

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ISRAEL AS A NATION AND A SYMBOL: RONALD REAGAN'S STATEMENT BEFORE THE B'NAI B'RITH

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, no single nation has assumed the immense importance to American security—with or without benefit of a formal alliance—that Israel has acquired in her three decades of existence. Israel is, quite literally, a strategic asset to the United States in the midst of a troubled but vital region that is now the focus of Soviet covert as well as overt aggression. As a nation, Israel has stood without reservation as America's most loyal and valuable ally in the region.

Its resolve to retain its freedom in the face of implacable hostility and long odds have also served to make Israel a symbol of the relentless effort required to preserve peace.

Until the advent of the Carter administration, the central relationship of Israel to American security was well understood by every President since Truman. As a result, American diplomacy was directed to support Israel and her right to exist. Under the present administration, three decades of consistent American policy has been threatened. Israel's enemies are armed by the administration with advanced American offensive weapons. Crucial votes in international organizations on questions of profound concern to the security of Israel are met not with American support, but indifference. As one observer expressed it, "the stench of America's abstention—from voting—in the United Nations has the smell of oil"—a Faustian bargain the administration appears to believe it can make to trade off Israel's security for the favor of the Petro-Shiiks.

In a statement before the B'nai B'rith forum on September 3, 1980, Ronald Reagan reaffirmed his commitment to the traditional American understanding of the importance of Israel to our national interest.

In his remarks, he called attention to the grave risks associated with the administration's policy. "To weaken Israel is to destabilize the Middle East and risk the peace of the world, for the road to world peace runs through the Middle East." Governor Reagan's reaffirmation of our commitment to Israel stands in stark contrast to the unremitting efforts of the Carter administration to pressure Israel into accepting terms for a Middle East settle-

ment which jeopardizes Israel's security. Ronald Reagan's statement on Israel deserves to be read as an assertion of a change of course in American policy in the Middle East that will restore our policy to one which supports our interests in the region.

Governor Reagan's speech follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. RONALD REAGAN

I know it will come as no surprise to you that I have chosen to speak to you tonight about the State of Israel, its importance to our own nation and world peace.

But in a sense when I speak of Israel, I speak as well of other concerns of B'nai B'rith and of the entire Jewish community in the United States. Israel is not only a nation—it is a symbol. During my campaign I have spoken of the values of family, work, neighborhood, peace and freedom. I made a commitment to see to it that those values would be at the heart of policy-making in a Reagan Administration. Israel symbolizes those values. What is Israel if not the creation of families, working together to build a place to live and work and prosper in peace and freedom?

In defending Israel's right to exist, we defend the very values upon which our nation is built.

The long agony of Jews in the Soviet Union, is, of course, never far from our minds and hearts. All these suffering people ask is that their families get the chance to work where they choose, in freedom and peace. They will not be forgotten by a Reagan Administration.

But, I must tell you this:

No policy, no matter how heartfelt, no matter how deeply rooted in the humanitarian vision we share, can succeed if the United States of America continues its descent into economic impotence and despair.

Neither the survival of Israel nor the ability of the United States to bring pressure to bear on the situation of dissidents against tyranny can become realistic policy choices if our American economy continues to deteriorate under the Carter policies of high unemployment, taxes and inflation.

The rhetoric of compassion and concern becomes just that, mere words, if not supported by the vision—and reality—of economic growth. The present Administration does not seem to realize this. It seems to believe that if the right kind of words are chosen and repeated often enough, all will be well. Can those who share our humanitarian concerns ignore the connection between economic policy, national strength and the ability to do the work of friendship and justice and peace in our own nation and world?

The theme of this convention, "A Covenant with Tomorrow," speaks directly to the question of American interests and the well-being of Israel. There is no covenant with the future which is not firmly rooted in our covenant with the past. Since the rebirth of the State of Israel, there has been an iron-clad bond between that democracy and this one.

That bond is a moral imperative. But the history of relations between states demonstrates that while morality is most frequently given as a motive for actions, the true and abiding motive is self-interest. Well, the touchstone of our relationship with Israel is

that a secure, strong Israel is in America's self-interest. Israel is a major strategic asset to America.

Israel is not a client, but a very reliable friend, which is not something that can always be said of the United States today under the Carter Administration.

While we have since 1948 clung to the argument of a moral imperative to explain our commitment to Israel, no Administration has ever deluded itself that Israel was not of permanent strategic importance to America. Until, that is, the Carter Administration, which has violated this covenant with the past. Can we now have confidence it will honor a covenant with tomorrow?

The interests of all the world are served by peace and stability in the Middle East. To weaken Israel is to destabilize the Middle East and risk the peace of the world, for the road to world peace runs through the Middle East.

How do we travel that road?

We cannot positively influence events at the perimeters of our power if power—including economic power—at the center is diminished.

The conduct of this nation's foreign policy in the last four years has been marked by inconsistency and incompetence.

We must have a principled, consistent foreign policy which our people can support, our friends understand, and our adversaries respect. Our policies must be based upon close consultation with our allies.

We require the defensive capability necessary to ensure the credibility of our foreign policy, and the security of our allies and ourselves. There can be no security for one without the other.

Today, under Jimmy Carter, our defensive capability has been so seriously eroded as to constitute not a deterrent but a temptation.

This is not a campaign issue, it is a matter of grave national concern; indeed so grave that the President considers it a liability to his personal political fortunes. He has tried to give the appearance of responding to it. But the half-hearted measures he proposes are clearly inadequate to the task.

We must restore the vital margin of safety which this Administration has allowed to erode, maintaining a defense capability our adversaries will view as credible and that our allies can rely upon.

As an ally of the United States, Israel must have the means to remain strong and secure. Over the years, the United States has provided economic and defense assistance, and a Reagan Administration will maintain this traditional commitment.

In 1976, Candidate Jimmy Carter came before this convention and said: "I have called for closer ties with our traditional allies, and stronger ties with the State of Israel. I have stressed" he said, "the necessity for a strong defense—tough and muscular, and adequate to maintain freedom under any conceivable circumstances."

One wonders, did the candidate listen to his own call? Today we have fewer real allies and, among those, we speak with diminished authority. Our relations with Israel are marked by doubt and distrust. Israel today is in grave danger, and so is freedom itself.

In 1976, Jimmy Carter declared that he would seek what he called a "comprehensive settlement" in the Middle East. What this

might mean for Israel and how this might be achieved were questions neither asked nor answered.

The comprehensive agreement which Mr. Carter sought required, first, a reconvening of the Geneva Conference. Israel was amenable to this step. Her adversaries agreed conditionally. But, the conditions were that the Palestine Liberation Organization be represented and that Israel effectively agree in advance of negotiation to withdraw to the pre-1967 borders, which were in fact armistice lines resulting from the first effort to destroy the State of Israel. Israel rightly refused these conditions and was promptly accused of intransigence. Can we believe that Mr. Carter is not still in favor of dealing with the P.L.O. and desirous of forcing the terms of a settlement?

Mr. Carter invited the Soviet Union to join him in his effort to force Israel to accept the mockery of negotiations in Geneva. Before that, it had required a major effort to keep the Soviets out of the Middle East peace process. In October, 1977, Mr. Carter invited them back in free of charge, and they graciously accepted. The Carter Administration presented as a major achievement the conclusion of a joint Soviet-American accord which would have given the Russians a stranglehold on negotiations, as well as a convenient calling card for inserting themselves more deeply into the Middle East.

This seriously disturbed President Sadat. The President of Egypt did not share Mr. Carter's appreciation of the Soviets, and he came to the conclusion which other world leaders, including Mr. Brezhnev, have now reached: Mr. Carter is incapable of distinguishing between his own short-term political interest, and the nation's long-term foreign policy interests. Mr. Carter professed not to understand what all the fuss was about.

The result was that the United States Government, for the first time in the history of the rebirth of Israel, found itself on the outside looking in. President Sadat made his courageous trip to Jerusalem at the invitation of Prime Minister Begin, and a bilateral peace process began. Without, let me re-emphasize, the participation of Mr. Carter. The quick foreign policy success that Carter had hoped to achieve turned instead into another major foreign policy blunder.

What we do or fail to do in the Middle East is of vital importance not only to the peoples of the region, but also to the security of our country, our Atlantic and Pacific allies, Africa, China, and the Asian subcontinent.

Because of the weak and confused leadership of Jimmy Carter, we are approaching a flashpoint in this tragic process, with Soviet power now deployed in a manner which directly threatens Iran, the Persian Gulf and Arabian Sea; with Soviet forces and proxy forces building up again in the region; with Soviet fleets and air bases emplaced along the sea lanes on which we and our Allies and the entire free world depend.

In spite of this I am confident that if we act with vigor, vision and practical good sense, we can peacefully blunt this Soviet thrust. We can rely upon responsible Arab leaders in time to learn what Anwar Sadat learned, which is that no people can long endure the cost of Soviet patronage.

How we deal with Israel and her neighbors in this period will determine whether we rebuild the peace process or whether we continue to drift. But let it be clear that the cornerstone of our effort and of our interest is a secure Israel, and our mutual objective is peace.

While we can help the nations of that area move toward peace, we should not try to force a settlement upon them.

Our diplomacy must be sensitive to the legitimate concerns of all in the area. Before a negotiated peace can ever hope to command the loyalty of the whole region, it must be acceptable to Israelis and Arabs alike.

Most important, we must rebuild our lost reputation for trustworthiness. We must again become a nation that can be relied upon to live up to its commitments.

In 1976, Candidate Jimmy Carter said: "I am concerned with the way in which our country, as well as the Soviet Union, Britain and France have poured arms into certain Arab countries—five or six times more than Israel receives."

But it was Mr. Carter who agreed to sell sixty F-15 fighters to Saudi Arabia. To get the Congress to go along, he assured these aircraft would not have certain offensive capabilities. Now, the Secretary of Defense tells us he cannot say whether this commitment to Congress will be honored.

It was Mr. Carter who agreed to sell one hundred main battle tanks to Jordan.

It was Mr. Carter who agreed to provide U.S. licensed turbine engines for Iraqi warships.

Meanwhile, Israel is being increasingly isolated by international terrorism and by U.N. resolutions designed to undermine Israel's position in the world while Carter stands by and watches.

I was appalled to see the Carter Administration abstain from voting on, rather than veto, the Resolution passed by the United Nations Security Council two weeks ago, totally disregarding the Democratic Platform promises of 1976 and 1980. As I stated then, that Resolution not only undermines progress toward peace by putting the United Nations on record against Israel and on one side of the sensitive issue of the status of Jerusalem; it also presumes to order other nations—including our Dutch ally—to move their embassies from Jerusalem.

I believe this sorry episode sheds some light on an earlier action by Jimmy Carter concerning another U.N. resolution, voted on in March this year. On March 1st, the Carter Administration failed to veto a mischievous U.N. resolution condemning Israel's presence in Jerusalem, calling it an "occupation." That was the position of the Carter Administration on Saturday. Two days later, on a Monday, reacting to the public outcry, Jimmy Carter put the blame for this outrage on his Secretary of State and reversed the position of the Administration.

The man who asks "trust me," zigzags and flip-flops in ever more rapid gyrations, trying to court favor with everyone: Israel, the P.L.O., the voting bloc in the United Nations and the voters at home. On March 1st, it took the Carter Administration three days to switch positions. On August 20th, it took only three minutes. Secretary of State Muskie condemned the U.N. Resolution on Jerusalem in a long speech that was for the voters in this country. Minutes later, he abstained instead of vetoing the U.N. Resolution. That was for the P.L.O. and their friends.

This is the Carter record on the Middle East. Arab leaders are persuaded that we don't mean what we say. How do we build productive relations with either side on such a basis?

Before we can act with authority abroad, we have to demonstrate our ability to make domestic policy without asking permission of other governments.

Mr. Carter sent an emissary to Saudi Arabia to ask for permission to store petro-

leum here in our own country—a strategic reserve vital to our national security and long demanded by Congress. The Saudis, predictably, said no. Mr. Carter halted the stockpiling.

Can we have relations with our friends in the Arab world if those relations are built on contempt for us?

Clear away the debris of the past four years, and the following issues remain to test the good faith of the Arab nations and of Israel, and to challenge our national will and diplomatic skill in helping them to shape a peace.

There is the unresolved question of territorial rights resulting from the 1967 war.

There is the status of Jerusalem which is part of the first question.

There is the matter of refugees.

There is the matter of the P.L.O., which I consider distinct from the matter of the refugees.

The question of territory, putting aside Jerusalem for the moment, must still be decided in accordance with Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. We will tolerate no effort to supersede those Resolutions. We must weigh the future utility of the Camp David accords against that position.

There are basic ambiguities in the documents Camp David produced, both in the links between the Israeli-Egyptian peace, and in the provisions for an autonomous regime in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. These ambiguities have now brought negotiations to a dangerous impasse.

Let us remember that an autonomous Palestinian Arab regime for the West Bank and the Gaza Strip was an Israeli proposal—a major concession on Israel's part in the interest of progress toward peace.

Negotiations between Israel and Jordan could result in long and creative steps toward resolving these problems. Israel and Jordan are the two Palestinian states envisioned and authorized by the United Nations. Jordan is now recognized as sovereign in some 80 percent of the old territory of Palestine. Israel and Jordan are the parties primarily authorized to settle the future of the unallocated territories, in accordance with the principles of the Mandate and the provisions of Resolutions 242 and 338.

Thus, the autonomy plan called for in the Camp David Agreements must be interpreted in accordance with the two Security Council Resolutions, which remain the decisive and authoritative rules governing the situation. The Camp David Agreements cannot and should not lead to fundamental changes in the security position, or to the withdrawals of Israeli troops, until Jordan and other neighbors make peace.

Jerusalem has been a source of man's spiritual inspiration since King David founded it. Its centrality to Jewish life is known to all.

Now it exists as a shared trust. The holy places of all faiths are protected and open to all. More than this, each is under the care and control of representatives of the respective faiths. Unlike the days prior to 1967, Jerusalem is now and will continue to be one city, undivided, with continuing free access for all. That is why I disagree with the cynical actions of the Carter Administration in pledging to preserve the status of Jerusalem in its party platform and its undercutting Israel and Jerusalem by abstaining on a key U.N. vote. I believe the problem of Jerusalem can be solved by men of good will as part of a permanent settlement. The immediate problem is to make it easier for men of good will to come to the peace table.

President Carter refuses to brand the P.L.O. as a terrorist organization.

I have no hesitation in doing so.

We live in a world in which any band of thugs clever enough to get the word "liberation" into its name can thereupon murder school children and have its deeds considered glamorous and glorious. Terrorists are not guerrillas, or commandos, or freedom-fighters or anything else. They are terrorists and they should be identified as such. If others wish to deal with them, establish diplomatic relations with them, let it be on their heads. And let them be willing to pay the price of appeasement.

The P.L.O. is said to represent the Palestinian refugees. It represents no one but the leaders who established it as a means of organizing aggression against Israel. The P.L.O. is kept under tight control in every state in the area except Lebanon, which it has effectively destroyed. As for those it purports to represent, when any Palestinian breathes a word about peace to Israel, he is an immediate target for assassination. The P.L.O. has murdered more Palestinians than it has Israelis.

This nation made an agreement with Israel in 1975 concerning its relations with the P.L.O.

This Administration has violated that agreement.

We are concerned not only with whether the P.L.O. renounces its charter calling for the destruction of Israel, we are equally concerned with whether it is truly representative of the Palestinian people. If we can be satisfied on both counts, then we will not be dealing with the P.L.O. as we know it, but a quite different organization, one truly representative of those Arab Palestinians dedicated to peace and not to the establishment of a Soviet satellite in the heart of the Middle East.

Finally, the question of Arab Palestinian refugees.

My analysis of this tragic situation begins with the Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel, May 14, 1948. Let me read the relevant paragraph:

"We appeal—in the very midst of the onslaught launched against us now for months—to the Arab inhabitants of the State of Israel to preserve peace and to participate with us in the rebuilding of the State on the basis of full and equal citizenship and due representation in all its provisional and permanent institutions."

Tragically, this appeal was rejected. People left their land and their homes confident Israel would be destroyed in a matter of days and they could return. Israel was not destroyed and the refugee problem is with us today.

One solution to this refugee problem could be assimilation in Jordan, designated by the U.N. as the Arab Palestinian state.

In the final analysis, this or some other solution must be found as part of a peace settlement. The Psalms speak to our concerns, for they encompass all that we strive for. They are a vision of our ideals, of the goal to which we strive with constancy, dedication and faith. They embrace our hopes for a just, lasting peace in the Middle East and our hopes that the works of justice and mercy be done at home:

May our garners be full, Affording every kind of store;

May there be no breach in the walls, No exile, no outcry in our streets.

Happy the people for whom things are thus.

It is given to us to see that this vision is never lost, its message never forgotten, that the work of peace and justice and freedom goes on, inspired by our values, guided by our faith and made permanent by our commitment.●

TRIBUTE TO HAROLD SAY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness this morning that I learned of the death of our good friend Harold Say. He was for many years the legislative director of the Veterans of World War I organization.

I do not want to recount all of his substantial and sometimes colorful accomplishments. But I do want my colleagues who may not have been so fortunate to know him well, to be aware that we have lost someone very special. Ever since I have been in Congress, I have been promoting a service pension for veterans of World War I and their widows. In this effort, I have been privileged to work closely with Harold Say. I have seen him as a determined, firm and irrepensible fighter for just programs for all veterans. I knew him personally as a very warm, honest, and likable individual.

One of Harold's dreams was the pension I mentioned. One of the tragic aspects of that proposal is that every day there are fewer veterans left who could receive it. Now their ranks are diminished by one more, diminished by one who is not replaceable. So, my sadness comes not only from losing a friend, but also from seeing his dream unfulfilled in his lifetime.

My sincere sympathy goes out to his wife, Lillian, and his family.●

FARMERS HIT FROM ALL SIDES

HON. E. THOMAS COLEMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that this year has been one of the toughest ever faced by the American farmer. Many of the problems have been at the hands of Mother Nature. Recently I have toured some of the farms in my district to survey damage from the heat wave and unusual storms that have significantly affected crop yields. I do not know if more people are using that margarine they advertise on TV, but something riled Mother Nature this year and she let us know that she is one lady who does not fool around.

What has been even harder on the American farmer than the weather, however, has been the policies and economic factors originating in Washington. A monolithic bureaucracy and a mixed up administration have created an economic climate more damaging to farmers than any heat wave.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address three major points. The first is an overview of the present economic conditions created in Washington that I

just mentioned. How it got rolling and where it is going. The second is an update on some of the things done by the Agriculture Committee to address these problems and what we intend to do next year as we draft the 1981 farm bill. Finally, I want to share some ideas of mine—of the farmers role in reestablishing the preeminence of our Nation while developing for themselves and their families a stable economic foundation.

The stage is set for a disastrous year. In 1980 we have seen:

First. Low prices weakened further by the administration's embargo of grain to the Soviet Union;

Second. Sharply rising production costs being driven up daily by spiraling inflation;

Third. A farm credit crunch brought on by an administration demand for higher interest rates—up to 20 percent;

Fourth. A precipitous drop in livestock prices, falling to the point where many producers are unable to regain even their costs of production;

Fifth. Transportation and storage problems; and

Sixth. On top of it all, the heat wave and drought.

Specifically, the USDA shows farm income down 39 percent during the second quarter of 1980, compared to the same period of 1979.

Production expenses jumped from \$112 billion in the second quarter of 1979 to \$126 billion during the same period this year.

This is the effect of inflation on the family farmer. And, what does Washington do about it? The administration and the majority in Congress promise a balanced budget.

But as we move toward final passage of the Federal budget, we see \$60 billion worth of red ink, the second largest deficit in our history. The big spenders and supporters of big government do not have the guts to cut the fat out of the many misdirected and mismanaged social programs. Instead, they settle for rising unemployment, a deepening recession, and continued inflation. For 25 years the big spenders have dominated Congress. That domination means taxes are up eightfold from 1955; Federal spending is up 800 percent since 1955; the national debt has risen from \$270 billion in 1955 to \$900 billion today; and, the 1955 dollar is worth just 36 cents.

With the cost-price squeeze I mentioned a few moments ago, it is obvious that the farmer is really getting stuck under inflationary policies like these. That is why we must, for the good of the farmer and the entire Nation, slash Federal spending and balance the Federal budget. Many of us feel a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced Federal budget is the only answer to force Congress and the White House to get serious about inflation. The mood of the country is finally shifting our way and hopefully in the near future we can end the

domination of the big spenders and bring inflation under control.

Two years ago I sat on the same platform with President Carter at a convention of the Missouri Farmers Association in Columbia, Mo. Two years ago President Carter stood before the MFA and the entire Nation, and declared there would be no more embargoes.

Of course we must stand up to the Soviet Union. We cannot condone Soviet expansionism into Afghanistan. But an embargo of grain has not and will not scare the Russian troops out of Afghanistan.

The farmers of America have a record of patriotism that cannot be questioned. But, they have every right to wonder if they are having to bear an unfair burden in this administration's response to Soviet aggression. With all the resources of this Nation and the Federal Government why should the burden fall almost totally on the shoulders of 4 percent of the American people—the American farmer? We must be dedicated to the proposition that our farmers will not be the first or only card played in world politics.

Now let us look at the prices farmers were faced with before the embargo and then after the embargo, but before the recent heat wave ruined many crops and escalated prices somewhat. In fact, commodity prices have gone up along with the temperature, not because of any administration farm policy:

Wheat before the embargo—\$4.39 per bushel.

After the embargo—\$4.01 per bushel.

Corn before the embargo—\$2.56 per bushel.

Corn after the embargo—\$2.30 per bushel.

Soybeans before the embargo—\$6.15 per bushel.

Soybeans after the embargo—\$5.63 per bushel.

And while American farmers were suffering depressed prices, were the Soviets faced with lower quantities of grain? No, the Russians are getting their grain and the other exporting nations are getting rich. Let us look at the figures again. In Australia wheat prices went from \$173 per ton on January 3 to \$210 per ton on February 7. And in Argentina, corn prices went from \$123 per ton on January 3 to \$150 per ton of February 7.

So much for showing the Kremlin we mean business. So much for a promise made 2 years ago in Columbia. And now, to the credit crunch of 1980.

Thousands of farmers went to the bank this year for loans, none of them could believe their ears when their friendly banker said 17 percent, 18 percent, 19 percent, 20 percent interests.

And in Washington the economic soothsayers of the administration and the Federal Reserve demand higher interest rates and sagely proclaim they

will slow down inflation. Cut up your credit cards, they say. Do not buy unnecessary luxuries on credit.

Well, farmers are not borrowing money to buy their wives a fur coat, or to get their children a new stereo, or to buy themselves a new set of golf clubs. Farmers are borrowing money to farm. To plant their crops in spite of low prices. To work the land. To try to make a living and feed our Nation.

This spring, after talking to some of the farmers in my district, I went to the Federal Reserve to tell them of my concerns about the credit squeeze. Needless to say, the Fed underestimated the impact of their decision. Later in the year, Congress extended an economic emergency loan program to help farmers survive the credit crunch, but not before it took its toll on thousands of producers throughout the Nation.

So in 1980, with a backdrop of double-digit inflation, the administration ushered in the New Year with an embargo and marked the coming of spring with a credit crunch and the costs of farming keep going up.

Using the USDA's own figures: the cost of planting an acre of soybeans went up 21 percent from 1979 to 1980. An acre of wheat cost 23 percent more to grow. Corn, 24 percent more. From last year to this the cost of tractors and machinery jumped 12 percent; fertilizer up 26 percent; farm equipment supplies climbed 40 percent; and fuel and energy skyrocketed 41 percent over the last year.

In the last decade the costs of production to the farmer went up an average of 84 percent, while at the grocery store, every dollar increase in the typical marketbasket means only 32 cents to the farm producer.

Is it any wonder, with policies like the embargo and credit restraints, coupled with inflation, that the ranks of the farmer has dwindled from 23 million in the mid-1950's to fewer than 8 million today?

But, 1980 has not been a total loss. There have been some positive accomplishments in the House Agriculture Committee. We have approved legislation ranging from increases in crop price supports to measures dealing with credit, transportation, pesticides and energy.

Among the successes I am most proud of is the repeal of the carryover basis provision. Congress repealed this tax provision which would have forced many heirs to sell off their family farms in order to pay the estate taxes. By repealing the carryover basis heirs who inherit property will be able to keep it thanks to a significant reduction in their potential capital gains tax liability. But I feel our job is not finished until we repeal all taxes on the transfer of family farms to family members.

Also passed into law was a 7-percent increase in target prices for 1980 crops; an extension of natural disaster compensation payments; and a major syn-

thetic fuels act which provides significant funds for the development of gasohol and other alternative fuels. Hopefully, the Synthetic Fuels Act will provide even greater encouragement to farm producers throughout the Nation to help us become energy independent while providing yet another market for American commodities.

Among legislation awaiting final passage in Congress this year is a bill which would end the unfair advantage foreign investors have in buying U.S. farmland. The bill would tax capital gains on all U.S. real estate owned by foreign citizens. Until now, believe it or not, foreigners have been able to escape capital gains taxes when selling property while American farm families are taxed to the limit.

While these steps have been necessary and important, there is a bigger question at hand. What will the role of agriculture be in the coming decade as our Nation faces one of its most perilous times in history.

Together we face a great challenge to assure that farmers and ranchers continue to be the strong backbone of America. We must look to the agricultural sector of our economy to help expand our Nation's influence and preeminence throughout the world; to revitalize our spirit as a world leader; and to rekindle the flames of freedom in the oppressed countries of the world.

To this end we must be aware of and prepared to meet the challenges of an ever growing world population.

Many nations, notably those in the so-called Third World, face expanding populations in the coming 10 years with no corresponding ability to feed their people. This situation presents us with great opportunities to expand trade relations throughout the world while significantly helping offset our own negative trade balance. Many of these developing countries have the natural resources that America needs to continue our own development and leadership in the world.

From \$6 billion worth of agricultural trade in 1968, we have seen American farm exports grow to a record \$32 billion in fiscal 1979. Of that, my home State of Missouri contributed \$1.14 billion, ninth highest in the Nation. These exports are not giveaway programs. Most are earning dollars from the marketplaces of the world. In fact, U.S. farm exports have significantly cushioned the impact of rising imported oil costs the last couple of years. If our other areas of export could expand at the rate of the agricultural sector, we could substantially reduce, if not eliminate, the negative trade balance which has seriously weakened the dollar at home and abroad.

It is my personal goal that the 1980's herald an even stronger period of trade expansion. Specifically, Congress should call for full implementation of the foreign trade offices authorized in legislation passed in 1978. Of 25 offices authorized in the bill, the administra-

tion has so far opened only 6. We must open the full complement of U.S. foreign trade offices in order to promote new markets for American farm products. Furthermore, we should better utilize our farm trade programs, such as food-for-peace—Public Law 480—to develop stronger economic and philosophical ties with Third World nations.

Conservation measures must also receive priority consideration. Each year the average farm in the United States loses an estimated 12 tons of soil per acre to erosion. As much as 900 tons of topsoil per minute flow from the mouth of the Mississippi River. This is why a strong, continuing effort to control erosion is necessary to prevent our wealth in soil from literally going down the drain.

Just as we pledge to work for the future of American agriculture, we must continue working to make rural America a good place to live. We must address the needs and problems of rural America in such areas as water and sewer facilities, electrical and telephone services and economic development. In recognizing that there is a role for the Federal Government in rural communities, most farmers believe as I do that local solutions are best for local problems and that Federal programs must work to reflect local priorities and minimize bureaucratic interference. We have the opportunity to learn from the lessons taught by years of Federal programs aimed at urban problems, with enormous costs, questionable benefits and increased bureaucratic control over local matters. Our commitment to finding solutions to the problems of our rural communities must be equaled by our determination to avoid the mistakes created by misguided Federal involvement in urban areas.

In order to accomplish many of these goals, it is important to reestablish the USDA's traditional role as the advocate of the American farmer rather than its current stature as a collector of statistics and an arm of the social welfare system.

Mr. Speaker, there are some who say the American will is gone; that the problems we face are too heavy a burden to carry and too difficult to solve.

Let me just say if there has been a decline in American will it has not been a failure of the people but of her leaders. The people want America to be respected. They want America to be secure. They want America to be strong. It is time America's leaders respond to the people and define her purpose, restore her strength and revitalize her will.

In closing, as I said earlier, we have seen the ranks of the farmer dwindle over the past 25 years from more than 23 million to fewer than 8 million. But those who remain are an inspiration to all Americans and the hope of the entire world. We cannot allow this vi-

brant sector of American life to slip from our grasp for if we do we will lose the very qualities upon which our Nation was founded. Those qualities of American spirit: of hard work, perseverance in the face of adversity, love of family, bold determination, freedom and independence.●

A WELL-MERITED TRIBUTE TO
FORMER CONGRESSMAN
JOSEPH E. CASEY OF MASSACHUSETTS

HON. JOSEPH D. EARLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry to learn of the passing, here in the District of Columbia last Tuesday, of one of the most distinguished native sons of our Massachusetts Commonwealth, former U.S. Representative Joseph E. Casey. Mr. Casey was an outstanding Representative, in this House, of the people of the Third Massachusetts Congressional District from 1934 to 1942. In 1942 he was an unsuccessful candidate for the U.S. Senate. Shortly thereafter he returned to Washington and was an eminently respected practicing attorney here during the intervening years. However, he maintained his friendships in Massachusetts and is a legend in the Clinton area where he was born, and which is part of the Third District that I now have the honor to represent in the Congress.

Even before he came to the U.S. House of Representatives "Joe" Casey was a well recognized young and rising figure in the legal and political circles of central Massachusetts. He had an unusually attractive personality, a genial nature, scholarly disposition, gifted mind, and eloquent voice. He had the reputation of always being well prepared for anything in which he engaged, was very warmly regarded by his friends and neighbors in Clinton and highly respected by his professional associates. He was universally admired for his exceptionally high character, integrity, and competence and commonly held to be one of the most persuasive orators in the legal and political history of Massachusetts.

In the comparatively short time of 8 years Joe Casey rose to become a leading influence in the U.S. Congress. He was a pioneering pleader for the enactment of such landmark legislation as the Lend-Lease Act of 1941, minimum wage and hour laws, public housing, rural electrification, social security, and a host of other social betterment measures and programs designed to realistically fulfill our constitutional pledge to extend equal justice, opportunity, and treatment to all American citizens of whatever level or class. These basic legislative achievements will always remain in this House as an everlasting monument to the patriotic

dedication, diligence and effectiveness of Congressman Joe Casey in trying to improve the quality of life for his contemporary fellow Americans and all who would come after him in this great country.

Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to meet Joe Casey shortly after I came here as a Member of Congress 6 years ago. Through the years I came to know him as a kind and courteous and thoughtful man. He was immensely proud of having been the first Democrat to be elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from the Third Massachusetts Congressional District. On every occasion that we met he was intensely interested in national issues, amazingly energetic, and deeply enthusiastic about the future of the United States. I am a most grateful beneficiary of his profound wisdom and guidance. I will long and greatly miss him as a valued adviser and dear friend. I extend my deepest sympathy to his gracious wife, Constance and his five children in their great sorrow.●

IMMIGRATION POLICY

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the United States is in danger of having its immigration policy determined by any other country that wants to shed itself of population.

The Carter administration has no real policy; the Congress has no real policy; we are floundering.

For many decades it has been the policy of dictatorial regimes to hem in their peoples and prevent anyone from getting out. The Soviet Union has more border guards than many countries have people; the Berlin wall is the most graphic example of the extremes totalitarian states will go to prevent their people from seeking better lives for themselves.

But now there is a shift away from the Soviet approach. Cuba and Vietnam exemplify the growing attitude that it is easier to rule if you simply let those elements that might coalesce as an opposition leave the country. Hanoi not only lets people leave, it made a profit out of them by selling the chance to leave for top dollar.

For the past 30 years, most refugees were fleeing war, insurrection or famine and simply walked to the next country where the United States helped by supplying food and funds but accepted few as immigrants. In that time we developed a special policy toward those fleeing Communist rule. Basically, it was an open door policy. That was acceptable to almost all Americans because, quite frankly, few people had the chance to get near the open door.

Now we face the growing prospect that more Communist countries, espe-

cially Castro's Cuba, will unleash their "people weapon" against the United States. On top of that we have burgeoning discontent in many Caribbean countries with the possibility of elicit boatlifts from many more islands than Cuba and Haiti. And on top of that, polls show that two out of every three people in Latin America would come here if they could. Modern transportation in the hands of the unscrupulous means that each year more and more can.

The absence of a policy is not just the fault of the administration. We have not really had a national debate on this because the public has not yet come to grips with it. And we cannot have a real policy until we have something approaching a national consensus.

The easy and obvious policy alternatives are all undesirable.

First, if we dump all illegal aliens found in this country in jail and leave them there until they arrange to leave this country, it would tend to discourage others from coming. But this society is not about to condone such concentration camp tactics.

Second, if we spend untold billions to vastly expand our border and coastal patrols, we might limit the inflow. But it will undoubtedly remain easier and cheaper for them to punch holes in our 10,000-mile wall than for us to plug the holes.

Third, we can severely crimp any boatlifts by letting vessels sink—a policy we have not and I hope we never will seriously consider.

It will take a lot more finesse to limit the refugee flow, but we will still continue to see periodic spurts. It was Hungarians in 1956, Cubans in the early 1960's, Vietnamese in 1975 and 1978, and Cubans in 1980. Every time there has been an outburst of refugees, there has been an outburst of protest.

Recently Congress passed the Refugee Act of 1980 specifically to try to control and regulate the inflow of refugees. The act, which went into effect just last spring, envisioned an influx of 50,000 refugees a year. Castro has neatly made mincemeat of our own legislation. Given that periodic bursts of large numbers of refugees can be expected to continue, we had better decide now how we are going to deal with them.

Therefore, I am outlining today a five-point immigration program designed to address the problems of immigration without punishing the immigrant.

The Nation needs to sail a careful course between our limited resources and our traditions of hospitality. I have no truck for the small minds of those who would lock our gates to all newcomers once they themselves are inside, but it is also a simple fact that we cannot accept anyone and everyone who would like to be an American or we will be overwhelmed and our resources depleted.

My program is designed to discourage what for lack of a better word we call moochers while attracting the kind of hard working immigrant who helped build America in the past and will continue to help build it in the future.

The five points are:

First, selectivity. We will accept refugees of our choosing, not Fidel Castro's or anyone else. The Coast Guard has proved that it can seal our sea borders reasonably tightly. It was President Carter's blunder not to use that ability from the first day that Castro unleashed his boat offensive. We have accepted Cuban refugees for two decades after selecting out the felons and the prostitutes. We can continue and should continue to do so through our mission in Havana.

Second, reduce costs. We are spending more than \$1.3 billion this year to support refugees and even have at least one welfare program that is closed to citizens and open only to refugees. We ought to switch to a system of no-interest, long-term loans for new arrivals. We will capitalize them to help get them settled. As they enter the mainstream, they will repay Uncle Sam. I think they will be more than happy to do so—certainly the type we want to attract would be most happy to do so.

Third, sponsor responsibility. Sometimes families now sponsor an aging relative into this country and then abandon the newcomer to the welfare rolls. Sponsors of these immigrants should be made financially liable for their arriving relatives.

Four, a special Mexican program. Geography means we cannot stop the flow of illegal immigrants across the Mexican border. We should make an agreement with Mexico to allow a certain number of their citizens to work in this country on a temporary basis each year. We did this before in the 1950's. While it did not work perfectly, it was far better than the mess we have now. The problem with the bracero program of the 1950's was that the Mexicans helped to hold down wage levels. The problem now is that the uncontrolled, illegal flood of Mexicans holds down wage levels even more. We have gone from the frying pan into the fire. Let us go back to the frying pan. The Mexican Government has indicated it is interested in a regularized flow. It is the United States that is sitting down and doing nothing.

Five, address the Caribbean now. The next refugee explosion could come from the Caribbean where dozens of poor and overcrowded islands have little future. Social upheaval could produce pro-Soviet regimes and send floods of refugees this way. We should allow more temporary workers into this country from the Caribbean and also create a special import preference program to encourage small-scale industry to locate in the islands knowing they would have a market in this country. These kinds of

programs are not popular, but a responsible government spends large sums on preventatives rather than immense sums on curatives.

I should say a word about refugee costs, which are scattered all over the Federal budget. Finding out how much we spend on refugees is almost as bad as trying to find out how much the Pentagon has overrun its weapons budget.

I have tracked down at least \$1.3 billion that will be spent this year on refugees who come to this country. That doesn't include the \$162 million we will send overseas to help maintain refugee camps in other countries.

The \$1.3 billion includes about a half billion in welfare program costs, largely for the Indochinese, close to \$400 million to run the refugee camps for the newly arrived Cubans and Haitians and almost \$300 million to help bring Indochinese here at the rate of 14,000 a month.

I mentioned earlier that there is a special welfare program open only to refugees and not to citizens. I saw some jaws drop at mention of that so I think I had better explain it.

This special refugee assistance program—which will cost about \$200 million this year—is calculated the same way as the main welfare program, Aid to Families with Dependent Children. AFDC provides funds in half the States only to one-parent families with minor children. The special refugee assistance program says that so long as your income is under the ceiling for AFDC eligibility, you can get AFDC-type payments even though you may be a married couple, a childless couple or even a single person.

This program was not dreamed up in a void. The logic behind the idea was that the Federal Government should pick up all refugee costs and should not leave some refugees to go on State welfare programs. I could not agree more wholeheartedly with the thought—but the practice leaves a great deal to be desired because there are two massive holes in the program:

First, about 10 States have no general assistance welfare programs so refugees there get funds while citizens in equally dire straits get zero. In many other States, general assistance is less than the AFDC payments so the refugees get more aid than citizens.

Second, under the Carter administration's proposal, none of the Cubans and Haitians who entered this country this year would come under the special Federal refugee aid plan. Despite the philosophy of having the Federal Government pick up all refugee costs, Washington would leave the States with general assistance programs to pick up the tab for the Cubans and Haitians.

Let us say there is a Cambodian family of four that came here in May, and a Cuban family of four that came here the same day. They both live on the same block with a native born American family of four in a State

with no general assistance program. And they all have the same poverty-level income.

The American family gets no government aid at all from either the State or Federal Government. The Cambodian family will get a few hundred dollars from Washington on the logic that the local authorities should not have to pay what is a nonexistent bill for refugee welfare. And the Cuban family will get nothing from anywhere because the administration simply does not want to spend more money.

Somehow, we have now managed both to discriminate between refugee and citizen and to discriminate among refugees depending on their place of birth. With the goal of complete fairness in mind, the system has produced a program that really is not fair to anybody.

If we want to be fair to the States and not leave them with a refugee bill, then Washington should reimburse the States for any general assistance costs—but it should not be paying welfare to foreigners who would not qualify if they were citizens. And if we are going to provide aid for refugees, we should not discriminate between the Cubans and Haitians on one hand and everybody else on the other hand.

If we simply dole out billions and include programs that even citizens cannot qualify under, then we are asking for trouble. We will feed hatred and animosity toward the refugees and end up making their lives here miserable.

That is why I am suggesting we supplant the bulk of the existing welfare programs with a Federal, no-interest loan program for refugees. They would get money to resettle and to start up new lives. But that money would not be a gift. They would be expected to repay it over succeeding years.

This idea has a number of benefits. For one thing, it would be a lot cheaper than the present costly approach. For another, it would help to sort out the refugees who are simply looking for a free ride here from those whom we want to attract—the hard-working, nose-to-the-grindstone types that helped build America over the last two centuries.

Another key question is how many refugees should be accepted. That is harder to answer because, first, almost any number is going to be arbitrary and, second, the flow of refugees obviously reflects disasters abroad and not just the desires of bureaucrats in Washington for an even and manageable flow. It is our nature in government to try to fix some annual figure. It might be better if we set a limit by the decade and recognized that half that number might come in any one year, like the surges of Hungarians, Cubans, and Indochinese I cited earlier.

I should note that we may face another explosion of Cuban refugees in the foreseeable future.

There are several pieces of evidence to support this:

First, economic conditions in Cuba and crime continue to be a problem.

Second, there is evidence that Castro has been improving the departure port of Mariel, giving it the look of a permanent installation.

Third, there is evidence that Castro has aligned himself with a hard line faction that favors a policy of confrontation with the United States.

Of course, a harsh clampdown by the United States on skippers who bring refugees over in their boats could severely crimp any boatlift. But that does not eliminate Castro's options.

I am concerned that Castro might retaliate by unloading truckloads of refugees outside the fence at the Guantanamo base and telling them to clamber over. It is not an invasion by Cuban troops that the Marines at Guantanamo have to worry about.

The Nation must give more thought to what policy we will pursue if there is another refugee flood because the chances are very good that Castro isn't finished cleansing his island of elements he doesn't like. What is more, there is the likelihood of more illegal inflows from Haiti and elsewhere around the Caribbean.

There are indications that an organized group using a secret mother ship is bringing Haitians to this country and only placing them on rickety old ships for the last few miles.

I am sure anyone who has looked at the news photos of hundreds of people jampacked on a tiny boat has wondered how they could have spent a week at sea in such a vessel. The Coast Guard wonders too—especially since officers who have met the boats report that the hordes of people on them are reasonably clean, neat, and well fed—too clean, neat and well fed to have spent many days at sea.

Coast Guard officials have compared the Haitians with the Cubans who generally arrived haggard and hungry despite a trip that is ostensibly only about a fifth as long.

This has led to the belief that some person or persons is actually bringing the refugees—for a large fee, of course—aboard a mother ship. Then they are put aboard a rickety boat only for the last segment of the trip to the Florida coast.

I am concerned that the proposal to amnesty all illegal Haitians in this country will simply spur even more to come here. Furthermore, this same boat ploy could be used to relieve dozens of other Caribbean islands of their population pressures. That is why one of my five points specifically addresses the unique problems of the Caribbean.

We need a far more comprehensive policy on refugees than the one we have now, which merely addresses what we will do if we can have a controlled, regulated and limited flow of 50,000 a year into the United States.

This does not reflect the realities of the periodic bursts of refugees we have seen since World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we frame a refugee policy that reflects the real rather than the ideal world. I submit my five-point proposal as the framework for just such a policy.●

THROWING MONEY AT A PROBLEM

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, Ed Sidey has written another one of his very fine editorials which cuts through the surface and gets right to the heart of the matter. Mr. Sidey, who is editor and publisher of the Adair County Free Press in Greenfield, Iowa, is widely known for his thoughtful and incisive editorials. This is another of his to the point editorials about how some political candidates accuse others of throwing money at a problem in order to solve that problem, and then that very same individual will turn right around and try to solve our defense problem by throwing money at it. It is an editorial which I am sure will be of interest to my colleagues. The editorial follows:

POSSIBLE TO "THROW MONEY" AT DEFENSE

In the political campaign ahead of us this fall, we will hear much comment about certain candidates who are supposed to be "strong" on defense or "weak" on defense. Too often, their positions on defense are equated with how much money they have voted or would vote for the defense budget.

Somewhere in the campaign, we hope the idea comes across that sometimes it isn't the amount of money spent, but how and for what it is spent, that determines whether we have strengthened our armed forces.

Republicans have been fond of accusing Democrats of "throwing money at a problem" in a futile attempt to solve it. We submit that it is possible to "throw money at defense" in a similar fashion, and just as futile. Some of the hawkish candidates, who pride themselves on being financial conservatives, are most guilty of throwing money at our defense problems.●

IN HONOR OF RABBI AND MRS. JACOB GOLDBERG

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, there are citizens in every part of this Nation who give inspiring, unselfish service to their communities. Two such citizens, Rabbi and Mrs. Jacob Goldberg, have left their mark on two parts of New York for the past several decades: The Lake Peekskill area upstate, and the Washington Heights neighborhood in New York City, which I have the privilege to represent in this House.

In each of these areas, Jewish congregations claim Rabbi Goldberg for their own. In Lake Peekskill, where the Goldbergs spend their summers, he has led Temple Israel. In Washington Heights, it is the Fort Tryon Jewish Center that cherishes him the rest of the year.

Our distinguished colleague, HAMILTON FISH, JR., who represents Lake Peekskill in Congress, recently took part in ceremonies honoring the Goldbergs in that community. As a friend and admirer of my constituent, Jacob Goldberg, I join Mr. FISH in applauding the rabbi's rare dedication to public service.

The Goldbergs have been particularly active in the struggle to end the persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union, a cause to which Mr. FISH has also lent his considerable talents.

I am honored, and proud, to commend the following remarks of Mr. FISH at the Lake Peekskill celebration to the attention of my colleagues. The remarks follow:

TEMPLE ISRAEL REMARKS HONORING RABBI AND MRS. JACOB GOLDBERG BY HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a privilege to be here with you this evening to honor Rabbi and Rabbitzen Goldberg for their dedication and good works here in Lake Peekskill, in New York City, and around the world.

I would like to mention Al Brenner, Sam Slutzky, and Abe Meltzer for their efforts in making tonight possible. I want to thank them all for their assistance in bringing us together for this special occasion.

Outstanding citizens like Rabbi and Rabbitzen Goldberg reaffirm my belief that this country does not suffer from a lack of moral leadership and unselfish commitment. They symbolize the faith, values, and social involvement—Americans dedicated to serve their community and to improve the lives of citizens of all denominations. By their continuing relationships with the Washington Heights and Lake Peekskill communities, Rabbi and Rabbitzen Goldberg have formed lasting and firm bonds with the members of the two congregations. We are all proud and delighted at celebrating thirty-two years of inspiration and wisdom from Rabbi Goldberg here at Temple Israel and I am honored to call him friend.

Rabbi Goldberg epitomizes that which Jewish congregation leaders have been throughout the centuries. For Rabbi Goldberg is a guiding force in prayer, study, cause and counseling. He carefully preserves the Jewish tradition and therefore the Jewish people. He is available to share times of happiness, console the bereaved, and to be a friend. For that we all are grateful, Rabbi.

Most of all, Rabbi Goldberg is that which all Rabbis are by definition—a teacher. He brings great scholarship and historical perspective to the traditional themes of prayer. His interpretations of the Hebrew Scriptures illuminate our understanding. It has been my good fortune, as you know, to attend some of Rabbi Goldberg's services and I have always come away better informed about the rich Jewish tradition.

Rabbi and Rabbitzen Goldberg have long been dedicated to a cause to which I am also fully committed, Soviet Jews. In 1967, Rabbi Goldberg was among the first of American Rabbis to visit the Soviet Union. The persecution and mistreatment of Soviet Jews, the

suffering of those imprisoned or tortured just because they were Jewish, and the horrors of the Gulag Archipelago were visions which Rabbi Goldberg has never forgotten.

Upon his return to the United States in 1967, Rabbi Goldberg helped form and became the first president of the New York Coordinating Council on Soviet Jewry, now the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry. Rabbi Goldberg created this group and worked hard to expand its influence and activities because of his anguish and dismay at what was happening to Jews in the Soviet Union. He continues this work today. And as we all know from my recent remarks to this congregation, there are still many Jews inside the Soviet Union, such as Vladimir Kislik, Ida Hindel, and Anatoly Shcharansky who are not free to live as they choose.

It is on behalf of these men and others equally unfortunate that Rabbi Goldberg and the organization he created will not cease their vigorous efforts until all who wish to live in freedom achieve their goal.

In order to further his education and knowledge, Rabbi and Rabbitzen Goldberg spent a year in Israel. He came back infused with the spirit of Israel and the Jewish people. This awareness is apparent in all that Rabbi Goldberg says and does among the congregation and in the outside world.

I think it is important for us to note the academic achievements of Rabbi Goldberg. The clarity and quality of his teaching reflects his three masters degrees in history, rabbinics, and counseling. His exceptional background benefits his entire congregation.

One of Rabbi Goldberg's degrees, his masters in counseling, has led him to involvement in a new area—bereavement counseling. In conjunction with an interfaith group in New York City, Rabbi Goldberg—ceaseless in his search for services—is developing a new and important program for educating clergy to better perform the difficult task of comforting the bereaved. This is just another example of Rabbi Goldberg's leadership in the community he so faithfully serves.

I again note my privilege in being able to speak to you on this special occasion. I would like to extend my best wishes to Rabbi and Rabbitzen Goldberg's family, his son and two daughters and their spouses and children, who are attending this ceremony this evening. This congregation is justifiably proud of Rabbi Goldberg, enriched by him as we all are. We all wish that he serve many more years here in Lake Peekskill. ●

UNION CONTEST WITH GOVERNMENT—PART II

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the following excerpt is the second part of a two-part series on unions by Clarence B. Carson. In part I, Mr. Carson examined union organization and their legal definition, union competition with Government regarding the latter's monopoly on coercion, and finally the response of Government to this competition. Part II takes a different tack and examines, from a historic perspective, labor union development and serious strikes since the

Civil War along with the attendant legal developments.

There are few if any power structures in our society today which strike at such a fundamental issue as Government control and monopoly on force as labor unions do. Misunderstanding of the constitutional necessities regarding this subject is the seed of serious civil upheaval and the foundation for what could well be a stifling hold on all production as well as the freedom of workers. For this reason I commend the conclusion of this paper to the careful attention of my colleagues:

UNION CONTEST WITH GOVERNMENT

UNIONS AFTER THE CIVIL WAR

Unions did begin to become nationally important after the Civil War. Several national unions were organized, and there were successful efforts to organize workers in many industries. "The Industrial Commission of 1900 reported that there were 22,793 strikes between 1881 and 1900 which affected some 117,000 businesses. During the same period there were 1,005 lockouts." A lockout occurs when facilities are closed to protect the premises from trespass and the property from damage. The number of them may provide some indication of the fear of destruction during labor disputes.

The union contest with government became visible, vociferous, sometimes violent during this period. The first national instance was the Railway Strike of 1877. This was not a single strike coordinated by a central union but a series of strikes which spread to several railroads and states during that year. The strike began in Baltimore following the announcement of a wage cut on the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. Crewmen refused to move trains, replacements were hired, and when the strikers remained in the yards, they were arrested. The trouble then shifted to Martinsburg, West Virginia. When the crewmen refused to take the trains through, the railroad asked the governor for troops. When the state troops met resistance they killed a striker and one of them was wounded. The governor requested Federal troops, and several hundred were dispatched. After a change of commander, these were able to get the trains moving again.

Much worse violence lay ahead in Pittsburgh, however. The reduction of wages was not the issue there. The trouble arose over the decision of the Pennsylvania Railroad to haul longer trains by using two engines. Crewmen and yardmen refused to move the train and, when an attempt was made to move it, they attacked it. All train traffic was stopped and the sheriff wired the governor for troops. Local Guardsmen from Pittsburgh were supplemented by a large contingent from Philadelphia.

When the sheriff assisted by Guardsmen, attempted to arrest the leaders, shooting broke out, and the Pittsburgh troops threw down their weapons and took sides with the strikers. The Philadelphia Guard withdrew to the railroad roundhouse. "Shut up in the roundhouse, the guardsmen were surrounded by a large crowd that called upon them to surrender. A gun brought by the rioters and loaded with couplings and broken rails steadily pelted the roundhouse, but the guardsmen held out and marched out only when the pickets had pushed burning oil cars against the building. The retreating troops were fired upon as they moved through the streets, and several fell from revolver and rifle shots." After another day

of violence, things quieted down, but trouble was spreading in Pennsylvania.

The governor requested troops from President Hayes. These were dispatched from Baltimore, but "Strikers blocked the road at Altoona and refused to allow National Guardsmen to proceed to Pittsburgh. . . . The governor set up headquarters in Philadelphia, assembled troops and set out for Western Pennsylvania, followed by several hundred regular army troops equipped with artillery." When a sympathy strike broke out in Scranton, large damage in mines was anticipated. "A clash between pickets and a posse that had been recruited by the mayor of Scranton resulted in the killing of four and the wounding of several others. Aid was sought from the governor while armed citizens patrolled the city streets. A force of 1,800 men was dispatched and was followed by 2,000 additional troops."

Trouble spread to Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. In Chicago, pickets went from one plant to another attempting to make them close down and go out on strike. Pleas from the mayor and governor were unavailing, for "crowds clashed with the police, some of them were killed and many others wounded." The army was brought in. "Order was restored with the arrest of rioters and their leaders."

THE HAYMARKET RIOT

Surely, these clashes between unions and government were unusual in scope and severity. However, there were instances when clashes were more pointedly ideological than those in the Railway Strike. Perhaps the most well known was the Haymarket Riot in 1886. There were anarchists directly involved in events which led to this series of events in Chicago, men who believed and taught that government was an instrument of capitalists to oppress the workers, that government, then, was an enemy to be overthrown.

Cyrus McCormick, owner of a harvester works in Chicago, had refused to accept a union to represent his employees. When pressed, he closed his factory and opened it later with non-union workers. Conflicts between the union men now on strike and the workers were frequent. Meanwhile, organized labor launched a campaign for the 8-hour day with a general strike. For whatever reasons, probably as a conciliatory measure toward his workers, McCormick granted the 8-hour day and gave his workers a half-day holiday to celebrate. "As the workers came out of the factory they were greeted with hoots of contempt and derision by the union men assembled near by. Not far away, in a vacant lot, striking lumbermen were holding a meeting. . . . The two groups joined forces. The owner summoned the police and, in the fighting that followed, several workmen were killed and a score or so wounded."

A protest meeting was scheduled for the next night to be held in Haymarket Square. Circulars were printed up in English and German and distributed over the city. The heading read: "Revenge! Revenge! Workmen to arms!" The body of it spelled out the antagonism toward the police:

"Men of labor, this afternoon the bloodhounds of your oppressors murdered six of your brothers at McCormick! Why did they murder them? Because they dared to be dissatisfied with the lot which your oppressors have assigned to them. They demanded bread, and they gave them lead for an answer."

Toward the end of the meeting a squad of police arrived and asked the crowd to disperse. A bomb was thrown into the ranks of police; the explosion killed one and wounded others. Shooting broke out; sixty-eight

policemen were wounded, and seven of them died. Four people in the crowd were killed. In the aftermath several anarchists were tried and convicted of murder.

THE HOMESTEAD STRIKE

The Homestead Strike of 1892 provides an example of another aspect of the contest. Companies sometimes hired their own police. When a strike portended, these might be supplemented by private forces such as the Pinkerton Detective Agency. The Homestead (Pennsylvania) plant was a part of Carnegie Steel. Henry C. Frick was the chief administrator. When the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers called a strike in 1891, Frick tried to operate the Homestead plant. More than a hundred deputy sheriffs were sent to the site. However, pickets refused to allow them to enter the plant, and the deputies would not force the picket lines. The sheriff managed to get negotiations opened, and the strike was settled.

Things went differently in 1892. Frick caused a three-mile-long fence to be constructed around the plant. The fence was topped with barbed wire, spaced holes were cut in it, and search-lights were mounted along it. When the union decided to strike, the company did ask the sheriff for protection, but Frick did not intend to place much reliance on him. Instead, he had already placed a tentative order with Pinkerton Detective Agency to supply guards, for he had concluded, he said, that "it would be necessary to protect our own property and secure new workmen."

Three hundred Pinkerton detectives tried to reach the plant by way of boats on the river. However, their approach was detected by the strikers who broke through the fence that had been erected and would not permit them to land. Shooting broke out and several were killed. The Pinkertons made two other unsuccessful assaults before they surrendered. The plant was taken over by the strikers and the guards held captive. The sheriff applied to the governor for troops, and 7,000 were sent. They removed the strikers from the premises, and the mill was eventually reopened without them. In the midst of these developments an anarchist shot and stabbed Frick but failed in the effort to kill him.

THE PULLMAN STRIKE

The Pullman Strike of 1894 provided the setting for a major shift in dealing with labor disputes. Theretofore, state and local governments had been primarily responsible for maintaining the peace in labor disputes. In this strike, the United States became involved on its own initiative (not simply as a backup force). A contest between a union and the federal government developed. Secondly, it began the shift to the widespread use of the injunction in labor disputes. Third, the Sherman Antitrust Act was invoked in a labor dispute.

Actually, Pullman Strike is a misnomer for the events that brought action by the federal government. There was a Pullman strike, but it was only the approximate cause of the trouble. It could more aptly be called the American Railway Union Boycott. When the workers at the Pullman plant near Chicago went out on strike, the American Railway Union proclaimed a boycott of Pullman cars on trains. That is, the members of their union were not to handle Pullman cars on the train that they worked. The associated railroads which came into Chicago determined that the lines would not be used in that way, that they would continue to use and pull Pullman cars. When the union men refused to comply with company orders, they were replaced by

those who would. Many railway workers then struck.

The railroads experienced increasing difficulty in operating. The mail was piling up in some cities because the railroads were tied up by the strike. Injunctions were obtained which enjoined interference with the railroads. A witness described the response to the reading of the injunction this way:

"Marshal Arnold stood in a mail car and read one injunction. He was jeered considerably . . . ; then the other injunction was read from the back of a passenger car by his deputy . . . The men, of course, gathered around and I suppose there were 500 men upon the hill, in the roadway and around the cars . . . It was from that crowd that the cry came, 'To hell with the Government.' 'To hell with the President.' 'To hell with the court and injunctions.'"

The United States Marshal wired that he was unable to enforce the injunction and requested that troops be sent in. This was done, but the immediate result was an increase in the violence. Several marshals and their resisters were killed and wounded. Shortly after the union leaders were arrested, the violence subsided, and the strike was called off.

The United States Strike Commission, appointed by President Grover Cleveland, described the situation this way in the latter part of the nineteenth century:

"It is encouraging to find general concurrence . . . in condemning strikes, boycotts, and lockouts as barbarisms unfit for the intelligence of this age, and as, economically considered, very jurious and destructive forces. Whether won or lost is broadly immaterial. They are war—internecine war—and call for progress to a higher plane . . . These barbarisms waste the products of both capital and labor, defy law and order, disturb society, intimidate capital, convert industrial paths where there ought to be plenty into highways of poverty and crime, bear as their fruit the arrogant flush of victory and the humiliating sting of defeat, and lead to preparations for greater and more destructive conflicts."

The Commission recommended that the government encourage labor combinations as it had capital formation in the interest of industrial peace.

Except for the railroads and more generally for a brief period during World War I, that would not be the course the government followed for the next four decades. (When the government did eventually turn to the encouragement of unions, as Metz called it—it might better be called empowerment—it hardly resulted in industrial peace.) The contest between unions and government did, however, shift to a different plane between the 1890s and early 1930s. Much of the initiative for maintaining the peace shifted from the police (and armed forces) to the courts. The main instrument for controlling labor unions was the injunction.

The injunction was increasingly used in labor disputes from the 1880s through the 1920s. Both state and Federal courts issued them. A total of 28 such injunctions were issued in the 1880s, 122 in the 1890s, 328 from 1900 through 1909, 446 from 1910 through 1919, and 921 in the 1920s. One authority described the impact of this use of the injunction this way:

"For almost a generation and a half, from the 1890s to the early 1930s . . . the power of the courts was invoked to assist in defeating most of the more important strikes—among them, the Pullman Strike of 1894, the coal strike of 1919, the shopmen's strike of 1922—and only a smaller proportion of the relatively less important ones . . . to prevent the successful spreading of labor

boycotts . . . and . . . to prevent organizing activities where the workers were engaged under individual nonunion or 'yellow-dog' contracts."

SHERMAN ACT OF 1890

The Sherman Act of 1890 provided legislative support to the use of the injunction in labor disputes. It was not essential to the use of the injunction in this way, per se, since courts of equity could, and did, issue injunctions to forestall irreparable damages where they were the appropriate remedy. The Sherman Act went much further, however. It prohibited combinations or conspiracies which restrained or obstructed interstate commerce. It provided for criminal prosecution, for injunction relief, and for suits in which triple damages could be awarded.

Labor unions were neither exempted from nor specifically mentioned in the Sherman Act. However, a provision to exempt combinations of laborers from its application was not adopted by Congress, and the language was altered to refer not only to trusts but to "other" combinations as well. In any case, the courts began to apply it, and in the Danbury Hatters case, heard in 1908, triple damages were assessed against a union. The Supreme Court eventually affirmed its validity.

The courts had now moved toward the position that labor unions were at least partially responsible legal entities. The fine in the Danbury Hatters case was levied against the membership of the American Federation of Labor. I say partially responsible, however, for only damage to employers was assessed, not that to non-union workers, to government, or to the general public. Indeed, there may be no way equitably to arrive at such damages. In any case, these developments concerned union leaders greatly. They launched a political campaign to get the antitrust laws modified so as to exempt unions from their applications.

THE CLAYTON ACT: "LABOR'S MAGNA CARTA"

This campaign bore fruit, or so many union leaders thought, with the passage of the Clayton Antitrust Act in 1914. Section 6 of the Act does appear to exempt labor unions. It reads, in part:

"That the labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce. Nothing contained in the anti-trust laws shall be construed to forbid the existence and operation of labor . . . organizations . . .; nor shall such organizations, or the members thereof, be held or construed to be illegal combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade, under the anti-trust laws."

Samuel Gompers, head of the AFL, hailed it as "Labor's Magna Carta," and declared that it was "the most important and comprehensive measure ever enacted touching the freedom of workers."

Indeed, the Act may have been a boon to "the freedom of workers," but it was hardly a victory for labor unions, as matters turned out. Section 20 of the Act did provide that no restraining order should be issued by the courts of the United States in cases involving employers and employees, but there was an exception: "unless necessary to prevent irreparable injury to property, or to a property right, of the party making the application, for which injury there is no adequate remedy at law. . ." Section 20 goes on to assert that labor organizations may engage in "peaceful" and "lawful" acts. Many states proceeded to pass acts modeled on the Clayton Act.

What the courts tended to do thereafter was to rule that the Clayton Act made no substantial change in the situation. (It did make one change, for theretofore the government had to initiate requests for injunc-

tions; this power was now extended to private parties.) It had simply declared what was settled law and good construction before it had been enacted. The injunction was more widely used than ever after its passage.

The Clayton Act did not, of course, end, or even reduce, the contest between unions and government. If anything, it sharpened and focused it. One writer says that "The result was that the labor injunction 'weakened and undermined the courts' and so respect for law and government, since unions considered the law so unfair and unduly restrictive of their right to self-protection." Moreover, "they did not prevent the violence which continued to be an accompaniment of industrial disputes."

In essence, there is a conflict between union coercion and government. The conflict has often been obscured by treating labor disputes as if they were simply something between employers and employees. When viewed in that light exclusively, government action becomes "interference" in a labor dispute. However, when the matter is looked at from the broad perspective of its impact on others, it takes on a different cast. When unions resort to coercion, government becomes a party to the dispute, else it forgoes its monopoly of the use of force. More, if government does not intervene, it does not perform the function which justifies its existence, namely the maintenance of the peace and the protection of life and property. These have been at issue in the union contest with government.●

OVER 80'S TOURNAMENT

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Select Committee on Aging, I was very pleased to view the "Tic Tac Dough Over 80's Tournament" produced by Mr. Allen Koss and the Barry & Enright Productions. The "Over 80's Tournament" provided an outstanding opportunity for all Americans to recognize not only the intelligence but also the warmth, charm, courage, and humor of a small number of people over 80 years old who mirror the qualities of our older Americans. Programs such as this present a serious and human projection of our senior citizens who should be the most respected and honored members of our society. I commend Mr. Allen Koss and the Barry & Enright Productions for their foresight and sensitivity in presenting the well-done and outstanding "Over 80's Tournament."

Additionally, I commend the senior citizens whose lively participation in the tournament contributed to the entertainment and interest of all the viewers. In particular, the final contestants, Dr. Reba Kelley and Ms. Bobbi Tremain, deserve our commendation for their knowledge and charm, and our highest admiration for the generosity of Ms. Tremain in offering to share her winnings with Dr. Kelley. I certainly support Ms. Tremain's hope that programs such as the "Over 80's

Tournament" will continue to be produced—programs such as this will truly show the value of our older Americans.

Finally, I would like to commend the program host, Mr. Wink Martindale, whose warmth and sensitivity toward the contestants certainly contributed to the success of the "Over 80's Tournament."●

WHO WILL REGULATE THE REGULATORS?

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, by now, I am sure my colleagues are aware of the ongoing efforts to secure passage of a regulatory reform bill this year. To this end, I have initiated discharge petition No. 12, to bring H.R. 3263, the Regulation Reform Act of 1980, to the House floor as quickly as possible.

Those of my colleagues who have not signed the petition are urged to do so.

Let me point out another compelling example of why regulatory reform on a comprehensive scale is needed.

Early this year, I had a meeting with Paul S. Ellison, director of the Cleveland Memorial Hospital in Shelby, N.C. Mr. Ellison related a story to me which I found, frankly, to be amazing.

It seems that Cleveland Memorial Hospital wanted to replace two X-ray machines. Out of curiosity, hospital officials monitored the paperwork and expense necessitated by compliance with the Department of Health and Human Services regulations promulgated under the Health Planning Act which require review and documentation of all hospital purchases of capital equipment in excess of \$100,000.

What Mr. Ellison found was that the staff at the Hospital spent 161 hours to prepare the 47 pounds, 3 ounces of paperwork necessitated by the regulations.

What a graphic example of the often burdensome effects of overregulation.

I asked Mr. Ellison to provide me with the documentation he had of the cost and efforts to replace the machines, and I believe my colleagues may find it of interest. If this does not convince you to sign Discharge Petition No. 12, then I would urge you to talk with some hospital administrators in your home district who, I am positive, can relate similar stories.

The material follows:

CLEVELAND MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, INC.,

Shelby, N.C., February 13, 1980.

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROYHILL: In my recent discussion with you, I described the process we went through in replacing two

radiographic diagnostic x-ray machines. Ordinarily, the x-ray machines would be depreciated over a ten-year period and we would reserve sufficient funds in our depreciation schedule for the appropriate replacement, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees of Cleveland Memorial Hospital. However, to replace the two machines we complied with Public Law 92-603 which mandates that all capital equipment in excess of \$100,000 be reviewed under Section 1122 of the Social Security Amendments. We prepared the appropriate documentation required by Public Law 93-641, National Health Planning and Resources Act, for review by health Systems Agency I and for further review by the State Planning Agency. From October 26, 1978 through December 13, 1978, our staff spent 161 manhours preparing the 47 pounds and 3 ounces of paper necessary to provide the required copies for the agencies. Since we are in the eastern section of the 26-county Health Systems Agency I, we were required to make several trips to Asheville for our project review hearing and the Health Systems Agency Board hearing. After we received notification of approval for the replacement of the two x-ray machines, the accepted bid for the machines amounted to \$450,000 (\$225,000 per machine). As a matter of interest, one of the machines was purchased in 1966 at a cost of \$32,134, and the other machine was purchased in 1967 for a price of \$33,104. Documentation of the cost and efforts to replace the machines is enclosed.

I also discussed with you my concerns about the changes in the Hill-Burton program, and I am enclosing a statement which reflects the impact on Cleveland Memorial Hospital as a result of the changes.

These are two of the many reasons our health care costs continue to escalate.

Sincerely,

PAUL S. ELLISON, FACHA,
Director.

Enclosures.

COSTS AND EFFORTS INVOLVED IN FILING OF 1122 APPLICATION FOR RADIOGRAPHIC AND FLUOROSCOPIC EQUIPMENT IN RADIOLOGY

(Oct. 26, 1978 to Dec. 13, 1978)

Weight of application	Each	8 copies	10 copies
Prepared.....	2 lbs, 7.5 oz.....	24 lbs, 11 oz.....	24 lbs, 11 oz.....
Requested from State and HSA	4 lbs, 11.5 oz.....	47 lbs, 3 oz.....	47 lbs, 3 oz.....
Sent to State and HSA	2 lbs, 7.5 oz.....	19 lbs, 12 oz.....	19 lbs, 12 oz.....

HOURS SPENT ON APPLICATION

Name	Hours
Clontz.....	78.5
Plyler.....	13.5
Friend.....	12.0
Ellison.....	5.0
Secretarial services.....	15.0
Subtotal.....	124.0
From page 3.....	37.0
Total.....	161.0

MAN-HOUR COSTS

Name	Hours paid	Dollars
Clontz:		
Application.....	44.0	254
3 trips to HSA—Morganton and Charlotte.....	10.0	58
Trip to Morganton—Con. meeting.....	3.5	20
Total.....	57.5	332

MAN-HOUR COSTS—Continued

Name	Hours paid	Dollars
Plyler:		
Application.....	3.0	18
2 trips to HSA—Morganton.....	7.0	42
Trip to Morganton—Con. meeting.....	3.5	21
Total.....	13.5	81
Friend: Application.....	12.0	72
Ellison:		
Application.....	1.5	9
Trip to Morganton—Con. meeting.....	3.5	21
Total.....	5.0	30
Secretarial services: Application and Xeroxing.....	15.0	90
Travel expense.....		61
Mailing:		
If mailed package to Raleigh.....		4
Mailing of package to Morganton.....		1
Total.....		5
Xerox: 2,000 copies x \$.0304.....		61
Paper and supplies.....		3

¹ In actuality, the applications were delivered in person.

COST TO DATE

Expenses	Dollars
Salary:	
Clontz.....	332
Secretarial.....	61
Administrative.....	
Travel.....	61
Mailing.....	5
Xerox.....	61
Paper and supplies.....	3
Total (Administration staff).....	523

ACTUAL FUTURE COSTS AND EFFORTS

(Man-hour costs)

Name	Hours	Dollars
Clontz.....	14	84
Plyler.....	16	96
Radiologist.....	7	42
Total.....	37	222
Travel:		
Travel to meetings in Asheville.....		51
Breakdown of future efforts:		
A. Public hearing in Shelby.....	2	12
B. Project Review Committee meeting in Asheville.....	7	42
C. Full HSA Board meeting in Asheville.....	7	42

FIRING A POLITICAL WEAPON

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Santa Barbara News Press raises serious questions about the motives of the Carter administration in leaking news of the Stealth bomber. I believe the questions raised are valid ones and that President Carter owes the American people straightforward answers on them.

The editorial follows:

FIRING A POLITICAL WEAPON

The more we learn about the "leak" of information about the Stealth bomber project, the more disturbing the case becomes. The evidence indicates that it is an ugly blight on the Carter administration.

Stealth is the name that the Pentagon gave to a project for developing a new attack airplane. Supposedly the use of some special materials in the construction of the plane would make it, in effect, all but "in-

visible" to detection devices. The research and development have been going on for two years or more, a top-secret project of the Air Force.

But recently someone "leaked" information on the project to a magazine named Armed Forces Journal. After the Journal's September issue carried an article about Stealth, defense officials confirmed the story. Then they went further. They held a news briefing and disclosed more details about the project. Clearly this would show that, though the Carter administration has been criticized for cutting military plans, in fact it had been secretly pushing a revolutionary aerial warfare program. Secretary of Defense Harold R. Brown held a briefing that told the world about Stealth.

A House subcommittee got the story this week on how the "leak" of information happened.

Benjamin F. Schemmer, editor of the Armed Forces Journal (not an official publication), testified that his magazine learned something about Stealth in early 1978. Pentagon officers persuaded him not to publish anything, on national security grounds. He agreed.

A few weeks ago, the Pentagon decided Schemmer could now publish the story. He was given a briefing on the project by William J. Perry, undersecretary of defense for research and engineering. Schemmer told the house subcommittee that he was assured that Secretary Brown would not announce the Stealth project until after the magazine's September issue was distributed. Schemmer also told the subcommittee that he thinks the official strategy was "irresponsible."

The case raises serious questions.

If secrecy was vital in the first years of the project, why was it of no consequence in August 1980, even though this program is still far from operational?

Does the heavy publicizing of Stealth now give the administration a new "image" of strong defense-mindedness, even though U.S. military strength has declined during the past three years?

Or does the handling of the publicity indicate that Carter is playing campaign politics with military secrets?

In our view, the answer to that last question is yes, and that leaves us shaken.

An incumbent president has many campaign advantages. A lot of departments are at his beck and call, and he has much control over the propagandizing of their projects. In the case of Stealth, he or someone on his first team apparently fired a political weapon long before it was ready for use. ●

TRIBUTE TO CLAUDE PEPPER

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that our colleagues will want to read the tribute to our friend, Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER, which appeared in the Boston Herald-American on September 4, 1980.

The article was written by prize winning Wendell Coltin, an expert who is nationally recognized on issues related to senior citizens.

This well-deserved tribute to Congressman PEPPER notes that his 80th birthday will occur on Monday, September 8.

The article follows:

HAPPY 80TH TO REPRESENTATIVE CLAUDE PEPPER

(By Wendell Coltin)

This Labor Day week, if you have a birthday card on hand—or would like to send a brief note of birthday greetings to someone who has labored for the elderly, you can address it to Rep. Claude Pepper, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Pepper, chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging, and, appropriately, the oldest member of the House, will be 80 next Monday, Sept. 8. He has been a true friend of the elderly; loyal to their cause.

Under his leadership, the Committee on Aging has concerned itself with many problems of the elderly. Pepper has initiated numerous public hearings related to those problems, to unearth evidence that called for changes, improvements in certain public programs, and dignified treatment of elders. Hearings that he and fellow committeeman Rev. Robert F. Drinan held in Brookline and Waltham produced overwhelming testimony against mandatory retirement of workers because of age.

Pepper achieved fame for his crusade in behalf of the elderly. He played a major role in the enactment of legislation that led to abolition of mandatory retirement in the Federal Government and raising of the mandatory retirement age from 65 to 70 in the private sector. It is his aim—as it has been Drinan's, too—that mandatory retirement be eliminated entirely.

Pepper's admirers point to his fighting leadership in getting a program of meals on wheels for persons too incapacitated to leave their homes; a \$32 million program to combat crime in the elderly's public housing projects; and discounts for elderly riders on Amtrak trains.

The Brookline and Waltham hearings demonstrated the importance of a state having membership on a congressional committee. Those hearings were held in Massachusetts because of Drinan's membership on the committee and a mutual respect that he and Pepper have publicly proclaimed for each other. When Sen. Edward M. Kennedy and former Sen. Edward W. Brooke were on the Senate Committee on Aging, the then chairman, Sen. Frank Church, D-Idaho, came to Boston to conduct a hearing in Gardner Auditorium, which was largely attended.

Val Halamandaris, an attorney on the staff of the House Committee on Aging, formerly on the Church-chaired Senate Committee on Aging, told me a few days ago, when I asked for a comment from him on Pepper:

"He is easily the most articulate and most able and most genteel member in the Congress.

"He has the greatest sensitivity, as far as understanding and appreciation of the problems of older Americans."

He recalled a meeting conducted by the leadership of the American Association of Retired Persons. He said, "Every major political figure came to address it. Pepper made the greatest impression. He has the ability to move a crowd. He loves people. He turns them on. Frank Church, a great orator, spoke; Kennedy, too. Pepper got the longest reception and a prolonged standing ovation."

Halamandaris revealed that the committee is soon to come out with a report on 15 years of Medicare. Asked what it would say, he disclosed, "It will state there is a need to expand the program, that Medicare is on the verge of becoming a broken promise; that fewer and fewer doctors are taking as-

ignment (on Medicare claims) and it will urge more doctors to take assignment."

Henry Pulchalsky, take a bow!

Barre resident Pulchalsky, formerly of Worcester, is a Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission ombudsman and last week I contacted him for assistance in the case of a young North Shore man, who received aid through the commission while a student and had been trying, without success, recently to find out if he was still registered with the commission.

Pulchalsky came through beautifully.

When thanked for his efforts, he graciously mentioned there is another person working with him in the ombudsman's office, Paul Dowd, who was on vacation at that time.

The Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission makes the determination of whether applicants for disability benefits under Social Security or Supplemental Security Income qualify, by reason of disability, and much of the ombudsman's office's work involves checking on the status of applications for benefits, in the interest of men and women who anxiously contact Mass. Rehab. for such information.

Memo to persons who will be 65 in December and are not collecting Social Security benefits: This is a good month for you to enroll in Medicare.●

WHITE HOUSE LOOKS OTHER WAY ON YUGOSLAVIAN HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, while we are concerned about human rights all over the world, the administration tends to ignore violations in certain countries.

The Communist dictatorship of Yugoslavia is an example. While it is not quite as oppressive as most of the other Communist states, it does its share of persecution of dissidents. The victims range from supporters of individual freedom, nationalists, to even dissident Communists—called in Yugoslavia "Cominformists."

The Committee to Aid Democratic Dissidents in Yugoslavia headed by the writer Mihajlo has released a report on political prisoners in Yugoslavia. The report also reveals how our State Department stonewalls on this issue.

The report follows:

MEMORANDUM ON HUMAN RIGHTS IN YUGOSLAVIA

The Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe has released its report to the Congress on "Implementation of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Five Years After Helsinki," in Washington on July 31, 1980. In spite of the numerous indications of human rights violations, including Amnesty International Reports, the Commission's Report ignores these violations in Yugoslavia!

At the Department of State daily press briefing on July 29, 1980, and in commemoration of the Fifth Anniversary of the Helsinki Accord, two questions were asked regarding Yugoslavia:

Q. "Does the US intend to give support to the amnesty movement in Yugoslavia, which was recently launched by the petition of 36 prominent intellectuals asking for amnesty for all political prisoners?"

A. "While the United States supports all efforts designed to advance the cause of human rights at home and abroad, we do not believe it would be useful to comment on the June 11 amnesty appeal by 36 Belgrade intellectuals. The Yugoslav Government is aware of the fact that its positive approach to many aspects of human rights is an important component of the special respect which Yugoslavia enjoys in this country."

Q. "Is the US Government intending to approach the Yugoslav Government regarding the case of Momcilo Selic, a young architect, in prison for criticizing US-Yugoslav relations?"

A. "We do not intend to approach the Yugoslav Government with regard to the case of Momcilo Selic. While our knowledge of his case is incomplete, on the basis of the information available to us and given the fact that an appeal process is underway in the Yugoslav courts, we do not believe it would be appropriate to raise his case at this time. Our understanding is that Selic was not imprisoned for criticizing US-Yugoslav relations."

While the Helsinki Commission ignores the intensified violations of human rights in Yugoslavia and the Department of State clings to the idea that Yugoslav Government pursues a "positive approach", the Federal Public Prosecutor in Belgrade, General Vuko Goce-Gucetic, claims that there are about 300 prosecutions for political crimes each year. He further states: "Ninety per cent of political crimes are committed verbally. Only every sixth verbal crime is of a serious nature and can be classified as enemy propaganda." (NIN, June 29, 1980).

Since the Helsinki Accord, signed by the Yugoslav Government, does not stipulate as a crime a verbal or written criticism of the existing socio-political order, and since the nonviolent exercise of human rights, freedom of expression and association are being punished by imprisonment, it is clear that the Yugoslav Government is violating the Helsinki Accord. In support of this contention, a partial list of arrests and sentences given, since the Accord was signed, is attached (Political Arrests 08/1/75-08/1/80).

POLITICAL ARRESTS 08/01/75-08/01/80

08/15/75—Dusan Brkic, former deputy premier of Croatia, and five others, for "Cominformist leanings". NYT.

09/13/75—Kostadin Dimevski, a salesman; Pende Eftimov, a reporter; and Djordje Ordev, publishing house employee, for "Macedonian separatism". VUS.

09/17/75—Esad Ajdini, 30, for "connection with emigre groups". VUS.

10/25/75—Branko Nazor, 28, a returnee from Australia, for "belonging to Croatian separatist organization", in Split, 3 yrs. BOR.

11/01/75—Arrested in Croatia: Lav Znidarcic, a defense attorney; Definka Vecerina, a lawyer; Tomislav Drazic, editor of daily Vjesnik; Mladen Grubisic and Mile Vukosav. LEM.

11/07/75—Thirty-five Cominformist sympathizers reported arrested. TEL.

11/23/75—Nine persons arrested for being "pro-Soviet communists". NYT.

11/27/75—Laszlo Toth, 43, US citizen, in a secret trial for "economic espionage", 7 yrs. NYT. Toth was released (07/24/76 NYT), however, the fate of the Yugoslav plant manager, the director of research, and the plant photographer, who were sentenced with Toth, is unknown.

12/21/75—A Swedish couple jailed for "passing out religious literature", 20 days. NYT.

12/25/75—In Banja Luka: Slavoljub Vranjesevic, 71, a former army officer, 9 yrs; Petar Trivunovic, 33, a worker, 12 yrs; Krstan Jagodic, 28, a worker, 2½ yrs; and Bozidar Gajic, 35, a worker, 2½ yrs. OSL.

01/—/76—In Tuzla, on variety of charges, from "hostile propaganda" to "insulting the President of the Republic"; Branko Rakisic, 50, to 7 yrs; Danica Rakisic, 42, to 2½ yrs; Vinko Jozic, 50, to 4 yrs and Stjepan Blazevic, 46, to 1½ yrs.

02/06/76—Seventeen persons including an Orthodox priest, sentenced in Belgrade for "opposing the regime of Marshal Tito." NYD.

02/14/76—Prof. Adam Demaci, 40, and others for "association against the People and the State," in Pristina. Prof. Demaci, 15yrs; Skender Kastrati, 29, to 12yrs; Ethem Bajrami, 30 to 7yrs; Hasan Dermaku to 7yrs; Osman Dumosa, 30, to 7yrs; Recep Malja, 25, to 9 yrs; Seljani Novoseli, 31, 7yrs; Ilijaz Pireva, 28, to 7yrs; Hakmir Salobu, 25, to 7yrs; David Dermaku, 27, to 9yrs; Sefir Masurica, 27, to 7yrs; Sami Dermaku, 27, 6yrs; Zihadin Spahiu, 31, 5yrs; prof. Isa Kastrati, 29, to 6yrs; Ahmet Hoti, 29, 6yrs; Nijaju Korca to 6yrs; prof. Irfan Sadjiri, 26, to 7yrs; Hilmi Ramadavi, 23, to 5yrs; Nazim Surlani, 26, to 4yrs. A78, VUS, NYT (04/26).

03/05/76—Rev. Miroslav Cvitkovic, 50, to 6yrs, and Drago Govan, 46, to 3yrs, for bringing "antigovernment publications to Yugoslavia." VEN. Rev. Cvitkovic released in November 1977.

03/11/76—In Valjevo, Srdja M. Popovic, 38, an attorney, for "maliciously spreading false information and causing public disorder" while defending his client, to 1yr. NYT (NYT editorial 03/26). The sentence was suspended 05/27.

03/13/76—Milivoje Stevanovic, 64, former editor of Tanjug, 10yrs; Dusan Brkic, former deputy premier of Croatia, 8yrs, (released Nov. 77); Radovan Zigic, 55, former minister of industry, 8½yrs, and Ljubomir Radulovic, 58, to 7½yrs, for allegedly "asking Yugoslav emigres if the Soviet army would interfere in Yugoslavia after Tito's death." NYT.

03/13/76—Ivan Cirk, 40, a returnee from abroad, for "hostile acts against the state," 12yrs. VUS.

03/16/76—In Sarajevo: Milorad Dacic, 45, an attorney, 8yrs, and Hristofor Siljanovic, 58, 5yrs. 8mos., for "nationalistic, dogmatic and separatist ideas". BOR, VUS(03/27).

03/16/76—In Novi Sad, for "forming an illegal organization with the aim to change, by force, the existing social system": Djuro Sargin, 63, to 15yrs; Velimir Moraca, 46, to 15yrs; Djordje Bikicki, 60, to 15yrs; Grga Lubic, 63, to 13yrs; Nikola Zec, 51, to 12yrs; Milena Sargin, 56, to 10yrs; Roman Milic, 36, an engineer, to 10yrs; Miroslav Moraca, 28, a student, to 10yrs; and Dr. Bojan Rucnov, 28, to 4yrs. BOR.

03/21/76—In Titograd, Radisav Gajic, 23, as a member of a Croatian separatist group. LEM.

03/22/76—In Zajecar, Milan Petrojckic, 38, a lawyer, for "attempting to form an enemy group", 13yrs. POL, LEM(03/25).

03/31/76—Stipe Kasunovic, 46, for "uttering hostile remarks", near Sibenik, sentence unknown. POL.

03/31/76—In Zajecar, Dragoljub Jovanovic, 47, a lawyer, for "defamatory and false statements", 2yrs. POL.

04/—/76—In Banja Luka, for "Creating a counter-revolutionary organization": Gojko Bjelajac, to 12yrs; Djordje Dadjenkovic, to 5yrs; Cedo Knezevic, to 6yrs; Dusan Strbac, to 1yr; Dr. Branka Mraovic, to 9yrs; Dr. Tufo Bukva, to 8yrs; Jefto Tadic, to 7 yrs;

Milenko Jankovic, to 7yrs; and Momcilo Pavicevic, to 6yrs.

05/12/76—In accordance with the report of Amnesty International, five newspaper reporters have disappeared in Yugoslavia. LEM

05/21/76—In Split: Nikola Bijader-Kutleic, to 8yrs; Slavko Stanic, to 3yrs; and Andrija Bakota to 2yrs., for "organizing a group to fight against Yugoslav socialist structure and its constitution".

05/27/76—Ms. Irina Pozega, 30, a Soviet Citizen, to 5yrs, for "spying". Fate of three Yugoslavs arrested with her is unknown. Ms. Pozega was released 07/20/76. NYT, LEM.

06/20/76—Rev. Ljubo Krasic, a permanent resident in the U.S., forcibly detained in Yugoslavia. NYT.

06/26/76—In Bihac: Rev. Marko Srdic, 28, to 9yrs; Bogoljub Vidovic, 58, a plant manager, to 15yrs; Lazar Arezina, 30, a barber, to 7yrs., for "hostile activities against the state while travelling abroad". POL.

07/26/76—In Belgrade, Vladimir Dapcevic, 59, a Belgian citizen and a former colonel in Tito's army, after abduction from Romania, to 20yrs, as an alleged Soviet agent. NYT.

07/18/76—Robert Edwards, British subject, editor of London Sunday Mirror, arrested for "photographing a steam engine". Sunday Mirror.

07/22/76—In Rijeka, four persons sentenced for "Cominformist connections", from 5 to 15yrs. LEM.

07/28/76—One of the five Americans held in Yugoslav prisons is Mihajlo Sedmak, 60, arrested in September 1974 on "spying" charges. NYT.

08/03/76—Rev. Peter Devey, a British subject, and Ms. Hillary Rishetts, sentenced to 30 and 15 days respectively, and held incommunicado. NYT.

09/29/76—In Ljubljana, Viktor Blazic, a writer for the Party paper Delo, to 2 yrs, for "articles in defense of Edvard Kocbek's ideas". NYT.

10/16/76—In Kranj, Judge Franc Miklavcic, 55, for "disseminating hostile propaganda", to 6 yrs. NYT.

11/08/76—Djordje Djuranovic, 55, a retiree from Vranje, for "handing out leaflets with enemy contents regarding our social system. . .", 4 yrs. NOV.

03/12/77—In Sarajevo, Mate Rajic, 53, a lawyer, for his activities as a "counter-revolutionary, Cominformist and nationalist", 5 yrs. VUS.

04/13/77—In Sarajevo, Zivadin Radovic, an engineer, for stating that there will be "more freedom after Tito's passing", 2½ yrs. IHT.

04/29/77—Momcilo Jokic, the editor of Pobeda, Party paper in Titograd. NYT.

05/07/77—Vitimor Djilas, 41, a lawyer, for "advocating democratic liberties in a letter", 2½ yrs. (The letter to a Belgrade newspaper was never published). NYT.

07/31/77—There are 201 persons serving prison terms for political offenses in Croatia, 127 persons sentenced but had not begun to serve their terms, and the prosecution of 180 others is still pending. NYT.

07/—/77—In Banja Luka, Dzemal Zulic, 31, upon returning from West Germany for having "hostile emigre papers" and belonging to a "terrorist group", to 9 yrs. Sentence reduced to 3 yrs. in Nov. 1979. A78.

08/06/77—Dr. Nikola Novakovic, medical doctor, for "establishing contact with hostile groups abroad" (in 1962), and for "disseminating hostile propaganda", in Sarajevo, to 12 yrs. LEM, A78.

08/27/77—Franjo Rupic, in Djebala near Bjelovar, for passing out "enemy, pro-western materials", to 3 yrs. VUS.

10/30/77—For the first half of 1977 there were 102 persons accused of political crimes,

compared to 152 for the same period in 1976. NIN.

11/01/77—Trajko Canevski and Mihailo Nastasievic, director and president of central worker's committee of shoe factory "Cik", for "abuse of self-management", in Kumanovo. POL.

11/29/77—In Tuzla, Manda Paric, a nurse, for "contacts with emigres", to 6yrs. NYT, A79.

12/03/77—Rev. Stjepan Brajkovic, 46, from Mostar, for "hostile propaganda", to 5 yrs. A78.

—/—/77—In Sarajevo, Mirko Kovacevic, a high-school teacher, for "enemy propaganda", to 8 yrs. A79.

—/—/77—Nenad Vasic, a lawyer, for "hostile propaganda" (opinion expressed in a private conversation), in Sarajevo, to 10 yrs. A79.

03/02/78—Bogdan Jovovic, member of the illegal communist party was kidnapped from abroad. TEL.

03/—/78—In Sremska Pozega, Anton Brkic, 22, for "hostile propaganda and possession of Croatian emigre publications", to 3 yrs. A78.

04/13/78—In Belgrade, Mileta Perovic, 54, general secretary of the illegal communist Party, kidnapped from Switzerland, his arrest announced 11/23/77, for "counter-revolutionary activities", to 20 yrs. A78.

08/—/78—Vjenceslav Cizek, in Nov. 1977 disappeared while on a trip from Germany to Italy. Subsequently sentenced for "acting from counter-revolutionary positions subversive to Yugoslav social system", in Sarajevo, to 15yrs. A79.

10/01/78—Mirko Rajcic, Marko Juranovic, Fabjan Dumancic, Jakoslav Rojnica, and Ante Rakic, all students from Zagreb, sentenced to prison terms for "liaison with emigres". A79.

12/—/78—Dr. Veselin Masic, 56, a gynecologist, for "hostile propaganda" (conversation in his own home), in Tuzla, to 6yrs. A79.

02/18/79—In Skopje, Dragan Bogdanovski, former editor of a Macedonian emigre paper, for "having conspired against the Yugoslav state and having illegally entered Yugoslavia", to 13yrs. LEM, A79.

03/18/79—Zvonimir Kiscic, 53, a barber, who demanded free Dubrovnik Republic, for "slandering social and political conditions in the country", to 2yrs. VJE.

05/23/79—Vladimir Markovic, 28, a student, sentenced to mandatory treatment in a psychiatric hospital, for "spreading false information". RCD.

08/08/79—In Sabac, Bogdan Stefanovic and a group of his followers from "Realistic European Union—Yugoslav Movement European", sentenced to terms of 1½ to 6yrs.

09/15/79—In Zajecar, Milan Budic, 26, a factory worker, for "falsely presenting socio-political conditions in the SFRY", to 2yrs. POL.

10/16/79—In Belgrade, Dragoljub Ignjatovic, a writer and the editor of the underground journal Casovnik (The Clock), for "illegal publication", to 30yrs. NYT.

12/09/79—Jovo Ilic, a factory worker, upon return from West Germany, for "association with emigre political organization", in Tuzla, to 9½ yrs. POL.

03-11-80—Zlatko Tomicic, writer and former editor of the Croatian Literary Journal, arrested in Jan. 1980 for "writing his memoirs from prison" (previously served 3-5yrs). Presently free in Rijeka, pending his trial. LEM.

03-12-80—Ivan Zalembar, 46, for "bringing banned publications into the country", in Osijek, to 5yrs.

03/15/80—In Cacak, during 1979 seven persons sentenced for "enemy activity against the country", sentences range from 3½ to 9yrs. POL.

03/30/80—Fifty Albanian nationalists in the Province of Kosovo to be tried for allegedly undermining "brotherhood and unity". POL.

04/04/80—In Zadar, Pavao Despot, professor of Croatian language, arrested for "enemy propaganda". VEL.

04/09/80—In Dobo, Zarko Aleksic, a lawyer, to 7yrs for "nationalistic activities", and Milorad Joksimovic, 40, a worker, for "attacking the policy of the LCY and our constitution", while living abroad. BOR.

04/25/80—In Belgrade, Momcilo Selic, 34, an architect and a writer, for disseminating "enemy propaganda". This was in a six page article given to friends, to 7yrs. OSL.

05/23/80—Dragutin Trumbetas, graphic artist and factory worker, author of the book 'Gastarbeiter', arrested upon return from West Germany. Released pending trial. GUA.

06/02/80—In Smederevo, Miroslav Cvetkovic, 28, a locksmith, for "enemy activities while living abroad", to 8 yrs.

06/10/80—In Pristina, for "enemy propaganda and for forming a coalition for enemy activities": Sefcet Jasari, 36, an interpreter, to 8 yrs; Ramadan Plana, 33, a student, to 7 yrs; Avdi Kelmendi, 29, a foreman, to 5 yrs; Avdulj Ljahu, 36, a clerk, to 4 yrs; Isa Demaj, 34, a teacher, to 4 yrs; Sulejman Djucala, 26, a factory worker, to 4 yrs; Skender Jasari, 26, a clerk, to 3 yrs, and Hisen Grvala, 39, a farmer, to 3 yrs. BOR.

06/17/80—In Zagreb: Andrija Mart, 45, to 15 yrs; Franjo Belancic, 38, to 13 yrs; Stjepan Jankovic, 62, to 8 yrs; Ivo Juric, 36, to 10 yrs; Djuro Krznar, 43, to 7 yrs; Branko Hodak, 43, to 6 yrs, and Vladimir Uzelac, 37, to 5 yrs, for alleged "terrorist activities". TAN.

06/19/80—Josip Cesarec, 25, for stating "a day will come when the political system in Yugoslavia will collapse", in Osjek, to 4 yrs.

07/08/80—Prof. Gani Sula, to 6 yrs; Muharem Shaliani, an attorney, to 5 yrs, and Ms. Hatixhe Maliki, a student, to 3 yrs, in Skopje, for "anti-state activities". RAB.

07/13/80—In Sarajevo, Rev. Franjo Vidovic, 21, and Franciscan novice Ivan Turudic, 20, for "enemy propaganda", to 6 and 5½ yrs respectively. GLK.

ABBREVIATIONS FOR SOURCES

A78 Amnesty International Report 1978.
A79 Amnesty International Report 1979.
BOR Borba, organ of the LCY, daily.
GLK Glas Koncila, Zagreb, weekly.
GUA The Guardian, London, daily.
IHT Inter. Herald Tribune, daily.
LEM Le Monde, Paris, daily.
NIN Belgrade, weekly.
NOV Novosti, Belgrade, daily.
NYD Daily News, New York.
NYT The New York Times.
OSL Oslobodjenje, Sarajevo.
POL Politika, Belgrade, daily.
RAB Radio Belgrade.
RCD Religion in Communist Dominated Areas, New York, mo.
TAN Yugoslav Press Agency
TEL The Daily Telegraph, London.
VEL Vecernji List, Zagreb.
VEN Vecernje novosti, Belgrade.
VJE Vjesnik, Zagreb, daily.
VUS Zagreb, weekly.●

442D REGIMENTAL COMBAT TEAM

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, in one of the more ironic episodes in our

recent past, thousands of Americans of Japanese ancestry served with distinction in this Nation's armed services during World War II while their families and neighbors were being detained in internment camps in the country's interior. In particular, many Americans will recall the outstanding record of the 442d Regimental Combat Team, which was proposed by Mike M. Masaoka, then executive secretary of the Japanese American Citizens League, to the War Department and approved by the President. The 442d consisted largely of Japanese Americans, among them the distinguished Senators from Hawaii, DANIEL K. INOUE and SPARK M. MATSUNAGA.

The 442d served in seven major campaigns, and its men were awarded more than 18,000 individual decorations, including 1 Congressional Medal of Honor, 52 Distinguished Service Crosses, 1 Distinguished Service Medal, nearly 600 Silver Stars, more than 5,000 Bronze Stars, and nearly 9,500 Purple Hearts.

One battle in particular stands out in this distinctive record, the rescue of the "Lost Battalion" of the Texas 36th Division by the 442d in southern France in October 1944. I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following account of a recent reunion of the men from the 442d and those of the 36th Division "Lost Battalion" from the Los Angeles Times, September 1, 1980.

JAPANESE-AMERICANS GET TEXANS' SALUTE AS HEROES

(By Charles Hillinger)

For the first time in 36 years, members of two Army units involved in one of the most heroic battles of World War II held an emotional reunion during the Labor Day weekend here.

Few of the 500 Texans or 250 Japanese-Americans had seen each other since the week-long battle to rescue the "Lost Battalion" in German-occupied southern France in October, 1944. For many of the Texans, the war was the only time they have ever had any contact with Japanese-Americans.

The Allies had landed the previous August but the fighting was still very heavy and Hitler's forces were still in control.

It was the famed all-Japanese-American 442nd "Go-for-Broke" regimental Combat Team that came to the rescue of the 2nd Battalion, 141st Infantry of the all-Texan 36th Division.

The Texas battalion was trapped behind German lines for seven days. Repeated attempts by other Texas combat units were repulsed, resulting in heavy casualties. Some of those men attended the reunion, too. Finally the Japanese-American forces were thrown into the fray.

The fighting was so fierce that there were more Japanese-American casualties in the rescue operation than there were Texans trapped behind the German lines.

The "Go-for-Broke" regiment suffered 800 casualties in the battle to free the 275 members of the Lost Battalion. More than 200 Japanese-Americans were killed and more than 600 were wounded in the effort. Of the trapped Texans, 211 were rescued by the 442nd and 64 were killed in the battle.

"It was the ultimate of patriotism. These men came from behind barbed-wire internment camps, where the Japanese-Americans

were held, to volunteer to fight and give their lives," said Sen. Daniel K. Inouye of Hawaii, a member of the 442nd who lost his right arm fighting the Germans in France.

WE KNEW WE WERE EXPENDABLE

Inouye was the principal speaker at the reunion.

"We knew we were expendable. We were willing to do this. We accepted the challenge," he said. "It wasn't easy. There was a lot of bloodshed."

"Out of this experience we—our Texas comrades and we of the 442nd—have developed a friendship that will last forever."

"Rescuing the Texans was something we had to do," said Hoppy Kaneshina, 56, who operates a small cafe in Gardena, Calif. His entire company was almost wiped out in the effort to rescue the Texans.

"It was the go-for-broke, shoot-the-works spirit of our men. We were out to prove ourselves, to prove that we were loyal Americans. We had to rescue those Texans no matter what the cost."

At the reunion were scores of Texans and Japanese-Americans like Inouye with arms and legs missing and scars from bullet wounds and shrapnel from the battlefield.

"I paid a high price—my leg—to get the Texans out from behind the enemy lines," said Frank Fujino, 62, of Culver City, Calif., who came to the reunion in a wheelchair. "I have no regrets," he added.

YOU ARE OUR HEROES

Among the Texans at the reunion were members of the Lost Battalion and many others of the 36th Division who were involved in the engagement.

Jack L. Scott, 60, president of the 36th Division Assn., saluted the assembled 442nd veterans:

"You are our heroes. To be with you men again is the most powerful experience I have ever had."

The groups celebrated their 36 years of separation with a four-day down-home Texas party with barbecue dinners, square dancing and an excursion to the Dallas Cowboy-Pittsburgh Steeler football game.

Among the veterans of the 36th division was John D. McKeel Sr. of Balch Springs, Tex., who wore a yellow ribbon on his lapel. His son, Marine Sgt. John D. McKeel Jr., 27, is a hostage in Iran.

FRESNO ATTORNEY SOUGHT REUNION

It was Fresno attorney Shim Hiraoka, 65, who had the original idea to get the two groups together and who worked to bring the reunion about.

"I thought the story of the 442nd and the 36th Division ought to be heard at this time," Hiraoka said. "No longer in our country is there a feeling of the necessity to sacrifice to keep this nation strong."

"If we had been surrounded by an enemy force and virtually captured like the Lost Battalion, we would have wanted someone to come and get us."

"There are 50 Americans in Iran and no one is going after them. . . ."

Texans and Japanese-Americans spent hours during the four-day reunion reminiscing.

In one room, survivors of the Lost Battalion and the Japanese-Americans from "I" company of the 442nd who made the breakthrough and were the first to contact the trapped Texans recalled that battle.

THEY HAD US SANDBAGGED

Everyone in the room had been shot or hit by shrapnel in the skirmish.

"There were 275 of us completely surrounded by the Germans. They had us sandbagged," recalled Harry McGowan, 58, a retired San Antonio fireman.

"We were trapped in the woods in the hills of southern France for seven days,

with fighting all around us. We cut down trees to cover our fox holes for protection. We were running out of ammunition. We were out of food," said Bill Stadler, 56, of Erie, Pa.

"It was desperate," chimed in Bob Harrison, 55, of Pryor, Okla. "Our 2nd Battalion tried to break through and reach us and were thrown back with heavy casualties from German fire.

"Then you fellows from the 442nd made it through at a heavy loss and got us out of there."

"How did it feel to have us Buddha Heads save you?" asked Monte Fujita, 64, of Los Angeles. (The 442nd veterans all through the war and to this day call one another Buddha Heads as a nickname.)

THE BEST DAMNED SOLDIERS EVER

"Hey, you guys are the greatest! You're the best damned soldiers ever. Because of you, 211 of the 275 men in our battalion walked out of that trap alive. If it wasn't for you, we would all have been slaughtered by the Germans," McGowan said.

"There's a lump in my throat and I've got this feeling in my heart," he continued, as tears welled in his eyes and he choked up with emotion. "There just are not the words to describe the deep feelings I have to be with you here today after all these years."

"God, remember how the Germans machine-gun emplacements were all over the place," said Hideo Takahashi, 63, of Ontario, Ore. "We gave them a banzai attack but we never had so many casualties in one battle. We had to step over bodies of our dead comrades to keep going up that hill to get to you Texans."

"It was one helluva battle. It took us four days just to go 1,000 yards. It took us a week to make it. Our fellows were being shot by Germans like flies. We kept fighting our way up that hill through machine-gun fire," recalled Shiro (Kash) Kashino, 58, of Seattle.

"What a good feeling we had when we finally broke through and reached you."

"You didn't feel half as good as we did," said Bill Stadler.

OUR GUYS WERE ALL VOLUNTEERS

"You know our guys were all volunteers, most of us came out of the barbed-wire Japanese interment camps on the West Coast and from Hawaii. When the war broke out all of us Japanese-Americans, guys like me who were born in America, were classified as enemy aliens," Kashino said.

"We had to prove to the rest of America that we were loyal to America. That's why we joined the Army as soon as we were permitted to, to show Americans that we love this country as much as everyone else born and living here."

"I had a feeling of anger, resentment and humiliation when myself and my family were hauled out to a concentration camp. All of our rights were taken away. It wasn't easy. We thought we were Americans. It means loyalty to a country that rejected us. It meant duty before human rights," said Victor Izui, 61, an Evanston, Ill., dentist.

"I was in Honolulu and was working near the Aloha Tower when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor," said James Okimoto, 68, of Kaneohe, Hawaii. "I saw those planes fly over and saw the red meatball on the wings (the Japanese rising-sun emblem) and I knew this was it—that we were at war."

I COULDN'T WAIT TO FIGHT

"For me it didn't make any difference what my ancestry was. Those planes were dropping bombs and trying to kill everyone in Hawaii. I couldn't wait to fight to defend my country."

Kashino turned to the Texans and said "Did you guys know we were in concentration camps?"

"It was a shame. It should never have happened. God Almighty knows it should never have happened," Stadler replied.

"There were a lot of ironies in those years," said Henry Nakada. "There were seven of us brothers in the service. In 1945 my mother was selected as the service mother of the year. She was in a concentration camp at the time. You should have seen all those gold stars for sons killed in action on the doors of the barracks in those concentration camps."

YOU LAID YOUR LIVES ON THE LINE

Bob Harrison recalled how some of the wounded in the Go-for-Broke unit and Texas soldiers wound up in the same military hospital in California.

"Do you remember how we would leave the hospital on passes and people would give you guys a bad time because you were of Japanese ancestry?" Harrison asked. "How we would go into a bar or into a place to eat and they refused to serve you fellows? "And hell, this is only a few weeks after you laid your lives on the line for us and lost so many of your comrades."

The Japanese-American veterans all nodded as they remembered.

"We made sure you were served when you fellows were out with us," Harrison continued.

"Sometimes it would wind up in a real donnybrook and we would have to eat on broken chairs or tables but we made sure they served all of us, you Go for Brokers and us guys from Texas."●

STEVENSON-WYDLER TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION ACT OF 1980

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, on July 29, 1980, I filed the report on S. 1250, the Stevenson Technology Innovation Act of 1980. This is a bill which provides a legislative basis for a number of steps which the administration has proposed to take to promote innovation.

The bill has had strong bipartisan support in the Committee on Science and Technology. Because of the contributions to this legislation of the gentleman from New York, Mr. WYDLER, ranking minority member of the Science and Technology Committee, who is retiring from Congress at the end of this session, I am proposing to retitle the bill as the Stevenson-Wydlar Technology Innovation Act of 1980.

The administration was not completely satisfied with the bill because it went beyond the administration's proposals in several respects, so since the time the bill was filed, the staff of the Committee on Science and Technology has been negotiating with the administration to arrive at a compromise version of the bill which is acceptable to the administration. A suitable compromise has now been reached resolving all but minor differences on the amounts authorized and

amounts for research and development utilization. This compromise version of the bill is scheduled for consideration on the House floor on Monday, September 8, 1980, under suspension of the rules.

I am putting the compromise version of the bill in the RECORD at this point so that Members will have a chance to study it before floor action Monday:

S. 1250

An act to promote United States technological innovation for the achievement of national economic, environmental, and social goals, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Stevenson-Wydlar Innovation Act of 1980".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds and declares that:

(1) Technology and industrial innovation are central to the economic, environmental, and social well-being of citizens of the United States.

(2) Technology and industrial innovation offer an improved standard of living, increased public and private sector productivity, creation of new industries and employment opportunities, improved public services and enhanced competitiveness of United States products in world markets.

(3) Many new discoveries and advances in science occur in universities and Federal laboratories, while the application of this new knowledge to commercial and useful public purposes depends largely upon actions by business and labor. Cooperation among academia, Federal laboratories, labor, and industry, in such forms as technology transfer, personnel exchange, joint research projects, and others, should be renewed, expanded, and strengthened.

(4) Small businesses have performed an important role in advancing industrial and technological innovation.

(5) Industrial and technological innovation in the United States may be lagging when compared to historical patterns and other industrialized nations.

(6) Increased industrial and technological innovation would reduce trade deficits, stabilize the dollar, increase productivity gains, increase employment, and stabilize prices.

(7) Government antitrust, economic, trade, patent, procurement, regulatory, research and development, and tax policies have significant impact upon industrial innovation and development of technology, but there is insufficient knowledge of their effects in particular sections of the economy.

(8) No comprehensive national policy exists to enhance technological innovation for commercial and public purposes. There is a need for such a policy, including a strong national policy supporting domestic technology transfer and utilization of the science and technology resources of the Federal Government.

(9) It is in the national interest to promote the adaptation of technological innovations to State and local government uses. Technological innovations can improve services, reduce their costs, and increase productivity in State and local governments.

(10) The Federal laboratories and other performers of federally funded research and development frequently provide scientific and technological developments of potential use to State and local governments and private industry. These developments should be made accessible to those governments and industry. There is a need to provide

means of access and to give adequate personnel and funding support to these means.

(11) The Nation should give fuller recognition to individuals and companies which have made outstanding contributions to the promotion of technology or technological manpower for the improvement of the economic, environmental, or social well-being of the United States.

SEC. 3. PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this Act to improve the economic, environmental, and social well-being of the United States by—

(1) establishing organizations in the executive branch to study and stimulate technology;

(2) promoting technology development through the establishment of centers for industrial technology;

(3) stimulating improved utilization of federally funded technology developments by State and local governments and the private sector;

(4) providing encouragement for the development of technology through the recognition of individuals and companies which have made outstanding contributions in technology; and

(5) encouraging the exchange of scientific and technical personnel among academia, industry, and Federal laboratories.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, the term—

(1) "Office" means the Office of Industrial Technology established under section 5 of this Act.

(2) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce.

(3) "Director" means the Director of the Office of Industrial Technology, appointed pursuant to section 5 of this Act.

(4) "Centers" means the Centers for Industrial Technology established under section 6 or section 8 of this Act.

(5) "Nonprofit institution" means an organization owned and operated exclusively for scientific or educational purposes, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(6) "Federal laboratory" means any laboratory, any federally funded research and development center, or any center established under section 6 or section 8 of this Act that is owned and funded by the Federal Government, whether operated by the Government or by a contractor.

(7) "Supporting agency" means either the Secretary of Commerce or the National Science Foundation, as appropriate.

SEC. 5. COMMERCE AND TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish and maintain an Office of Industrial Technology in accordance with the provisions, findings, and purposes of this Act.

(b) DIRECTOR.—The Secretary shall appoint, a Director of the Office, who shall be compensated at the rate provided for level V of the Executive Schedule in section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) DUTIES.—The Secretary through the Director, on a continuing basis, shall—

(1) determine the relationships of technological developments and international technology transfers to the output, employment, productivity, and world trade performance of United States and foreign industrial sectors;

(2) determine the influence of economic, labor and other conditions, industrial structure and management, and government policies on technological developments in particular industrial sectors worldwide;

(3) identify technological needs, problems, and opportunities within and across indus-

trial sectors that, if addressed, could make a significant contribution to the economy of the United States;

(4) assess whether the capital, technical and other resources being allocated to domestic industrial sectors which are likely to generate new technologies are adequate to meet private and social demands for goods and services and to promote productivity and economic growth;

(5) propose and support studies and policy experiments, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, to determine the effectiveness of measures with the potential of advancing United States technological innovation;

(6) consider government measures with the potential of advancing United States technological innovation and exploiting innovations of foreign origin; and

(7) publish the results of studies and policy experiments.

(d) REPORT.—The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President and Congress, within 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, a report on the progress, findings, and conclusions of activities conducted pursuant to sections 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, and 13 of this Act and recommendations for possible modifications thereof.

SEC. 6. CENTERS FOR INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall provide assistance for the establishment of Centers for Industrial Technology. Such Centers shall be nonprofit institutions and shall be affiliated with any university, or other nonprofit institution, or group thereof, that applies for and is awarded a grant or enters into a cooperative agreement under this section. The objective of the Centers is to enhance technological innovation through—

(1) the participation of individuals from industry and universities in cooperative technological innovation activities;

(2) the development of the generic research base, important for technological advance and innovative activity, in which individual firms have little incentive to invest, but which may have significant economic or strategic importance, such as manufacturing technology;

(3) the education and training of individuals in the technological innovation process;

(4) the improvement of mechanisms for the dissemination of scientific, engineering, and technical information among universities and industry;

(5) the utilization of the capability and expertise, where appropriate, that exists in Federal laboratories; and

(6) the development of continuing financial support from other mission agencies, from State and local government, and from industry and universities through, among other means, fees, licenses, and royalties.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—The activities of the Centers shall include, but need not be limited to—

(1) research supportive of technological and industrial innovation including cooperative industry-university basic and applied research;

(2) assistance to individuals and small businesses in the generation, evaluation and development of technological ideas supportive of industrial innovation and new business ventures;

(3) technical assistance and advisory services to industry, particularly small businesses; and

(4) curriculum development, training, and instruction in invention, entrepreneurship, and industrial innovation.

Each Center need not undertake all of the activities under this subsection.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—Prior to establishing a Center, the Secretary shall find that—

(1) consideration has been given to the potential contribution of the activities proposed under the Center to productivity, employment, and economic competitiveness of the United States;

(2) a high likelihood exists of continuing participation, advice, financial support, and other contributions from the private sector;

(3) the host university or other nonprofit institution has a plan for the management and evaluation of the activities proposed within the particular Center, including:

(A) the agreement between the parties as to the allocation of patent rights on a non-exclusive, partially exclusive, or exclusive license basis to and inventions conceived or made under the auspices of the Center; and

(B) the consideration of means to place the Center, to the maximum extent feasible, on a self-sustaining basis;

(4) suitable consideration has been given to the university's or other nonprofit institution's capabilities and geographical location; and

(5) consideration has been given to any effects upon competition of the activities proposed under the Center.

(d) PLANNING GRANTS.—The Secretary is authorized to make available nonrenewable planning grants to universities or nonprofit institutions for the purpose of developing a plan required under subsection (c)(3).

(e) ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATION.—The supporting agency may request the Attorney General's opinion whether the proposed joint research activities of a Center would violate any of the antitrust laws. The Attorney General shall advise the supporting agency of his determination and the reasons for it within 120 days after receipt of such request. However, the establishment of a Center, the rendering of an opinion by the Attorney General, or any other activity undertaken or approved under this Act, shall not convey to any person, association, corporation or other business organization immunity from civil or criminal liability, or create defenses to actions under any antitrust law.

SEC. 7. GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants and enter into cooperative agreements according to the provisions of this section in order to assist any activity consistent with this Act, including activities performed by individuals. The total amount of any such grant or cooperative agreement may not exceed 75 percent of the total cost of the program.

(b) ELIGIBILITY AND PROCEDURE.—Any person or institution may apply to the Secretary for a grant or cooperative agreement available under this section. Application shall be made in such form and manner, and with such content and other submissions, as the Secretary shall prescribe. The Secretary shall act upon each such application within 90 days after the date on which all required information is received.

(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) Any grant made, or cooperative agreement entered into, under this section shall be subject to the limitations and provisions set forth in paragraph (2) of this subsection, and to such other terms, conditions, and requirements as the Secretary deems necessary or appropriate.

(2) Any person who receives or utilizes any proceeds of any grant made or cooperative agreement entered into under this section shall keep such records as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe as being necessary and appropriate to facilitate effective audit and evaluation, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of such pro-

ceeds, the total cost of the program or project in connection with which such proceeds were used, and the amount, if any, of such costs which was provided through other sources.

SEC. 8. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION CENTERS FOR INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT AND PROVISIONS.**—The National Science Foundation shall provide assistance for the establishment of Centers for Industrial Technology. Such Centers shall be affiliated with a university, or other nonprofit institution, or a group thereof. The objective of the Centers is to enhance technological innovation as provided in section 6(a) through the conduct of activities as provided in section 6(b). The provisions of section 6(e) shall apply to Centers established under this section.

(b) **PLANNING GRANTS.**—The National Science Foundation is authorized to make available nonrenewable planning grants to universities or nonprofit institutions for the purpose of developing a plan, as required under section 6(c)(3).

(c) **TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—Grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements entered into by the National Science Foundation in execution of the powers and duties of the National Science Foundation under this Act shall be governed by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 and other pertinent Acts.

SEC. 9. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS.

(a) **COORDINATION.**—The Secretary and the National Science Foundation shall, on a continuing basis, obtain the advice and cooperation of departments and agencies whose missions contribute to or are affected by the programs established under this Act, including the development of an agenda for research and policy experimentation. These departments and agencies shall include but not be limited to the Departments of Defense, Energy, Education, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, the Environmental Protection Agency, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Small Business Administration, Council of Economic Advisers, Council on Environmental Quality, and Office of Science and Technology Policy.

(b) **COOPERATION.**—It is the sense of the Congress that departments and agencies, including the Federal laboratories, whose missions are affected by, or could contribute to, the programs established under this Act, should, within the limits of budgetary authorizations and appropriations, support or participate in activities or projects authorized by this Act.

(c) ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORIZATION.

(1) Departments and agencies described in subsection (b) are authorized to participate in, contribute to, and serve as resources for the Centers and for any other activities authorized under this Act.

(2) The Secretary and the National Science Foundation are authorized to receive moneys and to receive other forms of assistance from other departments or agencies to support activities of the Centers and any other activities authorized under this Act.

SEC. 10. EXTERNAL ADVICE.

The Secretary shall require an appropriate advisory committee to review annually the activities of the Office and to advise the Secretary and the Director with respect to—

(1) the formulation and conduct of activities under section 5 of this title;

(2) the designation and operation of Centers and their programs under section 6 of this Act including assistance in establishing priorities;

(3) the preparation of the report required under section 5(d); and

(4) such other matters as the Secretary or Director refers to the Committee for review and advice.

The Director shall make available to the Committee such information, personnel, and administrative services and assistance as it may reasonably require to carry out its duties.

SEC. 11. UTILIZATION OF FEDERAL TECHNOLOGY.

(a) **POLICY.**—It is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to ensure the full use of the results of the Nation's Federal investment in research and development. To this end the Federal Government shall strive, where appropriate, to transfer federally owned or originated technology to State and local governments and to the private sector.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT OF RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY APPLICATIONS OFFICES.**—Each Federal laboratory shall establish an Office of Research and Technology Applications. Laboratories having existing organizational structures which perform the functions of this section may elect to combine the Office of Research and Technology Applications within the existing organization. The staffing and funding levels for these offices shall be determined between each Federal laboratory and the Federal agency operating or directing the laboratory, except that (1) each laboratory having a total annual budget exceeding \$20,000,000 shall provide at least one professional individual full-time as staff for its Office of Research and Technology Applications, and (2) after September 30, 1981, each Federal agency which operates or directs one or more Federal laboratories shall make available not less than 0.5 percent of the agency's research and development budget to support the technology transfer function at the agency and at its laboratories, including support of the Offices of Research and Technology Applications, unless, at the time the agency transmits its annual budget to Congress, the agency also transmits to Congress a written justification for a waiver of requirement (1) of this subsection and/or requirement (2) of this subsection with a full and complete explanation of the reasons for the waiver and alternate plans for conducting the technology transfer function at the agency.

(c) **FUNCTIONS OF RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY APPLICATIONS OFFICES.**—It shall be the function of each Office of Research and Technology Applications—

(1) to prepare an application assessment of each research and development project in which that laboratory is engaged which has potential for successful application in State or local government or in private industry;

(2) to provide and disseminate information on federally owned or originated products, processes, and services having potential application to State and local governments and to private industry;

(3) to cooperate with and assist the Center for the Utilization of Federal Technology and other organizations which link the research and development resources of that laboratory and the Federal Government as a whole to potential users in State and local government and private industry; and

(4) to provide technical assistance in response to requests from State and local government officials.

Agencies which have established organizational structures outside their Federal laboratories which have as their principal purpose the transfer of federally owned or originated technology to State and local government and to the private sector may elect to perform the functions of this subsection in such organizational structures. No Office of Research and Technology Applica-

tions or other organizational structures performing the functions of this subsection shall substantially compete with similar services available in the private sector.

(d) **CENTER FOR THE UTILIZATION OF FEDERAL TECHNOLOGY.**—There is hereby established in the Department of Commerce a Center for the Utilization of Federal Technology. The Center for the Utilization of Federal Technology shall—

(1) serve as a central clearinghouse for the collection, dissemination and transfer of information on Federally-owned or originated technologies having potential application to State and local governments and to private industry;

(2) coordinate the activities of the Offices of Research and Technology Applications of the Federal laboratories;

(3) utilize the expertise and services of the National Science Foundation and the existing Federal Laboratory Consortium for Technology Transfer, particularly in dealing with State and local governments;

(4) receive requests for technical assistance from State and local governments and refer these requests to the appropriate Federal laboratories.

(5) provide funding, at the discretion of the Secretary, for Federal laboratories to provide the assistance specified in subsection (c)(4); and

(6) use appropriate technology transfer mechanisms such as personnel exchanges and computer-based systems.

(3) **AGENCY REPORTING.**—Each Federal agency which operates or directs one or more Federal laboratories shall prepare biennially a report summarizing the activities performed by that agency and its Federal laboratories pursuant to the provisions of this section. The report shall be transmitted to the Center for the Utilization of Federal Technology by November 1 of each year in which it is due.

SEC. 12. NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY MEDAL.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is hereby established a National Technology Medal, which shall be of such design and materials and bear such inscriptions as the President, on the basis of recommendations submitted by the Office of Science and Technology Policy, may prescribe.

(b) **AWARD.**—The President shall periodically award the medal, on the basis of recommendations received from the Secretary or on the basis of such other information and evidence as he deems appropriate, to individuals or companies, which in his judgment are deserving of special recognition by reason of their outstanding contributions to the promotion of technology or technological manpower for the improvement of the economic, environmental, or social well-being of the United States.

(c) **PRESENTATION.**—The presentation of the award shall be made by the President with such ceremonies as he may deem proper.

SEC. 13. PERSONNEL EXCHANGES.

The Secretary and the National Science Foundation, jointly, shall establish a program to foster the exchange of scientific and technical personnel among academia, industry, and Federal laboratories. Such program shall include both (1) federally supported exchanges and (2) efforts to stimulate exchanges without Federal funding.

SEC. 14. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for purposes of carrying out section 6, not to exceed \$19,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981, \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, \$50,000,000 for the fiscal

year ending September 30, 1983, and \$60,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending September 30, 1984, and 1985.

(b) In addition to authorizations of appropriations under subsection (a), there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act, not to exceed \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981, \$9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and \$14,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending September 30, 1983, 1984, and 1985.

(c) Such sums as may be appropriated under subsections (a) and (b) shall remain available until expended.

(d) To enable the National Science Foundation to carry out its powers and duties under this Act only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law. ●

TESTIMONY PRESENTED TO THE CONGRESSIONAL AUTO TASK FORCE

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, as a charter member of the Congressional Auto Task Force, I was pleased to have an opportunity to participate in its first public meeting, appropriately held in Detroit, Mich., on September 2. Today, I would like to share with my colleagues here in the House a statement I presented at that time.

The task force will be holding its next hearing in Washington on September 15. The following day, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs is scheduled to take up a related resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 363, which I introduced in June. I am hopeful that as many Members as possible will be able to participate in these proceedings.

STATEMENT OF HON. CARL D. PURSELL

As a charter member of the Congressional Auto Task Force, I am pleased to have an opportunity to participate in its first public meeting, appropriately being held here in Detroit today. I come, not only as a member of the Michigan delegation but also, as one privileged to serve on the powerful House Appropriations Committee and as Co-Chairman of the Northeast/Midwest Coalition's Budget Task Force.

Needless to say, the automobile industry is facing its greatest challenge in our lifetime, and the adverse consequences of this situation are being felt throughout the Nation's economy. One out of every 12 manufacturing jobs are directly, and one of six jobs are indirectly, dependent upon the auto industry. For every hourly job involved in the manufacture of motor vehicles, an additional 2 jobs are created in the entire economy. Steelworkers, in particular, can attest to the harmful effects on related industries of the downturn in the auto sector.

Over 300,000 auto workers currently are on layoff, as are an estimated 550,000 additional workers in auto-dependent industries. That means, not only hardships and suffering by the families of those out of work, but less tax revenue and more federal expenditures, which add to the burdens of those of us lucky enough to have a job.

However, I am not here to paint bleak pictures, join in a handringing session, or—most importantly—assess blame. Rather, I would like to offer some potential solutions for dealing with the short term, intermediate, and long-run problems associated with these serious conditions.

First, we cannot delay any longer in dealing with the flood of foreign automobiles and trucks—primarily from Japan—that are taking an increasing share of the American market. While our plants are being idled and shut down, Japanese plants are running overtime and producing an unprecedented volume of vehicles, which now represent 22 percent of the U.S. market.

Make no mistake about it, this is not happening by chance, but is part of a conscious, well-planned design. Shortly after World War II, Japan decided to develop its own passenger car industry. This was accomplished by excluding imports from the United States and other established producers through preventing foreign investment, as well as imposing prohibitive tariffs and discriminatory commodity taxes, and leaving the burdens of defense to others.

Once the Japanese auto industry got firmly on its feet, most of their barriers to foreign imports were reduced. (Although a U.S.-built car still costs almost twice as much in Japan as it sells for domestically.) Meanwhile, potential markets in Europe and elsewhere maintained quotas or other restraints to trade. Thus, the United States, the only substantial "open" market available, became the prime target for Japan's aggressive new export efforts.

The geographic size of Japan, its uncontrolled fuel costs, urban driving conditions, along with a host of other factors, demanded a small, fuel-efficient vehicle. Accordingly, when American driving and car-buying habits abruptly changed following the Iranian crises, the Japanese were the lucky beneficiaries. That is, their "grand design" worked better than they ever dreamed.

The U.S. automobile industry is currently in the midst of an \$80 billion conversion to meet the new demands of its driving public. And what is needed now is some "breathing room", such as that experienced by the Japanese industry during its time of conversion in the 1950's and 60's.

On September 16, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs will be holding hearings on a measure (H. Con. Res. 363) I introduced in June, along with my colleagues Bill Brodhead, Bob Davis, and Jim Blanchard. This resolution urges the President "to enter into negotiations with the representatives of the Government of Japan with respect to a temporary restraint in the exportation of automobiles into the United States, an equitable relationship between prices changed in domestic and foreign sales, and elimination of trade barriers affecting purchase of American products." I am hopeful that Congress will act promptly on this resolution following those hearings.

Now let us turn briefly to the intermediate problems facing the auto industry—and for that matter the American economy in the aggregate. Although increased imports have greatly exacerbated the current recession, they did not cause it. For example, it should be noted that total car sales—including imports—have declined from 11 million units in 1977 and 1978 to a present rate of about 9 million vehicles.

Many Americans simply cannot afford a new car, imported or domestic. One fast and effective way of improving this situation would be to enact a meaningful tax cut. Such action would leave billions of dollars in the paychecks of working men and

women—money available to spend and save, in turn, providing increased demand for goods and services. That, not incidentally, also means more jobs.

In July, along with 84 cosponsors, I introduced a new five-year tax cut proposal designed as a common ground for a bipartisan agreement. The bill (H.R. 7730) combines a total 30% tax rate cut for individuals, with tax rate indexing beginning in 1986, after all the cuts have been implemented.

As you probably know, the House Ways and Means Committee has been holding hearings on various tax proposals affecting both individuals and businesses. Again, I am hopeful that Congress will act on this important subject as promptly and effectively as possible.

Finally, I want to speak about the long-term—something which we in government do all too little. Budgets are battled out on an annual basis, Congressional elections are held every two years, and it seems like we now go from one Presidential campaign right into the next. Like most physicians, we spend almost all of our time fighting diseases, not preventing them.

Once again, we can learn a lesson from our friends in Japan. Let me briefly quote from a recent report by the U.S. Comptroller General:

"There is an important time-frame difference between Japan and the United States . . . Japan anticipates. Its conception of 'early warning' rests on economic projections 5 to 10 years or more in the future . . . the United States reacts."

In addition to looking beyond the current decade, Japan involves all aspects of its society in a voluntary planning process—management, labor, education, and government at all levels. On the contrary in the U.S. these various groups usually take on an adversarial relationship, even when their best interests would seem to require a cooperative approach.

I strongly believe that we can forge meaningful partnerships to solve common problems, without destroying the individual identity of institutions, without reducing competitiveness, and without damaging the diversity that has been our strength for over 200 years.

I am proud of the work of the Northeast/Midwest Coalition in recognizing this approach and in taking small, but important steps to implementing it on a regional basis in Congress. In addition, I have been working with various government and private sector leaders in Michigan to help lay the groundwork for long-range cooperative planning sessions on a statewide basis.

I challenge all of you here to seriously consider the opportunities available by such planning at the local, state, regional and even national levels.

Our nation was founded in the midst of conflict and has been at its best when facing adversity. Despite abundant natural resources, America's greatest wealth has always been its people. Through depressions, wars, and various social struggles leaders have emerged and the people have responded in a way that has produced a country stronger and more desirable than ever.

We are not now marching to war or facing the depths of the Great Depression; however, in many ways the tasks before us are every bit as difficult and serious as those of the 1930's and 40's. Let us not shirk our duty, but respond in the tradition that has been established for us. We have no other choice! ●

PATRIOTISM AND THE
NATIONAL ANTHEM

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to an article written by Bill Gold which appeared in his August 28, 1980, column in the Washington Post. The article follows:

THE PUNKS WON

A few days ago, this newspaper carried a dispatch from Waukegan that began with these words:

"The Star Spangled Banner waves over the Great Lakes Naval Training Center, but the national anthem singing its praise has been silenced at the base movie theater."

It used to be the custom to play the anthem before the start of every evening's entertainment. But one night a few catcalls and jeers broke out among the audience in the darkened theater, and thereafter the show of disrespect became standard operating procedure. The anthem was booed every night.

Adm. Charles Gurney III was furious. He ordered the playing of the anthem stopped "for as long as I am commander here," and added disgustedly, "The punks won."

When Maj. John M. Alley of Alexandria read those lines, he reacted to them pretty much as I had. "To say I was shocked would be an understatement," he wrote.

"What the commander should have done was to close the theater until assurances were received that the audience would act properly. I think more should be done about this."

I agree wholeheartedly.

Recruits in basic training are not permitted to attend the theater at Great Lakes. Those in attendance, from whose ranks the disorderly conduct emanated, were personnel in the technical training school, the base staff, and their dependants.

They should have known better. They should have had the decency to show respect for the government that pays them, feeds them and houses them.

Lt. Cherie Davis, a public information officer at the base, seemed annoyed that the public expects that "people in the service should have one standard of conduct and the civilian population should have another." She said people in the civilian community had been brought up to show disrespect for the flag and the anthem. "You've seen them at sporting events," she said. "They jeer, they slouch, they talk, they throw popcorn and spit, during the national anthem."

What she said is true. Some civilians do act like uncivilized animals, not only during the playing of the Star Spangled Banner but throughout their lives. But what does that have to do with the respect that a serviceman should show the flag to which he had taken an oath of allegiance? And what does it have to do with the respect that should be shown by a civilian employed by the military, or by his family?

Does Lt. Davis have any conception of what a military PIO's function is supposed to be? Is Adm. Gurney the most effective commander the Navy could find for this assignment?

I am thoroughly disgusted with the episode at Great Lakes and with the entire subject of disrespect to our nation and its symbols.

I wish the people who are so determined to show public disrespect for this country would go live in a country that suits them better and leave this one to those of us who thank God for granting us the blessings of liberty that flow from our American citizenship.

Your punks may have won, admiral, but if punks ever become a majority in this country they'll find out in short order what they've really won. They're not going to like that, either.

Mr. Speaker, however, after reading Mr. Gold's column on September 3, 1980, it seems that, after the original story was published, such an uproar of protest was made Admiral Gurney decided to resume playing the national anthem.

Needless to say, I was certainly glad to see that this ugly problem had been rectified; however, it should have never had happened to begin with. When Admiral Gurney decided that the solution to the situation was to stop playing the anthem, he did not solve the problem but became part of it. Admiral Gurney should have had the guts to have those individuals involved with this disgusting display of behavior apprehended and disciplined, or if this was infeasible, to simply close the theater until other patrons exerted sufficient pressure on the troublemakers to bring them into line.

In a time when Americans all across the country are once again joining together in a patriotic bond of unity for our hostages in Iran, this type of repulsive behavior should not be tolerated.

As you know, over 110 of our colleagues have joined in cosponsoring legislation I have introduced which would designate the week commencing with the third Monday in February 1981 as "National Patriotism Week." I only hope that this significant bill will be enacted into law this 96th Congress, to encourage Americans everywhere to demonstrate their patriotic feelings. This should show those few individuals at the Great Lakes Naval Training Center that there is a great deal of love and respect for our Nation, its flag, and its national anthem, and for what it represents.●

SANTA MARIA'S 75TH
ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to my colleagues that Santa Maria, Calif., will be celebrating its 75th anniversary on September 12, 1980. Mayor George Hobbs declared that the occasion will be commemorated with the celebration of "Diamond Jubilee Week."

The week's events will include concerts, dances, a western barbeque sponsored by the Santa Maria Historical Society, and the burying of a time

capsule. Also, the city's senior citizens' center will be renamed as the Elwin Mussell Senior Citizens Center, in honor of the late mayor.●

FOREIGN INVESTMENT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the Members to an editorial broadcast over Chicago's highly respected and popular radio station, WBBM 78. The editorial, carried on August 15, presents some very perceptive and farsighted views on foreign investment in American business and property. I believe that this editorial is worthy of review:

FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Yesterday we said that foreign interests are buying up our nation from under our feet, and that we aren't doing much about it. Today we'll suggest some measures to control this situation.

Most important, there must be Federal registration of all past and future foreign direct investment in American business and property. We also need a screening mechanism to assure that a foreign investment will be beneficial to the U.S. economy. And we need a complete and immediate restructuring of the interagency Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States. This committee has had the responsibility to evaluate foreign investment in light of U.S. interests. Unfortunately, a recently released government report accuses the Committee of shirking its duties.

We also need a presidential commission to conduct a major federal policy reappraisal on better ways to attract and manage foreign investment.

We don't believe these measures will harm foreign investment in our country. Registration and screening are already being used in other countries. Rather, our goal is to encourage foreign investment that will benefit the United States. As New York Congressman Benjamin Rosenthal says, "We need to understand the true sources and likely effects (of foreign investment). And we need to protect our businesses, workers and communities from harmful consequences. We are already hostage to foreign oil. We cannot become hostage to foreign control."●

CORRECTIONS IN H.R. 7972 AS
INTRODUCED

HON. CECIL (CEC) HEFTEL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. HEFTEL. Mr. Speaker, on August 20, 1980, I introduced H.R. 7972, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an independent Provider Payment Review Board to review disputes on cost reimbursement under the medicare program between provider of services and the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

There are two inadvertent errors to the bill as printed which I wish to

hereby clarify. These errors in H.R. 7972 are:

First, on page 10, line 2, instead of "A final decision," it should read: "In the case of entities which were not parties to the hearing, a final decision."

Second, on page 11, beginning on line 3, instead of "covered by the decision," it should read: "beginning after the date the decision was rendered."

I offer these changes in order to clarify the intent of the legislation and to expedite the dialog which will ensue.●

RONALD REAGAN SPEAKS OUT

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the liberal left and the media have been giving Ronald Reagan a lot of flack lately. Why? He has been committing one of the more serious of the political "sins." Governor Reagan has been honestly speaking his mind.

As columnist James J. Kilpatrick points out in the editorial that follows, Ronald Reagan should be commended—not condemned—for truthfully expressing his views. He is willing to "call a spade a spade instead of an implement for digging." And, as in the case of his comments on both Taiwan and the Marxist nature of the progressive income tax, Reagan's observations are generally right on target.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Kilpatrick's editorial, in its entirety, to the attention of my colleagues:

The editorial follows:

MR. REAGAN IS SPEAKING HIS MIND

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Ronald Reagan has been catching some garbage lately from the quiche-eating set of the liberal left. The general idea is to depict him as a blockhead, ignorant of history and diplomacy alike, a fellow who is just too stupid, my dears, to be entrusted with the White House. The two principal targets have to do with Karl Marx and Taiwan.

Let me take them one at a time. It appears that back in 1964, in a speech entitled "Losing Our Freedoms By Installments," Mr. Reagan spoke generally of an income tax characterized by disproportionately higher rates on personal income. "This progressive system," he said, "was spawned by Karl Marx and declared by him to be the prime essential of a socialist state—the method prescribed for taxing the middle class out of existence."

Sen. Edward Kennedy's speech-writers dug out the 16-year-old quote. In his rousing address in New York, Mr. Kennedy ridiculed Mr. Reagan for denouncing the progressive income tax "as the invention of Karl Marx." Mr. Kennedy was afraid Mr. Reagan "has confused Karl Marx with Theodore Roosevelt." Writing in *The New Republic*, Richard Strout was appalled by Mr. Reagan's ignorance. "Can America really elect a man president who believed (or at least declared) that the graduated income tax was invented by Karl Marx? Why does Reagan say such things?"

REAGAN AND MARX

The answer may be that Mr. Reagan had read the Communist Manifesto and that Messrs. Kennedy and Strout have not. Toward the end of this seminal work, Marx listed 10 measures by which the proletariat would wrest power. This was his second measure: "A heavy progressive or graduated income tax." Now, this pernicious scheme may have been invented, for all I know, by Hammurabi. But if Teddy Kennedy thinks it was invented by TR, who's the blockhead?

The point is that Reagan was precisely right in identifying a graduated income tax with Marx. On the matter of Taiwan: Here again, as in his assertion that Vietnam was a "noble cause," Mr. Reagan's distaste for sham has got him in trouble. He doubtless should have been more careful in defending an "official" relationship with Taiwan.

This is a buzz word. Chinese Communists and American liberals came to him like so many hornets. But why not call a spade a spade instead of an implement for digging? Must we forever persist in make-believe? Under the act passed by Congress after President Carter imperially nullified our treaty with Taiwan, our relations are conducted through "the American Institute in Taiwan."

The institute is a charade. It is financed entirely by the U.S. Treasury under appropriations approved by Congress. Its contacts go through the State Department. The law directs the institute to function "as if" it were a consulate. This is exactly what Mr. Reagan has agreed to support.

Yes, Mr. Reagan has been critical of President Carter's abandonment of a 25-year-old treaty with our small ally. The criticism is richly deserved. And without rehashing the whole unhappy story, it may be observed that "normalization" with the People's Republic has accomplished nothing in terms of Sino-Soviet relations, or in terms of worldwide balancing of powers, that would not have happened anyhow. Mr. Reagan is honestly speaking his mind. It is small wonder that liberal spokesmen are dumbfounded. As they say down South, you just don't hardly ever hear that kind of talk no more.●

JOHN BURTON—FOUNDER OF GRANDPARENTS DAY

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, Sunday is Grandparents Day. In addition to honoring all the grandparents of this country in these remarks, I would also like to honor the man who provided the inspiration for their celebration—our colleague JOHN BURTON.

While JOHN is not a grandparent, a candy salesman, a florist, or a stockholder in Hallmark Cards, he does have a vested interest in Grandparents Day—he invented it. He is a sincere admirer of those in our population who have earned the right to be called grandpa or grandma.

Sunday is their day and my colleague from California and the bay area deserves credit for what he has wrought.

Well done, JOHN, and best wishes to all the grandparents of the United States and everywhere.●

SOME FRIEND

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, according to the *Washington Post*, the education plans of 128,000 veterans who served our country during the Vietnam war may have to be changed either because of mismanagement by the Carter administration or lack of interest on their part. These veterans, who were guaranteed educational benefits under the GI bill, now have been told there is no money available for them.

Nearly 2 months ago, the VA notified the administration of the shortage, but OMB sat on the request until yesterday before sending us a supplemental appropriation request for the funds needed to cover the shortage. Most colleges have just begun classes or will just be beginning classes and what will the Veterans' Administration be able to say to those veterans who were planning on using this money to start school.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee that oversees the funding for Veterans' Administration programs, I can assure you that I will do everything possible to expedite this funding so that these veterans will not have to postpone their education plans. But this whole situation seems ironic to me. Several weeks ago President Carter stood before veterans organizations and claimed that his administration is a friend of veterans. Today's news about the problems created for the veterans by the Carter administration is certainly a strange way to express that friendship.●

VOTERS ARE STILL WAITING ON CARTER TO DELIVER ON HIS PROMISES OF 1976

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as the Presidential campaigns start to pick up steam, it is always best to consult the records of the two candidates. The *Rome News-Tribune* of Rome, Ga., did look at President Carter's promises made in 1976 and compared them with what he has delivered and found him wanting the other day in an editorial printed on Sunday, August 17, 1980. I think it is an excellent summary of campaign promises made, but not kept. The voters should certainly keep this in mind next fall. The editorial follows:

VOTERS ARE STILL WAITING ON CARTER TO DELIVER ON HIS PROMISES OF 1976

President Carter would have us believe that we must either return him to office for another four years in November or watch our nation move to the brink of economic chaos and international conflict. The choice is that simple, he says, between his candidacy and that of the Republican Party standard bearer.

Unfortunately for Mr. Carter, such rhetoric doesn't cut the mustard, not anymore. They are just meaningless words shot full of holes by Mr. Carter's miserable track record of the last three and a half years. Lest we forget, four years ago he promised the nation peace and prosperity. Four years ago he promised to return government to the people, to eliminate much of the bureaucracy that dictates our lives and to balance the budget. Four years ago he vowed to bring under control the cancer of inflation.

Four years ago he painted himself as America's saviour who has his hand on the pulse of the people—a man not infected by or influenced by the self-serving and special interest politics of Washington.

It is difficult for us to forget these promises because we're still waiting for Mr. Carter to deliver.

If there is peace in the world, Mr. Carter must have coined a new definition of the word. If there is prosperity he must be excluding the millions on food stamps, those who swell the welfare rolls, and the growing number of unemployed who are trying to retain what little pride they have left. The working people watched the purchasing power of their earnings diminish. Housing prices skyrocketed and finally the home building industry ground to a halt. Our giant automotive and steel industries posted record losses and record layoffs.

All of this under the administration of Mr. Carter, who promised us peace and prosperity.

Moreover, government still has control of our lives, contrary to what Mr. Carter promised. Business and industry grinds to a halt under the weight of federal regulations. Just as he did while serving as governor of Georgia, Mr. Carter's idea of reducing the size of government is to eliminate small agencies and create new cabinet-level monsters. That's like swapping mosquitoes for rats.

Mr. Carter juggled figures and projected record revenues to have us believe, at one time, that the federal budget would be balanced. He even tried to slip in a new tax on gasoline in the process. But, when the truth came out the administration had to hide—tuck its tail between its legs in the wake of another projected deficit.

Through all this—the undelivered promises and the dismal failure of Mr. Carter's administration—inflation remains an unwanted member of every home.

And now Mr. Carter talks with pride about the accomplishments of his Democratic administration. He asks the people to return him to office for another four years and tell us we cannot accept the alternative of voting for his opponent.

But, if Mr. Carter thinks the people are fooled by his rhetoric he had better think again. When a person can't accomplish at least a portion of his major goals with a Congress dominated by members of his own party, then he's a failure as a president. ●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DO NOT WEAKEN GUN LAWS

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, earlier this summer the House Judiciary Committee overwhelmingly rejected an amendment to the criminal code bill which would have drastically weakened existing Federal laws on firearms. There is currently underway a massive lobbying campaign to reverse this result when the bill comes to the floor. I strongly urge my colleagues to uphold the committee's action and reject the amendment again, not only because the amendment is bad policy but also because it has no place in legislation recodifying criminal law.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD for the information of the House an editorial on this subject which appeared in the Washington Post of Wednesday, September 3.

The editorial follows:

GUNRUNNERS' SNEAK ATTACK

It's been a busy summer for the master gun-worshippers of the National Rifle Association—whose troops have been all over Capitol Hill; methodically whipping up an ugly legislative surprise for all who believe in reasonable controls on handgun traffic. The NRA threat this year is double-barreled: If unchecked, it would mean (1) the end of almost all existing federal regulations of guns and (2) a go-ahead for handgun purchases by certain convicted felons and for free-wheeling interstate traffic in all sorts of pistols, machine guns and other firearms that can hardly be considered as sporting equipment.

Besides the old pistol-packers' game of loading key politicians' pockets with campaign contributions, this round of gun-lobby efforts includes sneak attacks to undo votes just taken in Congress that have gone against the NRA. Thanks to cooler heads in the House and Senate committees that traditionally consider gun-control legislation, the gun lobby's initial efforts were voted down. But now the NRA, having disguised its free-for-all gun proposal as a "Federal Firearms Reform Bill," seeks to slip its proposals into law in the form of an amendment to the Criminal Code Bill. In the House, where a committee voted 22 to 5 against the effort to repeal gun controls, a variation may be tried.

Whatever the camouflage, people shouldn't be fooled by this destructive legislative attempt to repeal the reasonable, minimum gun controls that do exist. The 1968 Gun Control Act, which the NRA would repeal, was enacted after the assassinations of Robert F. Kennedy and the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to put some basic safety rules on the books: licensing of gun dealers, bans against certain types of weapons such as machine guns, prohibitions against sales to out-of-state residents and against gun trafficking by convicted felons.

None of this has, or would, disarm the sportsman. National polls have shown time and again that a solid majority of Americans support federal handgun controls to place some responsibility on handgun ownership and handgun commerce. If thoughtful legislators respect this desire, and if they stop listening to a narrow special-inter-

September 5, 1980

est lobby, the scant controls now on the books can be preserved. ●

THE NINTH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, the residents of the Ninth Congressional District of Michigan have returned thousands of congressional questionnaires to me, and the results have been tabulated in the last few weeks. I would like to take this opportunity to share the results with my colleagues.

Of particular interest to me were the very strong opinions held on national defense issues, with 87 percent of the respondents agreeing that the United States should be prepared to defend our vital interests in the Persian Gulf region but only 6 percent saying that they are satisfied that the U.S. military is sufficiently strong. It was also interesting to note that only 21 percent said they approved of President Carter's handling of the Iranian hostage situation, and only 38 percent felt the President responded appropriately to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

Inflation remains the No. 1 issue to most Ninth District residents who responded to the annual questionnaire survey I sent in June, with 41 percent listing it as the most serious issue facing the Nation. Few, 18 percent, said they are optimistic that they will be better off economically 1 year from now than they are today, indicating to me a very low degree of confidence in the handling of the economy.

Another indication of the low esteem now held for our leaders was exhibited by the response to the general question asked on the single most serious problem facing our Nation. After inflation, most people, 31 percent, listed "Government leadership" as the Nation's most serious problem.

While energy was not listed as one of the greatest problems facing the Nation—only 7 percent listed it as such—there was evidence of concern over energy supplies; 83 percent favored the relaxation of some air pollution standards to permit more coal to be burned, and 73 percent favored the continued development of nuclear power; 59 percent said they favored Federal restrictions on the use of automobiles in the event of a gasoline shortage.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to the many newspapers throughout the Ninth District which assisted me by printing the 1980 congressional questionnaire to insure that every district resident would have the opportunity to participate.

The complete results of the 1980 questionnaire are:

ANNUAL NINTH DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE
RESULTS IN PERCENT

1. Do you approve of President Carter's handling of the Iranian hostage situation? yes, 21; no, 78.
2. Do you feel President Carter responded appropriately to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan? yes, 38; no, 62.
3. Do you agree that the United States must be prepared to "defend" vital interests in the Persian Gulf region? yes, 87; no, 13.
4. Are you satisfied that the U.S. military is sufficiently strong? yes, 6; no, 94.
5. Should the Federal budget be balanced even if it means slowing the growth of Federal support in areas such as health, education and other social programs? yes, 81; no, 19.
6. Do you feel that Federal tax cuts will help fight inflation? yes, 49; no, 51.
7. Are you optimistic that you will be better off economically one year from now than you are today? yes, 18; no, 82.
8. Would you favor the relaxation of air pollution standards to permit more coal to be burned? yes, 83; no, 17.
9. Do you favor the continued development of nuclear generated power to meet our energy needs? yes, 73; no, 27.
10. In the event of a gasoline shortage, should the Federal Government impose restrictions on the use of individuals' automobiles? yes, 59; no, 41.
11. Do you favor limitations on commercial fishing by Indians in the Great Lakes? yes, 84; no, 16.
12. Should state and local governments assume greater responsibility for programs and services now provided by the Federal Government? yes, 85; no, 15.

What do you consider is our Nation's most serious problem?

Inflation—41; taxes—6; national defense—9; energy—7; unemployment—6; Government leadership—31.●

TOOTHLESS WATCHDOGS OF
THE FEC

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1980

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, four more discrepancies in the continuing FEC coverups of the west coast, gulf coast, Potomac scandal involving Carey Peck and Donald Stewart.

The material follows:

DISCREPANCY: DENNIS CLAIMS HE GAVE \$11,000 "IN CASH" TO STEWART; STEWART DENIES YET BANK RECORDS NEVER CHECKED BY FEC TO VERIFY STEWART'S DENIAL

On June 20, 1979, the F.E.C. General Counsel Oldaker sent James Dennis a letter through his lawyer, Stephen Salter. (Get this: Salter and his partner Groenendyke are major donors to Stewart—\$2000.00—and presumably function as his lawyers behind the scenes. Conflict?), which stated in part:

"A summary of the evidence is as follows . . . (4) Mr. James H. Dennis, Sr., made contributions equaling \$11,000 in cash to the Friends of Donald Stewart in violation of 2 U.S.C. § 441(g) and 11 C.F.R. § 110.4 (c)(1)." A similar statement was included in a June 20, 1979 letter to the Stewart campaign. Both June 20, 1979 letters contained the following sentence: "Under the Act, you have an opportunity to demonstrate that no action should be taken against you."

This ludicrous statement of the F.E.C. Office of General Counsel was made in light of a prior June 4 Dennis affidavit which stated: "I utilized corporate funds of Dennis Mining Supply and Equipment, Inc., an Alabama Corporation, (a "dummy corporation" according to an investigative reporter who has been working on this case for months) to acquire the cashier's checks used to make all contributions to the campaigns of both Honorable Donald Stewart and Carey Peck."

What evidence for the cash contribution to Stewart the O.G.C. is referring to in item No. (4) does not appear in the F.E.C. MUR 970 or in the files. Nor does anybody associated with Stewart "demonstrate" that no cash was given. John W. (Jack) Vardaman, Counsel for Senator Stewart in a July 2, 1979 hand delivered letter to F.E.C. General Counsel William Oldaker, simply denies that any Dennis contributions were made in cash. (Is this the beginning day of the internal cover up?)

The Dennis affidavit of July 16, 1979 is silent about cash contributions. Nowhere in the above cited affidavit does Dennis deny the original allegation referred to the F.E.C. by the Justice Department, and repeated by General Counsel Oldaker in two letters sent out to the principals regarding the \$11,000 cash contribution Dennis allegedly made to Stewart. How did the \$11,000 cash contribution first arise except from a principal in the matter? Maybe U.S. Attorney J. R. Brooks was the first to learn this.

Since the original referral came from this Alabama Justice Department prosecutor, Mr. "J. R." Brooks (whose continuance in that job is at the sufferance of the Senator from Alabama, who was named as possibly receiving \$11,000 in illegal cash contributions from corporate funds) it stands to reason that Brooks has in his possession substantive evidence in order to forward to the Federal Election Commission in Washington, D.C.

"The ravings of a tea leaf reader" would hardly cause a U.S. District Attorney to forward evidence to the F.E.C., involving in effect the employer of that U.S. District Attorney, and yet the F.E.C. does not check the records of the First National Bank of Birmingham to verify, even as Dennis had frankly advised, whether Stewart received all of the \$23,150 from Dennis in the form of cashier's checks, mostly sequentially numbered. All this is what we get from an agency (F.E.C.) that was created because of Watergate! Tragic . . .

DISCREPANCY: FEC COMPOSES LETTER TO PECK WHICH WAS NEVER SENT TO HIM. WHY?

One of the 13 illegal Alabama "Phantom" contributions is listed by Carey Peck as having been given by a Robbie Chancey of 2106 Starlake Drive, Birmingham, Alabama and transmitted by C. Mike Chancey (F.E.C. Report for 10-24 through 11-27-78).

James Dennis laughingly told Congressman Dornan, while the Congressman interrogated him in the Warden's Conference Room at the Taladega Federal Prison in Alabama on April 30, 1980, that Robbie Chancey was 4 years old at the time of the 1978 election. "The Congressman can have fun with that one," Dennis told the FBI agent. Additionally, no cashier's check made out in Robbie Chancey's name was among those submitted by James Dennis in his July 4, 1979, contact with the F.E.C. There is a check from Mike Chancey, #1083646, dated November 14, 1978. (The day before the "defeat party" at Gregory Peck's house and Chasen's.) This apparently is the check which Carey Peck lists as coming from

Robbie Chancey, then four years old. The F.E.C. has possessed a customer's copy of this check since June 7, 1979!

Did the F.E.C. believe that Robbie Chancey gave the money or that C. Mike Chancey gave the money or that Mike Chancey gave the money. The Office of General Counsel apparently believed that the contribution to Peck came from all three at various times. Did this bother Peck or the O.G.C., William Oldaker, at the F.E.C.? Apparently not. Let's look at the following facts:

In the letter which the O.G.C. prepared on August 9, 1979 for Peck, Mike Chancey is listed as a contributor of \$1000 on November 24, 1978. Yet the Mike Chancey check is dated November 14, 1978. The only place that the date of November 24, 1978 shows up in any F.E.C. file is on Carey Peck's form for the period of 10-24-78 through 11-27-78. Yet, in finding the date for that particular contribution, the person (?) who prepared the letter from General Counsel Oldaker's signature, would also have had to see that Carey Peck listed the contribution as coming from Robbie Chancey, "transmitted by" C. Mike Chancey (whatever the hell that means). So, although the F.E.C.'s "pretend letter" disputes on its face the Peck claim about the name of the donor, the F.E.C. General Counsel just let this discrepancy slide under the covers.

In fact, this F.E.C. official omitted two points from the "Peck report form" for inclusion on the proposed F.E.C. letter to Carey Peck: (1) Robbie Chancey was the contributor listed by Peck! and (2) the initial "C" was omitted by the F.E.C. from "C" Mike Chancey's name. This covered Peck's acceptance of TWO Mike Chancey \$1000 checks.

Was this done by the F.E.C. because of the Office of General Counsel's policy that "Carey Peck hadn't done anything which even appeared to violate the law" which would be contradicted by an F.E.C. letter to Peck, which itself listed contributions from both a Charles Mike Chancey and a "C" Mike Chancey both of the same address? The answer is probably, Yes.

Yet, when the O.G.C. sent out a proposed conciliation agreement to Dennis, the "Mike Chancey" contribution was changed back to "Robbie Chancey."

In short, the O.G.C. saw a First National Bank of Birmingham check made out to "Carey Peck for Congress" apparently purchased by a Mike Chancey, but which Carey Peck's F.E.C. forms listed as having come from Robbie Chancey as transmitted by "C" Mike Chancey and couldn't have cared less.

None of this, as witnessed by the F.E.C. MUR 970, apparently bothered the O.G.C. then under William Oldaker or now under Charles Steele.

DISCREPANCY: FEC TAKES NO ACTION AGAINST PECK BECAUSE NO COMPLAINT WAS FILED

According to an A.P. news story by Reporter Jay Perkins dated in April of 1980, F.E.C. spokesman Fred Eiland claimed that the F.E.C. took no action on Dennis' contributions to Peck because there was never a complaint filed about the scandal.

Yet, F.E.C. law, 2 U.S.C. 437 g(a)(2) states that the F.E.C. shall notify any candidate of a suspected violation and shall investigate such violation on the basis of information ascertained "in the normal course of carrying out its supervisory responsibilities" after

four members of the F.E.C. agree that there is reason to believe a violation has occurred.

DISCREPANCY: THE FEC, OGC SEEMS TO PROTECT YOUNG CAREY PECK AT ALL COSTS IN VIOLATION OF THEIR OWN LAW

In the lengthy period since the Dennis contributions to Senator Stewart and Carey Peck first came to the attention of the F.E.C. and its O.G.C., there is not so much as a letter to be found in the F.E.C. files which the O.G.C. had actually sent to Carey Peck.

This O.G.C. policy is in conflict with what then F.E.C. Chairman Tiernan told Congressman Carroll Campbell, Jr., and others at an April 25, 1980 House Administration hearing:

Congressman CAMPBELL. All right. For instance, say I was running and I got a contribution from six or seven different people and later found out that the money had been given to six or seven different people by John Doe, and they sent it in. Under the circumstance, I would be directed to refund that money, or what?

Mr. TIERNAN. Well, if you were to find out about it, you know, a situation like that, and you on your own initiative returned those contributions to the individuals, the Commission certainly would take that—that is the primary purpose of the Act, and the function of the Commission, to see that there is voluntary compliance with the Act, and (but) if in fact we found out about it, we would notify the candidate or the treasurer of that candidate's committee that we have reason to believe that there was a prohibited contribution, and then proceed on that basis.

On June 20, 1979, the O.G.C. sent letters out to two of the principals in this case (1) James Stewart, Treasurer, Friends of Donald Stewart, and (2) Stephen Salter, lawyer for James Dennis, about the illegal contributions to Stewart and Carey Peck (MUR 970).

No letter was ever sent to Carey Peck by the O.G.C. even though at this time the O.G.C. had received 8 customer's copies of the 13 sequentially numbered cashier's checks which Dennis had given to Carey Peck's campaign coffers. An investigative windfall—the remainder of the customers copies were burned, says Dennis. Arson has been charged in Alabama and by the Intel executives. Additionally, James Dennis had submitted an affidavit signed June 3, 1979 along with the customer's copies of the 8 cashier's checks which stated in part:

"I utilized corporate funds of Dennis Mining Supply and Equipment Inc., an Alabama corporation, (To do what? No one knows.) to acquire the cashier's checks to make all contributions to the campaigns of both Hon. Donald Stewart and Mr. Carey Peck." (MUR 970).

Even though Dennis would be charged with violating the F.E.C. Act regarding the prohibitions on corporate contributions, the F.E.C. never—repeat, never—notified Carey Peck on this account. Unbelievable.

The copies of checks given to Peck with affidavit admissions were sent by Dennis' lawyer on June 4, 1979 directly to William Clyde Oldaker, General Counsel, F.E.C. They stamped in to the F.E.C. as received on June 7, 1979 (MUR 970).

Former Chairman Tiernan's words before Congress, and General Counsel Oldaker's action in the Dennis/Peck, Sr./Peck, Jr./Stewart scandal do not square.

However, other letters from the F.E.C. during the same time period, regarding so-called minor, very minor surface violations of the Peck campaign were sent to the Peck

treasurer. One "surface" violation involved an \$8,000 contribution which was later returned! The other involved a \$1,000 contribution from K. B. Tabatabay Development (a corporation?). Peck later told the F.E.C. that the \$1,000 Tabatabay contribution was K. R. Tabatabay—wholly owned. This two word explanation apparently satisfied the F.E.C. reviewers, even though a corporation could be wholly owned by one person and still be not allowed to make political contributions by law.

Another point to note is that in that Oldaker letter of June 20, 1979, to James Stewart (brother), treasurer of "Friends of Donald Stewart," he states in part:

"Under the Act, you have an opportunity to demonstrate that no action should be taken against you. Please submit any factual or legal materials which you believe are related to the Commission's analysis of the matter."

In the public records of the matter (MUR 970) nowhere does Stewart or his agents demonstrate that they did not accept cash. In a July 2, 1979 letter from Stewart's lawyer, Jack Vardaman to William Oldaker, we find Mr. Vardaman stating in part, "(3) In the course of a thorough investigation by our Committee, Mr. Dennis admitted that he contributed \$33,000 to the Committee in the names of other people. None of the contributions were made in cash." (MUR 970).

A clear demonstration that Stewart had not received \$23,150 from Dennis, \$11,000 of which was indicated to have been in cash, would be copies of all the cashier's checks. Interestingly enough, Dennis in a July 16, 1979 affidavit suggested that the F.E.C. "go to the First National Bank of Birmingham" to get actual cancelled cashier's checks. If the F.E.C. did go to the bank where Dennis says he purchased the checks, MUR 970 does not reflect this.

Did Senator Stewart or his lawyer, Jack Vardaman, show the F.E.C. xerox copies of the 23 checks from Dennis? Most campaigns copy every large check. Some campaigns like Congressman Dornan's copy every, repeat every, check. MUR 970 does have a hand delivered letter from Jack Vardaman dated Wednesday, August 1, 1979, regarding a prior phone conversation with Hal Ponder, office of the General Counsel and a personal meeting scheduled for Friday, August 3, 1979. Did Mr. Ponder see the checks? The public record is silent. However, from the letter's content and lack of reference to the \$11,000 cash contributions, it does not appear that the \$11,000 illegal cash contributions were to be discussed.

On August 16, 1979, General Counsel Oldaker sent Mr. Vardaman a letter regarding certain Commission determinations which said in part that "the \$22,000 in contributions made in the name of another by James Dennis to 'Friends of Donald Stewart' was not made in cash."

How did Oldaker know either tentatively or conclusively (the standard used by O.G.C.'s first memo, dated May 31, 1979, regarding the contributions to Peck) that all of the Dennis money to Stewart was in the form of cashier's checks? Did he, or Hal Ponder, or any other member of the O.G.C. staff see copies of all of the cashier's checks made out to Stewart? Did they total up to \$23,150? This is the only way that Stewart could "demonstrate" (Oldaker's words to Stewart's campaign) that he had received 23 (\$23,000) or 24 (the extra \$150) cashier's checks, and not a grab bag \$23,150 of which \$11,000 was in cash.

If O.G.C. saw the 23 or 24 cashier's checks, why are they not in the public record of MUR 970? Could it be the F.E.C. did ask the First National Bank of Birmingham

for records? Why doesn't a reporter or the F.B.I. ask lawyer Ed Ashton of the First National Bank of Birmingham if the F.E.C. ever asked for copies of the checks, or if another legal body (a grand jury) has ever asked for copies of the checks? If this was done, why is there no reference to this logical procedure in the files? Mr. Ashton told Congressman Dornan that all Dennis checks were subpoenaed in the spring of 1979. By whom?

Could it be that anyone who saw the checks in sequential order would have been naturally suspicious of the source of the monies but that the O.G.C. didn't want to expose this?

Reporter Tim Nagler of the Montgomery Advertiser, Alabama, wrote two editorials critical of the F.E.C.'s handling of the Peck/Dennis/Stewart affair. He told Bob Marshall of Dornan's staff that he (Nagler) had sent his two critical editorials to the F.E.C. and that they were sent by registered mail, return receipt requested.

Even without copies of the checks, Nagler and other Alabama reporters "smelled a rat" in the Stewart contributions. Nagler pointed out the obvious. Nagler also told Marshall that the F.E.C. gave him a "rough run-around." Stewart's campaign disclosure forms showed that 10 maximum \$1000 donors all came from the same post office box in tiny Sumiton, Alabama. If Nagler and others in Alabama who are only peripherally familiar with F.E.C. forms can see that 10 individuals who make maximum contributions to Senator Stewart would not obviously not have the same post office box as an address, why didn't Stewart and/or the O.G.C. of the F.E.C. also see that something was "rotten in the state of Alabama"? Perhaps they did; but if so, a sophisticated cover up would have been under way if the F.E.C./O.G.C. had failed to vigorously investigate.

F.E.C. reviewers and the Office of General Counsel cannot plead ignorance in this matter. Why? Because the "Friends of Donald Stewart" filed a complaint regarding campaign monies spent on behalf of their general election opponent, Mr. Jim Martin. (See MUR 820)

At the time this complaint was filed (November 3, 1978) 2 U.S.C. 437g(a)(3) required that F.E.C. officials audit the opposing campaign. The complaint was sent by James Stewart, treasurer, "Friends of Donald Stewart," to the Office of General Counsel. Why wasn't the O.G.C. suspicious when they routinely reviewed Stewart's forms in connection with the complaint about Martin and obviously saw 10 maximum donors all listed as receiving mail at Drawer S, Sumiton, Alabama?

Additionally, in a May 9, 1979, Birmingham Post Herald article, the Stewart campaign told the press that they had sent registered letters to all of the alleged illegal contributors and included a copy of the "money order or cashier's checks" of those individuals.

Yet, when James Stewart sent a letter to the F.E.C. about their "thorough investigation" he is silent about sending copies of the cashier's checks? Why didn't "good citizen Stewart" send the F.E.C. those valuable copies of the cashier's checks? Another question: how did Stewart receive all of those Dennis contributions (2 dozen)? By mail? By good ol' Federal Express? By a lackey? In person? ●