

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE CANDLEMAKERS' PETITION

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, Frederic Bastiat was an economist and journalist who served in the French Chamber of Deputies in the 1840's.

Bastiat's brilliant essays exposing the fallacies of economic intervention by the state are as contemporary as the 96th Congress.

In 1845, Bastiat described a mythical petition to the French Government from candlemakers who protested the Sun's unfair competition. As we continue down the road of massive interventionism, the legislation here in Congress becomes no less absurd than that lampooned by Bastiat.

I call this essay by Frederic Bastiat to my colleagues' attention.

THE CANDLEMAKERS' PETITION

(By Frederic Bastiat)

We candlemakers are suffering from the unfair competition of a foreign rival. This foreign manufacturer of light has such an advantage over us that he floods our domestic markets with his product. And he offers it at a fantastically low price. The moment this foreigner appears in our country, all our customers desert us and turn to him. As a result, an entire domestic industry is rendered completely stagnant. And even more, since the lighting industry has countless ramifications with other native industries, they, too, are injured. This foreign manufacturer who competes against us without mercy is none other than the sun itself!

Here is our petition: Please pass a law ordering the closing of all windows, skylights, shutters, curtains, and blinds—that is, all openings, holes, and cracks through which the light of the sun is allowed to enter houses. This free sunlight is hurting the business of us deserving manufacturers of candles. Since we have always served our country well, gratitude demands that our country ought not to abandon us now to this unequal competition.

We hope that you gentlemen will not regard our petition as mere satire, or refuse it without at least hearing our reasons in support of it.

First, if you make it as difficult as possible for the people to have access to natural light, and thus create an increased demand for artificial light, will not all domestic manufacturers be stimulated thereby?

For example, if more tallow is consumed, naturally there must be more cattle and sheep. As a result, there will also be more meat, wool, and hides. There will even be more manure, which is the basis of agriculture.

Next, if more oil is consumed for lighting, we shall have extensive olive groves and rape [variety of mustard] fields.

Also, our wastelands will be covered with pines and other resinous trees and plants. As a result of this, there will be numerous

swarms of bees to increase the production of honey. In fact, all branches of agriculture will show an increased development.

The same applies to the shipping industry. The increased demand for whale oil will then require thousands of ships for whale fishing. In a short time, this will result in a navy capable of upholding the honor of our country and gratifying the patriotic sentiments of the candlemakers and other persons in related industries.

The manufacturers of lighting fixtures—candlesticks, lamps, candelabra, chandeliers, crystals, bronzes, and so on—will be especially stimulated. The resulting warehouses and display rooms will make our present-day shops look poor indeed.

The resin collectors on the heights along the seacoast, as well as the coal miners in the depths of the earth, will rejoice at their higher wages and increased prosperity. In fact, gentlemen, the condition of every citizen of our country—from the wealthiest owner of coal mines to the poorest seller of matches—will be improved by the process of our petition.

TO THIS PETITION OF THE CANDLEMAKERS, BASTIAT IN EFFECT REPLIED

You neglect the consumer in your plea. Whenever the consumer's interest is opposed to that of the producer you sacrifice the consumer's—for the sake of increased work and employment. The consumer wants goods as cheaply as possible, even imports, if they are inexpensive. "But," you reply, "producers are interested in excluding cheap imports. Similarly, consumers may welcome free natural light, but producers of artificial light are interested in excluding it."

Nature and human labor cooperate in the production of commodities in various proportions, depending on the country and the climate. Nature's part is always "free." If a Lisbon orange sells in Paris for half the price of a Paris orange, it is because nature and, thus, free heat does for it what artificial and, therefore, expensive heat must do for the other. A part of the Portuguese orange is furnished free.

When we can acquire goods from abroad for less labor than if we make them ourselves, the difference is a gift. When the donor, like the sun in furnishing light, asks for nothing, the gift is complete. The question we would ask—and we pose it formally—is this: "Do you prefer that our people have the benefit of consuming free and inexpensive commodities? Or would you impose on them the supposed advantages of hard work and expensive production?"●

LITHUANIAN FREEDOM DAY

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 40 years ago, the Soviet Union forcibly and unlawfully occupied and incorporated Lithuania. Repression continues to this day—politically, religiously, and culturally.

There are thousands of Lithuanians who attempt to exercise their basic human rights and are arrested, harassed, and pressured by the Soviet-installed government. Many others are prisoners in a different sense. In their homes, families cannot practice their unique cultural heritage and religious traditions without fear of reprisals. And, in their schools, children are exposed only to the Soviet educational system.

The struggle for freedom is a recurrent theme in Lithuanian history. As Americans, we too often take our constitutional freedoms of speech, press, assemblage, and religion for granted. By celebrating Lithuanian Freedom Day, we serve to renew our belief in the democratic principles of our Nation and reassert that we will never accept violation of human rights and human dignity by the Soviets in countries like Lithuania or Afghanistan or the Baltic States.●

THE NEIGHBORHOOD PHARMACY

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the gradual decline in the importance of the small independent pharmacy is indicative of the problems facing millions of America's small businesses. Their declining share of the market is another indication that the small, independent retailer continues to face increasing odds in competition against chainstore and nationwide pharmacies.

A recent article on this subject, printed in the Buffalo Courier-Express, explains how this decline in the numbers of neighborhood drugstores also reflects the increasing challenges faced by those who wish to preserve the neighborhood business districts of our cities. As competition drives the independent retailer out of business, the vacuum that remains often goes unfilled, leaving a neighborhood or small community without an important business or without a concerned local businessman or businesswoman. The long-term effects of this trend are to undermine an entire business district and make new investors more hesitant in opening new shops.

I am certain that readers of this commentary will gain a renewed appreciation and enthusiasm for the neighborhood pharmacies that remain in business.

The article follows:

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express, June 16, 1980]

NEIGHBORHOOD PHARMACIES ON DECLINE
(By Ralph W. Loew)

Revolutions can happen before our eyes without ever being seen. Customs, habits, attitudes, values and ways of thinking and acting can change radically without even a decent obituary.

For instance, when we moved to the Central Park area 33 years ago there were 13 drugstores in the immediate area. Now there are 5. The corner delicatessen is gone, the three grocery stores on and around the corner are gone but fortunately for us, the corner drugstore is still there.

So I asked Robert N. Yaeger, who has been my favorite pharmacist through the years, to comment about all of this. The Parker Pharmacy has been there since 1944. He listed some of the many developments which have threatened these small independent servants of the public good. Those situations include the growing competition of the "chain pharmacies" and the addition of drug departments to supermarkets. Then there are such practical problems as the multiplication of 'paperwork' and the spiral of inflation.

In addition, there are threats which range from the petty shoplifting to the very serious holdups. The latter are for drugs as much as for money and are a continuing danger. Add to these the long hours involved and the need for a large investment before a business can be started and you understand the problem confronting the pharmacist.

Yet communities are held together by trust and respect and the corner drugstore is one of those institutions which add quality to a city. Bob Yaeger knows our family very well. He's filled our prescriptions since the girls were children, given us advice, shared counsel and been a neighborhood friend. One can get integrity from the chainstore pharmacist too but the turnover in personnel is constant. It is encouraging and comforting to know that Bob and his colleagues are in their usual place.

Another contributing factor to change is the decline of medical offices in neighborhoods. Doctors are now frequently located in group practice or in medical buildings, all of which changed the situation for the smaller independent pharmacist.

This revolution had been going on nationally as well as locally. The small independent druggist had 12 percent of the market in 1967. By 1970 that had declined to 8 percent and by 1980 it is estimated to be but 4.9 percent. Meanwhile the chain store pharmacists have captured 49 percent of the market.

So Bob and I discussed the future of these smaller establishments. He spoke of his philosophy of business, of his personal values added to professional integrity. He is also aware of the important role he and his colleagues play in the personal lives of the neighborhood.

That's important in a time when cities are in crisis. Beyond the financial crunch and the agony of integrating varieties of ethnic and racial groups there is requirement of keeping alive every organization or group which can share in the development of the environment of opportunity which is the keynote of the city. That community is happiest which has a variety of businesses, churches, schools and public agencies which provide the glue which holds the community together.

Among these is the corner drugstore where there is someone to greet you by name, deliver prescriptions when there's an

emergency, share with the family as the years go by and be available at hours beyond the 9 to 5 schedules of each day. To all of these pharmacists and those who work with them, our city owes gratitude. For our family, that salute is for Bob Yaeger and his professional family who continue to play an important role in the local neighborhood.●

H.R. 4155

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to applaud the action of the House yesterday in unanimously passing H.R. 4155, legislation which will strengthen the Department of Education's ability to recoup defaulted student loan money.

Under current law, the Internal Revenue Service may disclose the addresses of only a limited number of loan defaulters. H.R. 4155 will expand the authority of the IRS to provide the Education Department with the addresses of those who have failed to repay guaranteed student loans and loans made under the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act.

The problem of default on loans made in good faith by the Federal Government to thousands of college students is reaching monumental proportions. The General Accounting Office estimates that as of fiscal year 1979, there was \$2 billion in default under two programs: the guaranteed student loan program and the national direct student loan program. As we strive to reduce unnecessary Government spending it is essential that we use the most effective means available to recapture these funds.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4155 will enable the Department of Education and the Internal Revenue Service to work closely in the attempts to crack down on defaulters. It also provides adequate safeguards to prevent the misuse of the information made available to Education Department officials.

I commend the unanimous support that my colleagues provided to H.R. 4155. It is a matter of equity for the American taxpayers.●

A TOAST TO THE TERMINAL TOWER

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, June 28, 1980, marks the 50th anniversary of the Terminal Tower Building located in the heart of downtown Cleveland, Ohio. From 1920 groundbreaking ceremonies to her 50th anniversary cele-

brations, Public Square has been the site of Cleveland's towering citadel—708 feet and 52 stories high, the Terminal Tower was in her youth the second tallest building in the Nation after New York City's Woolworth Building. For Greater Clevelanders, the Terminal Tower is our centerpiece, skylining Lake Erie's northern shores and casting a warm shadow of concern over the industry, commerce, and business enterprises that make our city great. In short, the Terminal Tower is the focal point of our downtown and our city.

As Cleveland Plain Dealer columnist and noted author and storyteller, George Condon, spells out in his latest work, "Cleveland: Prodigy of the Western Reserve," "The effect of the unprecedented building venture was to change the face of Public Square and its adjacent neighborhood." Indeed, Mr. Condon's predictions proved accurate. The Terminal Tower has and continues to stand as the imposing symbol and constant reminder of the great traditions and history of our city. She has earned center stage on her golden anniversary. I am most pleased as the congressional Representative and a member of the Greater Cleveland community to have the opportunity to contribute to the Terminal Tower's well-deserved laurels by submitting for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tribute to the tower's enduring strength, grace, and beauty.

My mother and father were married in June 1931 shortly after the Terminal Tower was completed. In her diary, my mother noted: "What a beautiful building our Terminal Tower is—it will surely always be the pride and joy of our city." Her words are truly prophetic—every Clevelander is proud of the structure, and we are surely proud to be Clevelanders.

Mr. William F. Miller explains the celebration schedule in the following Plain Dealer article:

TERMINAL TOWER PARTY TO BE A REAL WINGING

A month-long celebration is being planned for June to celebrate the golden anniversary of Terminal Tower, the symbol of Cleveland.

"The Terminal Tower 50th Birthday Celebration," will feature entertainment, a party, dinners, exhibits and art in the Terminal Tower concourse or on Public Square.

The celebration is being sponsored by U.S. Realty Investments and its Terminal Management Co.

"It is going to be the best birthday party ever thrown for a building in Cleveland," said Daniel A. FitzSimons, president of FitzSimons LeGrand Advertising, which is planning the party.

FitzSimons said large walk-through exhibit cubes, with pictures and text about the construction of the building, will be built in the concourse.

The sponsors hope to fill Public Square for a party-in-the-park celebration on Friday, June 27, at 5 p.m. It will feature music and a fireworks display. A former Army ranger who is now a stunt man will rappel himself headfirst down the face of the tower.

A carnival on the square that Saturday and Sunday will feature concerts, hot-air balloon rides, mimes and jugglers.

FitzSimons plans to post apple sellers on the corners because the peddlers were common when the building opened in the early days of the Depression.

There will be street races, films, a parade, ethnic culture shows and other events during the month, said FitzSimons.

The 52-story building contains 750,000 square feet. The developers were the Van Sweringen brothers, Mantis James and Oris Paxton, who not only built the tower, but developed Shaker Heights.●

SIMPLE WORDS, HARD FACTS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. MICHEL, Mr. Speaker, amid all of the sophisticated economic theories and complex political rhetoric being heard these days, it might be useful to put in simple terms what we are enduring.

The Carter administration and the Democratic leadership in the Congress, through decisions consciously taken, have brought this Nation and its working people to an historically unprecedented crisis. We are enduring high inflation and rising unemployment. We have not yet hit the bottom of this slide. "Factory Capacity Rate Low" says a headline in the New York Times, reminding us that our factories are now operating at 78.9 percent of capacity, the lowest rate in years.

At this point I insert in the RECORD, "Factory Capacity Rate Low" from the New York Times, June 16, 1980:

FACTORY CAPACITY RATE LOW

WASHINGTON, June 16.—Affected by the deepening recession, the nation's factories operated last month at only 78.9 percent of capacity, the lowest level since February 1976 and 2 percentage points below April's mark, the Federal Reserve reported today.

The Federal Reserve said that the capacity rate had dropped nearly eight percentage points from 1979's first quarter, when the economy was still expanding.

In the last four months, the rate has declined by 5.5 percentage points after remaining stable during the last half of 1979.

During the last recession in 1974-75, the operating rate fell as low as 69 percent.

Reports of declining factory use came in the wake of other recession news. Industrial production in May fell 2.1 percent. Inventories rose 1.3 percent in April, as sales by manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers slumped 3.3 percent. And unemployment rose to 7.8 percent in May, from 7 percent in April.

The Federal Reserve's report said that the drop in factory operating rates was widespread.

The utilization level for primary processing plants plummeted 3.1 percentage points in May, to 77.8 percent, more than 10 percentage points lower than a year earlier. As recently as January, this figure stood at 86.3 percent of capacity.

The rate for advanced processing in May declined more moderately—1.3 percentage points, to 79.5 percent, the Federal Reserve said.

DROP IN METALS, OIL, AND PLASTICS

The factory use rates for production of iron and steel, petroleum products, rubber and plastics and motor vehicles all fell substantially.

For motor vehicles, the operating rate was slightly above its last recession low in February 1975 of 51.3 percent, the Federal Reserve said.

Producers of durable goods operated at 75.9 percent of capacity in May, a decline of 3 percentage points from April.

Manufacturers of nondurable goods, meanwhile, operated at 84.8 percent of capacity, 1.8 percentage points less than a month earlier.

The Federal Reserve also reported that the use rate of industrial materials fell 2.3 percentage points, to 80.2 percent in May, or 7.2 percentage points less than May 1979. During the last recession, this rate fell as low as 69.4 percent.●

HEARINGS RELEASED ON CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. WOLFF, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of our colleagues to a joint release today by my chairman, the Honorable CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, and I of hearings we held recently on the strategic implications of the use of chemical and biological weapons of war.

Mr. ZABLOCKI's Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs, and the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, which I have the honor to chair, held these hearings on April 24. They were an extension of hearings held by the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs last December.

Building on that record, the April hearing examined the strategic implications of reports of the use of chemical agents in Laos and Cambodia, and the new charges that chemical agents were being used in Afghanistan.

In addition, we explored the sensitive issues surrounding reports of an incident involving the possible existence of high levels of biological agents in the Soviet inventory.

Chairman ZABLOCKI and I are agreed that this hearing achieved the following results, in terms of demonstrating continuing congressional interest in:

(a) Separating the true facts from rumor relative to allegations of Soviet use of lethal chemical weapons in Afghanistan;

(b) Ascertaining the facts, or what remains to be proven, regarding the April 1979 incident in the Soviet city of Sverdlovsk, which may have been connected with a biological warfare agent;

(c) The continued need to enhance U.S. chemical warfare defensive capabilities;

(d) The pursuit of arms control negotiations to avoid the costly produc-

tion and destabilizing effect of new, lethal chemical weapons; and

(e) A commitment to an effective international ban on the use in war of chemical and biological weapons.

Witnesses testified that the United States was pursuing a diplomatic effort to obtain the concurrence of friends, allies, and key neutral or non-aligned nations in having an impartial international investigation into the allegations of chemical weapons use in Afghanistan, Laos, and Cambodia.

In our joint press statement today releasing the hearings, Chairman ZABLOCKI made the following comment regarding this important diplomatic effort:

I am pleased to report that preliminary responses to the administration's efforts to date are positive. Because of the need to sustain the credibility of our evidence, and to generate greater support for an impartial investigation, I would stress that it is critical that all public officials approach this effort in a responsible and non-political manner.

At our hearing, both Mr. ZABLOCKI and I indicated a concern that misleading public statements and news accounts may be contributing to a climate which obscures the actual facts on the use of lethal chemical weapons in Afghanistan, Laos, and Cambodia. This is also the case for what may—or may not—have happened in Sverdlovsk.

In our joint press statement today I noted:

I am concerned that an atmosphere may have been created which will make it difficult for the United States to make objective decisions on critical arms control and negotiation areas regarding both chemical and biological weapons. Thus, we must strive for objectivity while at the same time recognizing the risks of actions by other nations which would have serious implications for U.S. and international security, and the continued viability of international arms control.

Based on testimony from Hon. Matthew Nimetz, Under Secretary of State for Security Assistance, Science, and Technology, Rear Adm. Thomas Davies, Assistant Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and Prof. Matthew Meselson, Harvard University, the subcommittees learned the following facts:

With respect to the situation in Afghanistan, it is highly likely that Soviet invasion forces have used non-lethal chemical irritants in their efforts to suppress the Afghan resistance. The U.S. Government has not been able to confirm, however, that the Soviets have employed lethal and incapacitating agents in Afghanistan.

Due to persistent reports that lethal chemical weapons are being used in Afghanistan, Laos, and Cambodia, the administration has initiated efforts with other countries to obtain an impartial international investigation into these charges.

As to the Sverdlovsk incident, the administration's current assessment is

inconclusive as to whether or not the event involved biological warfare agents; however, pursuing this matter with the Soviets in an effort to obtain additional information is fully justified.

Based on the April 24 hearing, the House of Representatives on May 19, 1980, unanimously adopted House Resolution 644, a resolution encouraging the administration to pursue observance by all parties of the 1975 Biological Weapons Convention prohibiting biological warfare.

Commenting on the resolution in today's press statement, Chairman ZABLOCKI said:

It is necessary that the U.S.S.R. recognize the determined interest of the House in resolving this issue. Soviet cooperation is in our mutual interest and will help to achieve the complete elimination of bacteriological and biological agents from the arsenals of all countries. In this respect, as the administration pursues its on-going negotiations with the Soviets, an acceptable procedure for both countries might be to have some international health organization, such as the World Health Organization or the International Committee of the Red Cross, conduct a thorough, impartial and independent investigation into this incident.

Copies of the hearing, entitled "Strategic Implications of Chemical and Biological Warfare," are available in room 2169 Rayburn House Office Building.

I hope this summary of our hearings will prove useful to the House as we examine this important topic in the days ahead. I urge any Members who may have questions to feel free to call either the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, 225-3044, or the Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs, 225-8926.●

TEXARKANA MOBILIZES TO FIGHT CRIME

HON. SAM B. HALL, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years there has been a dramatic increase nationally in crime in small- and medium-sized cities. A medium-sized city in my congressional district has launched a crime-fighting program that could be used as a model for other cities. The city is Texarkana, Tex., and I would like to bring this effort to the attention of my colleagues.

Entitled "Awareness of Crime in Texarkana," or A.C.T., this program is a cooperative venture involving business, government, and private citizens.

A Federal correctional institution is located in Texarkana, and prison officials have been working with the community in the A.C.T. program. In fact, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Norman Carlson, endorsed

the project last year after looking it over.

A local businessman, Josh Morris, and president of the Junior League, Mrs. Joanne Howard, put together the original A.C.T. Action Committee, which was made up of representatives of local business, the police department and other city agencies, local universities and high schools, the Federal prison and local churches. The committee defined several goals for its work: Educate the public about the costs and consequences of crime; expose youngsters to the consequences of crime in order to discourage them from a life of crime; involve the community in crime prevention efforts; reduce crime.

The first goal of A.C.T.—to educate the public about crime—was addressed by public endorsements and speeches as well as a comprehensive media campaign.

The second goal was to reach the city's youngsters. High school students were taken to meet real prisoners. They heard about what life is like for a convict—the rigors of prison, the meaning of a life of crime. These same students were used as volunteers to distribute crime prevention materials. Scout troops were used to assemble materials. Elementary school children were given very imaginative comic papers instructing them on reporting crime. They had to take the papers home to their parents to review. If they came back to class with their parent's signature on the back of the paper, they would be designated junior deputies. The designation was made official in a ceremony in which they were awarded badges by local police officers. A Texarkana artist designed the comic papers and a local college printed them up.

Another goal of the program was to mobilize the entire community in crime prevention efforts. The first thing that had to be done was to find out which crimes the community was most concerned with preventing. To this end, a survey was designed. It was printed in local papers, distributed at civic meetings, and given to as many community members as possible. The results showed that burglary and vandalism were the crimes with which Texarkana residents were most concerned. A.C.T.'s police advisers agreed that these were in fact a high priority.

Three neighborhoods were targeted for a pilot program involving the distribution of crime prevention materials. They contained information about local burglary patterns, engravings for marking property, instructions for reporting suspicious events, and decals for display at home. The packets were distributed door to door by A.C.T. volunteers and were timed to precede the preholiday burglary season in late November. Materials for the packets were donated by Commercial Union Assurance Cos. and local businessmen.

A project director has been hired to coordinate the activities of A.C.T. funding for much of the activities are through local businesses including the Independent Insurance Agents of Texarkana and Commercial Union Insurance Co.

In its next phase of operations, A.C.T. hopes to distribute crime prevention packets citywide. The comic papers will be serialized and distributed to all elementary school students. Crime prevention information depositories will be established.

Mr. Speaker, we have become too willing as a nation to accept crime as a fact of life. But when entire communities mobilize to fight it, as did Texarkana, perhaps crime will no longer find a home.●

THE REFUGEE QUESTION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I insert my Washington report for Wednesday, June 18, 1980, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE REFUGEE QUESTION

Our recent experience with refugees—the Vietnamese in 1975 and the Cubans in the last several weeks—clearly shows the inadequacy of the laws under which we grant people entry into the United States. The central fact of our experience is that we have lost a large measure of control over who can and who cannot come into this country.

Immigration policy has always been a difficult matter for Americans. We have restricted immigration for more than 100 years. Quotas have regulated the flow of immigrants, according to their national origin, since 1921. Much immigration, however, is now occurring ad hoc. For the past quarter century the United States Attorney General has had discretionary parole power under which he has permitted into the country more than one million refugees from Hungary, Cuba, the Soviet Union, and other lands. Although our laws will allow about 630,000 refugees and immigrants into the country this year, many more will come in legally outside the ceiling. Moreover, the law gives the President the authority to let in an unlimited number of refugees. In addition, thousands more will cross our borders as illegal aliens. In the last half of the 19th Century and the first half of this one, we brought people in under laws that were not always wise or fair, but at least the immigration occurred within the law. Today, the laws of the United States are being evaded.

We have neither an effective emergency policy to deal with new waves of refugees nor a coherent national policy on immigration. When faced with a problem—the rapid influx of Cubans or the steady northward migration of people from the other nations of Latin America—we seem to flounder about, not knowing what we are doing or why we are doing it. The basic difficulty is that we have not determined for ourselves what our objectives are and how we can best achieve them. We have regarded immigration matters as marginal in importance and susceptible to expedient solutions. We have

set up a limit and then, through the use of the parole power or the "back door," have let in thousands more on their own initiative.

Our immigration policy must be geared to new realities. The world's population is now 4.4 billion, and it is expanding at a rate of 172 per minute, about 90 million per year. With political turmoil in many parts of the world, the number of refugees has swelled to 14 million. America is still the "promised land" for most of them, and they would flock to our shores if they could. We may be preoccupied with our own domestic troubles, but our nation is the shining hope of these homeless men and women, many of whom have felt the scourges of war, political oppression, and abject poverty. In the past, we have welcomed those who have fled their homes for racial, religious, or political reasons. We have helped them learn a new language, acquire new skills, and settle into new homes. In turn, these newcomers have enriched our national life by making remarkable contributions to their adopted homeland. We pride ourselves on being a haven for refugees and have been confident of our ability to absorb those who came here, but we cannot possibly accept all refugees. We must ask ourselves which we should admit, keeping in mind that the assimilation of refugees is not as easy for us as it once was. Unlimited immigration may have been appropriate in an earlier day, but resettlement programs can become a burden on many Americans who themselves may be faced with unemployment.

As I think about immigration policy, it strikes me that several general principles must guide us in the decisions we make:

Current immigration practices need to be looked at in their entirety, with a view toward their long-range impact and the emergence of a sound national policy on immigration. Our primary objective must be to regularize and slow the influx of people from abroad. Although we cannot afford to take in all refugees, we can afford to take in many. We are not an overcrowded country, and it is consistent with our traditions to be generous to displaced people. A chaotic avalanche of refugees, however, is something we do not want and should not tolerate.

An overall annual ceiling for refugees and immigrants is desirable. Once set, the ceiling should be strictly adhered to. Since we have accepted more refugees and immigrants this year than have all other nations of the free world combined, we need not apologize.

We should deal with all refugees and immigrants equally, not allowing the people of any foreign country special advantages. Race certainly ought not to be a factor.

We must intensify our effort to control illegal immigration. A substantial increase in the resources we commit to maintain the integrity of our borders is long overdue. Comprehensive bilateral programs with nations that "export" their people may be necessary.

We should work for the admission of "seed migrants" who can help our nation with their talents but who have no relatives in America. Our immigration policy is too dominated by the goal of family reunification. Although that goal is a worthy one, it is not the only one. Economic and cultural development is also in our interest.

Other nations should be encouraged both to participate in the resettlement of refugees and to help lessen the tensions that generate refugees.

Finally, all refugees should be screened carefully upon arrival in the United States. In no circumstances should we accept refugees who have committed serious crimes or

who would be disloyal to the United States.●

MEMBERS OF BOY SCOUT TROOP NO. 295 TO ATTEND INTERNATIONAL JAMBOREE

HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, on July 26, 1980, 10 members of Boy Scout Troop No. 295 at St. Patrick's Parish in Bay Ridge, Brooklyn, accompanied by 3 Scoutmasters, will leave for a 3-week tour of Sweden. While in Sweden, the Scouts will attend a 1-week International Jamboree with Boy Scout troops from eight other countries.

The Scouts of troop No. 295 were invited to the 1980 International Jamboree by members of the Swedish Boy Scout Council. They met the Swedish Scouts while participating in a bicentennial exchange program in England in 1977. These Scouts are the only American group going to the international festival.

Troop No. 295 has contributed much to the growth of the Brooklyn community both physically and spiritually. They perform a large number of community services with great regularity. Most recently, the Scouts offered free rides to Brooklynites during the New York City transit strike.

I feel that this group of young men characterizes the qualities every individual should possess—a pride in each other and themselves. In these troubled times, their goal—to continue to improve and shape a bigger and brighter world—should give each of us a cause for optimism.

It is my hope that these Scouts, by demonstrating their ability to finance their \$429 round-trip tickets through various fundraising activities, will revitalize Boy Scout organizations in Brooklyn and throughout the country. Boy Scout organizations must continue to mold our future leaders through their goals of character building, citizenship training, and physical fitness. In my opinion, the Scouts' invitation and trip to the International Jamboree in Sweden is well-deserved reward for the hours of hard work they have donated to the community and it will generate new enthusiasm for Boy Scouting in Brooklyn.●

AMERICA NEEDS REVIVAL OF PATRIOTISM

HON. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues what I

consider to be an outstanding editorial written by an 18-year-old senior in high school. This young woman from Jackson, Miss., has hit at the heart of the patriotic lethargy that currently exists in this Nation. I am very encouraged by the awareness Sonja Nall displays and am hopeful that her recognition of our problems is reflective of the rest of her generation. If that is so, we can rest easy that our future will be in good hands.

I commend her editorial in the Callaway High School newspaper to my colleagues:

[From the Thunderbolt, May 9, 1980]

AMERICA NEEDS REVIVAL OF PATRIOTISM

(By Sonja Nall)

How long has it been since we have stood in the classroom to recite the pledge of allegiance? How long has it been since we have stood in the schools to sing the National Anthem? And how long has it been since each of us, as individuals, has noticed the flag of the United States of America waving in the breeze and felt a tingle spread over one's body—a tingle that was the result of awesome pride and respect for this great nation?

Now, more than ever before, it is time for the people of this nation to stand united in all that we believe. What we believe as a nation is protected through our solemn promise of allegiance to the United States of America.

This promise of allegiance is symbolized by our pledge to the American flag. Over 200 years after our forefathers fought and died for the freedom that we take for granted each day, that pledge still reads, "... one Nation, under God, indivisible . . ."

Are we "one Nation?" Are we a nation "under God" and "indivisible" through His strength and guidance? These questions can only be answered through our actions as a people.

The official motto of the United States was adopted on July 3, 1956 and reads, "In God We Trust." We, as a united people, must begin to entrust the welfare of this nation to God, the very God to whom we can no longer pray in the public schools and for whose worship our forefathers left Europe for the New World.

The Constitution of the United States calls for majority rule. According to World Book Encyclopedia, 95 percent of all Americans committed to any religious organization is Christian. Isn't it ironic that a majority of this size is refused the right to prayer in the public schools in order to protect the rights of an atheist in our "one Nation, under God?"

The older generation is often critical of youth who lack patriotism. Yet, who is to blame when children are no longer asked to say the pledge of allegiance in the public schools?

A case in point is the statement made recently by a 12 year-old boy who has been in the Jackson Public Schools since he entered the first grade. He was quoted as saying, "It has been so long since I have heard the pledge of allegiance that I probably could not recite it correctly if I had to." Thus, we cannot blame the youth; for they certainly cannot teach patriotism to themselves.

On the other hand, young people often criticize the older generation, who they say created our foreign policy and thus the international conflicts that it has brought about. Yet, these youth rise each morning in the free nation that those same ancestors fought and died to preserve for them.

However, now is not the time to assess blame, not to any segment of the people nor to any leader. Rather it is the time for us to unite for the love of our God and country.

Let us once again be "... one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."●

FATHER ROBERT DRINAN

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1980

● Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I was sorry to hear of Father DRINAN's decision not to seek reelection to the House of Representatives this fall. For 10 years, since his election to the 92d Congress, Father DRINAN has ably and effectively served his constituency and the Congress.

As a colleague of Father DRINAN's on the House Government Operations Committee, I have come to know and respect his dedication to integrity in Government and his efforts on behalf of consumers all across America. Although we are on opposite sides of the aisle and do not always agree, I have witnessed, as my colleagues on the committee have witnessed, the force and conviction which characterizes his advocacy. His active participation on the Government Operations Committee will be missed.

Although BOB DRINAN will no longer represent Massachusetts Fourth Congressional District, I am confident he will continue to find ways to serve his community. I wish him well and further success in whatever tasks he pursues.●

WHO IS THE REAL DEMAGOGUE?

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, President Jimmy Carter said Gov. Ronald Reagan's campaign will feature "demagoguery." Unfortunately for Mr. Carter, syndicated columnist George Will happened to come across the Carter claim. What Will has done is simply to list some of the events and incidents during the past 4 years that demonstrate that Jimmy Carter has a first-hand experience with demagoguery because he seems to be expert at it himself.

At this point I include in the RECORD, "Look Who's Shouting 'Demagogue,'" by George Will, Chicago Sun-Times, June 15, 1980.

LOOK WHO'S SHOUTING "DEMAGOGUE"

(By George Will)

WASHINGTON.—Jimmy Carter says Ronald Reagan's campaign will feature "dema-

goguary." HMMMMMMMMMM. That's an interesting warning from the man who:

Early in 1977, said: Hey, let's mail everybody some money—a \$50 tax rebate.

Attacked entire classes of Americans, including doctors and lawyers.

Pandered to other public prejudices with repeated attacks on another safe target, oil companies.

Undermined respect for, and compliance with, the tax system by ridiculing it as "a disgrace to the human race."

Further lowered the discussion of complicated tax matters by displaying, for the merriment of yahoos, a stack of volumes containing the tax code, as though the size of the volumes is self-evident proof of something.

Lowered the tone still further by harping on the "three martini lunch."

Blamed most of America's inflation on wicked foreigners—OPEC—in spite of the fact that 11 of the 13 industrial nations that are more dependent on OPEC than America have lower inflation rates than America has.

Announced, as the economy tumbled into a free-fall, that his economic policies "suit me fine."

Said, as those policies produced the worst two consecutive months of rising unemployment statistics in the history of American unemployment statistics, that "no working man or woman can find fault with our policies."

Declared, six months after his treasury secretary declared the recession half over, and shortly before the shattering unemployment figures, that the nation's economy had "turned the corner."

Submitted a budget calling for a percentage increase of federal expenditures exceeded only once in a quarter of a century, and then denounced Edward Kennedy as "the biggest spender perhaps in the history of the United States Senate."

Said that, "The differences between me and Sen. Kennedy are very minor."

Said, three months ago, shortly before even his administration began to admit that the deficit will be at least \$20 billion, that: "I don't have any doubt that we will have a balanced budget in 1981."

Went on television to make a histrionic declaration that the presence of Soviet combat troops in Cuba is "unacceptable."

Went on television to say that, come to think about it, the presence is acceptable.

Solemnly said that the invasion of Afghanistan was the gravest threat to peace since the Second World War—and then cut the defense budget.

Said: "If I ever lie to you, don't vote for me."

Said, when it suited his political situation: "I want the world to know that I am not going to resume business-as-usual as a partisan campaigner out on the campaign trail until our hostages are back here—free and at home."

Went on television as the polls were opening in the Wisconsin primary, to announce, falsely, a breakthrough in the hostage crises.

Sprinted to Texas, on the eve of the Texas primary, to use a visit with the casualties of the rescue mission as a photo opportunity.

Enough already.●

ROOSTER BRIDGE

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, a tribute to American ingenuity has passed from the scene and it is fitting to mark that passage.

In the early 1900's, a bridge was needed to replace a ferry across the Tombigbee River in my home district of Alabama. It was a vital link in the chain becoming a 2,700-mile expanse of highways. Money was the problem—as it still is today. The citizens of Demopolis, Ala., solved their money problem in a very unique way which deserves special recognition in these days of budget cutting and belt tightening.

To raise money to build the bridge, a rooster auction was held. Local stores were closed and at least 20,000 folks showed up—many with roosters under their arms to donate—to watch and participate in the bidding. President Woodrow Wilson, Helen Keller, Lloyd George, and Mary Pickford were among the variety of celebrities who donated roosters for the event. A syndicate won President Wilson's rooster for a mere \$58,000—and the citizens of Demopolis were well on their way toward their \$237,000 price tag for the bridge which was dedicated in 1919.

Now the bridge has been replaced by a wider, safer span—with a modern day cost of \$8,730,000. And old Rooster Bridge will have to be torn down. But when it goes it will be remembered with New Rooster Bridge, a tribute to its predecessor and the ingenuity behind it.

WON PAT PLEDGES SUPPORT FOR RESERVES, GUARD

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, I recently received the following letter from Mr. J. M. Roche, national chairman of the National Committee for Employer Support of the U.S. Guard and Reserve.

Mr. Roche is asking all Members of Congress to honor the principles of his organization by assuring that any of our employees who are Guard or Reserve members have time to honor their commitments. I fully endorse this request and am proud to say that I have signed his statement of support.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I urge my colleagues to give their full support to Mr. Roche in this effort. As he notes in his letter, more than 358,000 employers across the country have

pledged their support to Guard and Reserve units. This is a most laudable effort and Mr. Roche is deserving of our praise for his drive to gain increased national support for this purpose.

For any Members who may have missed Mr. Roche's fine letter, I include it in the RECORD along with my own response. I wish the national committee success.

The letters follow:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR EMPLOYER SUPPORT OF THE GUARD AND RESERVE,

Arlington, Va., June 3, 1980.

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WON PAT: Since its establishment by Presidential announcement in 1972, I have been privileged to serve as chairman of this committee whose mission is to develop a better public understanding of the importance of the Reserve Forces in today's all-volunteer defense environment.

Assisted by more than 700 volunteer community and military leaders across the country, we solicit the pledge of employers, both public and private, to implement personnel policies which will permit, if not encourage, employee participation in Guard and Reserve training programs. Under the Total Force policy of defense, it is essential that we maintain strong, well trained, equipped and fully manned Reserve Forces capable of rapid mobilization and deployment in case of a national emergency. It is only with the understanding and support of their employers that reservist employees can attend scheduled training and thus achieve the high state of readiness required.

Over the past seven years we have received pledges of support from approximately 358,000 employers, thereby placing an "umbrella of support" over more than 60 percent of all working Americans. However, much remains to be done if we are to achieve our goal of 100 percent employer support and the assurance that supportive personnel policies are recognized by middle management.

I am asking you today, as an employer, to join the other members of Congress who have previously pledged their support of the Guard and Reserve. After reviewing the enclosed material, I hope that you will complete the pledge card and return it to the National Committee, thereby enabling us to forward a Statement of Support for your signature and appropriate display.

I look forward to your favorable response.
Sincerely,

J. M. ROCHE,
National Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 16, 1980.

MR. J. M. ROCHE,
National Chairman, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Defense, National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve, Arlington, Va.

DEAR MR. ROCHE: I am more than pleased to sign your statement as an employer supporting the national guard and the reserves. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I remain deeply committed to these organizations because of their deep importance to the defense role of this nation. I salute your office for its effort to increase employer awareness of the impor-

tance of the guard and reserve forces and applaud your success in this effort.

Keep up the good work. I look forward to receiving the Statement of Support from the National Committee for my office. Let me know if I can be of assistance in any way possible.

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,

ANTONIO B. WON PAT,
Member of Congress.●

HARRY COPPOLA

HON. ROBERT W. DAVIS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. DAVIS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this week a veteran of World War II died. This in itself is not great news as veterans of that war are dying every day. This man, however, probably died sooner than he should have. That he died after much pain and suffering, there is no doubt. The man's name was Harry Coppola and he died of a disease known as multiple myeloma.

Multiple myeloma is a form of bone marrow cancer that has been associated with exposure to radiation. Harry was among a group of marines that was sent into Hiroshima and Nagasaki shortly after the dropping of atomic bombs on those cities in August of 1945. The groups, of about a thousand in each, were sent in as part of a cleanup operation. It was believed at the time that radiation levels were too low to be considered a health hazard.

Today, out of that group of marines, there are at least five cases of multiple myeloma, a very rare disease. This is only the number of cases among veterans from the group that have been located, however, even this rate is 10 times higher than expected. Additionally, there are other reported cases of radiation-related diseases in this group of veterans.

Claims for compensation by this group have been summarily turned down by the Veterans' Administration on the grounds that the radiation levels were too low at the time of the occupation, a point that has been disputed by more recent data.

Harry devoted the last years of his life to the efforts of having his and his fellow veterans' plight resolved. He died without seeing this happen.

Mr. Speaker, legislation has been introduced which would address this problem by requiring a study of the causality of the relationship between health problems of these veterans and their exposure to radiation in 1945. I have requested hearings on the bill from the subcommittee and I urge my colleagues to support this measure. It is important that we face this responsibility to Harry and the others while there is still time for some.●

AID TO ISRAEL MUST CONTINUE WITHOUT STRINGS

HON. JEROME A. AMBRO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. AMBRO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 5, we completed action on H.R. 6942, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act, a lengthy and complicated piece of legislation containing a variety of economic and military assistance aid programs for scores of friendly and allied nations. As in previous years, the largest portion of economic and military funds will go to countries in the Middle East to support the on-going peace process, and most of that is slated for our good friends in the State of Israel. I might add, at this point, that most of my support for foreign assistance legislation this year and in the past is predicated upon the fact that a considerable share of these funds do go to Israel.

Perhaps the most significant feature of our lengthy and far-reaching debate on this bill is what did not take place, rather than what did. I am referring, of course, to the decision by my colleague from California, Mr. McCloskey, not to offer the three amendments that he had previously indicated that he planned to put forward. Those three amendments—to cut off \$150 million in aid to Israel if she continues to expand West Bank settlements; to require a certificate by the President that this aid money is not being used for settlement purposes; and to confirm that it is the sense of Congress that none of the funds appropriated under this bill be used for the construction of new settlements or the construction of additional facilities on the West Bank—would have only served to confuse and undermine our Israeli friends while giving unwarranted hope to those forces and nations that would subvert the peace process. Beyond that, it is important to note, as stated by the chairman of the Middle East Subcommittee, Mr. HAMILTON, that the United States, at the present time has an agreement with Israel which provides that any assistance from this country to Israel must be used in the geographical areas which were subject to the Government of Israel's administration prior to June 5, 1967, which agreement has been scrupulously adhered to by the Israelis. Given these facts, I am very pleased that the amendments were not presented after all.

I think it is interesting and somewhat ironic that we held the debate on the proposed amendments on the very day that we did: June 5, 1980. Let us not forget that this is the day which marks the 13th anniversary of the start of the Six Day War. Let us not forget that this conflict began because all of Israel's Arab neighbors, led by

Nasser's Egypt, had their armies poised for a massive invasion of the tiny state. Let us not forget that Jordan—which controlled both East Jerusalem and the West Bank—yes, they were Jordanian, hence Palestinian, territories until June 1967—received promises from the Israeli Government and military that they would not be disturbed, if they chose not to attack Israel. Let us not forget, that they refused that offer of security. Let us not forget that before 1967, Israel was indeed within its pre-1967 boundaries, and was forced to fight three major wars to defend even her small country. Let us not forget that before 1967, the West Bank was in Arab hands and absolutely no attempt was made to establish a Palestinian entity there. Let us not forget that prior to 1967 no Israelis—indeed no Jews—were allowed to enter, much less to settle on the West Bank or in East Jerusalem, while since then Arabs have been allowed free access to most of Israel. And finally, let us not forget that prior to 1967, East Jerusalem was an Arab city into which no Jew was ever permitted to enter, even to worship at some of Judaism's holiest shrines, in complete violation of the U.N. resolution which partitioned the British Palestinian mandate into the State of Israel and a Palestinian state, and not a single condemnation emanated from the United Nations or any other responsible international forum.

The question of the West Bank settlements is as controversial within Israel itself as it is in this country, and I believe that it is counterproductive, and indeed insulting to one of the few nations in the world on whose friendship, support, and democratic way of life we can rely. Let friend and foe alike make no mistake about it: It will never be our policy or intention to undermine the security and well-being of the State of Israel for any reason whatsoever.

I think several additional points need to be made. All of the discussion that one hears in the United States and from our fair weather friends in Europe about the participation of the PLO in peace negotiations presupposes that this terrorist band of outlaws wants to participate in a peaceful resolution of the Middle East crisis. That this is a giant and misguided presupposition is evidenced by the fact that as recently as June 2 a new political program was published by El Fatah's congress which states explicitly that "Fatah is an independent national revolutionary movement whose aim is to liberate Palestine completely and to liquidate the Zionist entity politically, economically, militarily, culturally, and ideologically. It also aims at establishing a Palestine democratic state on all the Palestinian soil. This struggle will not stop until the Zionist entity is liquidated and Palestine is liberat-

ed. . . . We will not allow anyone to interfere in our affairs or obstruct the Palestinian people's struggle to liberate its homeland." This hardly sounds like the conciliatory rhetoric of a prospective partner in the peace process.

Second, I think that a word should be said about the escalating violence on the West Bank. Certainly, any rational human being deplors the bombing and the maiming, no matter who perpetrates the violent act. I think that it is important for us to note here, that the Israeli Government was the first and the loudest in its condemnation of the attacks on the Palestinian mayors. Indeed, an Israeli policeman was gravely wounded in a successful attempt to save a third Palestinian mayor from danger. Let us stop and think for a moment and try—in vain—to recall the last time, or any time, that similar condemnations came from any Arab state in response to the murder of women, children, athletes, or any other Israeli citizens. Perhaps the sharp difference in the reactions of the two sides says it all.

Finally, I must say a few words about a matter that is not directly related to the bill under consideration, but is nonetheless of crucial importance. I am specifically talking about the request from the Saudi Arabian Government to upgrade the range and ground attack capability of the F-15 aircraft that the United States—much against my vociferous opposition—sold to them in 1978. All of my colleagues will remember the prolonged and sometimes bitter debate that ensued in this Chamber and in the other body at the time that the administration proposed to sell the Saudis these sophisticated planes. Those of us who vehemently opposed the sale felt that we were providing one of Israel's major enemies with combat equipment that could be used against our friends. In an effort to bolster its position, we all recall that the administration pledged to us that it would not supply the Saudis with the supplementary equipment that would be necessary to render the F-15's capable of attack. Many of us were not satisfied with these assurances, but unfortunately, we were outvoted by the other body which chose to accept the administration's promises. The fact that now, only 2 years later, we are faced with administration reviews of the Saudi request for this additional equipment is incomprehensible, outrageous, and indeed frightening. I call upon the administration to stand by its 1978 pledges, and I now call upon my colleagues to assure that the White House and the State and Defense Departments do not sell out our Israeli friends on the altar of petroleum. ●

RALEIGH REGISTER, 100 YEARS OLD

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the newspaper in my hometown of Beckley, W. Va., the Raleigh Register, for its 100 years of service to the community.

On June 15, 1880, the Register published its first edition, and has been doing so ever since. The newspaper has truly been a cornerstone for the city of Beckley, Raleigh County, and the State of West Virginia.

I would like to commend Mr. Lyell B. Clay, the publisher of the Register and chief executive officer of Clay Communications. Mr. Clay's leadership has been instrumental in seeing to it that the paper remains a strong force in the community.

Those who published the Register before him were: Edwin Price, 1880-90; Robert A. Spencer, 1891-96; G. W. Cook and E. Edwin Tucker, 1896-99; E. L. Elison and J. Price Beckley, 1899-1902; Joe L. Smith, 1902-11; Charles Hodel, 1921-73; John C. Hodel, 1973-76.

In its 100 years, the Raleigh Register has been under the leadership of 16 editors. The present editor being a fine man and a close friend of mine, W. R. "Bob" Wills. I congratulate Bob, and his staff, that includes: R. Keith Walter, managing editor; Nancy E. Stephen, news editor; and Bill Tolbert, city editor.

Mr. R. Sid Crim, serves as general manager of Beckley Newspapers, Inc. I also want to commend him for the job he has done in the past few years.

The Raleigh Register was named after Sir Walter Raleigh, the English adventurer and soldier. During its 100 years, the Register has certainly lived up to its namesake, and I am sure it will for the next 100 years. ●

*** AND WHO'S THE DEMAGOGUE?

HON. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, columnist George Will, in his usual incisive manner, made some telling observations about our presidential candidates in a recent column. The article follows, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, June 15, 1980]

*** AND WHO'S THE DEMAGOGUE?

(By George F. Will)

Jimmy Carter says Ronald Reagan's campaign will feature "demagoguery."

Hmmmmmmmmmm. That's an interesting warning from the man who:

Early in 1977, said: Hey, let's mail everybody some money—a \$50 tax rebate.

Attacked entire classes of Americans, including doctors and lawyers.

Pandered to other public prejudices with repeated attacks on another safe target, oil companies.

Undermined respect for, and compliance with, the tax system by ridiculing it as "a disgrace to the human race."

Further lowered the discussion of complicated tax matters by displaying, for the merriment of yahoos, a stack of volumes containing the tax code, as though the size of the volumes is self-evident proof of something.

Lowered the tone still further by harping on the "three-martini lunch."

Blamed most of America's inflation on wicked foreigners—OPEC—in spite of the fact that 11 of the 13 industrial nations that are more dependent on OPEC than America has lower inflation rates than America has.

Announced, as the economy tumbled into a free fall, that his economic policies "suit me fine."

Said, as those policies produced the worst two consecutive months of rising unemployment statistics in the history of American unemployment statistics, that "no working man or woman can find fault with our policies."

Declared, six months after his Treasury secretary declared the recession half over, and shortly before the shattering unemployment figures, that the nation's economy had "turned the corner."

Submitted a budget calling for a percentage increase of federal expenditures exceeded only once in a quarter of a century, and then denounced Edward Kennedy as "the biggest spender perhaps in the history of the United States Senate."

Said that "the differences between me and Sen. Kennedy are very minor."

Shattered the record for peacetime tax increases, proposed a budget calling for the federal government to command the highest percentage of GNP since 1944, a year of total war mobilization—and then denounced as "ideological nonsense" Reagan's idea that taxes should be cut.

Said, three months ago, shortly before even his administration began to admit that the deficit will be at least \$20 billion: "I don't have any doubt that we will have a balanced budget in 1981."

Delivered, 11 months ago, one of the worst speeches in the history of speeches, the "malaise" sermon in which he told the nation: I'm unpopular, so you're sick.

Followed that performance with yet another flamboyant visit to the porch of "average Americans."

Described SALT II, which not even a Democratic-controlled Senate would ratify, as "a major achievement of my administration."

Went on television to make a histrionic declaration that the presence of Soviet combat troops in Cuba is "unacceptable."

Went on television to say that, come to think about it, the presence is acceptable.

Solemnly said that the invasion of Afghanistan was the gravest threat to peace since the World War II—and then cut the defense budget.

Deliberately supported a grossly anti-Israel U.N. resolution, and then, when surprised by the public's revulsion, had his secretary of state say, in effect: Oops! It was all a misunderstanding.

Said: "If I ever lie to you, don't vote for me."

Said, when it suited his political situation: "I want the world to know that I am not going to resume business-as-usual as a partisan campaigner out on the campaign trail until our hostages are back here—free and at home."

Bashed the ayatollah with the national Christmas tree.

Went on television, as the polls are opening in the Wisconsin primary to announce, falsely, a breakthrough in the hostage crisis.

Said, months after two U.S. servicemen were killed defending the U.S. embassy in Pakistan: "We've not had any loss of life during this administration because of people being sent into combat."

Sprinted to Texas, on the eve of the Texas primary, to use a visit with the casualties of the rescue mission as a photo opportunity.

Baptized the rescue calamity "an incomplete success."

Having done his best to hold down military pay, used the men of the USS *Nimitz*, returning from an unreasonably long voyage, as props in a skit in which he said, in effect: Come to think about it, I'm for the pay increase I opposed until last week.

Enough, already.

Carter says Reagan is a demagogue. But, then Carter called Hubert Humphrey a "loser," LBJ a liar, and Edward Kennedy a "demagogue" whose campaigning is "very dangerous to our country," its principles and peace. When Carter, directed by his inner compass to the low road, issues warnings about "demagoguery," he is indulging, characteristically, in that against which he pretends to be warning.●

IN HONOR OF WILLIAM E. HESS ON RECEIVING A DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD

HON. THOMAS A. LUKEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize and commend former Representative William E. Hess for his years of dedicated service to the Second District, Cincinnati, and the Nation. Mr. Hess will be receiving a distinguished service award for these efforts later this week at a picnic held in his honor.

During his 28 years of public service to the people of Cincinnati, William Hess provided vital leadership through some of the most trying times in this country's history. Through the depression years, he assisted his constituents with great compassion and a remarkable understanding of their needs, hopes, and dreams. His work on several committees on which he served was most carefully done, but his work on the old Naval Affairs Committee throughout World War II was outstanding. In later years, as chairman and ranking member of a special subcommittee investigating defense contracts and military spending, Mr. Hess saved this country millions of dollars by exposing waste and extravagance in military procurements, and brought about economies which saved millions of dollars in taxpayers money. Yet, most Members of Congress remember

him most for his personal warmth, fine character, and legendary guitar playing.

Speaking for the people of the Second District, Cincinnati and the Nation as a whole, I would like to thank William E. Hess for his long years of dedicated and distinguished public service.●

CONTROVERSIAL DRUG—DMSO

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to create a national center for clinical pharmacology in the Department of Health and Human Resources. This bill is an outgrowth of our recent hearing on the controversial drug, dimethyl sulfoxide, otherwise known as DMSO.

DMSO is a common industrial solvent. It is a byproduct of the paper-making process. The medicinal properties of this agent were discovered less than 20 years ago.

Dr. Stanley Jacob of the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center is the strongest advocate of DMSO. He has led the battle to have it approved by the Food and Drug Administration for use in this country. It is presently approved for use in about a dozen foreign countries.

Dr. Jacob has met with a great deal of success. About 10 years ago he helped obtain FDA approval for the use of DMSO in veterinary medicine. Not long ago, the FDA approved the first use of DMSO in humans. At the present time, the drug can legally be used only to combat an uncommon bladder disease.

DMSO appears to have great promise. Hearings by our committee and an independent investigation by the excellent news program, CBS "Sixty Minutes" have established several points without doubt. First, the drug is an effective pain killer. In normal use it is applied topically to the skin. The drug penetrates the skin and within a matter of seconds, enters the bloodstream. This ability to enter the bloodstream and to carry with it other drugs which can be mixed with it is one of DMSO's most exciting attributes. The third conclusion which we reached is that the drug aids in the healing of soft tissue injuries. We heard testimonials from team physicians from various pro sports teams who talked about DMSO's ability to promote healing rapidly in the bumps and bruises which are the bane of a pro athlete's existence.

The drug has additional potential value which is supported by anecdotal references but not yet by the kind of objective proof which the FDA says it needs. The claim is that DMSO poten-

tiates the effects of other drugs—it makes the other drugs more effective. It is also claimed, with fairly good authority, that DMSO helps heal burns and that it is helpful in healing painful skin ulcers such as bedsores and those common to the disease scleroderma.

Finally, there is a category of uses for DMSO where there is yet little evidence but great hope. We heard testimony that DMSO is helpful in reducing intracranial pressure common when serious head injuries occur and that it helps relieve pressure on the spinal cord in the event of injury to this mainline of the human nervous system. Finally, the drug is thought to be of benefit in lessening the effect of strokes and in aiding victims to a speedy recovery.

With such a great potential and in view of the mountains of testimonials, the obvious assumption is that there must be serious side effects or the drug would be commonly available. If there is one conclusion that is well documented, it is that there is no history of dangerous side effects with DMSO. The FDA considers it a safe drug. The agency has said so explicitly and implicitly by approving the drug for use in humans in the bladder disease known as interstitial cystitis.

What then prevents DMSO from being made available to the American public? The FDA says that it needs more proof. From my point of view, based on our investigation and testimony before our committee, the drug should be approved for use in humans as an agent to help relieve pain, to promote healing of soft tissue injuries, for use in scleroderma, and to promote healing in bedsores. There is no excuse for holding up its approval in these areas.

The FDA has promised our committee that it would expedite its considerations of any requests to test DMSO presented by any pharmaceutical company. And here is the problem. The FDA, for the most part, must sit back and wait until it is approached by a drug company which asks to test a particular agent. The FDA then reviews the plan for the investigation and approves the investigator who will do the study. If satisfied with the study design, the company may go forward. FDA monitors the tests and reviews the results. Thereafter, FDA decides whether or not to give its approval to the drug in question.

The simple fact of the matter is that drug companies will not come forward and ask to test a drug unless they deem it in their financial interest to do so. With respect to DMSO, several drug companies told us that they have not filed with the FDA because the drug is a common chemical agent and not thought to be patentable. The drug companies ask why they should be expected to spend millions of dollars to test and win FDA approval for a drug when they would not, as a

result, secure a patent or some kind of exclusive right of sale which would allow them to recover their costs and then some. It might also be pointed out in the case of DMSO that it would be competitive with a host of medicines, elixirs, and remedies being sold by the drug companies, and it would be cheaper. DMSO is currently being produced for \$3 a gallon. On the black market, the drug is being sold for more than 100 times this amount.

This experience with DMSO convinced me that we need some means of testing these orphan drugs which have been abandoned by major drug companies. One approach is a bill I will soon introduce which would give an exclusive right of sale in interstate commerce for a certain period of time to the drug company which bears the cost of testing and gaining FDA approval. The bill I am introducing today would establish a drug testing center within the Department of Health and Human Services.

We hear so much about drug lag in this country. We hear that foreign countries are fast pulling ahead of us in their testing of new medicines. We hear that our own drug firms are shifting more and more of their resources abroad, taking American jobs and productivity with them. I am hopeful that my bill will be one small step toward reversing this process. The American public deserves the best in health care and medicines that we can provide. I pledge my best effort to make sure that the best we have is available. I ask the Members of the House to join me in cosponsoring this important legislation.

In closing, let me acknowledge that this bill is a modification of a concept contained in a bill originally authored by Congressman JOHN MURPHY of New York. He is to be commended for this fine idea. ●

THE "ME GENERATION" IS NOT A SOLID FRONT

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, at one time or another, I suspect, we have all bemoaned the political apathy of today's college students. I am certainly troubled by the lack of political awareness, concern, or activism that I have encountered when speaking with college-age Americans.

But not every 18- to 24-year-old belongs to the "me generation." I was particularly gratified to come across a letter written by one of my interns, a University of California student, John Godwin, and his two brothers. The letter displays an unusual amount of political awareness—both international and domestic—and I'm pleased to be

able to share it with my colleagues. The text of the letter follows:

26141 VEVA WAY,

Calabasas, CA, June 12, 1980.

To the Congress and the President of the United States of America:

In the arena of world affairs, it is generally accepted that morality plays a minor role in the anarchistic nature of international relations. Based on this premise, to attempt to apply morality to the actions of one nation towards another is futile. It is left to the individual to conduct his or her personal affairs with some code of ethics and morality.

For these reasons, the undersigned formally protest the active support by the United States Government of the military dictatorships of, among others, Batista of Cuba, Park Chung Hee of Korea, Marcos of the Philippines, Pinochet of Chile, Somoza of Nicaragua, and Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi of Iran, as well as the many years of involvement in Viet Nam, and all other aggressive and violent activities to be conducted by the U.S. Government in the future.

As conscientious objectors, we must protest the current movement to reinstate draft registration and any form of military conscription. If drafted, we will not fight, but we will not flee. With honor, we will suffer the consequences and accept punishment as designated under United States law, because we have a higher law, a stricter judge to answer to; our conscience.

This decision is not rooted in the fears of cowards, but in the love of God, belief in non-violence, and the respect for humanity, of heroes.

Sincerely,

ROBERT WILLIAM GODWIN, JR.
JOHN MOREL GODWIN.
DANIEL SIDNEY GODWIN. ●

THE NORTHEAST IS ALIVE, WELL, AND LIVING

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the rumors that the Northeastern region of the United States is dead are, to say the least, highly premature. Yet persistence of this and similar rumors has contributed in some instances to a psychological malaise in that region—a sense of pessimism about the future economic vitality of America's industrial heartland.

For this reason I was particularly pleased to see an article entitled "Northeast on the Move" on the op-ed page of the New York Times yesterday. This article was written by William D. Hassett, Jr., New York State's Commissioner of Commerce, and it makes an excellent case for optimism about the future of the Northeast's economic conditions.

Mr. Hassett's article raises a number of facts about the Northeast that back up his upbeat view of the region's future. There is no doubt that the region has problems and that those problems will not be resolved overnight, but, nonetheless, on balance there is great reason to be hopeful about the future. Accordingly, I would

like at this time to insert Mr. Hassett's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the hope that it will spur even more positive thinking about the Northeast.

The article follows:

NORTHEAST ON THE MOVE

(By William D. Hassett, Jr.)

The energetic Northeastern states that 150 years ago led our nation into the industrial age are now leading it into the post-industrial age. Despite a clouded recent economic past, and less-than-cheerful short-term national and international projections, many factors that contributed to our temporary regional eclipse behind the Sun Belt are emerging as our greatest strengths. How have these onetime liabilities suddenly become assets?

The Northeast (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, the six New England states) was considered even recently too crowded to be of any further economic use—at best, a questionable judgment. We form the core of the largest, most affluent consumer market in the hemisphere, if not the world. Put the point of a compass at Syracuse, which is not far from our region's center, and draw an arc 750 miles in radius—that is, 24 hours by road, a relatively short distance by interstate-trucking standards. In this area are 54 percent of the population of the United States and Canada and 54 percent of the countries' personal income; 65 percent of the total United States-Canadian manufacturing output in dollar value; 55 percent of all United States wholesale sales.

This market, which goes as far West as Chicago-Milwaukee, as far South as Charlotte, N.C., reveals another former "liability" turned asset: our labor force. The conventional wisdom is that most of our skilled workers have moved away; those who were left are libeled as unproductive, expensive, selfish, lazy. The truth is that New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts are among the five top industrial states (California and Texas are the other two) in terms of added wage-dollar value, and Pennsylvania is not far behind. As for the myth of selfish unions, the five industrial states with the least time lost through work stoppages in recent years included New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts.

To give an idea of our strength: If New York State's output of goods and services alone were considered to be that of a separate country, New York would rank among the world's 10 top economic powers.

Northeastern towns that lay idle a few decades ago are humming again; new factories and industries are springing up or expanding.

The economic future to a great extent lies with regions such as ours that not only have a closely knit, rich, diverse market, but also a labor force that is skilled or easily trained, and is mature and responsible.

We led America into industrial and commercial greatness because of a tradition of craftsmanship and cooperation; that tradition is even more valuable now because tomorrow's technically demanding industries will require it even more.

Furthermore, the Northeast is roomy enough to grow, yet compact enough so that we don't go broke or dry getting from one part of the region to the other. In urban centers—Philadelphia, New York, Buffalo, Hartford, Providence, Boston—are amassed the service skills to nurture our economic growth. Our regional energy costs are in many cases competitive with our rivals', and that "many" will soon be "most." We have easy access to the American and Canadian hinterlands and to markets and suppliers

abroad. This does not add up to a moribund "mature economy"—that neat euphemism for high costs, low profits and falling-down factories predicted for us. The spiritual descendants of the people who got this region started, grew with it and made it prosper are doing it again. I can't imagine a more exciting future.●

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOVIET ANNEXATION OF LITHUANIA

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity and call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the 40th anniversary of the Soviet annexation of Lithuania. It is an anniversary that shows the world that the seeds of current Soviet aggression were planted many years ago.

On the outside of the famed National Archives is the inscription, "What is past is prologue." It is an inscription which I believe we all should think of when pondering Soviet activities in Afghanistan and in other parts of the world, because Soviet policy toward territoriality is merely a reflection of the past. If there is one nation on this Earth that understands all too well that the Soviet policy of violating the national integrity of free nations is not a recent development, it is the tiny country of Lithuania. It is a country that for the past 40 years has lived under the weight of Soviet interference and control.

The United States is fortunate in that it is surrounded by neighbors who respect our rights as a sovereign nation. Lithuania has not been accorded that luxury, its freedom, for all sufficient purposes, ending on June 15, 1940. It was on that day Soviet troops occupied Lithuania. Thousands of people lost their lives resisting the invasion and over 300,000 were sent to Soviet labor camps in Siberia when Russification took place. Since that day, Lithuanians have lived in a nation where outside forces deny them their basic human rights.

But there is one thing the Soviets have been unable to deny the Lithuanian people—their spirit to return to a time when their fate was in their hands, not in the Soviets. The people of Lithuania are strong willed. They have suffered so much, and still their will to regain their freedom is as strong as ever. Unfortunately, they cannot do it alone. The United States must continue to fight for their cause. It must continue to stand up to the Soviets when they insist on violating the integrity of nations, and refusing to honor the Helsinki accords. We know the Soviets game plan and it is up to us to react accordingly. If we fail to do so, then all we are doing is invit-

ing more Lithuanians and Afghanists.●

DR. DONALD S. FREDRICKSON

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health and Environment, I have had the privilege over the years of working closely with Donald S. Fredrickson, M.D., who now serves as Director of the National Institutes of Health. In that position, Dr. Fredrickson has done an outstanding job of enhancing the overall mission of the NIH, while at the same time dealing effectively and fairly with the challenges and politics of the biomedical research field, including the pressures of tightening budgets and sometimes competing research needs. There is no doubt but that this Nation has been extremely well served by Dr. Fredrickson who has dedicated so much of his career to public service. I include a recent article from the Journal of the American Medical Association about Dr. Fredrickson's contributions, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

DONALD FREDRICKSON, M.D.: "HIGH PRIEST"

Known in Washington political circles as the "high priest" of biomedical research, Donald S. Fredrickson, M.D.—scientist, politician, and bureaucrat—has had what can only be described as a highly successful career spanning almost 30 years.

Director of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) since 1974, Fredrickson has proved himself adept at treading the political terrain. He is also a survivor. Nominated by Gerald Ford (the NIH directorship is a presidential appointment requiring congressional ratification), he has served both Democrat and Republican administrations. He is the only top official of the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS—formerly the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) to withstand the wholesale firings carried out by former Secretary Califano in 1976. Now Califano is gone and Fredrickson serves his fourth DHHS Secretary, Patricia Harris.

Politics aside, Fredrickson has, so far, been adroit as well in handling the tough challenges that the 36-year-old NIH has faced recently. An unprecedented budget squeeze, an endless new series of fragmented public health concerns ranging from recombinant DNA to medical ethics, saccharin, laetrile, and ionizing radiation all have been laid at the doorstep of NIH.

"Without a doubt, NIH is the biggest, most powerful biomedical research institution in the world. No other country has anything remotely like NIH," Fredrickson told JAMA Medical News. "But we are facing mounting pressures. Trying to define clearly the proper role of NIH in terms of performing biomedical research while being responsible to the public health is perhaps the most important task of the director."

Fredrickson is eminently qualified to discuss the NIH, having been a part of the institution since 1953 with only a 12-month hiatus in 1974 when he went across town to

head the National Academy of Sciences' Institute of Medicine. The year of his arrival at the NIH was the same year the massive clinical center was opened as, according to some, a gigantic version of the famous Rockefeller University research hospital.

Muses Fredrickson: "Some kind of fate brought me to the coils of this serpent [NIH], and I'm not able to get away."

Born in Canon City, Colo., in 1924, Fredrickson is a graduate of the University of Colorado and the University of Michigan Medical School, Ann Arbor. He began his career as a house officer in a Boston hospital and became a research fellow at Massachusetts General Hospital in 1952. The following year he moved to the fledgling National Heart Institute. He was one of the first group of 12 clinical associates at the institute and had planned to stay only the usual two years.

Instead, Fredrickson rose through the ranks at what is now the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute and pursued special research interests in lipid transport and metabolism, the cause and prevention of atherosclerosis, and medical genetics. In 1966 he became director of the institute; from 1969 to 1974 he was director of intramural research.

However, the nature of the NIH directorship is primarily political, a milieu that Fredrickson now relishes. He made 35 appearances before the 95th Congress to provide testimony, opinion, or advice—at least ten more congressional audiences than any NIH director before him. While this partially reflects the growing pressures on health science to account for itself publicly, it also says something about the personality of Donald Fredrickson. One longtime Washington observer describes him as "the consummate bureaucrat." Says Fredrickson, "It is clear that one has to combine political sense with all the other medical and technical aspects that make up this job."

One of the most difficult challenges that NIH must meet is to referee the occasional conflicts between the more formal health sciences and the everyday practice of medicine.

Says the director, "NIH is the knowledge agency par excellence related to health. It is crucial that we nurture the flow of new scientific knowledge in order to maintain the enormous scientific edge we have today in both the practice and teaching of medicine."

As Fredrickson and other top administrators at the NIH point out, the institutes are in a unique position to influence the practice of medicine in this country. It is sometimes forgotten that the NIH may push hard on Capitol Hill for the interests of medicine when others in government may have opposite concerns.

Says Fredrickson, "We have taken steps to try and get the whole medical community involved in evaluating their own performance. If we don't do this, medicine will find that decisions about practice are made by a few bureaucrats in small offices far from the mainstream. What will happen is more programs like Medicare or a national health plan."

He touts the NIH Consensus Development Program as the primary link between the NIH and the medical community. Now in its third year, the program (a series of conferences on different subjects) has regularly considered some of the most controversial areas of medicine, from the treatment of primary breast cancer to intraocular lens implantation.

The conferences are sponsored with government funds, and while they do attract the participation of outside physicians and

scientists, there has been some soul-searching as to how the resulting information should be used. Should the NIH take any role in government regulation of medicine?

According to Fredrickson this may be a moot point, since the institutes cannot ignore demands from elsewhere in DHHS for information regarding various medical procedures. "We are providing information that is used for regulatory purposes," he says. "But we have consciously drawn back from any active role in the regulatory process. I see nothing wrong, however, with making a scientific determination of what should be in the doctor's bag in terms of recommending which services and procedures should be made available."

Still, to the physician charged with managing the NIH and its \$3.6 billion annual budget, the most important subject right now—in the current period of austerity—is money.

"There was a tremendous growth of the NIH budget annually until 1961," he says. "Then there was modest growth until 1969, and then a period of erratic, almost bizarre growth which saw cancer and a few other areas get the biggest slice of the pie. Now we are hunkering down for a period of serious economic uncertainty."

So far Fredrickson has withstood the cries of outrage over the initial tough budget cuts he has been forced to make. On-campus (intramural) NIH research programs, training programs for new scientists, off-campus (extramural) NIH-supported research centers, and clinical trials all have felt the knife that the director wields. At the same time, Fredrickson has made the decision to go all out to defend a high number of extramural, investigator-initiated research grants that he believes are at the heart of the NIH mission.

"Our attempt to stabilize the number of these new grants at 5,000 a year [an effort that appears successful] is an honest attempt to broker between the executive and legislative branches of government for a willingness to maintain this tremendous apparatus which had made American medicine the greatest in the world," says Fredrickson.

In fact, much of his description of his work involves the metaphors of give and take. His is a world of perpetual exchange, bartering with Congress and the Administration, maneuvering for a better position from which to negotiate for more money or more time or more attention. He speaks of "cashing in all his chips" to win a point with Congress, or "going to the wall" to defend his agency within the gargantuan DHHS. More often than not it is Fredrickson who comes out on top, with the integrity of the NIH intact.

"The NIH is a remarkable organization," he says. "It cares enormously about the way it runs. It demands excellence and its reputation for such is well earned."

Fredrickson likes to point out that in more than 30 years of existence, NIH has never suffered a really serious scandal. This would be a startling claim for any government agency, but it is exceptional in that the NIH is a community that has always had control over the distribution of its money. "There is a great tradition to preserve here," says Fredrickson. "American science and medicine are good enough and big enough to overcome conflicts of self interest."

Fredrickson, who maintains wide outside interests in art, who plays the piano, and who describes himself as the "mad skier," has perhaps made his greatest contribution to the NIH in his responsiveness to Congress. The myriad special health interests that face lawmakers in Washington today have brought the legislators to the NIH.

Fredrickson sees that they get the answers they seek.

"This is an enormous challenge," Fredrickson told *JAMA MEDICAL NEWS*. "You have a chance to make a real difference here. But I'll tell you, it's an erosive job. In a Sisyphian sense, you never get through pushing the rock up on the mountain before another one falls down. One wouldn't want to try to go on and do this for more than a decade or so."

In Fredrickson's case, I wouldn't count on that.

JOHN ELLIOTT.●

SUPPORT FOR PASSAGE OF H.R. 2510, BILL THAT ALLOWS FOR REVIEW OF DISABILITY RETIREMENT DETERMINATIONS

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased with the passage of H.R. 2510, a bill which would permit Federal employees to obtain judicial review of certain disability determinations made by the Office of Personnel Management under the civil service retirement and disability system.

Essentially, this bill is an effort to respond to a concern about the use of psychiatric examinations to determine an employee's fitness for duty, where an adverse finding about the employee could cause mandatory retirement or a permanent stigma which would jeopardize future employment and promotional opportunities.

Even though the Office of Personnel Management believes that it has adequate safeguards to protect employees, both the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits and myself, acting independently several years ago in conducting a series of ad hoc hearings, have concluded that past practices left considerable doubt as to the efficacy of the protection of the rights of the individual, especially when there was disagreement over the findings. At present, when adverse findings are made, the employee has virtually no formal opportunity to adequately raise questions concerning the findings, or the procedures used in reaching them. There are numerous convincing examples of the kinds of misunderstandings and abuses which judicial review can eliminate, and they are well documented in the committee report—(H. Rept. 96-1080).

While the Office of Personnel Management has indicated that these kinds of determinations are essentially technical and medical, which should be undertaken by medical doctors, and are not suitable for a court, the fact of the matter is that these types of issues are taken up before the courts all of the time at present. In any event, it is essential and justifiable to provide a party who believes that he/she is aggrieved with a procedure that will assure that such matters are adequately

ly considered and studied, and that a fair, unbiased decision is handed down.

It seems that the only fair and justifiable way to conduct such matters is to allow the employees a greater opportunity to challenge findings which can have such an adverse impact on their future employment and reputation. H.R. 2510 accomplishes this, and I fully support its passage. ●

AIR FORCE ACADEMY GRADUATION

HON. JACK HIGHTOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. HIGHTOWER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 28, 1980, the 22d class of the U.S. Air Force Academy received its wings at Colorado Springs.

The remarks on this occasion by Hon. Hans M. Mark, Secretary of the Air Force, are worthy of the attention of the Members of Congress:

COMMENCEMENT SPEECH FOR THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY GRADUATION

(By Hans Mark, Secretary of the Air Force)

Distinguished guests, parents, families and friends of the graduates, ladies and gentlemen of the Cadet Wing.

I am very honored and pleased to be here with you to celebrate this day. It is an important day for all of us: a beginning for you who today become officers in the United States Air Force and a time of renewal for the rest of us who have the privilege of watching this great event.

It is a time for us to think of who we are, where we have been and where we are going. The ability of man to fly, the advent of powered flight is a uniquely American invention. In fact, I would assert that powered flight is perhaps the primary hallmark of American technology in this century. We have turned the earth's atmosphere into an ocean on which to travel and, in doing this, we have given new dimensions of freedom to people all over the world.

What is perhaps most remarkable is that it all has happened in such a short time. Members of the first generation of aviation—those who flew with the Wright Brothers, those who served with General Arnold—are still with us. They, the members of that first generation, not only created the airplane, but moved flying out of the category of daring stunts and turned it into a natural, routine activity.

I count myself as a member of the second generation of American aviation. My contemporaries and I have seen aviation become not only an enormous commercial enterprise but also a decisive factor in military conflicts around the world. We have also watched and participated as we have taken the first tentative steps into man's newest frontier—the vast reaches of space.

You who are graduating today are members of the third generation of American aviation. I have no doubt at all that you will see changes that are equally profound in your lifetimes. I believe that aeronautical vehicles will become more specialized and more attuned to working with little or no supporting facilities on the ground. I speak here of vertical takeoff and landing vehicles and airplanes that can operate in environments that are not available to us today. You will see space operations become rou-

tine, and before your own careers end, many of you will actually have conducted such operations and will have touched the edge of what my generation has called the space frontier. All of you will participate in the adventure that is aviation. Some as flyers, some as flight crews and some—like me—in supporting roles, but there is no doubt that you will have your eyes on the sky. I can promise you from personal experience that this will be a most exciting adventure for you.

But most important of all, you must also remember that you are soldiers. You will soon become the custodians of this nation's defense and this responsibility will be the central one in your careers. The next decade will probably see a realignment of some basic relationships around the world, relationships that were established at the end of the Second World War. Today's power balance is different than it was a generation ago so it is not surprising that there will be changes. Change always brings crisis and it is not at all difficult for me to predict that crisis will be the common denominator of the coming years. I prefer to look at crisis in the manner of the Chinese, whose ideograph for that word is a combination of the symbols meaning danger and opportunity. There will be danger, yes, but much more important, there will be opportunities to establish a global position for the United States much more advantageous than the one in which we find ourselves today. We bring great strengths to this enterprise. We are the world's leading agricultural nation; we are unsurpassed in the development and application of new technology and, most important of all, we are the only major nation in the world founded on a clear idea of what human freedom is all about. As long as people wish to live here rather than elsewhere—and we have recently had another example of this—those who intend to restrict liberty around the world must reckon with us.

The world being what it is, we will be engaged in conflict at various times during your careers as officers in the Air Force. When that happens, you will be asked to take extraordinary risks and tap reservoirs of courage and determination that you do not now know that you possess. You will be asked to prevail over whatever opposition you encounter and you must never forget that basic objective. It is the essential purpose of your existence as soldiers and it is, on this point that the continued future of the United States as a great and free nation will rest.

Finally, in addition to being airmen and soldiers, you will also be citizens. In that role, you will be called upon through our democratic processes to shape the principles and policies by which our nation lives. Almost twenty years ago, one of this country's great soldiers, General Douglas MacArthur, in addressing the Corps of Cadets at West Point, provided some thoughts on how soldiers should behave as citizens. I think that it is appropriate to repeat what he thought military life should teach to those people who have chosen the profession of arms. He said: "It teaches you to be proud and unbending in honest defeat but humble and gentle in success, not to substitute words for action, not to seek the path of comfort but to face the stress and spur of difficulty and challenge, to learn to stand up in the storm, but to have compassion on those who fall, to master yourself before you seek to master others, to have a heart that is clean, a goal that is high, to learn to laugh yet never to forget how to weep, to reach into the future yet never to neglect the past, to be serious yet never to take

yourself too seriously and to be modest so that you will remember the simplicity of true greatness and the open mind of true wisdom."

I cannot possibly improve on those words. And so, in the ancient farewell of the sea, let me wish you, the sailors on the new ocean of air and space, "Godspeed, a fair wind and a following sea." ●

A TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH L. FAGAN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I take this moment to give special recognition to Elizabeth L. Fagan, a resident of the 32d Congressional District I represent who will soon complete her 1-year term as president of the San Pedro Chamber of Community Development and Commerce. Known as Liz to her friends, this woman has a longstanding career of community service. Today I share with my colleagues a review of the many ways in which she has contributed her time and energies to the betterment of her community.

Liz Fagan has resided in the harbor area for over 20 years. Before her arrival in California, she lived in the Midwest, where she attended the University of Minnesota and received a bachelor of science degree in medical technology. In 1959 she married Jerry Fagan, an engineer presently employed by the Rockwell Corp.

Her civic involvement has been steady and substantial. For many years she served as volunteer for numerous organizations. Among them are the San Pedro Community Concerts Association, as a member and former president; the United Way as a board member; the Red Cross as speakers bureau chair; and the Parents and Teachers Association as a member and former vice president.

One of her most outstanding community contributions has been the leadership she has given as president of the San Pedro Chamber. Since her election as the chamber's first woman president, the organization has embarked on an aggressive program to aid the growth and prosperity of the local community. The organization of Greater San Pedro Merchants Association, approval by the Los Angeles Bicentennial Committee to revive the popular Fisherman's Fiesta, and achieving progress on efforts to release Federal lands needed for the San Pedro Marina project, are all credited to her successful term as chamber president.

Mr. Speaker, on June 21, at a dinner sponsored by the San Pedro Chamber, Liz Fagan's friends and associates will express their appreciation for her service and devotion to her community. My wife, Lee, joins me in extending

our own congratulations to her on the accomplishments of her term as chamber president. This is a highlight of her long career of community service, one which we know is bound to extend many more years. We also offer Liz; her husband, Jerry; and their four children; Michelle, Jo-etta, Gizele, and Shawn, our best wishes for future years of success and good fortune.●

PORTRAIT OF A CONGRESSMAN:
DON EDWARDS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, an excellent profile on our colleague, DON EDWARDS, appeared in a recent issue of Congressional Quarterly. While it is not often that a good legislator and politician gets a favorable profile before retirement, defeat, or death, sometimes the unusual happens. DON has genuinely earned this unusual treatment.

I commend the following article, which says much about the man, to my colleagues:

[From the Congressional Quarterly, June 14, 1980]

DON EDWARDS: FAIR HOUSING ENGINEER
(By Nadine Cohodas)

On a hot July day in 1979 when the House defeated a constitutional amendment to ban school busing, California Democrat Don Edwards was an island of calm in a sea of activity.

While spectators in the gallery hissed or cheered members' pleas, Edwards, who led the fight against the ban, patiently waited for the vote.

The reason for Edwards' tranquility was tucked in his coat pocket—a well-worn packet of paper with members' votes personally tallied by the congressman.

When the balloting was over, the amendment was defeated 209-216—just two off Edwards' prediction.

That kind of meticulous preparation is the hallmark of Don Edwards' congressional career, according to colleagues. History repeated itself last week as Edwards, chairman of Judiciary's Civil and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, engineered a one-vote victory on an amendment to a fair housing bill (H.R. 5200). His move saved the bill's key element—new federal powers to end housing bias.

"He's a tiger on legislation," his close friend, Robert W. Kastenmeier, D-Wis., said. "I don't think by nature he's a legislative technician, but he's learned that's the way to do it."

John H. F. Shattuck, director of the American Civil Liberties Union's Washington office, called Edwards the most effective congressman on civil liberties issues. "Lots of others are devoted to civil liberties," Shattuck said, "but none has been as consistently effective."

Edwards has been the principal mover behind some of the most sensitive legislation in the last decade:

The Equal Rights Amendment (H.J. Res. 208). (1971 Almanac p. 656)

The Voting Rights Act Extension of 1975. (1975 Almanac p. 521)

District of Columbia Voting Representation (H.J. Res. 554). (1978 Almanac p. 793)

The Equal Rights Amendment Extension (H.J. Res. 638). (1978 Almanac p. 773)

Edwards also was among the first congressmen to oppose the Vietnam War, and he led the effort to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC). He cast his first vote against the committee in 1963, and 12 years later, the panel finally went out of business. (1975 Almanac p. 31)

"I prepare my bills better than some members," Edwards said when asked recently about his legislative victories. "You have to have a good issue," he added, "and you have to sincerely believe in it."

The congressman said he's developed some guidelines from his legislative battles: First, "You have to have Republican support for civil rights bills." Second, "you try never to have fights where the hurts go deep, where tempers are lost." And third, "You never burn bridges around you. An opposing member on five issues in a row can be a supporter on the sixth."

Edwards has few, if any, enemies in Washington or in his district, which includes part of Santa Clara and Alameda counties south of San Francisco. Working class whites and Mexican Americans make up a majority of the district.

"I don't know anyone who thinks ill of him," said former colleague Abner J. Mikva, D-Ill. (1975-79)—now a federal appeals court judge. "He never jabs people, he never does them in."

Among Republicans, Edwards is considered fair and generally cooperative. Henry J. Hyde, R-Ill., who serves on Edwards' subcommittee, called Edwards a "superior guy. I have my disagreements with him . . . but I find him to be a very professional guy."

PLAYING TOUGH

Despite his friendly demeanor, Edwards will play tough on the issues. For example, to help stymie the effort to enact a constitutional ban on abortion, Edwards recently juggled his subcommittee membership to make sure he had a majority to prevent hearings on the matter. "That's all part of the game," Edwards said.

"That's hard-ball politics, and Don is as capable of that as anyone," Hyde said.

On paper, Edwards is an unlikely candidate to carry the liberal standard. He was born into a family he describes as "conservative Republican," was a Republican until after college, and served as chairman of the state Young Republicans. After law school, he worked a year as an FBI agent.

A Navy intelligence officer during World War II, Edwards said seeing the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima started him moving toward a different philosophy. He said he left the Republican Party in 1950 when he sensed the party was not interested in addressing the need for international agreements to promote peace.

Edwards also began reading biographies of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, among others, and, he said, "That gave me confidence I was heading in the right direction."

After running a title insurance company in San Jose for several years, Edwards was elected to Congress in 1962.

Always impeccably dressed, Edwards looks nearly two decades younger than his 65 years. That's partly the result of his long interest in athletics. He was an excellent golfer in college, and in 1950, he won the Bing Crosby National Pro-Am championship with his partner, Marty Furgol.

Though he is considered more liberal than his district, Edwards has consistently been re-elected by wide margins. San Jose Mayor

Janet Gray Hayes said Edwards "projects honesty and sensitivity and judgment. People just buy that. He also has a reputation for sticking his neck out for unpopular causes long before they're popular."●

ROBERT DRINAN

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1980

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of the service rendered to our country, to this body, to his constituents, by our friend and colleague, BOB DRINAN.

Father DRINAN has achieved distinction in an impressive list of endeavors: As lawyer, as academician, as a Member of Congress, as a clergyman. His vocations, his avocations, underscore his commitment to service.

Bob has always been a warrior of conscience. His decision to enter the House, in 1969, was prompted by his well-placed belief that his presence could help end the Vietnam war. He served on the House Committee on Un-American Activities with the express intent of abolishing it, which he was instrumental in doing. On the Judiciary Committee, Bob was a hard but fair judge of President Nixon. And through his chairmanship of the Criminal Justice Subcommittee he has worked to reform and revise the Criminal Justice Code.

Father DRINAN's decision to leave the House of Representatives is very much in character. He has applied a rigorous and strict logic in coming to it. BOB DRINAN has always been, and I am certain, will continue to be, a part of the solution. We are all the better for the example he sets, and the poorer from the loss to this Chamber which is occasioned.●

STREAMLINING THE
BUREAUCRATIC PROCESS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take note of a most helpful new provision in this year's housing bill, H.R. 7262, as reported by the House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

I am referring to that provision streamlining the bureaucratic process which handles historic preservation issues. Let me first explain what the amendment does:

1. It sets a 90-day finite time limit within which historic preservation issues are handled. No such limitation exists now.

2. It sets up an incentive to both localities and historic preservation groups to get their historic properties on the register. No such incentive exists now.

3. It allows for local-level conflict-resolution by a stricter definition of what constitutes successful conflict-resolution: An agreement between localities and the State Historic Preservation Office. Right now, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation can unilaterally preempt such agreements.

All this does not sound like a great accomplishment. We can all be for a little less redtape. But the provision is the best news possible for city administrators, who have been mired in the self-imposed Kafkaesque kangaroo court of the bureaucracy at the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Of this I am certain: If the real advisory council knew of what is being done, in its good name, it too, would support the change. Unfortunately, the real council never really meets and we have got a cadre of bureaucrats who have become a small U.S. Housing and Urban Development Department, U.S. Department of Transportation, and U.S. Commerce Department.

WHY AND HOW THIS HAPPENED

No one can legislate esthetic judgment, so the legislation authorizing the advisory council is accordingly flexible.

The bureaucrats there have assumed a license to do virtually anything they please at considerable costs to localities and their taxpayers.

Examples of regulations which provide de facto decisionmaking power include: (1) A requirement that project work be suspended as part of "good faith" consultations; (2) a requirement that localities submit to "memoranda of agreement" which have legally binding commitments in excess of legislative intent; (3) a requirement that delegates historic resource identification responsibility to the other Federal agencies and localities before undertaking a project.

These regulations have led to several abuses by council staffers that merit attention. For example:

Unilateral council requests that structures be listed in the National Register.

Coercing a city to submit to the council procedures, including the memorandum of understanding, even though an agreement on the dispute has been struck at the local level.

Unilaterally writing to a city when no specific project was involved and requesting that it sign a "blanket memorandum of agreement" and that it cease all federally funded activities until it does so.

The council's regulations fail to discriminate between projects requiring their involvement and those that do not. Moreover, the council has clearly exceeded in practice and in its regulatory language the legislative intent.

Briefly, the council's bureaucrats have designed an elaborate consultative procedure covering, for all practical purposes, just about any project in an urban area in which the Federal Government is involved. Moreover, the regulations are written in such a way as to give the council bureaucrats de facto decisionmaking power over a project, something never intended in

the legislation. As a byproduct, the regulations can involve the council bureaucrats in local-level disputes having little to do with historic preservation.

THE HORROR STORIES

Over the past year, I have carried out an informal pathological survey to try to ascertain why the problems arise. Here are some examples which help to illustrate my conclusions:

Oklahoma City, Okla. (Hales Building, 1978): A 1967 urban renewal project approved in compliance with all requirements called for demolition of the Hales Building. In 1978 it was the last building remaining to be cleared. The city and State historic preservation officer (SHPO) on three separate occasions agreed the building did not merit National Register listing. However, advisory council staff raised a question about its value and the Secretary of the Interior unilaterally, after demolition bids were let in 1978, placed the building on the National Register contrary to State recommendations. Development of a \$30 million commercial complex was halted pending disposition of a suit brought against the Oklahoma City renewal authority.

Milwaukee, Wis. (Plankinton Mansion, 1978): In 1978, 10 years after the urban renewal project was approved, the advisory council raised questions about the demolition of the Plankinton Mansion which was placed on the National Register by Interior in 1978.

Faneuil Hall project, Boston—Involving shadow of 60 State Street: In a downtown urban renewal project the council objected to possible effects, including shadows, on the Faneuil Hall Market Area. After some delay, a memorandum of agreement between the council, and the city of Boston was executed and carried out. The redesign required by the memorandum was undertaken. Though a success in the conflict-resolution sense, the whole question of a shadow being the cause for a project to grind to a halt is of concern.

Denver Urban Renewal project, D and F Tower: The D and F Department Store was demolished, with agreement that its corner clock tower be preserved. The tower continues to stand, but it presents a never-ending series of problems, both as to design and the effect of other buildings in the project on the tower. After much local effort to secure a purchaser failed, while deterioration goes on, the council will not agree to alternative designs to make it more useful. The council and the State historic preservation officer are concerned that other project activities would reduce the view of and from the now vacant tower.

Hudson, N.Y., 1977-78: This involves demolition of badly deteriorated workers' homes built in the 1840's which are located in a block grant project area where flooding and drainage have been a longstanding problem.

In mid-1978, after HUD approved the release of funds for the project, which included demolition of the structures, the advisory council raised questions as to the existence of buildings possibly eligible for National Register. The city employed a preservation consultant who recommended demolition of some structures as not significant but retention of others. The city agreed and requested HUD to release grant funds. SHPO staff disputed the quality of the consultant's report, the council contended its procedures had not been completed and funding was held up. The dispute continued some months, involving HUD, the city, the council and the State.

The city and the SHPO finally agreed that only three of the structures have any possible historical value and that the others may be demolished. However, the city was still formally requested to complete the advisory council's procedures including the execution of a memorandum of agreement between the city, SHPO, and the advisory council before the project can proceed—though the agreement has already been struck.

Fort Wayne, Ind.: This is a policy matter raised in correspondence between the city's development agency and the advisory council. This is an instance in which the council made strong requests of the city the authority for which is highly questionable.

First, the council staff demanded that the city make a choice between (a) entering into a blanket memorandum of agreement to cover all future cases which may involve activity effects on historic properties versus (b) a choice to enter agreements with the council on individual projects.

Second, the council staff requested the city to cease all federally assisted activity pending compliance with sec. 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

The council letter did not cite any specific project effects on historic properties. Council standing to require memorandum of agreement arises only from projects which specifically affect Register-eligible properties. It is not unusual for the council to request a blanket agreement covering future clearance as part of settling a particular project. What makes this a notable case is that there was not a project to justify the council staff's demands.

Of even greater concern was the council request that the city cease all federally assisted activity. The council has no authority for this. It is unlikely that a Federal agency would order a shutdown of all its activities on historic preservation grounds except in the rare instance where all such activity affected historic properties. Yet, here were the council bureaucrats asking for just this type of action.

CONCLUSION

The change in the housing bill will not guarantee that such abuses will

end. It does point, if marginally, in the right direction.

If I were to choose which element in the change is most responsible for such welcome success it is the local-level SHPO-locality agreement provision. It insures that, among other things, the council will have priorities because only truly important and seemingly unresolvable issues will surface in Washington. Right now any structure having a doric column is fair game.

I urge my colleagues to support it.●

A VIGIL ON BEHALF OF THE
RYNSKY FAMILY

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the "Spirit of Helsinki, Vigil 1980," on behalf of all prisoners of conscience and all who are being detained in the Soviet Union as a result of that Government's repressive emigration policies.

In 1975, 35 nations signed the Helsinki Final Act, which committed the 35 signatory nations to pursue policies consistent with basic principles of human rights, including the reunification of divided families whose members live in different countries, religious freedom, minority rights, and free travel between countries.

Unfortunately, the Soviet Government has regarded the human rights provisions of the Final Act as empty promises. This is most apparent now in the Soviet Union's restrictive emigration policies.

We who take freedom from such harassment for granted must do all we can to change these practices.

"Today, I would like to bring to my colleague's attention, for the third year, the plight of Edouard Mikhaïlovich Rynsky and his family in Moscow. He, his wife Natalya, his daughter Yelena, and his mother Mariya, have now applied over six times for emigration visas since 1974, and have been refused each time, ostensibly for "state interests."

This continued refusal of their emigration applications is entirely groundless. Mr. Rynsky had left his position as a design engineer engaged in elevator design projects—with a second class security clearance—in 1972, 2 years prior to first applying for his emigration visa. He found another job as an engineer with a passenger elevator operation and maintenance agency, in no way associated with sensitive matters. Since 1974, he has been employed as a mechanic at a small fac-

tory. Although trained as a mechanical engineer, he has been unable to find employment in his field since applying for exit visas for his family.

Edouard Rynsky and his family have no idea how long they will have to wait—days, months, or years—before they will be allowed to emigrate. It is my sincere hope that this vigil for freedom will result in early emigration to Israel for this family.●

TWENTY-YEAR REUNION OF CAPITOL PAGE SCHOOL CLASS OF 1960

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend of June 6, 15 of the original 23 members of the Capitol Page School class of 1960 gathered in the Nation's Capital for their 20-year, and also first, reunion. It was the first such reunion in the long history of the Capitol Page School and was a great success.

The celebration got underway with a welcome reception at the Capitol Hill Club. It was the first time in two decades that many of the former page boys—it would be yet another 12 years before the appointment of the first girl page—had seen each other. Joined by their wives, children, and former faculty members they quickly brought one another up to date on education, careers, and the contribution of the page experience to their lives.

On Saturday morning the group went to the White House for a special tour and photographs. The 1960 class was one of the few which did not have White House ceremony so the visit was happily received as better late than never.

The return to the Capitol was the next and certainly most nostalgic event. The former pages return to the House and Senate floors which had been the scene of their former congressional service. There was a flood of memories as they saw each other in their old and familiar settings. A highlight of the Capitol visit was a climb to the top of the dome. While most had made the climb in years gone by, this was the first time that they did not have to sneak up the stairs.

Later in the day the reunion group visited the Kennedy Center for a special behind-the-scenes tour. The Kennedy Center was only a dream in 1960.

Saturday evening the alumni gathered for an elegant banquet at the Georgetown Club. The Reverend Dennis Trout, a class member and Lutheran minister, led the friends in prayer before the dinner. Reverend Trout called to mind the fellowship of page days, the sweetness of renewed

friendship, the recollection of the five absent members, and the memories of the three deceased classmates. After dinner each member proposed a toast in which he expressed his thoughts on the meaning of the occasion.

On Sunday all drove to Burnside's Manor in Fredricksburg, Va., the home of classmate Duke Zeller, for a Virginia country buffet on the lawn. It was a beautiful climax to an all too short weekend of companionship. The former pages agreed that they would reunite in 5 years to celebrate their 25th jubilee.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is important to note that the 1960 Page School class reunion reflects the significance which service as a page has been to the thousands of young men and more recently young women who have had the opportunity. While only two members of the 1960 class have continued their congressional service and one holds State elective office, all members of the class are active in the affairs of their communities. They all maintain a high level of concern for the people and affairs of their Government. In larger measure the experience has given them a depth of understanding and affection for people of diverse background and regional difference. I know that my colleagues join me in congratulating the Capitol Page School class of 1960 on this landmark event.

Those who attended were: Donn Anderson, Tony and Malka David, Michael and Lynne Freehill, Steve Goad, Tom and Nancy Junkersfeld, Jim and Sarah Kolbe, Ron Lasch, Dave and Judy Loge, William and Shirley McIntyre, Dave and Judy Miller, John and Katherine Nolan, Bill and Nancy Owens, Dennis and Christal Trout, Sam and Pat Williams, and Fritz "Duke" Zeller.

Those who could not attend were: Wayne and Nina Moore, Mike Sprague, Paul and Nancy Stanford, Jim Wrobel, and Bob Chritesen.

Those who had passed away tragically were: Steve Smith, Scott Shoemaker, and Oswald Glymph.●

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE
JOHN W. WYDLER

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of his many friends in this Chamber to a notable tribute paid to the dean of our New York Republican delegation in Congress, Hon. JOHN W. WYDLER, who recently announced his intention to retire from the U.S. Congress upon completion of his present term.

On May 15, 1980, the Nassau County, N.Y., Republican Committee

held its annual dinner at Colonie Hill, Happaug, N.Y. Over 4,000 guests attended. Gov. Ronald Reagan, who undoubtedly will be our party's candidate for President this fall, was the guest of honor.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be fair to say—with all due respect to Governor Reagan—that our good friend JACK WYDLER was the real guest of honor at that dinner. In recognition of his 18 years of service to Nassau County as the Representative of the fabulous Fifth Congressional District, JACK WYDLER received a tremendous ovation and a special award honoring him for his distinguished and dedicated service to America.

I enjoyed the privilege of making the presentation to JACK WYDLER, and I insert in the RECORD my remarks in presenting the award and JACK WYDLER's response:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE NORMAN F. LENT, AT NASSAU COUNTY REPUBLICANS' ANNUAL DINNER

Chairman Joe Margiotta, Governor Reagan, Party leaders, Committeemen, officeholders and candidates, distinguished guests and friends:

Along with most of you, I'm really optimistic about the election prospects for this fall, even though we'll be campaigning without one of Nassau County's top vote-getters.

I refer, of course, to my good friend, Jack Wylder. Along with all of you, I was really saddened when I heard that Jack had decided against continuing his truly outstanding career in the U.S. Congress.

I don't know of anyone who is more respected by his colleagues in the House of Representatives, or who has worked more effectively in the Congress for Long Island than Jack. As a senior member of the Government Operations Committee, Jack has exerted tremendous influence in shaping the revenue sharing program so that suburban areas like Long Island would be able to share in its benefits.

As Co-chairman of the Suburban Caucus in the Congress, Jack has accomplished wonders in building the political strength needed to make sure that suburban areas receive fair treatment in the Congress.

As ranking Republican on the Committee on Science and Technology, Jack has been a major influence in shaping the scientific development of our Nation.

Yes, the Fabulous Fifth District, Nassau, and America all have reason to be very grateful to Jack Wylder. We will all miss his dedicated efforts on our behalf. But those of us who have worked more closely with Jack in the Congress and in the Republican organization of Nassau have even more reason to be grateful to him. His political judgment and leadership, and the hard work he has put into his District have helped strengthen the Republican organization of Nassau.

In the nine successful elections in which he was a candidate, John Wylder was a top vote-getter. His vote-pulling power helped countless other candidates. We're all going to have to work harder to make up for Jack's absence on the ticket this November. But, I know we can get the job done, and with the superbly qualified Ray McGrath, keep the Fabulous Fifth in the Republican column where it belongs!

Jack, as a token of our deep gratitude and appreciation for your dedication and many years of loyal service to the Republican

Party of Nassau, on behalf of the County Republicans I'd like to present you with this gift. It is a beautiful clock suitably engraved.

Jack, I hope you'll use it to reserve a lot of time to give advice and counsel to your many, many friends among the Nassau Republicans. Thank you for your great work, and your friendship! May you, your lovely wife, Brenda, and your three youngsters enjoy many beautiful years ahead!

RESPONSE OF HON. JOHN W. WYDLER TO TRIBUTE AT NASSAU COUNTY REPUBLICAN DINNER, MAY 15, 1980

Chairman Joe Margiotta—looking over this impressive audience of more than 4,000—more than anything else it represents you: Your stewardship of the Party, and why you are the most successful political leader in the United States!

Governor and Mrs. Reagan—Our hope for the future of the country, and I'm proud to be a congressional member of the Reagan for President Committee!

Bill Casey—Long Island's contribution to a winning Presidential campaign! Norm Lent—my colleague and friend in the House for the past 10 years, who has been a rock I could always depend upon!

All distinguished guests (everyone in the room), and friends:

This is obviously a night of high emotion for me, but I have a word to say about the past, present, and future.

As for the past, the word is Thanks! Thanks to those who helped me at the beginning—the most important time! And do as much for my successor's first run for the Fabulous Fifth seat, the good-looking Irishman who's going to succeed me, Assemblyman Ray McGrath!

Thanks to the friends who stuck with me when the going got tough; thanks to my wife Brenda, who like all politicians' wives suffers more than we.

Thanks for the opportunity to have the best job in the United States! And thanks for the good memories of 18 exciting years.

But that's the past. As for the present: The time has simply come for me to make a change in my life; time for a new life for me and my family; time to come back to Long Island—it really looks good when you're away—and time to undertake a new challenge in the private sector, trying to live under the rules I helped make in Washington.

But I can assure all those present that I will always keep an active interest in government and politics, which have been such an important and rewarding part of my life.

And—finally—a word about the future; not mine, but the future of our country. And that, Governor Reagan is where you come in!

Whatever anyone in this audience—or in this country—may think on a particular issue, one thing is clear: It's time for a change!

It's time to stop using up our hard-earned wealth and influence pursuing outdated social programs at home, and non-productive foreign programs around the world.

Governor Reagan, this will be a difficult election. President Carter will run on a platform of good intentions. Your problem is to make the American people judge him on his record of failures. It's just not enough for an American President to be good—or to be well meaning—or to try hard, he must be able to perform and win in the economic and military arenas of the world. The future is a time for change, not only for me, but for our country.

We must have a White House foreign policy of level-headed self interest in place of moralistic jingoism.

We must recapture the spirit of the old Yankee trader in foreign commerce and change the international bureaucracy with its red tape rules and regulations that deny us one world market after another.

The job of this audience, and this country is simple: It's to make Governor Reagan into Mr. President, and thereby make a bewildered America into the strong country it used to be, and which it can be again!●

MISS VERMONT NATIONAL TEEN-AGER FOR 1980 TELLS WHAT'S RIGHT ABOUT AMERICA

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to share with my colleagues an essay entitled, "What's Right About America."

Pamela J. Bordeau is 14 years old and recently was selected Miss Vermont National Teenager of 1980. In addition, Pamela received the winner's trophy in the essay contest, as well as for the Volunteer Community Service Leadership Award and Miss Hospitality. I am proud of Pamela and want to share with you that excellent essay she has written:

WHAT'S RIGHT ABOUT AMERICA

Freedom is what's right about America. The history of man has been a proud and arduous struggle for freedom. The fundamental freedoms of expression, religion and personal choice founded this country, have sustained it, and will be the core of its survival.

The right of expression includes our freedoms of thought, speech, actions and communications. This right has enabled Americans to relate and record their ideas and opinions for all time.

Religion has given strength and unity to man historically through belief in a higher level of existence. Our right to individually and collectively assemble in the practice of our faiths has nourished the spirit of all Americans since our Nation began.

Personal choice: Our right to love and marriage, education, individual lifestyles and occupations are of great importance to man in his pursuit of happiness.

Freedom is not a luxury to indulge in but rather an absolute necessity to maintain our country's growth and ensure its enrichment.●

AMERICAN FARMER NEEDS OUR ATTENTION

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on one of my recent trips back to my district, I met with a group of farmers and their wives and some businessmen whose livelihood is greatly dependent on the farm economy.

Their message to me was that American agriculture is in serious trouble and no one, especially the USDA, seems to be paying attention.

While the U.S. Department of Agriculture is turning its attention away from the farm, and busying itself teaching good nutrition and the art of gardening in the inner city, the family farm is being devastated by high interest rates, low prices, inflation, and a government that is doing more damage than good.

If we had a Department of Agriculture interested in agriculture then the American people would probably be more aware of the serious problems we have on the farm today. The public would probably have greater respect for the farmer and the means by which he supplies the world with food.

Those constituents of mine presented me with some information that might help get the message across.

They showed me a chart which itemized the specific costs of producing their corn and soybean crops in 1980, based on projections compiled by the University of Illinois, which collected data from more than 500 farms in central Illinois.

As it turned out, the average cost for producing a bushel of corn in 1980 is expected to be assuming a good yield of 136 bushels per acre. That price took into consideration such items as fertilizer, weedkillers, crop drying and storage, fuel, labor, buildings, taxes, and machinery. Several days ago I checked in Peoria for the current price of corn being paid to farmers on the open market. I was quoted a price of \$2.59 a bushel. So if a farmer in central Illinois, where we have some of the finest and most productive farmland in the world, plants 150 acres of corn and puts out \$2.81 a bushel to produce that corn, he has spent \$57,324 for a crop that he sells at \$2.59 a bushel for a total of \$52,236, taking a loss of \$5,088.

Now for the soybeans. The charts put the average cost per bushel of soybeans at \$6.95. The market in Peoria quoted me a price the other day of \$5.91 per bushel. With an average yield of 44 bushels to the acre, that means the farmer is going to lose about \$6,864.

There is not much incentive in those figures to produce food for a growing America.

About the time I got these charts, another constituent of mine who raises hogs, took some to market and sold them for 29 cents a pound. If you go into a popular supermarket in the Washington, D.C., area and buy some center cut pork chops which could have come from a hog exactly like the ones my constituent sold for 29 cents a pound, you would pay about \$2.29 per pound for that meat.

Something is horribly wrong with the system when the individual who produces the food gets only 12.6 percent of that same food's total retail

cost. The University of Illinois calculations, by the way, showed that the average Illinois pork producer lost money on hogs in 1979, by about a half a cent per pound.

I hope these illustrations will help focus a little more attention on the plight of the American farmer today. If we do not start paying more attention there is going to be trouble.

One other point needs to be made. When I called and got my quotations on corn and soybeans I also got a quotation on wheat, because the day we were making those calls the U.S. Department of Agriculture was dumping on the American market wheat and corn that it promised to buy up and hold after the Soviet grain embargo. So much for promises. The day after the Government dumped corn and wheat, corn went down to \$2.57 a bushel and wheat dropped from \$3.67 to \$3.62. That is the way the administration protects us from its errand and unpredictable foreign policy.

At this point I insert in the RECORD the summaries of average costs for the production of corn, soybeans, and hogs, compiled from the reports from more than 500 central Illinois farms in 1978 and 1979.

ILLINOIS—1979 COST AND RETURNS TO PRODUCE 100 LB OF PORK

Item	Amount
Building repairs.....	\$0.20
Building depreciation.....	2.38
Total building.....	\$2.58
Utilities.....	1.02
Machinery equipment repairs.....	.65
Machinery hire.....	.20
Gas and oil.....	.26
Auto expense.....	.02
Machinery-equipment depreciation.....	.81
Total machinery-equipment.....	2.96
Unpaid labor.....	1.17
Hired labor.....	3.43
Total labor.....	4.60
Livestock expense.....	1.09
Insurance.....	.55
Taxes.....	.20
Miscellaneous.....	.21
Interest on capital.....	3.78
Total other.....	5.83
Total nonfeed cost.....	15.97
Value feed fed.....	22.92
Total all cost.....	38.89
Total returns.....	38.48
Management return.....	- .41

PER ACRE COSTS TO GROW CORN AND SOYBEANS—CENTRAL ILLINOIS GRAIN FARMS

	1980 projections	
	Corn	Soybeans
Nonland costs:		
Variable costs:		
Soil fertility.....	\$60	\$19
Seed, crop, and drying.....	\$41	\$26
Machinery replacement, fuel and hire....	\$31	\$26
Total variable.....	\$132	\$71
Percent increase over 1979.....	16	15
Other nonland costs:		
Labor.....	\$28	\$28
Buildings and storage.....	\$11	\$6
Machinery depreciation.....	\$32	\$27
Nonland interest.....	\$45	\$40

PER ACRE COSTS TO GROW CORN AND SOYBEANS—CENTRAL ILLINOIS GRAIN FARMS—Continued

	1980 projections	
	Corn	Soybeans
Overhead.....	\$11	\$11
Total other.....	\$127	\$112
Total nonland costs.....	\$259	\$183
Percent increase over 1979.....	14	13
Land costs per acre:		
Taxes.....	\$19	\$19
Adjusted net rent.....	\$104	\$104
Total land cost.....	\$123	\$123
Total, all costs per acre.....	\$382	\$306
Percent increase over 1979.....	9	8
Yield, per acre, bushel.....	136	44
Nonland costs per bushel.....	\$1.90	\$4.16
All costs per bushel.....	\$2.81	\$6.95

THE SQUARE DOUGHNUT

HON. GARY A. LEE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

Mr. LEE. Mr. Speaker, if your doughnut maker is giving you square doughnuts, you will probably blame the machine, not the doughnuts.

America's Presidential politics machine, however, seems to escape this kind of logic. Now that the arduous primary system has concluded for another Presidential election year, it may be worthwhile to examine a new phenomenon generated around it.

Less than a third of the eligible American electorate took part in the 5-month primary campaign voting. Almost universally, however, there is the feeling that this year's Presidential race presents a choice of probably adequate but not very glamorous contenders.

Excitement being created for this summer's nominating conventions and the later general election is something closer to shopping for laundry detergents than national leaders.

TED KENNEDY and JOHN ANDERSON would have us believe that the two major parties' candidates are responsible for that apathy. As such, they are offering themselves in self-sacrificing fashion as alternatives to the apparent Republican and Democrat standard bearers.

Somehow, both KENNEDY and ANDERSON are losing sight of the fact that they were not the primary voter's first choices.

I choose to think that there are other reasons for the coast-to-coast "who cares" attitude developing today. The first, and most important reason, is that there has just been too much politicking.

The first shots of this Presidential campaign were fired nearly a year ago. The first primary, in Iowa, was held 1 day short of a year ahead of the next President's inauguration.

National news media have hyped us into thinking that no other news can or should capture our interest.

Let me say without hesitation that the election of a President of the United States ranks at the top of the list in our important-things-to-do category. Without a doubt, there is serious business to be done in the White House that should be attended by the most competent person we can find.

But there is also a matter of perspective that seems to be missed at the evening news and front page level: Americans tire easily, with virtually anything.

There are those who claim today that the average American's attention span is just about 11 minutes, the time we have most often devoted to television program segments between commercials.

At times, we can hold out for an hour during the super bowl or as many as seven games of a world series. But the plain fact is that no one can keep us on the edge of our seats through months and months of Presidential primaries without wearing out their welcome.

In quick summary, we have tired of Presidential politics and nothing but rest will help.

Reforms in the delegate selection and the nominating systems of both parties which were spawned in equality movements of the 1960's have contributed to our weariness. They have also helped the campaigns to become multi-million-dollar productions which drain as much of our money as our energy.

The national weariness we are experiencing now is not adequate reason to send conventioning back to precinct bosses and smoke-filled rooms, but it is enough to make us once again seriously consider some of the alternatives.

This may well be the time to think about compacting the primary schedules which lead up to candidate selection and to reduce the lengthy, blow-by-blow news coverage and analysis.

It could also be that it is time to consider an idea that has long been floating about as a possibility: To extend the term of office of President to 6 years. We would then close the door to reelection distractions by limiting each holder to only one 6-year term.

Debate will continue until one of the many possible methods of change has been effected. Until a change is made, however, we should not write off anyone as being too dull or lackluster, too right or too left, too disliked or unsupported to become President.

For now, let us just rest up from the wave of completed primaries and begin making personal pledges to participate this fall. ●

CORRECTING THE LONGSHOREMEN'S ACT'S DEFECTS

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to focus attention on one of the most ill-conceived pieces of legislation passed by Congress in recent years—the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act Amendments of 1972. The term "crisis" has been used to describe the situation that has developed under this law, and that terminology is hardly an exaggeration.

First, I would like to discuss some of the serious problems created by this statute, problems which are clearly evident even to those who are unfamiliar with Federal workers' compensation laws. Second, I would like to discuss a bill that I am introducing today, together with Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. McCLOSKEY, and Mr. BUCHANAN, which will address many of those problems and restore some semblance of workability to the Longshoremen's Act.

Before discussing some of the costly problems created by the 1972 amendments to the Longshore Act, I would like to emphasize the fundamental purpose of any program of workers' compensation; that is the payment of medical expenses and replacement of lost earnings stemming from a job-related injury. This is a simple and equitable standard; however, the Longshore Act, as presently drafted and administered, goes well beyond this legitimate concept, incorporating the principles of life insurance, pensions, supplemental income, and punitive damages.

Workers' compensation programs evolved as a no-fault system of replacing the wages of an employee injured on the job. Originally, an employee was required to sue his employer in order to recover any form of compensation for an injury on the job. The difficulties of determining liability and the delays encountered in obtaining benefits rendered this system unacceptable. States eventually drew up their own programs of workers' compensation.

The Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act was enacted in 1927 to cover employees working on navigable waters, in coastal ports, and river terminals who did not qualify for State compensation programs. Several problems stemming from court decisions developed under the law. By 1972 there also was a general recognition that the maximum benefit under the act of \$70 per week should be raised. Congress responded by passing the 1972 amendments. The amendments were far-reaching, however, addressing areas not initially contemplated. Since then, it has

become apparent that this cure was far worse than the disease.

Basically the 1972 amendments cracked the longshoremen's program wide open. The number of claims skyrocketed and the levels of benefits soared; the costs of insuring workers against injury exploded; the question of who was covered under the act and who was not became confused; litigation increased drastically. But the bottom line is that for all of the above reasons, the higher cost of shipping goods is ultimately passed on to the consumer, creating additional pressure on our inflationary economy.

A quick look at some of the pertinent statistics is convincing evidence that something is seriously wrong with the 1972 amendments.

Prior to 1972, injuries reported under the Longshore Act were steadily decreasing, dropping 25 percent in the course of the preceding 3 years. The 1972 amendments reversed this trend. According to the Department of Labor, claims rose from about 72,000 in 1972 to 205,500 in 1977. This 185-percent increase in the number of workers claiming injury in only 5 years did not occur because the maritime industry suddenly became more hazardous. It occurred because, under the 1972 amendments, benefits became much more generous; they became easier to get and more people could get them.

The 1972 amendments brought about a quantum leap in the weekly benefit levels which were indexed to increases in the nationwide average weekly wage. Under the current law, there is no limit to the annual escalation and all benefits are tax free. The maximum weekly compensation in 1972 was \$70—it is now \$426, and will rise again in October.

The sharp escalation of benefits, spurred by the 1972 amendments, has driven up the costs borne by employers under the Longshore Act to the point where the premiums for workers' compensation insurance come close to a worker's actual salary. For example, in 1972 the premium established by the New York State Compensation Board for general stevedoring was \$29.90 for every \$100 of payroll. Today that rate is \$87.24 per \$100 of payroll. This means for a longshoreman in New York earning \$20,000 a year, his employer would have to pay \$17,448 in longshore insurance premiums.

For many employers under the act, workers' compensation is the second greatest cost after direct payroll. A recent study shows that 6 percent of gross industry revenue is spent on Longshore Act compensation.

The high cost of the Longshoremen's Act is passed ultimately along to the consumer. For example, in the case of stevedoring companies, their higher costs are transferred to the shipowners, who in turn pass the cost on to the shipper. Higher shipping

rates are eventually reflected in higher retail prices which are paid by the American consumer.

The automatic escalation of benefits mandated by the 1972 amendments makes cost liability so unpredictable that the act is virtually uninsurable. Insurance companies cannot accurately determine how inflation will affect future benefits; they have no way of knowing who might be covered under the act. Therefore, they cannot project the risks involved in underwriting a longshore insurance policy and they refuse to insure an employer. Self-insurers face the same problems.

Perhaps the saddest aspect of the 1972 amendments is the fact that they have discouraged rehabilitation and the return to work. Because current benefits approach or even exceed preinjury take-home pay, disabilities may be unnecessarily prolonged and the severity of claims may be exaggerated.

The 1972 amendments confused the question of exactly which workers are covered by the Longshore Act and which are covered by State workers' compensation laws. Since 1972 many workers who work far landward of the water's edge have come under longshore coverage. Today the jurisdiction of the act remains uncertain and is the underlying cause of a great amount of litigation.

We have such serious problems under the Federal longshoremen's compensation program today because the 1972 amendments were passed hastily in the waning days of the 92d Congress. In fact, the origins of many of the provisions remain somewhat of a mystery. But one thing is certain, many important policy changes in the 1972 amendments were not supported by reliable studies or hard information, and there was virtually no consideration of the long-term costs to the legislation.

The imprecision of the act prompted the Chief Justice in the *Caputo* case, decided in 1977, to remark that the law was " * * * about as unclear as any statute could conceivably be * * *."

Numerous congressional hearings have been held to examine the deficiencies in the Longshore Act, but no serious effort has been made to amend this troublesome law. I was hopeful that Congress would recognize the error of its ways last November when hearings were held by the Education and Labor Subcommittee on Labor Standards. Unfortunately, they failed to produce any tangible results.

The legislation I am introducing today is the beginning of a concerted drive to correct many of the problems created by the 1972 Amendments to the Longshore Act. The forerunner of today's bill is H.R. 2448 which I and several of our colleagues introduced in February of 1979. The new bill embodies most of the major concepts in H.R. 2448, but it goes much further and addresses many additional prob-

lems. H.R. 2448 was introduced primarily as a vehicle for discussion, rather than a polished legislative remedy. The bill being introduced today comes much closer to a final workable solution.

The new bill makes major changes relating to the computation and payments of benefits under the Longshore Act. These changes are designed to restore reasonable standards in the way benefits are awarded to control the runaway costs which have occurred since 1972. The new bill would place a 3-percent cap on the annual increase in benefits which is calculated to offset the effects of inflation. Under the current law, the annual increase, which is based upon the increase in the national average weekly wage, can rise without limit. This is the principal reason why many insurers will no longer underwrite longshore policies. It is important to realize that the 3-percent cap applies to nontaxable income, and as such is comparable to a 5- or 6-percent increase in before tax earnings.

Under the new bill, benefits will be tied to 80 percent of the individual's after tax income, rather than the current rate of two-thirds of the individual's average weekly wage. This change reflects a recommendation by the National Commission on State Workmen's Compensation Laws. The bill also updates the method for determining the individual's average weekly wage.

For the first time, the bill provides a mechanism for offsetting Longshore Act benefits with receipt of other benefits including social security old age and disability benefits, pensions, unemployment compensation, and any other workers' compensation benefits. This provision will prevent the pyramiding of benefits which often results in a worker receiving more income from benefits than he or she ever made on the job. The offset applies to survivors as well.

The bill continues full compensation to an injured employee while undergoing a program of rehabilitation, but would suspend benefits if the employee unreasonably refuses rehabilitation. The bill would also suspend compensation during any period when an employee refuses to submit to medical treatment by an approved physician.

Two other changes under the new bill apply specifically to death benefits. First death benefits will be subject to a cap of 200 percent of the national average weekly wage—the same limit applicable to benefits paid to living recipients. Without such a cap the survivors of an injured worker may receive more in benefits than if the injured worker had lived.

The second change would prohibit the payment of unrelated death benefits. Under current law, death benefits are paid to survivors of employees who die from causes totally unrelated to

the injury associated with their job, such as an automobile accident.

The new bill will end the uncertainty over which workers are covered under the Longshoremen's Act by clearly defining the jurisdiction of the act. Employees will not be faced with walking in and out of coverage. The bill eliminates the confusing maritime employment test while spelling out the specific type of occupations that would be covered under the act, including the definition of a harbor worker which does not exist in the current law.

The bill excludes employees providing services on or for a vessel under 65 feet in length, thus exempting recreational boat builders whom Congress never intended to cover in the first place. Pleasure boat builders having factories far inland have been brought under the act by Department of Labor interpretations.

Finally, the new bill would make administrative changes to speed up the delays in adjudicating contested workers' compensation claims. It would impose deadlines for decisions at each stage of the adjudication process. In addition, it would depoliticize the Benefits Review Board by giving it more independence from the Department of Labor.

The legislation I have briefly described marks the first step of a broad-based effort to reverse the damage done by the 1972 amendments to the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act. Joining this drive is an ad hoc coalition of over 50 groups representing all aspects of the maritime industry and the insurance industry. The coalition includes other industries which are forced to absorb the steep costs of the program; it includes associations representing the national business community as well. Support for revisions of the Longshore Act comes from all areas of the country.

The problems created by the 1972 amendments are serious; the costs are severe. The 1972 amendments strayed from the only legitimate purpose of workers' compensation. By incorporating the principles of life insurance, pension income, and punitive damages, the 1972 amendments have spawned a new form of social welfare.

The bill I am introducing today is intended to reverse this trend. It is not designed to help or harm any particular group or organization. It is intended solely to bring the soaring costs of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act back under control. My bill will accomplish this end by restoring the original purpose of the program; namely, the replacement of earnings lost as a result of a job-related injury.

A brief comparison of this new bill and its predecessor H.R. 2448 follows:

SCOPE OF AMENDMENTS

Both H.R. 2448 and the new Erlenborn bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (Act of

March 4, 1927 chapter 509, 44 Stat. 1424, as amended by Public Law 92-576, 86 Stat. 1251, 33 U.S.C. §901, et seq.) address the major source of escalating costs experienced since 1972—uncertain jurisdiction, payment for deaths unrelated to employment, absence of a ceiling on death benefits, and an uncapped escalation of benefits geared to increases in the national average weekly wage—and institutional shortcomings in placement of the Benefits Review Board under authority of the Secretary of Labor.

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF H.R. 2448 AND NEW ERLBORN BILL

(1) Contract jurisdiction to more certain parameters; coverage would be dependent on status of an employee at the time of injury and on the point of injury. Covered employees are longshoremen, ship repairmen, shipbuilders, shipbreakers, and harbor workers. The troublesome, confusing "maritime employment" test enacted in 1972 is eliminated.

(2) Death benefits, payable to survivors of injured employees receiving compensation who die from causes unrelated to an employment injury are eliminated. No other workers' compensation law, State or Federal, includes this life insurance provision which was added in 1972.

(3) Death benefits are capped at 200 per cent of the national average weekly wage—the same cap applicable to living employee beneficiaries. Absence of this cap is admitted even by the Labor Department to be an oversight in drafting the 1972 Amendments. Without a cap, survivors of injured workers may receive more in benefits than the injured worker would have, had he lived. No other workers' compensation law contains this premium on death.

(4) The automatic annual cost-of-living benefits escalator is capped at 3 per cent, based on increases in the national average weekly wage. Open-ended indexing, adopted in 1972, has created a most significant risk-assessment problem for employers and insurance carriers. A rise in the annual escalator increases employer-carrier liability exponentially, leading to serious reserving problems.

(5) Integrity of the claims adjudication process is addressed in H.R. 2448 by deleting Benefits Review Board jurisdiction over Longshore Act cases. Compensation orders issued by Deputy Commissioners would be appealable to U.S. District Courts—the practice prior to 1972 when the Board was created by the Longshore Amendments.

The new bill establishes the Board as an agency independent of the Secretary of Labor whose members are appointed for fixed terms by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Administrative law judges are appointed by the Board, not the Secretary of Labor.

MAJOR ADDITIONAL CHANGES SOUGHT BY THE NEW ERLBORN BILL

(1) The new bill includes a definition of harbor worker which is not defined in existing law or H.R. 2448. This category encompasses miscellaneous employees who are providing services on or for a vessel upon navigable waters, are not covered by a State workers' compensation act, and do not fall within the definitions of other covered employees—longshoreman, shipbuilder, ship repairer, or shipbreaker.

(2) The net tonnage exemption in the present Act (and not modified in H.R. 2448) is altered to a vessel-length exemption as a more appropriate and readily determinable measure of exclusion. Presently, any vessel under 18 net tons (capacity tons) is excluded. The new bill excludes any employee providing services on or for a vessel under

65 feet (about 70 net tons) if covered by a State workers' compensation program. Intent: Exclude recreational boat builders whom Congress never intended to cover but who were brought under the Act through Department of Labor interpretations.

(3) For the first time, provides a mechanism for offsetting Longshore Act benefits with the receipt of other benefits—Social Security old age and disability benefits, pensions, unemployment compensation, and any other workers' compensation benefit—to prevent pyramiding of benefits.

(4) Creates a Longshore Act advisory committee.

(5) Establishes a Conservation Committee, patterned after New York's statute, which is financed and operated by employers and insurance carriers who would have the responsibility of defending claims made on the Special (Second Injury) Fund. Liabilities against the Fund are increasing exponentially, as the Act's tremendous costs provide employers and insurance carriers with incentive to assert second-injury claims and assert Fund jurisdiction which limits employer-carrier liability.

(6) Re-defines wage-earning capacity for purposes of partial disabilities, by reference to the formula recently adopted by Florida and the District of Columbia which requires an employee to establish the relationship between wage loss and employment. Measures wage-earning capacity with reference to actual post-injury earnings, and earnings which would have been realized should an employee voluntarily limit his income.

(7) Prohibits double recovery for scheduled and unscheduled awards (made pursuant to loss in wage-earning capacity).

(8) Pays employee full compensation while undergoing rehabilitation but suspends benefits while he unreasonably refuses rehabilitation.

(9) Permits an employee to choose a treating physician from an approved listing qualified by the Deputy Commissioner, suspends compensation during period of unreasonable refusal to submit to medical treatment, modifies reporting requirements of attending physicians, and generally transfers Secretary's authority to supervise medical treatment to deputy commissioners. The trust is to insulate the process from proven abuses by physicians and employees.

(10) Updates method for determining average weekly wage—the basis on which benefits are determined.

(11) Gears benefits to 80 per cent of after tax income, instead of 66% per cent of average weekly wage.

(12) Speeds up claims process and expedites issuance of compensation orders.

(13) Repeals numerous obsolete provisions which have been in the Act since its initial passage in 1927.

COST REDUCTION ESTIMATES

The National Council on Compensation Insurance, a voluntary, nonprofit, unincorporated association of insurers licensed by State insurance agencies in 31 jurisdictions and filling an advisory role in others, estimated that the combined effect of removing unrelated death benefits and of placing a maximum on weekly benefits in death cases of 200 per cent of the national average weekly wage would reduce premiums 2.5 per cent. In combination with a 3 per cent cap on the annual benefits escalator, premiums would fall 9.9 per cent.●

PROPOSED SALE OF NUCLEAR FUEL TO INDIA

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, I introduced a resolution disapproving President Carter's decision to sell to the Government of India, 7,638 kilograms of low-enriched uranium. At the time I expressed my concern that India was unlikely to comply with the requirements of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act of 1978, which requires that every nation receiving U.S.-supplied nuclear fuel accept full-scope international atomic energy safeguards on all its nuclear facilities.

Considering the fact that India is the only nation which exploded a nuclear weapon using materials from a civilian nuclear program, I felt that it would be unwise to continue supplying India with nuclear fuel when it showed absolutely no intention of agreeing to put its nuclear facilities under safeguards. When India exploded its nuclear device in 1974, the plutonium used had been extracted from a reactor supplied by Canada and run in part with U.S.-supplied heavy water. In response Canada ended its nuclear cooperation with India; the United States continued to supply India with nuclear exports and technology.

I felt it was important 2 years ago that our nonproliferation strategy be strong and clear, and that we continue to sell nuclear materials to nations which had misused nuclear technology in the past. However, the State Department and the President asked that the uranium sale go through, and they promised Congress that they would try to use the 2-year grace period contained in the Nonproliferation Act of 1978 to convince India to accept full-scope safeguards on its nuclear facilities.

The 2 years have come and gone and India has still not accepted full-scope safeguards. India has also not signed the Nonproliferation Treaty and has reserved the right to conduct more nuclear weapons tests in the future. India's continuing nuclear ambitions and the fact that India already has enough spent fuel available for reprocessing to manufacture scores of nuclear weapons is destabilizing the entire south Asian region.

I was therefore surprised when President Carter has once again asked that nuclear fuel be sold to India. The President intends to sell India almost 38 tons of enriched uranium to power India's Tarapur reactors for about 2 years. However, the President immediately ran into opposition from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission which is charged with reviewing U.S. nuclear exports. On May 16, 1980, the NRC voted unanimously not to permit the

sale, citing the provisions of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act prohibiting such sales to nations which have not accepted full-scope safeguards. The President may now decide to try and override the NRC and ask Congress to permit the sale.

Considering the fact that 2 years have past and absolutely no progress has been made in convincing India to accept international safeguards, I would advise the President not to submit a request to Congress.

Two years ago, the House of Representatives, in a closer-than-expected 227-to-181 vote, permitted the President to go through with the sale after accepting the argument that the State Department needed more time to convince India to accept safeguards. Today there can be no such argument. If we allow the current sale to proceed, we will simply be handing India nuclear material with no guarantee that it will not be misused.

Personally, I believe that preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons capability is one of the most important foreign policy goals this country can pursue. After having failed to halt our nuclear exports when India exploded an atomic bomb, our nonproliferation policy would be shown to be meaningless if we now failed to stop our exports after India has refused to comply with the safeguards provision of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act of 1978.

The fact that India has just concluded a \$1.6 billion arms deal with the Soviet Union should leave us with no illusions that continuing our nuclear relationship with India would keep India from growing closer to the Soviets.

Instead, we should take the opportunity to strongly reaffirm that we are indeed committed to the principle of nuclear nonproliferation.●

**THE MILITARY MANPOWER
PROBLEM: SENATOR ARM-
STRONG ON THE NEED FOR A
GI BILL**

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, new reports of problems in maintaining military manpower levels, particularly in the skilled middle-grade enlisted personnel, seem to arrive every day. As a member of the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I have taken a personal interest in addressing the military manpower problem. The manpower problems in the armed services have many origins, but the most fundamental is also the most obvious and remediable: declining real incomes. When one takes into account the effect of pay caps and the forcing of military personnel into ever higher

personal income tax brackets, the real income of military personnel has declined significantly since 1977. This attrition in military pay has caused the comparability of pay with civilian occupation to suffer, causing the loss of thousands of skilled enlisted personnel and officers.

History has demonstrated that one of the most powerful incentives to joining the Armed Forces is an opportunity for higher education. As military compensation has declined in real terms in the past few years, without a GI bill, the opportunity for a soldier to acquire an advanced education fades, and with it, his incentive to join or remain in the armed services.

Senator BILL ARMSTRONG has introduced a two-part effort that addresses the very heart of our military manpower problem: a GI bill to aid recruiting, and a reform of military compensation to assist retention. This proposal was described in a recent essay published in the June 9, 1980, edition of the New York Times. I strongly endorse this approach, and look forward to an opportunity to assist its passage through the House of Representatives.

NEEDED: A G.I. BILL

(By William L. Armstrong)

WASHINGTON.—When Congress killed the G.I. Bill in December 1976, the Army gloomily concluded that the pool of potential recruits would shrink by as much as 36.7 percent. Today, the Army has the right to tell Congress: "I told you so." Defense Department officials estimate that the Army is 50,000 short of its peacetime strength of 774,000 and 80,000 below projected wartime requirements.

Military manpower problems have gotten so bad that it is doubtful our armed forces could respond effectively to a major crisis. All Army units in the continental United States, except the 82d Airborne Division, are substantially under strength. The Navy, in April, had to tie up a frontline ship, the oiler U.S.S. Canisteo, for lack of skilled sailors to man it.

Along with the decline in numbers, there has been a precipitous drop in aptitude. Army manuals have been rewritten downward, to eighth- and even seventh-grade levels, but commanders still report that many soldiers have difficulty understanding them.

With world tensions rising, it is vital that Congress take action now to improve both the quantity and quality of the young men and women entering the armed forces. A step that some advocate is resumption of the peacetime draft, but, in addition to being divisive, the draft is a cumbersome, expensive means of resolving a relatively small recruiting shortfall. Furthermore, a two-year draft would not fill the Army military occupation specialties where shortages are most critical.

A far more effective, and cost-effective, step would be to reinstitute G.I. Bill education benefits nearly on the scale of those provided by the World War II G.I. Bill. That bill and successive G.I. Bills have proved to be among the most successful Government social programs ever instituted, returning to the Treasury in tax revenues several times their costs as a result of increased earnings by veterans who otherwise would not have been able to afford to continue their education.

The rate of attrition in the Army is nearer 40 percent than the 18 percent that the Army, in March 1975, predicted Congress would find "unacceptable." Properly tailored educational incentives almost certainly would bring into the armed forces at least 50,000 high-quality recruits each year. This would be enough to resolve current recruiting shortfalls, and to replace, in all the armed forces, 15,000 to 20,000 enlistees from the lowest mental-aptitude levels with recruits from the highest categories.

On April 22, a proposed G.I. Bill of 1980 was introduced in the Senate. It is based on comprehensive research done by Prof. Charles Moskos of Northwestern University, a prominent military sociologist. Under the bill, a serviceman or woman who completes two years of honorable service would earn the following benefits: 100 percent of tuition and fees at an accredited college or university, to a maximum of \$3,000 a year, for a maximum of four years, and a subsistence allowance of \$300 per month while enrolled in an accredited college or university, for a maximum of 36 months.

Because two years of honorable service would have to be performed before a serviceman would become eligible for benefits, there would be no cost for the G.I. Bill in the 1981 and 1982 fiscal years.

If 50,000 new recruits took advantage of the G.I. Bill benefits each year, the cost would be about \$840 million in fiscal 1986, the first year in which there could be four classes attending school under the program.

After luring high-quality people into the armed forces, the next step would be to encourage them to stay by providing fair pay. Many military families struggle at near-poverty levels. For example, a plane handler on an aircraft carrier works 100 hours a week for less pay than a 40-hour-a-week cashier at McDonald's.

To correct this inequity, in April a National Defense Compensation Act was introduced in the Senate: a four-part package of pay raises that would enable military families to meet basic financial obligations. The raises range from 9 percent for lower grades to 100 percent for special-duty pay such as submarine and parachute pay. Many of these special pays have not been increased since 1955.

Prospects are growing for approval of some form of military pay raise. President Carter recently said that he would support a pay package that would include higher pay for sea and flight duty, an increase in food allowances, and higher housing allowances in high-cost areas of the United States. This Senate legislation, already introduced, is a useful first step. With its approval and, I hope, acceptance of a more-extensive across-the-board pay package, we will be able to provide military families with a living wage.

With the G.I. Bill to boost recruiting, and pay increases to ease the retention problem, the all-volunteer military forces can be preserved and we can end the disgraceful treatment of Americans in military uniform.●

**TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
ARREST OF THE LENINGRAD
GROUP**

HON. WILLIAM CARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, on June 15, 1970, 20 coura-

geous men and women were arrested for attempting to flee the Soviet Union to Israel and were tried in the infamous Leningrad trials. Sentenced to terms of up to 15 years, they languished in prison while the world continued to protest their punishment.

In April 1979, in an unprecedented series of events, seven of the defendants were suddenly released and allowed to rejoin their families in Israel. Today, only Iosif Mendelevich, Yuri Federov, and Alesksei Murzhenko remain imprisoned.

Iosif Mendelevich has adhered to religious practice under the most adverse conditions. Yuri Federov and Aleksei Murzhenko, two non-Jews who offered their support to the Jewish activist cause, have become symbols of fortitude and humanitarian spirit upon which all freedom-loving societies are based.

Soviet aggression in Afghanistan and Russian intolerance within its own society achieves a striking similarity of results: Utter contempt for the individual, complete disregard for human rights, and an unwillingness to abide by the basic human rights recognized by the free world. Increased vigilance in the face of Soviet oppression and aggression is necessary. Failure to recognize the true threat posed by the Soviets will result in continued loss of liberty.●

FAIR HOUSING ACT

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent editorial is from the Washington Post of June 6, 1980, and compliments the House of Representatives on passing the fair housing bill.

A WIN FOR FAIR HOUSING

There was only a little cheering on Capitol Hill Thursday when the House passed legislation amending the 1968 Fair Housing Act. Too bad there wasn't more. If the Senate can now be persuaded to go along with what the House has done, the major weakness—a lack of effective enforcement provisions—in that 12-year-old statute will have been eliminated.

The final vote in the House, 310 to 95, was deceptive. Amendments designed to gut the legislation had failed by as little as one vote. But when the final count came—the count that will be examined during this fall's election campaigns—more than a hundred members who had previously voted to perpetuate the law's principal weakness lined up with the old civil-rights coalition.

The main argument in the House—and it will be repeated in the Senate—concerned where the power to enforce this law's provisions barring discrimination should be lodged. The civil-rights groups (and the administration) wanted and got it put in the hands of administrative law judges; the opponents of this bill wanted to leave it with the federal courts.

In theory, the whole argument was frivolous, since this law, like others, can be enforced by either group fairly and efficiently. But in practice, that is not the case. The federal courts are so busy with criminal and major civil cases that complaints about violations of the fair housing law drag on unresolved for months. And the truth of the old adage—justice delayed is justice denied—has been especially sharply illustrated all too often when the question is who will get to buy a particular house or rent a particular apartment.

Members of the House who wished to gut the bill contended that administrative law judges would be biased in favor of those who claim some property owner has discriminated against them. No one ever adequately explained why the opponents believed judges handling these cases would be biased while similar judges who handle cases involving the enforcement of dozens of other federal laws are not.

In other words, the principal objection to the legislation is phony. Unless those who raise the question of bias are prepared to dismantle the whole system of administrative law now in place and dump tens of thousands of cases on an already crazily busy court system, they should give up this objection.●

HONORING JOHN F. GREEN

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening, June 27, the Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce will be honoring John F. Green with its presentation of the George H. Whittlesey Memorial Award at their annual installation dinner. I will be unable to attend this event, so I would like to take this opportunity to honor Mr. Green before this distinguished body.

John Green first joined the Torrance Chamber of Commerce board of directors in 1973 as plant manager of PPG Industries' Torrance facility. He was subsequently elected to a 3-year board term and reelected to this position in 1977. He served as vice president of the Economic Development Division in 1975 and has actively participated in the South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce, South Bay Economic Education Foundation, and South Bay Medal of Valor Committee. Only days after his retirement from PPG Industries, John took over the duties as chamber president in 1977 and was renamed president in 1978.

John was selected as the recipient of the Whittlesey Award by a special committee for his individual contributions to the chamber. These contributions include work on committees, task forces and special projects, dedication to the general well-being of the organization, and promotion of the chamber's free enterprise ideology. He has distinguished himself as a leader in promoting and fostering business enterprise and has supplemented this leadership role by actively participating in fundraising activities as a trust-

ee for the Torrance Memorial Hospital Medical Center and serving many volunteer positions with the United Way.

I am confident that the recognition John will receive next Friday evening will quickly be set aside as he continues his efforts on behalf of others. I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal admiration to John for the example he has set. John and his lovely wife, Mary, have been personal friends of mine for years and I look forward to working with them both in the years to come.

I offer my colleagues this brief commendation as a reminder of the tremendous impact one man can have, especially when backed by a talented and supportive wife.

Thank you, John. The South Bay is fortunate to have Mary and John.●

H.R. 7230

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of last May, I introduced H.R. 7230, "Export Promotion and Export Trading Company Act of 1980." The bill was referred to the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade on which I have the privilege of being its ranking member and which is ably chaired by my distinguished colleague, Mr. BINGHAM.

I want to commend the chairman for moving so swiftly to hold hearings on this important legislation and other related measures that were subsequently introduced. We have now heard from numerous witnesses and hope to mark up the Export Trading Companies Act this week.

I am delighted to see the strong interest of my distinguished colleagues in trading company legislation. I would hope that this strong interest will translate itself into overwhelming support as the bill reaches the House for consideration. The time has never been better for Congress to exercise some leadership in the area of promoting exports.

Trade is round-the-clock, day-in-day-out activity. Never have we begun a decade with the massive trade deficits facing us today. As a trading Nation, we need to expand our penetration into foreign markets. In the last 3 years, we have been running the biggest deficits in our history and our share of world trade has declined steadily. It dropped from 20 percent in 1960 to 17 percent in 1970 to about 14 percent today.

Unfortunately, there are tens of thousands of American producers who do not export to their fullest potential. Some 98 percent of all companies do not export. A mere 200 companies

export 80 percent of our entire trade outside our borders.

As Dr. Michael Samuels said in testifying before the subcommittee:

The national political and economic interest justifies, indeed requires, an active export policy. Bold steps are called for. Awareness is demanded. The trading company idea captures this need. . . .

I want to recommend to my distinguished colleagues Dr. Samuel's timely and excellent testimony. He is currently the executive director of the Center for Strategic and International Studies of Georgetown University, in charge of Third World studies. His testimony follows:

TRADING COMPANIES ARE NEEDED TO ASSIST
OUR EXPORT COMPETITIVENESS

(By Michael A. Samuels¹)

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, let me thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify this afternoon during your important efforts to examine legislation to permit the creation of trading companies. I appreciate your willingness to accept, in lieu of a prepared statement due to my just concluded international travel, a speech I delivered recently in San Diego entitled "Let's Make Our Exports Competitive" which I understand will be inserted in the record.

Concerned about what I have felt to be a relative decline in American economic and political capabilities internationally, we at CSIS have spent the last two years trying to examine in particular the decline in U.S. export competitiveness. Many of our studies are complete, and I am pleased to be able to share with you some of our tentative conclusions today.

First, economically speaking at least, the world is interdependent. Our relatively open markets are increasingly attracting foreign competitors. Our competitors not only provide a wide array of incentives to aid the exporting of domestically produced products but do not abide by the same standards that we have imposed on our private business community in the interest of freer trade. We ignore foreign market opportunities at our own peril both economically and politically. Our study shows that the U.S. market share for manufactured products in the developing world market declined from 28 percent in 1970 to 22 percent in 1978. While our competitors France, Germany, Italy and England were able at least to maintain their market shares of 1970, Japan significantly increased its share of the market from 22 percent in 1970 to 26 percent in 1978. We are losing our footing abroad, and something must be done. Expanding exports should be a higher national priority.

Second, the customs of the international market place are different from those of our domestic market place. Institutional patterns that make sense domestically do not always make sense in international competition with foreign exporters whose governments encourage sufficient flexibility to adapt to the market conditions of the real world.

Third, after decades of self-satisfaction with both the size and rate of growth of our domestic economy, many of our producers, especially small and medium sized companies, lack the interest, will, and capability by themselves to become involved in a meaningful way in gaining export markets.

¹ Ambassador Samuels is executive director of the Center for Strategic and International Studies of Georgetown University in charge of Third World Studies.

The creation of new incentives is required to overcome this structural problem.

Fourth, the range of disincentives with which our exporters have been saddled—The Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, tax laws harmful to business overseas, human rights policy restrictions, antitrust restrictions and others—often deter small and medium sized companies from even trying. Our antitrust laws not only inhibit competition abroad by U.S. companies, but, especially through their extra-territorial reach, create international hostility and friction that makes it very difficult to negotiate and to implement further removal of trade restrictions by our competition. There is a need for larger institutional structures that could unfathom these restrictions and disincentives that many companies see as barriers even to involvement in international business in the first place.

Fifth, we have been misled by the passivity indicated by those traditional economists whose confidence in the rectifying capabilities of flexible exchange rates has led and could continue to lead to complacency and an unwillingness to fashion new mechanisms to rectify the clear competitive disadvantages of our institutions.

Sixth, even large companies are finding that certain foreign buyers—non-market economies and some developing countries for example—are not able to pay in currency and must exchange other products or raw materials. Counter trade (or barter trade) is a system of barter that requires downstream sales of unfamiliar products. It calls for new approaches that remove traditional shackles on corporate cooperation. The Japanese may have created the most efficient system to deal with this situation, and we may not be able to match them. We can, however, create institutions to allow our private sector to compete better with these arrangements.

Seventh, aiding the expanding of exports could be accomplished through a number of governmental actions. Many of these would require increased government budget allocations. At a time of belt tightening, such allocations, especially given OMB's apparent aversion to funding the export sector, may not be forthcoming. Thus, actions that do not require significant allocations but that still will make a difference should be identified. Once identified they should be actively encouraged—and now. To delay is to short change our own economic well-being.

The above background has led me to the conclusion that the creation of trading companies would be an important and wise step.

Suffice it to say that the trading company concept is an important one to be sanctioned by law. I fear, however, that among those who may speak out against such a concept will be a Justice Department reluctant to change and unwilling to accept the very basic fact that the international business climate is different from the domestic one. One of the great things about our system of government, however, is that it is you, the Congress, that makes new laws, even—or in some cases especially—when the Executive Branch takes an uncreative and short-sighted view.

Let me give you an example of a situation where a trading company is required. There are ever decreasing volumes of non-dedicated crude oil available in world markets. For a U.S. oil company, energy embedded in aluminum ingots is difficult to commercialize. But for a Japanese trading combine, which may produce aluminum through one affiliate and refine and market fuel oil through another, the trade off is straightforward and the adjustment can be accommodated within the firm.

One of the major observations of the Congress's Joint Economic Committee after their Mission to East Asia earlier this year to study the competitiveness of U.S. exports was the extent to which other countries use trading companies to their advantage. They noted in particular the involvement of private banks and government backing for the success of these companies. They identified situations where European and Japanese trading companies have had immense plantations, major raw material holdings, captive banks, or other assets to permit their expansion and development of a wide network of complementary services. I would urge this Committee to coordinate your activities on this subject with those of the Joint Economic Committee and others interested in this subject such as Senators Stevenson, Roth and Danforth and Congressmen AuCoin and LaFalce, to maximize your effect.

Let me address one specific issue that will come before you as you consider this legislation. First is the issue of the participation of commercial banks. By all means they should be allowed to participate. To me, arguments sometimes put forward about the need for separation of banking and commerce and the creation of the possibility of conflicts of interest are arguments not against their participation, but cautions on the way and extent of their participation. U.S. banks should be encouraged to offer more export services. Present law and practice aids the local branches of foreign banks and hurts especially small and medium sized companies that can not afford the requisite in-house staff.

As I look at the bill before you, it seems to me that it does not go far enough. I would urge you to bring your bill closer to the Senate's version (S. 2379), the Stevenson-Danforth bill. Even more importantly, let me urge you to act fast on this issue so that it can be passed this year. I know that this important bill faces some substantive disagreement and some internal House committee rivalries. For these latter to impede progress would be a serious setback for the national interest.

Mr. Chairman, the national political and economic interest justifies, indeed requires, an active export policy. Bold steps are called for. Awareness is demanded. The trading company idea captures this need. I urge this Committee to refine the legislation well and promptly so that this nation's exporters move one more step toward becoming competitive once more.

It is an important step to break with a legal past that impedes our adjustment to new world realities. The precedent could open the way for other much needed steps to insure a healthy America in need of increasing uncertainty and more dramatic change. ●

TRIBUTE TO CLARE MUSGROVE

HON. DAVE STOCKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor Clare Musgrove, who will soon be retiring from his services as an educator, adviser, and community leader. Mr. Musgrove devoted his life to community service through his leadership as county extension director of Berrien County, Mich. Mr. Musgrove de-

veloped and implemented agricultural education programs that have helped Berrien County become one of the Nation's leading agricultural counties.

The broad range of community service positions held by Mr. Musgrove is a clear indication of his devotion to the citizens and well-being of Berrien County. Mr. Musgrove served as an adviser to the following associations and community activities: Berrien County Youth Fair, Family Living Council, County Farm Bureau Board of Directors, 4-H Councils, Berrien County 4-H Foundation, Future Farmers of America, Dairy Herd Improvement Association, Farm Loan Officers, Twin City and Niles Model Cities, Inc., County Agricultural Service Club, Berrien County Blossom Time Festival, and Board of Trustees of the United Methodist Church of St. Joseph, Mich.

Since 1966 Mr. Musgrove has served as the county extension director of Berrien County. Through the years his work has not gone unnoticed. He has been the recipient of distinguished service awards from both the Michigan and National Associations of Agricultural Agents. Mr. Musgrove was also the first extension cooperative service employee to receive the honor of a Michigan State University Distinguished Faculty Award.

I call on my colleagues to join with me in acclaiming an outstanding citizen, Mr. Clare Musgrove. ●

RAMSEY CLARK'S VISIT TO IRAN

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the acrimonious discussion about whether or not Ramsey Clark should be prosecuted for his recent visit to Iran, it has been generally assumed that he violated the law. That conclusion is by no means clear.

What Mr. Clark did was to act in defiance of a Presidential order banning "transactions" that "relate" to travel to Iran. The President's order was issued under the authority of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act of 1977.

As the principal author of that act, I should like to point out that the law does not expressly authorize the President to ban travel by American citizens. I can state further that such a ban was not in the minds of the Foreign Affairs Committee when the bill was considered in that committee and in the House.

Thus the question of whether Mr. Clark's travel was effectively prohibited by a valid Presidential order is not an easy one to answer.

In determining whether or not Mr. Clark should be prosecuted, the Attor-

ney General will no doubt consider carefully whether the President had the authority effectively to ban travel to Iran under the act, and, if so, whether that authority was constitutional.

A negative answer to both questions is effectively argued by our distinguished and learned colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN) in an article appearing this week in the Boston Globe. That article follows, together with an article on the same subject from today's New York Times:

[From the Boston Globe, June 17, 1980]

WHY CLARK SHOULD NOT BE CHARGED

(By ROBERT F. DRINAN)

Ramsey Clark's recent visit to Iran was not the first time he has traveled outside the United States against the wishes of the American government, and it was not the first time he has been threatened with criminal proceedings because of his independent-minded missions. An examination of the United States overriding national and international interests, coupled with a dispassionate legal appraisal of his case, suggest that Ramsey Clark and his colleagues should not be prosecuted under the law.

In 1972, Clark and actress Jane Fonda visited Hanoi to meet with POW's much to President Nixon's consternation. Shortly thereafter, the House of Representatives considered legislation that would have prevented the travel of US citizens to nations designated by the President as restricted areas, and where such travel might endanger national security.

At that time, I argued on the floor of the House that the bill was unconstitutional "on a number of grounds, perhaps most importantly its proposed deprivation of the right to travel without provision of substantive or procedural due process." The bill was defeated by a narrow margin.

Last week, President Carter stated his "inclination" to prosecute Clark under the authority granted to him by the International Emergency Powers Act which passed Congress in 1977. This legislation was designed to establish standards for the Executive use of emergency powers in the absence of any previously mandated guidelines. One of the authors of the legislation, Rep. Jonathan Bingham (D-N.Y.), said then that it would be "... the height of folly to make emergency powers routinely available to the President with no standards to guide their use and no opportunity for congressional review."

The powers addressed in the bill relate directly to the commercial exchanges between citizens of nations, rather than the freedom of movement of individuals between, in this case, the United States and Iran.

If the President determines that a threat of imminent hostilities between nations is apparent, he may also, the law states, suspend postal, telegraphic, and other personal communications with that country. Still there is no specific mention in the statute of a prohibition on travel.

The principle in this case, as in the case of the Clark visit to Hanoi, is the extent to which the President may restrict travel abroad. This has been examined on several occasions by the Supreme Court. Most recently, in *U.S. v. Laub* (1967), the Court affirmed that the "right to travel is protected by the Fifth Amendment" in the case of a professor who desired to travel to Cuba in violation of a travel restriction to that country. The Court concluded that "... it does not follow that travel to Cuba with a pass-

port which is not specifically validated for that country is a criminal offense."

Even more convincing, in the context of building American confidence abroad, are the international agreements which the United States has pledged to uphold. Take for example the Helsinki Accords, signed in 1975 by 35 nations, including the Soviet Union. This document, among other things, binds its signatory nations to ensure the freedom of movement across national borders. This principle has been invoked by our country time and time again as we have called to the attention of the world the Soviet injustices against its Jewish population. From Romania, to Argentina, to Syria, we have called upon the nations of the world to protect freedom of movement across international borders.

The powers granted under the International Emergency Powers Act, then, offer slim justification for the prosecution of Ramsey Clark. In the international sphere, our commitment to freedom of movement, as witnessed by our signing of the Helsinki Accords, mandates that we demonstrate our credibility by adhering to that principle even in the face of the difficult situation in Iran.

But more important than the narrow legal interpretation of the President's emergency powers, or the image we project to the world, is the damage a prosecution of Ramsey Clark and his nine colleagues would do to our constitutional freedoms here at home.

Those who framed the Constitution and those who have sought to protect it for nearly 200 years have held that the free flow of ideas, even unpopular ideas, is essential to a healthy democracy. It is that principle of freedom which should guide us now.

[From the New York Times, June 18, 1980]

CARTER AIDES SAY DECISION TO ACT ON CLARK WAS PUT UP TO CIVILETTI

(By Steven R. Weisman)

WASHINGTON, June 17.—Senior officials in the Carter Administration said today the White House had told Attorney General Benjamin R. Civiletti that the decision on whether to bring an action against Ramsey Clark for traveling to Iran was "up to him."

Despite President Carter's expressed "inclination" to seek to punish Mr. Clark, one Administration official said, "no one at the White House has ever suggested to the Attorney General that he ought to bring a case whether or not he thought there was a case."

However, Mr. Civiletti has been told that "if he decided he had a case, he might want to review with the President and other members of the Cabinet any foreign policy or national security issues involved," this official said.

The Administration officials declined to be identified, but they said that they were familiar with the White House deliberations on Iran and on the President's ban on travel to that country.

CLARIFICATION OF CARTER ROLE

Their comments were intended to clarify Mr. Carter's role, which has become controversial since he said last week that it was his "inclination" to prosecute Mr. Clark.

Along with nine other Americans, Mr. Clark, a former United States Attorney General, flouted the travel ban by attending a conference in Teheran this month on American "crimes" in Iran.

Many legal experts joined with the American Civil Liberties Union in contending that Mr. Clark's trip was protected by the United States Constitution and by rulings of the

Supreme Court upholding the right to travel. Many of these critics also said that Mr. Carter had prejudged the case against Mr. Clark and jeopardized the independence of the Justice Department by saying that he was "inclined" to take action against him.

The statute being invoked by the White House as a possible cause for action against Mr. Clark is the International Emergency Economic Powers Act of 1977. The act was passed as an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act dating to World War I.

MONEY TRANSACTIONS BANNED

The emergency economic powers statute was passed with little fanfare at a time when apparently little consideration was being given to its possible use to enforce bans on travel by individual Americans. Since taking office, Mr. Carter has generally favored broadening the right of Americans to travel to areas from which they were previously barred.

Strictly speaking, the President's use of the 1977 statute does not ban travel. It simply bans any financial "transactions" that "relate" to such travel in Iran, and its definition of "transaction," as stated in a regulation issued last May 2, includes "acceptance of free sponsorship or support" for travel in Iran.

Mr. Clark has said that he did not pay for his trip, but Administration officials said that his acceptance of free accommodations fell within the regulation.

A VERY BROAD TERM

"The law in question does not directly ban travel," said Robert H. Mundheim, general counsel to the Treasury Department. "It does encompass transactions in connection with travel. As a matter of law, the word 'transaction' is a very broad term" * * * ●

TALL SHIPS AT BOSTON

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently the tall ships were in Boston to help the city celebrate its 350th birthday. The citizens of Boston are grateful to the crews of these ships for participating in this special event and went to considerable efforts to repay the graciousness of the crews. The Boston Globe of June 8 reports on the efforts of one remarkable Bostonian to make the stay of the crew of the *Christian Radich* memorable. I would like to share the report with my colleagues:

TALL SHIPS AT BOSTON

(By John Ahern)

The Tall Ships finally have left our port and it's no cliché to say they won't be forgotten. Thousands of sea lovers who get to see the ocean once every 10 years, including many who don't know that the sun rises in the East, appreciated the majesty of it all. Zillions never will forget the traffic problems and there are hundreds of young ladies in this town who will carry fond memories of young, handsome Scandinavians to their graves.

But there's one of our best-known citizens who never will forget the crew of *Christian Radich* and, in turn, the crew of the full ship never will forget Harry McDonough.

Two weeks ago the full ship arrived here and immediately sought a sailing facility where the sailors could sharpen up their small boat skills for the upcoming regattas. The facilities on the Charles were filled up, as was Pleasure Bay Sailing Facility at Castle Island. But McDonough made it very available at once. For hours, for days those handsome kids practiced. When the time came, they triumphed easily.

Hospitality didn't end there. Harry escorted them around town, taking them to Marblehead for parties at Eastern YC and at Frank Scully's house. He made sure they met lovely-looking young girls. In short he made their stay in Boston memorable. And they did not forget. First, they invited Dot and Barbara McDonough, Harry's wife and daughter, aboard the ship for the parade. Then there was a presentation to Harry himself. It is a silken scroll mounted on a staff and the message was from the heart.

It read: "Dear Harry: Thanks for everything that you have done for us while visiting Boston and your sailing program. The Norwegian sailors never will forget you!" It was signed by the captain and the entire crew, who will make sure that Harry McDonough will be as well known, respected and loved in Oslo as he is here in Boston. ●

WOMEN VERSUS MEN: ARE THEY BORN DIFFERENT?

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, some years ago, in a display of "legalism over realism," the Congress passed the equal rights amendment. We have been having problems ever since. We placed women in the military academies and now we are well on the way to having them killed in large numbers on the battlefield in a unisex Army. We will become the laughing stock of the world, as it will appear that American men no longer have the will to fight, but will sacrifice our women first. The differences between the sexes are just too basic and fundamental to ignore. In *Mainliner* magazine of May 1980, Mr. Tim Hackler wrote an excellent article pointing out some of the recent scientific findings, which he states, "mothers and poets have known all along." I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues who may still be confused on this issue:

WOMEN VERSUS MEN: ARE THEY BORN DIFFERENT?

These are the words of Dr. Alice Rossi, a University of Massachusetts sociologist. If they make her appear a bedrock conservative who would send every female vice-president back to her PTA meetings and cookbooks, they are misconstrued. In fact, Dr. Rossi has long advocated that women seek work outside the home and demand equality with men.

Yet as more and more women take their places alongside men in the ranks of management, the question arises: What is equality? Today, the weight of scientific and medical opinion says that equality does not mean sameness. Men and women not only

look different, they act differently and think differently, and no amount of dolls for boy babies and trucks for girls can completely alter this.

Recent research has established beyond a doubt that males and females are born with a different set of "instructions" built into their genetic code. Science is thus confirming what poets and parents have long taken for granted.

Studies at Harvard University and elsewhere show that marked differences between male and female baby behavior are already obvious in the first months of life. Female infants are more oriented toward people. Girls learn to recognize individual human faces and to distinguish between individual voices before male babies of the same age. By four months, a female infant is socially aware enough to distinguish between photographs of familiar people. Girls learn to talk earlier than boys; they articulate better and acquire a more extensive vocabulary than boys of a comparable age. They also begin to smile earlier than boys. (More than one study has found that females continue to smile more than males throughout life.)

Male infants, on the other hand, are more interested in things. At four months a boy will react to an inanimate object as readily as to a person. Given the choice between a mother's face and a bright geometric object hanging over his crib, the boy, unlike the girl, will just as frequently babble at the inanimate object as at his mother. A few months later he will begin trying to take it apart. When boys and girls of pre-elementary-school age are asked to manipulate three-dimensional objects, boys overwhelmingly outperform girls. Boys also show more rough-and-tumble play than girls—as almost any parent can attest—and tend to explore away from their mothers earlier and more often. Stanford psychologists Karl Pribram and Dianne McGuinness conclude that women are "communicative" animals and men are "manipulative" animals.

But to what extent are these sex differences learned, and to what extent are they genetically determined?

Until recently it was widely assumed that most human behavior could be explained by "socialization." In the heredity versus environment argument—sometimes phrased as nature versus nurture—environment was considered of overwhelming importance in determining human behavior. To suggest that any human behavior could even remotely be compared to the instinctive behavior that we see in animals was dismissed as barbarian. Indeed, extreme environmentalists remain committed to the idea that mankind is unlike all other animal species by insisting that heredity has nothing to do with the differences in the ways males and females act and think. If boys and girls were brought up in exactly the same way, they contend, then all behavioral differences between men and women would evaporate.

This notion has all but collapsed, however, as researchers in both the social and natural sciences are finding what they believe is evidence of a genetic component in certain kinds of behavior—for example, aggression or nurturance—that have traditionally been identified as masculine or feminine.

Of all the behavioral differences between men and women, aggression presents the most clear-cut case for a biological connection. "The evidence cited in favor of genetically based sex differences is more compelling for aggression than for any other temperamental qualities," writes psychologist Janet T. Spence of the University of Texas. Evidence for greater inherent male aggressiveness comes from such diverse sources as

ethnology, anthropology, endocrinology and experimental psychology.

In most animal species, and in all primate species, males are more active, exploratory and aggressive than females. The primate species *Homo sapiens* is no exception. In no human culture ever studied has the female been found more aggressive than the male. The argument that parents tolerate aggression in boys but discourage it in girls, and that therefore aggression is not genetically determined but culturally taught does not stand up to recent evidence linking aggression specifically to the male hormone testosterone.

Numerous studies have shown that when testosterone is administered to pregnant laboratory animals, the female offspring show an increase in the incidence of rough-and-tumble play and a decrease in the tendency to withdraw from threats and approaches of other animals.

In a famous decade-long series of studies at Johns Hopkins University, Drs. Anke Ehrhardt and John Money demonstrated that the same phenomenon seems to be true for human beings as well. They studied girls who had been accidentally exposed prenatally to male hormones and found that these girls considered themselves—and were considered by their mothers—to be more tomboyish than girls in control groups. They showed relatively little interest in dresses and dolls and a greater incidence of rough-and-tumble play. Ehrhardt and Money concluded that the genetically determined presence of male or female sex hormones tends to "wire" the brain for male and female behavior. (It should be emphasized that all of these studies are dealing with the behavior of the average man and the average woman. We can look around and see that there are many exceptions to the rule.)

If the studies on hormones and aggression make a good case for at least one kind of genetically predisposed sex difference in behavior, they at the same time illustrate the fundamental interaction between heredity and environment. In tests to determine if dominance among laboratory animals was correlated with testosterone levels, Dr. Robert Rose of Boston University put thirty-four male rhesus monkeys into a cage and let them fight it out until they had established their own dominance hierarchy, or "pecking order." He found (from blood samples) that a high positive correlation existed between the amount of testosterone and the level of aggression the animals displayed.

But he then asked himself whether the level of testosterone might be an effect as well as a cause of their dominance. In a following series of studies he showed that if a lone male monkey is introduced into a strange group in which the dominance hierarchy has already been established, the intimidated newcomer shows a sharp drop in testosterone after only half an hour. But if the same male monkey is introduced into a cage of twelve female monkeys in heat, his testosterone level shoots up dramatically.

Thus, while males carry a considerably higher level of these hormones than females, the level of the male hormone fluctuates substantially and is to some extent determined by conditions in the environment. (Men and women carry both testosterone and the female hormones, estrogens, but men carry a higher proportion of male hormones and women a higher proportion of female hormones.)

If the difference in aggression patterns between the average male and the average female can partially be explained by the effects of genetically determined hormones,

what about other differences in the way men and women think and act? We have already seen that one of the most pronounced differences between men and women—a difference that is already present in the first months of life and continues through adulthood—is that women show verbal superiority, while men show "spatial superiority," a quality that shows up in such tasks as map reading, solving mathematical problems and perceiving depth.

Researchers have found that this sex difference in skills apparently has something to do with the organization of the brain. It has been known for a decade that the two cerebral hemispheres of the brain are functionally different, and that in the large majority of individuals the left hemisphere specializes in verbal tasks while the right hemisphere specializes in spatial perception. It is only recently, however, that neuropsychologists have noticed that males and females differ in their tendencies to use these hemispheres.

Dr. Sandra F. Witelson of McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, was among the first to show that males tend to specialize in use of the spatially oriented left hemisphere, while females tend to use their left and right hemispheres about equally, thus implying a relatively greater usage of the linguistically oriented right hemisphere.

Dr. Marylou Reid of the University of Massachusetts has shown that differences in utilization of the hemispheres has already taken place among normal five-year-olds. She concludes: "Since the differences in the sexes are apparent well before puberty, it seems reasonable to suggest that the fetal sex steroids [hormones] may play a critical role in determining relative maturational rates of the two half-brains and, possibly, of some other bodily regions as well."

Dr. Jerre Levy of the University of Chicago found that girls who had received excessive testosterone prenatally do, as she predicted, show a greater degree of malelike hemispheric specialization than normal females. Furthermore, researchers have identified a sex-linked recessive gene that seems to be associated with high spatial skills, and have found that the gene will not be expressed, or "put into effect," without the presence of male hormones.

It bears repeating that all of the sex differences described here represent differences on the average. That is to say, a minority of women will be found to be more interested in "masculine" pursuits than the average man, and vice versa. Also, there is some evidence that the more creative the individual, the more he or she tends to include both typically male and female behavior in his or her personality. Finally, no experts suggest that the culture in which we live is unimportant in shaping male and female behavior; indeed it is probably more important than genetic considerations.

It does seem certain, however, that the extreme environmental explanation for behavior, which has been so dominant in political and academic thought for the past few decades, is no longer tenable. Males and females may in fact be marching to the beat of a different drummer or, as Harvard psychologist Jerome Kagan puts it, they "are sensitized to different aspects of experience and gratified by different profiles of events."

MEN AND WOMEN: PRIMAL DIFFERENCES

Dr. Richard M. Restak, a neurologist at Georgetown University School of Medicine, has summed up the growing number of typical masculine and feminine behaviors and skills that seem to have a genetic compo-

nent this way: "Men are more curious as to how things work and are more exploratory. They are object people who like to examine and take things apart and excel in a wide range of skills that require mechanical manipulation." Women, by comparison, "are people people. They rely on social cues, can pick up on body language and emotional tones in speech, remember names and faces better and are more empathetic."

The most commonly offered explanation for these differences is that such a division of skills had survival value for our ancestors, when men were specialized for skills involved in hunting, and women were specialized for skills involved in rearing children and tending to domestic tasks. (There is some evidence that women may have invented pottery, and it is almost certain that in most cultures they tended to the sewing. This is reflected today in the fact that women are able to perform better at manual dexterity tasks involving fine finger coordination than man.) Even though such division of tasks may have less survival value today than for our ancestors, such specialization has to some extent found its way into our genes, since mankind existed in a hunter/gatherer state for the first 99 percent of his history. ●

HONORING C. MARVIN BREWER

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening, June 27, the Torrance area Chamber of Commerce will be honoring C. Marvin Brewer at their annual installation dinner for his outstanding service as their president during 1979-80. I will be unable to attend this dinner, so I would like to take this opportunity to honor Mr. Brewer before this distinguished body.

C. Marvin Brewer is a long-time executive and current chairman of the board of Dominguez Water Corp. Mr. Brewer has an extensive background in finance and administrative management which has greatly assisted his efforts on behalf of the Torrance area Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Brewer has served as a chamber director since 1974 and as vice president of the governmental affairs division from 1976 to 1979.

Several new chamber projects have been initiated during Marvin's tenure. These projects include:

The Traffic and Transportation Committee's commuter bus pooling plan. This plan calls for institution of a private sector commuter bus system that would be shared by South Bay industries.

Formation and operation of the Private Industry Council, a group of local businessmen and community leaders that supervises private sector employee training under the CETA program. The Torrance Chamber had a leadership role in organizing the council.

The Paul Revere Committee, a grassroots political awareness effort which encourages members to write letters to legislators on a few crucial business issues.

The Small Business Council, offering improved and expanded services to the small business members of the Chamber.

The Future Quarters Committee which is formulating a plan for expanded chamber office space.

The George H. Whittlesey Memorial Award in honor of the past chamber president.

Mr. Speaker, while Marvin will be honored next week by his friends, family, and associates, I want to express my own personal admiration for the example he has set. I offer my colleagues this brief commendation as a reminder of the dedication and service men such as Marvin have given to local business in our country. ●

WATCHING THE WORLD GANG UP ON ISRAEL

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the spate of attacks on Israel in the past 2 years has assumed a level of intensity not experienced in the three decades of Israel's existence. After four major wars in the first 30 years of Israel's existence as a nation, its opponents in the Middle East and elsewhere were unable to destroy the state by force. The diplomatic assault on Israel's legitimacy has begun in deadly seriousness.

It is regrettable that the administration and State Department have so often become a party to the attack on Israel. Prof. John Roche, a senior White House official in the Johnson administration, has provided a useful catalog of a few of the most recent attacks on Israel to which the United States has been either an inadvertent participant, or has failed to provide a modicum of diplomatic support for Israel. Indeed, in the most recent outrage in the United Nations, the United States abstained from voting in the Security Council's condemnation of Israel in the terrorist bombing of several West Bank Arab mayors, although no evidence was presented that would link Israel with the crime—indeed the evidence suggested the contrary. Yet, the United States did not veto the resolution. As a result, the United States becomes a contributor to the weight of the diplomatic barrage Israel is now obliged to absorb. The evidence Professor Roche provides is worth pondering for it provides a helpful summary of the increasingly weak-kneed support of Israel by the administration—a view that cannot be lost on America's remaining allies.

[From the Washington Star, June 17, 1980]

WATCHING THE WORLD GANG UP ON ISRAEL

Anybody in politics who thinks a straight line is the shortest distance between two points always makes me profoundly nervous. Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin falls into this category, but Begin can hardly be blamed for the virtually worldwide gangup on Israel that has been build-

ing up since 1973. After all, while it didn't shout statistics from the housetops, the Israeli Labor government put more settlements on the West Bank than has Begin.

Let us take, for starters, the Security Council condemnation of Israel for the bomb attacks on the West Bank Arab mayors. No one in his senses actually believes the Israeli government aided and abetted this squalid act. Begin has denounced it, and the security forces have grappled right-wing Jewish fanatics under the Emergency Powers Act.

Yet the United Nations Security Council unanimously approved this inane pronouncement with the United States abstaining. Moreover, Hodding Carter III, the State Department's spokesman, registered our official disapproval. This could easily become a growth industry: Will the State Department protest to Britain every time a Catholic is murdered in Northern Ireland?

The rationale seems to be that even if the Israeli government had no hand in the bombings, it should have prevented them. It is responsible for acts of violence that take place within its jurisdiction.

But that is a private issue—Israel will surely compensate the victims. The question before the house is when the PLO killed the American ambassador to the Sudan and later our ambassador in Lebanon, did the United Nations rise in its wrath and denounce the governments of Sudan and Lebanon for aiding and abetting these heinous deeds? Further, as Israeli Ambassador to the U.N. Blum noted, he hadn't heard any screams of rage when the PLO assassinated Arab magnates.

Throughout the whole Andrew Young imbroglio I was convinced that Young's sin in Carter's eyes was not that he rattled ice cubes with the PLO spokesman, but that he got caught.

For reasons difficult to understand, the Carter administration has an anti-Israel tic. Like one of Pavlov's pups, who salivated whenever the bell rang, Israel generates automatic id-discharges in Washington.

On the fundamental level, Israel—Carter and Co. feel—simply shouldn't be there. It is a damned nuisance constantly interfering with the big stakes game. After all, in 1977 Cy Vance and Andrei Gromyko were ready to settle the whole Middle Eastern problem once and for all. On Sept. 1 they issued a communique urging a United Nations initiative with the U.S. and USSR at point.

This was absolute lunacy—the whole point of the bilateral feelers which had been going on surreptitiously between Sadat and Begin was to keep the Soviet Union out of play. Both Begin and Sadat denounced the scheme, but somehow Vance's minions made Israel out to be "intransigent."

More of this subterranean anti-Israel sentiment emerges in an interview in the New Leader between Gertrude Samuels and U.N. Ambassador Donald F. McHenry. Recall McHenry was instructed to vote for a March 1 Security Council resolution calling for a "Judenrein" (Jewless) West Bank and East Jerusalem. He did, Israel's friends went up in smoke, and President Carter repudiated the vote, taking personal blame.

In fact, Brzezinski's staffer on the Middle East had not even seen the exact text of the resolution before the vote; Vance must have told Carter not to worry. Vance may not have read it either: He may have accepted the assurances of one of State's many anti-Israel senior officers.

Samuels, in the New Leader, raised this vote with McHenry who denied that the president had disavowed it! "He," said McHenry, "said the United States would have abstained with regard to Jerusa-

lem . . . He (Carter) went on to reiterate the policy with regard to the settlements."

In short, according to McHenry, Carter only wants the West Bank, not Jerusalem, "Jew free." No wonder our NATO allies feel free to love it up with Arafat. Maybe a compromise is in order: Should Jews be permitted to settle on the West Bank if they wear yellow stars? ●

CONGRESS RESTRICTS IRS PROPOSED SCHOOL REGULATIONS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, when the Carter administration's Internal Revenue Service attempted to harass and manipulate private schools through new proposed regulations concerning nondiscriminatory policies for private schools, this Congress acted to restrict the IRS from enforcing these arbitrary regulations through amendments to the Treasury appropriations bill. It is important that we reenact these restrictions on the Treasury appropriations bill for fiscal year 1981.

One of the mistaken ideas which has circulated is that these private schools are segregation academies and the IRS needs new tools to prevent discrimination by removing the tax exemption of these schools. The IRS already has the power to do so and has exercised that power on a number of occasions. If we look at the entire picture, we see that the schools that have grown most rapidly have been private religious schools, especially Christian schools, and not so-called segregation academies.

I would like to point out a very interesting study entitled "More Than Segregation Academies: The Growing Protestant Fundamentalist Schools" by Virginia Davis Nordin and William Lloyd Turner which appeared in the February, 1980 issue of Phi Delta Kappan. These scholars point out that between 1965 and 1975, total enrollment in nonpublic schools declined by 28 percent while the enrollment in so-called Christian or fundamentalist schools climbed about 118 percent. It is this group of private schools which would be hurt most by the proposed IRS regulations.

I urge my colleagues to again adopt restrictions on the proposed IRS regulations and enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article from Phi Delta Kappan.

MORE THAN SEGREGATION ACADEMIES: THE GROWING PROTESTANT FUNDAMENTALIST SCHOOLS

(By Virginia Davis Nordin and William Lloyd Turner)

The most rapidly growing segment of American elementary and secondary education is that of private Protestant fundamentalist schools. The percentage of students attending nonpublic elementary and secondary schools in the U.S. declined from 13.6 percent in 1961 to 10.1 percent in 1971 (the most recent year for which figures are avail-

able).¹ This decline was due almost entirely to a decrease in the enrollment of Roman Catholic schools. Roman Catholic enrollment reached a peak of 5,600,519 in the 1964-65 academic year; it had declined to 3,364,000 by 1976-77, or 40 percent.²

During the same period, the enrollment in non-Catholic, nonpublic schools was increasing. Between 1965 and 1975 the number of students enrolled in such schools increased from 615,548 to 1,433,000, or 134.4 percent, according to an estimate by the Bureau of the Census.³ Total enrollment of all nonpublic schools has declined 22.7 percent during the years 1965-75, according to these estimates.⁴ This increase has been unevenly distributed among non-Catholic populations. While Lutheran school enrollment remained relatively stable during the decade and Adventist and Christian Reformed schools experienced slight declines,⁵ the so-called "Christian" or fundamentalist schools grew rapidly. Exact figures for these schools are difficult to obtain, as they do not all belong to one central organization as is the case with Catholic schools. The majority of such schools, however, belong to one of four major organizations: the National Association of Christian Schools, the American Association of Christian Schools, the Association of Christian Schools International, and Christian Schools International. Enrollment in the schools holding membership in these four organizations has increased from 159,916 in 1971 to 349,679 in 1977, or 118 percent.⁶

Although both the number of fundamentalist schools and the number of students enrolled in them appear to be increasing rapidly in virtually all sections of the U.S., few reliable figures are available, nor do we know much about their methods of operation or the quality of education they provide.⁷ In several states fundamentalist schools have filed suit to prevent the collection of these data; in most states regulation of nonpublic schools is not attempted.

Many authors have charged that these "Christian" schools are only a new type of segregation academy, similar to those that sprang up in the South after passage of the 1965 Civil Rights Act. These "new segregation academies" are said to be adopting a religious guise in order to claim First Amendment guarantees of religious protection and thus escape federal desegregation regulations.⁸ But research conducted in early 1979 on fundamentalist schools in Kentucky and Wisconsin disputes this claim and suggests that the factors producing this new wave of fundamentalist schools are more complex than previously supposed.⁹

This research shows that fundamentalist schools are growing rapidly in both states at present. The number of fundamentalist schools in Kentucky had increased from eight in 1969 to 33 in 1978, or 313%. In Wisconsin the number increased from five to 26 during the same period—420%. Enrollment in Kentucky fundamentalist schools increased from 787 in 1969 to 4,090 in 1978, or 420%. In Wisconsin fundamentalist enrollments increased from 426 in 1969 to 1,592 in 1978, or 274%.¹⁰ This study also found that 72% of Kentucky and 50% of Wisconsin fundamentalist schools did not belong to any national "Christian" school organization, suggesting that the total number of students enrolled in fundamentalist schools in the U.S. is substantially larger than the totals reported by the four national organizations.

While some of the Kentucky schools appear to have profited by widespread public opposition to racial integration, the

growth of fundamentalist schools in rural Wisconsin, where integration is not a factor, indicates that "Christian" education is a national, not a regional, phenomenon. Unlike the "segregation academies" that appeared in the South, these schools do not appear to attract students from a cross section of the community. Parents who enroll their children in these schools tend to come from churches of the sponsoring denomination or from churches holding similar doctrinal positions. The parents and students who patronize them are regular in church attendance and participate actively in the life of their congregations.

As part of the above research, William Turner analyzed two fundamentalist schools in Louisville, Kentucky, and one such school in Madison, Wisconsin. Approximately 20 of these schools have been founded in Louisville during the past decade, and it is frequently asserted that they are being used as one-year "havens" by parents wishing to avoid forced busing. This research does not support that assertion, as the percentage of students in the two fundamentalist schools who were subject to busing during the current school term was smaller than the percentage of such students in the general population. Furthermore, the average student in the survey was found to have been enrolled in his or her present school for a period of four years. Only one of the 68 families surveyed in the Louisville fundamentalist schools was using the nonpublic schools as a "haven" to avoid busing for one year.

While there is no question that nonpublic enrollments in Louisville have increased substantially since the implementation of forced busing in the fall of 1975, families who are entering the nonpublic sector are not doing so on a one-year basis. This research found that once parents had decided to leave the public sector of education, they usually withdrew all of their school-age children simultaneously; and once they had entered the nonpublic sector they tended to remain there for the duration of their children's school careers. There was also little tendency to move from one nonpublic school to another. The majority of persons surveyed also indicated their willingness and ability to continue bearing the cost of nonpublic tuitions for the foreseeable future.

Although the two cities surveyed are geographically distant and have differing cultural backgrounds, fundamentalist parents in both gave the same reasons for withdrawing their children from public schools. Most frequently they alleged poor academic quality of public education, a perceived lack of discipline in public schools, and the fact that the public schools were believed to be promulgating a philosophy of secular humanism that these parents found inimical to their religious beliefs.

While both parents and administrators of "Christian" schools in both states insisted that they were not opposed to integrated education, it was found that more than 95 percent of the students enrolled in fundamentalist schools in these states are white; fewer than 2 percent are black. No black teachers were employed by fundamentalist schools in either state.

The segregated nature of these schools might merely reflect the segregated nature of the sponsoring churches, or it could be a reflection of divergent values in the black and white communities, since respondents indicated that the only blacks who would be permitted to enroll were "those who are willing to abide by our standards." A more basic issue than integrated schools, it appears, is integrated marriage. All respond-

ents from both states strongly opposed interracial marriage, although their reasons for doing so remain unclear.

The majority of students enrolled in these schools also seem to come from relatively stable home backgrounds. Most of the families surveyed could be characterized as middle income (the average family income was \$25,000); 89 of the 91 families surveyed owned their own homes. Only two of the 91 families surveyed had experienced divorce and remarriage, while the divorce rate in the general population is one in two.

While there are relatively few of these schools at present, their potential for growth is considerable, both in number and in enrollment. Baptist schools comprised the largest group of schools in both states. Baptist churches in the U.S. had a total membership in excess of 25 million in 1975, and are the largest Protestant body in this country.¹¹ When other fundamentalist groups that operate schools are added to the Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Adventists, and various Jewish groups engaged in nonpublic education, it is apparent that the impact on public education would be considerable should they withdraw even a slightly larger percentage of their children from the public schools. Any significant trend in this direction could make it far more difficult for public school districts to pass tax referenda and approve bond issues.¹² Furthermore, this trend would be accelerated should any of the tuition tax credit plans now before Congress be enacted.

There is little or no regulation of nonpublic schools in most states, and fundamentalist groups are resisting attempts to impose any.¹³ While this resistance has been successful to date, the issue has not been finally resolved, and it seems likely to be a source of continued controversy. For related reasons, these schools will continue to resist data collection concerning their growth.

The motivation for founding and maintaining nonpublic schools appears to be more than racial prejudice. In recent decades religious influences in American public education have eroded rapidly. Many evangelical Protestants have come to believe that the public schools now espouse a philosophy that is completely secular, perhaps even antireligious. Hence many conservative Protestants have withdrawn their children from public schools and have established sectarian schools with quite different standards and curricula.

Fundamentalist educators perceive a basic philosophical difference between themselves and the leaders of public education. Like the seventeenth-century Puritans, they believe in the "Innate depravity of man." Because they believe that the corrupt nature of humanity can be changed only through a supernatural infusion of Divine grace, religious "conversion" becomes the basis of all education. Furthermore, since human nature is utterly depraved, children require strict supervision and authoritarian guidance if they are not to be overcome by Satan and the evil within their own nature.

Fundamentalists see public education, by contrast, as proceeding on John Dewey's conviction that human nature is basically good, that students will naturally seek the highest and best if left to themselves, and that the adversary is therefore not Satan or an evil nature but poverty, ignorance, and prejudice. Fundamentalists try to approach the educational task from a different philosophical perspective, using different methodology and pursuing different goals.

Because they perceive that the Protestant ethic has disappeared from public education philosophy, fundamentalists have voiced an increasing nostalgia and a desire to return

Footnotes at end of article.

to the practices of former days. One hears frequent references to the "old-time religion," "old-fashioned" virtues, and the "faith of our fathers." This has produced schools that attempt to recreate the environment of past generations. "Rock" music, movies, and most television programs are forbidden; hair and clothing styles resemble those of a by-gone era; textbooks stress "traditional" concepts in math, while education gets "back to the basics." Sex roles are sharply defined, and school policies are enforced through the administration of corporal punishment by an authoritarian teacher or principal.

Like the Amish, with whom they share a common origin, fundamentalists seek the security of the past and have rejected the values of modern society in favor of an earlier and simpler mode of life. This similarity was acknowledged by courts in Kentucky and Ohio, which have granted fundamentalist schools an exemption from state regulation similar to that earlier accorded the Amish.¹⁴

While the Amish are readily identified as a distinct cultural group by the fact that they live in separate communities, reject modern technology, and dress in a distinctive manner, the fundamentalist subculture is less readily apparent. Fundamentalists are dispersed through the larger community, accept most modern technology, and dress in a more conventional (though distinctive) manner. However, like the Amish, they comprise a distinctive cultural group based on religious beliefs. Also, like the Amish, their practice of religion extends to virtually all areas of life. The Kentucky District Court took note of this fact in a recent case involving regulation of private schools, saying:

In the face of truancy charges leveled by the state, what is shown by these plaintiffs . . . is a sober and devout belief that their religious faith should and does pervade every aspect of their lives, their churches, and their schools.¹⁵

Earlier research has failed to grasp this point. Focusing only on the issue of race, researchers have confused fundamentalist religious schools with segregationist academies and have failed to discover the true nature of fundamentalist education. While fundamentalist schools deny that they discriminate on the basis of race, they admit that they discriminate on the basis of religion, and they feel that they have a constitutional right to do so. They cannot recruit mathematical quotas of students randomly from the larger community, as advocated by the Internal Revenue Service, when their institutions are based on religious adherence. In view of the predominantly religious nature of their schools, fundamentalists feel that they are entitled to the same exemption from federal regulations accorded the Amish and other religious groups.

In their 1953 study, *The Small Town in Mass Society*, Arthur Vidich and Joseph Bensenman found that the only ties fundamentalists had to the larger community were political and educational.¹⁶ In this context, the development of religious schools by fundamentalist churches may be viewed as representing a severing of the educational tie and as another step in their withdrawal from the community and from modern society. This withdrawal seems likely to continue and even accelerate, as fundamentalists remain locked into rigid, theologically based positions on many issues while American society moves forward. As this occurs, it seems likely that increasing numbers of fundamentalist parents will withdraw their children from public schools.

As this process accelerates, and we believe it will, American education must assess the impact on society of the withdrawal of large numbers of students from public education. The courts must weigh the parents' right to direct the religious upbringing of their children against the rights of the children as citizens to know, to be exposed to a wide diversity of viewpoints, and to join the mainstream of American society. As is true with all cultural minorities, the relationship of fundamentalists to the larger society presents both a problem and a challenge. At issue is the right to maintain cultural diversity in an increasingly complex and interdependent society.

In the early days of our republic, Henry David Thoreau wrote, "If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer. Let him step to the music which he hears, however measured or far away."¹⁷

Fundamentalists are listening to a different drummer, and they are marching resolutely toward the values of their past. While their right to do so is beyond dispute, one may question whether they should take a growing percentage of America's youth there with them.

FOOTNOTES

1. National Center for Education Statistics, *Statistics of Non-Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, 1971-1972* (Washington, D.C.: NCES, 1973), pp. 5, 6.

2. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary Day Schools* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1976), p. 47.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 6.

4. *Ibid.*

5. National Union of Christian Schools, *1977-1978 Directory* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: NUCS, 1978), p. 21.

6. Based on a telephone interview with Herman Van Schuyver, executive director of the National Association of Christian Schools, 25 September 1978.

7. While total enrollment figures for fundamentalist schools are not available, enrollment in those schools belonging to the four largest fundamentalist school organizations (American Association of Christian Schools, Association of Christian Schools International, National Association of Christian Schools, and Christian Schools International) increased by 118.7% from 1971 to 1977 (the most recent year for which figures are available). The number of member schools in these organizations has increased by 144.8% during the same period.

8. "In the past year, die-hard segregationists who are the parents of school-age children have financed the opening of almost 50 new 'Christian Academies' (in North Carolina). . . ." Harry Golden, *The Nation*, 22 December 1969, p. 697. See also David Nevin and Robert E. Bills, *The Schools That Fear Built* (Washington, D.C.: Acropolis Books, 1976).

9. William Lloyd Turner, "Reasons for Enrollment in Religious Schools: A Case Study of Three Recently Established Fundamentalist Schools in Kentucky and Wisconsin" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1979).

10. It should be noted that these data are based on a response rate of 50% from Kentucky schools and 35% from Wisconsin schools. This underscores the difficulty of collecting such data, and the reluctance of these schools to reveal any information about their educational programs.

11. Frank S. Mead, *Handbook of Denominations in the United States*, 6th ed. (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1975), p. 32.

12. Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers, stated his belief that a loss of as little as 5%-7% of students of these schools would severely "cripple" public schools by depriving them of their best-motivated students and parents. *Education Daily*, 17 January 1979, p. 1.

13. Fundamentalists successfully challenged the right of the state to regulate their schools in Ohio (*Ohio v. Whisner* 351 N.E. 2d 750, Ohio, 1976) and Vermont [*Vermont v. LeBarge*, 134 Vt. 276 (1976)]. Similar challenges are under way in Kentucky (*Kentucky State Board of Education v. Hinton*, Franklin Circuit Court, Division 1, Civil Action No. 88314, 1978) and North Carolina (*State of North*

Carolina v. Columbus Christian Academy et al., 78-OVS-1678).

14. *Kentucky State Board of Education v. Hinton*, *supra*; *Ohio v. Whisner*, *supra*.

15. *Kentucky State Board of Education v. Hinton*, *supra*.

16. Arthur J. Vidich and Joseph Bensenman, *The Small Town in Mass Society* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1968), p. 255.

17. Henry David Thoreau, *Walden*, XVIII (1854). ●

THE ANTIPRIVATE SCHOOL
BIAS OF IRS

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the House will vote on whether to amend the Treasury appropriations bill to block the Internal Revenue Service from harassing private schools. Because we passed two amendments which did just that last year, the IRS has had a very low profile on this issue since then. So let us refresh my colleagues' memories on just one aspect of the proposed revenue procedures which the IRS issued in February of 1979.

IRS wanted to place in a suspect category private schools which were "formed or substantially expanded" during a period of public school desegregation. Once placed in that category, such schools would be assumed guilty until proven innocent. They would bear the burden of satisfying IRS that they do not discriminate.

The implicit assumption behind this proposal is that the main reason why families turn to private schools is racism. The IRS language actually specified that it would be evidence of racial discrimination for a private school to have grown as a result of transfers from the public schools. This assumption is so brazen in its simple mindedness that you would think IRS must be talking about voluntary withdrawals from the Harvard School of Business. But in fact IRS is talking about a school system which, during the last 15 years, has seen the following: A massive shift of decisionmaking power away from parents and local boards toward militant teachers unions and State and Federal bureaucrats; steady decline in academic achievement as measured by standardized tests; an epidemic of theft, vandalism, and violence which has become so serious in some schools that it is necessary to post uniformed guards in the corridors; and a series of mindless experiments in open classrooms, sensitivity training, and other trendy gimmicks. Incredibly, IRS wants to erect as a principle of evidence the assumption that the reason families flee these schools is white racism.

We cannot avoid questioning how the salutary will of the Congress was removed from this year's appropriation bill. Is Internal Revenue still lobbying in this House for the right to in-

terfere in the free exercise of religion? Its unsavory record in the past on interfering with the civil rights of citizens is too well known to need repetition here. It is sufficient to say that the fight to keep private sectarian education out of the brutalizing hands of the IRS is a matter of public record.

Do we need new reminders that Commissioner Kurtz of IRS claimed to strike down private religious schooling as a matter of implementing national social policy. Part of his claim then was that he found that policy in statute. Was the restriction placed in last year's appropriation lost on him? Does he have a source of national public policy unknown to any other Government official?

We are told that a shabby district court decision which ignores the will of Congress binds this body. If we fail to exert our will and if we allow the Jerome Kurtz' of the country to decide what is the national policy on freedom of religion, then we will, by default, have deeded the power of this body to the agencies we are charged to control.

Do we forget so soon that it is the same judiciary which has told us how we may spend the money of the country which now attempts to set the national policy with respect to the free exercise of religion?

Last week Time magazine, June 16, 1980, which is hardly a bastion of racism, devoted its cover story to the crisis in public education. Here are some highlights:

In spite of declining real achievement, "students today get at least 25 percent more A's and B's than they did 15 years ago."

High school seniors who plan to major in education "score lower in English than majors in almost every other field."

Last year 110,000 teachers reported that they had been attacked by students.

I think we can all agree that elected officials at every level should be working to reverse the deterioration of our public schools. But at the same time we need to protect the right of parents to choose private schools. That is why this House voted for tuition tax credits 2 years ago, and that is why we must now vote against the brazenly antiprivate school bias of IRS. There follows a slightly abridged text of last week's article in Time:

HELP! TEACHER CAN'T TEACH!

Like some vast jury gradually and reluctantly arriving at a verdict, politicians, educators and especially millions of parents have come to believe that the U.S. public schools are in parlous trouble. Violence keeps making headlines. Test scores keep dropping. Debate rages over whether or not one-fifth or more adult Americans are functionally illiterate. High school graduates go so far as to sue their school systems because they get respectable grades and a diploma but cannot fill in job application forms correctly. Experts confirm that students today get at least 25% more A's and B's than they did 15 years ago, but know less. A Government-funded nationwide survey group, the National Assessment of Educational Progress, reports that in science, writing, social

studies and mathematics the achievement of U.S. 17-year-olds has dropped regularly over the past decade.

Rounding up the usual suspects in the learning crisis is easy enough. The decline of the family that once instilled respect for authority and learning. The influence of television on student attention span. The disruption of schools created by busing, and the national policy of keeping more students in school longer, regardless of attitude or aptitude. The conflicting demands, upon the public school system, which is now expected not only to teach but to make up for past and present racial and economic injustice.

But increasingly too, parents have begun to blame the shortcomings of the schools, on the lone and very visible figure at the front of the classroom. Teachers for decades have been admired for selfless devotion. More recently, as things went wrong, they were pitied as over-worked martyrs to an overburdened school system. Now bewildered and beleaguered, teachers are being blamed—rightly or wrongly—for much of the trouble, in the classroom.

One reason is simply that it is easier for society to find someone to blame than to hold up a mirror and see that U.S. culture itself is largely responsible. But the new complaints about teaching also arise from a dismaying discovery; quite a few teachers (estimates range up to 20%) simply have not mastered the basic skills in reading, writing and arithmetic that they are supposed to teach.

Of course, among the 2.2 million teachers in the nation's public schools are hundreds of thousands of skilled and dedicated people who, despite immense problems, manage to produce the miraculous blend of care and discipline, energy, learning and imagination that good teaching requires. Many newcomers to the field are still attracted by the dream of helping children rather than for reasons of security or salary. The estimated average salary of elementary school teachers is \$15,661, and of high school teachers \$16,387, for nine months' work. The average yearly pay of a plumber is about \$19,700; for a government clerk it's approximately \$15,500. The best-educated and most selfless teachers are highly critical and deeply concerned about the decline in teaching standards and educational procedures. Their frustration is perhaps the strongest warning signal of all.

Horror stories about teaching abound. In Oregon a kindergarten teacher who had been given As and Bs at Portland State University was recently found to be functionally illiterate. How could this be? Says Acting Dean of the School of Education Harold Jorgensen: "It was a whole series of people not looking closely at her."

In Chicago a third-grade teacher wrote on the blackboard: "Put the following words in alphabetical order." During the weeklong teacher strike last winter, many Chicago parents were appalled by what they saw on television news of schools and teachers. Recalls one mother. "I froze when I heard a teacher tell a TV reporter, 'I teaches English.'"

In the Milwaukee suburb of Wales, Wis., school board members were outraged when teachers sent them written curriculum proposals riddled with bad grammar and spelling. Teachers had written debate for debate, document for document. Would was woud, and separate was seperate. Angry parents waved samples of their children's work that contained uncorrected whoppers, marked with such teacher comments as "outstanding" and "excellent."

A Gallup poll has found that teacher laziness and lack of interest are the most frequent accusations of half the nation's parents, who complain that students get "less schoolwork" now than 20 years ago. Whether the parent perceptions are fair or not, there is no doubt that circumstances have certainly changed some teacher attitudes. At a Miami senior high school this spring, one social studies teacher asked his pupils whether their homework was completed. Half the students said no. The teacher recorded their answers in his gradebook but never bothered to collect the papers. Says the teacher, who has been in the profession for 15 years and has now become dispirited: "I'm not willing any more to take home 150 notebooks and grade them. I work from 7:30 a.m. to 2 p.m., and that's what I get paid for." A longtime teacher in a large suburban school outside Boston told Time it is common knowledge that some of her colleagues, anxious to preserve their jobs as enrollments dwindle, fall children simply to ensure hefty class size the next year.

The new doubts about teachers have led to a state-by-state demand from legislators and citizen groups that teachers take special examinations to prove they are competent, much like the student competency exams that they have become a requirement in 38 states. Asks Indiana State Senator Joan Gubbins: "Shouldn't we first see if the teachers are competent before we expect the kids to be competent?"

With 41 million pupils, public school education is one of the nation's largest single government activities. Current expenditures (federal, state and local) run to \$95 billion. So vast and costly an educational system does not cheerfully react to criticism or adapt to change.

The push toward testing teacher competency, however, depends less on Washington than on state and local governments. One of the most instructive battles fought over the issue occurred in Mobile, Ala., and was led by conservative attorney Dan Alexander, president of the board of education. In 1978, after the board required competency testing of Mobile high school seniors, Alexander was besieged by angry parents, at least partly because 53 percent of the students who took the city's first competency exam flunked it. Recalls Alexander: "Parents came out of the woodwork saying, 'If you're going to crack down on my child, let me tell you about some of my children's teachers.'" One parent brought him a note sent home by a fifth-grade teacher with a master's degree, which read in part: "Scott is dropping in his studies he acts as if he don't Care. Scott want pass in his assignment at all, he had a poem to learn and he fell to do it." Says Alexander: "I was shocked. I could not believe we had teachers who could not write a grammatically correct sentence. I took the complaints down to the superintendent, and what shocked me worse was that he wasn't shocked."

Alexander made the note public as the kickoff of a campaign for teacher testing. Says he: "Competency testing is probably a misnomer. You cannot test a teacher on whether he's competent, but you certainly can prove he's incompetent." The proposed exams for veteran teachers were blocked by Alexander's colleagues on the board. But they agreed that all new teachers should score at least 500 on the Educational Testing Service's 3¼-hr. National Teacher Examination (N.T.E.) which measures general knowledge, reading, writing and arithmetic. Only about half of the Mobile job applicants who took the N.T.E. in 1979 passed.

The American Federation of Teachers, which has 550,000 members, is opposed to

testing experienced teachers, though it approves competency exams for new candidates. The much larger National Education Association is against any kind of competency testing for teachers, claiming teacher competency cannot be measured by written tests. Even so, some form of teacher testing has been approved in twelve states.¹ Proposals for teacher testing have been introduced in Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, New York, Vermont and Wisconsin, and a bill in Oklahoma is scheduled to be signed into law this week. Polls say the teacher-testing movement is supported by 85% of U.S. adults.

Thus far actual test scores of teacher applicants seem depressing. In Louisiana, for instance, only 53% passed in 1978, 63% last year. What about the ones who fail? Says Louisiana Certification Director Jacqueline Lewis: "Obviously they're moving out of state to teach in states where the tests are not required." The results of basic achievement tests taken by job applicants at Florida's Pinellas County school board (St. Petersburg, Clearwater) are not encouraging. Since 1976, the board has required teacher candidates to read at an advanced tenth-grade level and solve math problems at an eighth-grade level. Though all had their B.A. in hand, about one-third of the applicants (25% of the whites, 79% of the blacks) flunked Pinellas' test the first time they took it in 1979.

In 1900, when only 6% of U.S. children graduated from high school, secondary school teachers were looked up to as scholars of considerable learning. Public school teachers were essential to what was regarded as the proud advance of U.S. education. By 1930, 30% of American 17-year-olds were graduating from high school, and by the mid-1960s, graduates totaled 70%. The American public school was hailed for teaching citizenship and common sense to rich and poor, immigrant and native-born children, and for giving them a common democratic experience. "The public school was the true melting pot," William O. Douglas once wrote, "and the public school teacher was the leading architect of the new America that was being fashioned."

The academic effectiveness of the system was challenged in 1957, when the Soviet Union launched its Sputnik satellite. Almost overnight, it was perceived that American training was not competitive with that of the U.S.S.R. Public criticism and government funds began to converge on U.S. schools. By 1964, achievement scores in math and reading had risen to an alltime high. But in the '60s the number of students (and teachers too) was expanding tremendously as a result of the maturing crop of post-World War II babies. In the decade before 1969, the number of high school teachers almost doubled, from 575,000 to nearly 1 million. Writes Reading Expert Paul Copperman in *The Literacy Hoax*: "The stage was set for an academic tragedy of historic proportions as the nation's high school faculty, about half of whom were young and immature, prepared to meet the largest generation of high school students in American history." To compound the problem, many teachers had been radicalized by the 1960s. They suspected that competition was immoral, grades undemocratic, and promotion based on merit and measurable accomplishment a likely way to discriminate against minorities and the poor. Ever since the mid-1960s, the average achievement of high school graduates has gone steadily downhill.

¹Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia.

Ironically, the slide occurred at a time when teachers were getting far more training than ever before. In the early 1900s, few elementary school teachers went to college; most were trained at two-year normal schools. Now a bachelor's degree from college is a general requirement for teaching. Today's teaching incompetence reflects the lax standards in many of the education programs at the 1,150 colleges around the country that train teachers. It also reflects on colleges generally, since teachers take more than half their courses in traditional departments like English, history and mathematics.

Research by W. Timothy Weaver, an associate professor of education at Boston University, seems to confirm a long-standing charge that one of the easiest U.S. college majors is education. Weaver found the high school seniors who planned to major in education well below the average for all college-bound seniors—34 points below average in verbal scores on the 1976 Scholastic Aptitude Test, 43 points below average in math. Teaching majors score lower in English than majors in almost every other field.

Evidence that many graduates of teacher-training programs cannot read, write or do sums adequately has led educators like Robert L. Egbert, president of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, to urge higher standards on his colleagues. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education has become warier about issuing its seal of approval, which is largely honorific, since state boards of education issue their own, often easygoing approval for teacher-training programs. Nevertheless, with an awakened interest in "consumer protection" for parents and pupils, the council denied accreditation to teacher-training programs at 31% of colleges reviewed in 1979, compared with 10% in 1973. Says Salem, Ore., School Superintendent William Kendrick: "For too long, we've believed that if you hold a teaching certificate you can do the job."

Many teachers favor rigorous teaching standards, including the use of compulsory minimum-competency tests—at least for candidates starting out in their careers. They are dismayed by the public's disapproval. Says Linda Kovacic, 32, a teacher at Olympic Continuation High School in Santa Monica, Calif.: "The administration tells you you're doing a crummy job, parents tell you you're doing a crummy job, kids even tell you you're doing a crummy job. A lot of teachers these days feel and look like soldiers who returned from Viet Nam. You see the same glazed look in their eyes."

Many teachers have come to see themselves as casualties in a losing battle for learning and order in an indulgent age. Society does not support them, though it expects them to compensate in the classroom for racial prejudice, economic inequality and parental indifference. Says American School Board Journal Managing Editor Jerome Cramer: "Schools are now asked to do what people used to ask God to do." The steady increase in the number of working mothers (35% work full time now) has sharply reduced family supervision of children and thrown many personal problems into the teacher's lap, while weakening support for the teacher's efforts. Says Thomas Anderson, 31, who plans to quit this month after teaching social studies for seven years in Clearwater, Fla.: "I know more about some of my kids than their mothers or fathers do."

A teacher's view, in short, of why teachers cannot teach is that teachers are not allowed to teach. "The teacher today is expected to be mother, father, priest or rabbi,

peacekeeper, police officer, playground monitor and lunchroom patrol," says David Imig, executive director of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. "Over and above that, he's supposed to teach Johnny and Mary how to read." Adds Edith Shain, a veteran kindergarten teacher at the Hancock Park School in Los Angeles: "The teacher doesn't know who she has to please. She's not as autonomous as she once was."

In the past 15 years the number of teachers with 20 years or more experience has dropped by nearly half. Four out of ten claim they plan to quit before retirement. In 1965 more than half of America's teachers told polltakers they were happy in their work. Now barely a third say they would become teachers if they had to make the choice again.

For many teachers, whether to leave their profession is not seen as a question of choice, or economics, but as a matter of emotional necessity. The latest pedagogic phenomenon is something called "teacher burnout." It is a psychological condition, produced by stress, that can result in anything from acute loss of will to suicidal tendencies, ulcers, migraine, colitis, dizziness, even the inability to throw off chronic, and perhaps psychosomatic, colds.

This spring the first national conference on teacher burnout was held in New York City. Surprisingly, the syndrome seems nearly as common in small towns and well-off suburbs as in big cities. The National Education Association has already held more than 100 local workshops round the country to help teachers cope with the problem, which University of California Social Psychologist Ayala Pines defines as "physical, emotional and attitudinal exhaustion." Last March, Stress Consultant Marian Leibowitz held a burnout seminar in Edwardsville, Ill. (pop. 11,982). It drew a paying audience of 250 to a hall big enough for only 100.

According to Dr. Herbert Padres, director of the National Institute of Mental Health, what emerges from the familiar litany of teacher complaints is that administrative headaches and even physical assaults on teachers can be psychologically less wounding than the frustrating fact that teachers feel unable to do enough that is constructive and rewarding in their classrooms. Whether it is blackboard jungle, red-tape jumble, a place of learning or a collective holding pen for the hapless young, the modern classroom, teachers claim, is out of teachers' control. Some reasons:

DISCIPLINE AND VIOLENCE

Last year 110,000 teachers, 5% of the U.S. total, reported they were attacked by students, an increase of 57% over 1977-78. Teachers believe administrators tend to duck the subject of violence in the schools to avoid adverse publicity. More than half the teachers assaulted feel that afterward authorities did not take adequate action. Today one in eight high school teachers says he "hesitates to confront students out of fear." One in every four reports that he has had personal property stolen at school.

Since the *Wood vs. Strickland* Supreme Court decision of 1975, which upheld the right to due process of students accused of troublemaking, the number of students expelled from school has dropped by about 30%. As always in a democracy, the problem of expulsion turns in part on the question of concern for the rights of the disruptive individual vs. the rights of classmates and of society. School officials argue that it is wiser and more humane to keep a violent or disruptive student in school than to turn him

loose on the streets. But, says John Kotaskis of the Chicago Teachers Union, "schools are now being asked to be more tolerant of disruptive or criminal behavior than society." In a Washington, D.C. high school, a jealous boy tried to shoot his girlfriend in class. The boy was briefly suspended from school. No other action was taken. Says a teacher from that school: "These days if you order a student to the principal's office, he won't go. Hall monitors have to be called to drag him away."

STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD LEARNING

In a current hit song called *Another Brick in the Wall*, the rock group Pink Floyd brays: "We don't need no education." There is near unanimity among teachers that many students are defiantly uninterested in schoolwork. Says one West Coast teacher: "Tell me kids haven't changed since we were in high school, and I'll tell you you're living in a fantasy world." A New York panel investigated declining test scores and found that homework assignments had been cut nearly in half during the years from 1968 to 1977. Why? Often simply because students refuse to do them. Blame for the shift in student attitude has been assigned to such things as Watergate, the Viet Nam War, the Me culture. Also to television, which reduces attention span. Now there are 76 million TV homes in the U.S., vs. only 10 million in 1950. By age 18, the average American has spent an estimated 15,000 hours in front of the set, far more time than in school. Whatever the figures, teachers agree, television is a hard act to follow.

SHIFTING TIDES OF THEORY

Because it is American, American education dreams of panaceas—universal modern cures for the ancient pain of learning, easy ways to raise test scores and at the same time prepare the "whole child" for his role in society. Education has become a tormented field where armies of theorists clash, frequently using language that is unintelligible to the layman. Faddish theories sweep through the profession, changing standards, techniques, procedures. Often these changes dislocate students and teachers to little purpose. The New Math is an instructive example. Introduced in the early '60s without adequate tryout, and poorly understood by teachers and parents, the New Math eventually was used in more than half the nation's schools. The result: lowered basic skills and test scores in elementary math. Exotic features, like binary arithmetic, have since been dropped. Another trend is the "open classroom," with its many competing "learning centers," which can turn a class into a bulpen of babble. There was the look-say approach to reading (learning to read by recognizing a whole word), which for years displaced the more effective "phonics" (learning to read by sounding out syllables).

Pedagogues seeking a "science of education" are sometimes mere comic pinpricks in a teacher's side. For example, Ph.D. theses have been written on such topics as Service in the High School Cafeteria, Student Posture and Public School Plumbing. But many studies are hard on teacher morale. Sociologist James S. Coleman's celebrated 1966 survey of pupil achievement seemed glum news for teachers. That study argued that family background made almost all the difference, and that qualities of schools and teachers, good and bad, accounted "for only a small fraction of differences in pupil achievement." Later researchers, examining Coleman's work, found that pupils do seem to learn more when they receive more hours of instruction.

The sensible thing for any effective teacher would be to fend off such theories as best

he can and go on teaching. As teachers are fond of saying, "Teaching occurs behind closed doors." But theory, some of it foolish and damaging, inexorably seeps under the doors and into the classrooms. For example, the sound idea that teachers should concentrate on whetting the interests of students and stirring creativity has been unsoundly used as an excuse to duck detailed schoolwork. Says Columbia's Teachers College Professor Diane Ravitch: "It is really putting things backward to say that if children feel good about themselves, then they will achieve. Instead, if children are learning and achieving, then they feel good about themselves." Ravitch believes U.S. education has suffered much from such pedagogic theories, and especially from the notion, which emerged from the social climate of the 1960s, that the pursuit of competency is "elitist and undemocratic."

TEXTBOOKS AND PAPERWORK

Teachers are consulted about textbooks but rarely decide what books are finally bought. The textbook business is a \$1.3 billion a year industry. Books are ordered by editorial committees and updated at the pleasure of the publisher to sell in as many school systems as possible. Since the late 1960s, according to Reading Expert Copperman, publishers have found that if a textbook is to sell really well, it must be written at a level "two years below the grade for which it is intended."

Paperwork done by teachers and administrators for district, state and national agencies proliferates geometrically. Though it all may be necessary to some distant bureaucrat—a most unlikely circumstance—when teachers comply they tend to feel like spindling, folding and mutilating all the forms. Paperwork wastes an enormous amount of teaching time. In Atlanta, for example, fourth- and fifth-grade teachers must evaluate their students on 60 separate skills. The children must be rated on everything from whether they can express "written ideas clearly" to whether they can apply "scarcity, opportunity cost and resource allocation to local, national and global situations."

ADMINISTRATIVE HASSLES

School procedures, the size and quality of classes, the textbooks and time allotted to study are all affected by government demands, including desegregation of classes, integration of faculty, even federal food programs. One way or another, teachers are bureaucratically hammered at by public health officials (about vaccinations, ringworm, cavities, malnutrition), by social workers and insurance companies (about driver education and broken windows), by juvenile police, civil liberties lawyers, Justice Department lawyers, even divorce lawyers (about child custody).

MAINSTREAMING AS NIGHTMARE

Since the passage of Public Law 94-142 in 1975, it has been federal policy that all handicapped children, insofar as possible, be "mainstreamed," i.e., educated in the same class with everyone else. The law is theoretically useful and just, as a means of avoiding unwarranted discrimination. But in practice it often puts an overwhelming strain on the teacher. "Mainstreaming is ludicrous," says Detroit Counselor Jeanne Latcham. "We have children whose needs are complicated: a child in the third grade who has already been in 16 schools, children who need love and attention and disrupt the classroom to get it. Ten percent of the students in Detroit's classrooms can't conform and can't learn. These children need a disproportionate amount of the teacher's time. It's a

teacher's nightmare—she can't help them, but she never forgets them." ●

ON ALERT FOR MISSILE ATTACK

HON. LARRY J. HOPKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, the House Armed Services Committee took the opportunity a few weeks ago to listen to the testimony of Colonel Beckwith, leader of the Delta team which attempted the Tehran rescue mission. Because the Congress has not investigated thoroughly the malfunctions experienced by another Delta team, this one from the Strategic Air Command, I am submitting a reporter's documentation of the events which took place on June 2 in an underground command post at Cheyenne Mountain, Colo. The Pentagon stated its belief at a press conference yesterday that a dime-sized piece of hardware probably caused two false alarms last week in the Nation's strategic early warning system.

While the Congress was assured that there would be no recurrence of last November's false warning, the Pentagon is currently exploring ways to improve the error detection and correction abilities of this important component in our national security. We have been assured that there never was any danger due to other controls, including human judgments. I hope my colleagues, the American people, and all nations of the world can feel safer after reviewing the events of June 2 as interpreted by this journalist.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, June 16, 1980]

ON ALERT FOR MISSILE ATTACK

(By Joseph Albright)

OMAHA, NEB.—A few minutes before midnight on June 2, the five members of the Strategic Air Command's Delta Team descended into the underground command post, carrying their lunch in brown bags, ready for another eight-hour wait to see if the computers would say the Soviet Union had started World War III.

Their mission was to make certain America's nuclear forces aren't destroyed in a Pearl Harbor-like missile attack. They have to do it in a way that won't dispatch even one American warhead toward Russia by accident.

Delta Team was about to be thrown up against a different kind of threat, this one from an errant computer at another underground command post at the North American Air Defense Command's Cheyenne Mountain complex in Colorado.

Their performance was less dashing, but much more successful and maybe just as heroic, as that of the similarly named Army Delta Team which led the U.S. commando raid to rescue American hostages in Iran.

For security reasons, SAC has not identified the five Air Force officers and enlisted men who, along with counterparts at NORAD and in Washington, kept the false computer alert from triggering anything worse. But SAC did allow a Cox Newspapers reporter to spend about an hour in the com-

mand post watching an emergency action team at work.

From interviews with SAC command-and-control officials and other sources in Washington, one impression emerged quite clearly: this time, at least, the United States really wasn't—as one headline writer put it—"one moment from Nuclear War."

Of course Delta Team didn't know that when the first warning came in from NORAD between 1 and 2 a.m. on June 3.

The team's Warning System Controller—a captain or a major—received that staggering message on one of the two TV-like screens of his computer terminal. The terminal looks like a small piano organ with two computer keyboards instead of musical keys.

Although SAC won't discuss this warning message, sources elsewhere have said it reported a very large Russian missile attack, with scores and scores of warheads already flying toward America from Russia and from Russian submarines off U.S. coasts.

A single one-megaton warhead detonated in the air over a metropolitan area would kill one million people and wound two million others, not counting additional casualties from radiation, a spokesman for the U.S. Defense Nuclear Agency said last week.

So in the first few instants, Delta Team had to deal with a situation that might be either a computer glitch or an attack that might kill 50 million Americans.

The Warning System Controller, nicknamed the "Wisc," had only to turn to his right to inform the key senior SAC duty officer in the command post, known as the SAC senior controller. He sits at a desk of his own which looks like a telephone operator's work place.

No doubt the senior controller and the 10 or so other men in the Command Post knew already knew something was up. As soon as NORAD transmits an alert message, the Wisc's terminal starts beeping.

Almost immediately, the Wisc tapped a command on one of his two keyboards to display the all-important "decision matrix" from the memory of a SAC computer. The matrix, whose details are classified, is a checklist telling the senior controller precisely what he can do on his own and what actions certain higher officials, such as the four-star general in charge of SAC, can take on their own.

The senior controller is always a full colonel whose personal life has been checked by Air Force security agents to make sure he is stable and unsusceptible to blackmail.

At any time, five colonels serve on a rotating basis as senior controllers, each heading one of the alphabetically-designated SAC emergency action teams. All his subordinates on the team are checked with equal rigor under the so-called Personnel Reliability Program, as are the six others who serve in supporting jobs in the command post on any shift.

During the three-minute, 12-second alert, the senior controller took at least three actions. He called his superior, a brigadier general. He called Gen. Richard Ellis, the four-star who commands SAC. And most important, he used the red telephone to order all SAC's bomber and missile units to a slightly higher state of readiness.

The red telephone is SAC's primary alerting system for the crews of U.S. Minuteman and Titan missiles and for the B-52 and FB-111 nuclear bombers. "It's hot to all units of SAC," explained Maj. Jim Platt, a briefing officer.

To use it, the senior controller touches a red button on his switchboard, which activates a warbling tone throughout the tennis

court-sized command post. Immediately, a red whirling light—like that of a speeding police car—casts eerie arcs across the six huge display boards that cover the front wall of the command post.

To reach all SAC command posts simultaneously, the senior controller uses a call signal, "Skybird." That means the message applies to every unit.

In the June 3 false alert, the senior controller—possibly after checking with higher officers in SAC—took at least three precautionary steps. He ordered all 153 U.S. missile launch crews at their remote launching sites in the Western United States to stay by their consoles for further instructions. If some of them were reading or making lunch, the order from SAC brought them to attention—but did not change the condition of their missiles.

As for the nuclear bombers at SAC's 20 bomber bases around the country, the SAC controller took two quick steps. He roused the crews out of their alert shelters and ordered them to their battle stations inside the planes. Next, requiring a separate decision by the SAC senior controller, he ordered pilots to fire up the sometimes balky engines of the bombers—but not to begin taxiing.

Under SAC's long-standing and laboriously constructed procedures, the controller did not simply pick up the red phone and start talking.

It is up to the man sitting at a desk on his right, known as the Emergency Action Officer Controller, to prepare an exact written message that includes everything the senior controller wants to say. The Emergency Action Officer Controller—a major—must always be checked by a senior non-commissioned officer, known as the Emergency Action NCO Controller, to make sure the message is accurately transcribed.

Once these two have drafted the message, the senior controller checks it, and then one of the three reads it over the red phone while a second looks over his shoulder to make sure the words were read clearly.

All this is part of SAC's adherence to the nuclear "two-man" rule, which holds that no one person can do anything with a nuclear weapon. It is a derivative of an even more fundamental rule that only the President is allowed to release a nuclear weapon.

Actually, it takes less time to get a message onto the red phone than it takes to describe the safeguard procedures surrounding it. "You can do it damn quickly but you can do it exactly right," said one Air Force colonel.

Despite widespread myths, the hotline from Washington is not a red telephone. It is yellow. On its dial the inscription: "JCS Alerting Network to All Units/Specified Commands."

It is over the yellow telephone that the SAC commander in chief can expect to receive an order passed down from the president to launch an American retaliatory attack. That is, if the SAC command post hasn't already been demolished. In that case, both the president and surviving SAC officers would presumably be transmitting orders from their separate flying command posts—planes kept constantly ready for takeoff at Andrews Air Force Base near Washington and at Offutt Air Force Base, where SAC's command post is situated.

To make sure that some SAC official will always be at the other end of the yellow telephone, SAC keeps a succession of "looking glass" communications planes flying random eight-hour shifts over the central United States.

One little-known aspect of the system is the SAC senior controller's "patch." It is a simple electronic switching device that allows him to "patch" the yellow phone into the red phone. Once the "patch" has been connected, the top officials in the Pentagon's command center can talk directly to all missile launch and bomber crews.

Using a separate electronic patch between the White House and the Pentagon, the president himself could theoretically talk to the missile crews.

At least in theory, this system would allow the president to retain absolute control over the release of nuclear weapons. He could, if he chose, require that the firing codes for nuclear weapons consist of two sets of digits—one to be transmitted by the president and another by SAC headquarters.

On June 3, the supposed threat evaporated even as the SAC bomber pilots in places like Loring Air Force Base, Maine, were running toward their planes.

Someone in the SAC command center, presumably the Wisc officer, figured out that the warning from NORAD was based on faulty information of some sort. Within 15 seconds, one of the Delta Team members tapped out the appropriate instructions on the computer console to get direct readings from the country's array of missile warning sensors. What the computer reported back is that none of the sensors had noticed anything wrong.

"We get our tactical information from NORAD," said briefer Jim Platt. This is part of an old division of labor within the Air Force—that NORAD has the radars and satellites and assimilates the information to issue battle alerts. Then it is up to SAC to keep its force from being wiped out on the ground.

As warning times have shortened, succeeding Secretaries of Defense have found it wise to bypass NORAD with some of the warning signals, making sure that it as well as SAC and the Pentagon's command post have the same sensor data simultaneously.

So it was possible, within seconds, for Delta Team to query the huge PAVE PAWS radar installation in Massachusetts to find that it had found no sign of a submarine-launched missile rising off the East Coast. PAVE PAWS, which sends 1,000 pulsing radar beams in a 240 degree arc, became operational under SAC's direct management in early 1980.

Another PAVE PAWS installation is still being tested in California. Until it goes on line later this year, the Air Force must rely on an older radar network to detect sub launches, known as the FSS-7, or "Fuzzy 7", system.

The Delta Team may also have had the ability to bypass NORAD and obtain direct readings from the radar systems in Greenland, Alaska, England and several other classified sites that are assigned to detect launches of missiles from Tyuratam, a big missile base in the Soviet Union, as well as all other Russian ground-based sites.

Still other sensor readings were no doubt available from America's spy satellites, which detect the booster flame of any missile and report the data to NORAD.

As it happens, it was the Delta Team which acted first, within 15 seconds, to figure out that some computer somewhere was wrong. If the men on duty—no females have yet been assigned to emergency action teams—had been more opaque that morning, their counterparts at NORAD or at the Pentagon command post could have solved the computer glitch by taking the same set of actions.

The alert ended with a telephone conference call between a SAC general—presumably one of those roused by the senior controller—and the ranking duty officers at NORAD and the Pentagon command post. Using a long-established procedure, they "voted" that there was no real threat all along.

For Delta Team, it was back to the old routine, with no secret meetings with the president, no book offers, no medals.●

HONORING GEORGE A. ESCOFIE

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, 1980, the Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce holds its 59th annual installation and awards banquet to honor its 1979-80 president, George A. Escofie. I would like to take this opportunity to join in paying tribute to Mr. Escofie before this distinguished body.

George, the assistant branch manager at Home Bank in Redondo Beach, Calif., has a long record of community activism. His civic involvement has led to service on the Redondo Beach City Board of Education as a trustee, the Redondo Beach Coordinating Council, and the Aviation/Artesia Task Force. He is also a past president of the Redondo Beach Jaycees.

As a member of the Independent Bankers Association and a one-time regional credit manager for the Firestone Tire and Rubber Co., George's business and financial background enabled him to revitalize many chamber of commerce committees. His energizing approach greatly accounts for the 25 percent chamber membership increase in 1979-80.

Among the innovative projects initiated by Mr. Escofie during his tenure are the beach cleanup program, a summer old-fashioned community picnic/concert, a new Community Business magazine, a holiday decorating contest, and an export symposium. These events complemented the chamber's existing calendar which includes the international surf festival, the South Bay Medal of Valor luncheon, and the Redondo Beach super bowl 10K run, which is the west coast's largest.

This former Outstanding Young Man for the City of Redondo Beach (1979) and Redondo Beach Jaycee of the Year (1978) has given a great deal to his community. George's years of dedicated service are a reminder of the tremendous impact one man can have in our society.

Well done, George. Redondo Beach is indeed lucky to have you.●

STILL CHASING LOBBYISTS TOO FAR

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial recently appeared in the New York Times which addresses one of the central concerns with lobby disclosure legislation being considered in Congress. I feel that the article is worth calling to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial explores the difficulties in requiring disclosure of the grassroots efforts of lobbying organizations. It makes the point in a cogent way that these grassroots efforts ought not to be hampered—rather they should be encouraged. Grassroots lobbying efforts are a key element in the exercise of our constitutionally guaranteed rights of freedom of speech and petitioning the Government. No compelling case has been made for a regulation of the exercise of this right.

When the House Judiciary Committee marked up lobbying disclosure legislation earlier in this Congress, it wisely chose not to attempt to require disclosure of grassroots efforts. As the Senate Government Affairs Committee takes up this sensitive issue later this week, I hope that they will reach the same conclusion. Our respect for the Constitution and the rights it guarantees demands that they do.

The editorial from the June 17, 1980, New York Times follows:

STILL CHASING LOBBYISTS TOO FAR

Senator Lawton Chiles and some fellow reformers in Congress simply will not let go of their misguided pursuit of the "grassroots lobbyists." Having usefully made lobbyists accountable for their conduct on Capitol Hill, they insist on pursuing them out among the citizenry to require disclosure of their propaganda tactics, sources of money and hidden hand in organized letterwriting to Congress.

We think we understand the problem. Lawmakers' lives have, in fact, been complicated by the growing skill of special interest groups at stirring up the folks back home. But one group's special interest is another's public interest. And while a lobbyist in Congress and his paymasters should be known, their political communication and activities among the public should normally be free and uncontrolled. If Congressmen cannot distinguish between private mail from constituents and an organized barrage of letters from the National Rifle Association or Common Cause, they're probably in the wrong line of work. And if on some new issue they're in doubt, what's wrong with a little concern about the true views of their constituents?

The effort to regulate grassroots politicking has at least become more moderate. The reformers are willing to settle now for civil instead of criminal penalties for violations of their code. They still want disclosure of the names of companies that donate money

to lobby groups but no longer the names of individuals. They would still, however, require elaborate disclosures, including the names of all involved and itemized expenses, from any group that spends \$5,000 to promote a legislative purpose. The law would apply even to Boy Scout headquarters if, besides talking to Congressmen, it spends \$5,000 to ask old Scouts to support a bill aimed at delinquency. It would cover a group that, besides lobbying legislators, spends \$5,000 on a newspaper ad exhorting readers to urge Congress to block nuclear plants.

Without such disclosure, the reformers contend, existing controls on lobbyists will become meaningless. All their major activities must be known, they say, and this can be revealed without infringing the rights of citizens.

But lobbyists are citizens, guaranteed free speech. Political debate, in Justice William Brennan's words, "should be uninhibited, robust and wide open." Grassroots lobbying presents no compelling danger that justifies interference with organized petition. Indeed, we find it hard to distinguish from other political activity. The proposed regulations would impose legal and accounting costs that amount to a tax on political effort and would be especially burdensome to smaller groups. Those letter-blizzards in Congress may occasionally make it harder to know what the voters really think. But the public in fact is never unprompted, and the right to prompt is worth cherishing.●

APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGY: THE DEBATE SHIFTS FROM TECHNOLOGY TO POLICY

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the term "appropriate technology" is now commonly used, even though the definition continues to be debated. The success of individual appropriate technology programs, such as the Department of Energy's small grant program for appropriate technology, has only added to the acceptance of this concept in certain circumstances.

Today the appropriate technology debate is moving away from arguments of technological feasibility to more fundamental discussions of economies of scale, local control over development policies, and concepts of efficiency. While any policy can be oversold, and any program can be improperly implemented, I believe the return to appropriate technologies is a trend which will continue, and should be encouraged by the Federal Government. Certainly our Federal policies in the past have strongly encouraged the development of large-scale technologies, including many of those which have been identified as part of the problem in modern society. But beyond this question of individual technologies is the mindset about development which is, in my view, at the

center of the debate over the role of appropriate technology.

An excellent article on this topic appeared in a recent edition of *Chemical and Engineering News*. I commend it to my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the *Chemical and Engineering News*, June 16, 1980]

APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGY PRODS SCIENCE
POLICY

(By Wil Lepkowski)

Some call it "Tinkertoy technology." Others are even less kind and dub it the plaything of assorted dropouts, gurus, radicals, activists, utopians, and other inarticulates of the blue jeans set. The science establishment shuns it. A growing portion of the public wants it. The country grew up on it.

The "it" is appropriate technology. And by now it has so many meanings and connotations that its originators want to drop the name altogether and focus on its economic and political aims of community self-reliance. But what seems clear is that the movement is growing, is beginning to penetrate the thinking of such staid institutions as various state agricultural extension services, and is fast developing a theoretical base that could be hard to assail.

The hardware of appropriate technology is well known: windmills, greenhouses, aquaculture systems, solar panels, geodesic domes, wood-burning stoves, compost heaps, methane generators, waterless toilets, alcohol stills, all the way down to the humble shovel.

Appropriate technology's literature is colorful—from the thoughtful journal *Ambio*, published in Sweden, to *Mother Earth News* of Hendersonville, N.C. Its "official" journal is *Co-Evolution Quarterly*, published by those who produced "The Whole Earth Catalogue." Its middle class sophisticates read *Country Journal*. Those with their fists in the air and fire in their eyes read *Science For The People*.

What the movement all too obviously lacks is a solid social analysis. But its founding father was a solid economist, E. F. Schumacher, author of "Small is Beautiful—Economics as if People Mattered." Its theoretical foundations lie in the book, "The Entropy Law and the Economic Process," by Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen, an international luminary in analytical economics.

In the U.S. appropriate technology boasts almost 3000 separate centers of activity around the country, according to the National Center for Appropriate Technology (NCAT), a federal agency located in Butte, Mont.

There are two roots now from which appropriate technology is feeding, explains Ed Kepler, director of the national center. "One is the counterculture orientation that had as its model pretty much the overseas application of technologies described by Schumacher. The other is the interest of government and the private sector in solving the energy problem. The people who come out of the movement side fear that social values and cultural change—the values of democracy—will be lost sight of as big money comes through.

"To me," he says, "if appropriate technology didn't move out of that counterculture phase, it would be seen just as a cult phenomenon. What NCAT is trying to do is play it both ways and preserve the best of both roots."

Many in the appropriate technology movement fear that during the 1980's two opposing lines will form, separating what they view as the big and the mighty from the many hankering for the simple life

devoid of the confusions and complexities wrought by technologies that violate the natural laws of the biosphere. They charge that conventional science policy, which sets research and technological priorities, is stuck in the paradigm of separate disciplines and by the attitude of "objectivity" is a passive and sometimes active coconspirator in a general rape of the Earth.

They believe that the decay process is already moving at an alarming rate and point to the soon-to-be-released Global 2000 study being done by the White House Council on Environmental Quality that bears out their apocalyptic vision. Acid rain is lowering the pH level of countless lakes and ponds, rendering them lifeless. Atmospheric carbon dioxide levels are continuing to rise from the burning of fossil fuels so that the global climate will shift irrevocably. The soil is losing its biologically essential trace mineral content under intense treatment with chemical fertilizers. Seed strains compatible with a more "natural" system of agriculture are being lost in favor of those designed to produce crops under an energy-intensive agriculture. All groups keeping watch over such trends are worried.

When out, the study will say that the systems of resource forecasting by the different government agencies are so disorganized, contradictory, and misinformed that the President is getting no useful advice on the near-term dangers.

These are harsh indictments of the current science policy process. The preservers and the protectors of science policy—the symbolic chieftains being White House Science Adviser Frank Press and National Academy of Sciences president Philip Handler—represent the view that science is neutral, its endeavor is pure, and any criticisms of its content simply constitute a shameless assault on the citadel.

The appropriate technology community, however, doesn't agree. Its members say that the methods of science may be unsalvageably neutral but the choice of the things science does isn't. They charge that the scientific establishment is interested in only two things: the funding of disciplines and the preservation of its own form of power detached from the needs of people. They say further that it is so unwilling to undertake or sanction truly interrelated assessments of social/environmental/ecological interactions that when called upon its advice only worsens the predicament.

"I think it is unrealistic to expect the tall hogs of science in [Washington] to show much interest or enthusiasm for anything that is out of their paradigm," declares Richard Holt, a policy analyst with the Department of Energy. "In general, I don't think people like Frank Press or Phil Handler are against appropriate technology. I just don't think they would consider it as a possible model for the future undertakings of science."

"I think they would continue to see continued specialization rather than diversification and generalization. They would not admit that the social, environmental, political, and institutional effects of the scientific endeavor are as tangled as they really are. They'd rather think of science as the source of truth."

Handler clearly expressed his attitudes toward "alternative" science not long ago in a speech at Duke University. "Today," he said, "there has arisen an antiscientific, antirationalist trend that should give us pause. At its ugliest—or most absurd—it funds expression in gurus, tarot cards, astrology, faddist approaches to nutrition, and easy assertion and acceptance of unfounded allegations of environmental hazard. That anti-science attitude perniciously infiltrates the news media, affecting the intelligentsia and

decision makers alike. It must be confronted at every opportunity."

The appropriate technology leaders would like nothing better than an honest confrontation. Believing much of Handler's rhetoric is directed at them, they would put him to the task of contrasting "his" subjective view of science against their own subjective view. As their armamentarium they would apply theories of mind, consciousness, perception, cybernetics, thermodynamics, even his own field of biochemistry in attempts to demonstrate to him that his method of thought is out of tune with the times, that one can attain science to a deeper and at the same time broader conception of reality. They would tell him his approach to science is not so value-free as he might think, and that writers such as Michael Polanyi and a host of others have asserted that the basis of scientific objectivity is the subjectivity and institution that motivates the researcher.

One leader of the appropriate technology movement was asked recently what she would tell a President's science adviser on his responsibilities to science and the public. She is Hazel Henderson, who was active in the consumer and environmental movements of the 1970's and during that time served on the Office of Technology Assessment's Council, was an adviser to the National Science Foundation's now defunct Research Applied to National Needs Program, and consulted with the National Academy of Engineering's Committee on Public Engineering Policy.

"I would tell him," she says, "that this country has 10 years to transfer from a non-renewable to a renewable energy base. It will require a monstrous effort that can't be done without his type of leadership. It will be no less than something on the scope of the Manhattan Project. We would amplify the examples of appropriate technology and help people understand what is happening. Everything the Administration does must be geared toward that shift." Naturally, as the President's science adviser, Press can advocate no such thing, especially when Administration energy policy is leaning heavily toward coal.

But what are these examples of appropriate technology that, according to Henderson, need amplification? Some can be found at the New Alchemy Institute on Cape Cod, run for the past 10 years by biologist John Todd. The institute is one of the most mature of appropriate technology research centers and is based on the types of knowledge and hardware required to establish self-sufficiency in any community in any climate.

What the institute most resembles is a small farm, or agricultural experiment station, which in fact it is. (Ties are being developed with the Massachusetts State Agricultural Extension Service to share information and counsel.) Rows of crops labeled for variety and growing conditions run across the 17-acre site. Jutting up here and there are windmills either spinning or under repair or construction. A geodesic dome raises its hump at intervals. A small forest is under cultivation. The scene is idyllic and obviously what the new alchemists see as the shape of things to come. In cities the view would be somewhat different, with crops grown on roofs, vacant lots, basements, and in attached greenhouses. Windmills would rise from roofs, supplying small amounts of electrical power to households.

"Here at the New Alchemy Institute," says Todd, "we use a way of thinking about the future that makes certain assumptions. For us, an appropriate technology would be an adaptive technology—sophisticated but simple—that would minimize the side effects of nature. It would focus on the nature

of materials rather than on the burning of fuels. Also, we are looking at organisms that would take over the work of capital-intensive hardware."

Todd says his 25-member group uses sophisticated technologies such as microprocessors to interact with the subtle biological systems in the growing of crops and the heating of shelters. "In a way," he says, "the biological era that will be coming into full bloom had to wait on modern electronics to mature. The trouble has been that appropriate technology came to be seen in the public eye as crude if not dumb technology. But we think our designs here are at the forefront of intellectual activity."

"When we started this activity 10 years ago, we felt that science was reaching a plateau. Modern knowledge was being reformed because its product was presenting the world with insurmountable problems. So we decided to work on very-small-scale projects. For example, the first dome shelter built was an example of the kind of thinking we wanted to explore. We wanted to find out if it were possible in a tiny space to produce much of the protein for a small group of people."

The result is something the institute calls the Ark, which is in a sense a highly sophisticated greenhouse designed to provide heat in cold weather by the cultivation of fish in closed-system tanks. Todd says that the Cape Code Ark isn't totally self-sufficient yet—"we can't tell the sun to do its job just yet"—but a more highly developed ark, used also as a four-room residence, is working splendidly on Prince Edward Island in Canada.

Another model of appropriate technology is the Rock Castle Research Center, part of the Appalachian Science in the Public Interest program in Livingston, Ky. The project is supported by the National Science Foundation's Science for Citizens Program and is run by chemist Alfred J. Fritsch, also, a Jesuit priest.

In contrast to the New Alchemy Institute, Fritsch's "public service science" center is located in a newly built passive solar house in the woods off a road leading to a strip mine.

Loaded coal trucks thunder by every quarter hour, undoing freshly repaired holes in the road. The building demonstrates the "appropriateness" of solar energy to Appalachian people while inside the staff is developing an Appalachian Technical Network linking other public interest and appropriate technology groups throughout the Appalachian region.

Fritsch is against wreckage of the land and the human spirit by irresponsible technology in the form of illegally loaded coal trucks, or the damage to homes by blasting at strip mines, or the unauthorized disposal of chemical wastes. Priests are known to get angry, and this priest-scientist harbors a sense of moral outrage at those who wield technology's power without a sense of human impact.

So the aim of the center is to spark citizen involvement in the laws and regulations that supposedly control abuse. The entire aim is to use technical data to educate citizens in the use of it to pressure the political structure toward reform. Fritsch uses the "neutrality" of science to measure results and design observation. But its neutrality serves the purpose of a moral goal. Fritsch would argue that all scientists and engineers should be educated in the logical, ethical, and humanistic principles at the very least to be well-rounded human beings.

But to Fritsch, appropriate technology is not immune to fault.

"It can be very passive, and that bothers me," he says. "Many times the people in it are dropouts from the system." To him, the

field has to mature constantly in the way it goes about assessing science, proposes solutions to its abuses, and involves itself in the basic process of institutional change so that political decisions are not made out of ignorance or greed."

Fritsch pretty much typifies the public interest scientist in his opposition to the philosophy of bigness. "The question is whether solar energy and appropriate technology will be put in the control of large companies or whether the small guys will be given some leeway to develop their own approaches."

"We're at about the same state as the country was when Henry Ford came along with mass production of the automobile. So much depends on whether we can preserve and protect the ideas the true entrepreneur has. If big industry takes over appropriate technology, it will be lost. We could actually develop a solar energy policy that is totally decentralized. A lot of the people who are entrepreneurial really want to see their ideas incorporated into small business. We already have opted for a policy of individual homes long ago. The danger is that we will opt for solar energy as part of a centralized power grid network."

Currently, Appalachian Science in the Public Interest has developed affiliations and cooperative activities with 70 organizations in the central regions of the Appalachians as part of its function to establish a network. That brings up another characteristic of the appropriate technology movement, a phenomenon analogous to the "invisible college" feature of academic science. Some groups already are establishing computer teleconferences. Others are establishing computerized data banks, hoping to provide functional—"community sharing"—alternatives to the more commercial approach Control Data Corp. is taking. The sharing philosophy is so central to the appropriate technology movement that its importance shouldn't be overlooked. Its economic base is largely, but not exclusively, barter. Its business ethic corresponds to that of the small town and big city neighborhood shopkeeper. And it is this feature that appeals to the country's old-line conservatives, despite appropriate technology's roots in the 1960's counterculture. In a way, there's something in it for everyone.

Technical people in industry have their own ideas, too, about the appropriateness of technology. Richard Quisenberry, director of feedstock research and development at Du Pont, acknowledges shifts in values toward naturalness in, say, fibers and respect for the land. But he doubts that the appropriate technology movement will envelop the country.

"The bigness associated with industrialization, we have to remember, is really economies of scale," he says. "You can have a lot of little gasohol plants or a few very large ones." The issue is what is least expensive to produce.

As for the protests by the appropriate technology community against bigness, Quisenberry differs.

For industry to survive, Quisenberry points out, it will require large amounts of electrical power even as the cities are turned into high-technology gardens. Du Pont and other companies will provide the panels. He believes, however, that holding out for solar substitutes in large-scale systems "is a mistake."

But he worries about some of the same things that the appropriate technology community does: carbon dioxide and the greenhouse effect, acid rain. He says he wonders whether it is ethical to divert cropland away from food and toward the production of ethanol when more than half the world is starving. And, of course, he opposes

arguments that favor the constraint on growth. He also agrees that on the global economic scale the practices and laws of supply and demand that served the industrial countries well are undergoing change. U.S. technology and industry will have to adapt to that truth. He is certain, furthermore, that appropriate technology as a whole does not represent the majority views of people in the U.S.

So appropriate technology seems to have a long way to go before being seen as a legitimate factor in the planning and operation of science policy. The big, recently released five-year outlook for science and technology, prepared for the Office of Science & Technology Policy by the National Science Foundation and National Academy of Sciences, makes no mention of it either by name or implication. It is as if the two cultures exist in different worlds of value.

But the problems the report lists all speak to the solutions the appropriate technologists claim to offer: the need to "identify new alternatives that would ease the access of small- and part-time farmers to markets and enhance the opportunities for consumers to obtain high-quality food at reasonable prices." Or on energy: "Production of on-site energy from agricultural wastes holds promise. Plants are the only renewable raw material that produces some hydrocarbons now obtained from petrochemicals . . . the conversion of biomass to energy competes with other uses for which the economics may be more favorable."

NSF has just established a small grants program in appropriate technology, directed by Robert Lamson, and so far has received about 100 unsolicited proposals. As Lamson sizes the science policy issue vis-à-vis appropriate technology, he sees the appropriate technology philosophy making inroads into science policy through existing programs oriented toward environmental management and quality.

"But my perception," he says, "is that people tend not to start with the environmental and human values and move back into how technology can be designed for them. Rather, they still tend to start with the technology and push it to the forefront for its own sake. On the whole, the vulnerability of systems doesn't get much into science policy. I see it as a legitimate science policy issue. But at the National Academy of Sciences, what you find is that the mind set there tends to challenge that attitude as an issue and subsequently dismisses it. The whole thing is about nourishing people's capacity for self-government."

There is an interesting—even fascinating—appropriate technology issue that could easily merge as a scientific/philosophical debate over coming years. That issue is the meaning and implications of entropy.

In September, Viking Press will publish a book entitled "Entropy: A New World View" by Jeremy Rifkin. The author, one of the directors of People's Business Commission in Washington, is no friend of the science establishment. Rifkin was one of the leading opponents of recombinant DNA research and proposed in an earlier book that giving corporations patent rights to new forms of life would constitute eventual danger to human freedom.

In any case, Rifkin was smitten with the ideas of economist Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen and produced the book that popularizes the complex ideas of the Vanderbilt University economist. Rifkin believes that once the social, economic, and technological implications of the second law of thermodynamics set in, the world will be forced to become one big New Alchemy Institute with not only an ecologically based technology

but a flowering of the arts and labor intensive industry.

The gist of the argument is that modern technology uses energy at such a rate that it also causes accelerated complexities.

Simply put, man is producing entropy faster than nature is. But man is part of nature. Therefore if he is outproducing nature, he must at some point come back into equilibrium with nature. Because he is living off a finite amount of stored energy, giving him some extra entropy to play around with, the scales will balance. But he should not be caught unprepared.

There is another angle. According to Rifkin, the speed of energy dissipation also frames the structure and design of institutions. At the same time, institutions affect individual lives. As technology becomes more complex, so do the institutions and their impact on personal lives. Stress increases, uncertainties breed anxiety over the future; economic perturbations are the order of the day—all because conventional technology forces a design that maximizes the production of entropy. The technology becomes more complex. Nations compete for the edge in "technological innovation," while simultaneously time runs out. Entropy has been called the "arrow of time." That means the mechanics of energy are not reversible. Once used it is gone. And it is being used too fast today.

Concludes Rifkin: "The Entropy Law destroys the notion of history as progress. The Entropy Law destroys the notion that science and technology create a more ordered world. In fact, the Entropy Law transcends the modern world view with a force of conviction that is every bit as convincing as was the Newtonian world machine when it replaced the Medieval Christian world view of the Roman Church."

One of the best sources of information and evaluation of appropriate technology could come from Congress' Office of Technology Assessment this summer. The project—"Assessment of Technology for Local Development"—is a series of on-site surveys of about 15 centers of activity in appropriate technology ranging from architectural experiments to cost-efficient health systems. The project could be interesting to track because its director, Michaela Walsh, has left the project in dispute over its handling. The final report, compared with Walsh's original rendering, may provide clues to how an institution such as Congress reacts to ideas that pose a challenge to the conventional ways of paying for and doing technology.

"Appropriate technology is still fighting the rap that it's a Tinkertoy technology," says Scott Sklar, head of NCAT's Washington office. "But that's how the centralized technologies want people to perceive it."

"I'm trying to get science decision makers in this town to have a basic understanding that sound technology does not have to come from the laboratory or from approved think tanks or universities or the R&D divisions of large corporations. I'm trying to convince these people that technology can have a value at the site where it is needed by people who need it."

Nevertheless, approaches proliferate. At Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a group under David Noble in the program on science, technology, and society, is setting up a program on "alternative industrial technology." The idea, says Noble, is to "design machinery to the specification of workers—machine tools that allow the workers themselves to do more of the programming, software systems that enhance communication between people."

What appropriate technology represents is the emergence of a new value in science and technology: that the decisions around

science and technology are not objective and cannot be. As James Nolfi, dean at Goddard College in Vermont puts it, "The question seems to be how much should modern man surrender his historical goal of self-sufficiency to modern technology. We want to stress the psychological, spiritual, and emotional importance of having some control over the technologies we are working with."●

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the full amount of the authorization reported by our Committee for the National Science Foundation.

Chairing a subcommittee in another committee as I do, I have come to realize the critical underpinning role played by the National Science Foundation for activities in many other areas, such as my own Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Finance. Foundation-sponsored basic research in the physical, biological, and social sciences lays the groundwork for advances in energy and materials, health and medicine, and in the understanding of our economy and social programs.

In recent years, I have been particularly concerned with the development of new drugs to ease the pain and suffering of many of our life-threatening and chronic diseases. Many of the fundamental biochemical mechanisms discovered through work such as that supported by the biological, behavioral, and social sciences division of the NSF have been translated into a capability to design molecules with specific curative properties, and in such a way to minimize undesirable side effects. Most important has been the Foundation's high prestige and strong network of contacts in international science, often enabling research undertaken under its aegis to become rapidly diffused into world scientific literature and practical application. Probably nowhere has this strength been better demonstrated than in the connection of basic biochemical advances to biomedical applications. I should add, parenthetically, that many of those strange-sounding and sometimes ridiculed research projects involving animal behavior have been the very ones which have demonstrated the efficacy of new classes of neural and other vital pharmaceutical compounds.

Another area of special interest to me and one which shows the vital "balance wheel" role the Science Foundation plays in our Nation's science and technology base, has been the national emphasis on, and allocation of resources to the very important area of population and demographic research and impact assessment. With

the demise of the House Select Committee on Population, a key element in oversight over, and stimulation of, this important area has been lost.

Fortunately, in our committee's extensive review of the National Science Foundation's effort in social and behavioral sciences, it has become clear that this is typical of the important areas in which the Foundation can help insure that we have the knowledge for optimal allocation of our society's resources. If we are not to be trapped into wasteful investments, we must understand the implications of the changing age patterns of our population, its changing geographical distribution, and its relationship to similar changing population, immigration, and emigration patterns of our neighbors in this continent and the rest of the world. Similarly, such an understanding is crucial to our foreign policy strategy formulation, and to the determination of the most effective role we can play in promoting world economic developing and stability.

Given the significance of this area, the committee has stressed its intent that the National Science Foundation give this area of research special attention. In its program planning, the Foundation will assess the overall state of population research, along with its own optimal role in the area. As in many other areas, I fully expect that the Science Foundation will lay the groundwork for an effort which will multiply the Foundation's direct contribution manifold.

This is the basic reason why so many of us view the Foundation's budget as an investment on the future, rather than a current expenditure. It is the reason I counsel my colleagues to fully support this vital authorization bill before us today.

It is now increasingly understood that U.S. society and economic policies are being strongly affected by population changes. The pressure in the 1960's on our schools, the decline of productivity, the growth of crime, the trend toward the suburbs and now toward rural areas and refurbished central cities, the high cost of housing—all of these trends are in substantial part the consequence of the dramatic effects of the postwar baby boom generation as it worked its way through childhood into young adulthood.

Many of these trends were quite predictable once the baby boom generation had been born, but a broad array of Federal agencies—and indeed Congress itself—failed to anticipate it. In all likelihood, tens of billions of dollars have been wasted on overexpansion of our educational facilities alone, not to mention the many other areas of waste resulting from our failure to plan policies effectively.

Other developments are of great policy significance—for example, the growing problem of early teenage pregnancy. It is now reliably estimated that fully one-half of aid for dependent children and related welfare ex-

penditures are related to teenage pregnancy, amounting to at least \$4.65 billion in 1975—and probably much more now.

In another example, last year the Congress passed a synthetic fuels production bill at a cost of \$20 billion, which was intended to make this country energy independent. But no thought was given to the fact that with the increase in the production of synfuels, U.S. farmers will have a new market here for their surplus grains and most likely would not sell it to the Government at a lower price for distribution abroad in the developing world. The result of this shift in markets could be worldwide famine unless a thoughtful policy is developed.

Finally, in the international sphere it is apparent that unprecedentedly high rates of population growth in many developing countries are contributing substantially to severe economic, political, and social problems. Many of these countries are barely able to increase their economic production sufficiently to stay even with population growth, thereby frustrating sincere efforts by the Government of the United States and by other countries to assist in improving the standards of life for the bulk of these poor populations. Such imbalances give rise to increased political turmoil and instability around the developing world, and also represent a major factor in the rapid escalation of refugee and immigrant populations, many of whom seek to settle in the United States.

The executive and legislative branches of Government are poorly organized to deal systematically with this set of problems. In both branches of Government, responsibility for population and closely related issues is widely dispersed among a large number of committees, departments, and agencies.

Nowhere is there a central core of expertise and attention that seeks to consider population change in all of its ramifications for public policy. The Select Committee on Population sought to serve this function in a modest way for the House, but it had no links to the Senate or to the executive branch—and was a temporary body in any case.

The intent of my resolution is to establish a more secure and well-positioned center of expertise on these complex issues and to advise both the Congress and executive branch on demographic change and its public policy significance. The cost of such a venture would be very small indeed, and the potential savings from even a small improvement in our capacity to plan effectively would be enormous, as evidenced by the massive waste that has resulted from our failure to plan in the sphere of education alone.

Thus, such a new population commission will help in planning efficient-

ly the optimal use of our scarce research funds, not only in demography and the social sciences but also in biomedical and technical areas.●

ABSCAM

HON. JIM MATTOX

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. MATTOX. Mr. Speaker, the public first learned of the FBI's Abscam investigation on February 3, 1980. After reading the news accounts, I realized that there had been attempts to draw me into it.

Almost immediately the spotlight turned to a Member of Congress who was making headlines because he had been lured into the trap but refused to take the bait.

It went through my mind, then, that I should do the same thing myself—stand up, beat my chest, and cry, "Me, too. I'm an honest man."

I decided not to. I thought that the appropriate thing to do, instead of trying to make headlines, was to talk about these matters at my town hall meetings and to discuss it with anyone who asked me. I did this on a number of occasions.

I assumed the press in my district would be asking about Abscam. Only one editor did, and we discussed it fully. I also visited with my pastor about it and asked him to continue to pray for all of us.

I felt at that time, and I still do, that it is wrong to glorify anyone simply for being honest. In my regular weekly column, dated February 15, 1980, I wrote:

Congress is still reeling from Abscam—the FBI investigation that uncovered eight members who allegedly took bribes up to \$50,000.

The investigation and its premature disclosures are questionable on a number of points, and the Justice Department needs to ferret out those employees who leaked the investigation to the press.

Most importantly, the individuals who took the bribes should receive swift and firm punishment. Congress must not interfere with the prosecution of those who violated the law.

But what about Congress as an institution? What, really, is its trouble?

The 535 men and women who compose it are average people dealing with extraordinary problems. They are different from the rest of the population only in a desire for public service. Other than that, they reflect the same morality that is found in the communities they represent. They are no different from the business people, the lawyers, the doctors, accountants, farmers, laborers—you name it—who make up their constituency * * *.

More than one congressman turned down the FBI's illegal overtures. A number, in fact, held themselves so aloof from the possibility of being bribed that the FBI didn't have a chance to make them an offer they could refuse. This didn't make headlines. And perhaps it shouldn't. The day that rou-

tine honesty on a large scale is news will be a sorry day for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, because of a recent newspaper column by Jack Anderson, we may be dangerously close to that day. I want to relate to you and my colleagues the Abscam story as it happened to me. What follows is a summary of the chronology:

Dallas attorney J. Richard Whittington received a telephone call from Philadelphia attorney Howard Criden during the last week in September 1979. See the following statement and letter.

Whittington said he met Criden when the two of them were attorneys representing opposite sides of a lawsuit.

Criden asked Whittington if Whittington "knew any Texas Senators or Congressmen." Whittington said he did not—but that he had met Congressman JIM MATTOX's law partner, A. Don Crowder, at the courthouse.

Criden asked Whittington, as a favor to him, to please call Crowder, give him an introduction, and ask Crowder to accept a call from Criden.

Whittington agreed to do so. He called Crowder, and Crowder agreed to accept the call from Criden.

Shortly thereafter, Crowder received a call from Howard Criden, the Philadelphia attorney. After the conversation, Crowder called me and related the substance of it. Crowder told me he was somewhat alarmed, and suspicious of Criden, but perhaps he had taken what Criden said wrong.

He said Criden told him that he represented several "wealthy Arab businessmen" who wanted to meet as many Congressmen as they could. Criden said they might need to gain admittance into the United States in case anything went wrong in their own country. Then Criden told Crowder that a "substantial campaign contribution" could be made in order to be able to "plead their case." Crowder was immediately alarmed by that statement. He told Criden that he did not have to give me anything to see me, that I was a very accessible individual and that if he wanted to meet with me, all he had to do was call my office and make an appointment. Crowder said he would call me and ask me to expect a call from Criden—but that he could "leave his checkbook at home." Crowder said that he thought that I should talk to Criden, but that I should be on guard for any improper overtures.

After my conversation with Crowder, I received a call from Criden, and I returned his call. Criden told me he represented "wealthy Arab businessmen" who were interested in making a \$200 million investment in my district. He asked me if I would join him and his clients for dinner so they could discuss the matter.

At this point, my suspicions were aroused further since Criden had mentioned to Crowder that his clients were interested in possibly gaining entry into the United States—and now

Mr. Criden was telling me that his clients were interested in making a sizable investment in my district. Of course, I was interested in getting a large business investment for my district.

Pursuant to a long standing rule about meeting people in circumstances such as this and also because of my suspicions in this particular case, I told Criden that I would meet with him, but that I would prefer to meet in my office.

This seemed to frustrate him, and he said his clients were "very well-to-do people" and that they would probably be willing to make a campaign contribution.

I immediately said: "You understand that contributions from foreign nationals are illegal—I would not be interested in that." Criden assured me that he meant nothing inappropriate or illegal. After his assurance, I was not quite as concerned, because I felt that I had dealt with the matter in a firm way.

I told Criden that I was soon leaving Washington to return to Dallas for the district work period which began September 29 and lasted through October 8. I told him I could see him before I left, or he could call me in about a week when I returned from my district.

While I was in Dallas during the district work period, I received a second telephone call from Criden. Criden said he and his clients would like to come to Dallas to see me. I told him I was extremely busy, that I saw no reason for them to come from Philadelphia and that I would prefer to meet with them in Washington. The conversation was very brief, and he agreed to call me in Washington.

The third and last call from Criden came when I was back in Washington. Criden again asked me if I would join him and his clients for dinner to discuss his clients' business investment. I told him again that I preferred to meet with him in my office and offered to set up an appointment. He tried to persuade me to go out to dinner, but I politely declined. An appointment was made for 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, October 9, 1979. I had another engagement at 6 p.m. On the afternoon of October 9, I was in my office but neither Criden nor anyone else associated with him showed up. I left the office for the evening, and I never heard from Criden again.

In hindsight, I can see that my refusal to meet with them anywhere but my office frustrated their attempts to steer me into their den of iniquity. Since the foregoing events occurred, I have talked with the FBI about being a witness in the Criden matter and with the House Ethics Committee investigators.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to share a portion of another of my weekly columns with you and the Members of the House. This one is called:

GOOD RULES TO LIVE BY

How can a thing like this Abscam happen? people demand to know.

The temptations are great, I tell them. Congressmen deal with so much money that the idea of it is almost impossible to grasp. There's no denying that directing the distribution of \$700 billion bestows on an ordinary man or woman power and influence.

I personally handle this problem in two ways. (I don't think my approach is unique.) The most important thing is to have a sense of moral direction. In my case, this comes from the Judeo-Christian principles I learned from my family and my church. Secondly, it's helpful to have practical guidelines for carrying on the business of being a congressman. You have to avoid the appearance of evil. Like Caesar's wife, you have to be above reproach.

The guidelines I try to apply take several forms. One is not to accept personal gifts. Let me give you an example. After my first election as a congressman, a friend offered me an expensive pen and pencil set. He told me that he wanted to be able to say, "My congressman signs his mail and legislation with the pen that I gave him." He felt it was an honor to give it to me and meant nothing improper. I told him that I loved and appreciated him and his family, but that I had set up a rule that I would not accept any personal gifts.

Another important rule I try to abide by is to meet whenever possible in my office with people who want to talk about legislation in which they have a personal financial interest. This is not an easy rule to follow because I practice an open door policy for my constituents and my goal is to be "the most accessible congressman in Washington." There's a line to be drawn between talking with a constituent on the street about Social Security legislation and talking with someone I don't know about help in getting grants for personal or business projects, immigration assistance, or other topics that could directly benefit that person. If people are talking with me in my office, they are a lot less willing to make offers that could be construed as improper. I think a lot of potentially improper overtures are not made thanks to the fact that I try to shroud myself in the dignity of the office that surrounds me. A country club, a bar, or a restaurant wouldn't have the same prohibitive atmosphere. Having staff members around is helpful, too, in lending an aura of officialdom that discourages impropriety.

I've discussed, in my Town Hall meetings, how I believe that many times these rules have kept me out of questionable circumstances, including the FBI's Abscam. A number of us in Congress were offered the opportunity to venture into compromising circumstances. Some apparently allowed themselves to be tempted, and accepted what was offered; some were tempted, but refused. Some of us had rules like the ones I've described that kept us out of compromising situations, making it unnecessary for us even to have to refuse an improper offer.

Every single member of Congress daily comes across the opportunity to engage in something illegal. By the same token, so does every businessman or woman, or every employee. It's just plain honesty that keeps people straight, after all. When you have to stand up and say, "Hey, look at me. I'm an honest man," and thereby imply that you're the exception, it's a poor day.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that day has not arrived.

I might add that I also have another rule. I do not accept honoraria for speaking engagements. Many Mem-

bers accept such honoraria, and certainly there is nothing wrong with this. Nevertheless, I believe that public speaking is all part of the public job I was elected to do and I do not want to create even the impression that a large honorarium would affect my judgment.

I have set up these rules, Mr. Speaker, to try to insure that I do nothing, even inadvertently, to dishonor this great institution. I further pledge to you, my colleagues, and constituents, that I will continue to do everything within my power to conduct myself in a way that will reflect how seriously I take the responsibilities that have been bestowed upon me.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to add several items for the RECORD. The following is a statement and letter I received from J. Richard Whittington and a formal statement issued by the FBI following the publication of the Anderson column.

These items make it clear that there was no preexisting list of targeted public officials. The members were contacted by so-called middlemen who did not know they were part of any investigation.

The information follows:

BENTLEY, PATTERSON & WHITTINGTON,
Dallas, Tex., June 12, 1980.

HON. JIM MATTOX,
c/o A. DON CROWDER,
Dallas, Tex.

DEAR JIM: In light of the recent news stories concerning your alleged involvement in the Abscam matter, I believe it only fair to provide you with my statement detailing my knowledge of the events which led to such alleged involvement.

Enclosed herewith you will find such statement and you have my permission to use it as you deem best.

My father asked me if I had learned anything from this experience and I had to tell him that I was really not sure that there was a lesson to be learned since I would help out any attorney who I believed to be honest and reputable with such a simple matter as Mr. Criden's request. I did tell him however that after all I had been through as a result of my telephone conversation with Don, that I probably would be suspicious if my best friend asked me to help him get in touch with Dr. Criswell of the First Baptist Church.

Very truly yours,

J. RICHARD WHITTINGTON.

Enclosure.

STATEMENT

To my knowledge, Congressman Jim Mattox's alleged involvement in the current Abscam matter was by pure chance. I received a telephone call from Howard Criden, an attorney in Philadelphia, whom I had met two years ago through a legal matter that was finalized last summer. From such dealings with him, I believed Mr. Criden to be an honest and highly respected attorney. Mr. Criden asked me if I knew any Texas senators or congressmen inasmuch as he had a new client who was interested in meeting them. I told Mr. Criden that I did not and he then asked if I knew anyone associated with any members of Congress. I informed Mr. Criden that I casually knew Jim Mattox's law partner as a result of an earlier court case. He then asked me if I would mind calling Mr. Mattox's law part-

ner, A. Don Crowder, for the purpose of introducing Mr. Criden to him. I told him I would be glad to and called Mr. Crowder. I told Mr. Crowder who Mr. Criden was and how I knew him and that Mr. Criden would be calling him.

After the Abscam story broke, I was troubled by the fact that I might have inadvertently involved a United States Congressman in the Abscam matter. Thereafter, in mid-March, while on a business trip to Washington, D.C., I stopped by Mr. Mattox's office. I introduced myself to Mr. Mattox and apologized for any problems that I may have caused him as a result of my telephone call to Mr. Crowder. Mr. Mattox then told me that he wanted me to know the rest of the story so that I would not have to wonder about his actions regarding Mr. Criden. He then told me the same story that appeared in Wednesday's newspapers. I thereafter told Mr. Mattox that I believed him and even though we differed politically, I was proud of him for his honesty. He then accepted my apology and thanked me for my visit.

Afterwards, I was interviewed by the FBI and asked me not to discuss this matter. However, in light of recent news stories, it is only fair that this statement be made.

J. RICHARD WHITTINGTON.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

June 13, 1980.

FBI Director William H. Webster and Assistant Attorney General Philip B. Heymann, in response to recently published material regarding the Abscam investigation, today furnished the following statement:

The decision as to when to terminate the undercover phase of the Abscam investigation was based upon professional and not political considerations. No public official was in any way shielded from legitimate inquiry. We jointly made the final decisions based on the evidence that had been developed and our assessment that the time for the overt phase of the investigation had arrived.

Adverse inferences about any public official should not be drawn simply because a name may have appeared in accounts of an investigation or have been mentioned or discussed by a third-party during the investigation. ●

AMERICANS, STOP THINKING
LIKE COMMUNISTS

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, Julia Brown, who was for many years an undercover member of the Communist Party of the United States for the FBI, addressed the council of the John Birch Society here in Washington on June 9, 1980. She felt it appropriate at that time to restate her testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee of 1 year ago pertaining to the possible enactment of a Federal paid holiday in honor of the late Martin Luther King. Her testimony, then, as now, is deserving of wider attention. This lady has given a lot to her country and her views are not popular in some circles but they are valid in my view. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

Her testimony follows:

MRS. JULIA BROWN—JUNE 9, 1980

Thank you Mr. Welch.

Members of the council, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to attend a gathering such as this—even more of an honor to be asked to speak.

I have done a great deal of speaking throughout the United States, and I have come to Washington on many occasions to testify before various government agencies. I believe this is the first time that I have ever appeared before an audience in this city to deliver a speech, instead of to provide testimony.

My most recent visit to Washington occurred just about one year ago when I addressed the Senate Judiciary Committee. The matter under consideration was a bill to declare a national holiday in honor of Martin Luther King. As you know, the measure did not pass last year. Unfortunately, however, it is still being promoted by a large number of Senators and Congressmen. I am strongly opposed to such a proposal. If I may, I would like to repeat the short testimony I gave to the Senate Judiciary Committee last June.

Mr. Chairman, I, Julia Brown, joined the Communist Party in December, 1947, thinking I was joining a legitimate civil rights movement. Finding out that I was a true member of the Communist Party which advocated the overthrow of the U.S. Government, I decided to leave the organization, but I had to bide my time to avoid suspicion. Subsequently I went to the FBI to report what I had heard and seen. In 1951, I was asked by the FBI to go back into the Communist Party as an undercover agent to report on their subversive activities.

While at the Communist Party meetings, which only Party members attended, I frequently heard Martin Luther King discussed, and was told by Frieda Catz that he was in training for a civil rights movement. Frieda Catz was a Party member from Cleveland, Ohio, who had been assigned to my training and education within the Communist Party. On learning this, I reported it to my contact in the FBI. He told me that the Bureau knew that Martin Luther King had high level connections with the Communist Party, and I should report anything else that I heard about his activities. I continued to report until 1960, over ten long years.

In Martin Luther King's early years of agitation, he was the hero of America's communists. The cells that I was associated with in Cleveland were continually being asked to raise money for Martin Luther King's activities and to support his civil rights movement by writing letters to the press and influencing local clergymen, and especially black clergymen, that Martin Luther King was a good person, unselfishly working for the American Negro, and in no way connected with the Communist Party.

There are many great American Negroes such as George Washington Carver and Booker T. Washington who provide the youth of America with an example they can follow. Martin Luther King provides an example of agitation and manipulation for goals dictated by hatred and envy. The memory of Carver and Washington would be dishonored if your committee acts favorably in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, while I was in the Communist Party, as a loyal American Negro, I knew Martin Luther King to be closely connected with the Communist Party. If this measure is passed honoring Martin Luther King, we may as well take down the stars and stripes that fly over this building and replace it with a red flag.

And that was my message to the Senate Judiciary Committee on June 2, 1979.

I would like to believe that what I said would have been enough to stop the glorification of Martin Luther King. But we all know that, even if they never name a holiday after him, there are still too many Americans who hold that man to be like a god. What has happened, of course, is that there are too many of our fellow citizens who actually have been conditioned to think exactly the way Communists want them to think.

And not just about Martin Luther King! Right now, in America, huge numbers of our people have been convinced that they should rely on government to provide all the necessities of life, and even to provide the distinction between right and wrong. Government has become the source of everything for many Americans. Such attitudes never built this great country and made it such a wonderful land of plenty.

On the contrary, the attitude that holds that government is the provider is the one that dominates countries like Soviet Russia, China and Cuba. But Americans who think like the Communist do not appreciate the difference between a free country such as ours, and a slave country such as exists in Red Russia.

When I was working for the FBI as a member of the Communist Party, it became evident to me that the Party's open and announced intention regarding our country was quite different from its quiet and more important intention. The announced intention was to overthrow the United States government by force and violence.

But, while all Communists were told to build for the day when that overthrow could be accomplished, a great deal more of the Party's efforts were directed towards making the United States government larger and more of a dominant influence over the lives of the American people. Actually, Communists were seeking to strengthen the federal government all the time—through socialistic legislation and through increasing government control over the free enterprise system. Communists were seeking to destroy the U.S. government and to build it into an all-powerful force at the same time.

Except for the area of military defense, no American should want a powerful central government. This is what Communists want. Yet, today, millions of Americans not only want a big, federal bureaucracy—they also want to cut back on needed military and defense programs. They have been led to think exactly like the Communists want them to think.

A good example of what is happening to America came to mind with the establishment of the new cabinet-level Department of Education. This is something that Communists have always wanted. And just a few weeks ago, this new Department came into existence.

William Z. Foster called for this Communist goal in a very explicit way in his famous book "Toward Soviet America". In that book, Foster, who was the National Chairman of the Communist Party of the United States actually stated that one of the steps toward the creation of a Communist America was the creation of a National Department of Education. And he wrote his book in 1932! His book was so important to the Communists that it was published simultaneously by two publishing houses, only one of which was openly Communist.

Only a short time after Foster wrote his book, however, American Communists received orders to suppress it. The book turned out to be too explicit. And so, from

that time on, American Communists did whatever they could to hide the publication of Foster's plans by destroying *Toward Soviet America*. Communists were allowed to read it, but no one else was to see it. Through the efforts of some patriotic anti-Communists, however, this book was re-published in 1961. It carried a Foreword by Congressman Francis Walter, who was at that time the Chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

On page 316 of *Toward Soviet America*, Communist Party Chairman William Z. Foster wrote as follows: "Among the elementary measures the American Soviet government will adopt to further the cultural revolution are the following; the schools, colleges and universities will be co-ordinated and grouped under a National Department of Education and its state and local branches." Then he said: "The studies will be revolutionized, being cleansed of religions, patriotic and other features of the bourgeois ideology. The students will be taught internationalism and the general ethics of the new Socialist society."

So, here we have the National Chairman of the Communist Party calling for the establishment of a National Department of Education. And he wanted it to remove religion and patriotism from the schools, and at the same time promote internationalism and Socialist ethics. Socialist ethics means that whatever is good for the state is right; whatever is not good for the state is wrong. That amounts to no real ethics at all.

In 1979, Congress passed the legislation which set up this Communist-desired Education Department. Then, President Carter selected as the nation's first Secretary of Education a Los Angeles Judge named Shirley Hufstедler who is a member of the Board of Trustees of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies. In other words, the lady chosen to run the Department of Education, which Communists have wanted since 1932, is a Humanist.

What do Humanists believe in? Well, the Humanist Manifesto published in 1973 says that Humanists do not believe in God; reject any standard of ethics; and oppose national sovereignty. According to the same document, Humanists are for: world government, sexual freedom, abortion, and an end to parental control over children. Does any of that differ from William Z. Foster or any other Communist's design for America? No, it does not!

Am I saying that Mrs. Hufstедler is a Communist? No, I'm saying that she is a Humanist. And although not all Humanists are Communists, my experience tells me that all Communists are Humanists.

So, not only have Congress and the President followed Communist desires in creating a federal Education Department, but an ideal Communist choice to head it has been chosen by Mr. Carter.

You are not going to read or hear about this shocking information in the public news media. It takes a group like The John Birch Society to focus attention on these matters. And, without information such as this, most of the American people will end up thinking exactly as Communists want them to think—that a federal Department of Education is a good thing, and that the lady judge will be a good administrator.

Years ago, this Society produced a film about the civil rights movement called *Anarchy USA*. I was pleased to appear in a portion of that film. And I was even more pleased to know that the film did a great deal of good.

Many times, in *Anarchy USA*, Soviet dictator Lenin was quoted as saying: "Communism must be built with non-Communist

hands." That lesson was drummed into all Party members when I was in the Party. The Communist strategy aimed at deceiving people into accepting and working for Communist programs, without ever letting it be known that Communism was the result.

This strategy is still working very well today. If you need proof that it is, I ask you: How long has it been since you took a look at the Communist Manifesto? Or, have you ever looked at it? If you have, you know how many present federal programs have been called for by Karl Marx in his famous document. And you know how many other programs dreamed up by Marx are being proposed.

The heavy progressive income tax and the Federal Reserve System are planks in the Communist Manifesto. Federal takeover of land and land-use controls can be found in it. The Manifesto calls for an end to the rights of inheritance, which has largely been accomplished. Yet, all these Communist programs were sold to Americans as something else.

The Manifesto calls for federal control of communications and transportation—and the appropriate federal agencies are already in place to accomplish those tasks. Government ownership of business is called for, and we are well along this road. Establishment of industrial armies is proposed, and we have VISTA, CETA and other such agencies. Finally, the Communist Manifesto calls for free education for all in government schools. The Communists want no diversity in education. They want a government controlled by them to be everyone's teacher.

Maybe we should extend a great big thank you to all the people who in recent years, have started private schools. They may not know that they are refusing to go along with Karl Marx's program, but they know enough to know that something is terribly wrong in the government schools. I certainly hope that the private school movement grows stronger and stronger in America.

What I am telling you, of course, is that America is being converted into a Communist country. It is not hard to see this if you know what to look for. This conversion is certainly being accomplished by Communists. But they get tremendous help from Democrats and Republicans. The problem is that the American people do not know what the Communist program is. And they also do not know what the American system is supposed to be.

One of the greatest goals of Communism has always been to get people dependent on government. The American system has always meant that government should leave us alone and merely protect our rights.

The Communist way costs tremendous amounts of money. The taxes and controls that result from government taking care of huge numbers of people actually lead to a destruction of jobs and businesses. In turn, this leads to more people becoming dependent on government.

We all read recently about the horrible riot in Miami. It resulted in fifteen deaths, 370 injuries and millions of dollars in property damage. The riot was a chilling reminder of what happened twelve to fifteen years ago—in Watts, Detroit, Newark and so many other places.

One aspect of the Miami riot that has received little attention was its terrible savagery. One of the victims was killed after being dragged from his car and beaten. He died when a car was driven back and forth over his body—several times. A group standing by cheered! Another victim was so badly mutilated that he could not even be identified.

We like to think that, because there have been no large riots in over a decade, there has been a big improvement in race relations. I wish I could say that such was the case.

What has happened is that Communists and those who do their will have accomplished two major goals. First, they have convinced a great many Americans that government is supposed to be the provider. And, second, they have slowed down American industry—which means that there are fewer jobs, fewer opportunities to start a small business, and fewer Americans able to be independent of government.

When America's productivity slows down, who gets hurt first? The unskilled worker who lives in the inner city gets hurt first. And, because of what he has been told, he immediately looks to government to take care of him. What he doesn't know, and what leaders like Martin Luther King never told him is that too much government took away his job in the first place.

The government programs that are supposed to help him actually turn out to make him a slave—to government! Deep down, he knows this. He ends up hating the system, and hating the people who administer it. It is then very easy to make his hatred racial in nature.

As I see reports in the newspaper about steel mills closing, and automobile plants shutting down, and America not growing the way it always has grown, I become very concerned. It has been almost twenty years since I served the FBI in the Communist Party. The Party members that I know were all trained to use this type of economic disorder to further the cause of Communism and to further the destruction of America. And, even though the Communist Party receives little attention today, its people are still active and still able to turn many things to a Communist purpose.

Even worse, self-serving politicians of all races continue to push for the same goals as the Communists. They have no regard for the people they claim to be helping. And they have no regard for the country they are supposed to be serving.

It is more than foolish to make government larger and more powerful. Doing so is the certain road to a Communist America. And I, for one, think that the Carters, the Kennedys and lots more like them don't even care about what they are doing to America—as long as their own nests are feathered.

The task that remains for real Americans is to tell the truth about where this country is headed—and who is taking all of us down the road to a Communist America. What has to be done is to get more Americans to stop thinking like the Communists want them to think.

It has been obvious to me for a long time that this organization is doing the right thing. I have travelled all over the United States to speak for the John Birch Society's speakers bureau. The Society members that I met in cities and towns everywhere were fine people who were not taken in by Communist propaganda.

They helped to slow down the rush toward Soviet-style rule here in America. But there is still plenty left to be done. Only now, there is less time to do it.

So I urge all of you who are part of this wonderful group to keep working hard. You're on the right track. And, to those of you who are not members, or who are not hard-working members, I ask you to get busy. If you don't, the Communists will win with all the help that they're getting from those Democrats and Republicans. They

will win because the American people did not know the difference between Americanism and Communism.

Julia Brown does not ever want a situation to develop where she has to say: "I told you so!"

Julia Brown would much rather be able, in a few years to say: "I was part of a great team that helped to save America."

Thank you very much.●

FAIR HOUSING ACT

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the editorial that appeared in the Los Angeles Times shortly after passage of the fair housing bill. It shows a sensitive and sensible attitude on this important civil rights bill.

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 16, 1980]

SHOWING THAT AMERICA STILL CARES

In 1968 Congress passed the Fair Housing Act amid much drama and debate. Opponents in the Senate staged a six-week filibuster before action was finally taken. In contrast, amendments that would strengthen the enforcement of that act have passed the House after relatively low-key discussion despite heavy opposition from realtors.

The original act bars housing discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or sex. If someone charges discrimination, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development can try to settle the dispute by conciliation. If that does not work, the aggrieved individual—not the government—may file suit. The Justice Department can file cases only if it finds discrimination patterns.

The amendments, sponsored by Rep. Don Edwards (D-Calif.), would allow HUD to initiate hearings before an administrative-law judge, who could order a violator to stop discriminatory practices and assess a civil penalty of up to \$10,000. That decision could be appealed to a federal district court judge. Realtors complain that these administrative-law judges may not render independent decisions because they are hired and promoted by the department. The bigger problem may be that the hearing procedure may be no quicker than going to court now is, but we agree that some administrative mechanism is needed to help make fair housing a reality.

The House also passed changes in the 12-year-old law that would forbid appraisers and insurance companies from discriminatory judgments. Unfortunately, the companion Senate bill contains no authority for the government to initiate administrative actions, nor does it cover appraisers or property insurers. The bill will go before the Senate Judiciary Committee later this month.

Lack of tension in the halls of Congress over this measure should not be confused with lack of hostility among minorities denied housing because of who they are. Passage of this bill would show that the nation still cares about eliminating discrimination, which is no more right today than it was 12 years ago.●

NEW FOCUS NEEDED ON FOREIGN AID

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, many in this body have been critical in recent years of American foreign policy. While the criticism has ranged across a broad spectrum, there has been general agreement that we have been doing something wrong. Many of the complaints from my congressional colleagues have focused on the contentions that our foreign policy lacks consistent direction and that despite our generosity we have been losing friends in the international arena.

But part of the blame for that failure lies right here with the Congress and its policies. In simple words, the bills we have passed send out blurred signals. Our recent efforts seem to view foreign policy as the sum of domestic political considerations and our perceived need to emphasize military assistance. But we must ask how such a policy plays to the people of a developing nation whose economy is likely suffering from the escalating price of oil and whose people are likely suffering from inadequate food.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the missing element in our foreign policy is our seeming inability to see the value of economic assistance. Our foreign policy has not realized that we are more likely to head off social unrest and to win friends by helping to alleviate poverty and hunger than by paying for military weapons to be used to ward off future social upheavals.

Among the trenchant remarks made recently by former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance in his excellent Harvard University commencement address was the observation that this country needs to reevaluate the basic assumptions of its foreign policy. I offer the following two commentaries in the hopes they will help focus thought on the comprehensive foreign policy we must follow in order to reassert our rightful place in world affairs.

The articles follow:

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 12, 1980]

VANCE IS RIGHT—U.S. AID EFFORT IS A DISGRACE

(By Philip Geyelin)

In his farewell address at Harvard the other day, former secretary of state Cyrus R. Vance used uncharacteristically sharp words ("dangerous . . . naive . . . foolish") to deplore the "new nostalgia" for military solutions as a substitute for diplomacy.

Without mentioning names, he took unmistakable issue with the Administration that he served and resigned from on a matter of principle, and took a calculated whack at the Kissingerian "grand design"

approach to foreign policy as well. And that's what caught the attention, understandably.

But the fact remains that the issue that he spoke of most passionately—his most "heartfelt concern," according to associates—was not the failure to ratify SALT II, or the overemphasis on arms spending, or the "perverted hubris that overestimates our power." Vance's sharpest words were reserved for the state of the American foreign-aid effort in recent years:

"American aid programs . . . make the most difference in supporting our Third World diplomacy and in addressing now the causes of later crises. Yet they are under constant assault in Congress and elsewhere. "The result is—I can think of no other word—disgraceful."

That statement attracted no notice. And that, alas, is also understandable. The American public, Congress and the executive branch all seem to be about equally turned off by the idea of providing economic development assistance to the dangerously destitute and politically turbulent nations of the so-called Third World.

Long gone is the spirit of the Marshall Plan or the days of Harry S. Truman's Point Four, or the time when a secretary of defense, Robert S. McNamara, could devote a major address to a global challenge as far removed from the traditional preoccupations of the Pentagon as economic development.

Yet McNamara spoke eloquently nearly 20 years ago of the problems of poverty and hunger and overpopulation as the root cause of the sort of economic deprivation and consequent social unrest that offer easy targets of opportunity for communist expansion and lead us, ultimately, into confrontation with the Soviets.

It was never such a large leap for McNamara from the Defense Department to the presidency of the World Bank. He saw it the way Vance sees it—as the difference between the operating table and preventive medicine.

But Congress, it is all too evident, does not believe in preventive medicine. As Vance also noted bitterly: "We are far in arrears in meeting the pledges we have made to the multilateral development banks, and likely to slip still farther."

All the while, Congress strains to spend more money to build rapid-deployment forces for instant intervention in Third World internal upheavals on behalf of governments that have their own "Vietnam complexes" and no great yearning to be saved from themselves by force of American arms.

This is not to knock military preparedness, or the prudent application of American force when diplomacy and deterrence fail. It is merely to commend Vance's sober balancing of risks and needs—military, economic, diplomatic.

It is undeniably "disgraceful," as Vance noted, that the United States now ranks 13th among the world's 17 largest industrial nations in the percentage of gross national product that it devotes to development assistance, and is about to be knocked down another notch by Japan.

It is no more defensible that American foreign aid, as Vance also pointed out, has been reduced by 25% over the last 20 years, even as the number of needy new nations—and potential trouble spots—has rapidly grown. Economic development now accounts for only about 1.5% of the entire federal budget.

True, there is waste in these efforts. There is also corruption; we are talking

about nations newly formed. But there is also more than enough evidence that economic development can be made to work; that it offers diplomatic leverage for the short haul, if your interests are pragmatic and immediate, and that doing nothing to ease the Third World's economic misery is a certain prescription for trouble even if doing something is no guarantee of tranquillity.

What economic development aid won't do, of course, is measurably improve the welfare of mankind within the term of an incumbent member of the House, or of a President, or even of a senator. And because it is preventive medicine, you can't even prove beyond doubt that what you set out to prevent was ever going to happen. It is not rewarding, in that sense.

And yet there is a certain nuttiness in spending greatly increased amounts of money so that sophisticated new weapons now on drawing boards will be ready 10 years from now to deal with crises and conflicts directly related to social and political unrest that relatively inexpensive economic-development programs, launched today, might do much to alleviate.

Foreign aid is a way of hedging bets, I suppose, and only really worth doing if you think that it matters what sort of world awaits your children—and theirs.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 12, 1980]

GUNS AND BUTTER, CLARIFIED
(By Joseph C. Harsch)

Cyrus Vance, recent U.S. secretary of state, has done all of us a service by identifying coolly, lucidly, accurately the reasons for what has been bothering a lot of his fellow citizens about their country's place in the world.

If you have not yet done so, I recommend a careful reading of the speech he made at the Harvard graduation ceremonies this spring. The full text was printed in the New York Times June 6.

For example, there is a decline in U.S. ability to influence events around the world. Why? Mr. Vance notes two major reasons:

"... by 1985 world demand for oil is likely to outstrip global oil production by two million barrels a day."

"Productivity in the United States declined in every quarter of 1979 after the rate of increase in our productivity had steadily slowed over the previous two decades."

In other words, U.S. economic vitality has been slowing down for a long time, indeed for 20 years.

One result of declining productivity has been a trade deficit. In spite of that deficit the U.S. has continued to be the world's heaviest importer and user of oil, thus hastening the day when there will be a shortage of oil for everyone. Continued importation of oil plus the continuing trade deficit has fueled the inflation which in turn further damages the U.S. economy. The weakening of the economy undermines U.S. influence with other countries, particularly with the allies who are all threatened with oil shortage by the high rate of U.S. consumption.

Inflation and declining productivity also make it more expensive to try to keep up with the Soviets in military weapons.

Right now there is a rising demand, particularly on the election year hustings, for regaining U.S. military superiority over the Soviets. Mr. Vance calls this "... a pervasive fallacy that America could have the power to order the world just the way we want it to be. It assumes, for example, that we could dominate the Soviet Union—that we

could prevent it from being a superpower—if we chose to do so."

That fallacy, he says, has "more to do with nostalgia than with present-day reality." Why?

Because, says Mr. Vance, "it is naive to believe that they [the Soviets]—any more than we—would willingly accept a position of second best in military strength."

In other words, in the years ahead there will be two global superpowers, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., of roughly equal strength and range of influence. "We must preserve and manage a position of essential equivalence with the Soviet Union." But if the U.S. cannot convert equivalence into superiority then what is to be done?

Mr. Vance's answer is that the U.S. must direct its long-term efforts toward achieving "a strong American economy in a strong international economy." That means heavy emphasis on improving relations with the allies. This in turn depends on curbing the inflation, curbing excess use of oil, "a higher rate of capital investment." "a willingness to shift from obsolete industries instead of propping them up with protectionist trade barriers."

This world, says Mr. Vance, is no longer in the "good old days" when the U.S. was the only true global power. "The international diffusion of power" is the new fact which will not go away. The U.S. must learn to come to terms with this new and diffuse world. It will require, he says, more than just keeping up with the Soviets in military power. There must also be a return to diplomacy in order to "limit the costs, and to increase our safety." Mr. Vance wants SALT II ratified because "without this treaty both sides will have more nuclear weapons than with it. In particular the Soviet Union will have thousands of additional warheads."

But above all, according to Mr. Vance, the U.S. must regain its economic health in cooperation with its allies in order to build "a strong American economy in a strong international economy."

Obviously, this speech is the distillation of Mr. Vance's three years as head of the State Department. It explains why he resigned over the unsuccessful resort to military power in Iran. It is written partly because, in his opinion, "it is far too easy, in an election year, to let what may seem smart politics produce bad policies." But it ends on an optimistic note.

"If we are prepared to accept the implications of a world of diffuse power, and work with others where we cannot succeed alone, there need be no insurmountable barriers to our progress."

In my opinion it is the finest, most balanced, and most perceptive discussion of U.S. foreign policy since the great days of Acheson and Dulles. ●

AMERICA'S HUMAN CAPITAL

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, capital is not just money. If it were, then government could solve its problems by printing more of it, or we could double—triple—government aid to industry. Capital, in my view, is productive capability and thus exists in the minds, hands, and creativity of the people.

As Warren Brookes incisively argues in a June 10 editorial for the Boston Herald-American, "America's greatest assets"—our human capital—"all come here on boats from over the seas." The Cubans, Indochinese, and Haitians are only the latest in our long history of new arrivals. All have contributed to the economic development of our Nation. The Cubans in particular have contributed mightily to Florida. That State's personal income and jobs have grown twice as fast as the Nation's, and its unemployment declined in precisely those years when the influx of Cuban immigrants was greatest. Today the percentage of Florida residents on welfare is half the national average.

I commend Warren Brookes' generous and thoughtful editorial to your attention.

[From the Boston Herald-American—June 10, 1980]

IMMIGRANTS ARE A NATIONAL ASSET, NOT A LIABILITY

A recent cartoon on this page showed two native American Indians standing astride Plymouth Rock, skeptically eyeing the approaching Mayflower, loaded with Pilgrims.

One of them was saying, "There goes the neighborhood," and the other, "just more unemployment and welfare, and besides, they talk funny."

The cartoon was an ironic reminder that of the 222 million Americans, less than 1 million can trace their original roots to this land. The other 99.6 percent of us are rooted in other lands, and are the offspring of descendants of immigrants.

It was also a commentary, by inversion, on an economic reality: While the Indians, themselves, were brutalized by the arrival of immigrants, this nation's great economy was entirely built by them.

When the Pilgrims landed, there were fewer than 300,000 native American Indians living on 3.5 million square miles—or less than one individual eking out the barest subsistence from 10 square miles.

Today, there are more than 600 Americans on every 10 square miles of our country, living at a level of affluence undreamed of in most of the rest of the world.

Yet, given today's spectre of limited energy resources, and deepening recession, it is not surprising that Americans are now taking a somewhat mixed view of the arrival of 100,000 Cuban refugees on Florida's shores.

On the one hand, we are inspired by their courage, and proud that they have reached out to America, and on the other hand we wonder if they will take our jobs, or consume too many of our tax dollars.

Indeed, part of the stimulus for the Miami riots may well have been fear and resentment over the influx of so many new mouths to feed, and hands to employ.

Americans would do well to remember, however, that this nation's greatest economic growth took place from 1880 to 1930, when we took in 37 million immigrants who, with their offspring, accounted for fully 60 percent of our huge population growth in that period.

It must be apparent that not all of these 37 million were ideal, and that among them were the usual number of "undesirables." Yet, without this huge influx, America could never have achieved its economic supremacy in the world—a supremacy that de-

veloped almost entirely during the period of the greatest immigration to our shores.

It is a useful reminder that the wealth of any nation is not in the ground, but in its people, and in the qualities, ideas, energies, hopes and dreams they express.

If you don't think this is still true, consider Japan whose 114 million people are now crowded on less than 144,000 square miles of some of the lowest-resource territory in the world. Yet, with a population density of over 900 per square mile (15 times that of the U.S., and 11 times that of the world as a whole), Japan is not the world's leading export nation, its third richest nation, and its fastest-growing economy in terms of productivity!

When you compare Japan, with its per capita GNP of more than \$9,000 a year from a population density of 900 per square mile, with Zaïre, one of the richest resource countries of Africa, with its per capita output of less than \$120 from a population of only 30, you realize that even in this age of resource scarcity, a nation's wealth has more to do with its people than its territory.

This is, of course, because, our individual wealth has always had more to do, not only with our individual abilities, motivations, capacities and ideas, but with the political and economic opportunity to express them, than it has to do with "ground wealth."

The best modern proof of this lies in the more than 600,000 Cuban Americans who have emigrated to our shores since 1958, most of them settling in Florida.

This huge influx of Cubans has done far more for Florida's economy than against it. While Florida's population has grown three times as fast as the nation, its personal income and jobs have consistently grown twice as fast as the nation, and its unemployment rate actually fell sharply throughout the 1960's, the period of the greatest influx of Cuban immigrants. What's more, while the average Cuban in Cuba still produces less than \$700 a year in gross product the average Cuban in Florida produces more than \$9,000, thirteen times as much.

What is more important, the percentage of Florida's population on welfare has actually declined since 1970 by 18 percent, even as it has grown by 31 percent in the nation, and over 75 percent in Massachusetts. Today, only 2.7 percent of Florida's vastly inflated population is receiving AFDC welfare, compared with 4.7 percent of the nation and 6.3 percent of Mass.

Today, less than 5 percent of the Cuban-American population in Florida is on welfare, and less than 7 percent are unemployed—compared with 24 percent of urban blacks on welfare, and 16 percent unemployment.

It is abundantly clear that the infusion of nearly half a million Cubans into the Florida economy has been one of the primary reasons why it has now outstripped, in total Gross State Product, many northern urban states like Massachusetts, which it used to trail before the Cuban migrations began.

In other words, the Cubans have "brought their wealth with them," in their energies, ambitions, hopes and qualities of thought, with which they have created their own economic progress, despite the fact that they came here without the English language, and with only the clothes on their backs.

It is one more demonstration that, within a context of political and economic freedom, the wealth of a population is limited only by its individual human capacities, and not by its natural environment.

Today, less than 30 percent of even our reduced annual population growth is coming from immigration (compared with 40-50

percent from 1900-1930). The Florida experience suggests that the nation as a whole may well be suffering more from restricted immigration, than benefitting from it. It is no accident that three of the world's richest nations—Canada, Australia, and the U.S.—were all built by immigrants.

The present boom in the Massachusetts economy, coming as it does entirely from high technology and in the face of severe state limitations in energy and the environment, is a reminder that the most important component of wealth is still ideas, and the individual human capacity to express and develop them. Massachusetts is being richly blessed by an "immigration" of engineers, and their products.

One cannot help seeing in the faces of those eager Cubans, who gave up everything and risked their lives to find freedom in America, exactly the kind of social and economic stimulus we now so urgently need—a stimulus that does not depend on the turgid programs of federal bureaucracies, but on the spirit the hearts and the minds of individuals.

It is also a reminder that America's greatest assets, its people, have, in our deepest roots, all come here on boats from over the seas.●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO
HON. JAMES SALVATO OF
NEW JERSEY, OUTSTANDING
CITIZEN, SPORTSMAN, AND
CONSERVATIONIST

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 20, the residents of my congressional district and State of New Jersey will join together in testimony to an outstanding sportsman, distinguished conservationist, leading citizen, and good friend, the Honorable James Salvato, whose birthday celebration commemorating the 80th year of his birth will provide an opportunity for his relatives and many, many friends to express tribute to his lifetime of good works. 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, Ina, daughter Joan, and sons Jim, Jr., and Lou on this most joyous occasion in testimony to the quality of his leadership and professional expertise in his field of endeavor, the warmth of his friendship, and his standards of excellence in our American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud to boast that Jim Salvato was born and raised in the city of Paterson, N.J. Immediately upon his graduation from high school he entered the business world as an accountant/bookkeeper. In 1926 he joined in a partnership and founded the Paterson Rod & Gun Store, Inc., a most prestigious establishment of long standing for the sportsmen of New Jersey.

As an active outdoorsman, he joined the Passaic County Fish & Game Pro-

tective Association in 1927 and was one of the founders of the Izaak Walton League of Paterson. He was also instrumental in helping commence the Passaic County Deputy Fish & Game Warden Association.

Jim Salvato is a lifetime member of the Consolidated Sportsmen of New Jersey and the Wortendyke Field & Stream Association.

As an active participant in these most esteemed organizations, Jimmy was in the vanguard of the humanitarian efforts of caring for and feeding the wildlife. He would accompany his fellow members on snow-laden woodland trails during the dead of winter with stale bread from local bakeries, produce from the marketplace, corn and alfalfa from the State division of fish and game, and when the trails were impassable food would be dropped by air to the starving animals.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to his conservation endeavors, Jim Salvato is a highly respected hunter and fisherman. During the 1930's Jim embarked on his career as a writer. He has become a most adroit and highly acclaimed author on hunting, fishing, conservation, and environmental concerns and his column entitled "The Great Outdoors" is, and will long be remembered as, one of the most popular among the outdoor enthusiasts and sportsmen of our State and Nation. He served as president of the New York Metropolitan Outdoor Writers Association and continued for many years as treasurer of that organization. For many years he also wrote a column on dog care, field trials, and show competitions.

Mr. Speaker, Jim Salvato helped organize and establish the Paterson Casting Club and competed in many casting events, becoming eastern U.S. champion on several occasions.

In 1948, the sportsmen of the North Jersey district nominated Jim for appointment by the Governor to the New Jersey Fish and Game Council where he served for 8 years. While on this commission, he was in charge of the trout stocking program and field trial chairman. During his tenure he earned the title "Mr. Rabbit" for his efforts in having the State adopt a program to stock rabbits for the sportsman.

His achievements as a hunter are renowned. In fishing he has recorded, personally, over 3,000 smallmouth bass caught on a bass bug at Lake Cananoque, Canada, and is proud of the fact that he never destroyed one of these bass.

Mr. Speaker, there is so much that could be said of the friendship and good will that he has so willingly and abundantly given over these many years that mean so much to the lives of all of us who have had the good fortune to know him.

As we join together in a birthday celebration to a good friend and distinguished citizen, we extend the appre-

ciation of the Congress to James Salvo for his outstanding contribution to the quality of life and way of life here in America as an outdoorsman, sportsman, conservationist, environmentalist, and writer who has truly enriched our community, State, and Nation. ●

THE SECRET CLUB OF PARIS

HON. JOHN J. CAVANAUGH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. CAVANAUGH. Mr. Speaker, the June 1980 issue of *Institutional Investor* contains an article, "Inside the Paris Club" by Vivian Lewis, which offers an unique and significant public view of the ad hoc group of nations which have for the past 25 years managed the economic and, therefore, social destinies of the debtor nations of the world. As the decisions made by the Paris Club increasingly affect not only the international credit worthiness and resulting developmental capacity, economic, social, and political stability of the less developed countries of the world but also significantly influences U.S. global, political, and economic policies and goals, it is important that Members of Congress and the American people acquire an understanding of the operations and influences of the Paris Club. Since 1973 the economic and political faith of our Nation has become inextricably entwined with the economic and political fate of the developing debtor nations of the world. For the first time in history, collapse and chaos among the poor nations of the world directly threatens the stability of the rich. The dependence of the world economic order on the continued recycling of the oil petroleum countries surplus dollars through the private banking system means that a default by a major debtor nation such as Turkey, Brazil, or Indonesia or the collapse of groups of smaller borrowers such as Zaire, Peru, or Sudan could severely threaten the soundness of the major banks of this country and the safety of the entire banking system. This article is essential reading for those who wish to understand the dangers and weaknesses of an international economic system which operates without goals or rules and yet determines the destiny of nations and their people:

[From the *Institutional Investor*, June 1980]

INSIDE THE PARIS CLUB

(By Vivian Lewis)

Terror and futility haunt the hallways of the old Hotel Majestic on Paris' Avenue Kléber. It was formerly the headquarters of the Gestapo, and subsequently the scene of abortive attempts at international cooperation like the 1977 North-South Conference that collected richer and poorer countries for a round of frustrating talks. And many

people the world over are familiar with the building from its appearance on television as the site of the Vietnam peace negotiations—four-sided table and all.

These days, rechristened the Center for International Meetings, the Majestic building is the locale for the Paris Club, the informal, ad hoc institution that brings together country debtors unable to pay up and their Western country creditors. And today, with LDC indebtedness growing at an alarming pace, the club has never been busier—nor more under fire from critics, who charge that its mechanisms are now inadequate to deal with the huge debt problems of developing nations.

If little is known about the Paris Club—and how it goes about its business of rescheduling country-to-country loans—it is not because the organization is a newcomer to the scene. It dates back, in fact, to 1956, when Argentina, a year after the demise of the Peron regime, needed to consolidate some \$350 million debts incurred under bilateral trade agreements with European countries. Argentina wanted to deal with as many of its creditors as possible at once, rather than go through the time-consuming process of negotiating with each separately. The IMF had no interest in putting together such a group; the fund, after all, has always said it is not a creditor but a buyer and seller of foreign currency. The World Bank would have been a more likely candidate to sponsor a meeting. But the bank, which considers itself the world's preferred creditor that must be paid all debts precisely when due, was not about to chair a conference to talk about debt renegotiations.

What the World Bank has done it considers quite different. Since 1958, in response to a call from India, it has sponsored a host of gatherings to study the needs of third-world countries and rally the support of industrialized nations for development programs. And if necessary, the bank would later convene and "aid consortium" to discuss how the debt portion of the aid to a struggling nation might be restructured or even forgiven—a format that has also been used by the OECD, officials of creditor countries and even once, in the case of Ghana, by the IMF. But the context of these meetings is not debt relief per se; in 1976, in fact, the U.S. announced flatly that debt relief was no substitute for aid and that henceforth it would discuss debt restructuring only through the medium of creditor clubs. As a result, consortia have been little used in recent years.

Argentina, moreover, did not want the glare of publicity that would result from World Bank involvement. It wanted, instead, a quiet, informal meeting where finance ministers could sit down in relative obscurity and talk things over. The result was an invitation from Argentina's public creditors to a face-to-face negotiation in Paris. Thus, the pattern was set for future club responses to debt repayment problems. The debtor country would ask for a hearing and a meeting would be called—normally for about two days—to work out terms to reschedule its debt payments.

Why Paris, with the French as official hosts? The French claim it was because they are known to be more open to the Third World, but one wonders how true that could have been in 1956, when France—although out of Indochina for two years—was still very much embroiled in Algeria. More to the point, a South American debtor like Argentina didn't want to turn to the U.S. for help—the U.S. didn't even participate in the first Paris meeting—and Britain was considered too closely linked to the

U.S. France has always been more independent, and Paris was second to London as a European financial center; the IMF and World Bank both have their European headquarters there. Besides, Paris itself is always a pleasant lure. A recent Paris Club luncheon to celebrate the completion of Sierra Leone talks went on until four in the afternoon. "Sometimes if creditors take too long agreeing to terms, we tell them they won't be allowed for dinner unless they sign," jokes one of the club bureaucrats. Others note that even the poorest countries manage to put up their Paris Club delegation at the best hotels.

France had its own motives for welcoming a sponsor position. There would be advantages in being at the center of things; knowing, for example, what terms Western countries were asking borrowers could prove useful in negotiating France's own arrangements, particularly government-insured credits for private loans. Also, debtor countries initiate these requests for a club convocation with the French Treasury; if there are political reasons for being friendly toward that country, the ministry can speed up the process; if, on the other hand, the politics are unfriendly, it can stall. And, in point of fact, creditors and debtors alike, from time to time, have accused France of politically motivated favoritism.

Be that as it may, the Paris Club meetings are chaired by a representative of the French Treasury, currently Michel Camdessus, who heads a section that also deals with France's other international finance commitments. According to one club staff officer, "Judicially we do not exist. The French taxpayer pays us, however." Backing Camdessus at the Finance Ministry is a staff of two executives, Isabelle Cheyvalle and Gérard Pfauwadel. This lean structure had been adopted to underscore the fiction that the Paris Club debt rescheduling exercises are a rare and exceptional phenomenon.

In reality, they aren't. Argentina revisited the Paris site three times after its initial foray in 1956, and other countries that have renegotiated their debt payments with the club include Brazil, Cambodia and Sierra Leone, twice; Pakistan, Peru and Zaire, three times; Chile, Ghana and Indonesia, four times; Sudan, Togo and Turkey, five times; and India, a whopping nine times, most recently last year. To further confuse matters, other countries have sometimes sponsored the meetings in different cities, such as London, The Hague and Brussels. But the label "Paris Club" has been slapped on all occasions when creditor governments meet to discuss debt relief for developing countries. Last year the club met five times, and this year it gathered twice during the first three months. "Ours is a booming business, thanks to the growing volume of LDC debt," says one private banker close to the club.

EMPHASIS ON SECRECY

In spite of the fact that the Paris Club has met regularly for almost 25 years now, it has been singularly successful in keeping its proceedings quiet. Hardly anything has appeared in print about the club, and none of the government officials, private bankers, diplomats and academics from nearly a dozen nations interviewed by *Institutional Investor* for this article would talk on the record. (The one exception was Peruvian Finance Minister Javier Silva Ruete: "I too preferred secrecy when we were in a bad situation," he says. "But now that we are doing well, I want everyone to know.")

This emphasis on secrecy has helped the club maintain the pretense that mecha-

nisms for debt relief are almost nonexistent, that they involve extraordinary favors or dire political consequences to the debtors, that the system will somehow collapse if creditors are not paid on the nail to the very last penny. And that impression in turn discourages debtor countries from using the club's facilities too liberally.

Nevertheless, this magazine's off-the-record sources drew a fascinating picture of how the club's increasingly important role has embroiled it in controversy and how in its secretive, low-key manner it actually functions. When a debtor nation calls for a meeting, the French secretariat invites all Western creditor countries to attend, and although not all necessarily show up, the terms of the agreement are binding on all. There is no legal basis for this arrangement; it is simply a matter of convenience. At a March debt rescheduling for Turkey, for example, treasury representatives from nineteen countries appeared—a tribute to Turkey's political importance.

Observers from the IMF and the World Bank are normally present—and kept informed of between meeting developments by telexes from Camdessus' office—and since the middle of last year, representatives of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development have been included as well. And while the Paris Club meets solely to discuss debt relief, the IMF and World Bank provide information about the development and balance-of-payments status of the debtor country. In fact, creditor nations often request the debtor country to seek standby credits from the IMF, which in other cases is asked to play a monitoring role. As Constantine Michalopoulos, deputy administrator for economic affairs at the Agency for International Development in Washington, has written, "The creditors thus use the IMF conditionality as a means of assuring the restoration of debt-servicing capacity for the debtors."

While it remains a fundamental condition of the international finance system that debts are not normally renegotiated but simply paid, the terms of club deals have tended to soften in recent years. They now amount to something like five years' grace (during which interest is payable at varying below-market rates) and ten years during which debt is rescheduled. Usually a country's total loan portfolio is not discussed; only the debt falling due in a given year is rescheduled at one convocation of the club, and, in principle, debt rescheduled cannot be rescheduled again. As we have seen, however, countries do make repeat visits to ask for further help.

NEW FIRE

But today, the club is under increasing fire from critics, who insist that its 25-year-old mechanisms are no longer adequate to deal with the growing volume of LDC debt. Officials of UNCTAD, for example, criticize the club's traditional emphasis on short-term solutions, which, they say, only because of Western prejudice are kept independent from the aid measures that developing countries need to ensure their economic recovery. They point out that countries win a round of concessions only to return seeking more, wasting time and goodwill on both sides. What is needed instead, they argue, is long-term remedial planning to ensure continued development. An UNCTAD official close to the Sierra Leone talks in February points out, for example, that the main reason the negotiations went so smoothly is that the club had been through the same exercise less than three years earlier. But an official of the French Treasury sees it differently. In his view, the

club has assumed an ongoing educational role: "We have a civilizing mission to help debtor countries recognize the nature of their problems and the kind of international help they require."

But UNCTAD's credibility as a critic has been considerably eroded by its recent participation in the debt rescheduling business; it now seems to be subscribing to the system it has been attacking. And UNCTAD's clamor to have debt relief more closely linked to aid is criticized by some people in the development lobby quite as severely as by Paris Club creditor participants. "The real world does not correspond to UNCTAD rhetoric," sniffs one of the latter. "There is no conflict between debtors and creditors as soon as there is a real danger to a country's ability to repay." At the same time, an academic spokesman for third-world interests remarks that "UNCTAD, by pressing for a medium-term, aid-linked alternative to the club process, is opening the way to setting up institutions like the International Monetary Fund as policemen of all lending and refinancing, from government or from private banks. I, for one, think it would be a disaster to remove the Paris Club crack between which debtors now fall."

SPECIAL DEALS

But UNCTAD also charges that the club does not treat all countries equally, and today has assumed the role of monitor to make sure all debtor nations get the same terms. But this will not be easy. Special deals have characterized club exercises from the start. During the late 1960s, the club managed to win a certain reputation for evenhandedness by its handling of negotiations over Chile (with first the Frey and then the Allende and the Pinochet governments). But at the same time, invidious comparisons were being regularly drawn between the alleged easy terms that had been granted to Indonesia and the toughness shown toward Ghana after each country struggled to pick up the pieces following the fall of a dictator.

Critics charged that the Indonesians had won softer terms from the Paris Club by bringing in as friend of the court Hermann Abs, the chairman of the board of Deutsche Bank and a distinguished international economist, who himself had been principal negotiator for the German Federal Republic in the 1953 London Conference on German External Debt. The Indonesians got a precedent-breaking, no-interest grace period for rescheduling what they owed—which did not, however, prevent their having to return a total of four times to the negotiating table, to be saved, finally, by the rise in oil prices.

The situation of Ghana (which resorted to a Paris Club-type mechanism on official debt run, on that occasion, out of London) is cited as a contrast. World Bank expert Albert Cizaukas recently wrote that the settlements, "while more innovative and less commercial than earlier Paris Club reschedulings, provided only partial and short-term debt relief largely at market rates of interest. Ghana could not understand or accept the contrast in treatment accorded to it and to Indonesia by virtually the same creditors at virtually the same time." French Treasury officials, in fact, blame the bitterness over the Ghana renegotiations on the change of venue from Paris to London (reflecting the disproportionate volume of British credits and loans). "The whole atmosphere was poisoned by colonial memories," says one official. "We have greater experience in defusing the issue." And, in fact, after the January 1972 coup, the new army

regime repudiated some medium-term debts and unilaterally rescheduled the remainder.

But Ghana's problem with the club mechanism may not have been only the terms at which debt was rescheduled. According to one recent study, in fact, Ghana's terms involved "a larger grant element—61 per cent—than any country had hitherto received from a debt settlement." More difficult was the creditors' insistence that all debt, including that tainted by bribery or "project mongery," be treated equally.

It may well be that the secret of why Indonesia came out so well has nothing to do with having had Hermann Abs stick up for it; the real key to its preferred treatment may be the fact that it owed sums to creditors wholly outside the Western private and public system, namely the Soviet Union. For political reasons, the Soviets offer their debtors extremely soft terms when things go wrong, and Indonesian President Sukarno's successors were able to defer repayment (at zero interest) on part of their Western debt because they also owed socialist countries (which refused to join club talks).

The East Bloc continues to boycott Paris Club exercises (although, significantly, some developing countries from the oil bloc, like Abu Dhabi and the Emirates, have participated). So, the Russian connection can be turned to advantage even today. Peru's canny Finance Minister, Javier Silva Ruete, during his country's most recent club negotiation in 1978, was able to cite the generous concessions offered by the U.S.S.R. and the Andean bloc a mere week earlier in order to force extremely advantageous terms from the Western developed country governments.

Early this year, Silva Ruete informed the club that its services would not be required in rescheduling debt that would fall due in 1980. Then, he tried to force the private banks to accept accelerated payment of the debt that they had rescheduled in the wake of the 1978 Paris Club talks. After all, why pay for a moratorium you do not need? Questioned about his country's success, Silva Ruete was sufficiently in tune with the UNCTAD line to insist that the Paris Club had been no more than "fair" with his negotiating team. He attributed the success of his country's recovery program to a combination of "sound and realistic policies" and "a good measure of luck. With Peruvian oil production rising and the prices of traditional exports of silver, copper and gold going up, Peru does not need any more refinancing," he says. "From 1980, we can pay our debts."

ANOTHER FICTION

Another sign that some debt-burdened countries are more equal than others is provided by Turkey's saga, which officially transpired outside the context of the Paris Club, thanks to yet another fiction. The most recent Turkish rescheduling exercise, in March, although held at the OECD with a triad of private bank advisers from Lazard Frères, Warburgs and Lehman Brothers, nonetheless involved a Paris Club cast of characters, including as chairman of the meeting the French Treasury's Camdessus. Turkey got to hold its rescheduling exercises at the Château de la Muette rather than the Majestic because it is a member of NATO and the OECD.

Although earlier Turkish refinancing programs included uninsured private credits at more generous terms than the Paris Club was awarding at that time, the more liberal treatment has nonetheless been carried out recently by the same representatives who attend the more stringent Paris Club.

Turkey has managed, thanks perhaps to its strategic importance, to win a whole host of concessions no one else has ever received. They range from the re-scheduling of debt already rescheduled once to officially recognized non-uniform terms for creditors, from inclusion of balance-of-payments loans in the club program to the association of debt relief with aid (Turkey had already met with the OECD and IMF before the March meeting). For Turkey (and no other country), very short-term debt not normally included in multilateral relief operations has been thrown in—including such creations as convertible Turkish lira deposits, third-party reimbursable credits and short-term debt of less than one year. (In addition to its OECD refinancing exercise in 1979, Turkey was also advised by the triad of banks led by Lazard over its negotiations with 24 commercial banks.)

Another cloud on the club's horizon is the growing conflict between private and public lenders. Officially, the club speaks only for government creditors, and no private banks are present, even as observers. Still, in the club's early days, when discussion centered on trade financing, there seemed to be some direct coordination between the two groups. Back then it was common for the club terms to be made public, along with mention of the conditions under which private banks from some or all of the creditor nations would take part in the consolidation scheme.

But after 1961, the club was no longer able to broadcast information about what private banks were doing. As the volume of bank lending to governments mushroomed, the coordination became increasingly complicated and, more importantly, governments involved in club negotiations were terrified of any public suggestions that taxpayers' money was being used to bail out the private banks. "Thanks to a kind of hide-and-seek game," says a close observer of the club's operations, "the club normally manages to insure that debtor countries are not borrowing from Peter to pay Paul—or using official debt relief to repay private creditors."

Today, a debtor country meets with private creditors beforehand, to get some idea of the terms it can bargain for—a matter that is then considered during the club negotiations. The final club deal has a standard clause requiring that the private sector provide similar and parallel concessions. Then, about one or two weeks later, a still more informal club of private bankers—called the New York Club or the London Club, depending on location—meets to work out its debt relief. "Banks can do things we cannot do, and we can do things they cannot do," says a club expert. "But normally, our interest rates are lower than the LIBOR-plus banks charge."

GETTING TOUGHER

But today, club critics charge that this ad hoc system no longer works so neatly. Zaire was a prominent case in point. In June 1976, the Paris Club rescheduled the payment of some billion dollars Zaire owed government creditors, including the granting of a three-year moratorium. Zaire expected the private banks to fall in line with similarly liberal terms. But some 100 private creditors, led by Citibank (Institutional Investor, March 1977), firmly insisted that they should not, like governments, rewrite the terms of existing loans, and the debt restructuring was only a fallback position. Instead, they demanded that Zaire retain its creditworthiness by serving its outstanding debt, and then use IMF help and new credit arrangements

from the private sector to get back on its feet. Paris Club members were obviously distressed at this stubbornness by the private sector, and again raised charges that the banks were being bailed out. But the private arrangements stuck, and the Paris Club itself now usually insists on tough work-out conditions, with IMF surveillance. Zaire is presently against discussing refinancing arrangements with private creditors following the Paris Club rescheduling arranged last year.

Another current problem is Sudan, a country entangled in a frustrating morass of debt-management difficulties. The private banks refuse to discuss their arrangement with Sudan until the nation settles with its public creditors, with whom it has been talking individually. But a Paris Club intervention may be the next step. "This conflict between public and private creditors is the greatest area of potential trouble," admits a club participant. "In a crisis, people often forget the convergence of their individual interests—which is that the debtor country recover its ability to repay its debts." The potential fight for funds between creditors, in fact, is a far more potent threat to the club system than UNCTAD's agitation for greater liberality from creditors—or for that matter the persistent exaggerated concern about some sort of liquidity crisis among the banks.

After the Sudanese problem is wrapped up—if this happens at all—the club, in the view of private bankers, must again tackle Zaire. "It will have to happen in a couple of months," one banker guesses. Furthermore, Senegal may also be in need of club help soon. "1980 will be a busy year," this banker adds. Indeed, the next few years are likely to be very busy. For one thing, much of the huge debt incurred as a result of the 1973 oil crisis is now coming due. And while much of it is held by private banks, they are already talking about sizable cutbacks in LDC lending. More importantly, worldwide inflation has exacerbated debt problems in two ways—by increasing the internal difficulties of the third-world countries and making it harder for the industrialized world to help them with their development programs.

Irving Friedman, who spent 28 years with the IMF and World Bank, and who recently left Citibank to join First Boston as senior international adviser, believes this situation may well affect the Paris Club mechanism. As developed countries, weighed down by their own economic problems, become increasingly reluctant to sustain foreign aid programs, they could well turn to a restructuring of old debt as a surrogate measure. "A more generous attitude toward outstanding debt may be a more acceptable form of development assistance than finding new money on generous terms," says Friedman.

If such is the case, there may be a move away from the club mechanism, which separates debt from assistance considerations, in favor of some sort of aid consortia approach, probably under World Bank auspices. LDC countries would certainly prefer this alternative, where long-term development goals are discussed in an atmosphere of collaboration rather than confrontation. But as we have seen, the U.S. has been opposed to viewing debt relief as a form of aid, and presumably, a change in U.S. policy would be necessary before the Paris Club could be eclipsed.

Meanwhile, with all of its faults—the short-term nature of its approach, its tendency to treat some debtors better than others and its difficulties in meshing its decisions with those of the private sector—the

Paris Club has played, and can continue to play, a valuable role in giving developing countries a way to service their debt without undermining their growth objectives or upsetting the international monetary system.●

LOS ANGELES LITHUANIAN COMMUNITY PLANS WEEKEND DEMONSTRATION

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, the youth of the Los Angeles Lithuanian community, with the coordinated efforts by the San Francisco Lithuanian and Latvian communities, are organizing weekend demonstrations at the Soviet mission in San Francisco on the 20th and 21st of June. The goals of the demonstrations are: To insure the immediate withdrawal of all Soviet troops and personnel from Afghanistan, Baltic States, and all other Soviet-occupied areas; to request an international investigation of war crimes and genocide committed by the Soviets against Afghanistan and Lithuanians; and to request economic and military aid by the United States to Afghanistan.

The demonstration will indicate to the American public that what has recently occurred in Afghanistan runs parallel to the Soviet's illegal seizure of the Baltic States in 1940 and 1944. Although in 1920 the Soviets signed a treaty recognizing the sovereignty and independence of the state of Lithuania, in 1940 the U.S.S.R. positioned troops in Lithuania under the guise of providing military protection against Germany. The troops never left despite the Soviet promise to recognize the Lithuanian Government's sovereignty. To add to the irony of the situation, 9 months after the Soviet invasion of the Baltic States, Stalin signed the Atlantic Charter with the United States and Great Britain. This agreement allegedly respects the right of all nations to choose for themselves the form of government under which they want to live. It was stated in the charter that the Soviets would "strive to reestablish the sovereign rights and self-rule of all nations which were deprived of these by means of force." The Baltic States and several newly occupied nations still remain under Soviet control.

The Lithuanian Americans are demonstrating to remind all Americans of the men and nations who have been deprived of their sovereignty by Soviet force. Lithuania, its Baltic neighbors Latvia and Estonia, Hungary, and Poland, to name a few, have all suffered Afghanistan's recent fate. Those nations now living under Soviet tyranny must be remembered and we must continue to work for their freedom.●

TERRORISM IN EL SALVADOR

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1980

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, while Cuban-backed Marxist revolutionary forces smuggle increasing numbers of weapons into El Salvador and as foreign Marxist-Leninist mercenaries, so-called international brigades, mass along the Nicaraguan border for an invasion, support groups for the Marxist organizations who have been waging an unrelenting terrorist campaign against the Salvadorean people are working here in the United States to insure that our country takes no action to oppose the Communist conquest of Central America.

The pressure campaign involves considerable lobbying by the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy (CNFMP) which takes a radical, extreme isolationist position against U.S. action to interfere with Soviet-backed revolutionary terrorist organizations. Leaders of the CNFMP have ties to the U.S.S.R.'s principal international propaganda front, the World Peace Council (WPC), and the coalition staff have coordinated additional lobbying by CNFMP affiliate organizations that range from Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) through a variety of terrorist support groups to the bureaucratic structures of several religious denominations to join the pressure campaign against El Salvador.

In addition to the lobbying, Salvadorean Marxists living in New York, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and other cities, joined by United States and Central American supporters, have been holding street demonstrations to attract publicity for their demands. The New York support group for the Salvadorean Marxists, the Committee in Support of the Salvadorean People's Struggle-Farabundo Marti (CALPS-FM), in which members of the Salvadorean Communist Party are playing a leading role, has called for a demonstration outside the United Nations in New York for June 28, as part of the pressure campaign.

An emergency demonstration in New York on March 25, 1980, was called by the Coordinating Committee of Solidarity with El Salvador (CCSS). This is composed of the U.S. arms of the three principal Salvadorean revolutionary terrorist groups:

Comite de Apoyo a la Lucha Popular Salvadorense—Farabundo Marti (CALPS-FM)—Committee in Support of the Salvadorean People's Struggle—Farabundo Marti—operating from P.O. Box 748, Old Chelsea Station, New York, N.Y. 10013. It should be noted that Farabundo Marti was a founder of the Communist Party of Central America in 1925, which by 1930 had been broken into national Communist parties in Nicaragua, El

Salvador, Costa Rica, and other Central American nations. Marti served as a top aide to rebel Gen. Augusto Sandino in Nicaragua in the early 1930's, and was killed in a Communist uprising in El Salvador.

Frente Solidario Salvadorense, P.O. Box 208, Bronx, N.Y. 10468.

Comite de Solidaridad Anastasio Aquino, P.O. Box 180, Bronx, N.Y. 10468.

These were joined in the CCAS rally by members of the Moscow-line Communist Party, U.S.A. (CPUSA); the Trotskyite-Communist Socialist Workers Party (SWP) which has reaffirmed its full support for Fidel Castro's regime in Cuba; the militant, violence-oriented Workers World Party which uses the North Korean and Cuban dictatorships as its international leaders; the Coalition for a Free Nicaragua (CFN), a FSLN support group; Non-Intervention in Chile (NICH), a support group for the terrorist Movement of the Revolutionary Left (MIR) of Chile; and the intelligence-gathering arm of U.S. Castroites, the North American Congress on Latin America (NACLA).

In San Francisco, under the banners of the three terrorist-operated mass-front groups—the Popular Revolutionary Bloc (BPR), the United Popular Action Front (FAPU) and the 28th of February Popular Leagues (LP-28)—supporters of the terrorist movements have held a series of rallies that commenced with the March 15, 1980, observances of the "International Day of Solidarity With the People of El Salvador," marked by demonstrations in several Latin American and European countries by the affiliates of the U.S.S.R.'s World Peace Council (WPC), solidarity groups and Havana's Organization of Solidarity With the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (OSPAAL), the Cuban tricontinental apparatus for the coordination and export of revolutionary subversion and terrorism.

Participating in the San Francisco demonstrations have been the following groups:

U.S. Friends of the BPR (Popular Revolutionary Bloc), P.O. Box 4084, San Francisco, Calif. 94140.

Casa El Salvador—Farabundo Marti, 3557 Twentieth Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94110, the headquarters for supporters of the terrorist Popular Liberation Forces-Farabundo Marti (FPL).

Comite de Salvadorenos Progresistas (CSP)—Committee of Salvadorean Progressives—P.O. Box 12355, San Francisco, Calif. 94112, which reportedly is under the control of the Communist Party of El Salvador (PCES).

Bloque de Solidaridad, P.O. Box 31424, San Francisco, Calif. 94131. The Solidarity Bloc's literature and spokesmen have identified themselves in San Francisco rallies as members and representatives of the Popular Revolutionary Bloc (BPR), the mass front of the terrorist FPL-Farabundo Marti.

The Solidarity Bloc in San Francisco is really a local U.S. office of the BPR.

ADDITIONAL SALVADOREAN TERRORIST SUPPORT GROUPS IN THE UNITED STATES

Support organizations for the Salvadorean Marxist revolutionary organizations are operating in at least five additional cities. These are to a large extent composed of Salvadorean nationals, with admixtures of members who hold Nicaraguan, Costa Rican, United States, and other citizenship. They include:

Bloque de Salvadorenos Unidos en Washington, P.O. Box 884, Adelphi, Md. 20783, which receives support from the local Nicaraguan Sandinista backers.

Comite Centro Americano, P.O. Box 8971, Boston, Mass. 02114.

Salvadorenos Unidos, P.O. Box 162, Oglesby, Ill. 61348.

Comite Francisco Morazan, P.O. Box 31047, Cincinnati, Ohio 45231.

Front in Solidarity with the Salvadorean People (FSPS), P.O. Box 15213, Los Angeles, Calif. 90015; and MASPS, P.O. Box 38735, Los Angeles, Calif. 90038.

Solidarity groups for the Salvadorean revolutionaries are operating in most Latin American capitals including Caracas; San Jose, Costa Rica; Mexico City; and of course Cuba, Panama, and Nicaragua. A Canadian support group, the El Salvador Committee, operates at 41 George Street, South, Toronto, P.O., Canada.

During April, while the Cuban Government worked to impose unity on the Salvadorean terrorist factions as it had on the factions of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) of Nicaragua last year, the east coast solidarity groups met in Yonkers, N.Y., to discuss coordination of a nationwide campaign to prevent the United States from taking any action to block the Communist subversion, and planned invasion from Nicaragua.

On April 4, the National Council of Churches issued a statement demanding that America end all aid and support for the Salvadorean Government. On the following day, a Comparative Law Seminar in Havana organized by the regional affiliates of the Soviet-controlled International Association of Democratic Jurists (IADJ) issued a resolution calling for identical U.S. abandonment of the Salvadorean people. Later the same day, April 5, 1980, Havana's International Service reported that the ambassador of the Marxist-Leninist Puerto Rican Socialist Party (PSP) in Havana, PSP Central Committee member Felipe Chirino, revealed the PSP was organizing "a committee of support for the revolutionary struggle in El Salvador whose only goal will be an absolute people's victory over the forces of imperialism and the national oligarchy."

In mid-May, one of the Marxist-Leninist terrorist organizations in El Salvador, the Armed Forces of National Resistance (FARN), called for a general

insurrection. FARN was not joined in this premature uprising by the other terrorist armed branches of the Communist and Castroite organizations. More than 100 FARN terrorists were killed by the Salvadorean Armed Forces.

On May 17, following this series of attacks, the AFP press service carried a report from San Salvador that strong international brigades of close to 3,000 men are in the Tamarindo area in Nicaragua, near the Honduran border, some 50 kilometers from El Salvador, prepared to intervene at any given moment.

The international brigades were reported to be composed basically of Chileans, Argentinians, Venezuelans, Panamanians, Costa Ricans, Nicaraguans, and Cubans. The Cubans are believed to be mostly military instructors and technicians, not ground troops.

Two months ago the former head of El Salvador's military intelligence, Maj. Robert d'Aubuisson, spoke on Capitol Hill and stated that the Nicaraguan FSLN regime had made two bases available for the training of Salvadorean terrorists by Cuban instructors. These were at the Montelimar Estate on the Pacific coast and at a tobacco farm near Esteli called La Milla. Guns were being smuggled into El Salvador by boats across the Gulf of Fonseca and by small light aircraft, some of which were using an airstrip near Chinandega, Nicaragua.

Major d'Aubuisson, a leader of a moderate-conservative political alliance of businessmen, middle-class professionals and some retired military officers called the Broad National Front (FAN), also charged that the Marxist forces based in Nicaragua had hired mercenary pilots who usually made their living smuggling drugs and weapons between the United States Southwest and Central America, had been hired to fly small planes of arms and ammunition into El Salvador, principally from Panama and Costa Rica, which served as staging areas for the FSLN invasion of Nicaragua last year.

That air smuggling operation appears to have stepped up. Last Sunday, on June 15, a Panamanian Air Force plane carrying 22,000 pounds of 7.62 caliber ammunition for rifles and carbines crashed on the outskirts of San Miguel, El Salvador, some 75 miles south of San Salvador. The plane was an Aerocommander 560-A, bearing the Panamanian registration No. 776, registered to Gen. Omar Torrijos' Panamanian Air Force. The plane made an emergency landing at a small airstrip, lost control on the ground, and crashed into a tree. Its pilots were injured.

However, within a few minutes, a second plane of an identical type landed and took on board the injured pilot and copilot. Press reports indicat-

ed that the second plane immediately took off.

The ammunition was found to bear Venezuelan markings. This was the second time Salvadorean authorities discovered ammunition of Venezuelan origin, the first being after a terrorist attack on the port of Acajutla, on the Pacific coast 20 miles from the Guatemalan border. Salvadorean military authorities said they believed the ammunition, and such weapons seized as U.S. M-1 carbines and other weapons that are not part of the equipment of the Salvadorean Army, were donated to the terrorists by the Nicaraguan FSLN.

On May 27, Col. Jaime Abdul Gutierrez, the Salvadorean Minister of Defense in the present military/Christian Democratic Party center-left junta, told the press that some 1,500 Nicaraguans had entered El Salvador, probably to reinforce the local Marxist terrorist forces. He said that the entry of the Nicaraguans had coincided with the outbreak of armed attacks in mid-May.

Colonel Gutierrez also said that the Salvadorean Government has proof that diplomats from the Nicaraguan FSLN Embassy in San Salvador have been present at meetings of the Revolutionary Coordinating Board of the Masses (JCRM) held at the National University. He said it was a violation of the principle of nonintervention and that the Nicaraguan Government had been informed.

The Salvadorean Defense Minister confirmed the earlier charges of former military intelligence chief Major d'Aubuisson when he revealed that Salvadorean Foreign Minister Fidel Chavez had spoken with the Sandinista regime's Foreign Minister, Fr. Miguel D'Escoto—former director of public information of the U.S. Maryknoll Order in New York—regarding the reports that mercenaries were training at a camp in El Tamarindo, in Chinandega Department, Nicaragua.

Colonel Gutierrez confirmed that many of the weapons captured at Acajutla could have come from Nicaragua, since there are indications that some of them were sent by the Venezuelan Government to Nicaragua during the Sandinist insurrection. In light of the change in government in Venezuela to a more moderate Social Christian (COPEI) government, the Salvadorean Government had turned over information on the weapons to the Venezuelan Embassy to facilitate an investigation.

HUMAN RIGHTS

The disaster of cataclysmic proportions known as the Carter administration foreign policy is beginning to reap the whirlwind in Central America. The revolutionary turmoil and terrorism now attacking El Salvador is the result of the administration's appeasement policies toward the Soviet Union, its satellites, surrogates, and client states.

Fidel Castro's regime for the past 20 years has been nothing more than the Kremlin's attack dog in the Western Hemisphere. Communist Cuba has tried to sow revolution, terrorism, and civil war in virtually every country in the Western Hemisphere. The record is public and consistent.

Nevertheless, this administration's first actions were to initiate diplomatic contacts with Castro, cut U.S. defense forces, and unilaterally hand over the strategic American-owned canal and Canal Zone to the leftist military dictatorship in Panama which is aligned with the Communists and takes its cues in the international political arena from Cuba.

Under the guise of protecting human rights, this administration began a campaign of destabilizing anti-Communist governments in Central America which were reliable free-world allies. At the same time, the Soviet Union and Cuba commenced a propaganda campaign in the free-world press—a disinformation campaign that depicted anti-Communist governments as uniquely and terribly repressive by the mere fact of restrictions of some political activities. No attention was paid to the systematic total repression of all human rights by Communist dictatorships whether in Cuba, Mozambique, Vietnam, or the Soviet Union.

Among the most active organizations in this human rights attack on anti-Communist governments has been Amnesty International. This is perceived by the media as a humanitarian organization, yet since the fall of 1978, the director of Amnesty International's central research department in London has been Derek Roebuck, a leading Australian Communist Party member active in the Soviet Union's international lawyers' front, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL).

Members of an organization called the Human Rights Commission of El Salvador led by one Ivan Escobar have been touring the United States charging that conservatives and anti-Communists in El Salvador are the ones who oppress human rights, not the revolutionaries.

On May 24, 1980, Ivan Escobar, treasurer of the commission, and Father Cuchulain Moriarty of the Social Justice Commission of the Archdiocese of San Francisco, gave an exclusive interview to the Communist Party, U.S.A. newspaper, Daily World, which reported June 6, 1980:

Escobar emphasized the important role being played by the Communist Party of El Salvador (PCES) in support of the revolutionary movement, noting both its part in the armed struggle and in the mass organizations. He cited the fact that the PCS "is really involved in the El Salvadorean people's liberation struggle."

In Chicago on May 10, 1980, the local United Salvadorean Solidarity

Committee of Chicago, in which local Communist Party members play a role, held a rally in Shoeworkers Hall—a site provided through the good offices of a veteran CPUSA activist Jack Spiegel, a United Shoe Workers official. The Daily World reported the evening as a show of support for the Revolutionary Democratic Front of El Salvador, and noted:

The committee has also begun publication of a monthly newspaper, *La Voz de El Salvador*, which is directed to the Spanish-speaking community of Chicago.

The Revolutionary Democratic Front is the umbrella organization for the terrorist groups, their controlling political parties, their mass fronts, the Communist Party, its fronts, and controlled unions. Its representatives are currently touring Europe and the Western Hemisphere trying to gain support as the legitimate government.

In order to clarify the political conflict in El Salvador, a brief summary may be helpful.

In the mid-1960's under the Cuban influence, a proterrorist faction arose in the Moscow-line Salvadorean Communist Party (PCS) which was led by poet and intellectual Roque Dalton Garcia, who provided essays in support of using "all forms of struggle" for World Marxist Review, October 1968, and Tricontinental, March-April 1969.

The first Castroite terrorist organization appeared in 1970, the Fuerzas Populares de Liberacion—Farabundo Marti (FPL)—Popular Liberation Forces—Farabundo Marti—named for the founder of the Salvadorean Communist Party who had been an aide to Nicaraguan Gen. Augusto Sandino, and who was killed in an insurrection in 1932.

In 1975, the FPL organized a mass front, the Bloque Populares Revolucionario (BPR), which included students, Christian socialist groups and radicalized clergy including some from the Jesuit-run Central American University. The leader of the FPL/BPR is "Companero Marcial"—Salvador Cayetano Carpio, formerly a member of the PCS Central Committee, who is expected to be named to any future Revolutionary Democratic Government.

Another split led by Dalton resulted in formation of the Partido Revolucionaria Salvadorense (PRS) and its terrorist arm, the Ejercito Revolucionario Popular (ERP). This was a Castroite and Trotskyist amalgam modeled after the ERP of Argentina. A second split developed late in 1974 when Dalton and his close followers organized the Frente de Accion Popular Unida (FAPU)—United Popular Action Front—to increase the party's influence. The extreme proterrorist wing murdered Dalton in May 1975. Dalton's faction left to form the Resistencia Nacional (RN) and their own terrorist armed branch, the Fuerzas Armadas de Resistencia Nacional

(FARN). On February 28, 1977, the ERP staged uprisings in four Salvadoran cities which were quashed. Later in the year, various student, peasant, and professional groups were organized under PRS/ERP leadership into the February 28th Popular Leagues (LP-28).

The upsurge of terrorism and sabotage, combined with labor strife instigated by the Communist-controlled FUSS labor federation and student disorders, began in 1975, shortly after El Salvador established trade relations with the Soviet Union. After 1977, U.S. human rights foreign policies became the springboard for agitation against the strict anti-Communist military junta and the 12 ruling families which control the country's economic life.

The FPL traditionally had close ties with the Nicaraguan FSLM, and after the Sandinista takeover, weapons formerly used by the Nicaraguan National Guard including M-16's, Galils, and Uzis have been captured from the new unified revolutionary forces, directed by the Revolutionary Coordinating Board of the Masses (JCRM).

Terrorism by the revolutionary left has been countered by terrorism by the anti-Communist right's clandestine groups like the White Warrior's Union (UGB). On April 4, the EPL was reported to have shot and hacked to death at least 20 men and women believed to have been former members of the now-disbanded group ORDEN, an anti-Communist group once sponsored by the National Guard.

The focus of leftist organizing is to prevent the intervention of U.S. Marines when full-scale civil war and insurrection breakout. ●

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, June 19, 1980, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 20

- 9:30 a.m.
Finance
Oversight of the Internal Revenue Service Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2402, 2403, 2404, and 2405, bills relating to the use of Internal Revenue information and personnel in non-tax-related criminal enforcement investigations, and to make changes to the duties of third parties who are asked to turn over tax information in their possession.
2221 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Business meeting, to resume consideration of S. 2160, to require public disclosure of certain lobbying activities to influence issues before the Congress.
3302 Dirksen Building

JUNE 23

- 9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Jurisprudence and Government Relations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2483, to require the Chief Justice of the United States to periodically address a joint session of Congress on the state of the judiciary.
2228 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of section 404, relating to wetlands, of the Clean Water Act.
4200 Dirksen Building

JUNE 24

- 9:00 a.m.
Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Generally Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 983, to establish national standards for State and local governments to impose sales and use taxes on out of State businesses, and income taxes on out of State corporations; and S. 1688, to limit the use of the worldwide combined reporting system a State may apply to a corporation operating under its jurisdiction.
2221 Dirksen Building
- 9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting, to consider S. 2827, to provide for improved domestic and international telecommunications development; and other pending calendar business.
235 Russell Building
- Governmental Affairs
Civil Service and General Services Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings with the House Post Office and Civil Service's Subcommittee on Human Resources on the Federal government's use of consultant services, focusing on the Department of Energy.
318 Russell Building
- Select on Small Business
To resume hearings on small businesses and their contributions to economic growth.
424 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
 Environment and Public Works
 Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
 To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of section 301(h), relating to modification of secondary treatment requirement, of the Clean Water Act.
 4200 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
 Business meeting, to consider the agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency for the Application of Safeguards in the United States (Ex. B, 95th Congress, 2d session); and to discuss the status of arms control agreements and negotiations.
 4221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
 Business meeting, to consider pending legislation and nominations.
 2228 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence
 To hold hearings on section 4, to provide for the protection of identities of certain U.S. undercover intelligence officers of S. 2216, proposed Intelligence Reform Act.
 1202 Dirksen Building

11:00 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 resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for certain programs of the Department of Transportation.
 1224 Dirksen Building

Finance
 Taxation and Debt Management Generally Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on the following miscellaneous tax legislation, S. 1614, 2075, 2493, 2547, 2646, 2660, 2757, 2766, 2783, 2784, and H.R. 5391.
 2221 Dirksen Building

Office of Technology Assessment
 The Board to hold a meeting on pending business items.
 EF-100, Capitol

JUNE 25

9:30 a.m.
 Select on Small Business
 To continue hearings on small businesses and their contributions to economic growth.
 424 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
 Finance
 Business meeting, to consider miscellaneous tax proposals, and other pending legislation.
 2221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
 Criminal Justice Subcommittee
 To hold oversight hearings to examine the law enforcement procedures by the Federal Government against persons involved in illegal drug activities.
 457 Russell Building

Rules and Administration
 Business meeting, to consider S. Res. 448, to establish the Select Committee on Indian Affairs as a permanent Senate committee, and other legislative and administrative business.
 301 Russell Building

Select on Indian Affairs
 To hold hearings on S. 2829, authorizing funds for the purchase of land in the State of Maine for the Passamaquoddy, Penobscot and Maliseet Indian tribes.
 1202 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
 Environment and Public Works
 To hold hearings on Federal building prospectus.
 4200 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
 Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
 To hold an open and closed business meeting, to consider criminal contempt or civil enforcement proceedings against a witness.
 3302 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence
 To continue hearings on section 4, to provide for the protection of identities of certain U.S. undercover intelligence officers of S. 2216, proposed Intelligence Reform Act.
 1202 Dirksen Building

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

Select Committee on Small Business
 To hold hearings on the impact of non-tariff barriers on American small businesses' ability to export to Japan.
 424 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
 Energy and Natural Resources
 Energy Regulation Subcommittee
 To resume oversight hearings on the implementation of the Department of Energy's Building Energy Performance Standards (BEPS), providing for energy efficiency standards for new building construction.
 3110 Dirksen Building

Finance
 Business meeting, to consider pending health insurance proposals.
 2221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
 Criminal Justice Subcommittee
 To continue oversight hearings to examine the law enforcement procedures by the Federal Government against persons involved in illegal drug activities.
 318 Russell Building

Select on Indian Affairs
 To continue hearings on S. 2829, authorizing funds for the purchase of land in the State of Maine for the Passamaquoddy, Penobscot and Maliseet Indian tribes.
 1202 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
 Finance
 Taxation and Debt Management Generally Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on S. 2283, 2418 and 2321, bills to increase the earned income exclusion for U.S. citizens working abroad who are bona fide residents of a foreign country.
 2221 Dirksen Building

JUNE 27

10:00 a.m.
 Environment and Public Works
 Environmental Pollution Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of sections 404 and 301(h) of the Clean Water Act.
 4200 Dirksen Building

Finance
 Business meeting, to continue consideration of pending health insurance proposals.
 2221 Dirksen Building

JUNE 30

10:00 a.m.
 Labor and Human Resources
 Child and Human Development Subcommittee
 To hold oversight hearings to examine overall efforts by the Federal Government and certain medical services to reduce infant mortality and birth defects.
 4232 Dirksen Building

JULY 1

9:30 a.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Consumer Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on S. 415, to strengthen highway safety programs by discouraging driving while under the influence of alcohol.
 5110 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on H.R. 2743, to provide for a national policy for materials research and development and to strengthen Federal and private programs of materials research and development to insure national security and economic stability and growth.
 235 Russell Building

Select on Small Business
 To resume hearings on small businesses and their contributions to economic growth.
 424 Russell Building

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 2

9:30 a.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on H.R. 2743, to provide for a national policy for materials research and development and to strengthen Federal and private programs of materials research and development, to insure national security and economic stability and growth.
 235 Russell Building

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

10:00 a.m.
 Select on Small Business
 Taxation, Financing, and Investment Subcommittee

To hold hearing on the procedural difficulties encountered by smaller business in dealing with the Internal Revenue Service.

424 Russell Building

JULY 15

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings with the Labor and Human Services' Subcommittee on Aging on the impact of senile dementia on older Americans.

4232 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Aging Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings with the Appropriations' Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education on the Impact of senile dementia on older Americans.

4232 Dirksen Building

JULY 21

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Consumer Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the Federal Trade Commission's review of the rulemaking procedures of the mobile home industry.

235 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

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the activities of the National Health Service Corps.

4232 Dirksen Building

JULY 29

9:30 a.m.

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

To hold hearings to assess certain provisions relating to the use of space environment contained in the proposed Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (pending receipt by the Senate).

235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Select on Indian Affairs

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

6226 Dirksen Building

JULY 31

9:30 a.m.

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

To resume hearings to assess certain provisions relating to the use of space

environment contained in the proposed Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (pending receipt by the Senate).

235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review the Food and Drug Administration's evaluation of the drug dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO), to determine its application and effectiveness.

4232 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 6

10:00 a.m.

*Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on S. 2695, to limit the severance tax percentage that a State may impose on coal shipped in interstate commerce.

3110 Dirksen Building

CANCELLATIONS

JUNE 19

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

*Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review the Food and Drug Administration's evaluation of the drug dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO), to determine its application and effectiveness.

4232 Dirksen Building