictator fostered and foisted on his country provides a dark side to the Tito legacy. The Meyer column appeared in the Richmond Times-Dispatch on May 16, 1980, and is reprinted below:

THE DARK SIDE OF THE TITO LEGACY  
(By Cord Meyer)

"The evil that men do lives after them, the good is oft interred with their bones." So wrote Shakespeare and so it may be for Tito, whose funeral inspired such indiscriminate praise that it obscures the dark side of his legacy.

For all his achievements, Tito leaves behind him a cult of personality that cannot long survive his death and a swollen one-party bureaucracy that cannot function effectively under the annually rotating leadership that he bequeathed to his successors.

Leonid Brezhnev's benign presence and soft words at Tito's funeral should not for a moment mislead the Carter administration as to Soviet intentions toward the first communist state that asserted its independence of Moscow's rule.

Accumulating over the years, there is a body of hard evidence available to President Carter that the Kremlin has assigned the highest priority to winning back, after Tito's death, the loyalty and obedience of the Yugoslav Communist Party. The Russians view their Yugoslav comrades as lost sheep who have strayed only temporarily from the fold.

The Soviets are not likely to risk anything so destructive of their hopes of selective détente in Western Europe as an armed invasion on the Afghan model. Rather the real threat is a relentless carrot-and-stick strategy designed to exploit every conceivable Yugoslav vulnerability by overt and covert means.

Economic pressures, diplomatic blandishments, secret penetration agents and nationality divisions, all will be orchestrated in the effort to restore the Soviet hegemony that Tito escaped.

The stakes in this cat-and-mouse game are very high. The Yugoslav heresy sticks like a bone in the Kremlin's throat, and Tito's condemnation of the Soviet invasions of Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan encouraged disobedience in Rumania and among Western communist parties. If the Yugoslavs can be brought back into line, only the ruling communist parties in tiny Albania

and in huge China would remain outside the Soviet orbit.

The strategic advantages of reintegrating Yugoslavia into the Warsaw Pact are almost as compelling for the Soviets as the benefits of ideological conformity. Soviet access to air and naval bases on the Adriatic would transform the eastern Mediterranean into a Russian lake. Soviet troops on the borders of Greece and Italy would destabilize the precarious political balance in those two countries and undermine the whole southern flank of NATO.

In Moscow, Konstantin Rusakov, as head of the Bloc Department of the Soviet Communist Party's Secretariat, has the main responsibility for proposing a coordinated operational plan to the Politburo for the winning back of Yugoslavia. Drawing on inputs from the KGB and from the defense, economic and foreign ministries, Rusakov must already be far advanced in his preparation of an assessment of Russian resources and a phased strategy for their deployment.

As the famous Yugoslav dissident, Milovan Djilas, tried to warn a year ago, the greatest danger does not lie in the small underground group of active pro-Soviet Yugoslavs but rather in the possibility that elements in the existing Yugoslav communist bureaucracy and police apparatus may decide that a rapprochement with the Soviet Union is the only way to preserve their monopoly on power in the wake of Tito's death. There are already disturbing signs of cooperation between intelligence services.

Despite his daring innovations, Tito never changed the basic structure of communist rule. When party supremacy was threatened by Croatian separatism in the early '70s, he re-established the authority of the Central Presidium. In his old age, he strengthened the secret police, the dreaded UDBA, under its present chief, Gen. Franjo Herljevič, a tough Leninist. Tito even ordered the assassination abroad of his opponents and sentenced his domestic critics to long prison terms.

On the other side of the ledger stand the deep national antipathy toward Russian hegemony and the profound changes in Yugoslav society brought about by the open borders, higher living standards and access to the West that Tito's policy permitted. There is a new generation of Yugoslavs, 70 per cent of the population, for whom the partisan battles of World War II and the nationality funds are a vague historical memory. For them, Tito in his last years was a respected but much too repressive father figure, and their sympathies lie with the West.

In a recent interview with this reporter, the noted Yugoslav emigre author, Mihailo Mihailov, who spent seven years in Tito's jails for his outspoken opinions, warned that Tito's personality cult will fade more quickly than Mao's. Both Mihailov and Djilas see the best hope in an alliance between the more liberal communists and the general population that can lead by gradual steps toward a more open and pluralistic society.

Whether American foreign policy-makers have the subtle skill required to encourage and protect this evolution will determine not only the future of Yugoslavia but of the NATO alliance as well.●

HONORING MR. RON FRANK

HON. DAN LUNGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, for more than 200 years, small business has provided the backbone of the American economy, and has exemplified the American spirit and character through the traits of individual initiative, self-reliance and creativity.

For the fifth consecutive year, the Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce is making an extra effort to recognize the importance and contributions of small business to the economy and the free enterprise system. One of the chamber's efforts is the presentation of the annual "Small Business Award" during May—Small Business Month in Long Beach.

The 1980 award was presented Tuesday, May 13, to Mr. Ron Frank, president of Frank Bros., a retail furniture and home furnishings business located in Long Beach.

Frank Bros. was established in 1930. Ron began at the bottom of this family-owned business, earning 10 cents a day. He worked his way up from janitor to stockboy, to salesman, to assistant manager, and became president in 1961.

Frank Bros. enjoys an admirable reputation in the Long Beach retail community. The establishment has long been known for its exceptional line of quality and unique merchandise.

In addition to being a successful and respected businessman, Ron Frank is also very active in community, civic, and charitable affairs. He is on the board of the Long Beach Heart Association, a member of the Industry-Education Council of Long Beach, a Grey-Y leader for 3 years for the Long Beach YMCA, a Rotarian, secretary-treasurer of the Queen Mary Tour, a board member of the Long Beach Boulevard Improvement Association, has served two terms on the chamber's board of directors, and is a founding member of the committee of 300, the support group for the annual running of the Long Beach Grand Prix.

Ron Frank exemplifies the men and women in small business, who, through their tremendous drive to succeed, characterize our free and dynamic people, and thus guarantee the future of our society.●

BUREAUCRATIC QUAGMIRES OF REDTAPE

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I thought my colleagues would be com-

forted to know that we are not the only ones in the world who must hassle labyrinthian bureaucratic quagmires of redtape and rules and regulations.

Indeed, the Imperial Clinical Industries of Australia might even rival our own Occupational Safety and Health Administration and Environmental Protection Agency in regulatory zeal. While I was in England recently to help kick off National Epilepsy Week in that country, a friend of mine gave me the following announcement:

Imperial Clinical Industries of Australia has announced the discovery of a new fire-fighting agent known as WATER (Wonderful And Total Extinguishing Resource). It is particularly suitable for dealing with fires in buildings, timber yards and warehouses, and is cheap to produce. It is intended that quantities of about one-and-a-half million gallons should be stored in open ponds or reservoirs near urban areas and installations of high fire risk.

WATER is already encountering opposition from safety and environmental groups. One group has pointed out that if anyone immersed his head in a bucket of WATER, it would prove fatal in as little as three minutes. Each of the proposed reservoirs will contain enough WATER to fill half a million three-gallon buckets. Each bucketful could be used a hundred or more times, so there is enough WATER in one reservoir to kill the entire population of the United Kingdom.

It has been reported that WATER is a constituent of beer. Does this mean that firemen could become intoxicated from the fumes when they use it to put out a fire?

The "Friends of the World" said they obtained a sample of WATER and found it made clothes shrink. It shrank cotton, so what would it do to people? In the House of Commons, the Home Secretary was asked if he would prohibit the manufacture and storage of this lethal new material. A full investigation was needed, he said. A group was formed to file an environmental report.●

#### BALANCE THE BUDGET: AN EDITORIAL VIEWPOINT

**HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER**  
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this week the House of Representatives is expected to consider the conference report on the congressional budget resolution. Once again we will be confronted with the task of whether to approve a real balanced Federal budget or one that "works out temporarily on paper."

I read a recent editorial in the Omaha World Herald that addresses this subject. I think it is appropriate for Members to review the contents of the editorial as they consider the votes on the conference report. I insert it in the RECORD as follows:

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

[From the Omaha World Herald, May 18, 1980]

##### A TRUE BALANCED BUDGET NEEDED

The Conference Board has issued a new set of inflation statistics which put into figures something we already knew—inflation is eroding purchasing power drastically.

The business-funded research unit said that in 1970, a family of four with an income of \$10,000 a year had \$8,640 left to spend after payment of federal income and Social Security taxes.

This year, that same family would need \$20,187 just to stay even. Taxes would take \$3,408 of the gross and an additional \$8,139 would be needed to make up for price increases.

Four-person families with salaries of \$15,000 to \$20,000 in 1970 require incomes today of \$30,722 to \$52,495 to equal purchasing power.

The answer, though, isn't to keep increasing the flow of "cheap" dollars. The permanent remedy is to strengthen the dollar by slowing the federal money printing presses. A true balanced federal budget, not just one that works out temporarily on paper in an election year, would be a firm step forward in restoring the buying power of the nation's hard-pressed families.●

#### YOUTH OPINION SURVEY

**HON. TOBY ROTH**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, during a recent visit to the Eighth Congressional District I had the opportunity to review current events in foreign affairs with students from Southern Door High School, Brussels, Wis. I was very impressed with the maturity and insight these students demonstrated by their knowledge and wisdom of these important matters.

During that visit I also conducted a brief survey of students, and the following are the results:

##### RESULTS OF YOUTH OPINION SURVEY

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you support President Carter's boycott of the summer Olympics in Moscow?.....	68	32
2. Do you agree with the manner in which the American hostage situation in Iran has been handled?.....	38	62
3. Do you believe that the United States must take a stronger stand against further Soviet aggression?.....	90	10
4. Do you favor a return to the selective service system beginning with the registration of all males 18 to 20 years of age?.....	45	55
5. Do you favor the registration of women?.....	45	55
6. Do you think that a person should have a choice between serving in the military or volunteering for an alternative such as the Peace Corps of community service?.....	86	14

#### A MONUMENT TO HONOR GENERAL MIHAILOVICH

**HON. MORRIS K. UDALL**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, along with my good friend from Illinois (Mr.

May 28, 1980

DERWINSKI) and numerous other Members of Congress, I have sponsored H.R. 262, a bill which would authorize the construction of a monument to Gen. Draza Mihailovich. General Mihailovich was a Yugoslav patriot who saved the lives of several hundred American airmen during World War II. Those airmen have formed themselves into an organization, the National Committee of American Airmen Saved by General Mihailovich, whose only goal is to honor this man to whom they owe so much. H.R. 262 authorizes the private construction and maintenance of this monument somewhere in Washington; no public moneys would be required.

Tom Tiede of the Newspaper Enterprise Association recently wrote an article on the Mihailovich issue which gives a good outline of the situation. I encourage my colleagues to read this article, and to become cosponsors of H.R. 262.

The article follows:

YUGOSLAV WAR HERO WAS TITO'S ENEMY—  
U.S. WON'T LET PILOTS THANK MIHAILOVICH  
(By Tom Tiede)

WASHINGTON—In the early 1940s, during World War II, a Yugoslavian resistance fighter became something of a legend and Godsend to a good number of American servicemen.

Gen. Draza Mihailovich organized rescue efforts to keep ditched bomber pilots out of the hands of the German forces.

After the war the pilots decided to repay the general with national gratitude. They formed an organization to propose the building of a small monument to the guerrilla leader. They came to Washington to get governmental sanction, and a piece of property, and were promptly and sharply turned down.

Federal officers said the memorial would be inappropriate. They explained that the United States was supporting Marshall Tito in Yugoslavia, and Tito did not want any honors for Mihailovich. No one denied that Mihailovich was a hero, and a wartime friend, but there were political realities to consider.

Undeterred, the pilots did not give up their idea. Nor did the government withdraw its steadfast opposition. Today, 35 years later, the standoff continues. The pilots, now aging, are still trying to construct a monument to Gen. Mihailovich. The U.S. administration still opposes the notion.

"It's a very sad story," says Maj. Gen. Donald Smith, retired. He was one of the downed airmen rescued by Mihailovich, and is now honorary chairman of the memorial organization.

Smith says the pilots want to build a simple granite obelisk in Washington. They would raise money through donations (perhaps \$40,000), then maintain the monument themselves.

The plan has wide support, he adds. Parks officials have accepted it, a memorial bill in the House has attracted 70 cosponsors, and the U.S. Senate has voted its approval on two occasions. But without full governmental blessing, Smith says the memorial can't be built in the capital.

Ironically, there was a time when the government would have welcomed a plan to honor Mihailovich. In the middle years of the war, the general's mountain troops were the best friends the Allies had in Yugosla-

via. Tito also had a resistance command, but historians say he was not so helpful as Mihailovich.

The general's primary assistance was to pilots based in Italy. They flew over Yugoslavia to bomb Hitler's oil fields in Rumania, and when they were crippled they turned to Mihailovich for help. The guerrilla rescued 520 U.S. airmen, many of whom would otherwise have been killed or captured by the Nazis.

But if Mihailovich was America's staunch friend, he was also Tito's sworn enemy. The general was a royalist, the marshal a communist. They fought each other as much or more than they did the Germans. The feud led to a discrediting of Mihailovich in the view of Allied authorities.

Gen. Smith believes the communists engineered the discrediting. They are said to have planted a spy in British intelligence who embellished Tito's reputation at Mihailovich's expense. From then on the Allies turned their attention to Tito, and largely severed relationships with the general.

When the war ended, Tito took over the Yugoslav government, arrested Mihailovich and put him on trial. Smith says a number of U.S. pilots offered to testify on behalf of the guerrilla hero, but U.S. authorities denied them permission. The general was found guilty and swiftly executed.

Meantime, the Truman administration had awarded Mihailovich a medal for his wartime help: the Legion of Merit. But in deference to Tito, it was decided not to make it public. The award was classified for 20 years before Rep. Edward Derwinski, R-Ill., dragged the secret from government archives.

Derwinski has been a Mihailovich champion since. Partly because his Congressional district contains thousands of Serbian-Americans who, like the pilots, believe the general has been poorly served by the United States, Derwinski has been the chief sponsor of a number of memorial bills introduced in the House.

Derwinski has also been the target of some scathing communist anger. And so have a few of the airmen who continue to promote Mihailovich. Each time word reaches Yugoslavia of the memorial legislation, it's featured in Tito's newspapers. Gen. Smith says some of the memorial proponents have received death threats.

Tito has never had to fret. The U.S. State Department has stated repeatedly that it considers its fragile association with the marshal more important than a debt of honor. As far as federal officialdom has been concerned, Derwinski says, Draza Mihailovich has been a nonperson.

Some believe that when Tito is gone the United States will at last give Gen. Mihailovich his due. But then again perhaps not. After all these years the government may be too embarrassed to admit how it's treated an old friend. ●

**CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO  
MAN OF THE YEAR ALBERT U.  
KOCH**

**HON. RAPHAEL MUSTO**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. MUSTO. Mr. Speaker, the Lehigh Area Chamber of Commerce has seen fit to honor Albert U. "Brady" Koch as the "Man of the

Year," and it is my great pleasure to call your attention to this distinguished gentleman and seek this national recognition of his dedicated service, outstanding community leadership, and contributions to our area during the past 20 some years.

All of us who have had the good fortune to know Brady Koch are especially proud of his many accomplishments as a Carbon County commissioner in his fourth term and presently serving as chairman. His personal commitment to the community and his outstanding public service as mayor of Lehigh for two terms are applauded by all of our people. Particularly noteworthy are his many years of service to the Gnadent Memorial Hospital on the board of directors and presently as its first vice president. We also recognize that he served as director of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association and is a past president of the Rotary Club of Lehigh. In addition, he has served as chairman of the economic council fund drive for the last 2 years. Of even greater significance is the heart-warming knowledge of the magnitude of the unselfish efforts that he has extended to his fellow man in many other capacities.

Mr. Speaker, I know you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our heartiest congratulations to Albert U. "Brady" Koch and share the great pride of his family and friends in honoring an outstanding citizen and great American. We do indeed salute Lehigh's man of the year, Albert U. Koch. ●

**HEAD START IS A SUCCESS**

**HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to congratulate and commend the thousands of dedicated Americans who serve their communities through the Head Start program.

It is also with great pride that I join my State's Governor, John D. Rockefeller IV, in celebrating the month of May in West Virginia, as "Head Start Month."

For over 15 years now, individuals from all over this great land of our's have been brought together in their support of Head Start by a common bond: love for children.

Day in and day out, these people volunteer to help, guide, and love millions of children aged 3 and 4. Their work is remarkable. Their success is even more astonishing.

In particular, I think of the Head Start program in Mingo County, W. Va., 16 centers, under the direction of Ida Mae Copley, work with over 400

children. At these Head Start centers, the staff believes that our Nation's children is our future, and they work with the interests of the children and the United States in mind.

But the children are not the only beneficiaries of Head Start. Parents of preschool children are made aware of the needs of their youngsters. Medical concerns, psychological needs, physical development among others, all play a part in the formation of a well-rounded young person. In Mingo County, as well in all eight of the counties in the Fourth District, Head Start is working, and it must continue. With the support of all of us, it will. ●

**INTERNATIONAL PEACE ACADEMY'S  
THIRD MIDDLE EAST  
TASK FORCE REPORT**

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the International Peace Academy in New York is a small organization devoted to furthering the skills of conflict resolution. It is involved in scrutinizing and promoting peacekeeping, mediation, and negotiations efforts.

The report of the Academy's Third Middle East Task Force to the Middle East was recently brought to my attention and I would like to share its conclusions with my colleagues. The task force consisted of John Edwin Mroz, Executive Vice President of the Academy and author of "Beyond Security: Private Perceptions Among Arabs and Israelis" and Ira D. Wallach, a member of the academy's board of directors and chairman of the Gottesman Corp.

The summary of the task force's visit to the Middle East offers useful insights into the situation in that crucial area and is helpful background for understanding current diplomatic efforts to try to promote a comprehensive peace settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and some of the problems these negotiations are encountering.

The summary follows:

**SUMMARY VIEWS OF THE THIRD MIDDLE EAST  
TASK FORCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL PEACE  
ACADEMY**

**I. BACKGROUND NOTE**

The International Peace Academy is a professional teaching institute which provides training programs for diplomats and military officials from 114 nations (including the USA) in the skills and procedures of negotiation, mediation, and peacekeeping. The Academy is headed by Major General Indarjit Rikhye, former Commander of UNEF in Gaza and Military Adviser to UN Secretaries-General Hammarskjöld and Thant. The Academy had conducted numerous professional training programs around the world, including the Foreign Service Institute's seminar in Multilateral Diplomacy in 1979 and 1980. In addition to its training activities, the Academy produces and pub-

lishes practitioner-oriented publications in the conflict resolution field, such as the "Peacekeeper's Handbook." Former Secretary of State, Vance, who continues to serve as a member of the Academy's International Advisory Board, said of this publication: "This handbook will unquestionably help to strengthen the UN's peacekeeping capabilities. It would be of particular use in training of the sort we have recently proposed." (1978).

The "Third Middle East Task Force" was authorized by the Academy's governing Board to spend 6 weeks in Israel, the West Bank, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, Oman, and the United Arab Emirates. In addition, lengthy meetings were held with Arab League officials in Tunis and a wide spectrum of the PLO leadership. The Task Force consisted of John Edwin Mroz, Academy Executive Vice President and author of "Beyond Security: Private Perceptions Among Arabs and Israelis;" and Ira D. Wallach, a member of the Academy's Board of Directors and New York industrialist. The book "Beyond Security" is a product of three years' work of the Academy's Middle East Task Force.

## II. SUMMARY OF VIEWS

The following views were among those which emerged during private discussions with 124 governmental and non-governmental leaders in the Mideast, March 9-April 21, 1980.

1. It was generally believed by the Arabs and Israelis with whom the Task Force talked that the vast majority of the people of the other group favors an end to the Arab-Israeli conflict. Likewise they doubt that the leadership of their adversary equally seeks an immediate end to the conflict. Many feel that the major initiative for peace will come from the youth of the countries and from the military, the latter because of a deep-seated frustration over their inability to achieve a decisive military victory as a result of great power interference (examples given include 1956, 1967, and 1973).

2. A clear majority of the Israeli people with whom the Task Force spoke support an end to the current military occupation of most of the West Bank and Gaza (however, this often excludes Jerusalem). The crucial question is clearly how one reconciles the security needs of Israel and its neighbors with the exercise of Palestinian self-determination.

3. There is full agreement by all Arabs and Israelis with whom the Task Force spoke that the Middle East will know no peace until the Palestinian problem is solved in all its aspects. The Palestinian problem is seen as inextricably linked to dozens of other current or potential conflicts from the north of Africa to the Gulf. It is felt by many that settlement of this problem will tend to facilitate resolution of other regional problems.

4. There is full agreement among Arab policy and opinion leaders with whom the Task Force spoke, including the mainstream PLO leadership, that Israel is a permanent factor in the region and there is a noticeable absence of talk of militarily defeating Israel. The Task Force encountered persistent discussion in all quarters about the mechanics and specific benefits of a comprehensive settlement. The Arab view is that delay of a settlement for a period of years could again negatively change the Arab position on acceptance of Israel (the favorable change appears to have taken place between 1973 and 1976). Meanwhile strong private pressure upon the PLO to publicly recognize

Israel's right to exist is coming from both West and East.

5. Most Israelis with whom the Task Force spoke believe that Israel is finding the military occupation of the West Bank and Gaza increasingly difficult to maintain. The Palestinians, including small children, are becoming openly rebellious and antagonistic. Incidents of mass civil disobedience and acts of violence are becoming more common and difficult to control. Fears of wider violence by extremist Arab (Moslem and Christian) and Jewish fringe groups is growing.

6. There is unanimous agreement by Arabs and Israelis alike that some third parties will play a major role in carrying out the transitional phases of a settlement. This could include monitoring buffer zones, inspection of demilitarized and limited armament areas, providing early warning information, plebiscite supervision, and the like.

7. The desire was generally expressed by most Arabs and Israelis of the need to limit Soviet military influence in the region, in which case it often followed that the United States military presence likewise should be restricted. The growing military presence of the Soviets and the Americans is a cause of private concern to most Arabs with whom the Task Force spoke; Israelis are likewise concerned about the Soviet presence. The confidence in the intentions and capabilities of both great powers has seriously eroded during the past year.

8. It is evident to the Task Force that security fears are deeply held by all of the parties (including the Palestinians for the security of a Palestinian state). All parties agree that a period of confidence-building will be necessary to allay these fears. There was some feeling that outside guarantees might be helpful, as part of a comprehensive settlement, possibly under Security Council auspices. Some Arab leaders, including the PLO, also hoped that a final settlement would include an agreement by the signatories to limit great power military presence in the region.

9. It was explained to the Task Force by many Arab leaders that communist parties in the region are considerably weaker today than in the 1940s.

10. Most Palestinians and other Arabs with whom the Task Force spoke (except in Egypt and Oman) do not see where the Camp David process is going. They fear that acceptance of Mr. Begin's "full autonomy" (which they claim is actually a limited autonomy designed to continue Israeli control over the military, water, and other critical areas) would amount to an acceptance of the perpetuation of the occupation. Based on extensive conversations with Jordanian officials, it appears unlikely that Jordan will participate in the autonomy talks under present circumstances.

The PLO, Syrian and other Arab leaders do not privately call for the renunciation of the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty but for a freeze of the normalization process and pressure on Mr. Begin to change his policy on the occupied territories and self-determination. Most Israelis with whom the Task Force spoke agreed that some change of the status of the occupied territories would come with a change of government in Israel. However, many Arabs doubted whether a change of Israel's government would make a major difference in its policy.

**BIO SKETCH OF JOHN EDWIN MROZ, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL PEACE ACADEMY, NEW YORK, N.Y.**

Mroz has served since 1977 as Executive Vice President of the International Peace Academy, a professional educational insti-

tute that provides training to government officials from 114 nations in the skills of peacekeeping, mediation, and negotiation. He previously served as Director of Development of the Academy.

Mroz completed his doctoral work at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. He has served as a National Science Foundation Teaching Fellow in Boston and has earned three master's degrees in areas of international politics, international law and organization, communist studies and public diplomacy.

His first book "Beyond Security: Private Perceptions Among Arabs and Israelis" is being published in the Spring of 1980. It systematically explores the perceived threats and security requirements of the Palestinians, Israelis, Jordanians, Egyptians, Syrians, and Lebanese in the 1980's and includes several compromise options mentioned privately by Arabs and Israelis to resolve the critical security issue. He is completing a more detailed study of the impact of third parties in the Arab Israeli conflict and is writing several articles for professional journals and newspapers.

Mroz is married and lives in Fairfield, Connecticut. He travels extensively, particularly in the Middle East. He is a member of the Pi Sigma Alpha (Political Science Honor Fraternity), the University Club, the English Speaking Union, the Middle East Institute, the American Society of International Law, the International Studies Association, and other professional associations. He is a frequent lecturer in the United States, Europe and the Third World on subjects of conflict resolution skills and techniques, international political and security matters, and the Middle East. Additional information is available upon request. ●

## CYRUS VANCE

### HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1980

● Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, many thoughts come to mind as we reflect on the career of Cyrus Vance. During the past 3½ years he worked to build the central elements of a foreign policy which have served our Nation's interests. Secretary Vance believed and worked for strong alliances and strong American defenses. During his tenure he worked diligently for balanced arms control agreements like SALT II which would help to fortify our security. He firmly believed that it was in the interest of the United States to work for peace in troubled areas, especially the Middle East. It was Cyrus Vance who made great strides in building our new relationship with the People's Republic of China, while emphasizing the importance of broadening our ties to many of the nations of the Third World and of Eastern Europe.

Although the past few months have been filled with a great deal of trial, the past few years have been filled with accomplishment. Through his strong leadership we can note the modernization of conventional and theater nuclear forces in NATO, Camp

David, SALT II, China normalization, the Panama Canal Treaty, peace in Zimbabwe, regular economic summits, successful multilateral trade negotiations, and human rights advances in many countries.

Cyrus Vance has made a fine record for himself both at home and around the world. His distinguished work will not be forgotten.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN STEPHEN MONAGAN

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is most appropriate that the Federal building in Waterbury, Conn., should be named to honor one of that city's most distinguished public men, former Congressman John Stephen Monagan, and I am today introducing legislation to accomplish this objective.

A native of Waterbury, John Monagan's entire career of public service is inextricably linked with Waterbury. As a young lawyer, he began his legal career there; he served his fellow townsmen as president of the board of aldermen, then as their mayor, and finally, as their voice in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1959 until his retirement from public life in 1973.

In his seven terms as a Member of Congress, Representative Monagan served with distinction on the committees on Foreign Affairs and Government Operations. He held the post of chairman of the Legal and Monetary Subcommittee. Congressman Monagan represented the United States on numerous commissions established by the President to advance the cause of world peace.

John Monagan served in this body with integrity of purpose and deep devotion to the cause of improving the lives of his constituents and all citizens of our Nation and the world. He was not afraid of hard decisions, and he always carried the heavy responsibilities of his job gracefully and effectively.

I urge all Members of the House to consider and support the bill which I and the entire Connecticut delegation are introducing today to pay proper tribute to this great citizen and public servant.●

U.S. AID TO NICARAGUA

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Robert Muth, vice president of the American Smelting & Refining Co., recently sent me a copy of a letter written to Sena-

tor EDWARD ZORINSKY by Asarco's chairman, Charles F. Barber. Mr. Barber has some interesting insights into the question of U.S. aid to Nicaragua and on the attitudes of that nation's leaders toward private investment. The House will be considering this question as part of the International Security and Development Act and during the appropriations process, and I wanted to share the letter with my colleagues:

ASARCO, March 11, 1980.

HON. EDWARD ZORINSKY,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ZORINSKY: I am writing to express our hope that Congress will approve the pending legislation to provide aid for Nicaragua. The needs are great. The confidence of the Nicaraguan people in their institutions and their country is evident in that the majority of the private-sector farmers and businessmen have remained in Nicaragua and are doing their part to restore the Nicaraguan economy.

In the debate over this legislation in the Congress, much has been made of the Marxist declarations of certain of the Nicaraguan officials. In our day-to-day contacts with these same officials, we have found them pragmatic in economic matters and correct in meeting commitments which they have made. They appear to be developing their political directions as they go along; the issue is by no means determined at this time.

ASARCO Incorporated has operated in Nicaragua since the middle 1930's as manager of Neptune Mining Company, 53% owned by Asarco. Neptune has gold-mining properties in the eastern part of Nicaragua. The mines were expropriated on November 2, 1979. We have since been in continual contact with members of the Junta and the Minister of Mines on matters of personal security, supplies, transportation, and the like. At the present time, the Government is auditing Neptune's books and making an inventory of its fixed assets in company with a representative of Neptune. This is in preparation for discussions as to compensation to be paid. This is not a pleasant matter, but is going forward in an orderly way.

I think it is in the interest of the United States to encourage the new government and the Nicaraguan private sector to work together to rebuild the country and its institutions. Approval of aid for Nicaragua would, I believe, encourage the private-sector people to believe that a sound future for their country exists.

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES F. BARBER,  
Chairman.●

TRIBUTE TO CYRUS VANCE

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1980

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute our former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance. Cy Vance left office recently with the same dignity and grace that he brought to his job.

He will be well remembered as a voice of moderation at a period in his-

tory filled with escalating international tension and saber rattling.

As we well know by the headlines in our daily newspapers, this is a tough time to be a diplomat. And this is especially true for a man with the sensitivity of Cy Vance.

Unlike some past officials in his position, Cyrus Vance did not seek celebrity status. His tact was to work diligently behind the scenes, with as little hoopla as possible, to achieve his objectives. And once they were accomplished, he appeared embarrassed to hear words of praise for his often impossible tasks.

There is no question that Cy Vance will be remembered as a man dedicated to achieving a lasting peace in the world. And it was with honor, dignity, and courage that he sought that goal. His successful efforts to bring Egypt and Israel to a peace settlement via the Camp David accords capped a long career of dedicated public service.

Cyrus Vance will be rightfully sought after in the years to come for his expert advice in the field of foreign affairs.●

CONSIDERATIONS IN THE CASE OF CHARLES H. WILSON OF CALIFORNIA

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, 1980, Mr. HAMILTON inserted in the RECORD his "Considerations in the Case of Charles H. Wilson of California." For those Members who wish to refer to his remarks, they appear on page E2535 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Careful reading of the remarks by Mr. HAMILTON, and the subsequent summary "Dear Colleague" signed by Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. PREYER, and Mr. FOWLER received by each Member on May 21, last Wednesday, indicates that even a careful and conscientious Member such as Mr. HAMILTON can be led to reach conclusions contrary to the House precedents involved in the consideration of the matter of CHARLES H. WILSON of California.

I insert in the RECORD at this point a summary of the precedents which clearly indicate that Mr. HAMILTON has unwittingly pursued an examination of the law and legal principles and standards of due process and fundamental fairness that conflict with established precedents and fundamental requirements of the Constitution.

The summary follows:

I. HOUSE ETHICS PROCEEDINGS MUST BE FUNDAMENTALLY FAIR

A. Mr. Wilson has never asserted that House Disciplinary procedures must conform "perfectly" to the judicial mode, however, he does insist that the procedures enforced by the House in exercising its disciplinary function, must comport with due

process of law as guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution. In short, the procedures must be "fundamentally fair." As the Supreme Court itself recognized long ago, there is no definitive test for the absence of due process, rather, it is lacking if a practice or procedure "offends some principle of justice so rooted in the traditions and conscience of our people so to be ranked fundamental." *Snyder v. Massachusetts*, 291 U.S. 97, 105 (1934). Moreover, Mr. Hamilton's arguments to the contrary notwithstanding, this guarantee of "fundamental fairness" applies to the legislature as well as the other branches of government. *Murray's Lessee v. Hoboken Land and Improvement Co.*, 18 How. (59 U.S.) 272, 276 (1856).

B. Mr. Hamilton places primary reliance on the case of Representative Powell for the proposition that House disciplinary proceedings are non-judicial in nature. However, this precedent is of questionable value since the House action in the Powell case was reversed by the Supreme Court of the United States on the ground that in excluding Mr. Powell from the legislature, the House had exceeded its constitutional authority, *Powell v. McCormack*, 395 U.S. 486 (1969). Significantly, the Court noted in *Powell*, quoting from another case cited by Mr. Hamilton, that the Congressional power under Article I, § 5 of the Constitution is subject "to the restraints imposed by or found in the implications of the Constitution." *Barry v. United States ex rel. Cunningham*, 279 U.S. 597, 614 (1929). The *Barry* case further states that the Constitution confers upon the House "certain powers which are not legislative, but judicial in character." 279 U.S. at 613. Among these powers "judicial in character" is the power of the House to discipline its own members. See Potts, "Power of Legislative Bodies to Punish for Contempt," 74 U. Pa. L. Rev. 691 (1926).

C. Finally, as to the argument that disciplinary proceedings are not adversary in nature, the best answer can be found in the Rules of Procedure for the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, which establish nearly all of the traditional procedures of an adversary hearing including the rights to counsel, cross examination, and the presentation of evidence in a respondent's behalf. These Rules, adopted by the Committee on which Mr. Hamilton serves, provide the very procedures requested by Representative Powell, and denied by Representative Celler. They therefore belie Mr. Hamilton's claim that disciplinary proceedings are investigatory and non-adversary in nature.

## II. MR. WILSON'S OBJECTIONS TO THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

### A. SEVERITY OF THE CHARGES

1. There is no pattern or practice of misconduct. The Committee charged in its statement of Alleged Violations that the misconduct occurred between 1971 and 1978. It sustained only charges alleged to have occurred in 1971 and 1972, more than seven years ago. There is no claim or evidence that these transactions continued past 1972.

2. The charges are less severe than those in the cases relied upon by Mr. Hamilton. Each of the three cases cited by Mr. Hamilton involves a Congressman who profited directly from his official status. In short, each member received a "quid pro quo" for an official action. Such is not the case here. The Committee admits that the evidence failed to show that the receipt of money by Mr. Wilson occurred under circumstances which might be construed as influencing the performance of Mr. Wilson's governmental

duties, H.R. Rep. 96-930. In short, there was no evidence that Mr. Wilson was corrupt.

### B. COUNTS 1-3

This portion of Mr. Hamilton's remarks demonstrates the Committee's lack of care and understanding in evaluating the evidence. It suggests that Mr. Wilson's Subcommittee acted upon legislation of direct interest to Mr. Rogers. In 1971 and 1972 when the loans were made Mr. Wilson chaired the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, an area where Mr. Rogers had no "direct interest". Indeed, the testimony at the Disciplinary Hearing was that Mr. Wilson never introduced or sponsored any legislation which would benefit Lee Rogers. See H.R. Rep. 96-930 at 208-209, 215-216. Moreover, the letter quoted by Mr. Hamilton, Exhibit 15(d), does not relate to postal or other matters before Mr. Wilson's subcommittees, it relates to an F.T.C. bill, which the F.T.C. itself opposed.

Finally, Mr. Hamilton's remarks on the question of loans are simply incorrect. The Committee's own witness, testifying with a grant of immunity from any crime except lying to the Committee stated the payments were loans (H.R. Rep. 96-630 at 183, 174, 175). The checks were clearly marked by the word "LOAN". The absence of a maturity date simply makes them loans payable on demand of the lender, and a California statute supplies the interest as a matter of law. Mr. Wilson was not required to report these loans in 1977 because the four year statute of limitations in California had run, and the loans were no longer legally enforceable.

### C. COUNTS 7-11

Mr. Hamilton asserts that there was no evidence that these transfers alleged in these counts were reimbursement for campaign expenses. He has obviously overlooked Mr. Wilson's prior testimony to that effect, which was introduced as Exhibit 17 by the Committee. The Committee acknowledges that it has the burden to prove by clear and convincing evidence that the expenditures were not reimbursement, H.R. Rep. 96-930 at 6. Mr. Hamilton, instead, relies upon mere "suggestion" from the evidence. He claims the timing of the transfers "suggests" they were not campaign related. However, the largest of the transfers, that in Count 7, was made to pay off a loan obtained in 1970, an election year. Mr. Hamilton also chooses to ignore the testimony of Committee witness Chlan, an accountant of many years experience, that when a person is reimbursed, he is entitled to spend that reimbursement money as he sees fit. H.R. Rep. 96-930 at 157-58. The evidence concerning the status of Mr. Wilson's personal account simply begs the question of whether the transfers were reimbursement. Mr. Hamilton further suggests that the transfers were "laundered" through an office account.

There was no evidence that Mr. Wilson signed any of the checks to the Office Account or even knew about the transfers. H.R. Rep. 96-930 at 152, 154, 155. A finding of guilt based on reasoning of this sort recalls the King's reply to the Knave in "Wonderland." The Knave, in denying that he had written a certain document, pointed out the absence of a signature. To which the King replied: "If you didn't sign it, that only makes matters worse. You must have meant some mischief, or else you'd have signed your name like an honest man." L. Carroll, "Alice's Adventures in Wonderland." 182(1866).

### D. AGE OF THE CHARGES

Mr. Hamilton conveniently ignores the lynchpin of Mr. Wilson's argument; it is

fundamentally unfair to prosecute a person for offenses, whether criminal or ethical, after the passage of time has stripped that person of his means of defense. It is equally unfair to apply the ethical conventions of today to matters more than seven years old. Mr. Hamilton attempts no rebuttal of these principles. Instead he suggests despite their age, the facts "have just been revealed". However, Mr. Levy, a Committee Witness testified that he uncovered these facts between 1½ and 2 years ago. H.R. Rep. 96-930 at 129. Moreover, it is specious to argue that this revelation caused recent damage to the integrity of the House, since the damage was either done when the transactions took place, or was due solely to the Committee's revelation, not to the acts themselves.

### E. ROLE OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Mr. Hamilton states that the Committee functions only as a grand jury since the full House acts as judge and jury. This assertion demonstrates a complete misunderstanding of the function of a trial jury. A trial jury hears evidence, decides facts and judges the credibility of witnesses, functions performed here by the Standards Committee, not the full House. The proper analogy is that the full House, at least since the creation of the Standards Committee, acts as an appellate body, reviewing the case for legal error and sufficiency of the evidence. This is consistent with its decision in the matter of Representative Roybal; a case cited by Mr. Hamilton.

Since the Standards Committee finds facts and judges credibility, its multiple role as accuser, prosecutor, grand jury, judge and trial jury destroys its impartiality and renders its decision virtually a self-fulfilling prophecy.

### III. THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE SANCTION

Mr. Hamilton argues that it is appropriate to strip Mr. Wilson of his Chairmanship because he used this position to influence legislation. The Committee squarely rejected this charge. H.R. Rep. 96-930 at 5. Moreover, as previously pointed out, the bill which Mr. Hamilton claims was stopped by Mr. Wilson, had nothing whatsoever to do with his Committee assignments. Therefore, there is no support for Mr. Hamilton's assertion that this punishment is especially fitting given the particular facts of Mr. Wilson's case.

Lastly, Mr. Hamilton urges the House to uphold the Committees' Report in order to satisfy public opinion. It is a sufficient answer to state that where fundamentally fair procedures and sufficient evidence are lacking, as they are here, the House of Representatives, as an institution, earns no public respect by sacrificing one of its Members.●

## ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, May 28, commemorates the 62d anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Armenian people from Russian and Ottoman Turkish domination. On this day in 1918, the Armenians united their forces in an attempt to establish a free Armenia. However, they were prevented from achieving this goal by the fortunes of

war, the indifference of the World War I allied powers, and the statesmen of that period who unfortunately ignored the justice of the Armenian cause.

The Armenian people have suffered centuries of persecution but steadfastly maintained their unique cultural, artistic, and linguistic identity. However, one of the most remarkable things in this long and excruciating visitation of persecution, injustice, and extreme suffering is that the Armenian people retained their faith, their courage, their beliefs, and their hopes and survived as a Christian nation. I salute the brave Armenian people on this anniversary of their independence and encourage them to continue to persevere in their hope for legitimate restoration of independence and freedom to Armenia.

Armenian-Americans have made tremendous contributions to our national, political, economic, educational, and artistic success. As loyal Americans, they have maintained a very proper interest in the restoration of freedom to the brave Armenian people still held in bondage in the historic land that is their birthright. On this anniversary of Armenian independence, let us remember Armenia and all other people who are still deprived the right of self-determination and who are held captive by Soviet tyranny.●

**GUN CONTROL DOES NOT MEAN GUN CONFISCATION**

**HON. ROBERT McCLORY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is quite apparent that the expression "gun control" has a variety of meanings—which tend to excite the emotions of many Americans. This is particularly so among those who are apprehensive that the expression means the confiscation of all firearms of every description—leaving the American people potentially at the mercy of some Communist dictator from abroad or even emerging from within our country.

My own thoughtful study of our Federal laws relating to firearms convinces me that we in the Congress have been dreadfully deficient in providing for controlling the interstate trafficking in firearms—particularly the illegal trafficking in handguns.

Mr. Speaker, political officeholders and candidates are vulnerable to the attacks of the emotionally motivated persons who misinterpret or misunderstand the intentions of those of us who feel that some improvements in our firearms laws could assist local law enforcement personnel in reducing gun-related crimes in the areas which they serve.

Mr. Speaker, a thoughtful article along this line, relating essentially to the recent primary elections in Maryland, has been composed by a Washington Post columnist, Bill Gold. His column, entitled "What Does 'Gun Control' Mean to You?" is attached for the purpose of further clarifying this subject. Indeed, he has articulated my views far more eloquently than these introductory paragraphs.

The article follows:

**WHAT DOES "GUN CONTROL" MEAN TO YOU?**

"Gun control" has been injected into today's Maryland Primary races for United States senator. Background information may therefore be useful.

To those who become emotional about their right to own handguns, any "gun control law," however mild, is regarded as a prelude to the confiscation of all guns. Red-blooded Americans would be left without weapons with which to foil a would-be dictator.

At the other extreme are those who become emotional about the danger of guns and want to make it illegal for anybody to own any weapon for any reason—presumably not even a steak knife, a hammer, a cane or a woman's high-heeled slipper.

To those of us who understand what makes supporters of both these extreme positions so emotional, the term "gun control laws" means many things. To me, it means laws that protect a qualified citizen's right to own a weapon, but only under specifically described terms.

My kind of law would require that all guns be registered to their owners, just as automobiles are. It would demand that a prospective owner demonstrate that he can operate his gun safely, just as he must now demonstrate that he can drive safely before he obtains a driver's license.

My law would spell out specific criteria for determining who is qualified and who is not. Convicted criminals would be barred from gun permits. So would persons with a record of mental or emotional instability. Minors would be ineligible. So would aliens, transients and others who do not have "community roots."

My law would, of course, also deal with a gun owner's responsibilities. It would prohibit guns from being carried about, much as our present "concealed weapons" laws specify. It would restrict guns to safe storage in homes and businesses for protective purposes. It would make the prompt reporting of gun thefts mandatory.

It would not, repeat not, ban all handguns willy-nilly. Such a law would be obeyed only by honest citizens, who would then become easy prey to criminals who ignored the law. The argument that we could "stop the gun traffic" by prohibiting all gun sales is pure nonsense. There are already between 50 million and 100 million guns in private hands, and it might take 100 years or more for existing guns to become inoperative with age. For 100 years, a man would not even be able to defend his home against a midnight break-in.

During the recently concluded session of the Maryland legislature, Sen. J. Joseph Curran introduced a bill to require a 21-day waiting period for anybody who wants to buy a handgun. The bill would have permitted the Maryland State Police to check the purchaser's record.

Curran's mild and reasonable "gun control" bill was defeated!

Three of the men who voted on it in the state legislature are now running for the

Democratic nomination for the United States Senate.

Let the record show that Edward T. Conroy and Victor L. Crawford voted against this "gun control" law. Robert L. Douglas voted for it.

In the Republican race, Dr. Roscoe G. Bartlett is attacking Sen. Charles M. Mathias's position on gun controls. Bartlett is against controls. He says, "One of the first things Hitler did was to pick up (citizens') guns." He concedes that gun control is not a major issue in this race, but some people are single-issue voters, and politicians must therefore "campaign on issues that help you win."

The implication is that Mathias favors gun controls, but Mathias's voting record does not bear this out.

Mathias is aware that Maryland's Joe Tydings was blasted out of the Senate by the gun lobby. Mac is a smart enough politician to avoid the error made by the turkey that decided to attend a turkey shoot because he was curious to find out what takes place at such events.

Mathias says he recalls only two or three occasions in the past decade in which he has had an opportunity to vote on gun laws of any kind. He voted against registration of guns and against licensing of owners. The only gun law he supported was the one to ban manufacture of "Saturday night specials." Dr. Bartlett's attack is therefore highly suspect.

I am not impressed by support for a law aimed at low-priced handguns. Such a law merely makes guns a bit more expensive. It does little to keep guns out of criminal hands.

I think those who vote in Maryland today have a legitimate interest in knowing where the candidates stand on gun controls of various kinds, especially the innocuous controls that merely give local policemen a chance to take a look at who it is that wants to buy a gun, and for what purpose.

However, I do not believe in single-issue voting. I think our gun policy is important, but I would not vote for or against anybody on that single issue. In fact, I don't even know what "gun control" means to each candidate or each voter.●

**FOREIGN POLICY SURVEY IN THE 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT**

**HON. JAMES J. BLANCHARD**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, recently I mailed out a foreign policy questionnaire to the residents of the 18th Congressional District of Michigan. I think it is useful for my colleagues to be apprised of the feelings of those people who were kind enough to respond to the questionnaire. There were approximately 25,000 respondents. The results are as follows:

1. Do you support registration?  
For men only 28 percent.  
For men and women 58 percent.  
Not at all 12 percent.  
Not sure 2 percent.
2. Should we restore some version of the draft?  
Yes 71 percent.  
No 22 percent.  
Not sure 7 percent.

3. Should the U.S. boycott the 1980 Summer Olympics if they are held in Moscow?

Yes 80 percent.  
No 17 percent.  
Not sure 3 percent.

4. How would you rate the Carter Administration's handling of the hostage crisis?

Excellent 5 percent.  
Good 22 percent.  
Fair 28 percent.  
Poor 42 percent.  
Not sure 3 percent.

5. Do you think that the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan requires that we provide aid to Pakistan?

Yes 43 percent.  
No 40 percent.  
Not sure 17 percent.

6. Should the U.S. increase the level of military aid to Egypt?

Yes 45 percent.  
No 39 percent.  
Not sure 16 percent.

7. Would you support an American military intervention to defend oil-producing countries from a Soviet invasion?

Yes 67 percent.  
No 21 percent.  
Not sure 12 percent.

8. Which statement do you think should guide our foreign policy?

Let every nation know whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty—44 percent.

I'm interested in the rights and responsibilities of the United States. We are not the policemen of the world, and we shouldn't pretend that we can be. Let us tend to our own business, which is great enough as it is. We have neglected our own affairs—51 percent. In between—5 percent.●

H.R. 4717

**HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to comment on H.R. 4717, my bill to eliminate waste and promote economy in the operation of the Federal Government. This bill which enjoys the cosponsorship of 63 of my colleagues has been favorably reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and more recently by the Government Operations Committee.

A large number of Members have approached me to discuss the volume of correspondence which they have received on the issues addressed by the proposal. A great deal of the correspondence supports the cost-effective requirements of the bill. However, I am becoming increasingly concerned with inquiries which contain distortions of the intent of the legislation.

Simply stated, the bill would require agencies to accomplish their missions through the most economical means available while recognizing that certain functions are inherently governmental in nature and must be performed in-house. H.R. 4717 implements this current Government policy.

It will also require that certain functions such as those essential to maintaining a strong defense posture remain in-house due to the paramount public interest.

Several pieces of correspondence which I have viewed have purposely distorted the intent of the legislation in an attempt to confuse Members of this House. Although I am shocked by the tactics employed, I am not surprised that the vested interests which benefit from deficiencies in the Federal Government's procurement practices are opposing this legislation. Attempts to eliminate Government waste are always opposed by groups and individuals who are riding the gravy train. However, I feel that this Congress has demonstrated its desire to exercise fiscal restraint and I would caution my colleagues to carefully scrutinize the vague generalities which are being employed by opponents of H.R. 4717.

A number of my colleagues who are thoroughly familiar with the issues addressed in the legislation and who are also closely identified with fiscal conservation have congratulated me on clearly identifying a wasteful practice and introducing a legislative remedy. They have urged me to vigorously pursue this matter and I want to state flatly that I intend to do just that.

I have recently received a letter of support on H.R. 4717 from my good friend and colleague from Virginia, Mr. WHITEHURST. Portions of the correspondence follow this statement. I would like to commend Mr. WHITEHURST for his solid, straightforward support, and I would urge all of my colleagues to consider the points contained in the letter from my distinguished colleague.

TEXT OF LETTER FROM CONGRESSMAN  
WHITEHURST

DEAR HERB: Through my service on the Armed Services Committee, I have found that the current personnel ceilings have severely hampered the ability of many of our military industrial facilities to perform efficiently and to maintain our armed forces in an adequate state of preparedness. As a result of artificially low personnel ceilings, work has been contracted out from the military industrial activities solely because the federal government has insufficient personnel. Inevitably, when a federal agency contracts out work purely as a result of an artificially imposed personnel ceiling, the government and the taxpayers end up paying a much higher price. Opponents of the bill who state that this proposal would substantially reduce contracting by the federal government obviously believe that the private sector cannot provide goods and services as economically as government in-house sources. I believe in the competitive free enterprise system and do not feel that this would be the case.

A second major drawback, I believe, to excessive contracting out from military industrial activities such as my own Norfolk Naval Air Rework Facility is that it can weaken our defense capability. A decision to contract out work from a facility like the NARF must be taken with far greater care

than the contracting out of relatively non-sensitive activities such as janitorial or laundry services. Traditionally, the Navy has held the view that no more than 30 percent of the NARF's workload could be contracted out to private firms if these facilities were to maintain full mobilization capability in the event of a national emergency. Yet the current Navy policy will very shortly force the NARF's to contract out fully 45 percent of the Navy aircraft maintenance work. This poses a serious potential threat to our national defense effort.

It is appalling to me that no one in the government even knows how much money is actually being spent on the contracting, although the estimates range as high as \$150 billion annually. Certainly efforts to control federal spending by limiting the number of federal employees have not worked. When faced with personnel ceilings, agencies simply hire contract employees, often at a higher cost than doing the job in-house. And when contractors begin to hire contractors to do some of their work, it seems to me we have reached the pinnacle of waste.

The final benefit which would result from enactment of H.R. 4717, of course, is the limitation on the year-end spending spree in which many federal agencies are engaging at the present time. When HUD obligates 49 percent and HEW 20 percent of their expenditures and grants and contracts in the last month of the fiscal year, I agree with you that the taxpayer's money is slipping down a bottomless hole, further fueling the rampant inflation we are currently experiencing.

Please do not hesitate to call on me if there is any way in which I can give H.R. 4717 a boost.

With all best wishes, I remain  
Cordially,

G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST.●

MSGR. THADDEUS A. HERUDAY

**HON. LYLE WILLIAMS**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention and the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to the humanitarian accomplishments of a resident of my district. The man is Msgr. Thaddeus A. Heruday, pastor of St. Stanislaus Church in Youngstown, Ohio.

Monsignor Heruday was born May 5, 1905, in Cleveland, Ohio, and was ordained May 30, 1931. During his lifetime he has served many people and made many contributions to the spiritual and physical well-being of literally thousands of people.

Monsignor Heruday first came to my district in 1940 when he was appointed pastor of St. John the Baptist Church in Campbell, Ohio. There, he helped start a kindergarten and first grade that eventually developed into a school for students in grades K through 8. He also helped establish a Puerto Rican mission at that church.

In recognition of Monsignor Heruday's work, the Holy Father Pope John the 23d named him a domestic prelate. However, Monsignor Heruday

did not rest on his laurels. He planned the purchase of land and the erection of a new church in Campbell, St. Joseph the Provider.

In 1964, he was transferred to St. Stanislaus Church, where there was a need for a pastor who spoke Polish. At St. Stanislaus, he was instrumental in the building of a gymnasium, teacher's lounge, and school offices.

Throughout his career of helping others, Monsignor Heruday has been a symbol of dedication and hard work to all those who knew him. On June 8 of this year, Monsignor Heruday will retire from St. Stanislaus, but he will not retire from his labors of love on behalf of God and the people around him. I wish Monsignor Heruday good luck and God speed in whatever the future may bring. ●

MAN AS NATURE'S STEWARD—  
CAN HE DO THE JOB?

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Roderick Nash, a veteran outdoorsman and professor of history and environmental studies at the University of California at Santa Barbara, recently published an insightful article entitled "Next and Last—Let's Save the Wilderness From Its Friends" in the exciting new magazine *Next*. As Dr. Nash so aptly points out, our primary environmental problem is "numbers." The population of the Earth has expanded far beyond the point where all lifestyle and technological options are open to us—especially if we are to maintain even a portion of our planet's original wilderness. If we are to maintain a desirable balance between wilderness and civilization, we must recognize that there are choices to be made. Dr. Nash further emphasizes the importance of basing those choices on reason and logic, rather than emotion and irrational surmise. I concur with Dr. Nash's comments and commend his article, which follows, to my colleagues attention:

NEXT AND LAST—LET'S SAVE THE WILDERNESS  
FROM ITS FRIENDS

(By Roderick Nash)

"Soft technology" has a nice ring to it. There is the suggestion of a compromise—between past and future, between beauty and business, between men and machines. Soft (sometimes "appropriate" or "alternate") technologists profess respect, even love, for the land. They sketch an appealing future of happy families spread out over a carefully cultivated landscape. There are woodlots for fuel and windmills for energy. Solar collectors gather energy quietly and safely. The dream is of man the good steward, the gentle master of the environment. Big cities, agribusiness, and especially "hard" nuclear technologies are decidedly not part of this paradise. Return to nature, environmentalists insist, and all parties will benefit—nature included.

But will they really? Consider the true wilderness, which one dictionary defines as an "unsettled, uncultivated region left in its natural condition." Now consider the "wilderness" beloved by the soft technologists. Can grizzly bears and alligators find a place in this fake wilderness, one settled and cultivated by man? And what of visitors who value the solitude and the freedom and the challenge of unmodified nature? Does the true wilderness have much of a future in the soft technologists' utopia?

The answers are already apparent in places where large numbers of people now attempt to follow a close-to-the-earth way of life. Even in these locales, the true wilderness is gone or going fast. There may be woodsmen in Europe, but no *backwoodsmen*. The woodcutters and the shepherds of neighboring villages meet at the top of the ridge. The Alps today are a large garden—pastoral, but not wild. . . . In Peru, hikers—even at 14,000 feet—find that their campsites are somebody's potato fields. Llamas and small children stare curiously at the hikers' strange packs and tents. . . . In East Africa, a burgeoning population is pressing against the borders of national parks and game reserves. Many observers think that the end of the game is only a matter of a few decades. . . . Yet the people in these areas are living the decentralized, low-energy lifestyle that *Mother Earth News* and the *Co-Evolution Quarterly* idealize.

The problem, obviously, is numbers. We have bred ourselves beyond the point where all lifestyle and technological options are open. This is especially true if we want to maintain a fragment of the planet's original wilderness.

Consider the effect of scattering the Boston/Washington megalopolis throughout the Appalachian Mountains on 160-acre family farms—something that Wendell Berry seriously advocates in *The Unsettling of America* (1977). It would be like distributing all the residents of Los Angeles and San Francisco into the Sierras. Of course this is extreme. But there are also advocates of a future in which large cities are replaced by a series of small towns. The University of Wisconsin's plan (John Steinhart et al., *A Low Energy Scenario for the United States, 1975-2050*) argues that a community of 35,000 could exist splendidly on five square miles of carefully tended fields, pastures, and wood-producing forests. The only joker is alluded to near the end of the report: "The five square miles should, of course, link up with the open spaces of neighboring villages in a linear fashion." Thus we would have Europe again; the New World become old. We must face the fact that the wilderness that was the crucible of American character and culture is long gone.

But wouldn't the wilderness survive on land that is too high or dry or cold for human settlement? Forget the deserts and the poles. There are proposals to blanket them with solar-energy devices. Forget the mountains. The forests will be needed for wood, their ridges as locations for windmills. Swamps, jungles, and so-called marginal lands are already coveted as sources of biomass farming for fuel-alcohol production. Hydropower developments would take care of the remaining canyons and wild rivers.

Granted, all these alternative energy possibilities avoid the problems of nuclear power. But they also constitute much more of a threat to open space, wilderness, and wildlife than a *safe* nuclear facility would. One relatively tiny nuclear plant is the energy equivalent of a 200-mile hydropower reservoir, or several thousand ridge-top windmills, or many square miles of solar collectors. Damming Arizona's Grand Canyon

or the last extensive wild river in the East (St. Johns in Maine) is, for some people, too high a price to pay even for avoiding the possibility of a nuclear accident.

Isn't it logical for wilderness lovers at least to investigate safer nuclear technologies, rather than turn their backs on "hard" technology, which promises the greatest protection of the real wilderness? For the same reason, big cities and mechanized farming will prove better friends of the real wilderness than a society of small farmers.

Environmentalists who have an ingrained distaste for bigness, for concentrated populations, and for sophisticated technology might well reexamine their prejudices in the interest of environmental diversity. If we really want the true wilderness to share the earth's future with civilization, we would do well to make big cities livable, food production increasingly mechanized, and nuclear energy as safe as possible. ●

THE REVEREND DR. GEORGE  
JOHNSON HALL RETIRES

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, one of man's greatest satisfactions is in knowing his efforts and career have been of service to his fellowmen. Dr. George Hall, rector, All Saints by the Sea Episcopal Church, can be secure in this knowledge as he retires after 32 years of devotion to his church in Santa Barbara, Calif.

Dr. Hall held his first service at All Saints on Sunday, July 18, 1948. He had been ordained deacon priest on July 5, 1936, in Greenville, Miss. Following ordination, between 1937 and 1940, he served as assistant to the rector at St. Thomas's Church, New York City. In 1940 he was called to his alma mater at Sewanee and for 5 years combined the duties of professor of English Bible, chaplain, and assistant football coach. During 1945 and 1946 he served as chaplain in the U.S. Navy, and observed the atomic bomb tests at Bikini.

Between the end of the war and his call to All Saints by the Sea, he served as chaplain at Stanford University, director of college work for the diocese of California, and as canon of Grace Cathedral in San Francisco.

Dr. Hall was born September 2, 1911, in Greenville, Miss. After graduating from local schools in 1929, he entered the University of Virginia. In 1931 he entered the University of the South at Sewanee, Tenn., graduating in 1936. He received his bachelor of arts degree and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa in 1934. In 1936 he became a bachelor of divinity and won the Greek medal. In 1936 he entered the General Theological Seminary in New York City for graduate study and while there served as chaplain of Trinity Preparatory School and curate of St. Thomas' Church.

Dr. Hall's eminent success in both church and community affairs during the past many years is a matter of record. He was a founding board member of many organizations including the Volunteer Bureau, Childrens Home Society, Santa Barbara Scholarship Society, Alcoholic Information Service, University Religious Conference, Cachuma Camp, and Casa Nuestra.

He also helped to found the General Hospital Volunteer Service. He has served on the board of the Crane Country Day School, Santa Barbara YMCA, Channel City Club, and on the Santa Barbara County Juvenile Justice Commission. Dr. Hall has served on many committees in the diocese of Los Angeles and has been dean of the Santa Barbara Convocation and twice president of the Standing Committee for the Diocese of Los Angeles. The Church Divinity School of the Pacific awarded the doctor of humane letters to Dr. Hall in 1958.

In 1960 Dr. Hall was in charge of St. Bartholomew Church in Dinnard, France, for 2 months. In 1964 he was granted a sabbatical leave for further study in theology and Christian ministry at Cambridge University in England.

Because of this long and distinguished career, because of his dedication and devotion to mankind, his church and community, I ask the Members of the House to join with me, his wife, Sally, his children and the thousands of persons whose lives have been enriched by this man of the cloth, in extending best wishes for a happy retirement to Dr. George Hall. ●

#### NORTHERN IRELAND POLICE STILL ENGAGING IN INHUMAN PRACTICES

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, in the May 17 edition of the Irish Echo there appears an article discussing the ongoing issue of brutality complaints being lodged against the Royal Ulster Constabulary, the main police force in Northern Ireland. According to one of Ireland's leading legal experts—Mr. Rory O'Hanlon, S.C., these complaints remain at "an alarmingly high level."

The significance of this article rests with the fact that since August of 1979, the U.S. Department of State has suspended all sales, and exports of our weapons to the Royal Ulster Constabulary pending a full review of U.S. policy. This action followed an amendment I offered to last year's State Department appropriations bill which would have denied any U.S. weaponry to Great Britain for use in Northern Ireland. In January of 1979, the U.S. Department of State approved the

sale of 3,500 weapons to the RUC despite the fact that this organization had been cited by leading international organizations including Amnesty International for inhumane treatment of prisoners and prison suspects. Section 502(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act bars U.S. weapons to any nation or organization which engages in a persistent pattern of human rights violations.

In recent weeks published reports in Irish and Irish American newspapers have suggested that the State Department may be reconsidering the suspension. I and 17 of my colleagues wrote to Secretary of State Muskie to express our continued support for the suspension on the grounds that the human rights problems which prompted the imposition of the suspension had not changed.

The Irish Echo article confirms our position and if anything lends credence to our initial argument. As chairman of the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs I reaffirm my support for the suspension of U.S. arms to the RUC until substantial improvement in their human rights practices are employed.

The Irish Echo article follows:

#### BRUTALITY COMPLAINTS AT 'ALARMING LEVEL' IN N.I.

DUBLIN.—Complaints of brutality made against British troops and the RUC (police) in Northern Ireland remained at an "alarmingly high level," said one of the most distinguished legal experts in Ireland last week.

"The very fact that such allegations continued to be made at all times down to the present day, highlights the need for pressing Ireland's case in the European Court of Human Rights against England to its final conclusion," said Rory O'Hanlon, S.C., addressing a seminar on the Commission of Human Rights held by the Incorporated Law Society, in Dublin.

However, there had been a marked falling off of complaints of brutality, since Ireland's case in Strasbourg.

But up to the present, the number of allegations of torture, inhuman and degrading treatment made against the British Army, the RUC are numbered in thousands rather than in hundreds.

The army and the police in Northern Ireland had to tighten up their complaints procedure very considerably since the action started, Mr. O'Hanlon said.

However, the Irish Government could feel a legitimate sense of grievance when only 16 of about 200 cases were examined in depth and when findings were made that no case had been made out in respect of all the other charges, although the State against which the charges were brought had never been called upon to deal in any detail with the remaining charges.

It had taken from 1971 to 1978 to get a decision in Strasbourg because of deliberate obstruction by Britain.

"When the Commission decided to examine in depth 16 of the allegations of breaches of Articles 3 of the Convention, nothing was admitted and strict proof of every allegation was demanded by the U.K.," said Mr. O'Hanlon.

"This involved examining over 100 witnesses, although in a number of these cases, the UK threw in their hand once they came

on for hearing to and admitted that they had no defense whatever to the complaints made.

"Had they been frank with the Commission and given them all the information in their possession about the cases which Ireland had presented in a fully documented form, then the whole enquiry could have been conducted in much greater detail and with much greater speed." ●

#### COMMUTER SERVICE BACK TO RACINE

### HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that significant progress has been made toward returning passenger rail service to the city of Racine, Wis., after years of having no luck with Amtrak.

With the help of the Urban Mass Transit Administration—the Federal agency that oversees mass transit—and the Regional Transit Authority in Chicago, another alternative opened up. We have reached an agreement, now approved by the local, State, and Federal governments, that will soon bring commuter service back to Racine and, I hope, full service through to Milwaukee soon thereafter.

The funding plan is as follows:

Track rehabilitation costs: \$1.2 million from UMTA; \$200,000 from the State; and \$100,000 from other sources.

Operating costs for 2 years: \$750,000 from UMTA; \$300,000 from Racine; and \$150,000 from Kenosha.

The total cost of this project is \$2.7 million. ●

#### TRIBUTE TO JO PADDOCK

### HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me today in paying tribute to Jo Paddock of Paramount, Calif. Jo Paddock's friends in the Soroptimist International of Paramount gathered on May 21, 1980, to honor her for her lifelong service to her community.

Humanitarians in this world are few and far between. Jo's accomplishments can fill a book. Every place this woman has been, she has left a trail of pure happiness for all of her "do-good deeds."

Jo joined the Salvation Army in 1940 and since then she has contributed countless hours to the welfare of mankind. During the floods in the early 1950's, Jo took charge of the relief operations for the Salvation Army in Nuevo Laredo, Mexico. She made ar-

rangements for food, shelter, and supplies for the victims.

In 1975 she teamed up with the Flying Samaritans. To date, she has made over 25 trips into the back country of Mexico where the need is great and help nonexistent. Jo seeks out special cases of burn and cleft palate victims. She then makes all the arrangements with the Immigration and Naturalization Service, proceeds to seek out doctors, hospitals, and housing at no cost to the victims. Jo is known among the Border Patrol as the "Tijuana Taxi."

The list of credits are so numerous that I cannot even begin to touch the surface of the accomplishments of this marvelous lady.

In 1976 and 1978, Ms. Paddock was given the Salvation Army "Volunteer of the Year" award.

With 40 years of humanitarian effort behind her, you can bet that if and when a need arises, Jo Paddock will be there. ●

CONGRATULATIONS TO CALIFORNIA'S GIRL SCOUT COUNCIL DISTRICT VII

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very special event which will take place on June 5, 1980.

I am happy to announce that the Angeles Girl Scout Council will be honoring the outstanding achievement of 60 young women from the South Bay Girl Scouts. These fine girls have reached the highest level of Cadette Girl Scouting, Cadette First Class, which is equivalent to the Eagle Scout in the Boy Scouting organization.

The Cadettes First Class deserve special recognition for their diligent work over the past 3 years, earning enough badges from six different categories, and for completing four rigorous challenges to qualify for this outstanding honor.

I would also like to take this time to recognize the efforts of these Cadettes' dedicated leaders, who have given so much of their time and talent to make Scouting such a tremendous national endeavor.

It is with privilege to list the honorees, as follows, in the RECORD.

PALOS VERDES ESTATES

Natalie Baszile, April Beagle, Cathy Crandall, Holly Knight, Katy Kronenberg, Christine Olson, Caitlin Rodgers, Anne Williams, Janet Busso, Michele Duclos, Madelon Mackey, Sheri Range, Nancy Gorrell, Kristine Popovich, Laura Wilcox, Christine Hagan, Amy Carolyn Barkley, Nanci Ann Browning, Elizabeth Ann Cartwright, Katherine Dian Gaffney, Kristin Joy Ward, Kelly Ann Jackson, and Jill Ann La Marca.

TORRANCE

Jeanette McPartland, Natalie Cauble, Janet C. Cocke, Joyce C. Cocke, Marie Helene Huggert, Renee Nash, Lisa Marie Peek, and Amanda Susette Wilcox.

ROLLING HILLS

Karen Trujillo and Linda Zimmerman.

RANCHO PALOS VERDES

Julia S. Gardner, Cheryl Renee Arico, Gail Louise Bedrosian, Kimberly Rochat, Cheryl Waterman, Noreen Cash, Barbara Huffman, Laura Hundt, Jessica Lynch, Heidi Traxler, Annabelle Abba, Linda Donaldson, Cindy Lynn Grant, Janice Phelps, Noelle Waeschle, Julie Connor, Katrina Fleming, Holly Marie DiMuccio, Kathleen Claire Guthrie, Alesia Marie McManus, Karen Elizabeth Smith, Stephanie Ann Zamzow, and Danya Irene Schmid.

REDONDO BEACH

Ann Crase, Beth Essmeier, Catherine Johnson, Catherine Denise Large, and Kristina Ann Burns.

ROLLING HILLS ESTATES

Diane Baker, Molly Markert, and Jeanette Patricia Tom. ●

MEMORIAL DAY POETIC TRIBUTE

HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, during the Memorial Day recess, I returned to Oklahoma to visit with the citizens of my State, and like most people I participated in services to honor the veterans of our military conflicts. The services in Tulsa and at Fort Gibson National Cemetery were inspirational, and it was heartwarming to see the sense of patriotism and devotion to our Nation on this historic day when we pay tribute to those who gave their time and their lives in defense of America.

Before I returned home, I received a letter from a man whom I had come to admire as a youngster growing up in Muskogee, Okla. His name is Cy Tuma, and he was for many years the premier television newscaster in Tulsa, Okla. Cy was truly a pioneer in broadcast journalism, and to a young man in rural Oklahoma, his sense of professionalism and dedication made a deep imprint on me.

Cy's letter enclosed a poem which was written by his wife, Monty. The verse was a moving tribute to those Americans who gave their lives in the Iranian desert in an attempt to rescue our hostages in Teheran. I shared this poem with my friends in Oklahoma, but on reflection, it is clear that Monty's poem goes beyond the immediate tragedy of our loss in Iran. It actually speaks to the pain and sorrow we feel as a nation for the loss of all those who have sacrificed for our freedom and our way of life.

I wanted to share Monty's poem with my colleagues in hopes that our memorial observance is not a once-a-

year break in our routine, but rather something that we keep foremost in our minds as we go about the business of governing our Nation. The poem follows:

IN REMEMBRANCE

Our Lord can speak in a silken whisper  
Or with the mighty ocean's roar,  
When He summons us,  
From our earthly tasks.  
And we are heard no more.

We pay homage here today  
To those we learned to love  
Who did their work  
And did it well  
They have nothing else to prove.

They glowed like signal candles  
That cast their radiance about  
And still have power  
To warm our hearts  
Long after their flame is out.

The sweet remembrance of this day  
Tho' the sadness of our loss be keen,  
Is the sacred trust  
That is given to us  
To keep their memory green.

If they lingered in the silent shallows  
It was only a pause to rest  
For when the Angelus rang  
At eventide  
They had given their very best.

Solemn purpose and deep concern  
Take their toll in grief  
But kneeling sorrow  
With her healing tears  
Brings a respite of sweet relief.

They have followed their secret star  
Fulfilling their destiny  
And tho' their season  
In the sun be brief  
Their mark is for all to see.

And with our master at the helm  
Our hopes and dreams securing  
May he guide our crafts  
Into quieter waters  
When we have slipped our mooring  
Tread softly here  
Lest ye walk on Hallowed ground!

MONTY TUMA. ●

SOUND ADVICE ON NUCLEAR EXPORTS TO INDIA

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the Congress may shortly be confronted with reviewing a Presidential recommendation to override the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on the matter of exporting nuclear fuel to India. While I sincerely hope the President ultimately decides to concur with the NRC, the Congress should be aware of the importance of this issue and be prepared to exercise its independent judgment, in accordance with the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act.

A recent editorial in the Los Angeles Times addressed this topic. I commend it to my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

FOR CARTER, A NUCLEAR HEADACHE

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, by voting unanimously against granting two licenses for export of nuclear fuel to India,

has created a king-sized headache for President Carter—and an opportunity for Congress.

The Nuclear Nonproliferation Act of 1978 bars the shipment of nuclear materials to any country refusing to accept the application of international safeguards to prevent the covert development or manufacture of atomic weapons.

India consistently refuses to make such a commitment. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi also won't promise that her government will not set off more "peaceful" nuclear explosions—the term that was used to describe the 1974 test blast that is widely regarded as having been military in purpose.

The State Department nonetheless urged the commission to approve the nuclear-fuel shipments, and warned the President would use his authority to override any contrary decision.

Since then, however, Edmund S. Muskie has taken over as secretary of state, and has decided to involve himself personally in the issue. It's conceivable, therefore, that the Administration will change its mind and accept the NRC decision. But, in the end, Carter, who has become persuaded that the United States cannot risk a serious quarrel with India in the wake of the Soviet drive into Afghanistan, probably will use his authority to go ahead with the transaction.

Under terms of the 1978 law, his decision in that event will be final unless Congress votes within 60 days to overturn it. Normally Congress would be disposed to accept the President's judgment in such a case. However, Senate Democratic leader Byrd has made it plain that the Indian transaction will receive unusually close scrutiny. Certainly it should.

The proposed sale to India is a perfect example of what the 1978 antiproliferation law was designed to prevent. If the United States chooses to look the other way in the case of India—which has already tested a nuclear device and refuses to accept international safeguards—how can it enforce the nonproliferation act against anybody else?

It's probably true that enforcing the law against India might have adverse effects on U.S.-Indian relations, and on the American position in South Asia. But the virtual destruction of the U.S. nonproliferation program should not be taken lightly, either.

As Commissioner Victor Gilinsky said in his written opinion, a decision to exempt India from the central provision of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act should not be made "without a full understanding of the price we may be forced to pay."

That price could be a world in which every confrontation of regional powers carries the danger of nuclear catastrophe for everybody.

Congress owes it to the American people—and to future generations everywhere—to make sure that the dangers that would be posed by withholding the nuclear fuel from India are really greater than the dangers of neutering the nonproliferation act. ●

#### THE COUNTS IN THE MATTER OF REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES H. WILSON OF CALIFORNIA

#### HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the eight counts and the applicable rules

of the House in the matter of Representative CHARLES H. WILSON:

#### COUNT 1

On or about June 1, 1971, the Respondent, Charles H. Wilson, conducted himself in a manner which did not reflect creditably on the United States House of Representatives in violation of clause 1 of the Code of Official Conduct, Rule XLIII, the Rules of the House of Representatives, and also violated clause 4 of the Code of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives, Rule XLIII, the Rules of the House of Representatives, in that he accepted a gift, to wit, \$5,000.00 from a person, Lee Rogers, having a direct interest in legislation before the Congress.

#### HOUSE RULE XLIII, CLAUSE 1

A Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives shall conduct himself at all times in a manner which shall reflect creditably on the House of Representatives.

#### HOUSE RULE XLIII, CLAUSE 4 (AS IN EFFECT AT THE RELEVANT TIMES)

A Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives shall accept no gift of substantial value, directly or indirectly, from any person, organization, or corporation having a direct interest in legislation before the Congress.

#### COUNT 2

On or about June 20, 1972, the Respondent, Charles H. Wilson, conducted himself in a manner which did not reflect creditably on the United States House of Representatives in violation of clause 1 of the Code of Official Conduct, Rule XLIII, the Rules of the House of Representatives, and also violated clause 4 of the Code of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives, Rule XLIII, the Rules of the House of Representatives, in that he accepted a gift, to wit, \$5,000.00, from a person, Lee Rogers, having a direct interest in legislation before the Congress.

(The text of House Rule XLIII, clauses 1 and 4 are quoted in Count 1.)

#### COUNT 3

On or about December 11, 1972, the Respondent, Charles H. Wilson, conducted himself in a manner which did not reflect creditably on the United States House of Representatives in violation of clause 1 of the Code of Official Conduct, Rule XLIII, the Rules of the House of Representatives, and also violated clause 4 of the Code of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives, Rule XLIII, the Rules of the House of Representatives, in that he accepted a gift, to wit, \$500.00, from a person, Lee Rogers, having a direct interest in legislation before the Congress.

(The text of House Rule XLIII, clauses 1 and 4 are quoted in Count 1.)

#### COUNT 7

Commencing on or about March 3, 1971, the Respondent, Charles H. Wilson, did violate clause 6 of the Code of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives, Rule XLIII, the Rules of the House of Representatives, in that the Respondent did convert \$10,283.35 of campaign funds to his personal use and did fail to keep his campaign funds separate from his personal funds.

#### HOUSE RULE XLIII, CLAUSE 6 (AS IN EFFECT AT THE RELEVANT TIMES)

A Member of the House of Representatives shall keep his campaign funds separate from his personal funds. He shall convert no campaign funds to personal use in excess of reimbursement for legitimate and verifiable prior campaign expenditures. He shall expend no funds from his campaign account

not attributable to bona fide campaign purposes.

#### COUNT 8

Commencing on or about March 15, 1971, the Respondent, Charles H. Wilson, did violate clause 6 of the Code of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives, Rule XLIII, the Rules of the House of Representatives, in that the Respondent did convert \$5,129.85 of campaign funds to his personal use and did fail to keep his campaign funds separate from his personal funds.

(The text of House Rule XLIII, clause 6 is quoted in Count 7.)

#### COUNT 9

Commencing on or about November 23, 1971, the Respondent, Charles H. Wilson, did violate clause 6 of the Code of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives, Rule XLIII, the Rules of the House of Representatives, in that the Respondent did convert \$3,047.91 of campaign funds to his personal use and did fail to keep his campaign funds separate from his personal funds.

(The text of House Rule XLIII, clause 6 is quoted in Count 7.)

#### COUNT 10

Commencing on or about November 29, 1971, the Respondent, Charles H. Wilson, did violate clause 6 of the Code of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives, Rule XLIII, the Rules of the House of Representatives, in that the Respondent did convert \$3,500.00 of campaign funds to his personal use and did fail to keep his campaign funds separate from his personal funds.

(The text of House Rule XLIII, clause 6 is quoted in Count 7.)

#### COUNT 11

Commencing on or about November 1, 1971, the Respondent, Charles H. Wilson, did violate clause 6 of the Code of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives, Rule XLIII, the Rules of the House of Representatives, in that the Respondent did convert \$3,000.00 of campaign funds to his personal use and did fail to keep his campaign funds separate from his personal funds.

(The text of House Rule XLIII, clause 6 is quoted in Count 7.) ●

#### A DEDICATED POSTAL EMPLOYEE

#### HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I would today like to recognize a gentleman from Uniondale, N.Y., whose work with the U.S. Postal Service has been and continues to be noteworthy and deserving of our thanks.

Just appointed postmaster of Woodbury, N.Y., Mr. Jack H. Chan has already served the Postal Service for 23 years, earning commendations throughout for his dedication and initiative. Mr. Chan's accomplishments have been numerous, and were recently summarized in an article in the *Syosset Tribune*, which I offer for your consideration:

Jack H. Chan, 49, of Uniondale, was selected as Postmaster of Woodbury. Mr.

Chan, we believe is the first Chinese-American from the east coast appointed to the position of postmaster. Also, he will be the second one from the mainland of the United States.

Mr. Chan, an Air Force disabled veteran, has 23 years of postal service. He began his career as a sub-clerk in Hempstead and worked his way up the ladder through mail expeditor, scheme technician, EEO investigator, officer-in-charge of Franklin Square and Lawrence, director of mail transportation, and most recently served as a specialist for the Transportation Management Office, Northeast Regional Office.

While Mr. Chan was with the Military Mail Term., he wrote and edited a book which is called "Military Mailer's Guide." This book was approved by the USPS Headquarters and published for distribution. Mr. Chan also planned and developed a "Military Mail Improvement" program and served as an instructor. The first seminar was given to all sale and retail managers in the Northeast region. The booklet and the program have already demonstrated their efficiency—a saving of millions of dollars.

During his 23 years of postal service, Mr. Chan has received 18 beneficial suggestions, letter of commendation from the Postmaster General, letter of commendation from the Regional Postmaster General, letter of commendation from the U.S. Navy (Postal Unit), and the commemoration of the United States Bicentennial.

Some of Mr. Chan's other activities have included 21 years of volunteer service as a Nassau County Aux. Police Officer. He serves as the Chief of the Uniondale Aux. Police, Liaison Officer of the First Precinct, Nassau County Police Dept., and Liaison Officer of the Town of Hempstead. Under his direction, the Uniondale Aux. Police Unit is the first and only Aux. Police unit in the State of New York to receive a Proclamation from the Governor. Mr. Chan was awarded by the Memorial Service Ass'n, Nassau County Republican Committee, Presiding Supervisor of the Town of Hempstead, Nassau County Executive Officer and most recent one is the John Peter Zenger Award from the Nassau County Press Ass'n.

Mr. Chan and his wife, Margie, and five of their children, Vickie, Victor, Rosemarie, Robert and Ramon have lived in Uniondale for 22 years.●

**WEEQUAHIC HIGH SCHOOL  
COMMENCEMENT**

**HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of June 11, approximately 250 young men and women will be graduated from Weequahic High School in Newark, N.J.

The community is proud of this fine school, and particularly of the senior class being graduated next month. That pride, which I share, is fully justified by the distinctions of Weequahic High School and the achievements of its graduates.

The school has made great progress and has overcome some difficult problems, thanks to an excellent staff headed by Principal Claude Scott Bey, a Weequahic alumnus.

The record of Weequahic High School in the field of sports is outstanding. The great athletes who came out of Weequahic include Dennis Layton, former player with the New York Knicks; Albert Baker, who was chosen 1979 Rookie of the Year in the National Football League for his play with the Detroit Lions; and Alvin Attles, coach of the Golden State Warriors.

This past year, Weequahic's football team, coached by Burney Adams, recorded one of its best seasons ever, eight wins and two losses.

The school's basketball team, coached by Artie Johnson, had a 27-4 record this past season and was co-champion of the city league.

Weequahic's sports program is not only victorious; it is also enlightened. Assistant Coach Lorraine White was the first black woman to become a high school football coach in the United States.

This year's senior class is impressive in many ways, including its determination to maintain high academic standards. That determination was backed up by an unusual action. Earlier in the year, the members of the class voted approval for a measure stating that any senior not passing a required course could not participate in class activities, including the prom.

The class members adopted the motto "Always and Forever," with the purpose of seeking to remain in contact with one another always and of maintaining high standards forever.

An estimated 70 percent of the class members intend to continue their education after graduation from Weequahic High School. It is a pleasure to note that Cassandra Smith—president of the class, captain of the girl's basketball team and president of the honor society—plans to attend Howard University in Washington.

I congratulate each of the young men and women who will be graduated at the commencement ceremony on June 11. They have added a new dimension to the community's pride in Weequahic High School.●

**CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO  
HON. MANUEL FRANCISCO  
LAGOS OF NEW JERSEY, DISTINGUISHED BUSINESS EXECUTIVE AND COMMUNITY LEADER, UPON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE MANUEL F. LAGOS SCHOLARSHIP FUND**

**HON. ROBERT A. ROE**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 31, residents of my congressional district and State of New Jersey will assemble at the Passaic County Community College, Paterson, N.J., in testimony to the lifetime of outstanding

public service that our people have received from a distinguished business executive, exemplary community leader, and good friend, Hon. Manuel Francisco Lagos, whose contributions to our youth, the Diocese of Paterson and community service have truly enriched our community, State, and Nation. A gala evening is planned to honor "Manny" Lagos and to formally establish the Manuel F. Lagos Scholarship Fund. I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our warmest greetings and felicitations to him, his good wife Eileen and their four sons, Anthony, Manuel, Gerard, and John upon this most memorable event culminating a milestone of achievement in life's purpose and fulfillment.

Mr. Speaker, Manuel Francisco Lagos was born in Valdemoro, Madrid, Spain, on August 13, 1911, the second child and first son of Antonio Lagos and Josefa Besteiro. When he was but an infant, the family journeyed to Cuba where they resided for 2 years before coming to the United States. New York City was home to the Lagos family until 1921 when they moved to Paterson where Antonio Lagos taught languages at the Paterson High School.

In 1936 Manuel Lagos joined the employees of Bright Star Battery Co. as a clerk in the export department. Through his diligence and expertise he worked his way up to assistant office manager, office manager, and comptroller of this most prestigious manufacturing plant.

It is important to note that Manny Lagos has always been keenly interested and actively involved in community affairs. Since his retirement from his daily career pursuits in the battery industry, his community commitments have become even more extensive. At various times over the years he has served as athletic director, Saint Mary's High School; treasurer, the Paterson Catholic Conference; president, Clifton Chamber of Commerce; treasurer, Paterson-Hawthorne CYO; President, Totowa Borough PAL. He is a member of the Bergen-Passaic Health Services Agency, and served as chairman of the board of trustees of the Passaic County Community College. He currently serves as a member of that board as well as president of the Passaic County Community College Foundation and trustee of Saint Joseph's Hospital and Medical Center, Saint John's Cathedral and Holy Sepulcher Cemetery. He is on the board of the Boys' Club of Paterson, the Liceo Cubano, and the New Jersey State Organization of Cystic Fibrosis. He is also a Knight of Columbus. Other projects on which he is presently working include the Hispanic Commission of the Diocese of Paterson and a committee of the Paterson Community Support Fund.

Mr. Speaker, there is so much that can be said of Manny's lifetime of good works but the designation of a scholarship fund in his name voted by the esteemed executive committee of the Passaic County Community College Foundation is indeed the finest evidence of expression of merit and distinction that one could achieve.

The Manuel F. Lagos Scholarship Fund will provide awards to deserving students for their pursuit of higher education at Passaic County Community College. It is significant to note that this commemorative tribute to Manny Lagos was unanimously approved by distinguished leaders of our community and State who comprise the board of trustees of the Passaic County Community College Foundation, as follows:

#### HONORARY COMMITTEE

Gustavo A. Mellander, president, Passaic County Community College; Rev. Jose A. Alonzo; Sister Jane Frances; John A. Girgenti, State assemblyman; Frank X. Graves, State senator; Mrs. Colt Hendley; Joseph Hirkala, State senator.

Lawrence F. (Pat) Kramer, mayor of Paterson; Rabbi David H. Panitz; Vincent O. Pellechia, State assemblyman; Rev. Msgr. Vincent E. Puma, S.T.M.; Most Rev. Frank J. Rodimer, D.D., J.C.D.; Robert A. Roe, Congressman; Cyril Y. Yannarelli, Freeholder.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Barbara Corcoran, Guido R. Rocco, Ronald J. Frederick, Robert J. Jablonski, Alexander J. Krenicki, Marion Mitchell, Frank A. Pecci, Gustave F. Perna, Joseph A. Russo, Arthur M. Zuckerman, Richard P. Kamenitzer, Kenneth E. Wright, Joseph Barcelona, Iris Barriera, Charles Bishop.

Margaret Borowski, Elliott Collins, James Comerford, John Cross, Jesse M. Gist, James Gleeson, Ida Greidanus, George Homcy, Richard Hornbeck, Charles Lagos, Thomas Martorana, Edward G. O'Byrne, William Pascrell, Jr., Ansel Payne, Herman Schmidt, Albert Tallia, Joseph Williams.

Mr. Speaker, Manny has served our people and our country with honor and distinction. He is an outstanding administrator and good friend whose richness of wisdom and expertise in his daily pursuits have touched the lives of many, many people in my congressional district. I appreciate the opportunity to publicly acclaim all of his good works and share the pride of his family in his accomplishments. We do indeed salute an esteemed community leader—Hon. Manuel Francisco Lagos with our compliments upon the establishment of the Manuel F. Lagos Scholarship Fund.●

#### ANTHRACITE: MAKING A RECOVERY

HON. ALLEN E. ERTEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. ERTEL. Mr. Speaker, in recent months increased attention has been directed to the potential that coal

offers as an alternative to oil as a source of energy for the United States. I support the increased utilization of coal both for direct burning and for synthetic fuels. There is one important type of coal which has not received the attention that it deserves: anthracite.

Anthracite coal offers a number of attractions. It is high in Btu rating and it burns cleanly. Anthracite is very low in sulfur content and is the most environmentally attractive type of coal. This is particularly important because the Northeast, where anthracite is found, is the part of the country which has the greatest problem with acid rains. Acid rains are related to sulfur emissions from the burning of fossil fuels, particularly coal. In addition, most of the powerplants covered by coal conversion legislation are located in the Northeast. Anthracite offers the region a clean and available domestic energy source.

Unfortunately, production has been declining from its high in the early part of the century. There are, however, preliminary indications that this trend may be reversed. We must work to insure that anthracite's potential market is not lost because of low levels of production.

An article appeared in this morning's Washington Star discussing the possibility of an anthracite comeback. I commend this article to my colleagues' attention:

#### ANTHRACITE: MAKING A RECOVERY

SCRANTON, Pa.—In 1917, 200,000 miners, using mules and crawling through dark subterranean passages, removed more than 100 million tons of American hard coal from the earth.

Anthracite production has experienced a steady decline ever since—until now.

Only 4.76 million tons was mined last year. But, in the face of supply shortages and soaring prices for other sources of energy, especially oil, the shiny, rock-like fuel appears to have begun a slow but certain recovery.

Most government and industry officials contend the nation's future energy needs will depend, at least partially, upon its 7 billion to 8 billion tons of recoverable anthracite reserves, more than 96 percent of which lies in Northeast Pennsylvania.

Anthracite production for the first three months of 1980 topped 1.2 million tons, something short of a boom, but 200,000 more tons than the same quarter a year ago.

According to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, this represented the first significant increase in production since World War II.

Leonard Westerstrom, an industry economist with the U.S. Department of Energy, feels the increase was merely a start. He predicts production will rise by 1 million tons this year.

Charles Zink, vice president of sales for Jeddo-Highland Coal Co., Hazleton, Pa., the nation's largest producers, says the anthracite recovery is "not as fast as the politicians are tooting their horns" about. But he estimates a 10 percent annual output increase through 1985 and perhaps more if transportation problems can be alleviated.

The Pennsylvania Governor's Energy Council takes a positive but more conservative line, with consultants estimating production increases to 3 percent per year for the next 10 years.

But, said Roger Tellefsen, council senior policy analyst, "Everything's in motion now and it's all being driven by the high price of oil. There is a large amount of initiative and ingenuity being focused on coal and anthracite is getting its share."

A spokesman for Bethlehem Mines Corp. described the industry's recovery as "slow but steady." The 8,000-acre Schuylkill County tract purchased by the company five years ago exemplifies change in the industry.

At the same site in the 1840s, deep mining was the main anthracite-producing method and by 1919 there were 11,000 men working underground in the mine. Today, deep mining is used in less than one-eighth of all removal operations.

Because of its own benefits and the improbability of an oil price reduction, the anthracite turnaround has the ingredients for permanence. It is making headway in a series of crucial areas—as a fuel for power plants, industry, export and domestic heating.

The tiny home coal furnace industry is reporting a landslide business as homeowners realize the average house can save \$600 yearly in fuel bills.

Despite its high cost compared to bituminous, or soft coal, anthracite is low in sulfur content, making it an attractive fuel for commercial use.

Under a recent U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ruling, new utility generating plants that burn anthracite are not required to install scrubbers, expensive devices that remove sulfur from emissions.

The Philadelphia Electric Co., Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. and Allegheny Electric Cooperative, Inc. recently announced they will develop a large-scale generating station fired by anthracite in coal-rich Schuylkill County. The plant is expected to employ 2,000 people.

The EPA also will decide whether industrial plants using anthracite can do without scrubbers.

Tellefsen, who notes scrubbers sometimes make up one-third of a plant's cost, speculates the decision will be a favorable one. That could mean even greater demand for hard coal.

Anthracite also does not produce the tars and oils that come from soft coal when it is converted into a substitute for natural gas. Gasification, receiving more attention and experimentation as of late, thus is a less costly process using hard coal.●

#### SCIENTISTS STEP UP EFFORTS TO PROMOTE NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the events which resulted in the delay in considering the SALT II Treaty, and which postponed the beginning of the SALT III negotiating process have sparked increased interest by scientists in promoting nuclear arms control. Scientists, as a group, appear to have a better understanding

of the enormous devastation which would be caused by nuclear war, and appear to be much less likely to glibly discuss the use of nuclear weapons.

I want to commend the admirable efforts by the National Academy of Sciences, the American Physical Society, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the Physicians for Social Responsibility to educate their members and the public to the dangers of nuclear war and the need for meaningful arms control.

I commend a recent article on this subject to my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the Chemical & Engineering News, May 19, 1980]

#### NAS, OTHERS TAKE ON ARMS CONTROL ISSUES

(By Michael Heylin)

Nuclear arms control is quite suddenly again becoming a topic of increasingly widespread debate and consideration by the U.S. scientific establishment. The prestigious National Academy of Sciences is the latest of the institutions of science to formalize its participation in the intensifying public discussion of the role of weapons of mass destruction in national and world security.

In his recent annual report, NAS president Philip Handler reveals that the academy has taken the first steps to set up what will be called a Board on International Security & Arms Control. This follows establishment earlier this year of a working group by the American Association for the Advancement of Science to organize AAAS resources toward nuclear arms control—a group that recently held its first meeting. In other related activities, the American Physical Society presented a symposium on arms control and weapons technology at its recent annual meeting in Washington, D.C., and earlier this year the Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR) group kicked off an active campaign to bring to public attention the medical aspects of nuclear war by holding a two-day symposium at Harvard University.

At least some of the issues behind these moves are not hard to trace. A rapid weapons buildup by the Soviet Union has brought its strategic nuclear capability to rough equivalence with that of the U.S. This has caused major concern about the vulnerability of U.S. land-based intercontinental missiles to a first strike by the Soviets. This, in turn, is presented as the reason for an extensive program to modernize all branches of the U.S. nuclear triad—land-based missiles, submarine-launched missiles, and air-launched weapons. Included in these plans is the multiple-warhead M-X missile with its complicated and controversial basing system. The present uncertainty over ratification of the second treaty to evolve from 10 years of strategic arms limitations talks (SALT II) is also causing alarm within arms control circles.

California Institute of Technology president Marvin L. Goldberger has agreed to chair the new NAS board. A physicist by profession, he has been a Presidential science adviser and was 1972-73 chairman of the Federation of American Scientists.

In announcing formation of the board, Handler points out that NAS has a long tradition of assistance to the military. But he adds, "I have been frustrated by our lack of meaningful contribution to the search for a path that combines military security with meaningful arms control and, one day, effective nuclear disarmament." This is the

117-year-old academy's first involvement with arms control.

Goldberger says it is too early to spell out in detail the program for the new board, as its full membership has not yet been named. He says that formation of such a group has been discussed within NAS for some years. And he points out that the Soviet scientific establishment last year set up a council to research the problems of peace and disarmament and that Soviet Academy of Sciences president Anatoly P. Alexandrov last fall suggested interaction between it and any parallel group established by NAS.

The new 13-person Nuclear Arms Control Group of AAAS was authorized by the AAAS council at its meeting in San Francisco in January. Chairman is political scientist George Rathjens of Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The group's first order of business, tackled at its first meeting late last month, has been to set up a series of five or six half-day symposia for the next AAAS meeting, in Toronto in January 1981.

The symposium on arms control and new weapons technology at the APS national meeting in Washington, D.C., last month was organized by the society's forum on physics and society. Among the speakers was Massachusetts Institute of Technology physicist Bernard T. Feld.

Feld, who is editor of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, stated that "numbers of nuclear weapons continue to grow, far beyond any levels defensible from the point of view of deterrence." The only hope he sees for eventual arms reductions is through a mutual agreement for the no-first-use of nuclear weapons.

Physicians for Social Responsibility was formed in the early 1960's and was active in supporting the nuclear test ban treaty. It then became involved in Vietnam war issues and was largely inactive for some years. In recent years it has been revived, sensing that nuclear war is again being spoken of as a national policy option. For instance, one still active candidate for President of the U.S. has said recently that a nuclear war is winnable. The group is planning a series of roughly monthly symposia in various cities this fall on its perception of the extreme destructiveness of nuclear conflict, even on a limited scale. These will follow the well-attended meeting at Harvard and another in Washington, D.C.●

#### POSTAL SERVICE DOES MORE THAN OTHERS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, no one says anything nice about the Postal Service—most of the time. We ought to say a lot of nice things.

But the other day, while reading the Brenham Banner Press in Brenham, Tex., I came across a column on the Postal Service. It made several noteworthy points. The column was written by Robert Walters, and I commend it to all members of the House.

The column follows:

#### STAMP OF APPROVAL

WASHINGTON.—Few institutions surpass the U.S. Postal Service among organizations Americans love to hate—and nothing produces a universal display of that hostility

faster than an announced increase in the price of a first-class letter.

Thus, it was hardly surprising that the Postal Service's recent proposal to begin charging 20 cents for a typical letter next year (an increase of 5 cents over the current rate) was received with something less than popular acclaim.

But here's an irreverent and unpopular—if not downright heretical—view of the situation that suggests the Postal Service is, on balance, doing an exemplary job and its requested rate hike is entirely justified.

The operator of the nation's most elaborate, complex and sophisticated system of transmitting written communication, the Postal Service—and only the Postal Service—is committed to serving every business and household in the country.

The United Parcel Service, for example, has been widely acclaimed in recent years for its aggressive expansion program that now offers a purportedly quicker and cheaper alternative to parcel post for delivery of packages.

But UPS maintains only about 1,000 receiving stations scattered around the country where senders must bring their parcels for shipment. Only if an additional fee is paid (and an elaborate description of the package provided) will UPS provide pickup service from the shipper's home or office the following day.

The Postal Service, however, provides free daily pickup not only from 40,000 post offices but also from 298,000 street mailboxes and office building chutes and racks. In the downtown areas of major cities, those pickup points are serviced five times or more every day.

Federal Express, Purolator Courier, Emery Air Freight and other air couriers boast of large fleets of jet planes that guarantee overnight delivery to dozens of cities—but the cost of that service ranges from \$25 to \$100 per item.

The delivery field is indeed overcrowded with Postal Service competitors anxious to provide yet costly service from Boston to Washington, New York to Chicago and Los Angeles to San Francisco.

But only the Postal Service accepts as part of its basic mission providing regular service connecting French Creek, Idaho; Clayton Lake, Maine; Kayenta, Ariz., and Duck Hill, Miss.

That means daily delivery to 76 million different locations in this country—71.5 million households and 4.5 million businesses that comprise almost 5.8 billion different combinations of senders and receivers.

During the 1979 fiscal year, the Postal Service handled 99,828,900,000 pieces of mail and completed delivery of virtually every letter and package—a record few other enterprises, public or private, can match.

There are, of course, the occasional horror stories about somebody receiving a Christmas card mailed by a neighbor in 1914. But far less attention is paid to the Postal Service's reliable and timely delivery every month of millions of dollars worth of bank-by-mail deposits.

Notwithstanding its inflated claims, the Postal Service isn't especially speedy. What's touted as overnight delivery too often involves a two- or three-day process.

But most mail really doesn't suffer from those relatively minor delays. Those who do require guaranteed speed now have a wide array of alternatives, including the Postal Service's own Express Mail, available at a premium price.

Finally, there's the cost. Critics are fond of recalling that as recently as the mid-

1960s only 5 cents in postage was required to mail a 1-ounce first-class letter.

Candy bars that cost a nickel or a dime in those less inflationary times now sell for a quarter or more—but the makers of Hershey bars, Milky Ways and Almond Joys aren't subjected to the abuse regularly heaped upon the Postal Service.

The Postal Service may not be perfect, but it surely deserves better treatment than it has received in recent years.●

#### IN HONOR OF WALTER TICE

#### HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of Westchester County's outstanding teachers, Mr. Walter Tice.

Walter was recently honored by the B'nai B'rith in Yonkers, N.Y., for his dedicated service to education and educators. In fact, I recently received a petition signed by over 70 students praising his work and teaching abilities. In addition, he has served with distinction as president of the Yonkers Federation of Teachers.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the students of Roosevelt High School in Yonkers, N.Y., I salute Walter Tice for his many accomplishments.●

#### REDUCING UOSA COSTS

#### HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 22, 1980, I introduced legislation of vital importance to residents of Fairfax County, Prince William County, and the cities of Manassas and Manassas Park who are presently served by the Upper Occoquan Sewage Authority (UOSA) regional advanced wastewater treatment plant. Ratepayers in these localities are currently experiencing record sewage charges as a result of high capital cost overruns and excessive operation costs. As outlined below, this project was undertaken during the 1970's as a joint venture by the local, State, and Federal governments to correct serious pollution of the local drinking water supply. The end result was a technological wonder which left the local jurisdictions with an unmanageable share of the costs.

#### BACKGROUND—THE DECISION TO CONSTRUCT UOSA

Studies by the Virginia State Water Control Board (SWCB) in the late 1960's suggested that northern Virginia's main water supply, the Occoquan Reservoir, was being threatened by the pollution of inadequately treated sewage. A final study report issued by the SWCB in 1970 concluded that sewage effluent discharged from the

11 low-performance secondary sewage treatment plants in the Occoquan watershed was causing significant deterioration of the water quality in the Occoquan Reservoir.

The Virginia State Water Control Board (SWCB) adopted the Occoquan policy in July 1971. This policy required the consolidation of facilities upstream from the reservoir into one regional sewage treatment system. The State water control board called for treatment standards on the new regional plant to be the highest in the United States since it was located upstream from a water supply.

The four jurisdictions affected by the Occoquan policy—Fairfax County, Prince William County, and the cities of Manassas and Manassas Park—created the Upper Occoquan Sewage Authority (UOSA) to construct and operate the facilities. A UOSA service agreement was signed by the four jurisdictions involved in May 1972. The UOSA advanced wastewater treatment plant began operations in June 1978.

#### THE OPERABLE UNIT REQUIREMENT

Seventy-five percent of the allowable capital costs of the project were to be funded by Federal EPA grants. In order to permit the State of Virginia to start other projects necessary in the State, EPA required that the UOSA project be constructed in operable units. The project had to be separated into a number of discrete construction contracts designed to fit the amount of grant assistance available to Virginia at the time. Funds at that time were limited as a result of an impoundment by President Nixon of \$3 billion of the \$5 billion appropriated by Congress for the funding of construction grant programs in fiscal year 1973. Finally, each contract had to result in operable facilities which would provide better treatment than already existed.

The operable unit requirement together with President Nixon's impoundments is estimated to have caused construction delays of 2 to 3 years. Inflation took its toll on the project, increasing the final costs from a projected \$49.4 million in 1973, to \$82 million upon completion.

EPA provided \$54 million for the project. The Virginia State government provided \$4 million or 5.5 percent of the final costs, even though Virginia had committed to 10 percent originally. The localities were left with a \$24 million capital cost contribution, double their original projection.

Subsequent to the start of the UOSA project, the Congress enacted legislation abolishing the operable unit requirement in Public Law 93-243. However, the enactment of that legislation came too late to prevent the significant delays and inefficiencies affecting the UOSA construction.

#### EXCESSIVE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS

The UOSA plant has particularly high treatment standards which re-

quired the development of innovative and sophisticated technology. With a 100-percent redundancy factor and these high quality of treatment standards, the operation and maintenance costs of the facility are 40 to 50 percent higher than a typical AWT plant and over 100 percent higher than the typical secondary treatment plant. The UOSA system serves as a full-scale demonstration project of wastewater reclamation for the world by providing an example of the effectiveness of the new technological advances used in its operation.

#### EFFORTS TO FIND A PRACTICAL SOLUTION

As a result of the high construction and operational costs I have outlined, the jurisdictions served by UOSA are facing rapidly increasing charges. Just this past January, one sanitary district in Prince William County increased quarterly rates by 100 percent to cover the debt service and rising treatment costs.

In an effort to bring about the needed cooperation at the State, local, and Federal levels of government to effectively relieve individual ratepayers of this excessive burden, I called a meeting on May 9, 1980, to discuss a specific legislative solution.

All the jurisdictions involved were represented except Manassas Park, which declined the invitation because of a pending lawsuit against EPA concerning the construction cost overruns incurred. Since presenting my proposal, the jurisdictions of Prince William County, Fairfax County, and the city of Manassas have endorsed this legislative proposal.

#### MAJOR ELEMENTS OF THE LEGISLATION

I think that it is important to view this proposal as a way of providing an equitable solution to individual ratepayers caught in a very unfair situation.

I propose to reduce the current debt service being paid by UOSA customers by providing a 75-percent Federal/25-percent State contribution toward the \$24 million local share of the UOSA capital costs. However, the Federal portion would only be provided on a matching basis when the State commits its share of funds. This will insure the proper Federal/State cooperation to achieve the needed reduction in rates.

Also, because of the increasing operation and maintenance costs incurred as a result of the high treatment quality and redundancy factor provided by the plant, I feel that there should be an annual Federal grant allocated toward a portion of the treatment costs.

Finally, the most important provision of this legislation requires that all Federal assistance to UOSA be passed on through direct reductions for the ratepayers in the four jurisdictions of Fairfax and Prince William Counties, and the cities of Manassas and Manassas Park. Families in those areas are currently in a desperate position—they

are actually having to cut back on essentials such as food and clothing to make payments on the water and sewer bills they have received this year. I can cite the example of one family of four in Manassas, Va., whose bill just for sewer service had increased from \$15 a quarter in April 1977, to \$109 this past March—an increase of 627 percent. This increase was not related to additional water use, which averaged 30,000 gallons a quarter and was never higher than 35,000 gallons. The major single increase came in the first quarter of 1980 when their bill went up 100 percent from the last quarter of 1979. One woman who wrote me noted that she was alone and living on a fixed income. Her bill had gone from \$11 for 7,000 gallons of water in the last quarter of 1979 to \$65 for 7,000 gallons in 1980. How can we expect people on fixed incomes to keep up with 490 percent increases in water bills, when they can't keep up with the current 18 percent inflation rate?

Without a cooperative effort, ratepayers will have no relief. Under this legislation, the Commonwealth of Virginia must bear a share of the responsibility to reduce water-sewer rates. It requires Virginia to assume 25 percent—\$6 million—of the \$24 million local costs. But the Federal Government could not—and should not—come forth with the remaining 75 percent until the State money is in hand. The State is clearly responsible for developing the Occoquan policy and the UOSA advanced water treatment system and must accept some of the financial obligation presently straining local budgets to their limits. At the same time, Virginia will be meeting its original commitment to fund a major portion of the costs of this project for the localities. My legislation will provide the necessary incentives to bring about a joint Federal/State effort to enable both to meet their responsibilities and resolve this problem in an equitable manner for the local jurisdictions.

Inflation is already too great a burden without adding excessive charges for water and sewer services. Such services are not a luxury—these are services that should be provided to the public at reasonable rates that they can afford. The Federal Government has mandated a number of measures to clean up our rivers and protect our water supplies from further degradation over the past decade. We have a responsibility to see that these measures and standards are met in ways that fairly distribute the costs when benefits go beyond jurisdictional boundaries. I urge your support of this legislation.

The following is the text of my bill, H.R. 7431:

## H.R. 7431

A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to the Upper Occoquan Sewage Authority to reimburse such authority for a portion of the costs incurred by such Authority in constructing its advanced waste water treatment plant in the Occoquan Reservoir watershed area in Fairfax County, Virginia, and to pay 25 percent of the costs of operating and maintaining such plant

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Administrator") shall make grants to the Upper Occoquan Sewage Authority (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Authority") to reimburse the Authority for 75 percent of the costs incurred by the Authority in constructing the advanced waste water treatment plant in the Occoquan Reservoir watershed area in Fairfax County, Virginia, and not otherwise reimbursed or paid by the United States or the State of Virginia.

(b) Grants made under this subsection may only be made to match on a three-to-one basis money paid to the Authority by the State of Virginia after the date of enactment of this Act for constructing the advanced waste water treatment plant described in subsection (a) of this section.

(c) The total amount of Federal assistance provided to the Authority under this section may not exceed \$18,000,000.

SEC. 2. In addition to grants made under the first section of this Act, the Administrator shall make grants to the Authority to pay 25 percent of the costs of operating and maintaining the advanced waste water treatment plant described in subsection (a) of such section.

SEC. 3. No grant may be made under this Act unless the Administrator receives such reasonable assurances as the Administrator may require to ensure that the Authority will use all Federal assistance provided under such grant to reduce the sewer rates charged by the Authority to its customers in Fairfax and Prince William Counties, Virginia, and the cities of Manassas and Manassas Park, Virginia.

SEC. 4. Grants made under this Act may be subject to such terms and conditions as the Administrator may require to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry the provisions of this Act.●

### ED MUSKIE REFLECTS ON THE 'CLEAN AIR ACT 10 YEARS LATER

#### HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in one of his last interviews as a U.S. Senator, Secretary of State Edmund S. Muskie, the father of the Clean Air Act, discussed his views on this essential and important Federal law. For those, like myself, who were in Congress 10 years ago, it is sometimes difficult to remember that there are few Members of Congress here today who were here 10 years ago

when the modern version of the Clean Air Act was originally enacted. Some of the comments by those special interests who have consistently opposed the implementation of effective clean air laws and regulations have convinced me that they believe the present Congress does not care about air pollution. I think this Congress is being underestimated as to its commitment to the public interest, although I must confess that the departures of Paul Rogers and Ed Muskie have left a gap in the institutional memory of the Congress.

Perhaps the most important air pollution control measure presently being debated in several State legislatures, including, I regret to say, California, is the debate over inspection and maintenance programs for automobiles. This is one of the most cost-effective means available to improve air quality, and its full implementation in nonattainment areas nationwide is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, because of the knowledge and experience of Ed Muskie with the Clean Air Act, I recommend that each Member take the time to read the interview which appeared in *Automotive News* on February 25, 1980.

The interview follows:

#### TOUGH EMISSION TESTS CALLED FOR BY MUSKIE

(By Helen Kahn)

The Clean Air Act will not be completely effective until in-use and assembly line testing are in place, according to Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Democrat, Maine.

Ten years after he introduced the Clean Air Bill, Muskie has not relaxed his efforts to achieve the statutory auto emissions standards and says the government must "hold the auto companies' feet to the fire" until the standards are met.

Following are Senator Muskie's answers to queries from *Automotive News* concerning his view on progress of the emissions standards.

*Automotive News.* Are you in general satisfied with the progress made under the Clean Air Act? Has the progress been greater in stationary sources or mobile sources?

Muskie. Progress has been made, and I am proud of that progress. However, the date by which all areas of the country were to achieve healthful air was 1975, as mandated in the 1970 Clean Air Act. It is now five years later, and many areas are not even close. The majority of these problems are due to mobile source pollution. There is a recognition now that the air pollution problem in dirty air areas was more severe and complex than we initially understood when we wrote the 1970 Act.

We have revised our expectations as to the amount of time and effort required to achieve our goals. But the goals remain the same.

Greater progress has been made in developing the automobile pollution control technology than in stationary source cleanup. We are close to achieving the statutory auto emission standards. Stationary sources include many more industries and technological cleanup processes than do mobile sources.

In autos we are talking about one industry and a limited number of technologies. The complication comes in urban areas where

simply substituting clean cars for dirty ones will not be adequate.

The most widely exceeded ambient standard continues to be photochemical oxidant, the two components of which, hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxide, are emitted by the automobile. In 1978, of 105 urban areas in the country with populations of at least 200,000, virtually all exceeded the primary, health protective standard.

In contrast, violations of the sulfur dioxide standard are limited to a few parts of the country—approximately 100 counties or parts of counties in Arizona, Nevada, Utah and the north-central regions.

It is clear that attainment of the oxidant standard is our most ubiquitous cleanup problem. Additional measures beyond auto emission control are required. That is where the mobile source problem becomes more difficult than cleaning up stationary sources. Local and state governments are being asked to modify habits of their populations which have been many years in development. These are difficult to change.

Q: Section 109(a)(2) of the Act told EPA to set ambient air quality standards that are "requisite to protect public health" plus "an adequate margin of safety." Other laws—like the 1976 vehicle safety law—allow an administrator to consider "technological feasibility" and "economic practicability" in setting standards. If you had it to do over again, would you have changed the reliance on public health and given more consideration to costs?

A: Absolutely not. First, prior to 1970 the law only permitted auto emission controls which were technically and economically feasible. Because the auto industry had complete control over the decision on what was "feasible," absolutely no progress was made. In fact, the "feasible" emission controls adopted caused an increase in NOx emissions. More importantly the question poses a non sequitur. Health standards are based on scientific information on the levels of pollution which affect health. To suggest that scientific data on health effects should be compromised because that level of clean air is difficult or expensive to achieve is absurd.

Q: In retrospect was it a good idea in view of the costs and disruptions to both government and industry to set auto emission standards in the Clean Air Act itself rather than allowing them to be set by an administrative agency?

A: I challenge the assumption that there has been any disruption. If there has, it has been the result of industry failure to take the mandate of Congress seriously and act in a timely way.

Q: In early 1970s your view was that in order to get the auto companies to clean up emissions, it was necessary to hold their feet to the fire. Do you now detect a better climate? Or is the situation unchanged for items like safety and emissions control for which there is not a ready market such as exists for fuel economy?

A: I still believe we cannot relax our efforts to achieve the statutory auto emissions standards, and that we must still "hold the auto companies' feet to the fire." I'll be better able to answer the question after the statutory standards have been achieved and if we don't have another lobbying barrage to delay those standards again.

Q: In terms of emission control how would you compare the attitude, response, and progress made by the Detroit companies vs. the import companies?

A: I feel generally that some foreign manufacturers have been more forthcoming. They seem to have a less defensive attitude

toward public policy than their U.S. counterparts.

Q: Recently regulatory reform has become a buzz word. The Joint Economic Committee is looking at the feasibility of a regulatory budget; Senator Lloyd M. Bentsen, Democrat, Texas, has introduced legislation to mandate a regulatory budget; the Wall Street Journal in an editorial called on Congress to establish a regulatory budget to set limits on compliance costs that agencies may impose. As chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, how do you feel about these proposals?

A: As a general proposition I oppose arbitrary limits which bear no relation to statutory requirements. The Congress enacts specific requirements such as auto emission standards for reasons which include considerations other than costs. It is the prerogative of the Congress to change those requirements in each statute if it feels that its judgement on a specific issue has changed. I have very real reservations about generic regulatory reform legislation which seeks to amend specific statutes by imposing limits and requirements which either have been specifically rejected or bear no relationship to the problem to which a specific standard is directed.

Q: The Clean Air Act requires that EPA determine before allowing a vehicle to be sold that it meets emission standards over its useful life. This has resulted in a costly certification of prototypes. Eric Stork (no longer at EPA, but the man almost solely responsible for creating and defending certification) now says the program is nearly useless as an indicator of actual on-the-road emission performance. As an alternative would you now favor assembly line testing on a random basis? Or would you—as Stork recently recommended to the Swedish EPA—equivalent—favor a system of emission fees based on performance of in use cars?

A: First, for the program to be credible each consumer should be guaranteed that the car he buys meets the standard when he buys it and for its useful life. Second, certification testing is primarily a convenience for auto companies so they will not begin producing models which don't meet standards. Third, every car which comes off the assembly line should be tested and inspection tests should be provided in those areas with serious air quality problems to ensure in use compliance. Motorists should have warranty coverage for non-complying vehicles.

None of these programs standing alone can give us a meaningful auto emission control program over the useful life of vehicles. So I would not favor dependence on any component by itself, but I would not recommend abandoning the certification process at this point either. I am not ready to endorse a system of emission fees. The result would be to permit non-complying cars to continue to operate in violation of the law. This is counter to the philosophy of the Clean Air Act that cars must be built to comply with given emission standards over their useful life, and if they do not comply they must be brought into compliance. This is a critical part of the strategy to achieve ambient air quality standards to protect public health.

Q: The question of averaging vehicle emissions or requiring each and every vehicle to meet the standards has raged for years. The law itself is not entirely clear. Did you intend averaging? If you oppose averaging, why?

A: In my view the law is clear now and has been clear since 1970. We intend that each and every new vehicle meet applicable emission standards. We never intended averag-

ing. The concept of averaging is inconsistent with the requirement of the act that each and every vehicle achieve a certain level of emission reduction which then reduces the ambient concentrations of auto-related pollutants. Averaging is not an agreeable concept. How can you implement an assembly line test and an inspection and maintenance program using the concept of averaging?

Q: The 1977 amendments to the Clean Air Act mandate inspection and maintenance programs which will soon affect some 100 major urban areas. The general public has long opposed inspection for safety and is believed to oppose emission inspections as well. In view of the costs and inconveniences of these programs do you support EPA's thrust in this direction? Would you support a cutoff or reduction in highway money for communities resisting inspection and maintenance?

A: First of all I don't necessarily agree with your characterization of public opinion of safety inspections and the assumption that emission inspection will also run into opposition. However, I do support the implementation of an inspection and maintenance program.

EPA must require this under the 1977 amendments to the Clean Air Act. Inspection and maintenance programs must be implemented in areas which will not achieve auto-related ambient standards by 1982, as a condition for receiving an additional five-year extension to 1987 of the deadline for achieving those ambient standards.

Inspection and maintenance programs have been shown to be one of the most cost-effective ways of achieving incremental pollution cleanup. In areas where automotive pollution is and has been an intractable problem, it seemed reasonable to the Congress in 1977 to require, as a condition for receiving extra time for cleanup, that areas with such difficulty implement this reasonable measure. The sanction of reduction in highway money puts teeth into this requirement. So I do support this mechanism which is tied to the failure of communities to do the minimum necessary to receive an extension under the Clean Air Act.

Q: In view of the energy crunch and with the domestic auto industry severely strained for capital to down-size cars would you favor a bending of the law to allow more diesel engines?

A: No. I do not favor a bending of the law to permit the marketing of more diesel engines. At this point there is no evidence that diesel technology needs more favorable treatment than the gasoline engine. And it would be unwise in my view to permit diesel technology to compete on anything other than an equal basis with gasoline engines. It would not be beneficial to the auto industry to ignore pollution control requirements associated with diesel technology in the short-run because they will have to deal with it at some point. It makes sense from a business point of view to deal with those problems at the outset to determine if diesel technology can compete favorably with gasoline engines in all aspects, including their effect on the environment and the extent to which those effects can be minimized.

In addition, I am confident that the auto industry can solve the technological challenge presented by diesel technology just as they eventually met the challenges associated with pollution control technology in the early 1970s. By bending the law we would remove any impetus for forcing the development of diesel technology further. This remains one of the most significant handles we have in achieving the maximum cleanup and fuel economy possible in auto technology.

Q: In your view, did emission requirements significantly add to Chrysler's financial plight? Or were they even a factor?

A: No. Emission requirements were not a factor in Chrysler's financial plight. Chrysler's financial problems appear to have been related to its inability to compete and to management problems unrelated to federal standards.

Q: From what you have learned over the last 10 years, what would you have done differently? What the same? Has EPA enforced the law as you wished? Has the waiver authority been abused? Does the law need changing?

A: I think the structure of the auto emission program which we created in 1970 remains sound. I cannot think of anything major I would have done differently. On the other hand, the enforcement of the act has produced slower progress than I hoped for. For example, I do not believe we can have an effective program until two major components of the program are put in place—in use testing and assembly line testing. The performance of cars on the road has been neglected by EPA, and this is the major weakness in the program thus far. As for recalls, I believe EPA is doing a good job in finding problems and attempting to correct them with the auto companies.

With regard to the waiver authority, I do not feel it has been abused since the enactment of the 1977 amendments. Each company has the right statutorily to apply for a waiver. It is EPA's prerogative to grant or deny those waivers.

Recently the EPA has examined the applications for both the CO waiver and the NOx waiver on an engine family by engine family basis and has arduously applied the law's criteria to each application. The result has been at least as many denials as approvals of waiver applications. I feel that EPA is now complying with the mandate of the law in this area.

At this point, I do not believe that the law needs changing. We are less than one year away from the implementation of the statutory auto emission standards. I consider this significant. The basic thrust of the program is sound and has provided us with a means to achieve the goals we set in 1970. ●

#### FOREIGN TECHNOLOGY BEATS AMERICAN COMPETITION

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, maintaining our competitive edge in high technology products is one of the best ways to compete with foreign products—both at home and abroad. But we can't be too sanguine about our ability to maintain that edge.

The Task Force on Industrial Innovation, which I chair, has been looking into the reasons why innovation is lagging and productivity is on the decline. There is no simple explanation, but the danger signals are clear. Other nations have been increasing their commitment to research and development while ours is declining. An increasingly large proportion of American patents are held by foreigners. Our savings rate—and therefore our capacity to invest in new plants and machinery—is

the lowest of any industrial country. Last year the personal rate of saving in America was barely 3 percent. Japan has a 20-percent rate; Germany, a 15-percent rate.

Recently, the Washington Post carried an article describing how Federal contractors have been forced to buy major high technology components from foreign suppliers for the first time in decades. That news is just one more indicator of what will happen if we don't move quickly to stimulate innovation and increase productivity.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1980]

#### INFLATION, PRODUCTION PROBLEMS ERODE "BUY AMERICA" RULE

(By Thomas O'Toole)

Inflation and production problems have hit U.S. high technology so hard in the last two years that federal contractors have been forced to buy major components from foreign suppliers for the first time in decades.

In each case, the purchase was made at the end of a process that began with requests for bids from suppliers and ended with the selection of a foreign supplier whose bid was so far below the lowest U.S. proposal that the "buy America" rule on federal projects was waived. The "buy America" policy states that a foreign bid must be at least 6 percent below the U.S. bid to be considered.

Among the high-technology components bought abroad were \$470,000 worth of quick-acting Swiss vacuum valves for the Positron-Electron colliding beam project near completion at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center; \$100,000 worth of special Japanese steel for the Nova laser project at Lawrence Livermore Laboratory outside San Francisco; and \$3.9 million worth of pumps, seals and low-temperature controls from the Swiss, West Germans and French for the Tokomak Fusion Test Reactor being built at Princeton, N.J.

"These are the sort of things we've never had to buy outside the U.S.," said one official of the Department of Energy, which is financing all three projects. "Times have changed in the last few years."

The foreign purchases that have raised the most concern are a pair of orders placed with West Germany and Japan for the fusion project at Princeton. One is a \$1.5 million order for special steel from Japan, the other a \$1.6 million order for long billets of specially extruded copper from West Germany.

Both will be used in fabricating the largest magnets ever built. No fewer than 20 of these magnets will be placed in the doughnut-shaped Tokomak being built at Princeton to confine the deuterium plasma expected to reach heats of 100 million degrees and demonstrate the scientific feasibility of fusion.

The order placed to a West German firm called Kabbie Metal is for 500,000 pounds of copper extruded into shapes 50 feet long, 6.5 inches wide and five-eighths of an inch thick. Each 50-foot extrusion has an elliptical hole through its center.

Many of these copper strips already have been shipped to Westinghouse Electric Corp. in the United States, where 44 are welded together and wound to form the coil that will generate the magnetic field in the fusion machine. There will be 20 coils in the machine, each weighing 25,000 pounds.

The thing that most concerned Princeton project officials when bids came in for this job is that the two lowest bids were from West Germany and Finland. Only Phelps-Dodge and Anaconda in this country bid on the job. Neither one was close to the German and Finnish bids, according to DOE officials.

At each end of each of the 20 magnetic coils in the Princeton Tokomak, enormous steel rings will hold the copper coils rigidly in place. Each ring weighs 15,000 pounds and is being forged out of a supertough and superhard steel called "nitronic" steel. All the rings are being forged by the Japan Steel Co.

"These rings have a six-foot radius and they're six inches thick," one Energy Department official said. "The Japanese were not only the lowest bidder, they were the only suppliers who could deliver these very special rings on the schedule at which we needed them."

Carter administration officials point out that the orders to West Germany and Japan represent only 25 percent of the \$12 million in orders placed for the 20 magnets that will be the heart of the Princeton fusion machine.

"I do not see this as a worrisome trend," said R. Robert Russell, director of the Council on Wage and Price Stability. "The whole idea of international trading is that trading countries are better off by trading. High technology should be no exception to this."

One Energy Department official said that West Germany and Japan are the only countries with extrusion presses and forging furnaces large enough to make major magnet components. At least two U.S. suppliers said they could have developed such a capability if they'd been given time enough to do so.

There is no question that U.S. suppliers see it differently. One suggested that the Germans and Japanese deliberately may have shaved their bid price to get in on the ground floor of fusion development, which promises to take off in the next 20 years.

"One objective of this program was to train U.S. industry in the fabrication of major components," one potential supplier complained. "But when you go out of the country for these components, you defeat that objective. All you're really doing is exporting the know-how."

Dr. Melvin B. Gottlieb, director of Princeton University's Plasma Physics Laboratory and builder of the Princeton fusion machine, summed up this viewpoint:

"It raises my hackles to find out we have to go abroad for these things. It's all American money in this project, but it's sure not all American suppliers." ●

#### TWIN MILESTONES CELEBRATED BY TEMPLE BETH ELOHIM

HON. JEROME A. AMBRO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. AMBRO. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 30, 1980, the congregants of Temple Beth Elohim in Old Bethpage, N.Y., will come together to celebrate twin milestones: the 25th anniversary of the founding of the temple and silver anniversary of the ordination of their spiritual leader, Rabbi Louis Stein. Both occasions will be

commemorated at a special sabbath service on Friday evening.

In most families, a 25th anniversary is a very special one, to be marked with joyous festivities. It is equally special in the synagogue family, but, as is befitting a religious institution, it will be marked not only with celebration, but also with solemnity and a renewal of the sacred commitment to religious faith and ritual. For Rabbi Louis Stein, who has been the guiding force in the spiritual development of the temple since its inception in 1955 and since his own ordination the same year, this occasion will have even more special meaning. To him, and to all the members of the congregation of Temple Beth Elohim, I wish a very hearty mazel tov.

As it has been written:

"We perceive a community great in numbers, mighty in power,

Enjoying life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness;

True life, not mere breathing space;

Full liberty, not mere elbow room;

Real happiness, not that of pasture beasts; Actively participating in the civic, social and economic progress of the country,

Fully sharing and increasing its spiritual possessions and acquisitions,

Doubling its joys, halving its sorrows,

Yet deeply rooted in the soil of Judaism;

Clinging to its past, working for its future . . ."

#### THE GUINEA PIGS

### HON. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial entitled "The Guinea Pigs" which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of May 27, 1980. The editorial addresses what the Journal refers to as "a regulatory struggle going on now in the \* \* \* obscure realm of the Nation's social science research." The regulatory struggle is over proposed regulations, published last summer by the Department of HUD, requiring institutional review, board review, and approval of biomedical and behavioral research involving human subjects.

The editorial correctly points out that the proposed regulations are a grossly inappropriate way to regulate the ethical problems of social sciences research, but it fails to note that the problem in large part stems from the absence of clear congressional guidance in this area. This issue was recently addressed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during consideration of H.R. 7036 (Rept. No. 96-977), which consequently contains an amendment which goes far to narrow and clarify the statutory language under which the proposed regulations were issued, although it is

still not completely adequate. In the "Additional Views" which I submitted with the committee report this matter is discussed in greater detail.

The editorial follows:

#### THE GUINEA PIGS

In the middle of the fierce turf-ripping wars over deregulation in places from trucking to children's TV ads, there's also a regulatory struggle going on now in the more obscure realm of the nation's social science research. HEW is in the process of putting out new rules to govern the social scientists' treatment of their human research subjects. A good number of the social scientists are furious. And the whole thing is shaping up as a classic lesson in what happens when you combine benign intentions, government power, and an added intellectual basis of operations.

In the mid-1960s, responding in part to several truly scandalous cases in which medical researchers misused their human subjects, the Public Health Service ruled that institutions applying for its medical research grants would have to set up peer review boards to insure that no more such abuses occurred. This was inconvenient but, given the special kind of power a medical researcher holds over his subjects, certainly not inappropriate.

Before long, though, the jurisdiction of these peer review boards began to expand. Within five years HEW was applying their human protection requirements not only to biomedical but to all "behavioral" research. Within eight, the rules were being slapped not only on proposals for new grants but on all research going on in places receiving HEW money.

Soon stories of the review boards and their grossly inappropriate behavior towards the social sciences began to come out. The written release forms that some boards required from interview subjects were lousing up studies. The boards held a power over research projects in some places that made researchers reluctant to criticize them. Attempts were sometimes made to stop the most respectable of inquiries. In part to clear up some of these messes, HEW has now published and begun to consider some new rules.

The new rules are billed as a "deregulation" of the social sciences because they list certain exemptions from the full review procedure for various kinds of research. But the exemptions are just making the critics madder, because they serve mainly to remind the reader of how much is still covered by the rules. For instance, the regulations exempt the study of public documents—but only if the research information is recorded in a way that doesn't permit subjects to be identified. This formulation would seem to limit the research conducted out of the daily newspapers. Furthermore, the rules keep their requirement that the review boards decide not only about a project's safety but about the "appropriateness" of its methods, a kind of censorship that maddens scholars.

HEW regulators have been heard to say that all this fuss by the social scientists is only to be expected; the medical researchers used to make the same kind of noise, but have now gotten used to the necessary governmental regulation. This kind of breezy philosophizing misses the point. Biomedical research, because of factors from its setting to the kind of control a doctor exercises over the human guinea pig, raises ethical issues that make public regulation reasonable, if problematic. The nonexperimental

research that social scientists do does not raise the same issues of power and harm; certainly HEW does not have the empirical data marking the social scientists as public dangers who should have to prove each of their projects harmless. Much less can HEW justify the new ethical problem it is creating here, the problem of the massive lying that comes in the wake of a bureaucratic system of prior restraint.

This does not mean that the social sciences are without ethical problems in their research; there are many, ranging from hubris to manipulation and deceit. But the government has chosen a grossly inappropriate way to regulate these problems, and it would be a refreshing thing for once to see some regulators realize it and turning back.●

#### GEORGE MASON STAMPS

### HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to announce that the Postmaster General has recently responded favorably to my suggestion that George Mason be featured on the stamp used to implement the next first-class postage rate. Inasmuch as the Postal Service was seeking a rate increase, I had recommended that the new first-class stamp issued honor this great Virginia statesman.

I feel that George Mason's patriotic service and contributions to the critical documents on which our democracy is based have not received commensurate national recognition. George Mason was instrumental in the drafting of our Declaration of Independence; he was the author of the Virginia Bill of Rights; and he spelled out the doctrine of separation of powers. He was also a drafter of our Constitution, but refused to sign it because it initially did not contain the protection of a Bill of Rights. His opposition to ratification produced the "gentlemen's agreement" under which the first 10 amendments were introduced and adopted.

June 12, 1976 to December 1991 marks the dates of our American Constitutional Bicentennial Era, being the 200th anniversaries, respectively, of the adoption of the Virginia Declaration of Rights and the first 10 amendments of our Constitution. Millions of Americans have never heard of George Mason, yet we owe him a tremendous debt of gratitude. This is a fitting way to honor the father of our Bill of Rights during our Constitutional Bicentennial years. The stamp will be issued after the proposed new postage rates go into effect in 1981 and its denomination will be at the first-class postage rate.●

THE BEGINNING OF A U.S.  
INDUSTRIAL POLICY

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, during the Presidential campaign, several candidates have discussed the need for a U.S. "industrial policy," or for a "reindustrialization of America." Less discussed is what the present administration is doing along these lines. A recent article in the New York Times demonstrates that while a full-fledged policy is not yet in place, the beginnings of a U.S. industrial policy are appearing.

The main issue at hand is the present and future health of the U.S. automobile industry, which is a key component of the U.S. economy. I commend this article to my colleagues, and urge widespread and careful review of this subject by all the committees of the Congress:

[From the New York Times, May 20, 1980]  
AUTO AID STUDY AND "INDUSTRIAL POLICY"  
(By Edward Cowan)

WASHINGTON, MAY 19.—In an exercise that has large implications for the American economy in the 1980's, the Carter Administration has been appraising the vitality of the entire American automobile industry and whether it can prosper without Government assistance.

Initiated by the Secretary of Transportation, Neil E. Goldschmidt, last winter, the appraisal is described by officials as a first, cautious exploration by Washington into what looms as the dominant economic policy issue of the 1980's for the advanced countries—"industrial policy."

Precisely what that phrase means is open to interpretation and is likely to become a subject of national discussion. In general, industrial policy means a deliberate, comprehensive effort by government to assist and to subsidize some industries.

LIMITED STEEL POLICY IN 1978

The Carter Administration delineated a limited steel policy in 1978 when it pledged to guarantee up to \$550 million of private loans for steel plant modernization and also gave the industry protection from imports with the so-called trigger-price mechanism, intended to keep imported steel from being sold below cost.

This month it authorized \$1.5 billion in Federal loan guarantees to keep the Chrysler Corporation afloat and received pleas from industry executives and union leaders for a variety of aids to an industry whose sales have been declining sharply for months.

These stopgap measures might eventually lead to an industrial policy for the auto industry that could include import protection, relief from complying with clean air and safety regulations and tax advantages. Thus far, President Carter has opposed import protection, sentiment is mixed on regulatory relief and the Treasury Department and Congress would prefer to give tax incentives for all types of investment, not just for autos.

Whatever the final shape of automobile policy, it is likely to serve as a point of departure for possible help for other industries.

American executives have said for years that Japan's economic success was due partly to government support for business, such as the official funneling of investment funds to export industries on favorable terms. Less successful, say American officials, has been another type of industrial policy, the European Economic Community's effort to develop the economy of southern Italy in the 1960's and 1970's.

Curtis A. Hessler, the Treasury's Assistant Secretary for Economic Policy, notes that industrial policy is often used to mean "the reindustrialization of America," and in particular the rehabilitation of automobiles and steel, once the kingpins of a manufacturing sector that dominated world trade.

Most economists say industrial policy implies a deliberate Government process of choosing which industries should get help. "Picking winners" is the way Arnold H. Packer, an Assistant Secretary of Labor, and other economists summarize the process. They mean identifying industries that, with some Government help, will do well in world competition.

The steel industry might qualify under this definition, or the electronics and data processing industries.

TURNED TO A "PLANNED STRATEGY"

"Some people, including me, are skeptical that's something government can do well," says George C. Eads, a member of the Council of Economic Advisers. William B. Johnston, the chief policy planner at the Transportation Department, summarizes the challenge of shaping industrial policy this way: "Is there any way to get turned from market solutions to a jointly planned strategy?"

"Even the most enlightened macroeconomic policies"—those that deal with the entire economy—may need to be supplemented by policies that focus on particular sectors, Stuart E. Eizenstat, the White House domestic policy chief, told a University of North Carolina audience on May 10.

Mr. Eizenstat said it was President Carter's view that "we must strengthen the basic industries in our country—modernize them, increase their productivity and their competitiveness in world markets; we cannot let them deteriorate one by one."

Industrial policy recently has been a major research topic of the Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission, private study groups.

In the United States, industrial policy has an unfamiliar ring, as "energy policy" did 10 years ago. In Europe and in Japan, industrial policy is better understood and accepted. "From an ideological point of view, we in this country are much less interventionist," says Nancy S. Barrett, a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor, who attended an industrial policy conference in Madrid earlier this month.

"The overwhelming view was that it's a way to make the free enterprise system work better," Miss Barrett said. "It's not socialism. Everybody said we need to make an environment in which private enterprise can thrive."

The American view that the Government should not be "interventionist" is reflected in the comments of the policy planners examining the needs of the auto industry. Without exception, they voiced doubt in interviews that the Government could do as good a job as Detroit in deciding on investments, products and prices.

"For the Government to come in and say 'you ought to do this or that and we'll stake you to it' would be a disaster," said the Treasury's Mr. Hessler.

APPROACHING NEED FOR FUNDS

The question arises because the auto companies—even the General Motors Corporation, once the bluest of the blue chips—are approaching a tremendous need for investment funds, to tool up for the more gas-line-efficient models of the mid-1980's, just as an auto-centered economic recession is cutting deeply into car sales.

What worries several of the policy planners is that industrial policy in the United States will turn out to be highly political and indiscriminating, rather than selective and efficiency oriented. Jerry L. Jasinowski, an Assistant Secretary of Commerce who headed the American delegation, told the Madrid conference of "a history of ad hoc, reactive responses" by Washington.

Mr. Hessler posed the problem with this rhetorical question: "Could you have an industrial policy that is more than the push and pull of people with political power?"

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. SKELTON, Mr. Speaker, this past Monday, Memorial Day, the Secretary of the Army, Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., delivered the principal address at the Arlington National Cemetery. My family and I were in attendance and I feel that his speech should be shared with the other Members of the body.

It is set forth herewith:

ADDRESS OF HON. CLIFFORD L. ALEXANDER, JR.

I am honored to personally represent President Carter this Memorial Day at Arlington National Cemetery.

Memorial Day is not simply a holiday, or a three day weekend for some, but it is set aside as a special time to remember. What is it that we remember on this day? We remember our soldiers—all those men and women, of all races and creeds, who have served in and with the armed forces of the United States in times of war and in times of crisis. We remember, and are grateful to those who lost their lives in our defense. We remember, and are grateful to our veterans—those who served their country as a part of the armed forces, and who themselves remember on this day the hardships, the battles, the friends and comrades at arms no longer with us. Finally, we remember today that as a nation we have been fortunate.

We have faced many dangers; we—and our form of government—have survived in part because of the sacrifices our soldiers have been prepared to make. The remembrance of so many who have served, and who have died in our defense, must strengthen our resolve to keep this country a bastion of freedom of which we can all be proud.

Today we pause to thank those men and women who served and died in our defense, who are buried in this magnificent national cemetery, and in cemeteries large and small around the world. The fact that we are free to sit here today is ample proof of the debt of gratitude we owe our armed forces. How best do we repay it? The obvious answer is a simple one. We keep this country strong

enough to remain free; we use that freedom wisely, in the knowledge that freedom without compassion and honor and equality is not freedom at all; we strive to make this country better, in the knowledge that no matter how far we have gone on the road to equality and justice for all our citizens we have much farther to go before we rest.

There are other fitting ways to remember our fallen soldiers on this Memorial Day. Perhaps the best thing we can do—the most appropriate gesture we can make—is to thank those who serve today in the armed forces. Our gratitude for their service, their professionalism, their dedication, is the best living memorial for our honored dead.

This country is defended today by armed forces made up entirely by volunteers. That means that all of our soldiers, our sailors, our men and women of the Air Force and Marines are very special people. They have volunteered to serve, and to defend, all of us. They are dedicated to their country; to their jobs as members of the uniformed services; to the future of our country.

Our men and women in uniform are today on duty in many parts of the world. In some places they are in danger. In others, they are ready to be called on if extraordinary service is required of them. They are worthy of our respect, and our confidence and we as a nation need to show particularly our enlisted force that we are proud of them. I have seen them at the DMZ, in the Panama Jungle Training Center, as part of the crack Berlin Brigade, as weary but willing trainees at Fort Dix. Our sailors serve often for months at a time and around the clock at sea. Our airmen and marines show equal dedication carrying out their missions. They speak their minds and have the inner strengths this nation of individuals is known for.

Some of our soldiers in uniform who are working today have been summoned to answer emergency calls here at home. Some are serving at the refugee centers which have been set up on various military installations to house and process the Cubans who have arrived so precipitously in our country during the last few weeks. Our young Americans in uniform are getting a first-hand lesson in what this country is all about, and they are themselves examples of the best that this country has to offer, with their warmth and humanity and efficiency.

This past Thursday I was with President Carter as he inspected the devastation rendered on many hundreds of square miles by Mount Saint Helens. Our people in uniform are quietly but bravely searching for survivors near the mountain and recovering the remains of the dead.

President Carter described an appropriate vision of America in his State of the Union Address.

"An America strong and free.

"An America at peace.

"An America with equal rights for women—and for all citizens.

"An America with jobs and good health care and education for every citizen.

"\* \* \* An America of justice, tolerance and compassion."

This vision of America is not beyond the reach of a united people who have the will and determination to succeed. There will be challenges. We will meet them with the best that is in us \* \* \* so that those who lie here indeed will not have died in vain.

Thank you. ●

STATEMENT BY G. WILLIAM MILLER, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, ON OIL IMPORT FEE

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, G. William Miller, made to the Subcommittee on Trade of the House Ways and Means Committee, deserves the attention of every Member:

STATEMENT OF HON. G. WILLIAM MILLER, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy that you and the subcommittee have shown in agreeing to hear my testimony at this point in your deliberations.

You have before you the question of whether to block implementation of the ten cent gasoline conservation fee imposed by the President in March.

As you know, the implementation of the fee was enjoined yesterday by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. The government is appealing this decision. While the matter is thus before the courts, I strongly recommend that the subcommittee defer its own review of the issue. The Congress need not deal with the questions of substantive policy raised by the fee until its legal status is clarified.

However, with your permission, I will take this opportunity to deal with the major substantive issues.

Let me be blunt: For far too long, it has been assumed that the United States lacks the basic political discipline to recognize and act on its own clear self-interest in limiting its consumption and importation of foreign oil. Without this discipline, our prospects for economic security, and for a vigorous and independent foreign policy, would be very poor. Our prospects for exercising world leadership in any area of policy would be compromised. Leaving aside the legal question for the moment, for the Congress to reject this measure to reduce our oil import dependence could only be interpreted as a flight from the hard economic realities faced by the nation. The fee raises the price of gasoline by a mere 10 cents. Backing away from such a moderate and sensible step would send a very troubling signal to the American people, to the world financial markets, and to the governments of OPEC.

This gasoline conservation fee will have direct and important benefits: after approximately 12 months, it will cut our oil imports by about 100,000 barrels per day, and the savings will increase to about 250,000 barrels after 3 years. But the fee's importance transcends these direct benefits. The fee constitutes a clear test of our national will: Are we going to squeeze the fat out of our oil consumption and proceed in an orderly manner toward energy security over the next decade? Or are we going to leave our future prosperity and national security hostage to foreign events? The fee alone will not decide this watershed question—but it is rightly perceived as an important part of the answer.

THE OIL IMPORT PROBLEM

There can be no serious question that this nation's security is threatened by excessive oil imports. Formal findings to precisely this effect, pursuant to Section 232 of the Trade

Expansion Act of 1962, were made in 1975 by Treasury Secretary Simon and in 1979 by Treasury Secretary Blumenthal. In both cases, virtually every agency of the government certified in detail the acute dangers posed to our international military, political, and economic interests by excessive oil imports. During all this time, our oil import bill has steadily escalated. The dangers have multiplied.

The threat posed to our economic interest by oil import dependence was vividly dramatized by the explosion in world oil prices in 1979, triggered by the turmoil in world oil markets during and after the Iranian revolution. From December 1978 to April 1980, the average OPEC official price of crude oil on the world markets rose by 125 percent, from just under \$13.00 to over \$29.00 per barrel.

As in 1973, the impact of this price explosion on our economy was direct and momentous. The U.S. inflation rate last year soared to 13.3 percent as the higher world oil prices coursed rapidly through our economy. More than 3 percentage points of that increase can be traced directly to the oil price explosion. This trend intensified in early 1980. During the first three months of this year, inflation rose to an annual rate of 18 percent, with higher energy prices directly accounting for roughly one-third of the increases.

The 1979 oil price explosion was the single most important factor pushing our economy into recession this year: It was the primary cause of the acceleration in inflation, the consequent swift escalation in interest rates, and the massive drain of purchasing power which have combined to throw the U.S. economy into reverse gear.

The world's dependence on imported oil poses potentially serious problems for the international financial system. The oil exporting nations this year are likely to earn current account surpluses totalling \$100-120 billion—larger than the GNP of most of the world's countries. The oil importing nations of course face an equivalent deficit. While the international financing requirements posed by these imbalances are huge, we believe the system can handle the recycling of these funds in an immediate sense. But it would be highly imprudent simply to stand by and watch the world's oil bill and financing swell year after year.

A failure to stem oil imports would have serious consequences for our own efforts to achieve lasting improvement in the U.S. dollar balance of payments and to maintain a stable dollar. In 1978, our oil bill was \$42 billion. Last year it was \$60 billion. In 1980, we project it to rise to between \$85 and \$90 billion, in spite of an expected reduction in oil import volume. This mushrooming deficit is by far the largest single negative element in our balance of payments, threatening the stability of the dollar and thus our efforts to solve our domestic inflation problems.

The stability and strength of the dollar in the foreign exchange markets in recent months has a number of sound bases. But one of the major reasons is the growing perception around the world that the U.S. is at last moving aggressively to solve its energy problems. The President's decision to phase out oil price controls was a major step in building confidence in the dollar's long term prospects. This gasoline conservation fee is another such step. In both instances the world saw our system of government produce decisions in which long run economic good sense prevailed over well-entrenched political considerations. This was long-awaited good news that we had at last gen-

erated positive momentum in the energy area.

A decision by the Congress to shift now to a more passive course would be extremely short-sighted. We would be mortgaging our hopes for more fundamental improvement in our economic prospects, replacing forward momentum once again with confusion and stalemate.

#### QUESTIONS RAISED ABOUT THE FEE

In this subcommittee and elsewhere, a number of questions have been raised about the fee. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the major ones.

*1. Why impose a fee when oil imports are already falling and world oil markets seem to be well supplied?*

U.S. oil imports have indeed declined in volume terms, to an average rate of 7.4 mmb/d so far this year compared to 8.4 for the equivalent period last year. This is largely the result of the increase in world oil prices in 1979, which have encouraged conservation through greater energy-efficiency and, less pleasantly, through a retardation of economic growth. World oil markets have eased, and spot prices have actually declined, as world consumption has fallen temporarily below the rate of oil production.

But it is sheer folly to assume that this will last or that the energy problem is somehow "solved." As we should have learned, world oil markets do not long remain in surplus. The medium term trends for the world oil supply are not propitious; our economic growth will resume; markets will likely be tight again well before the mid-1980s. It is precisely at times of market slack that the consuming nations face the danger of misreading a temporary quiescence of oil prices and of giving up on their conservation efforts. This is what we did for nearly five years after the 1973 oil shock. That is why we suffered so greatly when the next shock arrived, in 1979.

We must not repeat this error. This fee is needed to communicate the inevitable to American consumers—that gasoline prices, over the long term, are going up and that oil conserving improvements must continue and accelerate, not be put in mothballs. To reverse this message would invite the same reversion to business as usual that paralyzed our energy policy through the last half of the 1970's.

*2. Isn't the fee inflationary?*

As a technical matter, the gasoline fee will add about .5 percentage points to the 1980 inflation rate in direct terms, and perhaps another .3 percentage points indirectly over the longer run. However, without the fee, and the conservation psychology it will help sustain, we face the near certainty of even greater inflationary pressure over the longer term from a renewed surge in U.S. gasoline consumption and oil imports. The oil price increases that would result from such an increase in imports would not only add to inflation but also to our import bill. The fee revenues, by contrast, would stay at home.

*3. With gasoline markets relatively soft, won't the fee in fact be passed on to other oil products, such as heating oil?*

This question has been of particular concern to the subcommittee. I believe this concern to be misplaced, for several reasons:

First, the markets for heating oil and other oil products are if anything "softer" than the gasoline market. Refiners are now pricing heating oil and other uncontrolled products according to their own best economic advantage. We do not believe the fee will change their calculations. The heating oil market is exceptionally soft, with stocks

at very high levels for this time of year. Thus, there will be little opportunity for refiners to pass through any of the fee to heating oil. The same is true for residual oil and other distillate products.

Second, the fee applies to imported gasoline, but not to imports of other refined products. Thus, competition from imported distillate products will tend to prevent refiners from being able to pass the fee through to products other than gasoline.

Third, the refining companies have notified the Department of Energy that the fee will be passed through to gasoline, not to other products. DOE has established a system to monitor the pass through effects of the conservation fee. Secretary Duncan would be happy to appear before you to discuss this monitoring effort and to report the results to you on an on-going basis.

It is understandable, but short-sighted, for those who are concerned with heating oil prices to oppose the gasoline conservation fee. The conservation fee will help instill discipline in world oil markets and dampen further OPEC price increases. This will help moderate heating oil prices.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I cannot stress too strongly my belief that it would be unwise for Congress to disapprove the President's decision to impose the gasoline conservation fee. Low gasoline prices are a major cause of our over-consumption of imported oil. By way of comparison, the tax on gasoline is \$1.14 a gallon in Germany, \$1.62 in France, and \$1.83 in Italy, the conservation fee will increase gasoline prices in U.S. by a dime. If we cannot do this, one can fairly ask: What precisely are we willing to do to meet the energy challenge?●

#### TRIBUTE TO DEBORAH DUNSTEN

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to count among my constituents a young woman who recently demonstrated remarkable courage and compassion. Miss Deborah Dunsten, of Angels Camp, Calif., undertook a rescue effort of such awesome proportions that she was called to Washington by the President to receive the Presidential Humanitarian Medal of Honor. As the father of six children, I personally find it difficult to adequately express my appreciation, admiration or regard for Miss Dunsten. At this time, I would like to share her act of bravery with my colleagues, as I believe that a description of that act will move others in this Chamber as it has moved me.

On March 23, Miss Dunsten was riding her bicycle home from a shopping errand while visiting relatives in Huntington Beach. As she crossed the Santos Arched Bridge above the Coy Sea-Water Canal, she was alarmed to hear high pitched screaming coming from the water below. Looking down, she saw five elementary school-age children and a capsized rowboat being swept toward the open sea. At great risk to her own life and limb, Miss

Dunsten jumped from the 65-foot-high bridge to rescue the children. Not only was she successfully able to guide five hysterical children to shore without assistance—she also administered cardiopulmonary resuscitation to an 11-year-old boy who might otherwise have died.

Miss Dunsten's courage and compassion are further enhanced by her modesty: She alleges that, having grown up on the water and being accustomed to swimming and diving, her feat was not so great. I must respectfully disagree. Her heroic act is deserving of full and appropriate recognition, and she herself is more than deserving of the gratitude of this Chamber. Individuals such as Miss Dunsten are more than assets to humanity—they are shining examples to be admired and emulated, at least emulated to the extent that it is possible.

I know that my colleagues will join me in expressing thanks to Miss Dunsten, and in according to her the recognition which she has earned.●

#### SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an interim procedure until the computerization of this information becomes operational, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, May 29, 1980, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

#### MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 30

9:00 a.m.

Finance

Taxation and Debt Management Generally Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the following miscellaneous tax legislation, S. 2484, 2486, 2500, 2503, 2548, and H.R. 5043.

221 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue hearings on S. 2704, authorizing the Federal Reserve Board to regulate transactions in certain financial instruments.

5302 Dirksen Building

JUNE 12

## Energy and Natural Resources

To resume hearings on S. 2665, to provide for the development of an adequate national coal distribution system by acquiring the necessary rights-of-way to grant access for coal slurry pipelines across railroad property, and to expedite the construction of such pipelines.

3110 Dirksen Building

JUNE 2

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
Energy Regulation Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine certain energy policy issues dealing with episodic, severe shortages in transportation fuel.

3110 Dirksen Building

## Governmental Affairs

## Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Federal Services Subcommittee

Business meeting, to consider S. 794, to create an arbitration board to settle disputes between organizations of supervisors and managerial personnel and the U.S. Postal Service, and S. 1938, to increase government efficiency and to provide a mechanism for raising the level of protection of workers, the general public, and the environment against unnecessary radiation exposure.

3302 Dirksen Building

## Select on Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of Federal recognition procedures, relating to the acknowledgement of nonrecognized Indian tribes.

5110 Dirksen Building

JUNE 3

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations  
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.

1223 Dirksen Building

## Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings on the nomination of John S. Hassel, Jr., of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration.

4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
To hold oversight hearings to review the progress of the negotiations on the future political status of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

S-407, Capitol

JUNE 4

10:00 a.m.

## Governmental Affairs

Business meeting, to consider S. 333, to strengthen Federal programs and policies for combating international and domestic terrorism; S. 2160, to require public disclosure of certain lobbying activities to influence issues before the Congress; and S. 2, to provide for a review of Government programs every ten years.

3302 Dirksen Building

## Select on Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Judgment Fund Distribution Act.

5110 Dirksen Building

## Select on Small Business

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Small Business Administration's loan assistance programs as they apply to veterans of the Armed Forces (Public Law 93-237).

424 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee

To hold hearings on H.R. 6613, to prohibit the regulation of collective bargaining agreements by the Federal Maritime Commission.

235 Russell Building

JUNE 5

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
Energy Regulation Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Department of Energy's Building Energy Performance Standards (BEPS) program.

3110 Dirksen Building

## Governmental Affairs

## Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on alleged fraud and mismanagement practices in Federal agencies performing community services, including the Departments of Health and Human Services, Labor, and Agriculture.

3302 Dirksen Building

JUNE 6

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources  
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the possible health effects caused by inadequate disposal of toxic waste.

4232 Dirksen Building

## Joint Economic

To hold hearings on the employment-unemployment situation for May.

2128 Rayburn Building

JUNE 10

9:30 a.m.

## Judiciary

To hold joint hearings with the Labor and Human Resources Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research on S. 1865, proposed Radiation Exposure Compensation Act.

4232 Dirksen Building

## Labor and Human Resources

## Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings with the Committee on the Judiciary on S. 1865, proposed Radiation Exposure Compensation Act.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

## Select on Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Tribally Controlled Community College Act.

5110 Dirksen Building

JUNE 11

9:30 a.m.

## \*Veterans' Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the activities of the Office of the Inspector General of the Veterans' Administration.

412 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources  
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2490, proposed Infant Formula Act.

4232 Dirksen Building

JUNE 17

9:30 a.m.

## \*Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to establish a cost-of-living increase for service-connected disability compensation.

412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources  
Business meeting, to mark up S. 2375, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1982, 1983, and 1984 to provide support for the training of professionals in health service needs.

4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations  
Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the U.S. Railway Association and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Authority.

1224 Dirksen Building

## Labor and Human Resources

## Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee

To resume hearings on Title II, proposed Youth Education and Training Act, of S. 2385, proposed Youth Act.

4232 Dirksen Building

JUNE 18

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources  
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee

To continue hearings on Title II, proposed Youth Education and Training Act, of S. 2385, proposed Youth Act.

4232 Dirksen Building

JUNE 19

9:30 a.m.

\*Labor and Human Resources  
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1424, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1981-84 for the advancement of international cooperation and assistance in health matters.

4232 Dirksen Building

## Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 2020 and 2596, bills to provide educational assistance programs for those individuals who enlist in the Armed Forces, and to hold oversight hearings on the implementation of current educational incentive programs to promote an All Volunteer Force.

412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
To hold hearings on S. 1957 and H.R. 4310, bills to promote increased use of U.S. waterways and provide for continued recreational boat safety programs.

235 Russell Building

May 28, 1980

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

12601

JUNE 26

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the administration's transition plans to develop an operational land remote sensing satellite system.

235 Russell Building

JUNE 24

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations  
Transportation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget

estimates for fiscal year 1981 for certain programs of the Department of Transportation.

1224 Dirksen Building

JULY 1

10:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of small business loan programs for veterans recommended by the White House Conference on Small Business.

412 Russell Building

JULY 24

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings on the administration's transition plans to develop an operational land remote sensing satellite system.

235 Russell Building

JULY 29

10:00 a.m.

Select Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 2166, to establish a National Institute of Native American Culture and Arts Development.

6226 Dirksen Building